UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 93—PART 4

APRIL 30, 1947, TO MAY 20, 1947
(PAGES 4251 TO 5560)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEC 11 '47

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, who dost love the whole world, save us from despair and fear as we ponder the little progress of the conference just concluded across the seas. Help us to see that there is gain in our statement of faith while others voice their fears, and that nothing is lost when our convictions and principles are expressed boldly and honestly in the midst of intrigue and suspicion. Keep us ever resolute in striving for the things for which so many of our men gave their lives in battle. Let us not throw away their sacrifice.

Since we seek unity and harmony in the world and in our own land, help us to achieve it in this place. If we, Thy servants, who pray together, who speak the same language, who share the same basic ideals, cannot work as a team, what hope have we that the leaders of other nations, with different languages, who do not pray together, whose ideals are so different, can achieve agreement? Help us, a hundred men, to find the secret of agreement, that we may show it to our own Nation, and lead it into teamwork between management and labor, between every group and faction, that our Nation may be one.

As we express our own ideas and listen to the ideas of those who differ with us, may we be humble enough to think about the third idea—Thine—and be persuaded by Thy Holy Spirit to embrace it, and thus discover the secret of harmony.

In the name of Jesus Christ, who was always right. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1947.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES P. KEM, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KEM thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 29, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Public Works Committee be allowed to sit this morning for the purpose of holding hearings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Buildings and Rents of the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet tomorrow between 11 and 12 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments of the Committee on Appropriations may hold a final hearing this afternoon on the Treasury-Post Office bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit Senate bill 1126 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions.

The clerk will read the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into yesterday, April 29.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, April 30, 1947, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with certain instructions the pending bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, and that the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said motion, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending motion has been so fully presented that we want only 15 or 20 minutes or perhaps half an hour after 12 o'clock. In the meantime, I wish to make a statement on another matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that only the opposition to the motion will be permitted to discuss it?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. The time is divided equally between the Senator from Oregon and myself. In our time, we will need only about half an hour after 12 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not observe such an agreement in the announcement from the Chair, and I may want a few minutes.

THE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the passage of the Interior Department appropriation bill by the House of Representatives has been made the occasion of an attack in the West on the Republican Party, representing that party as opposed to reclamation. As a matter of fact, the reverse is the truth. The bill makes large provision for a reclamation program, and the Republican Party intends to proceed with that program as rapidly as consistent with the other obligations of the Federal Government.

The truth is that the administration, and its departments, are opposed to all attempts to economize in the expenditures of the Federal Government. Whenever any reduction is made in the sums recommended by the President, it is at once charged that it destroys some important activity of the Federal Government. Yet, when all these cuts have been made, the departments will still have more money than before the war, and only excess activities and excess employees will be eliminated.

As to reclamation, the bill passed by the House provides $60,000,000 of new funds for reclamation, besides the carryover of $85,000,000, making a total available of $145,000,000, more than has ever been spent in a single year for reclamation.

The Republican Party is the party of reclamation. The program of reclamation and irrigation projects was instituted by the Republicans in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, and the party has supported the program ever since. We believe we have a greater appreciation of its significance and of the needs of the western areas than those who have administered the programs since 1933.

It was a major plank in our platform of 1944, and as chairman of the resolutions committee in the Republican convention I supported the following platform plank, which was adopted:

> We favor a comprehensive program of reclamation projects for our arid and semiarid States, with recognition and full protection of the rights and interests of those States in the use and control of water for present and future irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

Every Republican Member of the Senate was elected on that program, and we fully intend to carry it out.

I have stated that the bill as passed by the House does contain an extensive program of reclamation. If any projects of importance have been omitted, they will be given complete consideration by the Senate committee. Furthermore, consideration will be given to increased funds for preparation of plans to the end that projects may be available as soon as more funds can be found.

I myself come from a State in which there are no such projects, but I subscribe 100 percent to the proposition that the United States is one country and cannot be really prosperous unless all sections are prosperous. The whole country benefits directly and indirectly from the development of the West. In that development today, nothing is more important than the reclamation and irrigation projects with the incidental power. Not only does it make the country capable of supporting a larger population; not only does it increase the income of the people of the West and of the entire Nation, but it also makes possible the development of industries in the West which in turn contribute to the national wealth and prosperity.

It is quite true that all expenditures of the Federal Government today must be reconciled with the necessity for reducing the tremendous burden of Federal expenditure, debt and taxation. It is true that so long as we feel compelled to spend billions of dollars on foreign countries and maintain our armed forces at a point beyond the necessities of peace, we cannot expand with any lavish hand the services to our own people. It is also true that this is not a peculiarly propitious time for the expansion of our public works program. Costs are very high and the activities of private industry are making use of the entire labor supply and most of the materials. The question of spending for reclamation, therefore, is a question of degree. We should not move too rapidly, except where the matter is one of urgency. But certainly there should be no greater holdback on western projects than on other public works throughout the United States. In fact, since these projects are self-supporting, there is reason to be more generous in this field. Few people realize that every cent invested in a reclamation project is paid back out of water revenues from those who use the land reclaimed.

I repeat that the bill passed by the House makes possible the largest reclamation program we have had in any year, and that particular projects of an urgent nature will be given further consideration.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I should like to say a few words on the subject which has been discussed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The Republican Party which inaugurated the reclamation program, back in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, will continue it on whatever expanded basis the needs of the West require. It has always done that; it always will. Our reclamation program has always been a vital part of the steady development of American industry, as beneficial to the East, in its long-run aspects, as it is to the West in its immediate results. We Republicans inaugurated it; we have been committed to it for many years; we still are committed to it. We will translate party pledges into action.

The Senator from Ohio told the Senate that the Interior Department appropriations bill, as passed by the House, is an infinitely more generous bill than its critics realize or state, more generous, indeed, than any fund provided by the New Deal in all the years of its existence. That is true; far truer, no doubt, than many Senators realize. I am for economy and we can have economy without interfering with positive and orderly progress of this program.

Let us go to the record. The Interior Department, for reclamation, irrigation and incidental power development projects, has on hand a huge unexpended balance. It rarely has, in all its years, been able to spend all, in a single year, that Congress has appropriated for reclamation purposes. But this year, because of President Truman's freeze order of August 1946, greatly restricting the Department's public-works expenditures for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, it now has $85,826,767, in unexpended funds available for reclamation purposes.

In his order, the President specifically requested "that expenditures for construction projects of the Bureau of Reclamation be limited to $85,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1947 and 1948." Note carefully that Mr. Truman specifically included year 1948, for which we are now called upon to make appropriations. Now, to be precise, there is, in an unexpended balance, a total of $85,826,767 available for reclamation projects. The President recommended that the total appropriation be limited to $85,000,000.

The House Appropriations Committee provided $55,253,600 in new funds for reclamation construction work. When the bill was under consideration on the floor of the House an additional $5,175,000 was approved. This makes a total of $60,433,000 in new funds for reclamation projects. That sum alone, Mr. President, is greater than the Bureau of Reclamation was ever allotted in any prewar year of the New Deal, when widespread unemployment was a major problem.

But when we add the $60,433,000 in new funds to the $85,826,767, which the President froze, after twice liberalizing his economy order, once just before an election, we have a total of $146,260,367 for reclamation purposes in the fiscal year 1948. That is a very generous sum, far more generous than its critics realize or than was provided by the New Deal administration in any year of its existence; yet there are those who talk about cutting the heart out of reclamation.

Now, of course, $85,826,767 of that total amount is frozen by Presidential order, but the President can unfreeze it at his will. Indeed, steps already have been taken to unfreeze it, since a bill to require such unfreezing has been introduced in the House.

I have said that the Interior Department appropriations bill, as it stands today, on the eve of Senate committee hearings, provides much more generously for reclamation projects than the New Deal provided in any year of its lavish spending. For proof of that statement I refer to the yearly figures. In 1933 the Bureau of Reclamation was given $25,204,000 to spend. In 1934 it was given $24,000,000; in 1935, $40,000,000; in 1936, $49,000,000; in 1937, $52,000,000; in 1938, $65,000,000; in 1939, $79,000,000; in 1940, $96,000,000, which was the highest figure in any year of the New Deal; in 1941, $85,000,000; in 1942, $91,000,000; in 1943, $69,000,000; in 1944, $54,000,000; in 1945, $50,000,000; and in 1946, $64,000,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, through its subcommittee on the Interior Department, headed by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], will carefully investigate, I am sure, every proposed project before it. Every interested party will be given full opportunity to explain it, to present the need for it. If it can be shown, beyond any doubt, that there is a sound and vital need for spending the money it will be spent.

I have talked with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and I know that all interested persons and groups will be accorded a fair hearing by the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The remarks by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations are most pertinent and appropriate, but I should also like to have the RECORD show that the chairman of the committee has told me it is his desire that each one of the projects be given most careful consideration and that the subcommittee go into each of them in detail. The Senator from New Hampshire is just as anxious as any other Member of the Senate to see that full consideration is given to each of the requests for funds in connection with the different projects on the list. He is

wholeheartedly in sympathy with the desire of the subcommittee to look into the projects upon their merits. I assure the Senator the latitude extended to us by him is appreciated, that the subcommittee will keep faith with his desires, and that we will go into each and every one of the projects, determining what appropriations should be made, upon the merits of each project as it comes before us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I to understand that this is a declaration of sympathy, or a declaration of action?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield——

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that it is a declaration of action. I feel sure the Senator will agree that the Senator from Nebraska, last year, gave the reclamation program action when it came to the matter of appropriations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to acknowledge the service which the Senator from Nebraska performed last year in support of reclamation. I am forced to say, however——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the distinguished Senator will suspend for a moment, the chair would like to say that, as he understands, the Senate is proceeding under a consent agreement.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct; and I do not wish to give any more time to the Senator from New Hampshire than it takes for him to complete his statement, because there is another statement to be made.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to know against whose time the remarks by the Senator from Wyoming should be charged?

Mr. TAFT. It should be charged against my time. I should have formally requested time for the Senator from New Hampshire, but that time has about expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state the inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it to be understood, then, that a subject of this great importance to the entire West and to the United States as a whole, for that matter, may be raised upon the floor, by consent of the chairman of the Republican conference, with no opportunity given to any other Senator to make comment upon the matter?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at this time it happens that those opposed to the pending motion do not desire the full hour accorded for debate, and I have allotted certain time to others who wish to speak on reclamation. After 1 o'clock there will be no time limit. At present, I have reserved half an hour for debate on the motion itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TAFT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Ohio is parceling out the time for debate on the problem of reclamation and Interior Department appropriations, may I ask him whether or not he will be willing to allot me some of his time, which he is so generously distributing, upon that subject?

Mr. TAFT. I am very sorry, but I have no such time to yield now. I have promised the entire hour that I have at my disposal. I regret that the Senator will have to wait until 1 o'clock, after the vote, when there will be ample time to discuss the question. In the meantime the Senator will have an opportunity to read what I said, which opportunity he has not as yet had. I should be glad to have the comments of the Senator on my statement, which was read before the Senator came in.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Ohio has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall take but one more minute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, one more parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state his inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I to understand, then, that this is a new procedure which is introduced in the Senate, by which one side of a question, and only one, may be presented at any time, and according to the pleasure of the chairman of the Republican conference?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Wyoming has not made a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senate is now operating under a usual and customary unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say, Mr. President, it is a very extraordinary and unusual procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we must continue with our program. My position, as expressed here today, is in line with my belief in and desire for economy in governmental expenditures, but, at the same time, I do not want such legitimate economy to interfere with a constructive program of reclamation, for no work, no industry which is essential to the development and economy of the West can be curtailed without affecting the economy of the Nation as a whole, because the economy of the West or the economy of the East in the end is the economy of the entire Nation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am much interested in the statements which have been made by the distinguished chairman of the majority steering committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], regarding reclamation in the West and appropriations for reclamation.

It is encouraging to know, and it will be particularly encouraging to the people of the West to know, that these distinguished Senators, occupying such important positions in the United States Senate, today understand the great problem of reclamation and are determined to see that it is not only continued, but, if and when the opportunity and necessity arrive, funds will be provided to see that the far-reaching surveys of areas subject to reclamation and irrigation which are part of the great over-all plan will receive proper attention and that money will be supplied for the orderly carrying out of these projects. This is as it should be, for, after all, it was President Theodore Roosevelt who was responsible for reclamation, and it was during his term of office as President in 1902 that the first Reclamation Act was passed. Theodore Roosevelt knew the West. He spent a great deal of time there. He knew that this great arid, semiarid, and semidesert area of the United States needed only one thing to make it bloom, to make it one of the garden spots of the country, and that was water.

The West is the country of the small businessman, the country of the individual businessman, of the independent operator. The West feels that big business, big labor, and big government are not in the interests of the West or the Nation as a whole.

The West is disturbed at the big Government that has developed, particularly in the last decade. It seems that during the last 15 years the thought of those in positions of authority in the Government departments or bureaus has been to build more and greater bureaus, departments, and divisions of Government. I think perhaps one illustration will show the Senate clearly how this empire building progresses.

In 1934 the Taylor Grazing Act was passed. This was an act to lease the Government-controlled grazing lands in the Western States. In setting up the personnel necessary to operate this grazing service the then Secretary of Interior, Mr. Ickes, said he had no intention of the organization becoming a bureau or that any large sum should be spent for management, but that it would be a small office in his own Department, and it was just that, but not for long.

It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the Senate stating how each year this small group was enlarged and greater appropriations were asked for, until finally Mr. Ickes himself had it made a Bureau with a Bureau head and all that goes with a Bureau, and appropriations up to one-million-seven-hundred-thousand-odd dollars were asked for it. It actually received for 1 year's operation $1,100,000 and there was an ever-increasing demand. That is a small

but definite example of Government empire building.

Mr. President, I have here a schedule of appropriations for the operation of the Taylor Grazing Act from 1936 to 1947. In 1936 the appropriation was $250,000. In 1946 the appropriation, for the same services, had reached $1,121,470. I ask that this schedule for the years 1936 to 1947 be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Taylor Grazing Act and appropriations

(Passed 1934)

Fiscal year:	*Salaries and operating expenses*
1936	$250,000
1937	400,000
1938	550,000
1939	660,000
1940	750,000
1941	750,000
1942	800,000
1943	839,300
1944	978,700
1945	1,047,740
1946	1,121,470
1947	550,000
Total	8,687,210

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this steady enlargement no doubt has gone on to some extent in the Bureau of Reclamation just as it has in other Bureaus, and it is right and proper that the Congress should scrutinize the appeal for appropriation of this and other departments and bureaus, and go over them with a fine-tooth comb to eliminate all the unnecessary functions and confine the spending of the people's money to those projects or operations which will show a national business development of this great western area, covering one-third of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to assure the Senator from Wyoming, as I have already assured the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that our subcommittee will carefully scrutinize such appeals. I thank the distinguished Senator for calling the matter to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and also for the intense interest he has always shown in the reclamation program and projects, not only for his own State, but throughout the West.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I am distressed at the lack of knowledge of the people of the East and of people of the eastern part of the Middle West, and in fact of many from the South, as to the conditions in the West. By the West, I mean the vast arid and semiarid area of the west central United States. This includes the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and the eastern half of Washington, Oregon, and Californa. These States are frequently called, or I should say miscalled, "the public land States." I do not agree with that name. However, that is another story on which I intend to address the Senate at some later date.

I repeat, I am distressed at the general lack of knowledge and widespread misconceptions about conditions in the West, and particularly about reclamation. It is disturbing, not alone from the westerners' western point of view, but from the much larger point of view of the Nation as a whole. The West is an integral part of the United States. The population of the West is increasing. In proportion to its population, the West contributes to the United States its full share in war and peace.

There are no finer people in the United States—yes, in the world—than stout-hearted westerners who must continuously battle the elements, the adversities of nature, and worst of all, the damaging ignorance of those who have no understanding of their mission or their needs.

Comparatively few people of the country know anything about the terrain, the climate, the crops, or the inhabitants of this vast area of mountains and plains which covers one-third of the entire United States. The common conception of the West is based upon Hollywood "horse operas," romantic fiction, and childhood folklore.

I could cite figures to show that the Western States are leading producers of copper and many other mineral ores upon which the entire Nation depends; that the West is the meat producing center of the Nation; that its petroleum products are a significant portion of the country's total output; that most of the great rivers of our Nation rise in the high mountains of the West; that it produces agricultural crops which are many and varied, and serves as an unfailing market for great quantities of industrial products, the raw materials of which have their origin there.

But what I want to discuss today is not what the West now has, but what it needs. The potentialities of the West are legion, but they are linked closely with the development of its natural resources, chief of which is water.

The only feasible method of developing and utilizing that resource is through the reclamation program, whereby the West obtains refundable loans to finance initial construction of dams, reservoirs, and power plants.

Interrupted by the war at a time when the long-range program was just coming into full development in an orderly schedule of construction, the reclamation program in the Western States was to have been resumed as soon as the exigencies of total war permitted. The fighting has ended, and most production is rapidly returning to normal.

Reclamation, and with it irrigation, contributes more to national economic stability than almost any other single factor.

Thousands of veterans are seeking the opportunity of a new life—a home and income and a valuable stake in the expansion of the West and in the country they fought for.

Reclamation is an economy move. How great an economy few realize, but surely when we realize that every cent of all construction costs for reclamation projects is paid back in cash to the Federal Government by the settlers themselves on the various projects, there can be no doubt as to the economic value of this great development of the arid and semiarid areas of the country.

I want to convey to the Senate today, if possible, how this long-range program affects the West—how water is more precious than gold, and how honestly and honorably the pioneering settlers on these virgin lands have met their obligations to their Government in paying off these reclamation appropriations or loans, for these are in fact loans. To emphasize this point I think every reclamation appropriation in the appropriation bill should be placed in a separate category and marked "refundable appropriations."

This matter of appropriations for reclamation is of such vast importance, not only to the West but to the entire United States, that I ask Members of the Senate to bear with me for a few minutes while I explain in more detail how these refundable appropriations are used, the benefits that result, and how the money appropriated is refunded in cash to the United States Treasury.

I feel that the best way to do this is to take one of the projects with which I am familiar and describe how it began, how it operates, and what it means to the community, the State, and the Nation.

The example I have in mind is the Shoshone project in northwestern Wyoming—one of the earlier projects in the country but typical of all such undertakings. I take this example because I have seen it grow, almost from its inception, and I am familiar with its record and problems, as are most of the residents of the area, because it constitutes the very life blood of an agricultural economy in the Shoshone Valley.

From the jagged cliffs and canyons of the mountains ringing the eastern border of Yellowstone Park pour the roaring waters of thousands of small streams which combine to form the two forks of the Shoshone River. These two forks converge about 10 miles above the town of Cody, at a point where the stream plunges into a narrow canyon approximately 8 miles long. The precipitous granite walls of this canyon formed a natural site for a dam, and in 1907 the Bureau of Reclamation started construction on what was then the highest dam in the world, 328 feet high and 200 feet wide at the top.

Today it is dwarfed by half a dozen others of greater size, but it is still a splendid addition to the natural scenic beauty of the area, and an engineering masterpiece. Not only has the wishbone-shaped reservoir, holding 456,600 acre-feet of water, converted thousands of acres of sagebrush prairie into fertile and productive farm lands, but hydroelectric power from a power plant at the base of the dam serves the entire area with low-cost electricity. When full, the reservoir is about 10 miles long and 5 miles wide, providing a fine recreational area as well as stopping the roaring torrents of water which each year had worn down the river course along the valley to a point where it was impossible to raise

the water to adjacent lands for irrigation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can yield only 5 minutes more to the Senator, retaining 20 minutes for debate on the motion.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Over a period of years three irrigation districts were developed on the project—No. 1, the Garland division, No. 2, the Frannie division, and No. 3, the Willwood division. A fourth, the Heart Mountain division, is in process of being opened to homesteading, and already nearly 100 veterans of World War II have availed themselves of their priorty to establish a home and business. The Heart Mountain division can and will be expanded to allow many additional families to settle there. Over 500 veterans made application for the first units, and many more have expressed interest in the next opening.

A fifth division, Oregon Basin, is still in the planning state. The water is there, and the main ditch is partly constructed. Let us see that the final planning work on this division is provided with funds now to enable the Bureau to start the actual blueprints for construction of the necessary irrigation works.

In 1912 the floodgates of the dam were closed and the reservoir was allowed to fill up. An unusually heavy run-off, as the result of deep snow in the higher mountains and spring rains, filled the reservoir to the spillway level by August. Each year since that time the reservoir fills to overflowing by late May or early June. The town of Cody has started an annual guessing contest in which purchasers of tickets guess the date and time on which water will flow over the spillway. This contest, though highly profitable to the winners and the charitable organizations it supports, is symbolic of the meaning of this great project to the entire community. When the reservoir is full the farmers know that their crops are secure and the quiet, clear waters of the North Fork and South Fork of the Shoshone River stored in the reservoir are like money in the bank to all the enterprises which depend upon this life-giving gift of nature.

This dam and reservoir are named for William F. Cody, "Buffalo Bill," founder of the town of Cody and one of the early settlers of the region, who was instrumental in arranging for the project. I am proud to have been the sponsor of the bill introduced last year and enacted into law to change the name from Shoshone to Buffalo Bill Dam and Reservoir. "Buffalo Bill" voluntarily relinquished his water rights on the land in order that the project could be started.

Today—40 years after this farsighted project was undertaken—the four highly productive districts under cultivation on the project are eloquent testimony of the soundness of planning behind this development. What was wasteland now has become a veritable garden spot—an oasis in the desert. Through all the disturbing fluctuations in our economy—world war, depressions, drought, and crop infestation—this project maintained a fine record of repayment. The operating costs and water-use charges are being met as they come due.

In the center of the Shoshone project the Bureau of Reclamation located its headquarters for the operation, and a townsite was laid out which is today the thriving community of Powell, with a population of well over 3,000. It is the very heart of the community, consisting of sound businesses, providing goods and services for the thousands of settlers, employees, and other residents of the project. Growing up with the project, Powell has been able to keep abreast of the needs of its people by steady development of its schools, churches, civic and social and veterans' organizations, and its many business activities. A branch of the State university has recently been established in Powell, and enrollment is mounting steadily.

Through the consolidation of schools and the utilization of modern busses, a central school system has been provided which brings to hundreds of rural children the advantages of large-city schools, with adequate teachers, splendid recreational facilities, and economical administration.

It is in such localities that the school hot-lunch program is of great benefit. Many of the youngsters come long distances to school and would otherwise have to eat a dry, cold lunch packed at home.

Here is a town that might well serve as a model for any American community. There is a fine water system, and low-cost electricity is provided by the reclamation project.

Thoughtful planning of wide streets, parks, and playgrounds makes the town a pleasant place to live. There are none of the slums and other undesirable sections found in many industrial centers.

There is no problem of juvenile delinquency. The irrigated farm home is a cooperative enterprise, with each member of the family making his or her contribution to the all-out effort to make the land productive. There is a satisfaction in such hard work, for the rewards are more than material. When the crops are all in and the root cellars are bulging with stored fruits and vegetables, the neighbors gather at the county fair in Powell to compare the fruits of their labor. Competing in friendly rivalry for valuable prizes, they exchange ideas, relax for awhile, and reflect upon the goodness of nature.

Adjacent to the town is a spur railroad, and beside it the grain and bean elevators and warehouses where the local merchants buy from the farmers and store the farm produce for processing and shipment. From a few miles away the tractor fuel and other petroleum products necessary for farming are brought from refineries at Cody. Nearby also are many sawmills, producing low-cost timbers and lumber so essential to farming and building. Natural gas is available from the same oil fields which produce the petroleum products; also coal is mined on a small scale.

These are the components of the town which form the heart of the project, but they are typical of the other small towns which are the trading centers for other divisions of the project—such towns as Frannie, Ralston, Garland, and Deaver. The last-mentioned town is located on the main line of the Burlington Railroad, within a few miles of the other sections served by the spur line. Here a prisoner-of-war camp was operated during the war, using old barracks formerly occupied by a Civilian Conservation Corps group engaged in supplemental reclamation and drainage work during the depression years of the thirties.

After the Frannie and Garland divisions had been in operation for a number of years, the Willwood division was opened, with homesteaders entering the project between 1927-38. This division, like the others, will bear its proportionate share of the total construction costs. As is the custom, the division is operating on a water-rental basis pending establishment of a definite repayment schedule.

Like the other projects, this land was until a few years ago only used for limited grazing, and because of extremely arid conditions, most of it was only of limited use for that purpose. From my knowledge of land values I would say that without water it was not worth 50 cents an acre, and it would take at least 50 acres to carry a cow 1 year with the natural forage upon it. Today this irrigated land is worth from $50 to $150 an acre, and it is very difficult to buy any land on the project.

An idea of the relative value of irrigated and nonirrigated land in the arid sections of the West can be gained from the findings of two Bureau of Reclamation land surveys conducted in the Columbia River Basin. The first survey was designed to find out the per-acre value of lands potentially irrigable, but without any water at present. The survey showed that owners valued their arid lands at $2 to $25 per acre. A second survey, made to determine the value of irrigated lands which might have to be sold under excess land provisions, revealed that the owners valued these lands at between $150 and $400 an acre.

Now that the Heart Mountain division has been opened for settlement, by veterans of World War II, the Shoshone project is becoming a compact economic unit, with a variety of crops and enterprises which form a valuable supplement to the other ranching and industrial enterprises of the region. The power line from the project has been linked with other reclamation projects in the State, and with a supplemental power plant now under construction will provide an adequate power supply wherever electricity is required. Rural electrification cooperatives and some private concerns have extended distribution lines from the bus bars at the power station to bring electricity to hundreds of rural homes formerly unlighted except by kerosene lamps or other primitive means.

I have attempted in the past few minutes to give a general description of how the various phases of such a project are interrelated, and how they form a logical complement to the natural resources of the West. I hope I have illustrated the absolute necessity for adequate refundable appropriation from Federal funds for financing such construction.

Another example worthy of mention is the Tieton division of the Yakima reclamation project in the State of Washington. It, too, started out as vacant, sagebrush land. Recently there was a celebration of the Tieton water users to mark full repayment of the Government appropriations made for the project construction costs. In less than 30 years the entire Federal expenditure was paid back, dollar for dollar. But the returns to the Federal Treasury from the project were far greater. The cost was $3,584,027, which amount was repaid, but in addition the same people, that is, the settlers on the project, paid more than $13,000,000 in Federal income taxes during the period. There are estimates which show that the income-tax payments on the other similar projects are equally as impressive, and that construction costs are being paid back four times over in income taxes in addition to the actual refunding in cash of the original appropriation.

Since the beginning of reclamation, $352,400,000 has been spent in completing irrigation units. Not only has a portion of that amount been repaid, with the balance to be paid back in an orderly schedule over a period of years, but in addition, Federal income taxes from lands watered by these completed units and from cities entirely encompassed and surrounded by them has amounted to $900,000,000 in income to the Federal Treasury. While the Congress was appropriating this $350,000,000, it also appropriated $4,162,153,571 for flood control and inland waterways projects, in various States, without a single cent of it being required in repayment. In other words, this $4,000,000,000 plus is not, and cannot, and will not, be paid back.

Last spring, as many Senators will recall, the Senate, in less than half an hour approved projects for rivers and harbors and flood control in the amount of $1,800,000,000. It took less than half an hour to approve this amount. Not one penny of this $1,800,000,000 will be returned to the Treasury.

A moment ago I mentioned some $4,000,000,000 in nonrepayable contributions that had been made to various States of the Union. The major portion of this comes under rivers and harbors and flood control. I may point out that one State has received an amount in excess of $360,000,000. The amounts range from that figure downward to two States—Wyoming and Utah—neither of which has ever received one dollar in nonrepayable contributions of this type. I point out these figures simply to show the scope of this false economy. Had one-half of the money expended in these nonrepayable contributions been appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation, the entire reclamation program for the United States could be completed and every penny of the original appropriation would be returned to the United States Treasury, plus approximately four times that amount in increased revenue to the Treasury from Federal income taxes.

I may also remind the Senate that the cash value of crops produced on the 62 reclamation projects operating in the West during 1946 totaled $502,000,000—a figure equal to about half the Federal Government's total expenditures for reclamation in 45 years.

Let us not be so short-sighted as to imagine that this development can be put off from year to year and then suddenly be pushed to completion in a moment of need or a period of magnanimous generosity of the Congress. These very resources now crying for development and utilization are being wasted—lost forever—by just such delays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to extend to the Senator from Wyoming 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The repayment contracts providing for annual payments on construction charges are written and executed in accord with the laws that govern that particular project or unit, and contain various types of repayment plans covering different periods of time.

The Shoshone project, for example, has one repayment plan in effect for two divisions, and another for a third. The Garland and Frannie divisions are making repayment under the act of December 5, 1924, Forty-third Statutes, 672, which provided for a plan of payment based on 5 percent of the average gross crop value in a district for a 10-year period. These payments, as a general rule, will run for a long term of years. Authority for this type of contract was repealed in 1926.

The Willwood division is organized under the act of August 13, 1941, Thirty-eighth Statutes, 686. As the lands were opened for reclamation homesteading, the entry men pledged themselves to pay a certain construction charge per acre in 20 graduated annual installments upon completion of the division, or to assist in organizing an irrigation district, which would assume the obligation to pay the entire cost of construction in 40 years. The Willwood irrigation district was formed in 1943, and a repayment contract is being prepared to arrange for the repayment of the $1,355,738 in construction costs allocated to the division as its share of the project total.

The original Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, Thirty-second Statutes, 388, authorized the issuance of water-right applications by which individual water users contracted to repay their portion of the construction cost of a project in a period of 10 years. The repayment period under this law was prohibitive for many projects, so subsequent acts were passed to extend the repayment period and liberalize contract terms, but each new law specified that all construction costs had to be repaid.

The act of February 21, 1911, Thirty-sixth Statutes, 925, commonly known as the Warren Act, provided for the disposition of surplus water to individuals or irrigation enterprises outside Government reclamation projects, on terms determined to be just and equitable. The terms of payment now usually run from 10 to 40 years.

When the Omnibus Adjustment Act of May 25, 1926, Forty-fourth Statutes, 636, was passed, authorizing a 40-year repayment period in place of the crop-repayment plan, most subsequent projects were organized under this act. Some old contracts were renegotiated under this act.

Flexibility in determining the annual rate of repayment for new contracts is provided in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, Fifty-third Statutes, 1187, again on a crop-income basis, but total repayment must be made in 40 years for distribution systems. A development period of not to exceed 10 years may be established, from the time water is delivered, before payment of construction charges commences. During this development period water users pay for water on a rental basis.

That the water users are meeting their obligations is clear from the current repayment figures. A total of $76,645,081 had become due on June 30, 1946, and $74,443,243 of this amount, or 97.1 percent, had been paid. In the 6 months following the end of the fiscal year an additional $395,430 was paid, raising the total to 97.6 percent.

I referred a moment ago to the Tieton division, Yakima project, Washington, as having been one of the first to pay out. In addition payment has been made in full for two dams, the Laguna Dam, Yuma project, Arizona-California, and Jackson Lake Dam in Wyoming, Minidoka project, Idaho. The total obligation to the United States for these two dams and the Tieton division was $5,549,063. There are 80 contracts refunded in full, most of them having been made under the Warren Act of 1911. Several hundred individual water-right applicants have also completed construction payments.

Fourteen projects are 50 percent paid out and 38 districts or groups will be paid out between now and 1967. The total amount of contracted construction obligation on these projects is $47,147,916. The total refundable amount due and paid to June 30, 1946, is $32,879,895, making these projects 69.7 paid out. From 1948 to 1952 five of these projects will pay out. As of June 30, 1946, they are 94.5 percent complete in their payments.

During the 4-year period 1953-57 six projects will pay out. These projects are 90.4 percent paid.

During the period of 1958 to 1962, 12 projects will pay out. They are now 60.5 percent paid.

During the period of 1963 to 1967, 15 projects will pay out. They are now 60.1 percent completed. The following projects or units are 50 percent paid out: Yuma, reservation and Bard divisions; Minidoka, Gravity division; North Platte, storage division; Yuma, auxiliary; Yakima, Sunnyside division; Yuma, valley division; Minidoka, south side division; Minidoka, American Falls Reservoir; Klamath, main division; Newlands; Salt River; Sun River, Fort Shaw division; Strawberry Valley; Rio Grande.

The total contracted obligation of these projects is $58,623,526.

Among the other projects now paying out and in good financial condition are: Baker; Boise, Black Canyon Dam; Boise, Notus division; Burnt River; Deschutes,

central Oregon irrigation district; Fruitgrowers Dam; Grand Valley, Gravity; Grand Valley, Orchard Mesa irrigation district; Humboldt; Huntley; Klamath, Langell Valley division; Klamath, main division; Lower Yellowstone; Minidoka, American Falls Dam; Minidoka, Gooding division; Minidoka, south side division; Minidoka, Upper Snake River; Moon Lake; Newlands; North Platte, Fort Laramie division; Ogden River; Owyhee, Owyhee Ditch Co.; Rio Grande; Salt River; Shoshone, Garland division; Strawberry Valley; Sun River, Fort Shaw division; Sun River, Greenfields division; Truckee storage; Umatilla, Stanfield irrigation district; Riverton; Weber River; Yakima, Kittitas reclamation district; Yakima, Roza-Terrace Heights irrigation district; Yakima, storage division; Yuma, Mesa division.

The total contracted obligation of these projects which are current in their payments to the United States amounts to $126,374,741.

Mr. President, I have tried to show the Senate the great value of these reclamation projects in the semiarid and arid areas of the West, but more than that I have tried to show the Senate how every dollar appropriated for reclamation projects is returned to the Federal Treasury by the settlers on those projects. The West is immensely proud of its record of repayment. They do not ask or seek charity—they do not intend to do so in the future. All they are asking is that a portion of the money collected from them in taxes be loaned to them so that they can continue their development. I do not know of a sounder business proposition than the refundable reclamation loan, for that is what a reclamation appropriation is. I feel that it is important, and I have so suggested to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the Interior Department's appropriations that refundable appropriations should be separated from other appropriations so that when the House and the Senate consider these loans they will realize that they are loaning funds which will be returned in cash in full to the United States Treasury.

I am sure that when the Senate Appropriations Committee considers these reclamation refundable appropriations, they will do so with a knowledge that here is one of the greatest investments that the United States has ever made.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I learned of these irrigation and reclamation projects largely from the Senator from Wyoming. I want to thank him for what he has said, and to commend him for the support he has given to these developments. It is not alone an expenditure of Government funds that is involved, but also wealth-creating resources, for the money expended will all be recaptured many times over, I understand from the remarks of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. Not only will the money be recaptured, but the initial cost of construction of dams, ditches, and irrigation works will be repaid by the settlers on the projects.

Mr. BRICKER. Many people of the Central West from which I come do not fully appreciate the creative value of these expenditures; and I want to express my appreciation to the Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I wish to concur in the remarks made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I was very much impressed with what the Senator had to say concerning the value to the country as a whole of these projects. The Senator from Ohio spoke of the Central West. In the East there is not a sufficient appreciation of the great value which these projects add to the whole country, and especially to us, I might say. I wish to commend the Senator for the presentation which he is making.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I also want to commend the junior Senator from Wyoming on his remarks regarding this vital subject now before Congress. I recently returned from a trip to Spokane where I was a speaker at the national convention of REA cooperatives. I found a feeling of dismay in the Pacific Northwest because of the cuts made by the House in reclamation appropriations. If the Senate of the United States really knew the feeling of the people of the West toward reclamation, I would have no fear about the appropriations now before the Senate. The great new wealth these projects make possible in the West together with this record of repayment to the United States Treasury surely should cause this Senate to act favorably on the pending reclamation appropriation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the speeches this morning in support of reclamation are music to my ears. I fully expect the Republican leadership of the Senate to give ample support to our great western projects. The only way we can implement these speeches will be to appropriate the necessary funds so that these projects can be completed in the shortest possible time in order to have the great wealth which will flow from them turn itself into tax dollars, which always accumulate when wealth is created.

I am now very happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from the far western State of Washington desires to express his keen appreciation for the reclamation and power observations and statements of fact just offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], together with the other Senators who have spoken briefly.

It has recently been stated from public platforms in the West, particularly in the State of Washington, that Eastern States and interests are conspiring to retard and injure the progress and development of the West. It has been further claimed that the Republican Party is disinclined to encourage and provide for western reclamation projects and power generation. I have considered these public utterances of false prophets to be malicious, totally untrue, and viciously inspired. No portion of my experience in this body has given me any reason to be suspicious or doubtful of the motives of my eastern colleagues, nor have I any possible cause to doubt the intention and the desire of the Republican Party, of which I am an enthusiastic and happy member, to create new avenues and fields of opportunity for all Americans.

It is good to be in this Chamber and to hear Senators who are not westerners talk about what the progress of the West means to the future of the East and to the United States in its entirety. I think their spoken contributions make good, hard, American common sense. They have defined the need for national cooperation and unity of purpose. It will not be easy to achiev what we have in mind for the development of Western States, but no western Senator or Representative can ask for more than an opportunity to be heard by sympathetic colleagues.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I could not help but rise when my colleague from the State of Washington referred to the East, and particularly to New England, which, of course, is a part of the East. Back in the old days it used to be a tradition in Connecticut that the farmers put the noses of the sheep and cattle to the grindstone to sharpen them so that they could get down and eat the grass which grew between the rocks in our section of the country. I want to say to the Senator from Washington—he has been kind enough to allude to it, so that I may say it in all sincerity—that the people of the East are aware of the problems of the West. We are immediately interested in them, and we believe that these self-liquidating projects are worthy subjects of attention and appropriations at the hands of the Congress.

I may say, too, that we are interested, in the first place, because, from our past history, we know the hardships of farming, although in the West it is conducted on an entirely different basis and scale. We are also interested in the appropriation and use of money for a project which eventually will return the money to the people or to the lender with interest. That, too, is something that pleases any New Englander.

So I wish to thank the Senators from the West—the junior Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Wyoming—for their discussion of this

all-important subject. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Wyoming that I am quite sure not a great number of the people of my State understand these reclamation projects; so I am glad he has made his splendid address on the subject, and I hope our folks back home will read it. I shall do my best to see to it that they do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as one of the representatives of a great western State, I am particularly happy this morning to find so many of the Senators on the other side of the aisle come to the defense of reclamation. It needs it, Mr. President, if the record which has been made in the other branch of Congress and the record which has been made in the Senate are to be regarded as a basis on which to form a judgment.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has correctly called attention to the fact that the reclamation law was sponsored by the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Unfortunately, however, under the administration of succeeding Republican Presidents, reclamation in the West fell into disregard at the hands of the administration in Washington. I can speak from experience, because I can paint the picture of the record in the projects which were built in the State of Wyoming itself. The great Shoshone project, to which my colleague has so correctly referred this morning, was initiated in the early days of the Theodore Roosevelt program. In the case of another project, known as the North Platte, the upper fringe of it, so to speak, was in the State of Wyoming; and it and the Riverton project were initiated in the early days of the program. But thereafter the waters of Wyoming were permitted to flow into the surrounding States; and under the Republican Presidents who succeeded Mr. Roosevelt, nothing was done to reclaim those lands. My predecessor, the late Senator Kendrick, labored diligently throughout the administrations of Presidents Harding and Coolidge to secure an appropriation for the construction of the Casper-Alcova project, a project which now bears his name. No Republican administration would support such an expenditure. His requests were denied as often as they were made; and it was not until the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt began that he was able to secure the authorization and the construction of that great project in the center of my State.

Mr. President, the truth of the matter is that the golden era of reclamation began when the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt began.

In the appropriation bill which has been acted upon by the House of Representatives, we have clear evidence of the intention to stop the expansion of reclamation. That evidence can be based upon several specific facts. First of all, the bill as reported by the House committee reduced to $125,000 the President's recommendation of $5,000,000 for the investigation of future projects. It is perfectly obvious that with only $125,000 for the purpose of pursuing investigations for the development of future reclamation projects, it will be absolutely impossible to initiate the great projects in the West which must be initiated if the water resources of the West are to be utilized. The great Colorado River, on which four great upper basin States are dependent, cannot be developed unless funds are expended in the preparation of new projects; and unless that is done, we shall be compelled to see those waters flow by our doors down into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. President, another point which I should like to make is with respect to the misuse of figures which have been presented in the House committee report. We are told—and I have noticed that the statement has been given out to the press of the country—that there is a tremendous sum of money available for construction in 1948 as a result of the action of the House of Representatives upon the appropriation bill. We are told that there was a carry-over of $88,895,108 as a result of the freeze order of the President. So it is said, in defense of what has been done, "Why, we are only doing what the President did." But, Mr. President, of the $88,000,000 which is an unexpended carry-over, more than $33,000,000 has already been obligated for construction work already performed, so it is not available for work in 1948. Furthermore, more than $7,000,000 of that sum has been set aside for work on drainage in 1948, not upon the construction of any project.

The fact of the matter is that when the carry-over, unexpended and unobligated, which is $44,741,000, is added to the appropriation of $55,000,000 allowed in the committee report, there is a total of $99,900,000 for construction work in the fiscal year 1948, instead of one-hundred-and-forty-four-million-one-hundred-odd-thousand dollars, as reported by the committee.

But that is not the whole story, Mr. President. I am happy that western Senators on the Republican side of the aisle now are endeavoring to call the attention of their colleagues to the necessity of standing behind those of us who are working for the development of the West; but I wish to show the Senate today that the report which came from the House committee will eventually destroy the reclamation fund, and that it was intended by those who reported that bill to reduce the amount of money which would be available in the future for the development of reclamation.

Under the original act of 1902, the reclamation fund was a revolving fund derived from the proceeds of the sale of public lands. The sale of public lands in the early days produced annually rather large sums of money. Sometimes those sales amounted to $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 in a fiscal year. But as the West was settled, the receipts from the sale of public lands gradually fell off, until in recent years, for the past 20 years, the average has been scarcely $100,000 a year. So the reclamation fund was not sufficient to permit the construction of the projects which would develop the great western resources which must be developed if we are to provide homes for returning veterans and if we are to provide the electric power which will develop the mineral resources of the West.

So back in 1920 Congress passed the General Leasing Act. I am happy to give credit to my predecessor in the Senate, the late Senator John B. Kendrick, for the inclusion in that law of a provision to the effect that 52½ percent of all the royalties derived from the leasing of the public domain should go into the reclamation fund, to build up the great reclamation projects; that 32½ percent should go to the States in which oil and other minerals were developed, in lieu of taxation upon the projects, for the purpose of building roads and maintaining schools; that 10 percent should go into the Treasury of the United States for administration.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is now presiding over the Senate, was one of those who participated in the early development of the oil lands of Wyoming under the Mineral Leasing Act, and he has very complete knowledge about the subject I am discussing.

Under the leasing act there has been paid into the reclamation fund, from the passage of the act to the 30th of June 1946, the cumulative amount of $86,793,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to grant the Senator more time, but I do not have the time to yield to him. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to continue his remarks after 1 o'clock.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unfortunately, I have arranged to take a train at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. How much time would the Senator desire?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator let me have 3 minutes more?

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call attention to the report which the House committee submitted. There was no criticism of this report by any member of the committee. No minority views were submitted upon the part of any Republican Member of the House. If Senators wonder why the Republican Party is being subjected to some attack in the West, I shall explain it. The reason is clear upon the record. Not a single Republican Member of the House of Representatives from east of the Mississippi River voted to sustain the motion to recommit the bill, not one.

Mr. President, that is not the only fact in this connection. When the appropriation bill was before the Senate last year, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, demanded a roll call, and the reasons why he demanded a roll call are set forth in these words which he used on the 20th of June 1946:

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with this particular bill we have just wit-

nessed a very sorry spectacle. The bill is the worst money grab the Senate has enacted for a long time. The House passed a bill cutting down the budget estimates, and making appropriations of $179,426,846. We have restored probably $155,000,000 or more. We have deliberately taken a slap at private enterprise and at economy. We have moved toward the socialization of the electrical industry all along the line. I should like to see a yea-and-nay vote on the bill. Let us put Senators on record.

Mr. President, that is one of the reasons why the feeling is now abroad in the West that the Republican leadership is opposed to the development of reclamation. I hope it is not true, and I welcome the showing which has been made upon the floor here today; but I say, Mr. President, that it will be necessary for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to make the record clear by action, and not by fair words, that it is not opposed.

Mr. President, the report of the House committee to which I have referred proposes to take away all general fund appropriations. Listen to the language:

> One important change proposed in the bill is in the method of appropriating for projects heretofore financed with appropriations from the general fund. The bill provides that such projects shall be financed with appropriations from the reclamation fund. This practice is in accordance with the basic reclamation plan which contemplated that all reclamation expenditures should be financed from this special fund derived from the sale of oil, timber, and other products located primarily in the Western States. It is hoped that in the very near future a way can be found to finance all such projects from this fund.

The appropriation for the Geological Survey, a Bureau in the Department of the Interior which administers the leasing of oil lands on the public domain, has been cut from $18,104,900 to $9,113,230. That is a slash of $8,991,670 in one of the most productive bureaus of the entire Government. This is the Bureau which facilitates the drilling for oil upon the public domain. It is being obliged to curtail its services, and at this moment, as I understand, more than 100 employees have already been given notice that their services must be terminated. This notice has been given because under the law the Bureau cannot risk incurring a deficit for the payment of their terminal leave and their annual leave. So, as a result of short-sighted action, we are losing the services of experts in the Bureau which produces the revenue to support the Reclamation Service.

Mr. President, this is not only a western question, it is a national question, because only upon the public domain is it now possible to find any substantial new sources of petroleum. We must stimulate the search for oil in the public-land States if we are to maintain our supply of this most necessary fuel.

This is an item to which, when the committee assembles, I shall invite the attention of all members of the committee without regard to party label. I am hopeful, from the signs given here upon the floor of the Senate this morning, that the Senate will do this year what it did last year, and provide the funds necessary to maintain the essential public services of the Department of the Interior.

Of great importance to the whole Nation is another cut made in the House, a reduction of the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines from $16,834,000 to $10,983,000, a reduction of almost $6,000,000. This is the Bureau which was instructed by the last Congress to undertake the work of developing new sources of mineral supplies not only in the West, but wherever new sources of minerals might be found within the United States. This was done because we drew so heavily upon our mineral deposits during the war that unless we take steps now to replenish the supply we will find ourselves, in case of another crisis, dependent upon foreign sources of supply. Yet the House committee which had charge of the bill was acting on the theory that the Bureau of Mines should be reduced to a shell of itself. I quote from page 24 of the report, under the heading "Metallurgical research and pilot plants":

> The activities being carried on under this item consist of investigations and laboratory tests in connection with the most effective utilization of the mineral resources of the United States and was initiated as a part of the war program. The committee does not believe that the program should be regarded as a permanent activity, and it will review the results of the investigations with a view to eliminating such projects as cannot justify their continuation.

On page 23 of the report the committee points with pride to the fact that it has reduced the appropriation for the development of synthetic liquid fuels from $5,000,000, as recommended by President Truman, to $3,000,000. Here again is a reduction which has been made in complete disregard of the national interest.

Oil, Mr. President, is not only the fuel of war, it is the fuel of industry. As I pointed out a year ago in reporting to the Senate the bill approved by the Committee on Public Lands, and later enacted into law, to stimulate the search for oil on the public domain, the center of gravity of oil production has changed from the United States to the Eastern Hemisphere. The United States is no longer the world's greatest reservoir of oil. So it is essential that we shall take every possible step to make liquid fuel from our huge deposits of coal and our huge deposits of oil shale. This is work upon which the Bureau of Mines is engaged. But the House committee has cut the appropriation by two-fifths.

I could quote item after item in the report showing that a blind desire to reduce the appropriation has been carried out in complete disregard of the effect not only on the West, but the effect upon the entire country. The heaviest cuts have been directed against reclamation and public power, the two primary activities of the Department of the Interior which will create opportunity for new homes for veterans and new business for those who wish to engage in what we politely call "free private enterprise." But war is being waged against public power on every front. I have no hesitation in saying that if this war on public power is continued and the power activities of the Bureau are curtailed, the public interest in the West will suffer.

It is encouraging now to find Republican leadership in the Senate denying any purpose to carry on this war, and giving assurance that a full and free hearing will be accorded those who believe that the productive capital expenditures included in the President's budget should be substantially restored.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like very much to continue the discussion which has been proceeding during the past hour. I yield to no man a greater interest in reclamation and irrigation than I hold, and to no State are they of greater importance than to mine. I should like to take the time to continue the argument that was being made by the Senator from Wyoming. But, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has yielded me the time he has accorded, not for the purpose of discussing irrigation or reclamation, but for the purpose of resuming the discussion of the question which now pends before the Senate; that is, the motion of the Senator from Oregon to recommit the pending bill with certain instructions.

Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. I support it for many reasons, some of which I shall not be able to mention in the limited time I have. Nor shall I be able to discuss now, nor shall I attempt to discuss, the merits of the bill, or any of its demerits, or any of the amendments which have been proposed. I am interested in securing some labor legislation, and in that connection I think I may be pardoned if I mention my own record on labor legislation since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which considered the Smith-Connally bill. I supported that bill in the committee. I voted for it on the floor of the Senate. I voted and spoke in favor of overriding the President's veto.

I supported in the last session and voted for the Case bill. In the last session I moved in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to report the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill, and on my motion that bill was reported to the Senate. I made the motion in the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

In company with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and our then colleague, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, I anticipated, long before the end of the war, that with the end of the war would come labor disturbances and labor differences which would prevent and hinder reconstruction, so I thought that amendments to the labor laws were needed and that a comprehensive labor

bill should be enacted. Therefore, the three of us introduced a bill which was comprehensive in its nature, and far superior, in many respects, to the measure which is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I mention this merely to show that where I have seen that abuses or evils existed, I was willing to have legislation enacted to correct them, and my support of the pending motion can be in no sense construed as a move to prevent or hinder the enactment of proper legislation.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I supported every bit of legitimate legislation which was favorable to the cause of labor. I mention that only to show that in dealing with this subject I have always tried to keep a fair, open, unbiased and unprejudiced mind, and to vote as I believed to be best for the interests of the whole country, including both labor and management. My position this day is exactly the same.

I know full well, however, what would happen if we passed a bill such as the one now pending, as every other Member of this body knows, no matter on which side of the Chamber he may sit. There is no use deceiving ourselves at all about a difference existing between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch. It is well known by Senators that if certain provisions are included in the pending measure, it will inevitably evoke the presidental veto. Senators know full well that in the event of such veto it will not be overriden. What will the Senate do then? We shall have accomplished absolutely nothing. We shall have marched up the hill and then marched right back down again, just as has happened in the past; and the Eightieth Congress will end without any legislation whatever upon this subject.

I make that statement out of a sense of my own responsibility. I have conferred with no one. From my knowledge of existing conditions, I do not feel it necessary to do so. I know full well and I believe every other Senator agrees that if an omnibus bill is passed including provisions against which the President has already spoken he will feel bound to veto it.

The pending motion offers one way of securing legislation by permitting the reporting of separate bills to be considered separately and to be voted on separately. In that manner legislation will be obtained. How much legislation, I do not know; but whatever is done will represent a gain; some progress will have been made. If that is not done nothing will have been accomplished.

It has been said that Senators ought to confer with the President to obtain his views and to ascertain the type of legislation he would be willing to approve. There was legislation suggested, and if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which considered this bill, had been really in earnest about making progress, it could have taken the message delivered by the President to the joint session of the Congress and, regardless of other provisions which the committee wanted, it could have written a bill to include every one of the President's suggestions. There could have been a measure against secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and a measure covering other matters recommended to Congress by the President in his message. Had the committee really desired to cooperate with the President, a bill along such lines could have been reported, it could have been passed, and sent to the White House at the very beginning of the present session, and it would have been signed. All Senators favored legislation along those lines.

Mr. President, I urge upon Senators that it is not yet too late to take appropriate steps to enact necessary legislation on this subject. It is for that reason that I support the motion by the Senator from Oregon. Let the bill be recommitted; let separate measures be reported to the Senate; let the Senate pass such of the bills as it desires; let the House concur; and let them all be sent to the White House. Then, Mr. President, if there is responsibility, let it rest, not upon the legislative branch of Government but upon the executive branch. Should the President act unwisely in vetoing measures which ought to be signed it will then be his responsibility; and I feel sure he will be willing to carry it. Today the responsibility is ours, if we enact legislation that we know will be vetoed. We cannot foist the responsibility for that on to the President, if we do the very thing which we know will defeat the measure we seek to have enacted.

Those, Mr. President, are my reasons for supporting the motion. If the bill is recommitted, and later four bills are reported, so far as I know I shall vote for every one of them. If that procedure is followed, and the bills are vetoed, I shall vote to override the Presidential veto. But if the omnibus bill, together with pending amendments, is submitted to the Senate for final vote, feeling that it would be accomplishing nothing I shall vote against such a measure. If passed, and vetoed, I shall vote to sustain the Presidential veto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to take even these few minutes of the time of this body to discuss my attitude on the pending motion, but I have a deep conviction that agreement to the motion will allow the Senate a better opportunity to put first things first and to pass legislation which I think will be vitally important to the Nation, after June 30. It is for that reason that I speak briefly in support of the motion by the Senator from Oregon.

I call to the attention of Senators the fact that instead of having an agreed-upon, moderate bill, as reported by the committee, upon which we can pass, and which in a general way deals with all features of the troublesome labor problem—instead of having a bill that is reported, accompanied by a statement in the report that the committee worked together diligently on hearings for 5 weeks, and, in writing the bill, for 4 weeks, every member of the committee contributing vitally to the bill as reported, and the further statement that the sentiments and philosophy of the bill represent what the committee as a whole believed was the sound approach to this matter—instead of having such a bill as the recommendation of a committee, we now have amendments, very vital amendments, addressed to various parts of the bill; supported, if Senators please, by members of the committee, and even by the distinguished chairman; which is thoroughly within the rights of both members and chairman. But we do not have an omnibus bill coming here to be approved or disapproved, embodying the majority wisdom of the committee, after its hearings and after its combined efforts to draft such a bill.

Mr. President, in view of the situation as I have described it, and since there are many vital amendments, I think the Senate should go back to fundamentals and recognize the fact that there is a problem in this field, which I think every Senator will agree must be placed ahead of all other problems. That is whether or not, after June 30, the Nation is to have proper and vital legal machinery with which to deal with important disputes affecting the national welfare, in those industries treated under title II of the bill, or rather, under that part of the bill which has to do with national emergencies. When the Smith-Connally law ceases to exist by its terms, on June 30, the Nation expects the Senate, the House, and the President, working together, to have afforded machinery giving some promise of protection to the public. The public interest should be given first importance in the consideration of this matter. We ought to have a chance to deal with it as a matter of first importance. We do not have that chance under the pending bill, and it is for that reason that I am supporting the motion by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I want to make my position clear. I do not agree with what has been said here by Senators, to the effect that there is not a grave emergency in the field of labor-industry relations. I think there is grave difficulty throughout the Nation, and that we must deal with it effectively.

So far as I am concerned, I stand ready to support every provision of the bill as reported. I expect to do so. If, upon its passage, the bill should draw a Presidential veto, unless something occurs that is not now known to me, I should certainly expect, consistently to stand by my vote, by voting to pass the bill over the Presidential veto.

Mr. President, the matter is not so simple as that. We do not know what will be the effect of all the amendments. We do know that we are not being given a chance to pass upon the single vital question of whether or not there is to be passed emergency legislation giving some sort of machinery to the executive department, with which to handle the problems that will arise in vital industries after June 30.

I conclude by simply calling attention to one fact, that apparently there is no grave discord among Senators with respect to the provisions of title II of the pending bill.

If Senators will read carefully each of the amendments which have been proposed, and I think they comprise

some 8 or 10 amendments, they will find that not a single one of them amends any portion of title II of this bill. In other words, whether Senators agree or disagree with this part of the bill, there is no sniping at it, there is no great effort under way to change any of the provisions of title II. If we be given a chance to divide the measure it will not involve any great delay, because the motion to recommit the bill contains the instruction that it be divided into four parts and reported back by May 2. If the motion prevails we will have a chance to put first things first, and to enact some vital legislation.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that in the field of emergency legislation the President is on record, and so recommended to the last Congress, as favoring more drastic legislation than that which is now embraced in the provisions of title II.

I think we will be indeed recalcitrant if we overlook the fact that we have here in our hands the opportunity, by breaking the bill down into four parts, to put first things first, and to bring up for passage title II, which deals with situations which may be arising in the coal industry, in the steel industry, in the transportation industry other than railroads, in any of the other vital industries, and which will gravely threaten the economic peace and security of the entire Nation.

In closing I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that it is generally recognized by the rank and file of labor that labor itself is more hurt when shutdowns occur in vital industries than is any other single group of our citizens, because their work stops, their pay roll stops when their industries are unable to proceed because they cannot have transportation, or because they cannot secure steel, or because they cannot obtain coal, or because of the shortage and the failure and the shutdown in any of the comparatively few vital industries. So it is an absurd thing for us to try to put in one basket shoelaces and coal, because they are of such tremendously different importance to the people of the Nation and to every community of the Nation.

Mr. President, I hope the motion will prevail, so we may adopt a common sense method of dealing first with the emergency legislation and helping the President by giving him something through which he can protect the people of this Nation after June 30 of this year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we all agree that at the present time we are facing a delicate situation. We realize that the situation is delicate because there are probably many persons who will try to go farther than the President wants to go. We may as well face that fact. If we want any legislation, we must vote for the motion to recommit, because if labor legislation is enacted in the form of an omnibus bill, I predict that the President will veto it. I also believe that the greater the number of provisions placed in the bill the greater will be the number of votes in the Senate to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. President, I do not want to punish labor for the misdeeds of some labor leaders. I hope all Senators feel the same way. There are, however, certain practices which must be curbed, such as violations of agreements made by labor, but in curbing them we must not go too far by attaching amendments to the bill. If amendments to the omnibus bill are adopted, I believe it will be found, when the bill comes to passage, that many Members of this body will not want to vote for it, although it may contain many desirable provisions. It would be like putting rotten apples into a basket of good apples, with the inevitable result that the whole basket of apples would be ruined in a short time.

Mr. President, I also warn the Senate and the Nation that, if we now try to go too far in penalizing labor, we shall find a sharp reaction on the part of those who earn their living by the sweat of their brows. We shall find that they will rise up in opposition not only in a political way but also by refusing to work, and that, instead of benefits accruing from the passage of the legislation, it will kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Passage of such legislation will also do great injury to capital and to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, for that reason, and for many other reasons which, if time permitted, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, I shall vote to recommit the bill, hoping that it will be brought back as requested by the Senator from Oregon, not as one omnibus bill but at least as four bills, so that we can vote for the things we want and vote against the things we do not want. I believe that as Senators we have that right and privilege.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the other day, speaking on this subject, I indicated very strongly that the particular subject matters contained in the one omnibus bill should be divided into four bills as now proposed. I do not think there is any question that, in the consideration of this legislation, it should be considered in that manner.

However, in my remarks at that time I did not point out one or two other things. In the first place, in our efforts in the committee to work out a coordinated and integrated program of legislation we moved from among the various bills under consideration by us at that time those portions which belong under certain titles and certain sections amending certain acts and statutes as they now exist, into those titles and into those sections where they properly belong.

For instance, all matters presumably amending the Labor Relations Act were placed as amendments to that act, and not scattered around and placed also in other statutes. So again in dealing with the Mediation Service, and so in the consideration of the other matters of amendment. Consequently the bill before the Senate is a thoroughly coordinated and integrated piece of legislation. Every part is where it properly belongs. That is the first and most important matter of concern to us at this time.

From the standpoint of our consideration I again say it would be better to have four bills. There seems to be no argument about that. But the matter of consideration, it so happens, is not one for our determination alone. We ourselves must have regard for the position taken by the House. When this legislation is passed by the Senate, and I sincerely hope we shall pass legislation of a truly constructive nature, it will still contain some marked differences from the legislation already passed by the House. How we are going to get together with the House, operating as we would be with several bills if this motion should prevail, while the legislation passed by the House is in single omnibus form, is quite beyond my comprehension. What I fear in this instance is that, instead of obtaining legislation which we are really seeking as a result of the impasse arising, we might easily wind up with no legislation at all being passed and sent to the President by the Congress. That, Mr. President, to my way of thinking is even worse than sending legislation to the President and having it vetoed.

Our job, as I see it, is to pass constructive legislation. It is our job to work out a program, not only in one House or in the other House, but between the two Houses, so that out of this program we can have enacted legislation which is needed.

Insofar as the several parts of the bill are concerned, I reserve the right to object here and there where changes may be proposed. My attitude toward the substance of the measure has nothing to do with my position on the pending motion. This is a matter of tactics and strategy, decided in the first instance by the House of Representatives, and concurred in by the Senate conference of my own party. For these reasons I shall go along with the omnibus bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the proposal is to divide the bill into four bills. That certainly is completely contrary to the usual procedure of the Senate in matters of this kind; and the burden of proof is certainly on those who advocate dividing the bill into four parts.

In the first place, as the Senator in charge of the bill and as chairman of the committee, it seems to me that it is a very much shorter and simpler procedure to put one bill through the Senate than it would be to put four bills through the Senate. We have already seen a flood of oratory on this bill. Everything that has been said could be said all over again on bill number two. Everything that has been said could be said all over again on bill number three. In my opinion it would require a week longer to handle the subject in that manner than to handle it as one bill.

In the second place, the subjects embraced in the bill are all closely interrelated. They are not different subjects.

The bill is called an omnibus bill because all the provisions dealing with the subject are in one bill. However, the problems are all interrelated. As I stated the other day, they all have to do with collective-bargaining agreements

between employer and employee. That is the predominating subject in all the titles of the bill and throughout all the provisions of the bill.

Title I, in which we amend every section of the Wagner Act, is primarily devoted to the purpose of securing collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employee, and protecting the rights of employees to make such agreements.

What is the purpose of the mediation provision? The mediation title is for the purpose of setting up machinery to encourage and bring about collective bargaining agreements between the employer and the employee. The second part of that title provides that if mediation is not successful and a strike occurs in a Nation-wide industry, an injunction may be obtained for 60 days—for what purpose? In order to permit the Mediation Service to make further efforts to obtain a collective bargaining agreement between the employers and the employees. At the end of that time a vote is taken for the purpose of determining whether the employees want to make a collective bargaining agreement.

Finally, we have a provision in title III for bringing a lawsuit for breach of contract. Breach of what kind of contract? Breach of contract for collective bargaining.

Title IV establishes a commission to study all problems of labor relations. That title could be separated from the bill. It is more or less immaterial whether it is in the bill or not, but there is no objection to including it in the bill.

The major subjects with which we have dealt could be dealt with separately, or they could be dealt with in one title or another. Take the question of the closed shop. We could have a separate title on the closed shop, without mentioning the Wagner Act. It so happens that we have put it in the provisions dealing with the Wagner Act, because there is a proviso which has existed for a good many years. However, it has no direct relation to the Wagner Act, and it could be handled in an entirely separate bill. In fact, when the proposal was first made it was in a separate bill.

We could have handled the question of Nation-wide bargaining as the House handled it, as an entirely separate matter, making it a conspiracy under the Sherman Act to enter into Nation-wide bargaining. It could be handled as an amendment to the Sherman Act, something entirely different from the Wagner Act. Insofar as we propose to deal with it in title II, it is proposed to put it in the Wagner Act provision.

Take the case of the union filing reports. We could have a separate provision. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] introduced a separate bill requiring unions to file financial reports with their members and with the Secretary of Labor. The subject could be handled in a separate bill. We chose to put it in the Wagner Act provision, as a condition of certification.

The various subjects are inextricably mixed. There is no subject difference between the various provisions of the bill. The bill proposes to put the provisions regarding secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes in the Wagner Act. The amendment we shall offer proposes to make them separate. The House provided a separate remedy, outside the Wagner Act, against that type of strike.

These subjects are so intertwined that there would be constant debate. If we are to amend one bill by something that is in another bill in different form, we shall become so confused, if we handle the subject through four separate bills, that I think my estimate of an additional week required to handle the question in that manner is a very reasonable estimate.

There is no reason for it, except one, and that is a political reason. It is said that it is a political move to combine everything in a single bill. The political move is to separate the bill. The political move is to try to separate it so as to give the President the right to select among three or four different proposals and take one and not the other, although they are intimately related.

I cannot speculate as to what the President will veto and what he will not veto. I do not know how anyone can speculate. If we examine his veto message last year in respect to the Case bill, we find that he made five separate objections, which are just as much objections to the provisions of this bill. Some of them apply to title I, some to title II, and some to title III. I am very hopeful that the President has changed his position. I think he has changed his position. I believe that his experience with the coal strike and the difficulties which he has had has very much changed his attitude, and I very much hope that he will sign the bill as it is presented to him. However, I see no reason to suppose that he is more likely to make an objection to one title of the bill than to another.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] advises us that the President is likely to approve the Wagner Act section, and not the others. I would guess the other way. The provisions to which labor makes the most strenuous objections, it seems to me, are in title I. The President might approve title III, with the provision for mediation and the provision for a 60-day injunction, because it is very much like what he himself has done in the coal strike, and what he wanted to obtain in the bill which was presented last year. I do not know. That is mere speculation. I do not see how we can tell.

There are approximately 20 important provisions in this bill. I do not suppose that the President knows today what his position is going to be on any one of them or on the great majority of those 20 different matters. If we are to divide the bill into four bills, we could just as well divide it into 20 bills. We could have a separate bill on the question of the closed shop. We could have a separate bill on the question of Nation-wide bargaining. We could pass 20 bills dealing with this subject piecemeal, but there would be only one purpose in doing so, and that would be to allow the President to select what he likes and reject what he does not like. I have never heard of Congress doing such a thing in my entire legislative experience. There is no reason why matters relating to the same subject should not be developed in a program. If the President has some particular objection to that program, or if there is something that he thinks should come out of it, and he vetoes the bill for that reason alone, Congress can consider whether it will pass the bill over his veto, and whether what he approves amounts to a real legislative program or not. I do not know. Frankly, I do not think I would be satisfied with one of these titles unless at least a substantial part of one of the other titles were included with it.

It is a novel proposal to take a bill embracing a legislative program dealing with collective bargaining and divide it up for the purpose of permitting the President to select this and that and veto other parts of it. I never heard of such a proposal. I think it detracts from the dignity of the United States Senate.

On the question of cooperation, we are just as much involved in cooperation with the House of Representatives, a coordinate legislative body, as in cooperation with the President. The House of Representatives has taken the position that it wants one bill. If we go to conference with three or four bills, what will the House say? If we pass three or four bills and send them to the House, the House will say, "We sent you a comprehensive bill, and we are not going to consider your separate bills. We placed the entire program in one bill and sent it over to you, and we think that cooperation requires that you consider all of our proposal and come back with such amendments as you desire, to be settled in conference." Certainly, if it is simply a matter of cooperation, our first duty, in order to send to the President any bill at all, is to cooperate with the House of Representatives.

I know of no way to tell what the President is going to approve and what he is not going to approve. I see only one course to pursue in this whole proceeding. If we have an amendment to consider, if we have a bill to consider, let us consider whether what we are proposing is fair and just in itself. If it is fair and just, if it corrects a recognized abuse testified to before the committee, if it is a proposal which provides justice as between the employer and the employee, between the labor unions and the public, then it seems to me the Senate should approve it. It seems to me that those of us who desire to present amendments should have the right to have the Senate consider them on their individual merits. If the amendments have merit, we can only assume that the President of the United States will approach the matter from the same point of view from which we approach it.

There are four amendments which will have to be considered before the bill is finally acted upon. So far as those four amendments are concerned, I can see nothing which will make this bill any more objectionable to the President if they are agreed to than if they are not agreed to. I see nothing objectionable in any one of them. There were a great many disputes. Some dozen matters were eliminated from the bill in committee, although I should like to see them in the bill. But when we came to present the amendments to the Senate,

in order not to take the time of the Senate we chose what seemed to be the four most important ones, those which were the most just and to which no reasonable objection could be made. If we pass a bill of that nature, we must assume that the President is not going to veto the bill because of the adoption of those amendments. I do not think we can assume now that he will veto the bill because of title I, title II, title III, or title IV.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senate to give us the right to continue the procedure which has been initiated, and which I think will bring the most prompt results, and which I believe affords the best opportunity for cooperation with the House of Representatives and, I believe, with the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I was called from a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations by a note asking me to come to the Senate and talk for 10 or 15 minutes on the question now pending. When I arrived here, I found that the Senate was discussing reclamation. I should like to spend my time discussing reclamation because I come from the West, but I shall not do that. I shall attempt to do exactly what I was asked to do.

We find ourselves, Mr. President, in exactly the situation which I tried to avoid in the committee; that is, we are spending our time on a parliamentary question when we should be discussing a labor bill which has to do with human rights. I shall support, of course, the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I shall give one or two reasons why I shall support it.

We are dealing with one of the most complex subjects with which Congress has had to consider in a long time. Involved in the main problem are many separate subjects which have been lumped together in one bill, thereby increasing the difficulty of eliminating abuses.

I should like to illustrate my point by a concrete example. We spent a great deal of time discussing the so-called portal-to-portal pay bill. The simple proposition in regard to the portal-to-portal pay was to bring about legislation which would stop certain legal procedures on that subject and define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts.

I have before me page 4209 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the report of the conference committee on House bill 2157, the portal-to-portal bill. The conference report occupies seven full columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and represents, if agreed to, a new law which contains definition after definition, when the simple purpose of the original bill was to stop certain suits which Congress considered unjust.

In considering and acting upon great questions we often multiply law, multiply definitions, and make things so difficult that it is indeed hard for anyone to follow the congressional intent. Therefore, if we should discuss only one question and pass a law in regard to that one question, probably we would be able to go further.

Let me illustrate the point once more by choosing one from the scores of telegrams in regard to the pending legislation. We have to deal in this bill with Nation-wide collective bargaining, and in section 9 there is a provision with reference to it. It is assumed that in stopping Nation-wide collective bargaining the purpose is to put a curb upon labor. Let me show the Senate the reaction as the result of this telegram from Raphael Weill & Co., San Francisco. I shall read the telegram as an illustration of my point. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 29, 1947.*

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 9 (f) (1) and section 12 (c) of House bill 3020 banning industry-group bargaining would destroy local community-wide bargaining as practiced in the San Francisco Bay area and other northern and central California communities and the industrial relations stability brought about through such community-industry-group bargaining and group agreements. In San Francisco and the bay area alone we have 180 such employer-group contracts covering hundreds of employers and thousands of employees, elimination of which under H. R. 3020, would precipitate a return to the chaotic conditions existing prior to the development of such community-industry-group bargaining and contracts and under which conditions individual employers were at the mercy of strong local labor unions and without any group bargaining power. Under community-industry-group bargaining developed in this area since 1939 it has been possible to match local labor organizations' bargaining powers with the result that employers have not only been able to withstand unreasonable demands of labor but likewise cut down the number of strikes to the advantage of the community as well as organized labor itself; therefore we urge you to do everything you can to protect our community-group bargaining against such destruction threatened by the named provisions in 3020 in any legislation passed by the Senate or coming out of conference by the Senate and House conference committees.

RAPHAEL WEILL & CO.

Mr. President, the point is that here is a group of employers protesting a law which is supposed to curb labor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, during the time allotted to me I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the proposed legislation now before the Senate. I shall have time only to discuss very briefly, of course, the motion now before the Senate, which I am supporting.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] practically charged that the motion made by the Senator from Oregon to recommit the pending bill is of a political nature.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only 9 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I shall take only a moment. I simply wish to say that when this matter was debated previously, I was charged with sponsoring a political move. I said that if politics was involved on either side, it was on the other side. That was my statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the Senator from Ohio answered the charge made against him by making it against us.

Mr. President, it has been suggested in some quarters that some of those who sponsor this omnibus bill, which has been described by some as the "ominous" bill, desire to have the Congress pass a bill so offensive and so obnoxious that the President will be compelled to veto it. I make no such accusation against any Member of this body or any Member of the other body, which is the coordinate legislative branch of our Government. I do not know what political motives repose in the bosom of any Senator; but I do say that if there is any political motive, by which I mean any motive to gain any partisan or personal advantage by either promoting or opposing the proposed legislation, or by either offering or opposing the motion now under consideration, such motive would be utterly unworthy of any Member of the Senate of the United States.

We are passing through a very critical era, not only in the history of our country but in the history of the entire world. We need not delude ourselves into the belief that the entire world, and especially that part of it with which we do not agree, is not watching what we in the Congress are going to do and also what will be done elsewhere in the Government of the United States with respect to legislation dealing with the rights of labor. I have not time to go into that phase of the matter now, but later I expect to do so, as a result of some of the observations which I made during a recent trip abroad.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the people of the United States are in no mood either to appreciate or to condone political maneuvers in the Senate of the United States, on either side of this aisle, in order that by means of what is or is not done here, someone may gain an advantage in a future election. I am not in a position to say, and I would not intimate, what the President will do in regard to any legislation on this subject which may be sent to him. He had a long record of 10 years in the Senate of the United States, and that record speaks for itself. In his annual message to Congress in January he made recommendations on the subject of labor legislation, and those recommendations speak for themselves. I have no doubt in my own mind that some of the provisions of the proposed legislation now before the Senate meet with the approval of the President. But in view of the expressed desire of all Members of the Senate, without regard to politics, to obtain the enactment of some sort of legislation which we believe to be necessary, as a result of the experience with the Wagner Act and other labor laws, it would be a tragedy if we were to load down those meritorious provisions with others so obnoxious and so objectionable that the President would be required to veto the bill, in the exercise of his own judgment and his own discretion.

I have no doubt that to whatever measure the Congress sends to the President he will give very careful attention and consideration. I have no doubt that he will study it meticulously and carefully and in detail. Moreover, I have no doubt that the President in his heart hopes that the Congress will pass legislation which he can sign and approve, and thus have placed on the statute books of the United States. But I am satisfied that he has courage enough to do what he thinks his duty may require him to do, whenever such legislation reaches him, regardless of the consequences to him or to his political future.

So much, Mr. President, for the political side of this discussion, which I did not inject into it, but which I cannot avoid taking note of.

The Senator from Ohio has said that if four bills were reported by the committee, the result would be endless discussion and delay. The motion requires the committee to report not later than the 2d of May, which is the day after tomorrow. If the committee were to do what I think those who sponsor and support the motion would hope the committee would do, it would report four original bills, and at least two of them, and perhaps three of them, would require only a very brief discussion, and might be accepted generally by the Senate of the United States. But certainly the discussion of all four of them would not consume any more time than it now appears likely may be consumed in the discussion of the omnibus bill which now is before the Senate.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious now that there cannot be a final vote on the bill during the present week. How much longer its consideration and discussion will require is a matter of speculation. So I think that if we could simplify these matters, if we could have the committee report to the Senate four bills, any one of two or three of which we might generally agree upon, so as to concentrate the discussion upon the others, that would facilitate the enactment of legislation, instead of delaying its enactment.

The Senator from Ohio objects to giving the President the right to choose, among four bills, which he will approve and which he will disapprove. The Senator also invokes the cooperation of the Senate and the House of Representatives. So far as legislation is concerned, Mr. President, the President of the United States is just as much a legislative quantity in the passage of a law as is either branch of the Congress of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President in closing let me say that I hope the motion will be adopted, and, if it is adopted, that the committee will promptly report legislation which we can consider upon its merits, without complication and without any chance that nothing whatever will be done in the long run.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon, reading as follows:

I move that the pending bill S. 1126 be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to report in lieu thereof, on or before Friday, May 2, 1947, four separate bills, as follows:

A bill embracing the language contained in titles I and V of said S. 1126;

A bill embracing the language contained in title II thereof;

A bill embracing the langauge contained in title III thereof; and

A bill embracing the language contained in title IV thereof.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—35

Barkley	Langer	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Lucas	Pepper
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Stewart
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Morse	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Wagner
Kilgore	O'Conor	

NAYS—59

Baldwin	Butler	Donnell
Ball	Byrd	Dworshak
Brewster	Cain	Eastland
Bricker	Capehart	Ecton
Bridges	Capper	Ellender
Brooks	Connally	Ferguson
Buck	Cooper	Flanders
Bushfield	Cordon	George
Gurney	Malone	Taft
Hawkes	Martin	Thye
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Tobey
Hoey	Moore	Vandenberg
Ives	O'Daniel	Watkins
Jenner	Overton	Wherry
Kem	Reed	White
Knowland	Revercomb	Wiley
Lodge	Robertson, Va.	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
McClellan	Saltonstall	Young
McKellar	Smith	

NOT VOTING—1

Aiken

So Mr. MORSE's motion was rejected.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth report of th Department of State on the disposal of surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM OF FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on the survey of the accounting system of the Federal Public Housing Authority for the years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the progress report of that Administration for the first quarter of 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Textile Foundation, transmitting the annual report of that organization for the calendar year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to lasting world peace

"Whereas lasting peace is desired by every nation and by all peoples, there is no friend-

ly democracy that would not support any international program capable of effecting and maintaining that great objective.

"Something is preventing international peace-planning instrumentalities from formulating such a program. It is the desire of all sensible people throughout the world to discover the obstruction, and to remove it.

"It is the belief of many that the principal difficulty is the inability of adults to understand ideologies foreign to those of their own persuasion, even those of friendly nations professing democracy and desiring international amity. It is believed also that the most feasible means of correcting this defect is international education for peace, devoted to fostering universal understanding, friendliness, and good will among all nations which believe in the four freedoms and hold the conception of democracy accepted in the United States.

"This end can be effected only by large-scale international educational interchanges in elementary and secondary grades, between the qualified democracies of the United Nations.

"The first practical step toward the accomplishment of this aim must come from an aroused public opinion in the United States crystallized by proper direction. It is the imperative duty of the Federal Government to take the initiative in arousing and directing such public opinion: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

"1. The Governor is requested to invite the President and the Congress of the United States to undertake the following several enactments and negotiations, comprising a program to effect permanent world peace by means of international interchanges of students in elementary and secondary schools through reciprocal rotating scholarships, in which no nation shall be invited to participate except members of the United Nations subscribing to the four freedoms and the concept of democracy as defined in the program.

"First. Formulation of a plan of interchange, small scale to begin with and confined to boys; eventually at large scale and to include girls.

"Second. Submission of the proposed plan, together with a draft of a proposed resolution, to the legislatures of each State and Territorial possession of the United States.

"Third. Within a specified time the legislatures to return the proposed plan, accompanied by proposed amendments of the same, and the proposed resolution, adopted in its original or an amended form, to the end that the different suggestions may to the extent feasible be embodied in the proposed plan.

"Fourth. The plan finally developed and adopted by the Chief Executive to be, as far as practicable, a composite of the views and suggestions of the legislatures.

"Fifth. Adoption by the Congress of the plan so developed, in the form of a joint resolution, to be presented by the Department of State to the United Nations secretariat for the consideration of member governments, with a view to having the governments interested interchange, by means of rotating scholarships between the participating nations, students of formative years grades and a proportionate number of teachers

"Sixth. Resulting treaties between the United States and participating nations not to involve the State of Arizona in any expense without the consent of its citizens.

"Passed the house February 19, 1947.

"Passed the senate March 7, 1947.

"Approved by the Governor March 10, 1947."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Concurrent memorial requesting Congress to create the Petrified Forest National Park

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Within the boundaries of Navajo and Apache Counties in northeastern Arizona lies an area containing mineralized remains of mesozoic forests, commonly known as the Petrified Forest, and officially designated the Petrified Forest national monument.

"The Petrified Forest consists of six areas called First Forest, Second Forest, Third Forest, Rainbow Forest, Blue Forest, and Black Forest, which together constitute a deposit of petrified wood unequaled in extent, as well as for size of trees and beauty and variety of coloring of logs. Many of the logs measure over 200 feet in length and 7 to 10 feet in diameter.

"In addition to this petrified wood, the Petrified Forest contains an extensive deposit of fossil bones of reptiles which lived during the triassic period of the mesozoic age, and deposits of fossilized cycads and ferns and other plant life preserved in such perfect condition that the seeds pods and almost microscopic fruiting bodies are plainly visible. This field, discovered in comparatively recent years, affords unlimited opportunities for scientific research.

"Thousands of prehistoric petroglyphs are engraved on the sandstone cliffs within the monument, one huge rock alone bearing more than a thousand such symbols. Sites representing the prehistoric periods from basket maker and pit house type to and including Pueblo No. 3 dot the entire area of the Petrified Forest. The Pueblo No. 3 period is represented by the Agate house, a 7-room dwelling constructed of blocks of agatized wood and estimated to be about 800 years old."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 6

"Memorial requesting the representatives of the State of Arizona, in the Congress of the United States to support certain legislation beneficial to veterans and others

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"There are now pending in the Congress of the United States two certain bills affecting the rights of veterans, prisoners of war, and other persons in territory occupied by the Japanese forces, which are referred to as H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199; and

"This legislation extends to veterans, prisoners of war, and other persons in territory occupied by the Japanese during the war, certain benefits by war of exemption under and in connection with the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; and

"The legislation represented by H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199 will be of material benefit to the veterans and other persons therein throughout the United States as well as in the State of Arizona;

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, requests that the representatives of the State of Arizona in the Congress of the United States lend their support toward the passage of those certain bills now pending in Congress designated as H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199.

"Adopted by the house March 20, 1947."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Herbert B. Maw, Governor of the State of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation extending to the Japanese people the same privileges as are enjoyed by immigrants from other countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the State Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., favoring adequate appropriations for flood control in California during the year 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the National Petroleum Association, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the taxation of nonexempt cooperative business enterprises; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolution adopted by the National Petroleum Association, Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the tax on lubricating oils; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 350 citizens of Iola, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PEACE TREATY WITH ITALY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in the near future the Committee on Foreign Relations will be hearing testimony in regard to the peace treaty with Italy. Recently, in the city of Chicago, Ill., the members of the executive grand council of the grand lodge of the State of Illinois, Order Sons of Italy in America, met, and I have a resolution which was adopted and sent to me by that council, through its president, Mr. George J. Spatuzza. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America will soon be called upon to consider ratification of the treaties of peace recently signed in Paris, and that one of said treaties is the proposed peace treaty with Italy; and

Whereas it is a universal belief, and justly so, that the world will not be at rest unless and until the peace treaties ratified will be such as to conform with every principle of justice; and

Whereas the proposed treaty with Italy does not sufficiently take into account Italy's contribution to the cause of liberation and her full cooperation with the Allied forces against the common enemy, which contribution and cooperation has been attested by authoritative persons of the various Allied countries; certainly it is a known fact that in the struggle against the common enemy Italy lost over 300,000 in killed alone and suffered billions of dollars in property damage; and

Whereas it is our belief that the proposed treaty of peace with Italy as it now stands imposes upon Italy, among other things, territorial mutilation; demilitarization of her borders, which result in unbearable military servitude of that country to its neighbors; renunciation of colonial possessions in which billions of dollars of the Italian people's money is invested; allotting of a navy, the achievements of which on the side of the Allies wrote a beautiful page in the struggle for democracy; and other military and economic clauses, all of which is contrary to the terms of the Atlantic Charter, which Charter, from its very inception, was looked upon as a most effective instrument to guarantee to mankind a world at peace, and which Charter should be respected and adhered to; and

Whereas it is our sincere belief that in order that justice may ultimately triumph that consideration of the ratification of the peace treaty should be postponed until the European situation shall have been clarified, which undoubtedly will, to some extent at least, be as soon as a treaty of peace with Germany shall have been concluded; and

Whereas the Italians look upon this country to the end that they be accorded a just peace, as this country has at all times championed the cause of justice; be it

Resolved by the executive grand council of the grand lodge of the State of Illinois, Order Sons of Italy in America, meeting at its home office at Chicago, Ill., on the 29th day of March 1947, That we, for and on behalf of the thousands of our members, urge the Senators of our great State, the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS and C. WAYLAND BROOKS, to consider the suspension of the consideration of the peace treaty with Italy until the peace treaty with Germany shall have been concluded, or in the alternative to vote against the ratification of the peace treaty with Italy as it now stands, so that a new treaty may be negotiated, which shall do justice to a cobelligerent, Italy, thereby giving her people reason not only to look to the future with confidence and hope but to believe and be assured that justice does yet prevail in this universe.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,
Grand Venerable.

Attest:

N. V. DE FLORIO,
Recording Grand Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 629) concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 148) thereon.

RENT CONTROL—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. TAYLOR submitted the individual views of himself and Mr. WAGNER, as members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on the bill (S. 1017) providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes, heretofore reported, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 86.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1190. A bill to amend section 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics which become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 1192. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1193. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James H. Red Cloud; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1194. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the liability of common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders for payment of damages to persons injured by them through violations of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1195. A bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations;

S. 1196. A bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1197. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes;

S. 1198. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1199. A bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946;

S. 1200. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 1202, to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the States to relieve the critical shortage of housing for veterans of World War II; to provide subsidies to aid in the construction of such housing; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of the estate of William J. Collamore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS BEFORE ASSOCIATED MOTION PICTURE ADVERTISERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Politics Is Your Business, Too," delivered by him at a meeting of Associated Motion Picture Advertisers, at New York, N. Y., April 23 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN INDICTMENT OF RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "An Indictment of Russia—From the Record," which appears in this week's issue May 2 of the United States News. It is a factual statement of developments during our efforts to establish the United Nations and to make it function as a world organization for the preservation of peace and the amicable settlement of international disputes and problems. It also brings to light the lack of interest and cooperation on the part of Russia to establish better international relations and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDICTMENT OF RUSSIA—FROM THE RECORD—UNITED STATES HAS CONSISTENTLY OFFERED COOPERATION WITH THE SOVIET UNION IN MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL FIELDS DURING AND AFTER THE WAR—RUSSIAN RECORD IS ONE OF NONCOOPERATION IN ALL EFFORTS INVOLVING MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND ACTION

(The following report on the relations between Russia and the United States could have been made by anyone who would take the time to make the research into the authoritative records of the last 2 years. It speaks for itself.—David Lawrence, editor.)

I. SUMMARY OF ACTS FROM UNITED STATES SIDE EVIDENCING DESIRE FOR COOPERATION WITH SOVIET UNION

A. War aid

1. Military and civilian supplies to a value of over $11,000,000,000 were supplied the Soviet Union under Lend-Lease.

2. Military and technological information was furnished through United States military mission in Moscow.

3. Substantial medical supplies and civilian goods were sent to the Soviet Union by American agencies, such as the Red Cross and Russian War Relief.

B. Postwar aid

1. UNRRA supplies to the value of $250,000,000 were sent to Byelorussia and the Ukraine. Seventy-two percent of the cost of the UNRRA program was borne by the United States.

2. The United States agreed to discuss extension of large credit to the Soviet Government to assist in postwar reconstruction.

C. Decisions made at meetings of heads of states

1. At Yalta:

(a) United States agreed to cession of Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin to U. S. S. R.

(b) United States agreed to recognize independence of Outer Mongolia.

(c) United States agreed to Soviet interests as paramount in Dairen, Port Arthur, and the Manchurian railways.

(d) United States agreed to fixing of Curzon line as western border of Soviet Union, thereby incorporating in Soviet Union sizable area of prewar Polish territory.

(e) United States agreed to participation of Byelorussia and the Ukraine in United Nations, thereby giving Soviet Union three votes.

(f) Agreement was reached with Soviet Government for exchange of nationals liberated by Soviet and American armed forces.

2. At Potsdam:

(a) United States agreed to the Soviet annexation of northern portion of East Prussia.

(b) United States agreed to provisional Polish administration of eastern Germany.

(c) United States agreed that postwar conditions required modification of Montreux Convention in respect to the Dardanelles.

(d) Recognition was given to Soviet claims for preferential reparations from western Germany.

D. Peace treaties

1. Concessions were made to Soviet claims for reparations from Italy.

2. Compromises were made with Soviet and Yugoslav viewpoints on boundaries and administration of Venezia Giulia and Trieste.

3. Soviet Union was offered 25-year mutual guaranty pact against Japanese and German aggression. Period of proposed agreement was later extended to 40 years.

4. Secretary Byrnes publicly recognized special security interests of U. S. S. R. in central and eastern Europe.

E. United Nations

1. United States has displayed considerable patience with Soviet use of veto in the Security Council.

2. Generous United States offer on atomic energy is unprecedented in world history.

F. International organizations

United States has advocated Soviet participation in all specialized international organizations and has made direct efforts to obtain Soviet participation.

G. Cultural

United States has constantly sought to arrange for the exchange of publications, scientists, artists, students, etc., between United States and Soviet Union.

H. Civil aviation

United States has persistently sought to negotiate agreement with Soviet Union for reciprocal civil air traffic between the two countries.

II. SOVIET RESPONSE TO UNITED STATES EFFORTS TOWARD COOPERATION

A. War aid

1. Grudging Soviet recognition of extent and value of lend-lease aid and long delay in agreeing to begin negotiations for a settlement.

2. Complete lack of reciprocity in exchange of military and technological information during the war.

3. Little publicity given in Soviet Union to nongovernmental aid received from people of the United States.

B. Postwar aid

1. Refusal of Soviet Government to discuss settlement of outstanding economic questions between the two countries in connection with credit negotiations. Constant reiteration by Soviet propaganda of theme that United States was threatened by imminent economic crisis which would oblige it to grant large credits to Russian market.

C. Political and territorial questions

1. Failure of Soviet Government to observe Yalta commitments for free elections in Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria.

2 Encouragement by Soviet Union of obstructionism and truculence in governments of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.

3. Noncooperation by Soviet Union in implementing occupation policies in Germany, Austria and Korea.

4. Widespread Soviet removals from eastern Europe, Manchuria and Korea, thereby seriously interfering with resumption of industrial production.

5. Obstructionist Soviet tactics in negotiations for Italian and Balkan peace treaties in meetings of both Deputies and Foreign Ministers. Negotiations on these treaties extended from September 1945 to end of 1946. Soviet Union has likewise delayed consideration of proposed guaranty pact against German and Japanese aggression.

6. Soviet Union has refused to agree to organization of Germany as an economic unit, thereby preventing a more rapid return to a self-sustaining German economy, and the recovery of Europe.

7. The Soviets have rejected all overtures directed toward an agreement on international civil aviation.

8. Freedom of navigation on the Danube has not been restored because of Soviet opposition.

9. Soviet Union has declined to participate in most specialized international organizations. In those which it has joined its attitude has been distinguished by either obstructionism or disinterest.

10. Soviets refused to permit access by American repatriation teams to American citizens liberated by Soviet armed forces. For their part, the Soviets have insisted strenuously that all Soviet citizens, including persons coming from areas incorporated into Soviet Union since outbreak of war, be forcibly turned over to Soviet repatriation authorities regardless of their individual desires.

D. United Nations

1. Soviets have used United Nations as an instrument for political maneuvering and propaganda purposes and have shown little interest in true aims of the Organization.

2. Soviet attitude has prevented any progress in work of Military Staff Committee.

3. As a result of Soviet tactics, the UN has made little progress for a year in solving the problem of control of atomic energy. While preventing agreement on this, Soviets have exploited propaganda possibilities of their general disarmament proposals.

4. On 10 occasions Soviets have utilized veto in Security Council to prevent UN action. These occurred four times regarding Spain, three times concerning admission of new members to UN, and once each regarding the Syrian and Lebanon case, the proposal for a commission of investigation in Greece and the British charges against Albania in the matter of the Corfu Channel.

E. Propaganda

Since the war ended, Soviet propaganda, both for internal consumption and as distributed through controlled outlets around the world, has been violently and abusively anti-American. United States is pictured as imperialistic, reactionary, Fascist, and striving for world domination. United States Government is alleged to be in hands of small group aiming at imposing its will on world by force and as being entirely out of step with desires and aspirations of American people.

F. Cultural

United States efforts for cultural exchanges have not been reciprocated. On the contrary, the Soviet Government has made strenuous efforts to further isolate Soviet people from any cultural contact with outside world except such as occurs under auspices of Soviet Government agencies.

DESTRUCTION OF FERTILIZER PLANTS IN GERMANY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a few days ago there was some discussion on the floor of the Senate about keeping in operation the fertilizer plants in Germany. It is my purpose to read to the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War telling about the operation of fertilizer plants in Germany. During the recent debate on the matter, I promised to make inquiry of the Secretary of War. The letter I am now about to read was addressed to me, in response to my inquiry. Under date of April 29, the Secretary of War wrote me as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 29, 1947.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: In response to your request for a statement by the War Department concerning the question as to destruction of fertilizer plants in Germany, which has been recently discussed on the floor of the Senate, I submit the following information:

Immediately upon publication of the newspaper stories that Mr. Hoover had stated to reporters that the Allies were destroying certain fertilizer plants in Germany, a verbatim quotation of the United Press story was radioed to General Clay and transmitted by him to General Keyes in Vienna. Radio replies from both have been received, the substance of which is as follows:

First, as to Germany:

(a) As to phosphate fertilizer: There has been no destruction of such plants, and none of the existing plants have or will be declared available for reparations. At present, phosphate fertilizer plant capacity totals 218,000 tons per year of P_2O_5. Of this, 59,000 tons is in the form of basic slag. Requirements for this type of fertilizer total 688,000 tons, leaving a deficit of 470,000 tons. In prewar years, the basic slag production from the steel industry covered this deficiency.

(b) As to potash: There has been no destruction of potash mines in the western zones. The Soviets have destroyed potash mines in their zones, but have stated to the Allied Control Council that the mines destroyed were exhausted and had been used for underground production of war materials by the Germans.

(c) As to nitrogen fertilizer: There has been no destruction of synthetic-ammonia plants or any auxiliary fertilizer conversion plants in the western zones. Although synthetic ammonia is listed as a prohibited industry, the Allied Control Council has authorized its production for German peacetime requirements until exports are sufficient to pay for all imports. Germany has plants sufficient for production of its nitrogen-fertilizer requirements, and deficiencies are due primarily to the basic shortages of coal and power.

Second, as to Austria: The radio from General Keyes states that no fertilizer-producing plants in Austria have been or are being destroyed, nor are any contemplated for destruction or removal as a result of quadripartite action. The Austrian authorities have reported that sulfuric-acid production essential for manufacture of superphosphates has been largely eliminated by war damage or by removals by the Soviets.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask, is the Senator now referring only to the American, British, and French zones of occupation?

Mr. GURNEY. I am referring to Austria.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the letter indicate that no plants are being removed from the Russian zone of occupation in Germany and Austria?

Mr. GURNEY. I would say to the Senator from Nebraska that that is something which is covered later on in the letter. Continuing with the letter:

The fertilizer plant at Hoosbierbaum, part of which was destroyed by bombs, had a remaining annual capacity of 46,000 tons, and the plant at Pischelsdorf, which was lightly bombed, had a remaining capacity of 49,000 tons. These were both removed from Austria by Soviet order early in the occupation. The plant at Deutsch-Wagram, capacity 7,350 tons, was partially burned and production has been abandoned. The only remaining plant is at Liesing and has a capacity of 8,000 tons. This is under Russian management.

Production of nitrogen in Austria depends upon obtaining sufficient coal from Germany or other sources to permit fuller operation of the plant at Linz, in the United States zone. This is now, because of lack of sufficient coal, producing at a rate of only 15,000 tons pure nitrogen per year. The full installed capacity of such plant is 60,000 tons. Austria's annual domestic requirements are 30,000 tons. All tonnages are given in metric tons of pure nitrogen content.

Relative to the story which the newspapers carried on or about April 18 concerning a statement by former President Hoover as to the destruction of fertilizer plants in Germany, Mr. Hoover has written me that the published account was incorrect. His letter stated that in the interview with reporters he complained "of the Russian action with regard to fertilizers and other products in their

zones in Germany, Austria, and Korea," and that he stated "that in the American and British zones every effort was being made within the imposed levels of industry to restore production of fertilizers." However, Mr. Hoover says that he stated that "the net result was that our taxpayers were being called upon to furnish fertilizers to countries formerly self-supporting, or even exporting a surplus of those commodities." Mr. Hoover adds, in his statement to the reporters, that he "warmly supported the efforts of our military authorities."

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADEQUATE HOUSING FACILITIES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is my sincere conviction that one of the major demands the people of the country have on this Eightieth Congress is that we, in some way, provide adequate housing, and particularly adequate veterans' housing. It is one of our major concerns to try to make sure that this Congress passes legislation that will help actually build these needed houses.

In the last several months, I have talked with a variety of housing experts, builders, representatives of insurance companies, veterans' organizations, and others, to try to determine how we can best actually get houses built. In the course of these conversations, I have learned literally scores of ways that houses cannot be built. I have heard, in other words, a tremendous amount of destructive criticism of any plans offered. I must say that on the other hand I have heard very few constructive ideas.

We are, in this country, in the midst of a housing emergency. The building of houses has declined steadily. The cost of housing has risen steadily. I think few will deny that housing costs today are considerably inflated. Statistics show that the total number of private dwellings constructed is at a low level.

On the other hand, construction costs have risen steadily since 1932. One national survey shows that in recent months the lumber industry, for example, has made price boosts of as much as 100 percent and the wholesale level of lumber is up 290 percent since 1939. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports a serious drop in residential construction as compared with last year in most areas of the country. The Bureau also reports that prices are up since last year and that local housing programs have, for the most part, been ineffective.

The anticipated building boom in residential construction has failed to materialize. Buyers are resisting the high cost of housing and the poor quality of housing provided even at a high cost. Such high cost can be absorbed in some cases by commercial enterprises because of other high prices, but private individuals cannot and will not buy or rent houses constructed at present levels.

According to a careful survey made last fall in Connecticut, about 12 percent of the returning veterans there needed places to live. Four out of five wanted to rent instead of buy. This figure, of course, varies according to the size of the community. The majority could afford to pay between $35 and $45 a month for a four-room unit. For the same size unit, a monthly rental of approximately $90 would have to be charged in order to pay for the cost of construction and give the builder some return on his investment.

National figures obtained from competent, unbiased surveys substantially support the above statistics, except that they point out that Connecticut is unusually fortunate in having only 12 percent of the veterans in need of housing. The percentage of veterans in the country who need housing is roughly double that.

As of June 1946, a Government survey revealed that 25 percent of married veterans were living doubled up with another family. Less than half of the veterans married at the time of their discharge had separate homes to return to at that time. Not quite 3 out of 10 could afford to pay $50 or more a month for rent, and this represented about one-fourth of the veteran's income. Insofar as buying is concerned, only two out of five who wanted to buy homes could afford more than $6,000, and 25 percent were able to pay less than $4,000. The average median price veterans were able to pay was about $5,500. The average median gross monthly rental veterans were able to pay, according to this survey, was about $43.

In view of these various surveys, it is quite clear that, to talk of living quarters built to rent from $90 to $100, and to talk of houses built to be sold for $10,000 or more is most unrealistic. Veterans can not, and will not, pay those prices, but they do need homes in which to live. We have promised those homes.

We have had, in the past 5 or 6 years, a confusing conglomeration of Government housing agencies. It has become most difficult to find one's way through their maze. We have had a great number of plans advanced by which it was hoped houses would be built. Unfortunately, these appear to have, without exception, failed. We have before us, now, and have had previously, other plans that deal with special segments of the population. I hope they also help relieve the critical housing shortage. However, none of these specifically provides for a way of getting houses built to rent at rentals the veteran can afford to pay, or to sell at prices which would allow him to buy. Some people argue that we need only take off all controls of housing to see houses quickly appear on our streets. They point out that they will build units to sell and rent in the higher-priced brackets and that people now living in less costly units will take over these newer developments and so free older and cheaper housing for veterans. In the first place, I do not like the implication of that argument. It broadly suggests that our veterans shall be given second choice for the second best. But beyond that moral argument is a more practical and more realistic argument. We have passed the peak of individual spending. We have no longer, among our people, the uncontrollable urge to throw away money for unnecessary things. Our people are now looking more carefully into what they spend, because present taxes and present prices require a careful scrutiny of all budgets.

In my estimation, there are few people who would voluntarily move from any present low-cost home to a higher-priced one, nor are there many who are anxious to buy high-priced homes—particularly in light of inflated values. Therefore, it is my studied belief that those people who would be expected to move out of the cheaper quarters would stay where they are, giving the veteran the golden opportunity of renting an apartment at a price many times what he can afford to pay. Further than that, I am not willing to concede that in this country of free enterprise and great production, we cannot build new structures—whether they be thimbles or houses—to sell at prices the average citizen can afford to pay.

I should like to point out right here that I am afraid some of our people have a mistaken idea about the veteran. For every general in the Army who received a fairly substantial financial remuneration, there were thousands of ordinary GI's who received comparatively low pay, and who have now returned to jobs at wages of $20, $30, $40, or $50 a week. To offer them, as one of our veterans' housing programs did, first choice on $10,000 homes is somewhat ridiculous. To offer them first choice on apartments renting at $90 a month is equally as ridiculous. We must have houses built. We must encourage the builder to want to build houses, and to build houses at prices our veterans can pay. We must take drastic steps.

For those reasons, I am introducing a bill which I am sure will be met with objections. It will be called costly and it will be called a lot of other things, but I believe it will build houses.

I want to say right now, with as much emphasis as I can, that if anyone else on this floor can propose another bill which will cost less and will still build houses, I shall immediately withdraw this bill, and shall vote for his. However, unless such a bill can be produced, I am going to actively urge the consideration and passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I should like to list some of the provisions of this bill. It provides, first, a series of three amendments which are designed to reduce carrying charges and thus make possible reduced rentals and reduced monthly payments. The purpose of these amendments is to get the $90, of which I spoke earlier, nearer the $35 to $45 that the veteran can pay. What is left can be provided, in my estimation, by only one thing—a direct Federal-State subsidy.

The first of these amendments proposes that loans for veterans' housing be guaranteed at 100 percent, instead of the present 90 percent. In this connection, I have had one of our most learned housing experts tell me that the present law provides for such 100 percent loans for veterans. He may be technically correct. It is true that if a veteran can find a home priced at under $10,000 which the Veterans' Administration will appraise at the price asked, a loan can be

worked out which will not involve any cash payment on the part of the veteran. I wonder whether that expert could find for me, in this country, any substantial number of houses offered on the market at less than $10,000, which an appraiser would appraise at the full purchase price. If so, I am sure that I could furnish him with a long list of prospective tenants. As a factual matter, we all know such is not the case. Further than that, we know that any capital, whether it be the few dollars saved by the veteran or the millions available through loaning corporations, is not wisely risked right now, with inflated housing values. I think each of us knows several personal examples that would bear out that statement.

The second amendment is to lower the interest charge to 3¼ percent. I fully realize that is a very low rate, and I realize that the Government may have to absorb a large part of that. On the other hand, I believe private capital will see its way clear to accept some considerable proportion. The obvious necessity for this provision is that carrying charges must be reduced.

The third amendment is that the period of amortization will be increased to 40 years. On this point I have heard many arguments to the effect that the net cost to the veteran would be more. I have talked with veterans' groups about that point. They assure me, and I, myself, am convinced, that given the choice of not being able to rent or buy a house as against the choice of paying a little more over a longer period, the veteran will choose the latter.

Any consideration of veterans housing gets down to one issue—money. I see no other way of actually getting houses built. For that reason, and in spite of the fact that I believe and know that we must now establish strict Government economy, I believe in this emergency we are required to provide the money needed to close the gap I have pointed out.

Therefore, the major part of the bill is concerned with a subsidy to provide the difference between what the veteran can pay and the charges that must be made even after these liberalized regulations are in effect. This section provides that these aids shall be made available to veterans of World War II and to widows and orphans of veterans killed in that war. It provides that each State shall set up an adequate housing authority capable of dealing with this program. The respective builders, upon furnishing adequate proof of the need and desirability of their projected constructions, can apply for a Government subsidy that will make lower rentals to the tenants possible. There are certain restrictions and certain penalties attached to this provision in order to safeguard the public funds and in order to make sure the spirit of the act is carried out. Upon receiving adequate proof of intent, the State may notify the Federal Housing Commissioner of its plans, and be furnished, upon approval, with a sum equal to that provided by the State. The administration would be entirely State and local. The Federal Government simply provides its share of the funds, in return for certain demonstrations of good faith and sound practice in administration.

At a later date, I want to explain these provisions in more detail. At this time, I simply want to outline these points briefly to the Members of the Senate, and encourage the fastest possible action.

Again, I say, that if any other bill can be proposed to meet this emergency better, and to build houses faster, I shall gladly withdraw my bill, and shall actively support that one. Until such a time, Mr. President, I urge that the Members of the Senate concern themselves with the passing of some such legislation as this for the purpose of making it possible for builders to build and renters to rent.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1202) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the States to relieve the critical shortage of housing for veterans of World War II; to provide subsidies to aid in the construction of such housing; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be away from the Senate tomorrow, Thursday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate tomorrow, for the purpose of attending the funeral of a dear friend and law associate, whose funeral will be held in Chicago tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Thursday and Friday of this week, because of previous engagements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection consent is granted.

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted the conference agreement on H. R. 2157, exempting employers from liability for portal-to-portal wages in certain cases. The text of this agreement is to be found beginning on page 4209 of the RECORD.

Today I should like to submit a brief description of this agreement, section by section, in order to help clarify some of the questions which have arisen and in order that we may have on hand a convenient résumé.

DESCRIPTION OF AGREEMENT

The conference agreement contains findings and a declaration of policy by the Congress in conformity with the substitute agreed on in conference.

PAST CLAIMS

Section 2 of the conference agreement relates to existing portal-to-portal claims and relieves an employer of liability for such existing claims, except claims based on activities which were compensable by contract, custom or practice.

A provision is also inserted in the conference agreement—Section 2 (d) which denies jurisdiction to the courts of any portal-to-portal suits based on existing claims.

The conference agreement prohibits assignment of past claims so that it will be impossible for anyone to buy up existing claims which were not compensable under contract, custom, or practice, and make a profit by compromising same.

Section 3 of the conference agreement provides that any claims which accrued prior to the date of enactment of this bill may be compromised, in whole or in part, but only if there exists a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable by the employer. However, even in the case of a bona fide dispute, the compromise is not permitted if it goes lower than 40 cents an hour for straight time, or 60 cents an hour for overtime in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or is less than the minimum required by the Walsh-Healey or Bacon-Davis Acts, or is at a rate less than the overtime rate, which is one-and-one-half times such minimum, if the causes of action arose under either of said two acts.

FUTURE CLAIMS

Section 4 of the conference agreements relates to future claims and relieves an employer from liability for his failure to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation for activities engaged in outside of the workday, unless such activities are compensable by custom or contract. Activities performed by an employee during the workday are not affected in any manner by this bill, and the employer will remain liable or not liable for payment of such activities under the three acts to the same extent as he would be if this bill were not enacted. In other words, they are left under the applicability provisions of law in existence prior to the date of enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS

Section 5 of the conference agreement bans representative actions in the future. It does not affect pending representative actions. It adds a new sentence to section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, providing that no employee shall be a party plaintiff to any collective action after the date of enactment of this act, unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought.

Section 6 of the conference agreement provides for a 2-year statute of limitations with respect to future claims.

With respect to past claims, the applicable State statute of limitations will apply if the action is commenced within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act, so that, for example, in Florida the statute of limitations of 1 year would apply, and in Wisconsin the statute of limitations of 6 years would apply.

Section 7 is a provision relating to the method of determining date of commencement of future actions.

Section 8 sets up the method for determining the commencement of pending collective and representative actions.

GOOD FAITH RELIANCE

Section 9 contains the so-called good faith reliance rule with respect to reliance on past administrative rulings. In general, if the employer pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, he will be relieved from liability.

Section 10 of the conference agreement contains a rule, relating to good faith reliance in future on administrative rulings, which is the same as the rule relating to acts or omissions prior to the date of the enactment of the bill with two exceptions:

First. The regulations must be in writing.

Second. They must be regulations in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act—of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division; in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act—of the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him; and in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act of the Secretary of Labor.

It should be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 an employer will be relieved from liability in an action by an employee because of reliance in good faith on an administrative practice or enforcement policy only, first, where such practice or policy was based on the ground that an act or omission was not a violation of the act, or, second where a practice or policy of not enforcing the act with respect to acts or omissions led the employer to believe in good faith that such acts or omissions were not violations of the act.

However, the employer will be relieved from criminal proceedings or injunctions brought by the United States not only in the cases described in the preceding paragraphs, but also where the practice or policy was such as to lead him in good faith to believe that he would not be proceeded against by the United States.

Section 11 of the conference agreement permits a court in its sound discretion to award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable ground for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of such act. In other words, this provision is to give the court discretionary power in relation to liquidated damages, but again it should be clearly understood that this has no application in relation to bad claims. In other words, if section 2 of this act is held valid, then all bad claims go out the window.

AREA OF PRODUCTION

Section 12 of the conference agreement is inserted to relieve the situation created by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Holly Hill case handed down June 5, 1944, in which the Court held invalid certain regulations of the administrator relating to "area of production" and directed him to issue new regulations which the Administrator did not do for a period of approximately 2½ years after the date of such decision. In general, this provision relieves an employer from liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act for any act or omission prior to December 26, 1946—when the Administrator finally issued his new regulation—if he would have been exempt under any "area of production" regulations in effect during that time.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

In summary, the conference agreement accomplishes the following:

First. It changed the findings and declaration of policy to conform with the conference agreement.

Second. It adopts the provisions of both the House bill and the Senate amendment with respect to past claims.

Third. It adopted generally the Senate rule with respect to future claims.

Fourth. It bans representative actions as contained in the Senate amendment.

Fifth. It contains a 2-year statute of limitations with some modifications as stated above.

Sixth. It permits reliance on past and future administrative rulings.

Seventh. It permits a court in its discretion to award less than the liquidated damages which are now mandatory under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Eighth. It relieves from liability employers who were exempt under an "area of production" regulation for acts or omissions occurring prior to December 26, 1946.

FAIRNESS TO LABOR'S RIGHTS UNDER WAGE-HOUR ACT

There is so much misrepresentation as to the effect of this portal-to-portal bill on the Fair Labor Standards Act that I feel it my duty to clarify this matter.

First. It should be clearly understood that this bill in no way repeals the minimum wage requirements and the overtime compensation requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Second. In relation to past claims, if the action is brought within 120 days after the date of enactment the applicable State statute of limitations will apply. If the action is not brought within 120 days then the 2-year statute of limitations applies, or the shorter State statute, if it is shorter than 2 years.

Third. With respect to future claims, a 2-year over-all Federal statute of limitations will be applicable, doing away with the applicability of any State statute.

It may be claimed that the act is impaired by the provision relating to good faith reliance on administrative rulings, but it does not so appear to me. I feel that the paramount public interest, as well as the interest of the employer and employee, require that, once and for all, both the employer and employee have a right to rely on the interpretation or regulation or order of the Federal agency charged with administering the act.

It will be noted that the relief from liability must be based on a ruling of a Federal agency, and not a minor official thereof. I, therefore, feel that the legitimate interest of labor will be adequately protected under such a provision, since the agency will exercise due care in the issuance of any such ruling.

CONCLUSION

Finally, this conference agreement, the product, I humbly submit, of long and arduous labor of the managers for the Senate and the House, merits the promptest possible attention of the Senate and the House, enactment by both Chambers with complete bipartisan support and signature of approval by the President.

When this is done, the grave cloud of fear over American industry and American labor, arising from these disastrous suits, will have been dispelled and a principal factor will be operating for American industrial expansion and prosperity.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to insert on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", the words "(A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7; or (B)".

Mr. TAFT and Mr. IVES addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate is the amendment which prohibits, or makes it an unfair labor practice, for labor unions to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees. Two amendments have been suggested in order to clarify that amendment. It seems to me that if it could possibly be arranged to have those amendments now considered and accepted, perhaps, and dispose of the amendment, so that we could make some headway and go on to the next, it would be a very desirable procedure.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. A few days ago, in my remarks on this particular proposal, I pointed out, as my chief objection, my fear of the construction that might very easily be placed on the words "interfere with." They could easily be construed to mean that any conversation, and persuasion, any urging on the part of any person, in an effort to persuade another to join a labor organization, would constitute an unfair labor practice. That was my principal objection to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota. I am now in agreement with at least some of my friends in the Senate, and I think if I may at this time offer an amendment eliminating the words "in-

terfere with" and if the amendment can be adopted, I may be able to go along with the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Minnesota. I now offer that amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the amendment being offered? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the submission of the amendment of the Senator from New York. I simply want to say that I shall discuss at some length on a later day why I think the amendment is entirely unsatisfactory.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have consulted with the attorneys and they tell me that elimination of the words "interfere with" would not, so far as they know, have any effect on the court decisions. Eliminating those words would not make any substantial change in the meaning. I realize that the language to which the Senator from New York objects is perhaps somewhat broad, and certainly I shall join in asking the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to accept the amendment, if it is satisfactory to him.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New York has discussed the amendment with me, and I agree with him that the words "interfere with" are very vague. So far as I know, in the corresponding unfair practice for employers, no complaint is ever issued on the interference angle. I think when we are dealing with union organizational activities it is even more important that such vague language be eliminated from this section of the bill. So the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the bill is acceptable to me and, I believe, it is to the coauthors of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 6, after the word "to" it is proposed to strike out the words "interfere with", and after the word "restrain" to strike out the comma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that as one of the sponsors of the pending amendment, I am glad to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was the pending amendment amended to strike out the words "interfere with"?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the words "interfere with" are in the text of the bill and not in the so-called Ball amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the amendment has been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall explain briefly the proposed substitute. I have had some discussion with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and with other Senators in reference to the meaning of the pending amendment and as to how seriously, if at all, it would affect the internal administration of a labor union.

Apparently it is not intended by the sponsors of the amendment to affect at least that part of the internal administration which has to do with the admission or the expulsion of members, that is, with the questions of membership. So I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. After the word "coerce" I propose to insert the following:

(A) Employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein.

I offer that amendment on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the submission of the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the amendment. There is no question of objection, as I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, are we not becoming somewhat confused by the suggestion of an amendment which some of us thought was to the Ball amendment and then found it would not affect the Ball amendment at all, but was an amendment to the section of the bill which the Ball amendment seeks to amend? I think we are confused quite enough without having a further parliamentary tangle. It seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is definitely out of order; that it has nothing to do with the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators, which is printed and which we are supposed to be considering. It does affect the paragraph which the Ball amendment would change, but it is definitely an amendment to the bill and not an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York has been agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment was surely presented to us under false pretenses because I struggled with might and main to find out where the words "interfere with" were in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I want to be sure that the RECORD is perfectly clear, because I understood the Chair to state at the time the Ives amendment was ruled upon, that "without objection the amendment is agreed to." What the Chair meant was that without objection the Senate permitted the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to be perfected, but we are not agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment was submitted by unanimous consent, and it was accepted by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is an amendment to the bill, so that the Ball amendment is still pending, but the bill is amended by striking out the words "interfere with." That is behind us. Then there was another proposal, after that change is made, which makes the Ball amendment more acceptable to the Senator from New York and perhaps to other Senators, but this amendment has actually been made directly to the bill. That is not true of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Florida. That is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is pending. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", it is proposed to insert the following:

(A) Employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What has become of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLENDER. By unanimous consent? Who asked for unanimous consent? I was under the impression that unanimous consent had been asked for the mere submission of the amendment. Since the Chair states the amendment has been adopted, I move to reconsider the action by which the amendment was agreed to, because I am sure that few Senators understood the question was on the adoption of the amendment by unanimous consent. I was under the impression that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York was an amendment to the pending

amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to get the status and purport of my amendment straightened out, because apparently there seems to be some doubt as to what it does and the way the language would read. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment to the bill on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce," to insert certain words. On the same page and line of the bill I moved to strike out the words "interfere with," and also the comma after the words "interfere with" and the comma after the word "restrain." That is all the change effected by my amendment, which, as I understand, was agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I, for one, now understand the parliamentary situation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has offered as a substitute for the Ball amendment, which is printed, and which has not yet been agreed to. We do not know yet whether the Senator from Minnesota has accepted as part of his amendment, as a modification of his amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. I am interested in having an opportunity to talk about the amendment, and I should like to be informed about the matter before I make my few remarks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] be permitted to withdraw the amendment which he offered, and to offer another amendment which is clearly an amendment to the Ball amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment which was offered by me was prepared by the counsel for the committee and I think was correct, but as now reframed the amendment would simply add the following words after the figure "7" in the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators:

Provided, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein.

In other words, if accepted by the sponsors of the pending amendment, the inserted words would make it clear that the pending amendment would have no application to or effect upon the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules of membership either with respect to beginning or terminating membership. I understand that the amendment so offered meets with no serious objection on the part of the sponsors of the pending amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Florida has withdrawn his previous amendment, and is now offering another amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the so-called Ball amendment by inserting after the figure "7", the following: *"Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein, or (B)".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor.

Mr. BALL. I think I was recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thought I had the floor, and that I had been yielding to other Senators.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had the floor, and that he yielded to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALL. I do not think any Senator can hold the floor and farm it out indefinitely. I thought I was recognized by the Chair to make a brief statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the Chair's understanding.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I obtained the floor to ask a question about a parliamentary situation. I am very anxious to discuss the Ball amendment. That was my intention, but I wanted to be certain of the parliamentary situation. Various Senators have asked questions and have asked me to yield, and I have yielded several times. I should like to know whether I can discuss the pending question or not.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was under the impression that the Senator from Utah had completed the inquiry for which he asked the floor, and for which it was accorded him. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the Senator from Utah from the floor if he wishes to discuss the amendment but he did yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to offer his amendment to my amendment. I merely wish to state to the Senate that the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida is perfectly agreeable to me. It was never the intention of the sponsors of the pending amendment to interfere with the internal affairs or organization of unions. The amendment of the Senator from Florida makes that perfectly clear. I am willing, on behalf of myself and the other sponsors of the amendment, to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and, if it is necessary, so to modify and perfect my own amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I request also the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

In discussion yesterday between the Senator from Ohio and myself with respect to another part of the bill, dealing with the closed shop or the union shop, the Senator from Ohio stated what I recall his having stated in the committee, that if a union claimed the advantage or the status of a closed shop or union shop, it would have to have what the Senator called democracy in respect to the admission of members. I understood the Senator to say that that would mean that anyone who presented himself and was qualified in other respects for membership, and who complied with the usual conditions for membership, such as the payment of dues, and so forth, would be entitled to membership.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that. The union could refuse membership; but if the man were an employee of the company with which the union was dealing, the union could not demand that the company fire him. The union could refuse the man admission to the union, or expel him from the union; but if he were willing to enter the union and pay the same dues as other members of the union, he could not be fired from his job because the union refused to take him.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in assuming that it is the interpretation of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Minnesota that there is no provision of the bill which denies a labor union the right to prescribe the qualifications of its members, and that if the union wishes to discriminate in respect to membership, there is no provision in the bill which denies it the privilege of doing so?

Mr. BALL. Absolutely not. If the union expels a member of the union for any other reason than nonpayment of dues, and there is a union-shop contract, the union cannot under that contract require the employer to discharge the man from his job. It can expel him from the union at any time it wishes to do so, and for any reason.

Mr. PEPPER. And the union can admit to membership anyone it wishes to admit, and decline to admit anyone it does not wish to accept.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. But the union cannot, by declining membership for any other reason than nonpayment of dues, thereby deprive the individual concerned of the right to continue in his job. In other words, it cannot force the employer to discharge him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not possible to perfect an amendment without requiring unanimous consent to agree to the amendment involved in the perfection? It seems to me that we should keep the RECORD perfectly clear with regard to what we have done in our action on the Ives amendment. When the Ives amendment was offered, as the RECORD will show, I reserved the right to object. At a later date I wish to discuss why I think the amendment is unsatisfactory. I have no objection to the amendment being

used as a perfection in part of the Ball amendment; but I do not wish to have the RECORD show that we have agreed by unanimous consent to the substance of the Ives amendment. I think the point is pretty well taken, and I think the situation is clear in the RECORD. What we have agreed to is that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] should be allowed to perfect the Ball amendment by adding his amendment to it; but by so doing we do not agree to the substance of the Ives amendment. If so, then I think the Chair unwittingly misled us into the action which was taken. I would then support the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. May I have a ruling as to whether or not it was a perfecting of the Ball amendment which was proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and ruled upon by the Chair, or whether the unanimous-consent request was that we agree to the substance of the Ives amendment? They are two entirely different things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Ives amendment struck out a part of the bill which was not embraced in the Ball amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I assume that any Member of the Senate who offers an amendment should have control over the amendment which he is offering. I assume that is the procedure in the Senate. If that be the case, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is controlling the amendment which he offered, and should have control over it until such time as the Senate disposes of the amendment. I conferred with the senior Senator from Minnesota before offering my amendment and obtained his approval. Therefore I construe this procedure to be purely a matter of perfecting the amendment in line with his own ideas and mine, without in any way giving to the amendment as a whole the final approval of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since the parliamentary situation has been made plain, and it is apparent that the position which I took was justified, I withdraw the motion to reconsider the action by which the amendment of the Senator from New York was agreed to. As at present advised, I favor the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], as modified.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment as modified be printed and placed on the Senators' desks tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], on page 14, line 6, to insert certain language after the word "coerce."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senate has taken its first vote on the pending measure. By that vote it has been determined that we are to continue the consideration of the omnibus bill. I want to confine my remarks to the pending amendment. I do not desire in any way to interfere with prompt passage of legislation on this subject. I feel, however, that important amendments, such as the pending amendment, which on its face looks so innocent, should be discussed at length from the standpoint of the present law itself and the meaning of the law. The historical background, in my opinion, makes the amendment untimely, as such a proposal has always been. However, after the lapse of several years, it apparently seems timely to authors of the bill.

When the National Labor Relations Act was first discussed, it was considered that the rights of employer and employee were so out of balance that it should be the policy of the act to attempt to bring about equality between them, and that the law should be written entirely with a view to restraining the employer. The economic positions of employer and employee are so unequal that the odds are always, economically and in every other way, on the side of the employer, since he has the right to hire and fire.

The pending amendment is very similar to an amendment which was offered upon the floor of the Senate when the National Labor Relations Act was being discussed for the first time. The wording is different, but the theory and philosophy are identically the same. As I remember it, an amendment was offered at that time by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the purpose of which was to restrain the use of coercion, no matter by whom it was used. That seems so sensible and so logical, when an effort is being made to promote industrial peace, that scarcely anyone should rise to oppose it.

In 1941, I proposed an industry-labor conference measure, providing that there should be no strikes or lock-outs, and that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. I, therefore, in the very nature of things, should welcome any amendment or any kind of aid which would tend to do away with coercion and unjust restraint. I would support it with all my might and main. I think that is the ideal situation. But, Mr. President, certain words have a way of acquiring strange meanings, once they are enacted into law, and once the courts begin to pass upon their meaning.

The evil which lies in the amendment proposed by the pending bill to the National Labor Relations Act, which has been on the statute books for 11 or 12 years, lies in the fact that it defines unfair labor practices by the employees, and therefore provides enforcement against the employees quite as much as they have heretofore been defined and enforcement provided against the employer. Against that amendment I desire to speak, Mr. President. I wish to point out that the great evil in our industry-labor relations which grew through the years was that labor did not have what should have been the ordinary right to organize and carry on collective bargaining until, for the first time in the history of our country, by the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, labor was given that right. That right will be taken from labor, as surely as we are here today, if we attempt to modify the law which was enacted for the purpose of placing restraint upon one side. The minute we apply that restraint to both sides the old situation of all the power being on the side of the one who does the hiring and the firing will return, and the economic pressure will be so great that organization in and of itself cannot persist.

Mr. President, I believe that evils have grown out of the philosophy which began to be enunciated with the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. I realize that there have been advantage takers. I do not in any way reflect upon the honesty or upon the aims of the members of the committee who conscientiously and sincerely have become convinced that it is time to change the philosophy, to change the theory; but when the theory is changed, either through lapse of memory or because Senators know what they are doing, it will mean a return to conditions which we did not like. I am sure no one really and truly wants to see our country return to the economy of those days.

Mr. President, in all my experience in the Senate and on committees I have never known a time when more sincere consideration was given to a measure than has been given to Senate bill 1126. Day after day during the hearings the 13 members of the committee were all present. We discussed amendment after amendment, and our votes quite generally were 6 to 7. At this moment I wish

to speak a word of praise of the Reorganization Act so far as our committee is concerned. The Reorganization Act facilitates the handling of legislation of this character. It has resulted in a bill being reported which is the best possible bill, if it is once determined that the new theory which underlies it shall be adopted. It is that theory to which I am opposed.

Mr. President, let us look at the panorama of labor relations a dozen years ago and now. It is a measure of the progress which has been made. We have made progress. Before abandoning the present national policy and going back to former conditions, let me remind the Senate of what those conditions were. The real pattern of prevailing American industrial relations was most clearly brought out in the investigation of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee on which I served from 1936 to 1940. No one has ever challenged the map of affairs as brought out in that investigation. Since the present proposed legislation may easily turn the clock back to those conditions, let us take a quick look at the conditions which then existed.

Nor let us be deceived should the cry be raised, "All that is past. American business will not again engage in those practices." Witness after witness came before our committee in 1935, and said the National Labor Relations Act was necessary because the employer took such advantage of the employee that Congress must do something to correct the existing evils. The hearings before the Civil Liberties Committee showed that employers persisted, even after the act became the law of the land, in stopping the organization of unions, in placing all the restraints they could upon labor so as to make collective bargaining almost impossible. Let it never be forgotten that so great was the legal activity as well as other activity against that act that 69 men who called themselves, and who were recognized as the greatest constitutional lawyers in the land, advised their clients that it was not necessary to obey the National Labor Relations Act, because the act was patently so unconstitutional that it never would become upheld by the court.

Mr. President, some may assume that all that was evil in labor-management relations is past, and that we will never return to those evil days, but I maintain that if we change the law in the manner now proposed we merely invite the return of "the good old days." The evils which are incident to a given condition cannot be destroyed merely by saying, "We recognize those evils and we will never return to them again." That is what we may be told, but that is exactly what we were assured when the Committee on Civil Liberties began its work in 1935. We were told that business had reformed, that the days of the Homestead battle and the Ludlow massacre and the Pinkerton labor spies were gone; that industry had abandoned all that. That was told us from the witness stand. But our investigation developed the fact that such conditions had not been abandoned at all; that they were only being concealed. Our investigation tore off the mask which concealed actual practices in labor relations.

When Senators now talk, as some do, of this legislation which will put the risks back again into striking, let us recall what those conditions and those risks were.

I remind Senators that that investigation originated in the difficulties encountered by the National Labor Relations Act. The Labor Board came to the Senate Labor Committee saying, "in our very first cases we have encountered labor detective agencies as a means of frustrating the act; but they seem to be a part of a widespread system, too big for us to investigate in each separate case. We also find organized strike-breaking companies, and they, too, seem to be part of a system. We also find the system of plant arsenals for strike-breaking purposes; it, too, is too big for us to investigate by separate cases. Also, every time we try to touch these things our Board is enjoined; there are now 101 injunctions tying us up. Ought not Congress to investigate the extent of this kind of a system of labor relations?"

Mr. President, when the Smith-Connally Act was passed I opposed it, as Senators will remember. There was a discussion on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was sponsoring and fathering the act, and myself. There seemed to be in the bill an invitation again to use the courts for injunctive purposes against labor. I asked a simple question about it. It was denied that by reference to the district court we were inviting the lawyers of our land again to use the courts in industry-labor cases. I was afraid—and I mentioned the fear—that we were actually legislating against the Norris-LaGuardia Act and making possible a return to the terrible days of the labor injunction. The Senator from Texas and others who were mentioned as outstanding lawyers told me that I need have no concern; but the time came when the court was used, and in the decision in one case a great justice referred to the discussion which had taken place when the promise was made that the court would not be used. We cannot expect lawyers who represent important clients and receive large retaining fees not to use every advantage that is open to them under the law, and which can be legitimately used. I do not blame them; but I say that if we attempt to even up what is now called the disparity in the National Labor Relations Act, as this amendment would do, we immediately return to the good old days. But on with my story.

The words which I used a moment ago were quoted from statements made by the National Labor Relations Board when it said that it was being hindered in carrying out the policies of Congress, by spying, injunctions, and so forth. The Senate Civil Liberties Committee found those conditions far more widespread than the Labor Board had suspected. Senators would do well to refresh their recollections by glancing over the nearly 100 volumes of hearings, exhibits, and reports of that committee. I quote from a committee report dated 1939:

> The flagrant manner in which the labor relations law was being flouted and violated by powerful corporations all over the country was widely known, but the sinister means used to defraud workers of their rights guaranteed by the act—espionage, criminal strikebreakers, armed strike guards, guns and tear gas—remained undisclosed until this subcommittee investigation was underway.

In exposing the facts the Civil Liberties Committee encountered every form of evasion of Senate subpenas, plus the wholesale destruction of files, by trade associations such as the National Metal Trades Association, and by great corporations such as General Motors, whose officers admitted stripping the files of their highest officials. Yet the facts were unearthed in quantity, and the committee's findings were never challenged because almost the entire testimony was from the side of the accused. The panorama was that of American industry, of the greatest corporations in the land, strongly and secretly organized to defeat unionism, to prevent collective bargaining, and to frustrate national policy as enacted in the Wagner Act. It was a system which involved the National Association of Manufacturers, on which the committee made a 300-page report, and such secret agencies as the special conference committee, which concocted the policies and the legislative campaigns for the whole antilabor system. The labor relations of this country were in truth a barbaric jungle, enveloped in a fog of court litigations, and everywhere a morass of espionage.

BACK TO ESPIONAGE

The dirty and intricate and highly skilled business of labor spying was found to be organized as a professional occupation, in great detective companies, as well as in private systems within corporations. I quote from a committee report:

> From its study of five (labor detective) agencies, the committee was able to identify approximately 1,500 companies using one or the other of these services. Yet even this staggering total is not comprehensive. Other equally important labor-spying agencies remain untouched by the committee and their clients are still undisclosed.

The committee's listing of labor-spy agencies ran into the hundreds, their big-business clients ran into the thousands; and to this day no one knows what survives of that infamous system, though we do know that the largest of the labor detective agencies went out of business after the investigation.

Let Senators recall that labor espionage was the prevailing pattern of American industry. The committee reported:

> This practice which is so abhorrent to the American concept of a free system was found to be flourishing in every quarter. Organized businesses were taking in millions of dollars for dealing in labor spies. National and local employers' associations regarded labor espionage as a regular part of their services to their members. Great interstate corporations maintained private espionage systems which rivaled the detective agencies in scope and ruthlessness. The poison of espionage was

spread throughout industry, creating strife and corroding mutual trust between management and labor.

Let us keep a few of the hard facts in mind now when proposing to turn the clock back to that day. With respect to one of these labor-spying agencies, the committee found:

> Between 1933 and 1936 Pinkerton had 309 industrial clients, many of them giants in their respective fields of industry, such as the General Motors Corp., Bethlehem Steel Corp., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and Baldwin Locomotive Works.

The Senate committee found, as a sample, that of 1,228 Pinkerton labor spies, 331 had been infiltrated into unions; and "of these, at least 100 had held elective offices in unions, one even attained the position of national vice president of his union." Not a single important union was without its quota of hidden detective operatives, whose confessed business included union disruption, provocation of violence, and even the theft of union treasuries.

This spying extended even to Government officials. I drew from Pinkerton witnesses an account of how they surrounded the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Edward McGrady, at the time he was endeavoring to settle a violent strike and listened in on his conciliation conferences. The corporation responsible for that spying had not less than 14 detective agencies on its pay roll, to which it paid more than a million dollars in a year and a half.

Mr. President, it is an innocent remark when someone says, "This simple amendment merely makes it possible for labor and industry to b. treated on equal terms. We are merely trying to bring about a balance of justice."

Is this the kind of thing to which it is well to turn back by passing legislation which will "put the risks back into striking"? That is one of the aims of the present legislation.

I do not believe there has passed from public recollection the Senate committee's hearings on Harlan County, Ky., the many cities of so-called Little Steel, and other areas where labor relations were enforced through armies of private guards and the privately paid deputy sheriff system. For decades Harlan County had been the sinkhole where any stable pattern of national collective bargaining in coal had been frustrated. The committee reported:

> In the whole county there were 300 deputy sheriffs appointed in 2 years, only 3 of whom appear to have been paid from public funds. Over 100 deputy sheriffs have criminal records, having served sentences in State or Federal penitentiaries for murder, manslaughter, robbery, and other crimes of violence. In addition to these so-called peace officers the [coal] operators maintained cruising squads of thug gangs.

The details of dynamitings and murder were spread on the committee record. It took the Senate committee's investigation, some years of cases before the National Labor Relations Board, and prosecution by the Department of Justice to clear up that one situation. Do we seriously wish to tear up the law and the Board and permit such situations to spring again to life? Few Senators who were at those weeks of hearings and saw and heard that long procession of thugs, deputies, and experienced professional strikebreakers will forget those facts and desire to legislate so as to unleash that system again.

INDUSTRIAL MUNITIONS

Another essential part of that kind of labor relations consisted in industrial munitions, in manufacturing plants stocked like an arsenal. Represented as plant protection these arsenals were found by the committee to be there for the purpose of intimidating unions and smashing strikes. Several large chemical firms had sold huge quantities of tear gas and gas guns to businesses all over this land. In addition, the listing of plant arsenals showed that certain single corporations had more weapons than the National Guard of the State in which they were located. For example, the committee reported "The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. had 8 machine guns of standard Army tripod type; 369 rifles, 190 shot guns, and 454 revolvers, together with over 600 rounds of ball ammunition and 3,950 of shot ammunition. It also had 109 gas guns with over 3,000 rounds of gas ammunition." Nor was it the largest; the Republic Steel Corp. possessed over 83,000 rounds of ball and shot ammunition. The committee reported:

> These industrial arsenals far overshadowed the arms and gas equipment in the hands of local law enforcement authorities in the communities in which they had plants. The Republic Steel Corp., with 53,000 employees, purchased more than 10 times as many gas guns and more than 26 times as many gas shells and gas projectiles than the police force of Chicago with the population of almost 4,000,000 souls. Taking the arsenals of these companies together there were 1,800 firearms, over 300 gas guns, over 160,000 rounds of ammunition, and over 10,000 rounds of gas ammunition. This would be adequate equipment for a small war.

The Senate committee's exhaustive hearings left no doubt of "the conclusion that these arms were purchased not for property protection but rather as a part of a labor policy."

Mr. President, I cannot help digressing for a moment to recall that in 1936, in the autumn of the year—I remember it well, because I was out campaigning—we were urged to return to Washington because it had been discovered that quantities of a certain gas had been purchased for use in some mining operations. I need not name the companies; I need not go into the matter, because they did not use the gas. But it shows exactly how thoughtless people sometimes are. After we exposed the purchase and it was acknowledged that the gas was on hand and that it was planned to use it for certain purposes which might have resulted in the death of innocent boys and girls as well as miners, a promise was obtained that the gas would not be used. The most interesting part of that incident was that one of the persons who had been asked to testify rose and said, "Senator, we did buy the gas and we were going to use it, but I think it ought to be said here, and I hope you will be happy with us about it, that we did not use the gas." Of course, he was commended for not using it.

Few Senators who attended the committee hearings on the Chicago Memorial Day massacre of 1937 will forget the testimony, including the evidence of a news reel, of the workings-out of a labor policy to change which the Congress had passed the National Labor Relations Act. Let those facts be recalled by those legislators who would again put the risks back into striking.

Mr. President, as I said in the opening of my remarks, my theory in regard to industrial labor relations is embodied in the motion I made in the industrial-labor conference in 1941. I believe that strikes are as archaic as are many of the notions of long ago as to methods of obtaining justice. I think the day of striking is gone. I think we have adequate machinery to handle the situations which give rise to strikes. I think every thoughtful person realizes that our society is organized in such a way that a mere contest between employer and employee is not merely a contest between the two contending forces, but is a contest which affects hundreds of other persons, and that a strike in its ultimate effects, is actually a strike against society.

Mr. President, the day has come when we should do away with strikes; but we cannot do away with them by inviting a more universal use of them, and by again giving to industry the old power to crush, by warlike means, the persons who wish to strike or who wish to leave their employment, for whatever cause. We are trying to correct some evils; but in doing so we shall afflict society with even greater evils if we proceed in the way the pending bill contemplates.

Mr. President, to this day there is no proof, through Federal inspection, that the arsenals to which I have referred have been dispersed or destroyed. They are still in existence. The secrecy with which great corporations acquired their arms and the methods taken to conceal them were fully brought out in the Senate committee's investigation. If we repeal the laws that at present restrain their use, we shall have no assurance that those weapons will not be handy for the new labor policy.

In the words of the Senator from Minnesota, the proposed changes are simply for the purpose of providing equality of treatment in connection with the establishment by law of what are to be regarded as unfair labor practices. The purpose of the proposals is so innocent that at first we do not think about the still greater evils which will inevitably result. The antilabor employers associations will come into being overnight. The Senate committee's investigation produced a great amount of testimony regarding the activities of trade associations and manufacturers associations, both national and local, and their share in formulating and putting into practice the general policy of frustrating national law and destroying collective bargaining. That was shown to be their primary purpose. Most of those associations still

exist. The testimony proved that they fostered every sort of maneuver against collective bargaining, and that they did so by means of false-front citizens, committees and equally false propaganda organizations, all of whose real inspiration had been hidden.

Mr. President, one organization claimed a great membership; but when we investigated we found that it had copied from a telephone book the names on its membership list. Various tactics of that sort were revealed upon investigation. One organization, whose head appeared before us, was said to be organized for the purpose of defending the Constitution of the United States. Yet when the head of that organization was asked one or two simple questions about the Constitution he showed that he had never even seen a copy of the Constitution, the original of which today is displayed in the Library of Congress. He had no idea whether the Constitution is a long document or a short document. He knew nothing about it. When I asked him to quote one sentence from the Constitution he said, "All men are created evil." That shows the situation, Mr. President.

That man was selling memberships in his organization all over the United States, for the ostensible purpose of defending the Constitution of the United States. Yet he was using the funds of that organization and his influence as the head of it and all the other influences he could bring to bear to support the antilabor employers' associations. If the whole procedure in that case had not been so serious, it would have been laughable. But in that case, numerous men and women in the United States who love the Constitution of our country, thought that that supposedly great guardian of the Constitution would be able to tell them about it and help them defend it. However, he could not even name a single authority on the Constitution. He was not sufficiently familiar with the Constitution to be able to suggest that probably the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States might know something about the Constitution. Finally, when I pressed him for an answer, I said, "Please tell us the name of one man who teaches the Constitution or who expounds on the Constitution or who interprets the Constitution. I should like to have you name just one." He said, "Well, there are several Senators who know about the Constitution."

So, Mr. President, that is the type of thing which occurs when we allow free rein in such cases, and when we permit such organizations to sell their services in an attempt to accomplish purposes which should never be accomplished. One such was the Constitutional Educational League, which by its own testimony was proved to be not constitutional, not educational, nor even a league, but just a subsidized poison distributor. Another implement of this labor policy was a pamphlet for citizens' committees on how to organize vigilantes. Apparently anonymous, it was widely used amidst the Little Steel strike. No less than the officers of the National Association of Manufacturers finally owned up to the committee that it was their pamphlet. They had paid for it and distributed it, and it was part of their general system of attacking collective bargaining. They intensely regretted that that display of employer's free speech was frowned upon by the National Labor Relations Board.

The determined minority of employers who still want free speech and the emasculation of the national labor policy and the return to their good old days are still with us. The Senate committee reported that—

> Forty-five companies making the largest contributions to, or exerting a great influence in, the National Association of Manufacturers, purchased over 55 percent of the tear gas and tear gas equipment sold to industry.

Those same corporations are still with us. The Senate committee also reported on the methods those corporations used to break down and discipline businessmen who were opposed to their ruthless policy. Such coercion was attempted even on the chairman of the General Electric Corp. The committee reported:

> For advocating acceptance of collective bargaining, Gerard Swope was denounced as a "parlor pink" and "a dangerous man" by officials of the National Metal Trades Association.

Today the same corporations, the same forces, the same coercions exist to further a return, by legislative and other means, to the same old paradise, freed of collective bargaining.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire whether the top officials of the National Association of Manufacturers and similar organizations about which the Senator has spoken, had knowledge of the conditions which the Senator from Utah has mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I cannot answer that question, Mr. President. Many of the witnesses who appeared before our committee did not know what was going on.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that it would almost be impossible for them not to have knowledge of it. For instance, in the corporations which engage in practices of that kind, practices similar to those described a few moments ago by the Senator, certain departments are set up in those organizations for the express purpose of carrying on activities of violence of the sort the Senator has mentioned. Of course, it seems to me it would be impossible to have set up in the office building of the management a department which was engaged in that kind of practice, without having the top officials know that it was operating and that such activity was being carried on. I know that in some of the corporations which engaged in practices of that character, anyone who went into their offices or into their legal departments could see guns stacked in the corners, and sometimes could see revolvers lying on the tables or desks.

Furthermore, I understand that some of the corporations sometimes engaged in another practice, although I do not know whether the Senator's committee received evidence regarding it; sometimes they engaged in the practice of dynamiting their own buildings, for the purpose of creating public sentiment against the labor unions. Such things really did occur. It is known that buildings have been dynamited in some industrial areas in connection with violent labor disputes which have occurred. It has been my understanding that that system would be brought back again if we do not exercise care in the character of legislation we enact at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I agree with the last sentence wholeheartedly, because many of the individuals who opposed the National Labor Relations Act, and who fathered some of the injustices which have been perpetrated, have been those who during the last 10 to 20 years carried on propaganda against the act, and who sponsored and testified in favor of the passage of the pending bill.

We did not undertake our investigation as prosecuting attorneys. We were trying to clear up an evil. Some prosecutions grew out of some of the testimony that was given and that was proved to be accurate.

I am sure that many of the men who appeared, men industrially great and great in every other way, were as much shocked as was the committee itself at some of the things which happened. To answer the Senator's question, they were legally responsible for some of those things, and therefore, of course, could not be uninformed about them. It was their duty, as directors or officers of corporations, to know what was being done with the money spent by the corporations.

As in the case of the persons who refused to use the gas in the incident I mentioned a few moments ago, and who were glad they did not use it, we have learned to honor, men who have come to realize and acknowledge that practices in which they had engaged were wrong, and who have repented. The spy system is not an open evil in industry today. I do not know whether it is carried on in a secret way or not, but pretty generally the basic reforms which were attempted have been successful in eradicating many of the evils which previously existed.

What strikes me as strange is that among the industrialists who came before our committee—and there were many of them—we never saw a man who was not in some aspects at least, a great man. That is my own testimony about them. When they understand the value of procedures different from those they have been following they become converted to them. The best illustration of that and the good which comes from it is exemplified by what has happened in the steel industry lately. The steel industry was not organized until comparatively recent years. It has now not only been organized, but through the organization great bargaining processes

have been carried through to success. The whole country is benefited by the peaceful negotiations and the right kind of industrial labor relations. That has been true in the case of the electrical workers and of the automobile workers. All the great industries have been organized in the wake of the National Labor Relations Act, and it is well to point out these conditions.

Mr. President, I think it should be said that generally in the United States industry is in an extremely healthful condition, so far as labor relations are concerned. There are great corporations which have not had a strike for a generation—yea, two generations or three generations. The average laboring man and the average industrialist is carrying on as he should, and has worked in harmony with the laws which were enacted to overcome evils which had developed.

The fear is a return to the "good old days," which would invite the advantage-taker to appear again, and make it possible to destroy the great advances in industrial relations and turn back the clock very far.

I cannot help digressing for another observation. In the great coal and railway strike of 1922, I was called back into uniform, and many mines were placed under martial law. The Governor of my State had issued an order that since armed troops were in the locality, all arms owned by private citizens must be handed in. The type of employers the Senator from Montana has mentioned, the type he has known all his life, were surprised beyond words because we took their guns away, as well as the guns of the average person. They said that was not right, and they made appeals to the Governor; but we took their guns, and a degree of peace followed, and the advantage-taking which those guns encouraged has ceased to exist. Men like the Senator from Montana and myself have grown up where various industries have had their beginning in the desert, and we have seen in the little span of our lifetime everything in the way of industrial development, from the largest corporations to the smallest. There is always something to remind us how ruthless and inconsiderate, of every individual right men can become when a dollar is involved, and how hard it is to drive home to the people of our country the fact that there is something a little better than profit, and that certain human beings, even if they do not own an inch of ground, have rights.

Some have been surprised beyond words at our defending some poor fellow who could not talk a word of English, could not do anything about the condition in which he found himself. When we say, "This fellow is a human being; that the Constitution of the United States refers to persons, and that persons have certain rights as a result of the fact that the Constitution mentions persons," always the reply is made, "Of course, the Constitution did not refer to these persons. It was referring to other persons." Everyone knows what is back of such situations. Such things have happened within this generation, as we all know.

Anyone who votes for the bill as it passed the House, if he knows anything about the history of his country in the last 20 years or the last generation, will know that he is voting an invitation to a return of all the evils which made industry-labor relations abhorrent in the mind of everyone who sensed in any way a degree of genuine justice to the average man.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe the Senator will concede that it could easily have been otherwise if the corporations had displayed a reasonable spirit of cooperation with labor unions. I recall that in my State of Montana, when copper miners first began to constitute an important element in American industry, the management was entirely in the West, but after mining operations had been consolidated into great national organizations, with their headquarters in New York, the situation changed very rapidly.

When the Amalgamated Corp., a merger of western companies, was first organized, in 1899 or 1900, the Butte Miners' Union invested all its treasury funds in the stock of that corporation, showing the splendid sentiment that prevailed at that time between management and labor. Within a period of only 10 or 12 years afterward disputes began to develop. Gunmen began to appear, detectives and dynamite, and all manner of violence followed in very rapid succession, showing that when management and labor are able to work together in a spirit of friendly cooperation without outside interference they can usually come to fair and decent terms, if they are both willing to give and take.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I agree with that wholeheartedly. No one, Mr. President, can deny the historical reference that the Senator makes. I think I should take the time to remind the Senator from Montana of the fact that the first law sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States guaranteeing to miners an 8-hour day grew out of conditions in the Western States. When one reads the decision and learns of the claim of unconstitutionality made by a person who was appealing against being restrained from working more than 8 hours a day, one cannot but feel that the logic of his position was exactly the logic that appears in the preamble of the bill that has come from the House. That bill would give to the workman freedom to do what he pleases. In the case in the Supreme Court to which I refer, the man felt himself aggrieved because, as he maintained, he was being restrained of his liberty and deprived of his rights by the State, which had said that no miner should work longer than 8 hours a day, basing their decision upon the public good. Said the miner: "My liberty is being taken away from me; I have a right to work as long as I will, wherever I will. I have a right to quit when I will. You must not in any way interfere with my liberty."

That is exactly the aim of the House bill, as may be seen by a reading of the preamble. It is to liberate men from restraints imposed by "terrible" union organizations so that they may elect where they will go and what they will do and be entirely free from a law which compels them to fit into a groove, supposedly for the good of their companions and for the good of all.

Mr. President, as I proceed with the remainder of this address, my purpose is to show that the pending amendment is in keeping with the theory which was suggested by certain persons who gave testimony in the hearings on the original National Labor Relations Act. The idea is not new; it is old. It will probably become necessary, here and there, for me to mention a name, to show that those who are supporting the idea today are the same ones who supported it several years ago. They are today supporting it for exactly the same reasons that were given at that time. It is the desire to interfere with a protection given to labor in the choice of its bargaining agent and in the choice of its organization.

In the weeks of testimony heard by the Senate Labor Committee, there were many informative witnesses, and a fair picture, at least of sharply contending recommendations, was spread on the committee's record. Besides businessmen and labor leaders there were several economists whose advice was useful. But in comparison with many hearings which I have sat through in the past decade there was a regrettable lack of testimony from labor-law experts of national repute for authority, impartiality, and great experience. Instead, we had Dr. Leo Wolman, whose views I mention because they have been repeated in radio broadcasts and otherwise, by a member of the committee, and by others. Dr. Wolman, who writes a column on labor relations almost every day, and who qualified himself before the committee primarily as an economist who had worked for a labor union and in Government service in behalf of labor objectives, stressed what he represented as a kind of law, and a very bad law, inevitably governing union activities under the majority rule, which is the core of the National Labor Relations Act. He said that this law of majority rule in unions compelled the unions to "exterminate the minority," while the same majority rule in political life worked out to conserve the minority. That is old logic, Mr. President. The phrase has been used for a very long time. It does not take much application of logic to reveal the sophistry in such an argument. Dr. Wolman was regretting the elimination of various forms of company unionism, to which he said hundreds of thousands of workers belonged until the Wagner Act came along with its majority rule in collective bargaining. That rule, he said, "exterminated this minority," implying a picture of hundreds of thousands of little white crosses of tombstones under which the minority

lay buried. What his sophistry concealed was that it was the minority policy that was exterminated, to be succeeded by a truly representative workers' organization in true collective bargaining. He also omitted to state that the hundreds of thousands of company unionists were still alive, and had joined practically en masse the great trade unions in the basic industries where the so-called representation plans, fostered by Wolman, had once flourished.

His picture of majority rule in the political field was equally specious. He gave the impression that in that field the principal design was to preserve the minority from extermination, as if the principal purpose of a citizen in voting, let us say, Democratic, was to conserve the Republican minority, or vice versa. Here again what he failed to note was that in a political election the policy or the candidate of party A is exterminated, for the time being, when party B wins the election. In short, the majority rule in an industrial democracy, which is what collective bargaining is, works out precisely the same as majority rule in a political democracy and not at all according to Wolman's thesis. Yet this sort of loose talk about exterminated minorities, as well as about labor monopolies, has been all too current in much of the discussion of the present legislative proposals.

I asked Dr. Wolman some questions about the operations of manufacturers' associations. He belittled their influence and expressed a lack of personal knowledge of them which was, I am afraid, not entirely frank, for in the record of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee's investigation there are some documents about him in connection with the special conference committee. This secret organization, which is still active, was fully revealed in our investigation as a sort of general staff or policy-making group for the National Association of Manufacturers and other trade associations. The special conference committee was the efficient laboratory which devised a great many of the legalistic traps to entangle unionism which were then urged by manufacturers' lobbyists before Senate committees. The old traps, such as amendments to prohibit coercion from any source, and other amendments to equalize collective bargaining and such fair-seeming and plausible amendments as those to render unions responsible by making them suable in the courts—all of those old antilabor entanglements were gone over by the Senate Labor Committee a dozen years ago at great length and all were excluded for excellent reasons. They all emanated from employer groups like the special conference committee, and since that committee still is secretly active, we have the same amendments proposed in a dozen different forms.

Dr. Wolman's pretended ignorance of employer groups such as the special conference committee, seems a little less than candid to those of us who remembered the record of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. That record showed Wolman in friendly intimacy with the special conference committee in a secret meeting in a New York hotel in late 1935. There he told them that he had had a change of heart on the question of labor relations and no longer saw justification in labor's point of view. He assured them that wages and working conditions are the result of a prosperous industry and that labor unions had never contributed to the prosperity of an industry. He gave those employers some comforting predictions which in retrospect do not enhance his claims to being a labor-relations expert. He told them, and this was late 1935, that union membership has now reached its peak and is headed for a sharp decline. But when we compare union membership now with late 1935 we notice that the learned doctor missed his guess by just about 10,000,000 union members. Also he expertly advised the employers that the Wagner Act was just another "shot in the arm," but that its effects would wear off before May of 1936. In short, I am afraid that Wolman's estimates, as recently delivered to the Senate committee, may prove to be about as erroneous as his logic, though both his logic and his estimates have been enthusiastically promulgated by employers' associations, especially in the last few years.

PROFESSIONS AND PRACTICES

There are some other witnesses who recently appeared before the Senate Labor Committee whose professions sounded statesmanlike but whose past practice is perhaps a clearer indication of what they want in the way of legislation. Admittedly there has been considerable change in the tune of employer-recommendations in the past dozen years. Those of us who sat in Senate Labor Committee hearings recall what employers recommended when the National Labor Relations Act was under consideration in 1934 and 1935. Uniformly they were against collective bargaining. They were tender for individual bargaining. They stood on the constitutional right of the individual laborer to deal individually with his employer, freed of the menace of collective bargaining through trade unions. The farthest they would go collectively was in a tolerance for company unions, where the collectivism was confined to a single plant, or they would tolerate so-called employee-representation plans, of wide scope, but all thoroughly under the employer's control. We remember the moving arguments of that noted lawyer-lobbyist for the National Association of Manufacturers, James Emery, and his plausible findings that collective-bargaining was essentially unconstitutional, repugnant to the American workers and inevitably destructive of American industrial production.

Mr. President, those are the things that were said in 1935 and 1936. The same witnesses have now come before us and said, "We need collective bargaining today; we must maintain collective bargaining; all that is necessary to be done is to correct the evils existing in collective bargaining; great good has come through collective bargaining." I wonder whether those men could have stood before the committee and told the committee that collective bargaining must be maintained; that they believe in collective bargaining; and that great good has come through collective bargaining, if they had had read to them their testimony of the past. One of the witnesses, a man whom I had known for a long time, came before our committee on a day when there happened to be present the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], of Princeton University, and the present speaker, senior Senator from Utah, of Utah University. When he saw these two old broken-down college professors, as they may be called by some——

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Utah for classing me as a professor, though a broken-down professor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This man saw us sitting there, and yet he had the nerve to tell us that all the information and all the ideas he had respecting industrial relations he imbibed in the university of hard knocks, because he said, "I never learned these things when I went to the university. My knowledge of them has come from own experience." He was trying to point out to us how practical he was and how impractical we were. I looked at his gray hair and I figured that he graduated from college about the same time I did, and that he obtained his experience through hard knocks and his connection with practical affairs, and not in the academic field which the Senator from New Jersey and I are endeavoring to uphold here. There was not a single university in the whole of the United States in 1906 which gave a course on industry-labor relations. Such a course could not be had at that time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In 1920 Princeton University had very extensive courses in that field, and it now has a department studying such questions. I am very happy to report that information to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for the date.

Mr. SMITH. It might have been before that time. I did not get back to Princeton until 1920 after the First World War.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know pretty well when it started. I kept track of such things as a university administrator. It is like other subjects which have come to the front. In one university in the United States today there are 85 courses on the Orient; but at the time when the universities began to expand one could hardly find a single such course, except in the field of language or religion, or something of that kind. I believe that universities ought to grow up, just as everything else grows up. I am glad to see that in the stiff economics courses and courses dealing with the economic history of the United States, we are treating subjects which have to do with the life of our Nation. Before I am through with the discussion of this subject—not today—I shall quote from some of the scholars who have chairs in industry-labor relations, showing their views about the national labor relations

law, what it is doing for us, and what we hope it will continue to do for us.

Now the tune in the recent Labor Committee hearings has been changed. All of the employer witnesses support collective bargaining. Every one of them is in favor of collective bargaining, whereas not one of them was in favor of it in the good old days. Their testimony was full of professions, not so much of conversion but rather of original and historic devotion to true collective bargaining. It was in the name of "perfecting true collective bargaining" that they urged with unanimity a dozen simple amendments to the Wagner Act. These amendments are for the most part recognizable as the ancient antilabor stand-bys of employers designed to entangle and frustrate true collective bargaining. I do not for one moment question that certain employer witnesses were sincere in upholding collective bargaining and the present national labor relations policy. In fact, that is really the majority opinion of American industry—it is still the recalcitrant minority that is fathering these crippling "amendments." Examine the testimony of the past fortnight. The great industrialists who want to get on with production really have no expectations of destroying unionism and collective bargaining. Look at the procession of those who as their spring contracts with the unions expire, have recently completed new agreements, mostly including wage increases, deemed fair by both sides. The rubber industry, the electrical manufacturing industry, then the great United States Steel Corp., whose lead is being followed by other steel companies, then the automotive industry—one after another of our basic industries are right now in the process of continuing the collective bargaining practices to which they have become habituated, and all this without benefit of the repressive legislation for which a minority still clamors. All this is very different from the views which the manufacturers' associations urged on Senate committees when the Labor Relations Act was being debated in 1934 and 1935. At that time, be it remembered, the manufacturers' only allies in opposition to the Wagner Act were the Communists.

Let me repeat that. The only group who allied themselves with the manufacturers' associations when we held hearings in 1934 and in 1935 were those who admitted that they were Communists and stood for the doctrines of communism. At the Senate Labor Committee hearings in the spring of 1934 the Communist Party, represented by one of its chief officials, opposed the proposed act lock, stock, and barrel. The same opposition was reiterated in 1935, and it was not until 1937 that the Communist Party rushed to the support of the Labor Relations Act, implying that it had practically fathered the act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the statement of the able Senator that in 1934 the only group which followed the same course as the Manufacturers' Association, which opposed the Wagner Act, was the Communists, if we were to apply the reasoning which some apply today, we might say that the National Association of Manufacturers followed the Communist line at that time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not want to charge a similar inconsistency to some of the recent employer witnesses before the Senate committee. Despite their professions of devotio to collective bargaining there is some reason to reexamine the sincerity of their specific recommendations. For example, the head of the country's largest automotive concern, C. E. Wilson, of General Motors, was accompanied at the hearing by a personnel director, Harry W. Anderson. But this personnel director was the same official who had testified before the Senate Civil Liberties Committee; he was directly responsible for operating the huge collection of labor detective agencies employed by his corporation; he was personally responsible for destroying desired evidence; and he had asserted that while his corporation intended to dispense with Pinkertons and the rest, it would still maintain its own private system of watching the employees. Should the recommendations urged by this corporation be adopted by the Senate, they still have the same old-style equipment, and it could hardly be called true collective bargaining.

Another recent witness was the veteran counsel to the Weirton Steel Co., Earl F. Reed. He also wanted merely to perfect collective bargaining. He said:

> Until the policy of the Government becomes one of impartiality in which the various economic factors are allowed to have free play we will never correct the misconception in the minds of many people as to the rights of management in labor difficulties.

He has been associated with the labor difficulties of Weirton Steel Co. for many years. The Senate Civil Liberties Committee showed that at one period the company spent more than $23,000 for industrial munitions and labor espionage; its spies were hired through well-known strikebreaking agencies. It purchased most of its munitions from a chemical company on whose board of directors sat Mr. Reed's law partner. The National Labor Relations Board still has cases pending against Weirton Steel. I am afraid that Mr. Reed's advice, as well as his company's past practice, are hardly in the direction of true collective bargaining.

Another employer witness who recently assured the committee of his devotion to collective bargaining was Harold W. Storey, of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. He assured us that long before the National Labor Relations Act was written, Allis-Chalmers voluntarily recognized and accepted collective bargaining. But he entirely omitted to state that the record of the Civil Liberties Committee showed that for years his company had utilized the most notorious of labor-spying and strikebreaking services.

Another witness, a vice president of the Chrysler Corp., testified before our committee in almost the same words: "We were bargaining collectively with our employees before the Wagner Act was passed."

They seem to have forgotten that he had appeared before the Senate Civil Liberties Committee and had testified—part 18, page 7891:

> We have been willing, and still are willing, to bargain collectively with them for their members. Beyond this we do not agree to go.

In other words, at that time his corporation was not accepting majority rule in collective bargaining, even though it was the law of the land. Nor did he mention the amounts of tear gas and other plant munitions purchased by his company and the hiring of the services of strike-breaking agencies, even after the passage of the Wagner Act.

Another recent witness before the Senate committee, Ira Mosher, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, also expressed his devotion to collective bargaining: "We do not seek to put the employee at a disadvantage in collective bargaining. Any such program would be disastrous to the country." Aside from the notorious record of antilabor practices of the National Association of Manufacturers, as found in the Civil Liberties Committee record, there is mention of Mr. Mosher's labor-relations practice as head of the American Optical Co. One purchase of industrial munitions, valued at $874, by that concern was ordered shipped to another firm so that their strikebreaking preparations could be kept hidden from their employees. The record shows that the invoice for these munitions was to be marked secret and sent to Mr. Mosher personally. These are not very clean hands with which to come before a Senate committee with legislative recommendations.

Mr. President, after one has served for 5 or 6 years on a committee such as the Civil Liberties Committee, listening to testimony of witnesses day after day, week in and week out, piling up evidence running into a hundred volumes, one feels a little bit sick of the whole business. One hates to think that our country will ever slip back again to the evils to which it was formerly exposed in the common practices of labor and industry. Yet there is before us a bill containing amendments which will invite a return to those days. I know that every person who speaks for those amendments on the floor will say—and say truthfully, so far as his own mind and heart are concerned—that there is not a man in the United States Senate and not a man in the whole Congress who would like to return to the good old days of spying, munitions, strikebreaking, and all of the other things that then occurred. No one wants such a thing, and no one would vote for this bill if he dreamed that those days would return. I know that those who are advocating the amendments feel just as sure that those days will not return as I am certain that they will return if we enact a law which will permit them to return, because the invitation is there, and it will be heeded and accepted by someone. All advantage-takers in the world, Mr. President, are not dead. The process

of advantage-taking is not a thing of the past. The mere passage of the National Labor Relations Act did not cure all the evils which were inherent in the minds and souls of men who were perfectly happy to plan for and to execute the beating up of their neighbors. Those things will again come to life if we invite them.

Let me remind the Senate what I said in the opening part of my statement, that when a provision was placed in the bill which is now known as the Smith-Connally Act to make it possible to use again the district courts, every supporter of the amendment denied that the courts would be used. The chairman of the committee who defended the bill answered the question categorically by saying:

> Great lawyers have assured me that that which the Senator from Utah is concerned about cannot occur under the bill.

But it did occur; and the fact that it occurred is written into the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. That was several years ago. The resort to the district courts can probably be justified in the case which went to the district courts and has been justified by an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. But will every case that follows in the wake of that one justified case, which is now recognized as a proper functioning of the law of the land, be justified?

Possibly in the days of the use of spies and munitions, in the days when efforts were being made to break up unionism, there were some cases which were justified. Possibly there were evil men connected with some industries and some mines who wanted to blow up those industries and mines. There were occasions when there were great explosions after the last war, when unions were being organized on the basis of hurting everyone and everything. We went through that. There were evils. But, Mr. President, when we once pass a law and it is interpreted and used for 10 years and sustained by the courts, and we then change that law to such an extent that the whole philosophy is changed, we simply invite a return to the evils which existed prior to its enactment.

It is useless for me to say that those who are sponsoring this legislation do not sense these evils. I do not think they sense them as I sense them, because they have seen abuses which ought to be corrected. The trouble with the correction of the abuses is that we set out to take advantage of certain conditions which seem to exist, by stepping into a larger field and bringing about the utter destruction of the philosophy and theory of the National Labor Relations Act which has become the law of our land.

Those are the dangers, Mr. President, and they will return just so surely as we are here, because the advantage-taker has by no means ceased to exist in the world; and the men who can turn law to their own purposes when once they are invited to do so will probably use law as it was used before, if we give them the opportunity.

My plea, Mr. President, is that the pending amendment be defeated. Judging from the vote this afternoon, it will not be defeated. My words, therefore, in a sense, are spoken in vain; but this is not the first time that words have been uttered in vain in the Senate of the United States. My words on another amendment will probably be in vain, because the line-up has already been made in the vote taken this afternoon. But, nevertheless, from time to time during the discussion of the bill and of the amendments I shall try to point out, as I pointed out this afternoon, that we are running the risk of great evils. They were pointed out in the debate on the Smith-Connally bill, and the President of the United States, when he vetoed it, accepted the theory of those of us who opposed that bill. But there was an overriding of the veto. Those of us who opposed the bill were charged with being in favor of strikes; and strikes did not cease even with the passage of that bill.

Mr. President, my plea is that we try to cure the evils themselves and not invite other evils by adopting amendments such as the one now pending which will change the whole philosophy of the present law.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to some features of the proposed labor legislation. I wish to say first that it is always a pleasure to me to hear my distinguished colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], although I disagree with him quite profoundly in regard to the views he has expressed. I shall try to show the grounds for my disagreement. It seems to me that his approach to the problem is a negative one. As I interpret his remarks, he seems to say that there may be some evils in the present situation, but that we are in danger of bringing about many more serious evils if we attempt to remedy the ones now existing, and that if we let the terrible National Association of Manufacturers once get its hands on the situation, the country will go to wrack and ruin.

I also regret to be obliged to say that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who spoke on this subject a few days ago, seems to strike the same note that the Senator from Utah has struck; namely, that we face economic chaos and ruin in this country if, recognizing that certain evils exist, we try as statesmen intelligently to find a remedy for them.

Mr. President, in the remarks I shall make, I shall take a positive position. I shall endeavor to defend the bill now pending before the Senate, which I believe is well drafted and well worked out; and I shall also speak in regard to some of the proposed amendments, of which I am the sponsor of three out of the four.

Mr. President, in opening my remarks on the proposed labor legislation, I wish to express regret that it has not been possible for those of us who have had responsibility on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to receive a positive type of cooperation from the labor leadership. The greatest surprise I had in the hearings was the statements of both Mr. Philip Murray and Mr. Green, the heads, respectively, of the CIO and the AFL, that they could not offer us any constructive suggestions because they felt that any suggestions which might come from them might possibly involve their position or might possibly in some way impair what they call "the unconditional right to strike." I shall speak on that subject a little later.

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to say that it is too bad that today, at a critical time in our history, when everyone knows that we are having difficult management-labor problems and everyone knows that there may be wrongs on both sides, and everyone knows that, certainly, labor needs to check up on its attitudes and its practices, the men who are leading the labor movement have been unwilling to offer to our committee any constructive suggestions, except one, which was that if we would provide ways by which wages could be raised and prices could be lowered, there would be very few difficulties in the labor situation. Unfortunately, in view of the way our economic laws function, such results cannot be brought about as easily as suggestions of that sort can be made, and it is not possible to cure existing evils by undertaking to change the laws of God, which function in a certain way. We simply cannot do such things; and, especially, we cannot do them by means of Government fiat. It seems to me that it was reasonable for us to ask labor leadership to sit down with us and recognize that certain conditions should be corrected. So, I open my remarks by an expression of deep regret that that was the attitude of the labor leaders.

I also wish to express deep regret that today the wrong kind of propaganda is going out from union leadership to the people of this country, especially to the workers, as is evidenced by the hundreds of postal cards which I have received in the past few days. All of them are stated in exactly the same terms. All of them are printed with my name and address on the front, and the messages on all of them are written in pencil. Of course, they are signed by various persons, but all the postal cards contain the message, "Please vote against the antistrike bill."

Mr. President, you and I and those of us who are members of the committee, including the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who has preceded me in speaking to the Senate this afternoon, know perfectly well that the bill which the committee reported to the Senate is not an antistrike bill. The bill does not contain a word against strikes. On the contrary, the right to strike under proper conditions is recognized. Yet the word has gone out to the people of the United States, "Tell your Senators and Representatives in Congress that they must vote against the antistrike bill"—although such a bill does not exist. I pity the poor people of this country who are left in such a state of ignorance, at a time when true statesmanship requires that the actual facts be clearly set forth and that in the attempt to solve these problems every possible effort be made to have people work together, instead of working against each other. We need to have an approach which recognizes the fact, which I wish to discuss, that, no matter what we may do in the way of

enacting legislation in an effort to correct some of the evils which presently exist, management and labor must continue to live together after the legislation is enacted.

Mr. President, I have tried to say that we wish to have both sides get together and recognize that there are wrongs, and that all of us should act together, as friends, in trying to correct such wrongs, and in condemning evil practices, and in strengthening good practices. In this bill we have done nothing to take away the rights of labor. I simply take issue with anyone who says that we have.

We have simply provided by the bill that where the so-called rights of labor have been abused, the Government must step in if third parties are affected. The Government's function is not to regulate these matters, and assume to fix wages, or prices, or what not. The Government's responsibility is to protect the public, and all the public. The American public wants the Government to recognize the evils, and to take steps to protect all our 140,000,000 people against abuses, whether the abuse is by an employer, by the great corporations which are so frequently referred to, or by labor monopolies. We have a problem, as responsible legislators, to think in terms of the American people.

So, Mr. President, I am supporting the bill we reported by the committee. I am one of the sponsors of three of the amendments which have been proposed, because I think they will help to clarify the bill and make its terms a little plainer. I wish to say, however, that I am anxious to have passed a bill which will have the support of the Congress, which will have the support of the American people, and which the President of the United States will sign. Although I am sponsor for some of the amendments, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to lay the amendments aside and vote on the bill without any amendments in order to get it into conference and in final form as soon as possible. I am not pressing for that at this time, because I am going to discuss some of the amendments, as well as the bill.

Now, Mr. President, let us look at the bill, which has been described as such a terrible thing. I am referring to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida, who is always so eloquent, and can always paint such a splendid picture for those who are listening. Let us look at the bill.

What I am about to say has been said before, but it does not hurt repeating, so that those among the American people who care to listen to what different ones of us are saying may get a picture of the whole management-labor relationship and obtain an idea of what we are trying to accomplish. They can draw their own conclusions as to whether what we are doing is done in an attempt to injure the workers.

Title I is an over-all amendment of the National Labor Relations Act, otherwise known as the Wagner Act, and fills the need—and I say "need" advisedly—of making that act a two-way street, after we have had the experience with it for over 10 years as simply an act to protect the rights of labor.

I wish to say at that point that I think that when the act was passed it was needed, it was necessary to set up machinery to protect the rights of labor. In my opinion, the act was passed at a time when labor was not organized sufficiently to take care of itself, and when it needed the opportunity to organize and have a voice in collective bargaining.

Let me note here that, while we are now going a little further, enlarging the act, and recognizing that there are unfair practices possible on both sides of the bargaining table, that is all we are doing in this bill. I wish to say that we do not interfere in any paragraph of the bill with the existing rights of labor guaranteed by the original Wagner Act, but we do consider the rights of management as well, and we try to define what are unfair labor practices by unions and workers, as well as by employers.

At that point let me ask, is there anyone who could possibly take issue with the intelligent approach represented by that suggestion?

We still continue to look to the National Labor Relations Board for the adjustment of management-labor relations. We would not only not abolish the Board but would increase the size of the Board, and give it responsibility to take the initiative in any case in which a labor-management dispute arose.

The Board has been given a new perspective in its over-all job to protect both parties in labor controversies from unfair practices. An attack may be made on some of the provisions of title I of the bill, but that is the aim, nothing more nor less than to make it an over-all coverage of what are unfair labor practices, no matter who may indulge in them. The bill says to the Board, "It is up to you to hold hearings and determine whether there is an unfair practice, issue your cease and desist orders, and, when necessary, to call upon the courts to help you in carrying out your orders."

Title II of the bill sets up a newly organized Federal mediation service, entirely outside the Department of Labor, and with special emphasis on its voluntary character. It cannot impose its edicts on anybody. It is mediation pure and simple, and it is set up outside the Department of Labor advisedly, because the Department of Labor is, by the terms of the statute creating it, and properly so, the advocate of the labor side of controversies. Because of that fact it has been felt that mediation and conciliation should not be left within the Department of Labor, as the wrong atmosphere would surround what is supposed to be an impartial body. So we have set up an independent mediation board. We have drawn on the experience of the past Board; we have drawn on the experience of the conciliation services, and we have tried, through experts we have had advising the committee, to incorporate procedures and studies which have heretofore been found successful in mediation. We have tried to eliminate things which, on the other side, have not been helpful, and which have appeared in previous legislation.

Furthermore in title II of the bill we provide for the extreme cases which threaten national paralysis. To meet an industry-wide stoppage of some kind which may cause injury to the health or safety of 140,000,000 people, such as a transportation strike, or a coal strike, we have set up special machinery which will enable the Attorney General, on his own initiative, to petition the courts to prevent either a shut-down or a walk-out, until the mediation processes have had time to function.

That is one of the exceptions, as I shall mention them in a moment, where there is in the whole bill any mention of the immediate right to strike, and the provision does not prevent the ultimate right to strike, because at the end of the mediation procedures we provide for a vote to be taken by the employees involved as to whether or not they prefer to strike, or to accept the last offer of management. In the event of a deadlock and a strike is not ended, the matter is referred to the President, who can use his discretion as to whether he will present the matter to the Congress, whether or not the situation is such that emergency legislation is required.

Nothing has been done with respect to the Smith-Connally Act. There is no provision for taking over property or running plants by the Government. We simply provide a procedure which we hope will be effective in 99 out of 100 cases where the health or safety of the people may be affected, and still leave a loophole for congressional action. Let me emphasize that none of us must ever admit that the Government of the United States is impotent to take care of the health and safety of our 140,000,000 people. That is fundamental in any government organization.

Whether the machinery we provide will work, no one can predict, but I welcome this emergency procedure as the first step toward finding out, by trial and error, the best way to protect the public in disputes that threaten the national health or safety. That is title II.

As I have said, title I provided simply for amendment of the Wagner Act, so as to recognize unfair labor practices wherever they may be, and give the National Labor Relations Board a wider jurisdiction to take care of such matters.

Title II would increase the effectiveness of the Mediation Service, and authorize the use of whatever steps may be necessary in a situation threatening national paralysis.

I now come to title III, which is very brief, and merely provides for suits by and against labor organizations, and requires that labor organizations, as well as employers, shall be responsible for carrying out contracts legally entered into as the result of collective bargaining. That is all title III does. I cannot conceive of any sound reason why a party to a contract should not be responsible for the fulfillment of the contract; it is outside my comprehension how anyone can take such a position.

I have heard it argued that it is a terrible thing to make labor unions responsible for carrying out their contracts, but I have a quotation here, if I can find

it, from Mr. Justice Brandeis, who was the greatest friend of labor in the Federal judicial field. He said the greatest thing labor could do would be to recognize its responsibility. This is a quotation from an address delivered by him before the Economic Club of Boston on December 4, 1902:

> The unions should take the position squarely that they are amenable to law, prepared to take the consequences if they transgress, and thus show that they are in full sympathy with the spirit of our people, whose political system rests upon the proposition that this is a government of law, and not of men.

I cannot see how anycne can take issue with so clear-cut a statement as that, or can take issue with the provisions of title III, which simply carry out the idea, by providing that whichever side is guilty of violating a contract solemnly entered into shall be responsible for damages resulting from such violation.

Mr. Brandeis also used this expression:

> I can conceive of no expenditure of money by a union which could bring so large a return as the payment of compensation for some wrong actually committed by it. Any such payment would go far in curbing the officers and members of the union from future transgressions of the law, and it would, above all, establish the position of the union as a responsible agent in the community, ready to abide by the law. This would be of immense advantage to the union in all of its operations.

Let me remind Senators again that that was the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis, made years ago, at a time when he was one of the greatest defenders of the rights of the workingman, trying to bring about a right relationship between management and labor. Certainly no one could charge him with being a labor baiter; nobody could charge him with trying to promote vicious labor legislation.

All that has been done in title III of the pending bill is to state, in terms, the very principle that Mr. Brandeis lays down as a precept to be followed by unions who desire to be respected in the community.

I am also very much in favor of title IV of the bill, providing for the creation of a continuing joint committee of Congress to study and report on basic problems affecting friendly labor relations. That is a most important provision, because it is intended to create an official congressional body to observe the way in which labor legislation is affecting relationships between labor and management. The joint congressional committee is to conduct a continuing study of the things that make for a better relationship between management and labor. There is provision, for example, for a study of profit-sharing plans, a study of incentive plans, a study of the annual-wage principle, a study of welfare funds, and a study of the internal management of unions, so that they may be set up to protect the worker, who, after all, is a member of the union.

What is sought is to have the congressional committee make a continuing study to see how the legislation is working, and continually to recommend changes that may be positive and progressive and in line with what all Senators want, namely, a better understanding between management and labor.

I find myself very much in the dark when I hear it said, and when I read statements in the press, that the AFL and the CIO are raising a million and a half dollars with which to defeat the pending measure. Why should they want to defeat it? What is the point? If Mr. Murray and Mr. Green would not waste their money in trying to defeat the bill but would sit down with us and say, "This is what is wrong with the bill; we are reasonable men," I should be willing to talk to them. That is exactly what they ought to do. I challenge them here and now to tell us what is wrong with any of the provisions I have read here today, so far as sound principle is concerned with regard to management-labor relations.

As I said before, I should like to see a bill passed similar to the pending bill in its present form. I should like to see some of the amendments adopted. I shall support three of the four of them, but I should be perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to waive the question of amendments if it could be agreed that they could be laid aside and that we could pass the bill, send it to conference, and have emerge from conference a bill based upon the approach for which I am trying to speak. It is an approach to action in which all concerned could sit down together and determine what is the statesmanlike way to secure the enactment of legislation that would improve present conditions.

I would go further, Mr. President. I would have a committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States to say to him, "Mr. President, we do not want the issue discussed any longer of whether or not you are going to veto the bill." I do not want the President to veto the bill. I want the President to join with the Congress in enacting legislation which will at least be aimed at remedying existing evils. I think that is the correct approach. I should be happy to see a joint committee, representing both Houses, confer with the President to ascertain if it is possible to write legislation which will meet the needs of the day and the demands of the American people.

There has been criticism of the bill, Mr. President. Let us lay aside the proposed amendments, for a moment, and discuss the bill itself. I hold in my hand a copy of the minority views, signed by my distinguished friend the Senator from Utah, who spoke a moment ago. In fact, it is said:

> Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following minority views.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] were joined with the Senator from Utah. Those Senators think that the pending bill should not be passed. I have not heard them offer any alternative. They seem to feel that anything that is done will in some way curtail what they speak of as the rights of labor. I must take total issue with such a contention. Something should be done to bring the two parties into relationship so that they can understand each other, so that collective bargaining can become more effective, and so that the over-all picture will be one of a cooperative America, not an America divided by schisms and by controversies which I fear may, unless we are careful, deteriorate into class warfare. I deplore attacks made on a bill of this kind at a time when America needs to be united instead of being divided. I shall illustrate what I mean by calling attention to objectives stated in the minority views.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, there is an alternative. The Senator from New Jersey should read the opening statements, outlining the alternative for the pending bill, in keeping with the President's recommendations. It would not be difficult to prepare an alternative bill in keeping with our recommendations. That has not been done, because we have been working, as the Senator from New Jersey has been working, trying to make the pending bill as perfect as possible.

Mr. SMITH. All I can say in answer to the Senator is that the only bill offered by his group in committee was one to continue the study of the matter, and to do nothing else. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] offered an overall bill for a study which would continue for months, but would accomplish nothing else. There have been many pages of testimony, as the result of which, it seems to me, Senators should be able to sit down now without the necessity of further study, and solve some of the pressing problems.

As I said a moment ago, in the fourth title of the bill, provision is made for a continuing Congressional committee to study the effect of the legislation and to observe its impact upon management-labor relationships. That committee would continue to recommend legislation, and if necessary, it could recommend the repeal of legislation which may not function satisfactorily. The committee is not overlooking that. I agree that that should be done. But to wait until that is done before doing anything else, in the light of the very critical situation that exists today, frankly does not seem to me to make sense.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the attention of Senators should be called to the fact that under the Congressional Reorganization Act it is incumbent upon the standing committee as presently constituted to do those very things. That is already the law of the land. Nobody will object, therefore, to that part of the bill. It is also, of course, in keeping with the President's recommendations.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comment; it is very relevant.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator will remember that minority members of the committee voted for many of the provisions which are incorporated in the pending bill, and that the desire was ex-

pressed to have legislation which would correct many of the evils about which we are talking. All that is being sought is to prevent something being done that will do more harm than good. We are anxious to do that. It is recognized that there are certain evils that should be corrected, but, in order to correct them, it is not necessary to go so far as to injure labor-management relations.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator, I can remember very well that he and his colleagues voted for a great many of the provisions to be found in the pending bill, but when it comes to a consideration of the bill itself they are going to vote against it. It is difficult for me to understand their attitude. I regret to say that I feel that the attitude of some of the Democratic members of the committee was to vote for the mildest provisions they could find, and then to vote against the bill. I thought when they voted for those provisions they were for the bill, but now they oppose the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill contains many things that we opposed and were very strongly against. Of course the Senator could not expect us to vote for the bill as a whole after we had pointed out what was wrong with it and what damage it would create. I said we were perfectly willing to support a bill which in a proper manner would recognize and correct evils without giving the enemies of labor an opportunity to remove from the statute books very valuable and important provisions to protect the rights of organized labor which have been put there after years of struggle.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the Senator's comment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Another phase of the situation which should not be overlooked is that the pending bill is an amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. That is what we are discussing. The National Labor Relations Act is upon the statute books. Surely to oppose this bill would mean that we are in favor of the law as it is administered under the National Labor Relations Act. If it is simply a question of an alternative, there are plenty of alternatives that can be offered. All my remarks this afternoon were in defense of the National Labor Relations Act, which is the law of the land.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the Senator clarify his position on that point.

I want to continue, if I may, because the minority views charge that the bill would call a halt to progress in industrial relations. I am quoting from the minority views, which set forth the following reasons:

1. It—

That is the committee bill—

excludes entirely from the number of those who are to benefit under Federal legislation certain "agricultural" workers who are in reality industrial workers, and supervisors, who also have their problems.

In the existing Wagner Labor Relations Act, agricultural workers have heretofore been excluded and we are not taking any new stand on that subject. That is the situation we have now. It is a question whether they ought to be excluded or not. That is one of the questions I should like to have the proposed joint congressional committee study, because I realize that there are certain industries, such as the canning industry, related very closely to agricultural workers, where some exception might be made. But generally speaking the agricultural workers of the Nation, certainly in my State, do not want the principles of union labor applied to the farms. I am very sympathetic with them, because the situation on the farm is so different from what it is in the factory. On the farm the hours of labor which prevail in industry cannot be observed.

When it comes to supervisors, it is simply a question of finding a definition of what is a supervisor, and that is all the bill aims to do. It recognizes a supervisor as representing management, and not representing labor, and where the supervisor has to represent management, it seems only proper that he should not be in the category of being union-minded because unfortunately controversies between management and the unions do occur. That is all the supervisor provision takes care of, and it is a perfectly reasonable provision. I do not see how anyone can possibly object to it.

Let me read the second objection that is made by the minority in its views on this bill:

2. It slices a wedge out of the Norris-LaGuardia Act by making application for labor injunctions mandatory in certain types of labor disputes.

The only comment I can make on that statement is that we were very careful in this bill to protect the injunctive process as it is protected in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, except in exceptional cases where the Government has to step in. In national paralysis cases we permit the Attorney General to step in, and in the boycott and jurisdictional strike cases we permit the National Labor Relations Board to step in; and there is no other approach to the courts for injunction except in those two situations.

I insist that the Government of the United States should have the right to secure an injunction when an injunction is necessary in order to protect the health and welfare of our people.

This is the third objection raised in the minority views to the bill:

3. It calls for the splitting up of trade-unions in many industries where collective bargaining is working well.

All that is done in this respect in the bill is to preserve the independence of craft unions if the members of the craft so desire.

4. It gives an undue recognition to company-dominated unions by requiring that they be placed on the ballot under certain circumstances.

Under the bill, if the union continues to be company-dominated it is not eligible to be placed on the ballot. All we are doing here is to protect independent unions. If they can prove they are independent unions they are entitled to be placed on the ballot. It is distinctly provided in the bill that if unions are company-dominated they are not eligible. So, again, the writers of these views have failed to make the correct interpretation of the bill.

5. It requires that charges of unfair labor practices be filed within 6 months after their commission—the shortest statute of limitations known to the law—thereby offering a premium to those employers who conceal commission of unfair labor practices.

Of course that works both ways. Whatever the term of the statute of limitations there will be objections made to it. I remember last year when we were discussing a statute of limitations for the Fair Labor Standards Act the question was whether it should be 5 years or 3 years, and the bill, as passed, contained a provision for 2 years, which was objected to by some. There must be a limitation as to time, and it seems to me that in this type of thing which the National Labor Relations Board has to keep track of, within 6 months the complainant against an unfair labor practice should be able to bring it to the attention of the National Labor Relations Board. I think that is the present rule which the National Labor Relations Board has adopted for its practice.

6. It weakens the Conciliation Service by removing it from the Department of Labor, where it properly belongs, for no reason other than the desire to do something, regardless of merit.

I have already referred to that in the set-up of the new Mediation Service, pointing out that the Department of Labor quite properly is the proponent of the cause of labor. The Department of Labor has to represent one side of the controversy. It would be inconsistent that the Mediation Service should be in the same department. We simply make it independent, so that the accusation cannot be made that the Mediation Service is biased.

I come now to the next point made in the minority views:

7. It severely limits the right to strike in a variety of circumstances.

Mr. President, I wish the writers of these views had read the bill carefully, because the only limitation on the right to strike is in national paralysis cases where the Government under certain circumstances, where a Nation-wide industry is concerned, and Nation-wide paralysis is concerned, can obtain an injunction. That is not severely limiting the right to strike. That is something which protects everyone. The other case is one with respect to which the Senator who now occupies the chair offered a proposal. The amendment which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] offered very properly provided that if

a strike is in prospect notice shall be given respecting the requested terms of contract so that both sides may get ready and face the inevitable. Other than that, there is no limitation in the bill on the right to strike.

That is why I am very much disturbed to receive hundreds of telegrams, evidently dictated by union representatives, telling me to vote against the antistrike bill, when there is no antistrike bill. The people are deceived as to what we are trying to do in order to correct these abuses. It is amazing to me that such misrepresentations of fact should be made, stating that the bill limits the right to strike in a variety of circumstances, when the only cases are the ones which I have mentioned.

To continue with the points made by the minority:

8. It requires the holding of elections by the Federal Government on the issue of union security, and the holding of other elections before certain strikes become legal, despite the unhappy experience of the Smith-Connally Act.

In the Smith-Connally Act there is no reference whatever to this situation. There is no reference to such elections. It involves an entirely different matter. If a strike were contemplated, notice had to be given a long time in advance, which was always done, because a strike was contemplated when the discussions began. This bill simply provides that in the case of the union shop, before a man can be told that he cannot earn a livelihood unless he joins the unions, the workers themselves, by at least a majority vote, must decide that they want a union shop. If there is anything unfair about such a provision, I should like to know it. It was my position in committee that we ought to require at least a two-thirds vote. If we are to say that a man cannot earn a livelihood unless he joins a union, I say that there should be at least a two-thirds vote.

We permit the union shop because we realize that by agreement between employers and employees it is proper to have a union shop. So I take issue with the statement that the holding of elections is an impairment of some rights of the workers. It is the very thing that the workers want. If those who wrote the report could read the letters which I have received from workers, and from the wives of workers saying that they wished there were some way by which their husbands could express themselves in union meetings, or some way in which there could be a vote before a strike was called, they would realize that the workers want some such protection of their freedom. So I take issue very strongly with the criticism in that paragraph of the minority views.

9. In a multitude of ways it hampers the effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Board.

That obviously is a very biased, prejudiced statement. The bill enlarges the National Labor Relations Board. The Board is told, "You are a judicial body, and no longer a prosecuting body. You have the responsibility of deciding what is right and just, not only in behalf of the worker, but also in behalf of the employer." Thousands of small employers throughout the country need such protection from the National Labor Relations Board. We are in no way curtailing the activities of the Board or hampering its effectiveness. We are giving the Board a status of dignity as a body to exercise judicial functions.

10. It requires labor unions to file burdensome reports with the Secretary of Labor under penalty of denial of rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

If it is burdensome to file a report showing who the officers are, and what salaries they receive, then that criticism may be justified. The information is not made public. It is filed with the Department of Labor, and it is available to members of the union, who have a right to know those things. We are trying to protect workers against the abuses which have crept into some labor unions because of the kind of management they have. I am happy to say that some labor unions already follow this practice. I am glad to pay tribute to the CIO for its very full reports.

11. It provides, in the case of union-employer suits alone, that suits may be brought in Federal courts without the ordinary jurisdictional requirements of the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship.

So far as that particular provision is concerned, I have already covered that in my previous discussion of the national paralysis cases, involving injunctions, and the case of the National Labor Relations Board. In the special instances of boycotts and jurisdictional strikes there is provision for going into court and obtaining an injunction to restrain the activity, when damage is imminent.

12. It disregards in material respects President Truman's suggestions for the establishment of an investigating commission on labor problems.

It differs from President Truman's suggestion only in that the suggestion which he made was embodied in a bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to which I have heretofore referred, and which suggested that we continue to investigate before taking any action. I cannot defend that course. So far as title IV is concerned, I think it covers everything which President Truman wanted included, except that he wanted a much larger commission than that for which our proposal provides.

Mr. President, I think I have covered, as I see them, the objections to the bill made in the minority views. It seems to me that there is a complete misconception of the spirit and purpose of the bill and of what we are trying to do to bring about a better relationship between management and labor. The minority views entirely ignore the necessity of doing something constructive at once in order to cure existing evils.

I should like to continue a little further on this difficult question and make some comments on the various problems facing us. I recognize that in this picture there are three large, difficult issues, and I shall deal with them all briefly.

The first is the question of the so-called closed shop. I admit that when I first began to study this subject I found no way to justify in my own mind the principle of the closed shop. It seemed to me to be a denial of freedom of action to any worker to say to him, "You cannot earn a livelihood unless you join the union." On that point I should like to read again from the writings of the late Justice Brandeis, who was quoted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on this question. Mr. Brandeis goes much further than I go, for reasons which I shall state a little later. Some years ago he came out very strongly against the closed-shop principle, on the ground that it was a denial of American liberties. On February 26, 1912, in a letter to Mr. Ray Stannard Baker, who was a good friend of his, he said:

It is an essential condition of the advance of trade unionism that the unions shall renounce violence, restriction of output, and the closed shop. * * * the American people should not, and will not, accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employee. Unionism, therefore, cannot make a great advance until it abandons the closed shop.

Again, in a statement before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on December 14, 1911, he said:

I think there is no man or body of men whose intelligence or whose character will stand in absolute power, and I should no more think of giving absolute power to unions than I should of giving to capital monopoly power. I believe that experience will teach the labor unions that they can never succeed in a large way as long as they insist upon the closed shop.

In the bill we recognize that it would be unfair to the ordinary workingman to permit the closed shop, as such, to continue, that is, to compel an employer to go to a union and obtain a union man. However, I discovered from correspondence with employers and workers in my own State that there were cases in which the so-called union shop was justified, by agreement between the employer and the employees. We provide in our bill for the so-called union shop. That is to say, the employer can employ anyone he desires to employ, but within 30 days after employment the employee must join the union, provided that there has been a vote in the plant, and at least a majority of the workers in the plant have voted for a union shop; and provided also that membership in the union is open to the worker on terms as favorable as those extended to the existing membership, so far as dues and initiation fees are concerned. We included those provisions in the bill so there could not be unjust discrimination against a new man and there could not be a continuation of some of the charges we had heard that unfair initiation fees were charged, and so forth. We incorporated those provisions in the bill so as to pro-

tect the worker. The union does not have to take a man; it can impose any terms it wants to, but if it imposes on a new man terms which are more onerous than the other workers have, if the union goes outside the field of union initiation fees and dues, then the man may not be compelled to join the union as a condition of employment.

We have tried to recognize as fairly as we could the distinction between the closed shop, which we do not think is right—that is, to say that no one can be employed except a member of a union—and the union shop, which may have an agreement between employer and employees.

I want to read an illustration of that distinction, because I think it brings out clearly the kind of union shop which I think is thoroughly justified. I will read into the RECORD a letter from Mr. Glenn Gardiner, vice president of the Forstmann Woolen Co., of Passaic, N. J., dated April 17, 1947, addressed to Mr. Charles Serraino, business manager, Passaic Joint Board Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, 205 Madison Street, Passaic, N. J.

I may say, before I read the letter, that in this particular plant for some years, to my certain knowledge, Mr. Gardiner and his associates have been endeavoring to work out with the heads of the local union a program of relationship between management and labor, which has been very successful.

Mr. Gardiner's letter is as follows:

At the time when organized labor is under severe legislative attack, occasioned by excesses in certain areas by some labor leadership, I think it is appropriate that we give some tangible expression of our confidence in the union with which we deal.

Here is a case of management and labor acting together on this principle.

Frankly, the legislative measures which are being proposed seem to have little application to the relationship existing between our company and our union, because I feel that our bargaining together is carried on in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and respect, and with an underlying recognition of the interests which we have in common.

Accordingly, we are voluntarily—

I stress the word "voluntarily"—

extending to the union the privileges of a union shop to be effective as of June 1. This will give those workers who have not yet joined an opportunity to voluntarily become members of the union and to assume their share of the responsibility for the constructive work of the union.

I am attaching a copy of a bulletin which is being posted throughout the mills to announce this decision on the part of our company.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the notice which was posted in the shop, setting forth the union-shop principle in that particular plant.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 16, 1947.

UNION SHOP

For nearly 3 years, the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, has been the official bargaining representative for mill workers of our company. During that time, the union and its leadership have demonstrated their dependability and readiness to recognize the common interests of the company and its workers.

Because the conduct of the union has been such as to deserve the confidence of the workers, the membership in the union has experienced steady growth, to the point where now more than 95 percent of workers in the bargaining unit have joined the union. In this way our workers have themselves demonstrated by overwhelming numbers their faith in the union. Therefore, it seems only fair that the management also should indicate its confidence in the union and its leadership.

The management, therefore, is voluntarily demonstrating its faith in the future of cooperative relations by granting to the union the privileges of a union shop, to be effective on the first of June.

In the meantime, those few remaining workers in the bargaining unit who have not yet joined the union, will have the opportunity to voluntarily do so.

The management hopes that those who have not yet joined will recognize that the constructive efforts of the union in behalf of all workers in the bargaining unit will deserve their support as members.

As of June 1, when this becomes a union shop, all workers in the bargaining unit who have been with the company for 30 days or more, will be expected to be members of the union as a condition of employment.

GLENN GARDINER.

Mr. SMITH. I mention that matter because I feel that it is of first importance as bringing about what we on the committee believe is right—namely, that if there is an arrangement by which a union shop is voluntarily established in a certain plant, and if the workers in the plant want to have a union shop, there seems to be no reason why that arrangement should not be maintained.

As I have said, I have received so many letters which indicate to me that there are conditions in which a union shop is working effectively that I do not feel that we should absolutely ban the closed shop or union shop. But there is an ideal type of case where the parties voluntarily agree. In the statement which has been filed with us, it is said that 95 percent of the workers in that particular plant desire to have a union shop. So when the great preponderance of the workers want to have a union shop and the employer is willing to have it, we find that the proper atmosphere is created by that kind of cooperation.

I make these particular remarks in regard to the amendment with reference to the closed shop and the way in which the committee dealt with it. I have great difficulty in seeing how my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle can take issue with that disposition of the closed-shop or union-shop principle. I cannot see any way in which that treatment of the matter deprives any worker of his rights. It provides an opportunity for the establishment of a union shop in cases in which the workers themselves agree with their employer to have a union shop.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the closed-shop problem as one of the big issues. I wish to mention now a second big problem which confronts us, namely, the whole matter of industry-wide bargaining. I want to state for the RECORD that on the basis of the study which I have made of this subject, I am at the moment opposed to the enactment of any legislation which will prohibit industry-wide bargaining. I think that we should not go that far until we know much more about the subject, although I believe that in certain fields we should put up a caution sign.

I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from Prof. Richard A. Lester, associate professor of economics in the Department of Economics and Social Institutions, Industrial Relations Section, at Princeton University. I asked him his views on industry-wide bargaining. He wrote me as follows:

I am writing to ask you not to make the mistake of voting to prohibit national or regional collective bargaining on a multiple-employer basis. I have made an extensive study of such multiple-employer bargaining both in the West and in the East in such industries as pulp and paper, pottery, pressed and blown glassware, flat glass, textiles, men's and women's clothing, women's hosiery, and the stove industry.

I may add there, Mr. President, that I have received communications along the same line from various employers in industry. I read further from the letter:

Many of these industries have important plants located in New Jersey. This is especially true of silk and rayon finishing and dyeing, women's hosiery, pressed and blown glassware, pottery, clothing, and the stove industry.

As you know in some of these industries there has not been an authorized strike for as long as 20 to 55 years. I refer particularly to pressed and blown glassware, pottery and clothing. The same is pretty much true of women's hosiery in this State. In view of these circumstances I think you appreciate what an unfortunate thing it would be to embody in legislation provisions that would completely upset the fine relations that have been built up in these industries. From traveling around the State talking with both employers and labor officials, I am sure that there is a strong sentiment on both sides in favor of preserving the fine relations that they have worked out during the past decades and that have resulted in so much industrial peace in these industries.

So far as I can see there is nothing objectionable in the arrangements that these industries have worked out for the negotiation and peaceful settlement of their labor problems. The claim of monopoly cannot be pressed against them nor has there been any charge of jurisdictional disputes, racketeering, secondary boycotts, etc.

I realize, of course, as do labor leaders when they talk to you in confidence, that there is need for labor legislation to remedy certain abuses that have grown up such as those mentioned above; but it would be a serious mistake in trying to remedy abuses to destroy the good things that have been developed through long periods of trial and error and mutual discussion and confidence.

The problem of industry-wide strikes is a problem not of multiple-employer bargaining on a national or regional basis, because there have been a large number of industry-wide strikes with individual-company bargaining. The problem of strikes in essential industries or that threaten the health and safety of the general public has to be dealt with in terms of governmental authority to intervene in such strikes and to settle them through third-party action if necessary, and should not be attempted through

the destruction of systems of harmonious relationships that have been built up from long experience. Breaking up these satisfactory arrangements would only involve a great deal of industrial turmoil and unrest, the development of a large number of strikes in industries that now have peaceful relations, and the need for hundreds of negotiations and agreements with a much greater possibility of disagreement and dispute than now exists under multiple-employer bargaining, such as the annual conference of the pressed and blown glassware industry at Atlantic City. Such negotiations are really a model of democratic unionism working out in practice through appeals not to emotion, but to a rational understanding of the economic problems of an industry.

I hope you will see from the above why I feel so strongly that it would be a real injury to the State of New Jersey and important sections of the industry of this State to pass legislation that would involve the disestablishment of the fine arrangements and relationships that have been developed by labor and management in such industries as those mentioned.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD A. LESTER,
Associate Professor of Economics.

In short, Mr. President, Professor Lester makes out a very good case for our not jumping precipitately into abolishing Nation-wide bargaining in cases where such bargaining has been set up in industries of that kind.

There are evils in connection with industry-wide bargaining, and I shall speak of them now, because the second amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], in which I collaborated, deals with the question of industry-wide bargaining. Although it distinctly does not outlaw industry-wide or area-wide bargaining, as the House bill does, it carries out the original intent of the Wagner Act and gives the right to employees to make such arrangements with their own employers.

I read from the report of the committee on this matter:

> Thus Nation-wide bargaining may be authorized by the unions, say, in the coal fields, but if any local becomes dissatisfied it may withdraw and sign up with its own employer just as employers today may withdraw from an employers' association and sign up with their own employees.

In other words, it gives an option for a local to withdraw from an industry-wide set-up, but does not go the whole way of outlawing industry-wide bargaining. Because I think it is entirely just and fair to make that distinction, I am one of the proponents and one of the sponsors of the so-called second amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], which will come up for action after we have disposed of the first one. I think that distinction is worth making, because there is a real distinction between those two cases.

The third problem which I have found in studying management-labor relations is the question of compulsory arbitration. Is there any kind of case in which compulsory arbitration can be defended? I think we are generally agreed that we are not prepared to go that far yet, even in national paralysis cases; and in the bill we have not gone so far as to say "You must arbitrate."

I have already analyzed the procedure under the bill, and I shall not repeat that analysis. I merely state here that it seems to me that the time is coming when we must be possessed of sufficient statesmanship to find some way, somehow, to prevent, in certain types of industries whose functioning is necessary to our existence, a stoppage of production which may interfere with the health and safety of our people. We must develop some procedure to settle disputes in such industries, and make it plain that the Government cannot tolerate stoppages of that kind.

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, without subjecting my hearers to a detailed reading of it, an article written by me, and published in the April issue of The Republican magazine. The title of the article is, "Is There an Absolute Right to Strike?" I think the article is very pertinent to this whole discussion and particularly to the question of how far we should go in making legislative provision in regard to the absolute, unconditional right to strike, no matter what the circumstances may be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO STRIKE?

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey, member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee)

In all the hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare involving legislation to cure some of the obvious abuses that recently have been threatening the welfare of our country, the stone wall that we run up against, continuously, is the so-called absolute right to strike.

IS A STRIKE SACRED?

At a time when our labor leaders should be in the forefront of those who are trying to correct the existing evils, we find them saying: "We regret we can make no suggestions because anything that would tend to correct labor evils might impair the right to strike." They say that any impairment, even the so-called cooling-off period, creates involuntary servitude. The apparent complete vacuum of ideas of William Green and Philip Murray, for example, is profoundly distressing. To them, the right to strike, as they define it, is more sacred than the health, safety, and welfare of 141,000,000 Americans. They even feel compelled, in their public statements at least, to imply support of the defiance of the Government by John L. Lewis.

I am one of those who has tried sincerely to support the labor-union movement. I believe in it profoundly. I believe our workers should have the right to organize and to have representatives of their own choosing; I believe in the collective-bargaining process; I believe that management and labor can and should settle their differences without the intervention of government. But this great country of ours is doomed the minute we admit that the Government can be defied by any individual or by any group or that any minority seeking its own ends however worthy they may be can place those ends above the welfare of all the people. The very purpose of government is to protect all our people from monopolistic privileges, vested interests, or the uncontrolled power of any groups in our midst.

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this proviso is of first importance), his freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is) which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

ANYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO WORK

Nor can we leave the matter there. We may agree that no man should be compelled to work under conditions to which he has not voluntarily agreed. Any individual has the right to quit his job at any time. But this is a very different matter from his quitting with his fellows under a concerted arrangement to force his demands on others, irrespective of the rightness or wrongness of those demands. This distinction is especially important since, under the Wagner Act, he has the right, after the battle is over, to insist on his status as a continuing employee.

Under the Wagner Act as it now stands, the collective bargaining process was legalized and a labor relations board set up. It is that board's duty to see to it, first, that the worker is protected in the bargaining process and, second, that the employer does not use his economic strength to exploit the worker. Under the act, we have recognized that when management and labor come to the end of the road of the bargaining process, a stoppage of work may be preferable to compelling either party to continue a relationship that is not voluntarily entered into.

This was a necessary step in the evolution of management-labor relations. It was necessary because we have not been able to invent any form of judicial procedure which would do justice to both parties in a labor dispute, and would bring about what both parties would look upon as a satisfactory settlement without a work stoppage. If we are honest with ourselves, however, we must frankly admit that in recognizing the strike at all, we are approving a medieval system for the adjustment of disputes.

WE STRUGGLE OVER FREEDOM VERSUS JUSTICE

Mankind has struggled through the ages over this principle of freedom and justice. As far back as Biblical times we find the principle of retaliation—"an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"—which permitted the aggrieved party to retaliate in kind for an injustice done to him. In our Anglo-Saxon law, the principle of self-help was permitted until a fairly recent date. Self-help recognized the power of might; if between two individuals there was a difference, it was a crude way of permitting that difference to be settled so long as the interests of a third party were not affected. Illustrating this great principle is the history of our West, where once contending parties "shot it out."

Unfortunately, in all disputes of this kind, which become violent before they are settled, innocent bystanders were injured and it was recognized that certain kinds of disputes might lead to a breach of the peace and might damage whole communities. In the course of time the Anglo-Saxon people, following principles laid down in early Roman law, developed tribunals of justice where disputes could be heard, and where parties were compelled to submit their disputes for determination in what came to be courts of law. After the judgments of such courts were announced, the parties were compelled to accept them and were not allowed any longer to rely on the earlier principles of retaliation and self-help.

I have gone into this detail to emphasize the point that in management-labor relationships we still admit the self-help principle. When free bargaining comes to the end of the road, we insist that the dispute be left to the disputants. We say to them,

to use a slang expression: "Now you can slug it out—may the better man win." We have permitted the rule of force and might to determine the issue with no reference to the more fundamental question: What is right and what is just?

When employers were strong economically—when they could oppress and exploit their employees—we did not try to determine the principles on which the disputes might be settled on the basis of right and justice. Through the Wagner Act, we gave the workers a stronger position at the bargaining table. Then we let them "slug it out." Now many of us feel that the strength given to workers through their unions overshadows the strength of the employer-management group, and there is much sentiment for equalizing the weight of the "brass knuckles" on both sides. (I use the expression "brass knuckles" advisedly instead of "boxing gloves.") We delude ourselves that if there is an equality of armaments, there will be labor peace. This is like saying that if every nation in the world could be absolutely equally armed there would be no more international disputes. It is the balance of power principle.

EQUALIZING ARMAMENTS DOESN'T MEAN PEACE

But we have been struggling with this principle for some time in the international field, and we know that equalizing armaments or limiting armaments does not and cannot bring peace. The issues are far deeper and we are obliged to find some way in any dispute, no matter what its nature, to answer the question, "What is right and what is just, especially to protect the weak?" rather than, "Who can be strong enough to win in a death struggle?"

That is one reason we voted recently for optional adherence to the World Court, surrendering a measure of sovereignty—so that international disputes which are justiciable may be settled by judicial procedures and not by resort to arms. In labor-management disputes, on the other hand, we still function under the so-called Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Act. Well-meaning as it was, its effect has been to intensify the conflict—to raise barriers between employers and employees and make them contending parties where they should be partners in a common enterprise to produce the necessities and luxuries of life for our Nation and the world. If we attempt further to equalize the brass knuckles instead of going to the heart of the matter, which is to bring about understanding human relationships, we only extend the days of these difficulties and conflicts and ally ourselves with those insidious forces in our country which are aiming to divide us on the basis of class.

So today American statesmanship finds itself challenged—challenged to establish tribunals, call them labor courts or what you will, to which persons aggrieved can go, where their cases can be heard and justice done. We still can perfect and develop the voluntary collective-bargaining process; we still can support the mediation and conciliation service of the Labor Department; we still can call on the parties to the dispute to settle their differences between themselves. But suppose when we come to the end of that road, we find that the inability of the parties themselves to settle their difficulties is going to lead to the impairment of the health and safety of our whole population, or large segments of it—is going to lead to a national paralysis of our economic life as in the case of a transportation strike or a coal strike or a steel strike? Then are we not justified in saying that this is a matter that concerns the public interest? Are we not justified in saying that the parties must settle this dispute among themselves without stopping production and threatening our national life?

I believe we are. I believe that if they decline to do so within a reasonable time, on the initiative of the Government of the United States they should be brought before some properly composed tribunal. That tribunal would have jurisdiction definitely to say that concerted work stoppages would not be tolerated, and that, for at least a limited period, the parties must continue under such and such terms and be obligated within that period to come to an agreement. If they still were unable to agree, there should be a heavy penalty imposed on whichever party the court found to be at fault and whichever declined to cooperate with the award made. The court must have power to cite for contempt those who fail to obey its judgment, and to inflict such penalty as should be inflicted on any of our citizens when they defy the power of government to protect all the people.

WE AVOID THE REAL QUESTION

The whole issue can be summed up this way: we are confused because we do not courageously face the answer to a very simple question. We try to answer the question: "Who is right or who is economically strongest in a life and death struggle?" We should be trying to answer: "What is right and how can we do substantial justice under these conditions?"

Many students of these matters are already developing criteria and formulae which properly could be applied in management-labor disputes where the parties cannot agree. These criteria and formulae can be developed, in my judgment, in the course of time into a code to govern management-labor relations. I strongly favor the recommendation of President Truman that a committee be set up, composed of leaders of management, leaders of labor, and members of the Congress, who would explore the specific question of how we can develop such a labor code, to be applied only in cases where the parties are unable to get together themselves, and where a "national paralysis" threatens in consequence.

However, I would oppose the appointment of a commission that would simply go on a fishing expedition to review again the myriad of possible regulations that could be imposed on one party or the other. Neither am I desirous of developing further the equalization of "brass knuckles."

On a broader basis, I am profoundly interested in developing the right kind of environment for the worker and his family in our American life; in the way he can receive a proper reward for his contribution to national production; in the way he can be stimulated to be a part of the enterprise in which he is engaged by proper incentives, either for him individually or for his group of workers; in profit-sharing plans; in a satisfactory solution of the annual wage issue; in a proper handling of health and welfare funds—whether by individual industries taking care of their own people, or by an expansion of our social security system; the whole question of profits; the question of lower prices so that all our people may participate in the fruits of our production and gain a higher standard of living; and similar suggestions which can be brought out in the consideration of our American free enterprise system.

This is a matter that comes down to the simple but important problem of human relationships. The size of our industrial establishments has broken down the personal "family" relationships of the smaller industries of bygone days. In dealing with people in the mass we unfortunately have been tending to treat labor as a commodity to be bought and sold for a price; a commodity which, under the Wagner Act, is cold-bloodedly bargained for. We must find some way to correct this atmosphere of antagonism and come back to recognition of the principle that in order to attain the production we will need, for both the prosperity of our country and of other countries, there must be a happy environment in which the individual works, and where he becomes enthusiastic about the quality and quantity of his industry's output. It must be a partnership principle; we must in some way see to it that management takes a more personal interest in the welfare and prosperity of the workers, while the workers have a more personal understanding of the problems of management.

WE CAN PROGRESS

These considerations may look a long way ahead and will, perhaps, be characterized as too idealistic and seeking the millennium. I am willing to accept that challenge because progress always has come from the leadership of those who "hitched their wagon to a star." We can progress even though we cannot attain immediate perfection. But first, we must put ourselves on the right road. All our legislation must be directed toward establishing ways and means of determining what is right in these controversies and putting an end to this continuing struggle of might.

America cannot afford the luxury of division among her people. The world looks to us for leadership because we have been the land of the free and as a free people we must maintain the principles of unity and equality of opportunity. Unless we lead, the other nations of the world are going to falter. Should we fail in a crisis such as the present, civilization may well be doomed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in this connection I should like very much to point out that I come to the conclusion that, after all, the strike weapon, while we recognize it as a legitimate one, is a force weapon; it is a self-help weapon. The strike field is the only field I know of, in our life as a civilized Nation, where we tell the people on both sides of the controversy, "There is no way to settle your dispute except by determining who is the strongest in a knock-down and drag-out fight." If we know of no way of proceeding in such a case except to have the parties to the controversy determine which one is strongest, and if we are unable to proceed in any way other than by attempting to equalize the weight of the brass knuckles used by both sides in the controversy, and then letting them slug it out, it seems to me that we have not reached the proper approach to a statesmanlike solution of the problem.

Mr. President, I think my friend, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] must admit that we must find a means of solving this problem without calling for a resort to force. I think we must find a means of solving the problem by applying the law of justice and right, and we must substitute it for the law of force. I believe that some day we must find a means of solving these problems without in any way trying to dictate the terms on which management and labor shall work together. I mention that simply in passing. As I have said, I think the article to which I have referred develops the whole argument on that point.

Mr. President, I now come to certain general conclusions, and then I shall close my remarks.

I am one of those who do not believe in punitive legislation in the field of labor-management relations. I am one

of those who do not believe in "tough" legislation in that field, if by the word "tough" we mean that we are trying in any way to cripple the union movement or to treat it unfairly. I believe profoundly in the union movement. I believe that the workers must have the right to organize, and to select their own representatives, and to bargain. So, anything that would move toward crippling the union movement, as such, I would be opposed to. Therefore, I am, perhaps, somewhat more conservative than some of my colleagues in regard to the kind of legislation which I believe the Congress should pass. I am opposed to breaking down the Norris-LaGuardia Act insofar as injunctions are concerned, except to permit the issuance of injunctions on the initiation of the Government, either through the Attorney General or through the National Labor Relations Board, under the provisions of the measure now before the Senate.

I have opposed the fourth amendment, which has been offered on the floor of the Senate, and will be discussed before we finally dispose of the amendments, because it would permit the Norris-LaGuardia Act to be broken down to the extent of permitting injunctions to be issued at the request of private employers. I do not think we need go that far as yet, and I do not think we should do so until we have seen whether the problem in connection with secondary boycotts or strikes of that nature can be worked out by means of the National Labor Relations Board. I mention that point in passing.

Mr. President, another matter involved in the present controversy is the obvious conflict between the American Federation of Labor crafts-union approach to the problems and the CIO industry-wide approach. In our studies and in the testimony presented to the committee we found that some of the difficulties arise from the conflicts between those two points of view. The crafts-union group wish to maintain the integrity of that movement, and there is much to be said for it. The industry-wide groups, such as the CIO, take the other point of view. Consequently, there have been numerous jurisdictional disputes in which the employer is absolutely innocent, and yet he and the public have been made to suffer, even though they have had absolutely nothing to do with the controversy or the causes of it. Such controversies are simply battles between two unions in an attempt to determine which one will gain the mastery in that field. That problem is one of the present difficulties. I hope it will be possible for us to determine how best to resolve it.

So, Mr. President, I come to the procedure provided in the bill for studying the developments along those lines and ascertaining how the legislation in this field works and preparing to make improvements in it. Such a provision is a most important step forward. In the course of the next several years of experience we shall probably receive many suggestions in regard to what has worked well and what has not worked well and in regard to what should be repealed and what should be strengthened, and no doubt we shall receive various suggestions in regard to provisions which should be enacted into law, as a result of studies which have been made with respect to increasing production and with respect to the relationships between management and labor.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I must again express my regret at the unfortunate hysteria and misrepresentation in regard to the purpose of the bill which is now under consideration. In my remarks I have tried to show that if ever a bill was written from the standpoint of a sincere attempt to find a proper solution for an important problem, that procedure has been followed in the case of the pending bill.

I desire to pay a special tribute to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who have given so much of their time in studying every possible approach to the solution of these problems and in working out the various legislative proposals in response to the suggestions which have been made. To that work they have devoted endless time and an infinite amount of patience. The committee held hearings lasting several weeks, and during a period of several weeks thereafter the committee met in executive session. We who served on the committee went over every paragraph of the bill, and finally we reported to the Senate a bill which seems to cover every matter which we believe must be covered by legislation dealing with the problems which now confront us.

Mr. President, I desire to make a strong appeal to my colleagues in the Senate to support this bill. In doing so, of course, each one of us is entitled to vote as he pleases in regard to the amendments, and each one of us is entitled to decide which of the amendments he believes should be attached to the bill. I shall vote for three of the amendments; and, as I have previously said, I shall not vote for one of them.

I hope that we shall be able to place before the country and before the President for him to sign a bill which he will be glad to sign, and which he will regard as a constructive piece of legislation and a statesmanlike approach to the solution of these perplexing problems, and a solution of them which will be for the benefit of the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to join with the Senator from New Jersey in saying a word or two in regard to the right to strike. I realize that in speaking in regard to the right to strike one is playing with dynamite, because people very seldom hear or read all that one has to say on any particular subject, including that one.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not think any absolute right to strike was written into the law until the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, as the Senator from New Jersey has said. Provision for that right was included in that act as the result of a motion made on the floor of the Senate by a Member of the Senate. The provision for it was not reported from the committee, as I recall. The provision to which I refer merely states that nothing in that act shall be regarded as denying the right to strike.

Mr. President, to assume that there is such a thing as an absolute right to strike would, as the Senator from New Jersey pointed out, be likely to destroy all decent relationships between employees and industry, and probably would result in the destruction of the basic elements which hold society itself together. No law can provide any right at all, unless it is linked up with certain duties and responsibilities.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for that statement. He is perfectly correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when a man becomes an employee, he assumes some duties and some responsibilities. For him to interpret his right to strike as being an absolute right, entitling him to quit work while the water is turned on in the plant, for instance, thus destroying his employer's property, or for him to interpret the right to strike as permitting him to quit work while leaving in a mine certain equipment in such a way as to result in costly destruction, would obviously be most improper. No person has a right to do such things. No one has a right to act against society. No one has a right to destroy it.

All our liberties depend upon our being free only to the extent that we do not interfere with the freedom of others. Any other kind of liberty will eventually mean no liberty at all.

Mr. President, I hope that as a result of this discussion and our consideration of the law now proposed, there will come a realization of the obligations, duties, responsibilities, and the other finer things which go with citizenship, in order that our people may maintain the rights which make men free and independent and able to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for the spirit of his remarks. I appreciate them very much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks two editorials appearing in today's newspapers, one in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Wayward Omnibus," and another published in the Washington News of today entitled "Trying To Do Too Much," both dealing with the pending bill.

I wish to say that I agree completely with the observations made in the two editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 30, 1947]

WAYWARD OMNIBUS

It is not necessary to give weight to all the political brickbats that are being thrown in the Senate to see the folly of sending to the White House a labor bill that President Truman would feel compelled to veto. Senator ELLENDER directly charged that some of

his colleagues were trying to "toughen up" the bill so that the President would be compelled to reject it. We doubt that the charge is valid as against men like Senator TAFT and BALL and perhaps others who are pressing for stiffening amendments. But if they are accorded full sincerity, the fact remains that the course they are pursuing may leave the country without any legislation at all on this subject, and that must be regarded as a policy of great recklessness.

The surest means of avoiding a complete deadlock and another year of confusion in labor relations would be, as we have frequently noted, to divide the present omnibus bills into at least three parts. Some of the proposed reforms would thus go into effect with the President's blessing. At least one section and perhaps others would be vetoed, but that would merely give time for fuller study and reflection while the more important adjustments were being made. In renewing his appeal for splitting the bill into four parts, Senator MORSE seemed to realize that his plea was hopeless, yet he continued to make it as a matter of keeping the record straight. We, too, feel that if the current move for labor reforms comes a cropper, heavy responsibility for that outcome will fall upon Senator TAFT and others who have insisted on overcrowding too many diverse proposals into the bill.

An alternative to dividing the bill would be a bipartisan conference at the White House for the purpose of exchanging views and working out a compromise that would be acceptable to Congress and the President. Many Republicans, of course, are loath to compromise. They feel that they have a mandate from the people to put through a rigorous and thoroughgoing labor reform bill. As a practical matter, however, they control only one branch of the Government. Unwillingness to compromise will probably result in complete defeat of their objective. Legislators who have the best interest of their country and their constituents at heart ought not to take such risks. Regardless of what the political consequences of another statement might be, the economic consequences would be grave. We think the American people expect something better of their legislative and executive leaders than deadlocks and confusion. They expect sufficient statesmanship to bring about a meeting of minds on at least the basic essentials of a new labor relations law. If Congress does nothing more to satisfy this demand than to pass a bill which the President feels he must veto, we do not see how it will be able to escape condemnation for ineptness. And that criticism would probably be no less severe than criticism of the President for thwarting labor reforms.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 30, 1947]

TRYING TO DO TOO MUCH

If corrective labor legislation is to become Federal law—

Each branch of Congress must pass a bill (the House has passed one; the Senate is debating another). A conference committee then must take the two bills, reconcile their differences, and write them into a single measure. Both branches must approve the committee's work. Finally, President Truman must sign the measure, or, if he refuses, 2 to 1 votes must be mustered in both branches to pass over a veto.

There probably are enough votes in the House to override any veto. But there are not enough in the Senate to override a convincing veto.

Mr. Truman could write a convincing veto of a measure as extreme as the House-passed bill. It includes, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, "virtually all of what management believes essential in the public interest." To us, this means that it goes too far. We distrust the NAM's opinion as to "all" that is essential, just as we challenge the CIO and AFL inflexible opposition to any legislation whatsoever.

The Senate has before it a milder bill, a product of study and compromise in its Labor Committee. It is not namby-pamby. It provides for many urgently needed reforms. There is no assurance that Mr. Truman would sign it, but it would give him no such reason for a convincing veto. And more Senators would vote to override a veto of it than of the tougher House bill.

Senators TAFT and BALL and others are fighting for amendments to strengthen the Senate bill. If they win their fight, the probable result will be that no corrective labor legislation will become law in this session of Congress. House Republicans will be encouraged to resist any toning down of their extreme measure in the conference committee. And the bill finally sent to Mr. Truman will invite a veto which cannot be overridden in the Senate.

We don't agree with those who argue that this would put the President in a political hole. The country won't like it if he vetoes a labor bill that is manifestly sound and fair. But the country won't blame him for vetoing a bill that goes too far. It will blame the Republicans for sending him such a bill.

No single piece of legislation is going to correct all the abuses, excesses, and bad practices of the labor movement. Here, for the first time in years, Congress has a real opportunity to correct many of them. It will be wiser and safer to do too little than to attempt too much and wind up with nothing done.

JEWISH VOICE ON PALESTINE IN THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, today's Evening Star carries the following headline: "United States Group Reported Against Jewish Voice on Palestine in United Nations."

We all know that the Palestine question is now before the United Nations. I am sure that all of us have hoped, and still hope, that now that that tragic problem is before the United Nations organization, there will at long last be a full and fair consideration of it and a decision which will do justice to those pitiful, long-suffering people.

I understand that unless there is some change in policy, the Jewish Agency, which for a long time has been the spokesman of the Jewish people in the expression of their aspirations, will not have an opportunity adequately to be heard in the United Nations organization. I should like to suggest that fundamental justice and fair play require that a reasonable opportunity be given to the Jewish Agency to state the case for Palestine in the discussions about it in this session of the United Nations organization and in the meetings of any of its committees. The Arab members have had and will have full opportunity to state their position in the United Nations organization discussions. Under the Charter of the United Nations there is no need to decide that Palestine is a state and that the Jewish Agency represents a state, in order to give that Agency an opportunity to be heard in the discussions in the General Assembly. The United States' representatives to the United Nations organization not only can, but should, I respectfully submit, take the position, on grounds of morals and justice, that the Jewish Agency should have an opportunity to present its case. That does not imply in any way that the United States is prejudging the case either for itself or for anyone else. On the contrary, failure to give the Jewish Agency an opportunity to be heard would be unfair and unjust, and might well lead to the interpretation that the United States is prejudging the situation.

Mr. President, the Jewish Agency is recognized in the Palestine Mandate as a public body representing the Jewish people of Palestine on all matters related to the Jewish National Home.

I desire to express these views in order that they may receive whatever consideration our delegation to the United Nations organization may be disposed to give them, and in the hope that now that this problem for those tragic people is at long last before the United Nations organization, the Jewish agency, which has carried the burden of those people, may have a fair opportunity to be heard before the United Nations, because I feel that no fair and adequate consideration of the problem can be had without affording to that body an opportunity to express its views, based on its great knowledge in that field.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL FOR REGULATION OF WHALING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate, Executive P, Eightieth Congress, first session, a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling which was signed at London under date of March 3, 1947. Without objection the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the supplemental protocol, and without objection the supplementary protocol together with the message from the President and the letter from the Under Secretary of State will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The supplementary protocol, together with the message and letter are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling which was signed at London under date of March 3, 1947. This supplementary protocol modifies the protocol signed at London November 26, 1945, amending in certain particulars the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling signed at London June 8, 1937, as amended by the protocols signed at London June 24, 1938 and February 7, 1944. The supplementary protocol was signed for the United States of America "subject to ratification," and for Australia "subject to approval," Canada, Denmark, France,

New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State explanatory of the purpose of the supplementary protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 30, 1947.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of supplemental protocol, opened for signature at London March 3, 1947, for the regulation of whaling.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 26, 1947.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President for transmission to the Senate, to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling which was signed at London under date of March 3, 1947. This supplementary protocol modifies the protocol signed at London, November 26, 1945, amending in certain particulars the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling signed at London, June 8, 1937, as amended by the protocols signed at London June 24, 1938, and February 7, 1944. The supplementary protocol was signed at London for the United States of America "subject to ratification," and for Australia "subject to approval," Canada, Denmark, France, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The purpose of the supplementary protocol is to bring into force in their entirety the provisions of the protocol of November 26, 1945.

Article 3 (1) of the protocol of 1945 stipulates that that protocol shall enter into force in its entirety when the governments mentioned in the preamble thereof, namely, the United States of America, Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, shall have deposited their instruments of ratification or given notifications of accession. All of those governments except the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands have deposited instruments of ratification of the protocol of 1945. Certain of its provisions (articles 2, 3, 4, 6 (1) and (2), 7, and 8) became effective, in accordance with the procedure established by article 8 (2), when instruments of ratification had been deposited by at least three of the signatory governments. Since instruments of ratification have not been deposited by the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands, the provisions of articles 1, 5, and 6 (3) had not been brought into operation between any countries until the supplementary protocol of March 3, 1947, was signed.

The articles of the protocol of 1945 which are brought into force by the supplementary protocol contain provisions relating to a temporary extension in the period allotted for certain whaling activities. Article I provides that the season during which factory ships and whale catchers operating with them may be used in taking and treating baleen whales shall be extended for an additional month so as to cover the period from December 8, 1946, to April 7, 1947. If the protocol had not been brought into force in its entirety, the 1946–47 whaling season would have been governed by the stipulations of article 7 of the agreement of 1937, which provides that each season shall extend from December 8 of one year to March 7 of the following year.

Article 5 of the protocol of 1945 waives for the period from May 1 to October 31, 1947, the requirement contained in article 3 (2) of the protocol of 1938, concerning the use of factory ships as land stations when operating within territorial waters.

Paragraph (3) of article 6 of the protocol of 1945 defines certain expressions used in that protocol.

The Senate, on July 30, 1946, gave its advice and consent to ratification of the protocol of 1945, and that protocol was ratified by the President on August 12, 1946. The instrument of ratification was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on August 30, 1946, on which date the provisions specified in article 8 (2) became effective with respect to the United States of America.

The supplementary protocol of March 3, 1047, has two articles. Article I provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of article 8 (1) of the protocol of 1945, that protocol shall come into force with respect to the governments on behalf of which the supplementary protocol is signed, immediately on its signature. This article removes the necessity for the deposit of ratifications of the protocol of 1945 by the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands before all the provisions of the protocol of 1945 come into force. The Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands, according to information received officially by the Department, have given assurances that the procedure provided for by the supplementary protocol for the purpose of bringing the protocol of 1945 into force in its entirety meets with their approval. Article II relates to the duration of the period during which the supplementary protocol remained open for signature. In view of the constitutional processes of this Government with respect to treaties, the signature of this supplementary protocol was made "subject to ratification" in order that the advice and consent of the Senate might be obtained with respect to this change in the procedure for fixing the effective date of the protocol of 1945 in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The Governments of the Union of South Africa, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Having ratified or acceded to the Protocol signed in London on 26th November, 1945 (hereinafter called "The Protocol"), amending the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling signed in London on 8th June, 1937, as amended by the Protocols of 24th June, 1938, and 7th February, 1944;

Considering that it is provided under paragraph (1) of Article VIII of the Protocol that the Protocol shall come into force in its entirety when all the Governments referred to in the preamble of the Protocol shall have deposited their instruments of ratification or given notification of accession;

Considering further that ratifications or accessions have been deposited on behalf of all the Governments referred to in the preamble of the Protocol with the exception of the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands; and

Desiring that the Protocol should be brought into force in its entirety without awaiting ratification by the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands;

Have decided to conclude a Supplementary Protocol for this purpose and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of Article VIII of the Protocol, the Protocol shall, on the signature of the present Supplementary Protocol, come into force with respect to the Governments signing the present Supplementary Protocol immediately upon signature by them.

ARTICLE II

The present Supplementary Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of 14 days thereafter.

In witness whereof the Undersigned, duly authorised by their respective Governments, have signed the present Supplementary Protocol, done in London this 3rd day of March 1947 in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom and of which certified copies shall be transmitted to all the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

EUGENE K. SCALLAN.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

Subject to approval.

JOHN A. BEASLEY.

For the Government of Canada:

N. A. ROBERTSON.

For the Government of Denmark:

E. REVENTLOW.

For the Government of France:

JEAN LE ROY.

For the Government of New Zealand:

W. J. JORDAN.

For the Government of Norway:

P. PREBENSEN.

For the Government of the United Kingdom:

O. G. SARGENT.

For the Government of the United States of America:

Subject to ratification.

W. J. GALLMAN.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

G. ZAROUBIN.

Certified a true copy:

[SEAL] E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers at the Foreign Office.

LONDON, *24 Mar. 1947.*

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to speak at this time, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William M. Bates, of Missouri.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
Philip J. Halla, of Florida.
Raymond J. Harris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Warren A. Kelsey, of Massachusetts.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.

Miss Constance McCready, of Maryland.
John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
James D. Newton, of New York.
Kenedon P. Steins, of Pennsylvania.

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Hon. John Caskie Collet, of Missouri, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, vice Hon. Kimbrough Stone, retiring May 15, 1947.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointments and promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of oath of office:

Charles P. White
Richard P. French
Joseph W. Fridl

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of oath of office:

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello
Peter J. Coccaro

Senior surgeon to be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Henry A. Rasmussen.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Samuel J. Hall
Richard B. Holt
Edgar W. Norris

Surgeon to be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Marion B. Noyes

Senior assistant surgeon to be temporary surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

LeRoy R. Allen

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Earl O. Heaton, May 1, 1947.

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Lawrence W. Swanson, May 1, 1947.

To be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Lewis V. Evans 3d, April 29, 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the Corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Mather, Donald I.
*Muller, Harry P.
Theriault, Harold J.
*Young, Horace

ENSIGNS

Acton, William D.
Ambrosio, William
Andrich, Vincent J.
Askew, George V.
Aydelott, William "L"
Ayers, George "L", Jr.
Bailey, Ralston
Banks, Charles A.
Barnes, Jerald D.
Beatle, Ralph H.
*Beck, Preston E.
Becker, Terrill F.
Beckett, Philip E.
Benson, William D.
Berglund, Burton E.
Berry, David P. L.
Beyer, Delbert A.
Blair, James A.
Botten, Ralph D.
Brown, Glenn H., Jr.
Canto, Joseph V.
Carder, Frank B.
Carroll, Charles J., Jr.
Clark, Carroll D.
Collins, John J.
Collins, Wayne D.
Corbett, James F.
Corey, Richard A.
Cover, John H.
Coyle, Arthur J.
Coyne, Philip G.
Cunningham, Patrick F.
D'Albora, Duilo
Davenport, erman P., Jr.
David, Floyd J.
Davila, Daniel I.
De Baets, Donald J.
Deffenbaugh, Robert M.
Delaney, Henry L.
Dickey, John L.
Dionne, Robert J.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Dorman, Alvin E.
Dorroh, Ray P.
*Droz, John F.
Eaholtz, Galen M.
Edrington, Frank R.
Eckman, Charles J.
Egli, Clayton J.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Essert, Antone
Evans, Donald W.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr.
*Everett, Clayton F.
Fenby, Charles C.
Finke, Gordon R.
Finley, Howard B., Jr.
*Fisher, Robert E.
Forehand, Wendell C.
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr.
Garver, Richard E.
Girard, Jean L.
Godfrey, Earl F.
Gohr, Robert B.
Goodman, Louis R.
*Graham, Archibald "G", Jr.
*Groom, Ralph A.
Gullett, John H.
Hall, John C.
Hanley, Richard J.
Harper, Horace D.
Hartman, Richard V.
Hatheway, Valentine J., Jr.
Hedbawny, Edward J.
*Henderson, James W
Holbrook, Jack G.
Hook, John C.
Hough, William L.
*Howard, Cornelius S., Jr.
*Howard, Herbert B.
Howard, Sam R.
Hulka, Edward H.
*Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
*Hutchinson, Harold
Huval, Willard R.
*Jacobs, Benjamin P.
Jermann, Donald R.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, Clarence R.
Jones, Theodore
Kauffman, Harry R.
Kent, Robert B.
Kiernan, Francis J.
Kile, Newton A., Jr.
Killingbeck, William E.
Knudson, Angus J.
Koons, Jack L.
*Kralik, William F.
*Krouse, Gale E.
*Kurtz, George P.
Lake, Jarrett T., Jr.
Laughlin, George W.
Leslie, David A.
Lewis, Frederick E.
Lindgren, George B.
Lococo, Salvadore
Loranger, Donald
Lynch, James
Malan, Max E.
*Margolf, Edga L.
Marks, Earl J., Jr.
Martin, William H., Jr.
Maxwell, Jack A.
McAdams, Robert B.
McConnel, Joseph E.
McDaniel, Charles B.
*McKinney, Harold W.
McVay, Kenneth M.
Melton, John B., Jr.
Menconi, Harry E., Jr.
Merritt, John A., 3d
Miles, Bernard L.
Miles, Neagle W.
Mills, Allan W.
Mix, Robert W.
Moore, Willard H.
Moriarty, Norbert L.
Morris, Evan D.
Morris, John R.
Mottarella, Victor G.
Murphy, William F.
*Nardone, Henry J.
*Neill, Eugene R.
Neth, Robert L.
Nicolais, Anthony L.
O'Connell, Thomas A.
Orton, Robert D.
Parr, Charles W.
Perdue, Uley F.
*Plattner, Francis B.
Price, Kenneth W.
Rapacz, Edwardus
Ratliff, John "H"
*Reed, Richard C.
*Rich, Charles A.
Rich, Harold G.
Rooke, William A.
Rose, Charles J.
Schneider, Robert F. J.
Schnopp, Robert W.
Schock, Robert E.
Shea, John
Small, Rufus C.
Smith, Billie E.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, Gordon C.
Smith, John
Spaulding, John I.
Stanley, George M.
Steadley, William A.
Stecker, Kenneth W.
Stephens, Jerrel D.
Stevenson, Norman M.
Stockstill, Peter T.
Storey, Richard E.
Stowitts, Emory V. P., Jr.
Swanson, Hjalmer E.
Tefft, William V., 2d
Thomas, John
*Thompson, James B., Jr.
Thomson, Robert G., Jr.
*Thorpe, Milton W.
Trout, Roscoe L.
Truesdale, Francis E.
Van Hoomissen, Vincent F. P.
Voorheese, Jack R.
Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Warriner, Victor G.
*Watson, John M.
Welch, Paul R.
Wheeler, William L.
Whittemore, John B.
Wilson, William D.
Wysocki, Walter J.
Zeigler, Richard E.
*Zimmerman, Chester A.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bond, Victor P.
Cleary, James F., Jr.
Conley, John L.
Gundelfinger, Benjamin F.
Hagelstein, Arthur A.
McCann, Eugene C.
McCarthy, Robert J.
Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Savage, Charles
Schellen, Albert E.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Arrigo, Anthony J.
Bevan, Loren R.
Bigham, Robert G., Jr.
Cohen, John F.
Dellinger, Charley P.
Dorion, William E.
Downey, James G.
Duffie, Hubert W.
Farrell, George, 3d
Fitzpatrick, Julius W.
Hauck, Richard H.
Hix, Charles F.
Hiza, John
Johnson, Karl A.
Keenan, Joseph I.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J.
Larsen, Russell W.
Martin, Donald V.
McDonald, Raymond O., Jr.
McMullen, Marvin E.
Monahan, Edward F.
Nunn, Enoch W.
Ooyman, John G., 3d
Pierce, James M.
Pluto, Raymond J.
Reeves, James F., Jr.
Rocque, Paul F.
Ross, Joel E.
Tice, "J" P.
Tippin, Jesse R.
Tripp, Charles J.
Walker, Hinton C.
Wasko, Andrew J.
Wilson, Robert W.
Zelinski, William E.
Bentley, William R.
Corley, James O.
Kurek, Edward L.
Toll, David R.
Wallis, Eslie D.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marra, Peter S.

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Allen, Max H.
Mallory, Charles W.
Andrews, James D.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Blackwood, Robert M.
Gleisten, Howard P.
Harwood, Richard C.
Hudec, Ernest P.
Mitchell, Edward C.
Rumming, Ray C.
Secrest, Robert H.
Siemer, Harold N.
Steinauer, Jerome J.
Stoopack, Jerome C.
Van Damm, Vincent W
Wempie, Clifton "L"
Williams, Robert M.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Banks, Ned V.
Eddy, Harold B.
Elder, David A.
Hambley, Louis C.
Hima, Dennis
Jones, Leslie
McMillan, Donald J.
Proback, Nicholas
Robinson, Robert
Schuhmacher, John E.
Smith, Forrest E.
Trapp, Robert I.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Banks, Milton W.
Howell, Gerald U.
McGahee, Eall M.
Ritter, Preston R.

CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Kibsgaard, Henry
Novak, Louis

The following-named officer to the rank indicated in the line of the Navy, to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed:

ENSIGN

Hannah, Clyde B.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Donald Scott McAlpine, former pastor of Mariners Harbor Baptist Church, Staten Island, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and perfect Spirit in whom all things have their source, support, and end, Thou who hast given eternal life to those who believe in Thy son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray that all who humbly seek Thee this day may know that Thou dost hear them. Thou God of gracious wisdom, who hast given us even the right to choose the wrong, help us to shorten the days of our lessons and soon to shape our minds into unison with Thy divine purpose. Thus may we hasten the time when Thy will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven, and the nations of this world become the kingdom of our God and His Christ, to whom be glory and honor, majesty and power, both now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, after "not to exceed" strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 51, noes 37.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 165, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—225

Abernethy	Bender	Busbey
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Butler
Allen, La.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrnes, Wis.
Almond	Bishop	Case, S. Dak.
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Chenoweth
	Boggs, Del.	Chiperfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bolton	Church
Andresen, August H.	Bradley, Calif.	Clevenger
	Bradley, Mich.	Clippinger
Angell	Bramblett	Coffin
Arends	Brehm	Cole, Kans.
Arnold	Brooks	Cole, Mo.
Auchincloss	Brophy	Cox
Banta	Brown, Ohio	Cravens
Barden	Buck	Crawford
Barrett	Buffett	Crow
Bates, Mass.	Burke	Cunningham
Beall	Burleson	Curtis
Dague	Jones, Ohio	Robsion
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Wash.	Rockwell
Dawson, Utah	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Devitt	Kean	Rohrbough
D'Ewart	Kearney	Ross
Dirksen	Kearns	Russell
Dolliver	Keefe	St. George
Dondero	Kersten, Wis.	Sanborn
Dorn	Kilburn	Sarbacher
Doughton	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Elliott	Kunkel	Scoblick
Ellis	Landis	Scott, Hardie
Elsaesser	Larcade	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Elston	Latham	
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Scrivner
Engle, Calif.	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Fellows	Lemke	Shafer
Fenton	Lewis	Short
Fisher	Love	Simpson, Ill.
Fletcher	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Foote	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Gamble	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Gathings	McDonough	Smith, Wis.
Gavin	McDowell	Springer
Gearhart	McGarvey	Stanley
Gillette	McGregor	Stefan
Gillie	McMahon	Stevenson
Goff	McMillen, Ill.	Stockman
Goodwin	Maloney	Stratton
Graham	Martin, Iowa	Sundstrom
Grant, Ind.	Mason	Taber
Griffiths	Meyer	Talle
Gross	Michener	Taylor
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Md.	Teague
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Hagen	Mundt	Thomas, Tex.
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	Tibbott
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	Towe
	Nodar	Twyman
Hall, Leonard W.	Norblad	Vail
	O'Hara	Van Zandt
Halleck	O'Konski	Vorys
Hand	Pace	Vursell
Hardy	Passman	Weichel
Harness, Ind.	Phillips, Calif.	Welch
Harrison	Phillips, Tenn.	Wheeler
Herter	Ploeser	Whitten
Hess	Plumley	Whittington
Hill	Ramey	Wigglesworth
Hoeven	Rankin	Williams
Holmes	Redden	Wilson, Ind.
Hope	Reed, Ill.	Winstead
Horan	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Hull	Rees	Wolverton
Jenison	Reeves	Wood
Jenkins, Ohio	Rich	Woodruff
Jensen	Rivers	Worley
Johnson, Ill.	Rizley	Youngblood
Johnson, Ind.	Robertson	

NAYS—165

Albert	Eaton	Keating
Andrews, Ala.	Eberharter	Kee
Andrews, N. Y.	Evins	Kelley
Bakewell	Fallon	Kennedy
Bates, Ky.	Feighan	Keogh
Battle	Fernandez	Kerr
Beckworth	Flannagan	Kilday
Bell	Fogarty	Kirwan
Blatnik	Forand	Klein
Bloom	Fulton	Lane
Boggs, La.	Gary	Lanham
Bonner	Gordon	Lea
Boykin	Gore	Lesinski
Brown, Ga.	Gorski	Lodge
Bryson	Gossett	Lusk
Buchanan	Granger	Lyle
Byrne, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Lynch
Camp	Gregory	McCormack
Canfield	Harless, Ariz.	McMillan, S. C.
Cannon	Havenner	MacKinnon
Case, N. J.	Hays	Madden
Chadwick	Hedrick	Mahon
Chapman	Heffernan	Manasco
Chelf	Hendricks	Mansfield, Mont.
Clark	Heselton	
Clason	Hinshaw	Marcantonio
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Mathews
Combs	Holifield	Merrow
Cooley	Huber	Miller, Calif.
Cooper	Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Conn.
Corbett	Jackson, Wash.	Mills
Coudert	Jarman	Monroney
Courtney	Javits	Morgan
Crosser	Jenkins, Pa.	Morris
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Muhlenberg
Deane	Johnson, Okla.	Murdock
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Dingell	Jones, Ala.	O'Brien
Donohue	Jones, N. C.	O'Toole
Douglas	Judd	Owens
Drewry	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Patterson	Rains	Smith, Maine
Peden	Rayburn	Smith, Va.
Peterson	Rayfiel	Snyder
Pfeifer	Richards	Somers
Philbin	Riehlman	Spence
Pickett	Riley	Stigler
Poage	Rogers, Fla.	Thomason
Potts	Rooney	Tollefson
Poulson	Sabath	Trimble
Powell	Sadlak	Wadsworth
Preston	Sadowski	Walter
Price, Fla.	Sasscer	Wilson, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Sheppard	Zimmerman
Priest	Sikes	
Rabin	Smathers	

NOT VOTING—41

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	King
Bland	Folger	Macy
Buckley	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gallagher	Meade, Ky.
Carroll	Garlach	Meade, Md.
Carson	Gifford	Mitchell
Celler	Harris	Morrison
Clements	Hart	Morton
Colmer	Hartley	Norrell
Cotton	Hébert	Norton
D'Alesandro	Hoffman	Schwabe, Mo.
Dawson, Ill.	Howell	Vinson
Domengeaux	Jennings	West
Durham	Kefauver	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Schwabe of Missouri for, with Mr. D'Alesandro against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Cotton for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky for, with Mr. Meade of Maryland against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Harris.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Folger.

Mr. Carson with Mr. Durham.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Domengeaux.

Mr. WOLCOTT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. REDDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, after line 8, add a new sentence as follows:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds authorized to be appropriated herein shall be expended in or used for such relief assistance in those countries whose governments are dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics unless the governments of the countries covered by this amendment agree to the following regulations which are hereby declared to be applicable to every country receiving aid under this act.

"The State Department shall establish and maintain out of the funds herein authorized for appropriation a relief-distribution mission for each of the countries receiving aid under this act. This relief-distribution mission shall be comprised solely of American citizens who shall have been approved as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These missions shall have direct supervision and control of relief supplies in each country and when it is deemed desirable by the American authorities administering the provisions of this act these relief missions shall be empowered to retain possession of these sup-

plies up to the city or local community where our relief supplies are actually made available to the ultimate consumers."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 75, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—324

Abernethy	Devitt	Kean
Albert	D'Ewart	Kearney
Allen, Calif.	Dirksen	Kearns
Allen, La.	Dolliver	Keating
Almond	Dondero	Keefe
Andersen, H. Carl	Donohue	Kerr
Anderson, Calif.	Dorn	Kersten, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Doughton	Kilburn
Andrews, Ala.	Drewry	Knutson
Andrews, N. Y.	Eaton	Kunkel
Angell	Elliott	Landis
Arends	Ellis	Lanham
Arnold	Elsaesser	Larcade
Auchincloss	Elston	Latham
Bakewell	Engel, Mich.	Lea
Banta	Engle, Calif.	LeCompte
Barden	Evins	LeFevre
Barrett	Fallon	Lemke
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Lewis
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Lodge
Beall	Fernandez	Love
Bell	Fisher	Lucas
Bender	Fletcher	Lusk
Bennett, Mich.	Foote	McConnell
Bennett, Mo.	Fulton	McCowen
Bishop	Gamble	McDonough
Blackney	Gathings	McDowell
Blatnik	Gavin	McGarvey
Boggs, Del.	Gearhart	McGregor
Boggs, La.	Gillette	McMahon
Bolton	Gillie	McMillan, S. C.
Bonner	Goff	McMillen, Ill.
Boykin	Goodwin	MacKinnon
Bradley, Calif.	Graham	Maloney
Bradley, Mich.	Granger	Mansfield, Mont.
Brehm	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Iowa
Brooks	Grant, Ind.	Mason
Brophy	Gregory	Mathews
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	Meade, Md.
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Meyer
Bryson	Gwinn, N. Y.	Michener
Buck	Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Conn.
Buffett	Hagen	Miller, Md.
Burke	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Burleson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills
Busbey	Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison
Butler	Halleck	Muhlenberg
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Mundt
Camp	Hardy	Murdock
Canfield	Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Tenn.
Cannon	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Case, N. J.	Harris	Nixon
Case, S. Dak.	Harrison	Nodar
Chadwick	Hays	Norblad
Chapman	Hébert	Norrell
Chelf	Hendricks	O'Brien
Chenoweth	Herter	O'Hara
Chiperfield	Heselton	O'Konski
Church	Hess	Owens
Clason	Hill	Pace
Clevenger	Hoeven	Passman
Clippinger	Hoffman	Patman
Coffin	Holifield	Patterson
Cole, Kans.	Holmes	Peden
Cole, Mo.	Hope	Philbin
Cole, N. Y.	Horan	Phillips, Calif.
Colmer	Hull	Phillips, Tenn.
Cooley	Jackson, Calif.	Pickett
Cooper	Jackson, Wash.	Ploeser
Corbett	Jenison	Plumley
Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Poage
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Potts
Cravens	Jennings	Poulson
Crawford	Jensen	Preston
Crow	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Fla.
Cunningham	Johnson, Ill.	Ramey
Curtis	Johnson, Ind.	Rankin
Dague	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Reed, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.
Dawson, Utah	Jones, Wash.	Rees
Deane	Jonkman	Reeves
	Judd	Rich
		Riehlman
Riley	Sikes	Twyman
Rivers	Simpson, Ill.	Vail
Rizley	Simpson, Pa.	Van Zandt
Robertson	Smathers	Vorys
Robsion	Smith, Kans.	Vursell
Rockwell	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Ohio	Walter
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Wis.	Welchel
Rohrbough	Snyder	Welch
Ross	Springer	West
Russell	Stanley	Wheeler
Sadlak	Stefan	Whitten
St. George	Stevenson	Whittington
Sanborn	Stockman	Wigglesworth
Sarbacher	Stratton	Williams
Sasscer	Sundstrom	Wilson, Ind.
Schwabe, Okla.	Taber	Wilson, Tex.
Scoblick	Talle	Winstead
Scott, Hardie	Taylor	Wolcott
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Teague	Wolverton
Scrivner	Thomas, N. J.	Wood
Seely-Brown	Thomas, Tex.	Woodruff
Shafer	Tibbott	Worley
Short	Tollefson	Youngblood
	Towe	Zimmerman

NAYS—75

Battle	Heffernan	Miller, Calif.
Beckworth	Hobbs	Monroney
Bloom	Huber	Morgan
Buchanan	Jarman	Morris
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	O'Toole
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Peterson
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Pfeifer
Combs	Karsten, Mo	Powell
Courtney	Kee	Price, Ill.
Crosser	Kelley	Priest
Delaney	Kennedy	Rabin
Dingell	Keogh	Rains
Douglas	Kilday	Rayburn
Eberharter	Kirwan	Rayfiel
Feighan	Klein	Richards
Flannagan	Lane	Rooney
Fogarty	Lesinski	Sabath
Forand	Lyle	Sadowski
Gary	Lynch	Sheppard
Gordon	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Gore	Madden	Somers
Gorski	Mahon	Spence
Gossett	Manasco	Stigler
Havenner	Marcantonio	Thomason
Hedrick	Merrow	Trimble

NOT VOTING—32

Allen, Ill.	Durham	Kefauver
Bland	Ellsworth	King
Buckley	Folger	Macy
Bulwinkle	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
Carson	Gallagher	Meade, Ky.
Celler	Gerlach	Mitchell
Clements	Gifford	Morton
Cotton	Hart	Norton
D'Alesandro	Hartley	Schwabe, Mo.
Dawson, Ill.	Hinshaw	Vinson
Domengeaux	Howell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member on the minority side who wishes to offer a motion to recommit?

Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. O'KONSKI. In its present form, emphatically yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

A motion to recommit offered by Mr. O'KONSKI:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves that the bill, House Joint Resolution 134, be sent back to the Foreign Affairs Committee for further study and until such time as Secretary of State Marshall has had opportunity to reorganize the State Department to conform with a truly anticommunistic policy and until such time as President Truman has had opportunity to reorganize the executive branch of our Government to conform to a truly anticommunistic policy.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 66, answered "present" 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—333

Albert	Curtis	Holifield
Allen, Calif.	Dague	Holmes
Allen, La.	Davis, Ga.	Hope
Almond	Davis, Tenn.	Horan
Andersen, H. Carl	Dawson, Utah	Huber
Anderson, Calif.	Deane	Jackson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.	Delaney	Jackson, Wash.
Andrews, Ala.	Devitt	Jarman
Andrews, N. Y.	D'Ewart	Javits
Angell	Dingell	Jenison
Arends	Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio
Arnold	Dolliver	Jenkins, Pa.
Auchincloss	Dondero	Jennings
Bakewell	Donohue	Jensen
Barden	Doughton	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Douglas	Johnson, Okla.
Bates, Ky.	Drewry	Johnson, Tex.
Bates, Mass.	Eaton	Jones, Ala.
Battle	Eberharter	Jones, N. C.
Beall	Elliott	Jones, Wash.
Beckworth	Elsaesser	Jonkman
Bell	Elston	Judd
Bender	Engel, Mich.	Karsten, Mo.
Blackney	Engle, Calif.	Kean
Blatnik	Evins	Kearney
Bloom	Fallon	Keating
Boggs, Del.	Feighan	Kee
Boggs, La.	Fellows	Keefe
Bolton	Fenton	Kelley
Bonner	Fernandez	Kennedy
Boykin	Fisher	Keogh
Bradley, Calif.	Flannagan	Kerr
Bradley, Mich.	Fletcher	Kersten, Wis.
Bramblett	Fogarty	Kilburn
Brehm	Foote	Kilday
Brooks	Forand	Kirwan
Brophy	Fulton	Klein
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	Kunkel
Brown, Ohio	Gary	Lane
Bryson	Gearhart	Lanham
Buchanan	Gillie	Latham
Buck	Goff	Lea
Buckley	Goodwin	LeCompte
Burke	Gordon	LeFevre
Busbey	Gore	Lesinski
Butler	Gorski	Lewis
Byrne, N. Y.	Gossett	Lodge
Byrnes, Wis.	Granger	Love
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Lusk
Canfield	Grant, Ind.	Lyle
Cannon	Gregory	Lynch
Carroll	Griffiths	McConnell
Case, N. J.	Gross	McCormack
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne, Iowa	McCowen
Chadwick	Hagen	McDonough
Chapman	Hale	McDowell
Chelf	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey
Chenoweth	Hall, Leonard W.	McMillan, S. C.
Chiperfield	Halleck	McMillen, Ill.
Church	Hardy	MacKinnon
Clark	Harless, Ariz.	Madden
Clason	Harris	Mahon
Coffin	Havenner	Manasco
Cole, Kans.	Hays	Mansfield, Mont.
Cole, Mo.	Hébert	Marcantonio
Cole, N. Y.	Hedrick	Martin, Iowa
Combs	Heffernan	Mathews
Cooley	Hendricks	Meade, Md.
Cooper	Herter	Merrow
Corbett	Heselton	Meyer
Coudert	Hess	Michener
Courtney	Hill	Miller, Calif.
Cox	Hinshaw	Miller, Conn.
Crosser	Hobbs	Miller, Md.
Crow	Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.
Cunningham		Mills

Monroney	Ramey	Smith, Va.
Morgan	Rayburn	Smith, Wis.
Morris	Rayfiel	Snyder
Morrison	Redden	Somers
Muhlenberg	Reed, Ill.	Spence
Mundt	Rees	Stefan
Murdock	Richards	Stevenson
Murray, Tenn.	Riehlman	Stigler
Murray, Wis.	Riley	Stratton
Nixon	Rivers	Sundstrom
Nodar	Rizley	Taber
Norblad	Robertson	Talle
O'Brien	Robsion	Taylor
O'Hara	Rockwell	Thomas, N. J.
O'Toole	Rogers, Fla.	Thomason
Owens	Rogers, Mass.	Tibbott
Pace	Rohrbough	Tollefson
Patman	Rooney	Towe
Patterson	Ross	Trimble
Peden	Russell	Twyman
Peterson	Sabath	Vail
Pfeifer	Sadlak	Van Zandt
Philbin	Sadowski	Vorys
Phillips, Calif.	St. George	Wadsworth
Ploeser	Sanborn	Walter
Plumley	Sasscer	Welchel
Poage	Scoblick	Welch
Potts	Scott, Hardie	West
Poulson	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Whittington
Powell	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Preston	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Ind.
Price, Fla	Sheppard	Wilson, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Sikes	Wolcott
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton
Rabin	Smathers	Worley
Rains	Smith, Maine	Zimmerman

NAYS—66

Abernethy	Hoffman	Rich
Banta	Hull	Sarbacher
Bennett, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Bennett, Mo.	Johnson, Ind	Scrivner
Bishop	Jones, Ohio	Shafer
Bradley, Mich.	Kearns	Short
Buffett	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Burleson	Larcade	Smith, Kans.
Clevenger	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Clippinger	Lucas	Springer
Colmer	McGregor	Stanley
Cravens	McMahon	Stockman
Crawford	Maloney	Teague
Dorn	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Ellis	Norrell	Vursell
Gathings	O'Konski	Wheeler
Gavin	Passman	Whitten
Gillette	Phillips, Tenn.	Williams
Graham	Pickett	Winstead
Hand	Rankin	Wood
Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Harrison	Reeves	Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Landis Schwabe, Mo.

NOT VOTING—30

Allen, Ill.	Durham	Howell
Bland	Ellsworth	Kefauver
Bulwinkle	Folger	King
Carson	Fuller	Macy
Celler	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Clements	Gerlach	Meade, Ky.
Cotton	Gifford	Mitchell
D'Alesandro	Gwinn, N. Y.	Morton
Dawson, Ill.	Hart	Norton
Domengeaux	Hartley	Vinson

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Cotton for, with Mr. Landis against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. D'Alesandro.
Mr. Carson with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. King.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. COTTON. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 153.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Dulles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several quotations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this measure to provide $200,000,000 in further relief to foreign countries. I did so with reluctance because I know something of their need. I have, over the years, tried to be liberal with the less fortunate peoples of other lands. I have voted for much of some $15,000,000,000 in assistance we have extended them or are being asked to extend. But, there are conditions under which I must, to satisfy my feeling of obligation to America, draw the line.

The pending measure is a blank check written in the dark. It would give the President authority through a commission he appoints, to spend this money where he desires and the State Department has already told us that if it has its way it plans to spend a lot of it in Poland, Hungary, and other Russian-dominated countries. The administration asks us to help these Communist states and in the next breath to vote money for Greece and Turkey to stop communism. These Russian-dominated states are paying reparations to Russia. Any assistance from us puts us in a position of helping to pay those reparations. It is an inconsistent and foolish policy. This money will be used as our other assistance has been used, to entrench the Communists who distribute it abroad and to punish helpless and needy peoples who do not bow down to these Communists to whom we give authority to distribute the relief.

It is admitted by the State Department that no other nation is helping us to assume the burden of feeding the world. It is admitted that the sum now requested is an estimate, "picked out of the air." The tax money necessary to total this vast amount cannot be picked out of the air. It will have to be picked out of the pockets of my constituents in high taxes and high prices. Yes, high prices. As long as our Government is buying vast quantities of food and clothing to give to people who ought to go to work to supply their own instead of waiting for more checks from Uncle Sam, just that long will scarcities be continued in this country and the unreasonably high prices which go with scarcity. I hear a lot said by the politicians about business and labor being to blame for high prices. The greatest guilt for high prices belongs to the Government. In 1940, before the war, we had $7,848,000,000 of currency in circulation. Today we have $28,303,507,000 in circulation or about four times as much as six short years ago. Is it any wonder that prices have gone up or that money has become cheaper and will buy less? This money is printed to cover unnecessary Government expenditures.

Some effort has been made here to satisfy objections to this bill by amendment. These efforts fall far short of protection of this country's best interests and simply continue the policy of pauperizing other countries and spreading a spendthrift New Deal around the world. I am against it. I want to see taxes reduced, the budget balanced, the national debt reduced, and the American dollar again worth one hundred cents in purchasing power. There will always be a United States of America if we do not give it away. This measure and others like it will undo our hard work which is putting us back on the road to Federal sanity and solvency.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Admiral Bellinger.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. B. A. Lynch, of Blytheville, Ark.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan.

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a magazine entitled "Here in Ohio."

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, without going into detail or speaking at any length, let me say this is what is known as an ordinary open rule. It provides for 4 hours' debate. At the conclusion of the debate, all amendments will be considered under the well-known 5-minute rule. Points of order are waived. The Committee on Rules, which has reported this rule to the House, believes that this measure, known as the rent-control bill, is of sufficient importance to entitle it to prompt consideration by the House; hence, the presentation of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have but few requests for time on this side. I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

RULE FOR HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL BILL SHOULD BE ADOPTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters that I sent to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the rule has been briefly and intelligently explained by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], so I shall not restate what has been said by him.

The bill which this rule makes in order is to some extent in the right direction. It extends rent control to December 31, 1947, and then gives the President, if he sees fit and there is need, the power to extend it further until March 31, 1948.

Although I believe this bill falls woefully short of the legislation we should enact, as I shall explain as briefly as possible with so important a subject, it should be passed. I urge that the rule be adopted to make consideration in order, and I bespeak support for the bill.

THERE IS NOT ENOUGH HOUSING

I presume that Members of the House are laboring under the impression that with the passage of this bill free enterprise will miraculously bring forth acres of homes in which our returned soldiers and their families, not to mention a large proportion of the civilian population, can hang their hats and proceed to prosper and increase. They have heard the siren song of the spokesman of big business—the smooth-talking, self-assured legislative representatives of the real estate men, the producers of builders' materials, the lumber manufacturers, the apartment-house owners, the bankers, the contractors. They have heard these high-salaried, high-pressure lobbyists with their easy promises of houses, houses, houses—if we will just turn loose free enterprise and take off all the brakes.

Well, we have heard those promises before.

We heard them all through the war.

We heard them in full chorus and loud cry immediately after the war.

We took off all controls on materials—for a little while.

Then we had to put them back, or try to. Putting Humpty-Dumpty together again was too much of a job, so we did a little patchwork. Then finally we took them all off again, except rent control. These are just the funeral services for that orderly reconversion so much talked of. Even the rent control has a strange and sickly pallor—its time is short.

But we still have not enough housing. We have the highest prices in history.

NOT THE FAULT OF CONGRESS

This failure to supply decent homes for decent Americans at decent cost is not due to any failure of the Congress or of Wilson Wyatt, the energetic and idealistic Expediter of Housing. Government did not fail the homeless veteran.

The failure lies directly at the door of selfish businesses who could see only profits, unlimited, in the need of the people; of the lobbies, the contractors, the operators, whose greed blinded them to the public interest. I am not talking about all real-estate men, or all contractors, for there were many who not only supported but helped administer the Government's program. It did not take many willing to pay black market prices for material and for labor to wreck the program, when accompanied by a furious barrage of propaganda.

I really do not blame many of the real-estate operators and contractors for failing to build. Materials and labor had become so scarce, and prices had shot so far above any reasonable level, that they could not sell at a reasonable price. Some of those who built anyway, and skimped on quality, and jacked up the price to cover illegal bonus payments, are now stuck with third-rate houses they cannot sell. In the larger cities houses constructed in conformity with NHA specifications and local building codes would cost $10,000. Very few ex-servicemen are in a position to pay $10,000 for any house, even if the quality is there, and certainly not for a house worth, by normal standards, only $5,000 to $6,000.

BUSINESS LOBBIES TO BLAME

I repeat that the charges made by some Members to my left that Government is at fault for the lack of housing are unjustified and without foundation. The Government's housing program was a fair and equitable one which should have been welcomed by a truly free private, competitive enterprise system. The powerful lobbies, grown greater than their members, sabotaged that program.

Almost 2 years ago I first wrote to the Attorney General pointing out that there was much evidence of black-market operations in the lumber-manufacturing industry. As you know, prosecutive actions were begun in many parts of the country.

Just a few months ago I again wrote to him calling his attention to violent and uniform increases in some essential construction items in critically short supply which indicated collusive action in violation of the antitrust statutes. I here insert that letter which was dated February 18, 1947:

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: For years the building of homes for ex-servicemen and homeless Americans has been delayed principally because builders could not obtain absolutely essential materials for construction. It is my belief and the belief of many in the building trades that the virtual monopoly of some manufacturers and manufacturers' associations in scarce items contributed sharply to these acute shortages.

1. GYPSUM BOARD AND ROCK LATH

At the present time, under the stimulation of the incentive payments provided under the veterans' emergency housing program, production of gypsum products, both of sheathing and rock lath, for plaster base has reached the highest point in history. At the same time, however, prices have risen four, five, and six times above the prewar price of $50 to $60 a thousand. The fact remains, however, that the United States Gypsum Co., the Johns-Manville Co., and one or two other large firms constitute a virtually complete monopoly of this essential product through their control of raw materials and processing facilities.

2. HARDWOOD FLOORING

Because of the monopolistic restrictions of hardwood manufacturers, the present market is thoroughly disorganized and annual production in 1946 was relatively lower than in any other field.

A normal prewar price was from $70 to $75 a thousand board feet; while the present price ranges from $150 to $250 a thousand at the mill. Retailers and builders are caught in a tight squeeze. They cannot afford to destroy their future business by passing these exorbitant charges on to their customers and they are forced to handle their

retail sales on unprofitable marked-up margins.

3. IRON PIPE

The storage of iron pipe likewise has been under rigid control by manufacturers. It is probably true that, more than in any of the other fields, abnormal wartime consumption of all iron products contributed to the acute shortage of pipe for construction use. Nevertheless, the uniform agreements as to price and quotas point clearly toward collusive action.

It is significant that, while wartime controls remained effective, all of these items appeared in the black market at exorbitant prices. Since the removal of controls, prices have sky rocketed under the frantic bidding of construction contractors pressed for cash and forced to pay exorbitant prices for materials, which of course has the immediate result of pushing the new houses completely out of reach of veterans and low-income groups, which it was the intention of Congress and the Housing Expediter to help.

I feel that if you start an immediate investigation, or at least give notice of your intention to investigate these outrageous restraints, the result will be that these scare materials will begin to flow into the market at reasonable prices and in a more orderly manner and that the housing program will advance rapidly.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

Again on March 24, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Attorney General to point out that the average selling price for hardwood flooring in March 1947 was practically double that of March 1942. I here insert that letter and his reply:

MARCH 24, 1947.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not wish to harass you or embarrass you with too many communications. At the same time, knowing your interest in the enforcement of the antitrust acts, I feel that I should pass on to you any suggestions or information that seem pertinent.

On several occasions during the past year I have raised the issue of the extraordinary increases in some of the elements of residential construction; particularly in regard to common lumber and hardwood flooring and cast-iron pipe. I am forwarding to you a letter I have just received from the Forest Products Division of the Office of Temporary Controls showing almost unbelievable increases in the average selling price of hardwood flooring over the past 5 years.

Note that the average selling price in March 1947 is double that of March 1942 and that there is a reported spread between mill prices of $153 MBF for oak flooring and retail prices of $315 in Chicago. It seems to me that this could be achieved only by collusive monopolistic action.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

MARCH 27, 1947.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of March 24, enclosing one addressed to you by Mathias W. Niewenhous, Director of Forest Products Division of the Civilian Production Administration, containing information concerning the increase in the selling price of common lumber and hardwood flooring.

I greatly appreciate your consistent interest in these matters and assure you that they will be given careful attention here on the basis of the information which you furnish.

With kind regards.
Sincerely,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

PRIORITY PREFERENCE SYSTEM SHOULD BE RETAINED

Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of the national emergency, when it became evident that we could not produce everything we needed to fight and win an all-out war and still carry on our peacetime life, I have supported the system of rationing, under whatever name it happened to be called. When it came to doling out our precious industrial materials and facilities, we set up a complicated preferential priority system which channeled all materials and available labor first into the war effort and then tried to divide what was left over among essential nonwar industries.

It worked.

We won the most terrible war of all history. We were, in truth and in fact, the arsenal of democracy.

When we started to turn back to peacetime, it made sense to me that we should make our reconversion orderly and fair by continuing that system of priorities, especially in housing.

I felt that construction of homes—real homes, at prices which the ordinary American citizen could pay, either on a sale or rental basis—was our number one objective. It was a peacetime war against the enemy of need.

It is true that withholding of materials from the legal market and all kinds of propaganda, bonus payments, and other dodges, some legal and some illegal, largely nullified the priority provisions of the Veterans Emergency Housing Program; but the fact remains that a record number of homes was started in 1946 under the stimulus of preferential priority controls and incentive payments.

Such a system would be helpful now, even though materials are beginning to appear on the market, and I regret that it is not provided for in this bill. I venture the hope that an amendment will be successfully offered.

STEEL PIPE WITHDRAWN FROM CHICAGO AREA

We have in Chicago right now a concrete example of what I mean, Mr. Speaker, and I desire to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the Congress and of the whole country to a situation in which the steel industry, or at least a major segment of it, has abrogated its promises to the Government and to the construction industry by withdrawing steel pipe—ordinary steel pipe 2 inches and less in diameter, such as is used in water leads into buildings—from the entire Chicago area, and is rapidly bringing the home-construction program there to a standstill.

In August 1945, when it appeared that Japan would capitulate, the steel industry advisory committee brought pressure on the War Production Board to end the controlled materials plan in the final quarter of 1945. The industry representatives undertook, on their part, to assure the continuation of the distribution of steel-mill products based on an historical pattern which has long been the industry's means of distributing steel when demand exceeds supply.

The Government agreed.

Then this is what happened: Steel pipe is a low-profit item, and prices in the Chicago area are based on the price at the Chicago area mills rather than on Pittsburgh. There is no Pittsburgh-plus velvet on shipments into Chicago. Now many mills manufacturing this type of steel pipe have withdrawn entirely from the Chicago market. They have abandoned customers of many years standing, who have no place to turn to get pipe for their own customers.

Here is a partial list of steel-pipe manufacturers reported to have pulled out of the Chicago market entirely; though I am no friend of big business, it is to the credit of the National Tube & Steel Co. that they continue to ship from their Lorain, Ohio, plant, to their own customers.

Spang Chalfant Co., Bethlehem Steel Co. LaClede Steel Co., Pittsburgh Tube Co., Wheatland Tube Co., Mercer Tube Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., in at least one instance.

Though it is claimed that the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction, and that only moral suasion—a weak weapon against greed—can be brought to bear, I claim that they have the power to remedy the situation in Chicago and on the Pacific coast, where, if anything, the situation is worse. Certainly the steel companies themselves can do this even though it might infinitesimally reduce their tremendous profits of 1945 and 1946, as shown by the financial reports.

SAME SITUATION IN OIL

What applies to steel applies to the current freeze-out of small independent distributors of fuel oil in Chicago. The situation is more or less parallel, though there is not the same close relationship to home construction. I do not wish to encumber the RECORD, and therefore refrain with regret from including at this point a letter just received from the Mid-City Oil Co. of Chicago describing the unauthorized but effective rationing system imposed by the major oil company suppliers on the small companies, which already has resulted in their substantial loss of accounts.

RENT CONTROL EXTENDED

This bill aims to relieve the situation I have touched upon, at least to some extent, and it also extends rent control for a limited period.

There are some gentlemen who argue that rent control should be entirely eliminated.

May I say to you that we have had no rent control on commercial buildings—on offices, stores, factories, or manufacturing plants.

I take it that you all know what happened.

In many instances commercial rents have been ruthlessly boosted from 100 percent to 400 percent. Every one of you knows of some instance in which some man with a little store where he was paying $50 a month suddenly had his rent jacked up to $200 or $300 a

month just as soon as the landlord found out he was making a little profit on his business—naturally under a Democratic administration; I have to put that in.

You could go on and multiply those instances many times—office rents, factory rents, storage rents—all boosted to all the traffic would bear.

The same thing would have happened to tenants in apartment buildings and dwellings had it not been that Congress wisely and prudently provided for rent control and insisted on its enforcement.

HARDSHIP CASES PROVIDED FOR

I realize that there are some cases of genuine hardship, especially where a small landlord had rented to steady tenants at depression prices; but we provided for relief where actual hardship could be shown, and I am confident, on the basis of my own experience with the rent control program that relief was actually granted when the facts justified it.

Those provisions are continued in the present bill, and I am satisfied will be administered justly and equitably in view of increased operating costs of all kinds. I have always thought that from 10-percent to 15-percent increases were fair.

The provision in the bill that would permit a 15-percent increase in rents on all premises that have not been occupied for 2 years or more cannot, I am sure, apply in very many instances, although spokesmen for the real estate industry boasted of thousands of rental units taken off the market by owners when they became vacant. This provision is just a bribe to such owners to return the units to rental. It is my opinion that any owner who has refused to rent his premises because he was not able to increase his rents is not a person to deserve any consideration.

OPERATORS OF DEFAULTED PROPERTIES HAVE NOT BEEN HURT

The class of real-estate operator who receives no sympathy at all from me is made up of those who now own large tenement or apartment buildings taken from the original owners during the Republican panic of 1929, 1930, 1932, and 1933 through bankruptcy or foreclosure proceedings at a small fraction of their real value, and operated at very satisfactory rents with full tenancy and low turn-over.

Those buildings were taken over by banks and original houses of issue, or by their agents and representatives who became the so-called bondholders protective committees, or the trustees and receivers, and who, manipulating as such, acquired title to the buildings to their own great advantage and profit and to the bitter loss of the original bondholders, who had bought these so-termed gold bonds in good faith and, in many other cases, lost their life's savings.

Through clever and unscrupulous manipulations among the protective committees, the trustees and receivers, and sometimes the courts, the banks, and their friends, obtained ownership of thousands of the finest and largest apartment buildings in the United States at 10, 12, and 15 cents on the dollar.

Consequently, the present owners of such apartment houses are obtaining more than a fair return on their investments.

Yet these are the very ones, in conjunction with real-estate operators and builders, who during the past 5 years have conducted a relentless and vicious propaganda campaign against the Government policy of encouraging the building of decent homes for ex-servicemen at reasonable rentals or reasonable prices and who have sought unceasingly to bring about the end of all rent controls.

I know that the committee which studied and reported this bill will explain its provisions more fully. I feel obliged to yield time to the five members who signed a dissenting minority report and who wish to explain their objections to the adoption of the rule and the bill. While I have the utmost sympathy with these colleagues, and this bill is not what we want, legislation is always a compromise. This is a compromise. We seldom can obtain all we seek, ask, or expect. I presume the committee has, in its wisdom, done the best it could, and I favor the rule and the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield, but I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The real solution of this problem of rentals and housing is that of constructing more houses. We will all agree to that.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Has the gentleman heard that there has been a curtailment of construction loans? That is, that the banks now have embarked upon a policy of refusing construction money to builders? That means where a builder may have 20 or 30 houses under construction and goes to the bank to get money to finance the period the house is under construction, he gets a construction loan. If this construction money is denied to builders, that means they have to use their own funds to finance. The builder has got to dig down into his own pocket or into his own bank account to finance his own building program, which automatically means that instead of building 20 or 30 houses he will probably be compelled to embark upon a program of 5 houses. It will cut down this construction program, it will hurt the builder very deeply, it will hurt our rental program, it will hurt our housing program. I was in Detroit 2 or 3 weeks ago and it was brought to my attention by the builders in Detroit that this is happening. They said it is already in full effect in Indianapolis and other cities and that the bankers in Detroit are now embarking on that program in my city. If they do that, they will also go to Chicago, they will follow this throughout the country. This is one time I think all of us have to come out and say: "You cannot do this, you must not do this, you must not do anything that will hamper our housing construction program."

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman that I have heard of these complaints, too, and I know they are true. Many of the banks control large apartment buildings. They are trying to discourage construction as much as possible in order to be able to gouge the people as long as they can. But let me say that the bill provides a 90-percent loan to the builders of homes and I believe that is a good provision. It is restricted and I hope the loans will not be made to speculators who will build a house costing six or seven thousand dollars and then ask a loan of eight or nine thousand dollars. The provisions were so drafted that the Government, in my opinion, is protected in every way, but, as the gentleman says, the bankers have refused to make loans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I asked for time on this rule because it is important that the membership of the House get a better understanding of this problem, its ramifications, and difficulties than we did in committee. We had a lot of testimony, about 600 pages, but much of it was opinions and we lacked the factual information necessary to guide us to a sound decision.

Before the House extends rent control it should obtain credible testimony to indicate that this legislation will reverse the economic forces which are operating to intensify the shortage of rental houses.

That is one discovery we made in the committee. We learned that the shortage of residential rental property is becoming worse and not better 2 years after the war is over. We should get in this debate some evidence that the situation will be less acute next March than it is today; otherwise we do not achieve the purpose aimed at in extending rent control.

In this respect I urge that you do not take and are not asked to take, as we were in committee, the "I thinks" and "I hopes" that we got time and again from the Rent Administrator and other officials. We would ask these officials for the facts on this situation and they would say: "I do not know, I think"; "I do not know, I hope."

I believe we should have some credible evidence that the shortage in rental housing is actually being alleviated by rent control. We did not find such evidence in the committee. We found on the contrary, that probably 2,000,000 rental units have gone off the market since VJ-day, and only a small number of private rental units have come on the market since VJ-day.

The House should find the answer to the question of how many private rental units have been built in the last year and what private rental construction is going on now.

I read yesterday that the Department of Commerce says that because of buyers' resistance and high cost, home construction is at a standstill. They now report that 1947 construction will be two billion to two billion three hundred million less than predicted in December. We are considering action on legislation that is going to determine the rental housing situation of this country, and

rental housing is what most veterans of this country desire.

We have had a lot of talk about rental housing for veterans, but the OPA and Patman Housing Act have given special privilege, a vested interest to the people who stayed at home and occupied housing facilities. We should find some way of alleviating that discrimination, and this bill should do it, or we should not pass it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Richard M. Atkinson, who served here in the Seventy-fifth Congress, and who died suddenly in Nashville yesterday. He served well the Sixth Tennessee District, which I now have the honor to represent.

Prior to his service in the House of Representatives Mr. Atkinson had a distinguished record as a district attorney in the tenth judicial district of Tennessee. He was a veteran of the First World War and served with distinction in the Marine Corps, seeing action with the Second Division in France. He was a graduate of Vanderbilt University and of Cumberland University Law School. As a Member of the House he served on the Committees on the Civil Service, Claims, and World War Veterans' Legislation.

I am sure that the Members who served with him in the Seventy-fifth Congress recall his genial disposition, his loyalty to high ideals, and his enthusiasm for the work of his committee and of the Congress, and I am sure also that all who remember him join me in expressing deep regret to his wife and to the members of his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I gladly yield to the dean of our delegation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee in paying brief but very sincere tribute to the Honorable Richard M. Atkinson, a warm friend of mine for many years, and with whom I had the privilege of serving during his period of service here. He was a man of recognized ability, great character, and demonstrated devotion to public service, and we join in extending our sympathy to his bereaved widow.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock and with deep sorrow that I learned of the sudden passing of the Honorable Richard M. Atkinson, a former Member of the House. I did not have the privilege of serving with him here as he left this body a few months before I came in 1939 to fill out an unexpired term. I knew him intimately, however, for more than 30 years. First, as a friend of early manhood, next as a comrade in arms, and then as an able and outstanding lawyer in our section of Tennessee.

As a member of the bar, he was a powerful and aggressive advocate, but with high ideals about his profession and ever mindful of its ethics. For two terms, he served his people as district attorney general. His record in this high place was outstanding. He recognized that the office of a prosecuting attorney is a quasi-judicial position, and he always gave one charged with an offense the benefit of any reasonable doubt. But, once convinced of the guilt of a defendant, so skillful was his conduct of a case, and so convincing his argument, that few of the guilty in his court escaped the just penalty of the law, and the convictions that he obtained were rarely disturbed by the appellate courts.

He was a man of high moral character and a Christian gentleman, who cheerfully accepted and faithfully discharged all the obligations and responsibilities imposed upon him in all the walks and phases of his life.

The bench and bar of Tennessee mourn his loss today, for they will sorely miss his presence, his charm, and his personal magnetism.

I extend to the members of his family my deep sympathy in this their hour of sorrow and travail as they walk through the valley of the shadow. They, with his friends, however, can take comfort with the thought that:

Somewhere tonight, among the hills of heaven,
He walks with all his stars around him;
And we who lost him here on earth
Grow happy knowing God has found him.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I learned with deep regret a moment ago from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] of the great bereavement the people of Tennessee have suffered in the loss of Dick Atkinson. It was my privilege to enter Congress with him. I am very confident that not only every Member of this body who entered that year, but every Member whose privilege it was to serve with him and observe those fine characteristics which have just been referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee heartily shares your expressions of regret and wishes to join me in expressing through you to the members of his family our great sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the sorrows that are visited upon former or present Members of the House through the act of God are the sorrows of all of us, and the pleasures and honors conferred upon any Member of the House are also honors conferred upon the House itself. When a Member of the House receives an outstanding honor or an honor of any kind, all Members rejoice in the knowledge that a distinctive recognition has been given to a Member of this distinguished body.

I am glad to announce to my colleagues today that our colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is receiving in Norwood, Mass., outside of Boston, a great honor, the highest honor that can be paid during any one year in the United States to any lady who is a communicant of the Catholic Church.

Today in Norwood, Mass., at a pontifical mass celebrated by my archbishop, the great spiritual leader and great American, Archbishop Cushing of Boston, MARY NORTON will have conferred upon her the Siena medal for 1947. This is a medal conferred upon the Catholic lady in the United States who is selected by a very distinguished group as making the most distinctive contribution to Catholic life in the United States during a particular year. For the year of 1947 the one who has been selected is our distinguished colleague.

The group that makes the selection is composed of Archbishop Lucy of San Antonio, Bishop Babcock of Detroit, Monsignor Carroll of Washington, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the president of the National Council of Catholic Women, and the chairman of the board of trustees and the president of Theta Phi Alpha Sorority.

This award has been made since 1937 to an outstanding Catholic woman, and has already been conferred upon several such ladies, for example, Anne O'Hare McCormick, outstanding author and journalist; Mother M. Katherine Drexel, foundress of Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Colored People; Frances Parkinson Keyes, the outstanding author; Jane Hoey, the notable and outstanding social worker; Agnes Repplier, an outstanding author; and Agnes Regan, executive secretary of the National Council of Catholic Women.

I know that all the Members of the House without regard to party are pleased to hear of this honor, and on this day when it is being conferred upon MARY NORTON at a pontifical mass celebrating the six hundredth anniversary of St. Catherine of Siena, at the St. Catherine of Siena Church in Norwood, Mass., we all rejoice with her, and the Members of this body accept the honor conferred upon her as indirectly an honor conferred upon the House and upon each and every one of us.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Banking and Currency last week voted out the bill now under consideration, much of the newspaper space concerning that action was

devoted to the fact that the committee had rejected a proposal to increase rents across the Nation by 10 percent.

Indeed, one newspaper account referred to the committee action as "providing for the maintenance of rent ceilings in virtually their present form."

The average citizen, who reads his newspaper casually, probably was reassured that he had nothing to worry about so far as his rent was concerned, at least until December 31. Let me quote some of the newspaper headlines which helped to create the same impression.

One of them said: "House unit bans increases in rents."

Another one reported: " '47 rent boost killed."

And still another reassured the tenant this way: "House body blocks general rent rise."

Mr. Speaker, I trust that none of my colleagues were misled by these headlines. It is true that a general rent increase of 10 percent was rejected. Nevertheless, the bill we are considering today is not one that provides for a continuation of effective rent control. It falls woefully short of this desired goal at a time when the housing shortage in the Nation is the tightest it ever has been. If we vote for this bill in its present form we are failing utterly in our duty to protect tenants from a very real inflationary threat.

In the limited time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point crystal clear. This bill contains such dangerous and weakening features that it can be questioned whether it is in fact a rent control bill. It might be described more accurately as a bill to legalize weakening of rent controls. Let me list briefly some of the objectionable features.

This bill provides for a hidden rent increase of 15 percent that will be felt by hundreds of thousands of American families. I shall discuss this feature later.

It calls for the ending of rent control, either on next December 31, or at the latest, by March 31, 1948. By no stretch of the imagination will the housing shortage be relieved by either of those dates.

The bill ends protection for so-called permanent tenants living in hotels and motor courts—those who rent by the week or month. Many of these are aged persons living on fixed incomes who cannot afford homes of their own. Already they have been badly hit by sharp rises in prices since last fall. Certainly we would not knowingly deny them the protection of rent control.

Another provision exempts certain types of new housing and other newly converted rental units from controls. This sets up a group of housing units free from ceilings in the same areas in which older units remain subject to maximum rentals. Some landlords would be subject to rent controls. Others in the same area would not. Veterans, the chief group now seeking new places to live, would be forced to pay the higher rentals for these decontrolled units. Instead of giving veterans all of the protection they deserve from their Government, they are being told that the sky is the limit for some of the homes and apartments they want to rent.

Weakening of some phases of eviction controls which are needed during a period of such acute housing shortage and limitations placed upon some of the Government's powers to enforce rent controls are other unfavorable aspects of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, all of these weakening features are dangerous to the stability of rents. They are all the more dangerous because none of them in themselves can be singled out as being likely to result in an across-the-board increase in rents. Those members of the majority who seemed so willing to allow rents to go up 10 percent before the Easter recess have cooled in their ardor since going home and talking with their constituents. As one of the newspapers put it, they have become aware of the "disastrous political consequence of a general rent increase."

So, instead of providing for an overall rent boost, rent controls are about to be weakened through subterfuge, if the bill as reported out from committee is enacted.

The most damaging phase of this bill is the proviso contained in section 204 (b). This section provides that if at any time before next March 31 a tenant and a landlord enter into a written lease which is to expire on or after December 31, 1948, the rent may be increased up to 15 percent over the present maximum rent. This increase can take effect almost immediately, the only restriction being that a "true and duly executed copy" must first be filed with the rent administrator. The bill speaks of this increase as being—and I quote—"that which is mutually agreed between the tenant and landlord." "Mutually agreed," mind you.

Let us look into the circumstances under which such a mutual agreement is likely to be reached. Rent controls may end as early as next December 31 and no later than the following March 31. This short extension of rent control plays into the hands of the landlord. He comes to the tenant and says: "Rent controls are going to end next December 31. You know and I know that rents will shoot sky high after the ceilings come off. Don't you think it would be well for you to sign this lease. It gives you the privilege of continuing to live here for another year beyond December 31. And it protects you because the increase is only 15 percent. I'm sure it would be to your advantage to sign this reasonable lease." This is a rather mild version of what this conversation might be.

Of course, a lot of tenants will mutually agree with the landlord that they had better sign up. Tenants may not be subject to coercion, but when they look ahead to that relatively early date of decontrol, it is logical to expect that many of them will fear that they will be faced with a far greater increase, or, even worse, eviction. So they will sign on the dotted line.

Others may refuse to mutually agree to the increase. But even in these cases, the proviso still can have other unfavorable effects. As houses or apartments become vacant, because the tenant moves to another city, or another apartment, the landlord is given an even more powerful weapon against the prospective new tenant. He can refuse to rent unless the new tenant will sign a lease providing for the 15-percent increase. If we vote for this proviso today, gentlemen, we are voting for a 15-percent increase for all rental space which may become vacant from now on.

Still another provision of this section 204 (b) provides that once such a lease has been signed, the rental unit shall not be subject to any maximum rent. This simply means that if a tenant, who has signed a 15-percent-increase lease, moves out of the rental quarters, the landlord no longer is limited to a 15-percent increase on that particular property. He can charge whatever the traffic will bear.

No, Mr. Speaker; we are not confronted with a proposal for a general increase in rents. The bill we are considering today is far more subtle than that. Our citizens are being told that they are being afforded the protection of rent controls for another six to nine months. They are not being told that we are, in effect, providing landlords a shotgun which they can use to bring about a "mutual agreement" with the tenant to increase his rent 15 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if this House wants to allow a 15-percent increase in rents, it should do so in a straightforward manner. Or if certain landlords, because of inequities, are entitled to rent increases, they are adequately provided for in other parts of this section of the bill. These cases should be decided on their merits and not on the fears of tenants. The Congress should not legislate so as to allow 15-percent increases for a certain segment of landlords while others, who are more conscientious or more considerate of the welfare of their tenants, are maintaining stable rents. It is difficult to conceive a more inconsistent method of determining who shall be entitled to rent increases.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most of us can agree that an emergency still exists as far as the supply of rental housing is concerned. We are now witnessing a period during which inflationary forces have made themselves seriously felt on the general level of prices. The last Congress was impatient to rid the Nation of price controls. Business and industry gave assurance that if these controls were lifted, prices might rise for a while but the situation would soon right itself. We have seen how wrong those assertions can be. During this period of rapidly rising prices, rents have been held consistently steady. Now we have been subjected to extreme pressure to remove controls from residential rents. As I have stated, the housing shortage is now the tightest that it has ever been. This is no time to weaken the controls which have stood the test of time. The machinery exists within these controls to make adjustments where they are needed and to remove controls in those areas of the country where they are no longer required. Under these circumstances, effective rent control can best be secured by extension of the present system for a

period of 1 year after the present expiration date of June 30, 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency were by no means unanimous in agreeing to the provisions contained in this bill. There are several minority reports, including one of my own.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, apparently there are no more requests for time on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3203) dealing with housing and rent controls, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the time for general debate, 4 hours, is divided equally between the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of consideration has been given to this bill both in the committee and in private and public conferences. I think the purpose of the bill is quite generally understood. Primarily it is to encourage production of rental units to lick the housing shortage, and it is to be hoped that, because of the readjustments which must be made if the bill is enacted, the encouragement which is given to the construction of new units, it will be possible within a reasonably short time to take off all rent controls. Because the question of construction and the question of rents are so closely affiliated we seek to solve both of these problems in the same bill in two titles. Title I of the bill has to do with decontrols, with building itself. You will recall that last year we enacted what is known as the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act which set up an Expediter. That office was first occupied by Mr. Wyatt and now by Mr. Creedon. The Expediter was given very new and unusual powers to build homes primarily for our returning veterans and their immediate families.

The Expediter was given more power than had been given to any other single individual in Government except possibly the President of the United States in wartime. He could dictate to other agencies of the Government, to all other agencies of the Government having to do with the allocation of building materials, the price of those building materials, the cost of a finished home or apartment house and the rental to be charged for the home or apartment house. He could divert materials from any other use, industrial, commercial or otherwise, to the construction of homes and apartments. He could recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that they guarantee markets and they were bound to follow his recommendation that markets be guaranteed for new, and unusual perhaps, types of construction. He could recommend, but not direct, the RFC that up to $400,000,000 be used in payment of subsidies to encourage production. He could prevent the use of any building material in any commercial or noncommercial enterprise. He had control over every nail, over every foot of pipe, over roofing material, over every inch of lumber, every brick, every square inch of steel in the United States.

We set a goal of about 1,700,000 homes last year. In 1941 under what might be called free enterprise construction, where there were no Government controls over allocation of materials, private enterprise, without any help from the Government, without any restrictions, without any subsidies, without any guaranteed markets, without the influences against freedom of enterprise, without the pressures which were apparent last year for home construction, there were finished about 715,000 units. Last year with all these powers, which were given to the administrator to divert materials to home construction, to the prejudice of commercial commerce, to the prejudice of our economy generally if he saw fit to do so, under strict Government control we completed about 661,900 units or a matter of 53,000 units less than were completed without pressure but without restraint in 1941 by the building industry.

If anything has been proven from our experience in this field, it is the fallacy of trying to manage our economy by a bureau in Washington.

So, in the judgment of the committee these controls are removed. Many of them were removed last November by Executive order of the President. Some of them still remain, but the power to exercise these controls continues, unless we act on this bill, until December 31, 1947.

In title I we abolish the Office of Expediter. We abolish any authority which he had to allocate materials and to set maximum prices, both on the materials and the finished home. We remove any authority which he had to set rents on homes and apartments. We abolish the authority to make new premium payments of any amount by RFC or any other agency, and we abolish the authority which was given to the RFC through the Expediter in guaranteeing a market for these new, unusual types of prefabricated homes. To replace that we set up in this bill an authority for the FHA, under title VI, to guarantee the construction of prefabricated houses up to 90 percent of their value, and the machinery for that is set up similar to that which now operates to insure the finished building under title VI, which you will recall is the title under which FHA insures finished properties up to 90 percent of their value. We merely extend that insurance to the manufacturer of the house before it is on the site. This bill, of course, would remove any price limitation on the finished building. It would remove the limitation on floor space which is now 1,500 feet. It would remove the limitation on the number of bathrooms which might be built on the premises, which was due to shortage of materials. Of course, the net effect of providing for only one bathroom was that they would build the framework for the additional facilities but the contractor who built the house could not put in the second bathroom or half a bathroom under the initial contract. This resulted only in some inconvenience to the property owner because he could go to Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward and buy the bathroom equipment and install it himself or hire the same contractor who built the house to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

That was an ineffective regulation, as were many of the others. The bill removes all of the limitations on construction excepting on facilities for amusement and recreational purposes. We provide that a permit might have to be obtained from whoever administers this law if the head of the department administering the law certifies there is a shortage of materials. Of course, it continues veterans' priorities. It reduces the time, however, in which the veteran must exercise his priority from 60 to 30 days, which was recommended by almost all the veterans' organizations which appeared before the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to mean that all restrictions on the building of new homes will be removed by this legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They would be removed if this bill is enacted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. So that any individual who has the money and could buy the materials could go ahead and build his house without having to make application for a permit to do so?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Title II has to do with rent control. Rent control, you recall, was set up under OPA and would expire on June 30 of this year. This bill provides for the removal of rent control on units completed after the effective date of this act and on residential units which are made available for rental by reconversion and remodeling. It also removes rent control

from properties which have not been rented to others except members of the immediate family between the dates of February 1, 1945, and February 1, 1947.

It can readily be seen that the result of these provisions will be to impel adjustments in the occupancy and availability of rental properties to the extent that thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of existing properties will be made available for rental which are not available at the present time. This is one of the important parts of the bill. First, we encourage the production of rental properties and then we encourage people who are now living in properties to rent.

The bill provides that we continue maximum rents on existing units until December 31, 1947, with the exception that if the landlord and the tenant in good faith voluntarily enter into a valid written lease any time between the effective date of the act, which is the first of the month following enactment, and March 31, 1948, and providing the lease runs until at least December 31, 1948, then by mutual agreement the rent may be increased not to exceed 15 percent. The consideration for the lease, in other words, might be 15 percent over the existing maximum rental. It must be purely voluntary, however, and if the tenant does not desire to enter into a lease increasing his rent 15 percent or any part of 15 percent he is privileged, of course, to continue to live in his apartment or home or the unit which he occupies still under control at the ceiling that was on the property on the effective date of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The bill also provides that on December 15 the President must make a determination as to whether or not it is necessary to continue rent controls beyond December 31, 1947. If the President decides that it is not necessary to continue controls beyond December 31, 1947, rent controls shall be discontinued on all properties as of December 31, 1947. But if the President finds that it is necessary to continue rent controls, he must make an affirmative finding and give his reason for doing so, and that determination and the reasons therefor must be filed with the Congress. Then rent controls under the proclamation of the President may be continued until March 31, 1948. That will give the Congress an opportunity to consider the matter after it convenes next January.

Those of you who think you want to cut off these rent controls on December 31, 1947, had better give some sober thought to the fact that perhaps we will have a cold winter next year, and perhaps the Congress will not be in session on December 31. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to take the responsibility for wholesale evictions which might result in the dead of winter due to failure on the part of somebody to act with reasonable intelligence to meet any exigencies that might appear, any emergencies that might be created, while the Congress is not in a position to act. So in our wisdom we have given the President the responsibility, if he finds that rent controls should be continued beyond December 31, 1947, to continue them, but in no event shall such controls be continued by him beyond March 31, 1948. When we come back here next year we will then decide what we want to do about them.

It is to be hoped that the executive branch of the Government will enforce the laws passed by Congress in accordance with the declared policy of the Congress and that rent controls will be taken off just as quickly as possible. That is to be hoped, and I am one of those who hope. We cannot make any guaranty. We cannot bind a future Congress. We have our responsibilities, and the administration has its responsibilities. Under this form of government, the legislative branch of the Government cannot administer the laws. The executive branch has the responsibility for administering and for providing for the enforcement of laws, and we hope they will enforce them in accordance with the declared policy and intent of the Congress, and that rent controls will be taken off just as quickly as they possibly can.

We provide in the bill that adjustments shall be made in maximum rents to correct inequities. We do not fool around with it. We do not say that "the Administrator may make adjustments" to correct inequities. We say he "shall make adjustments to correct inequities." And if the inequities and the hardship cases had been relieved as many of them should have been relieved years ago we would not have all the trouble we have at the present time with respect to rent controls.

If this bill is properly administered we will get enough rental units so that we can safely take these controls off next December 31. We encourage the building industry to provide adequate rental units. I have been assured by many builders that the building industry will probably make the same mistake in the next 8 or 9 months that they frequently make in big cities, that is, overbuild in many cases. In those areas where because of production or the availability of rental units there is no longer any need for rent control, the Administrator may decontrol any single unit or any area or units in the United States.

Some question that, but I would like you to read that provision of the bill. It is very clear to me that the Administrator may decontrol single units or areas. He may do it on a Nation-wide basis or he may decontrol at any time he sees fit on an area-wide basis or on the basis of single units.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that the FHA had been instructed to insure loans up to 90 percent on prefabricated homes. Is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BREHM. Yes; that is, the FHA had been authorized to insure loans up to 90 percent on prefabricated homes only. Is that correct? In other words, what is the limit on the loans or can a loan be made up to 90 percent on homes constructed from other than prefabricated materials?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is in the general law. This is merely a specific authority for the FHA to insure loans on the house before it is put on the site.

Mr. BREHM. I am thinking of prefabricated houses.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am thinking of prefabricated houses also. Loans on prefabricated houses are eligible for FHA insurance on the manufacturer's level, and before the house is actually assembled on the site.

Mr. BREHM. Could that not work a hardship on the established dealers who have been in business for years and years past? On page 4 of subsection 2 the bill reads, "Such houses to be manufactured shall meet such requirements of sound quality, durability, livability, and safety as may be prescribed by the Administrator." Suppose a prefabricated home did not really comply with the above conditions but the Administrator favored prefabricated material, he could approve the loan even though the material used was cardboard.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He would have to comply with the standards set up in section 4.

Mr. BREHM. Yes; but he is his own boss and could be his own judge. I just do not want this to work a hardship on the old-line dealer in favor of some "quickie" producer which some governmental agency might want to set up in business to further some socialistic scheme.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think they would probably be protected.

You will notice that in subsection (b) on page 3 there are four standards which must be set up. I think they are pretty well protected in that respect.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Since this bill removes all rent control on newly constructed buildings, I would like to ask the gentleman what, if any, veterans' preferences remain with respect to rentals on those newly constructed buildings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Newly constructed rental properties must be held for 30 days for rental to veterans before they can be rented to anyone else. To protect against any finagling with respect to when they were completed, as authorized, the administrator of the act to establish by regulation the date upon which these properties are completed, and the veteran has 30 days after that date to apply for rental. Then, if the properties are not rented to veterans at the end of 30 days, they can be rented to anyone.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there any price limitation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. There will be no rental control on units completed after the effective date of the act.

Mr. ELSTON. So that while the veteran has a right to exercise priority within that 30-day period, there is no limit

on the amount of rent that may be charged by the property owner?

Mr. WOLCOTT. To the owner or anybody else. But the veteran now living in a controlled unit does not have to move out of that unit, and he can continue to live under rent control.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. By what test will the Administrator be bound to determine whether or not there are inequities in any of these rentals which he shall remedy?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, the question was put to me yesterday. If an Administrator decontrolled property on one side of the street and left another property on the other side of the street under control, I would think that constituted an inequity.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But how about those many cases where owners have applied to the OPA for relief under hardship, and have been denied? What rule, if there is any, shall this new Administrator apply to determine whether or not an inequity exists, and an increase is to be granted?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Common sense. We found it very difficult to write language to cover it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Common sense has been too much lacking in the past.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman. We studied for weeks to determine how we could compel the exercise of common sense in the administration of the law, and we failed. If anybody can find that language, I am sure the committee will be very glad to accept it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ascertain from the gentleman if, under this bill, the President thought, in his judgment, there should be a 10-percent increase across the board in rents, could he so order that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He has authority under this bill, as he has had authority ever since rent control was set up, to increase rents in any manner, by the unit, by the area, or to remove them throughout the Nation altogether. We do not interfere with that authority at all. If whoever is in charge of the rentals can get the President to consent to a 10-percent increase, then there is nothing in the law to prevent a 10-percent increase being made by Executive order or regulation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE RENT CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the great industrial sections of our Nation. In western Pennsylvania and in other great steelmaking centers, a wage pattern seems to have been worked out that is acceptable both to management and to labor. It is to be hoped that as a result of this pattern another costly work stoppage can be avoided. None of us wants a repetition of the race between wages and prices that followed—a race in which the wage earner was always the sure loser. All of us are hopeful, I am sure, that the dangerous period of rising prices is coming to an end and that a reasonable stability will follow.

The observations I have just made are very pertinent to the rent control legislation we now have under consideration. At this point in our transition to a peacetime economy, it is doubly important that we avoid any action which would disturb the general level of rents. The stability of rents is very significant in its relationship to the stability of prices and wages. Rent is the largest single item paid out at one time from the average family budget. So long as rents hold steady and the worker has a sense of security that he is not going to be evicted from the place where he lives, he is likely to be satisfied with the wage adjustment pattern that seems to be developing. But if the worker's belief that his budget is just about back in balance once more is jolted by a rise in rents, or if he is forced to look for another and more expensive place to live because he has been evicted, then we are risking the consequences of another period of friction between management and labor.

PERIOD OF EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

I am, therefore, particularly disturbed by the provision in the rent-control bill we are now considering which permits a landlord to negotiate with a tenant for an increase in rent up to 15 percent if a lease is signed before next March 31 to expire on or after December 31, 1948.

The workingman, who may be regarded as the average tenant, is in no position to bargain successfully with his landlord. To bargain on even terms, it is first necessary that there be a relatively normal supply of rental housing. In the abnormally tight situation now existing, all of the bargaining advantage rests with the landlord. That is why the protection of rent control is so necessary until the supply of homes for rent has increased, especially in the great overcrowded industrial areas where it is still so difficult for workers to find places to live at reasonable prices.

CONSEQUENCE OF PROVISIONS AUTHORIZING 15-PERCENT RENT INCREASES UNDER CERTAIN LEASES

The landlord has all of the advantages under the proposed changes contained in the bill under consideration. First, the very fact that rent controls are scheduled to expire at the earliest on December 31, and no later than next March 31 plays into the hands of the landlords. The wage earner who rents his home is confronted with the possibility that these protecting ceilings may stop by the end of the year. Fear starts to work on him, if his rent is going to soar—and I really mean soar. Not a 10- or 15-percent boost, but a rise of as much as 50 percent, may occur as after World War I. This is what will happen—it is typical.

At this point the landlord comes to him. He suggests to the worker that maybe the tenant would like a little protection. Of course he would. So the landlord offers to let him sign a lease that will be good to December 31, 1948. That sounds great. But there is a catch to it. There is a little matter of a 15-percent increase in rent. Well, the tenant does not like that so much. How soon would the 15-percent increase go into effect, he asks? Would it be on December 31 if rent controls end then, or would it be March 31, 1948, if the President decides that rents are needed that much longer?

No, the landlord replies, the 15 percent increase would take place on the tenant's next regular rent day. What kind of protection is that, I ask you? Has this Congress looked into the question of whether this landlord is entitled to a rent increase? Maybe he is. Well, there is a way for him to get it if he has been subject to an inequity. Maybe he is not. But the test we are setting up is not whether he is entitled to an increase. The test is simply whether he is a strong enough bargainer to force the increase on his tenant.

Now let us look further into the provisions of section 204 (b). Let us assume that the landlord has gotten the tenant to agree to and sign the lease for a 15-percent increase. The worker then loses his job; he decides to move, say, from McKeesport, Pa., to Akron, Ohio, where he has been told job prospects are better. The landlord now has a vacant home for rent. Is he limited to renting it to a new tenant for an increase of only 15 percent over his previous ceiling? Absolutely no. The very fact that the lease has been signed frees him forever from all the restrictions of rent control. Once his house becomes vacant, he can rent it for whatever the traffic will bear. The tenant, by signing the lease, also loses any protection against eviction that may be afforded him under the rent-control laws. That is the kind of provisions that we are considering today.

There is still another angle we cannot ignore. Suppose the tenant has resisted all pressure from the landlord to sign the new lease authorizing the 15-percent increase. The tenant then moves to Illinois. The house becomes vacant. Does the landlord rent to the first desirable tenant who is willing to take the house at the old ceiling price? Of course not. He holds it off the market until a prospective tenant comes along who wants the house badly enough, or who has money enough, to be willing to sign the 15-percent increase lease.

EXEMPTIONS—DISCRIMINATORY FEATURES

We are considering legislation here today which is discriminatory in character. It opens the door for landlords who wish to use strong-arm methods. It discriminates against the workers who have nothing but fear on their side when it comes to negotiating for a place to live after December 31.

There are other discriminatory features in this bill. I can dwell upon them only briefly. We are discriminating between landlords owning new housing which is completed after this bill becomes law and which has not been built with the aid of allocations or priorities on the one hand and landlords with older housing, on the other. Side by side in the same

community will be houses which are subject to rent controls and others which are not. This proviso exempting from rent control also applies to units being converted from existing residential use into additional housing accommodations, or to housing which has not been rented during the year ending January 31, 1947. This section of the bill also is a practical form of discrimination against our veterans. They are the ones chiefly who are seeking new places to live at this time because older housing is now thoroughly occupied. If this Government wants to protect its veterans from soaring rents, certainly this is not the way to do it.

The bill also discriminates against elderly people who cannot afford a home of their own, but who are living on fixed incomes in permanent hotel rooms or in motor courts. Permanent quarters in these types of accommodations are to be freed from rent ceilings.

LEGAL PROTECTION RESTRAINTS SHIFTED

The proposed bill is not an extension of the existing Price Control Act with such modifications as the proponent of the bill deems necessary. It is a completely new bill.

It supersedes the Price Control Act completely. It leaves out, for example, all of the provisions of section 4 of the existing Price Control Act, which sets forth what is unlawful for landlords to do. It leaves out all of section 201, which deals with the administration of rent control, as it now exists; section 202, which gives the administrative agency the investigative power, the power to require reports from landlords, and the power to require landlords to maintain records; it leaves out the provisions of section 205 of the existing law which gives enforcement powers to the existing agency. That is where we get the power of injunction and that is where the Department of Justice gets its right to bring prosecution against landlords guilty of flagrant and willful violations of the law. Then, it leaves out all of the provisions of sections 203 and 204 of the act, which deal with the present provisions of the law relating to the manner in which landlords may challenge the validity of existing regulations. Even if a tenant, under the proposed bill, does sue a landlord in any court, it would leave to any State, Federal, or local court throughout the United States the right to declare rent controls in that area invalid or unconstitutional.

It eliminates the whole orderly procedure which we now have, which gives the landlords the right to challenge the validity of existing regulations and orders in an orderly fashion.

Let us take a typical case here of what would happen insofar as enforcement is concerned between landlord and tenant. The responsibility rests with the tenant so far as bringing suit against the landlord is concerned. Of course, we know that the average worker in a steel area or coal area or heavily populated metropolitan industrial district just does not have the wherewithal to bring the necessary litigation or will be able to supply himself with the facts and the information to build a case and to build a record in the court. These protective devices are removed, and the responsibility, of course, is placed solely on the tenant to recover against the landlord. Previously, under the other section, the Federal Government acted as a protector for the tenant.

It is not a question of competency of local or State courts. Let me give you an example of what would happen. An ordinary tenant, if he did want to sue his landlord, would obviously bring his suit in a court where it does not cost much to file. For example, in the District of Columbia, he would go to the small claims court where it costs a dollar to file. In a good many areas of the country he would go before an ordinary justice of the peace, and, by filing a small amount of money, an ordinary tenant would claim that he has been charged an illegal rent.

The landlord in that case could come in and say that the regulation is invalid; that the rents fixed in that area are too low; that he should have gotten an adjustment which the administrative agency denied him, and that rent control is unconstitutional, or any other of a lot of defenses that the landlord might assert.

The landlord associations keep statistics which would be available to the landlord, about net operating income and all the rest. In such a suit, when the tenant would be met with those defenses, as a practical matter, he would be stymied—why is he stymied? Because he has no information available. An ordinary tenant does not know whether the rents in that area are fair or not. He has no statistics available to him.

Well, as you know, courts can only act on the basis of the record made before them. Courts have no independent investigating power. Courts, in their ordinary jurisdiction, do not reach independent judgments on these things. Courts act on the basis of records made for them in particular cases by the attorneys or parties on both sides.

I think that if a landlord, for example, came in and introduced some evidence—let us forget for a moment whether that evidence is good or bad—that the rents in that area do not allow him a fair return on his property, what will the tenant do?

In an ordinary dispute, no party to the lawsuit has to be acquainted with difficult economic facts, and problems that are as difficult as we have. We are talking about alternatives, now; whether what is proposed is better or worse than what we now have. We now have an orderly procedure by a court composed of five Federal judges, appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States, which goes to any community where a landlord wants the court to go, hears what the landlord has to say, applies uniform standards to the cases they hear, and comes out with decisions.

ENFORCEMENT—EVICTION SAFEGUARDS WEAKENED

Under certain conditions, eviction controls are weakened. Tenants who have had houses sold out from under them, under the existing law, have had the protection of a reasonable period in which to seek other housing accommodations. The present bill would end this and provide only that evictions under this and other similar circumstances be governed by the local law. In general, this period before eviction varies from a few days to a month.

Under present acute housing conditions, these short periods before eviction fail to give proper time for an evicted tenant to find shelter.

I again speak in behalf of my constituents, many of whom are wage earners, when I oppose another weakening feature of the bill now before us. This would deprive the Government of its existing authority to bring criminal actions against willful violators or treble damage suits against landlords whose tenants failed to bring suits in time. The tenant is still privileged to sue his landlord for overcharges. But many tenants in my district and in the districts of many Representatives will not know how to bring suit nor will they want to bear the cost of litigation. The weakened enforcement provisions also eliminate the exclusive jurisdiction of the Emergency Court of Appeals to review the validity of rent regulations or orders. This opens up the questions of validity in the courts in which tenants may seek to sue their landlords for overcharges. Landlords will discourage suits brought by tenants by pleading invalidity of the rent regulations. The elimination of the Emergency Court of Appeals deprives the country of the services of a court which has gained invaluable experience in and proven itself admirably suited to the task of reviewing rent regulations and orders.

In conclusion, I want to ask every Representative in this great body who comes from an industrial center to ask himself a searching question. Does he conscientiously feel that he is giving the great bulk of his constituents, the wage-earning tenants, an even break if he votes for this discriminatory bill? We have a simple solution to this rent-control problem which will be facing us as long as this serious housing shortage exists. All we have to do is to extend the present rent-control system for another year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr SMITH.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe H. R. 3203, a bill to extend rent control, represents the desire of the American people. There is every reason to believe they want rent control abolished, and that they expect this. It should be recalled that it was public sentiment that brought about general decontrol of prices last year, not the President or the Congress. Indeed, as the record will show, the President and the Congress obstinately resisted decontrol and yielded only when they were forced by public indignation. Precisely the same argument was used by those who opposed decontrol of prices in 1946, as is presently advanced against rent control, namely, short supply. We were told that there was a scarcity of goods

and that prices would rise inordinately because of this if decontrol were instituted. There was a shortage of goods, but decontrol of prices proved that this was caused by the controls which had been in effect. Removal of price ceilings quickly resulted in greatly increased supply of goods. It is true that prices of some commodities advanced after the ceilings were abrogated, but, as everyone recalls, they were constantly rising before.

The alleged shortage of housing does not exist. Furthermore, rent and other controls very powerfully hindered the production of housing just as price control of commodities stymied their production.

One can prove or disprove almost anything by statistics, to some people. I shall not resort to statistics to support my case. Suffice it to say that the politicians were wrong in their figures relating to price control in general, and they were wrong in their statistics, their promises, and their predictions in respect of the Patman housing bill which the Congress passed last year. That program not only failed but it harmed the production of housing. Only apologies are now forthcoming for the enactment of the Patman housing bill.

After going into the rent ceiling and housing problem as thoroughly as I could, I became convinced that if ceilings were abolished an enormous number of additional dwelling units would become available for rental use. Mark you, that is the important consideration that confronts this Congress. There is a large number of houses being held out of the rental market because of rent ceilings, and also living space in homes that heretofore have not been rented, but would be for rent if ceilings were removed. There is still another source from which additional living space would be provided for rental purposes if ceilings were removed. I refer to the situation where the number of occupied rooms per family has greatly increased since rent ceilings went on. From these three sources and the additional dwellings that would be constructed if rent and all other controls relating to housing were abolished an ample supply of dwelling units to meet demand would soon be available.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Right along that line, I think it is well to state at this time that in the year 1925, when every job required a selling job, private industry in this Nation built over 900,000 homes and 900,000 living apartments, in 1 year, with no Government pressure or interference.

Since we have given every other segment of the American people their freedom from Government control, since we have relieved them from as much Government control as possible under the OPA, and since we have even released the prisoners of war, does not the gentleman agree that it does not quite make sense when we at this time, almost 2 years after VJ-day, refuse to give the property owners of America, who are certainly a very fine segment of our American people, the freedom that we have given the rest of the people, including prisoners of war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We have to be fair. But the matter that I have discussed goes much deeper than that. As I previously stated, rent control should have been eliminated along with price control in general. That would have been fair. It would have been just.

The Congress is not doing justice to the renters themselves by continuing rent control. The majority of renters of this country want controls removed. To say anything other would be to accuse them of being unfair, and you cannot do that. The majority want no special favors. I am sure they expected the Eightieth Congress to remove rent control.

The pending bill provides for continuing rent control until December 31, 1947, but authorizes the President to extend control until March 31, 1948, if he believes that to be necessary. Why should the Eightieth Congress vest in this administration such legislative power? If the incumbent Congress is willing to freely and voluntarily delegate this power to the Executive, what good reason can be given for not further relying upon his judgment as to the need for rent control beyond March 31, 1948?

I did not find in the testimony given before the committee evidence indicating anything other than the forces responsible for the present proposed extension will be back with the same arguments for the continuance of rent control beyond March 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The grave danger in all these extensions of wartime control is that succeeding extensions cause such controls to further entrench themselves and make their removal more difficult.

The bill also provides that landlords and tenants may by voluntary agreement enter into a lease increasing rents not to exceed 15 percent above the OPA ceiling prices, such lease to be effective until December 1948. One can do no more than speculate on the implications of this provision. Certain it is, however, that it sets up a special category of renters and landlords.

An extraordinary provision in the bill provides for Treasury financing of manufacturers of prefabricated houses, and FHA loans on the finished products. This, of course, is tantamount to a Government-guaranteed market for prefabricated houses.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. In regard to loans, is it not a fact that in our own State practically every loan company is willing to make loans to the veterans? Have they not said, "Come in and borrow," and are they not better able to do it and are they not more willing to do it in a great many instances than loans by the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course, there is no reason for putting the Government further into the housing business.

Mr. RAMEY. And are not the folks who want to build homes for the veterans, veterans themselves of one war or another—just neighbors, who can do it and want to?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Does the sitting Congress propose to put the Government further in business?

Proponents of this particular provision to have the Government finance the manufacture of prefabricated houses claim it would have the effect of revolutionizing housing. I understand the houses that would be built under this provision would not be of the conventional type. Well, there is nothing particularly wrong about revolutionizing housing construction, so long as it is done in the natural, competitive way; that is, with private money and not with funds wrung from the public, especially an exsanguinated one. Why should this particular Congress lend itself to promoting a scheme like this? What constitutional or moral right does the Congress have to destroy industries engaged in the construction of conventional type houses?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was wondering if any sentiment was developed in the committee during the hearings for an extension of the rent control bill, which would empower the States and individual communities to set up local rent control boards to handle the problems locally.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; and I am opposed to that sort of proposition. I want to see this Congress exercise its responsibility and not pass the buck on to the States. The States have enough troubles of their own. We created this problem and we ought to solve it.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the gentleman feel that the Federal Government can better regulate rents than the municipalities or States?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would not want to enter into a discussion of that. If the States themselves decide they want to institute rent control, that is their affair. I do not think it is within our province even to discuss that question.

The bill further provides for the removal of ceiling prices on new homes and also on residences which have not been occupied between February 1, 1945, and January 31, 1947. Price ceilings are to remain on old homes. Surely this is rank discrimination. It is class legislation. The claim which some make that it is only temporary in no wise mitigates the unfairness involved in this arrangement.

The bill provides for the creation of an emergency and predicates the need for the extension of rent control on such arbitrarily constituted emergency. It has been explained that this has been done to make the act constitutional.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. George Washington in his Farewell Address warned future generations to beware of schemes

to destroy the Constitution by usurpation. Surely here is an instance where we might well heed his advice. I am of the opinion that if the mentality of Congress has become so distorted as to cause it to yield to the tactic of overriding the Constitution by the simple device of declaring an emergency, then we have about reached the end of all constitutional government.

There are few good provisions in the bill. Title I would remove practically all remaining controls over materials going into the construction of houses. But these provisions should have been presented to Congress by themselves and not made a part of the other provisions of this bill.

Full production of housing cannot be expected until rent and all other controls relating thereto are entirely abolished. So long as there remains any shadow of such controls hanging over the heads of manufacturers and suppliers of home building materials there will be hesitation and doubt in their minds as to what the future may have in store for them.

Mr. Chairman, let us do the fair and just thing today, not what may be politically expedient.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing here today a very important bill, not only to the veterans of this country, but also to the millions of people who must have a roof over their heads and must rent housing in order to have that protection.

This bill is really a double-barreled bill. I see no real reason why the two issues should be joined: (a) the repeal of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act or the virtual repeal of the act joined and coupled with (b) the extension of the Rent Control Act.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that this bill is drafted in such fashion that if you vote against the bill you are voting against the extension of rent control, and if you vote for it you are voting to destroy the veterans' housing program?

Mr. MONRONEY. My colleague has expressed it in perfect terms and perfect words. I am afraid that somewhere in the compromise of which this bill is probably the result, that the sugar coating to the well-established real-estate lobby is the promise to get rid of such construction controls as they do not like in exchange for their acquiescence to continued rent control. For that reason I think that if we had divided this bill, the House could have worked its will in a much better measure.

CRIPPLES VETERANS' PROGRAM

I wish to address my remarks first to title I of the bill. As I said earlier, the bill virtually repeals every single bit of help that the Federal Government can give to the 15,000,000 veterans of World War II that would help them get housing either for rental or sale.

When you pass this bill you will have not one vestige of authority in any governmental agency empowered to channel any scarce material, no matter how necessary for the completion of the veterans' housing program, into housing construction.

Instead, by title I of this bill you open up the floodgates of all the unnecessary commercial construction that has been held back for the past 10 or 11 months by the veterans' emergency housing law.

There has been a great deal of commercial construction now going on. According to my figures, in the last year we have permitted over $3,000,000,000 of necessary commercial construction to be done. Commercial construction that is not needed has been held back under Government regulations administered by local communities formed by veterans' and civic and church groups to carefully screen and determine which projects are necessary to put in work and which are not.

SIXTY MILLION IN ONE CITY

Let me give you an illustration. I do not have the complete backlog of the country, but to illustrate, in my own home city, Oklahoma City, this restriction against unnecessary commercial construction has resulted in a backlog in that community of over $60,000,000 worth of deferrable construction.

For the life of me, I cannot see how we will help the veteran who hopes to build a $4,000, $5,000, or $6,000 home or to rent a home of that character by putting this veteran in competition with gigantic commercial construction projects, that type of project, not needed, not necessary, but for which funds are on hand and the builders are anxious to build. So we will have the veteran, hoping to get this little home, placed in competition with public utilities, in competition with department stores, automobile showrooms, summer hotels, and beach houses. In fact, in competition with any kind of development that can be conceived by anyone will be opened up by this bill for immediate construction to hamper the veteran who needs a house.

You may say that that is wrong. That we have put a limitation in the bill. But my, what a very, very wonderful limitation this is. It says that whoever is to administer this act—and we do not know who it will be because that is another thing the Republican Congress is delegating to the President—the choice of who is going to administer the act—that if he finds out there is a scarcity of building materials he may limit the construction of amusement and recreational facilities. Well, I will admit that is a concession. Maybe we will not have all the race tracks or baseball parks built, but I expect we are going to get almost all of the unnecessary construction that is sought in spite of that limitation placed in this act.

PROVES DANGER TO PROGRAM

I think the placing of this limitation in the act is a confession on the part of the majority that limitation is needed. I regret they have not gone far enough to give real authority to somebody in the Government to prevent competition with veterans' housing for these scarce materials used in all this unnecessary construction.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Evidently the gentleman's district is different from the one which I attempt to represent in Ohio. My mail has been coming in criticizing the present administration terribly for permitting honky-tonks, as they call them, dance halls and other buildings of that kind, to be built while no material can be supplied for legitimate construction. Something certainly needs to be done to correct this situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. In his home community there have been boards set up and appointed by the mayor and local authorities to carefully screen the essentiality of all of the construction that is done.

We did have a lot of honky-tonks, juke joints, beer parlors, race tracks and those things built, but they were built as a result of that great mistake that was made—and many Members on the floor of this House helped to contribute to that mistake—when order L–41 was revoked immediately after VJ-day. Premature revocation of that construction limitation order that time opened up the floodgates that took about 6 to 8 months to get closed again. Those projects started then and which were more than 35 percent completed were permitted to continue. Let me remind you that order L–41 was taken out by the same groups who today are asking us again to open up the floodgates and permit all kinds of unneeded commercial construction.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that the adoption of this title as now written would actually interfere with the construction of essential commercial building; for instance in the building of veterans housing projects you need extension of utilities services?

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course, and veterans' hospitals.

This tears out any chance to channel scarce material to where it is needed most urgently in this postwar period.

GRANTS LIMITED AUTHORITY

I am not asking that we give unlimited authority, I am not asking that we delegate even the broad, sweeping powers that were given in the Emergency Housing Act, but in an amendment which I propose to introduce when we reach that section of the bill, I am going to propose several specific things.

I wish you gentlemen would consider them, because I think they are highly important.

My amendment will allow the Government Administrator to continue allocation and priorities (a) for pig iron, shop-grade lumber for millwork, steel, phenolic molding compounds and resins for electrical wiring devices, and for bottleneck items needed by public-service utilities and producers of housing and housing

materials; (b) for Government-owned surplus, including temporary structures and utilities; and (c) to limit, on not more restrictive terms, nonessential construction and use of housing materials, including the requirement that a dwelling must be suitable for year-round occupancy, not to exceed 1,500 square feet floor area, and have not more than one bathroom; second, to use not more than $65,000,000 of the $400,000,000 previously authorized for access roads and premium payments; and, third, to carry out market guaranty contracts heretofore entered into.

Now, those are all the powers we are giving to the Government in this amendment. I wish you could understand how minimum they are. These are the bare essentials found necessary to channel the tough bottleneck items to see that the veterans can get the scarcest building materials to help complete their houses.

EXAMPLE OF PIG IRON

Pig iron is a perfect example. You cannot complete a house unless you have cast-iron soil pipe; it is impossible to connect sewers otherwise. Cast-iron soil pipe is the only thing that the builders can use, and you simply cannot get enough of the pig iron necessary to make soil pipe unless the Government can say to the pig-iron industry, "You have got to give a percentage of your production to housing production."

If you want the automobile industry or if you want all of the other industries that are now running at peak production to come in first and take all the scarce items necessary for veterans' housing away, then title I will do it, and your housing will suffer. Housing is a combination of relatively small companies. These small producers are not able to take command in a tight market and get deliveries on that command.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BANTA. The gentleman's statement about the scarcity of soil pipe calls my attention to some testimony before the committee, in which some gentleman, having heard Mr. Creedon say that soil pipe was one of the critical materials, went out to get the facts as to the production of soil pipe, Mr. Creedon not having presented anything in his conclusions. On page 386 of the hearings you will find what this gentleman submitted as a result of this study of Government figures.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman did not claim there was a shortage of soil pipe?

Mr. BANTA. Yes; he did.

Mr. MONRONEY. He claimed there was a shortage of soil pipe. Does the gentleman from Missouri claim there is no shortage of soil pipe?

Mr. BANTA. I am only going by the record.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman should correspond a little bit with the builders of this country.

Mr. BANTA. I am only going by the record, and there is nothing in this record, nor was there any testimony by any witness beyond the conclusion that there is a shortage of soil pipe, except that of the witness whose testimony is found on page 386 of the hearings, and in that statement, may I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, he said that we were advised by the Civilian Production Administration that the production of cast-iron soil pipe in January was 55,000 tons, which is at the rate of 660,000 tons annually. Then he told us that 1 ton of soil pipe is needed for every 4 houses, and if that is true, if we would build 1,000,000 units this year, we would need 335,000 tons of soil pipe and, he said further, "we estimate that 144,000 additional tons will be needed for other construction, and that at the rate therefor at which soil pipe is now being manufactured today, we would have an excess of soil pipe if we build 1,000,000 this year."

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution, and believe me it is a contribution, for this increase that has occurred in soil-pipe production has occurred because the Government had the right to allocate the pig iron. Without the allocation of the pig iron, this increase would not have occurred.

You take away the allocation rights and you go right back to the deficiency in soil pipe. You are getting production now on many heretofore scarce materials because you are able to allocate the scarce basic materials.

But if you wipe out that power and put the small cast-iron pipe manufacturers in competition with Ford and General Motors and the great giant industries of this country for a scarce supply of pig iron, you certainly will not get the soil pipe. Give to your Government the minimum controls that are now being exercised and getting the job done and bringing these supplies along, and let us go forward. Why disturb a program that is beginning to work?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand my colleague from Oklahoma correctly, one of the prohibitions contained in his amendment is with reference to Government surplus.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; for use of Government surplus. Give the Government the right to have first crack at the necessary supplies and machinery and things like that that need to be channeled into housing.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to call this to the gentleman's attention. He is probably not familiar with it. In the investigation of surplus war assets, one of the troubles we have run into is the fact that the Housing Expediter or FPHA get hold of a lot of this Government surplus property, or maybe they want to use it in veterans' housing, or maybe some veteran wants to buy this property, and they say that once you get it tied up with the Housing Administrator it is just there and nothing is done about it. Last December we were out in California making an investigation of surplus property out there. We ran into some huge cranes out there that were sitting there, stored, with other surplus assets. We wondered why they had not been sold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. We wondered why these cranes were not being used. We were told by one of the administrators of WPA that some people out on the west coast who wanted to engage in the lumber business said that if they could get these cranes they could make available 100,000,000 feet of lumber, but they were tied up.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has the gentleman followed out the cranes? I know nothing about them.

Mr. RIZLEY. They were tied up by Federal Housing. They owned the lot. The cranes were not being used by anyone. As a result of that, we were losing the benefit of that lumber.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say to the gentleman that undoubtedly you can find scores of cases where there have been mistakes made, but you will also find hundreds of cases where the Housing Authority has been securing this scarce material for use in lumbering and for transportation, bulldozers for opening sites. This equipment has been made available to builders who could not otherwise have gotten the necessary machinery they needed to do this housing job.

I think that for every case of an error you can point out you will probably find 10 or 20 places where this power has been the only relief that they have been able to get as regards scarce machinery or materials to home builders.

I know the gentleman is doing a great job in checking those things. It is to his great credit that he is following all of those details. Every time you can correct a case like that where this material is idle it is a great help. But you have first to freeze it to have the right to channel it if the builders and lumber people, the producers of building materials, are to have access with a decent priority to get this stuff to produce the materials we need for veterans' housing.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman's amendment relates to premium payments. Under the Patman bill we provide $400,000,000 for premium payments. The testimony here shows that only $50,000,000 has been spent on building materials.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is right. This extends it only another $15,000,000, to carry out the contracts already entered into and the programs under way. If you pass title I of this bill you are going to cut off the premium payments that have been getting increased production of scarce materials. There are many, many other scarce items where premium payments have been the only thing that have gotten out the maximum amount of production.

HELPS TO LOWER COSTS

I think this is an amendment that everybody should support with good

grace, knowing that you are carefully delimiting the amount of authority that the Government can exercise.

I would hate to be one who voted against these minimum powers and then face the veterans who see all of this gigantic wave of commercial construction that is unneeded going up, and also see their costs rising higher and higher.

Every issue of the papers that I have read in the past 2 weeks has said the building of houses has come virtually to a standstill. They also went on to say it was because of two things, primarily (a) prices of construction, and, (b) scarcity of materials.

If any Member in the House can tell me how the opening up of untold billions of unnecessary commercial construction competing with the veterans' housing will give him one cent reduction in the price of a house or give him a bigger supply of construction materials, I would like to have an answer to that question.

I know we will be running into the same thing that plagued us through the first 3 or 4 months of the veterans' housing program when this much-needed material went into unnecessary construction that had been started because of the unwise repeal of construction limitation order L–41.

VETERAN NEEDS FIRST RIGHT

I would like to bring out another point with reference to title I. The provision in the bill says that we are going to provide that the veteran gets first crack at the completed houses. That, I believe, was the hope of the chairman of committee, but if you read the bill carefully you can easily see that we are not giving the veteran a single bit of protection.

We are, in fact, saying to any contractor that all he must do is wait for the 30 days—just leave the house stand idle and not even offer it to anyone—and then he can sell it to his brother-in-law or his uncle or anybody he wants to. The veteran does not actually have a bit of guaranteed preference on the house.

If you will look on page 8, line 13, of the bill you will see this language:

> No housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single-family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale, prior to the expiration of 30 days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families.

That does not give the veteran a dime's worth of protection because the house can set vacant for 30 days and no veteran has any right nor has the Government a right of action against the contractor who completed it. The contractor can let it set for 30 days and then sell it to whomever he pleases, whether the purchaser is a veteran or not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman interpret that section to mean that the owner can hold it for 30 days and then sell it to someone other than a veteran at a price which a veteran was willing to pay for it?

Mr. MONRONEY. He can sell it at less than what the veteran was willing to pay for it under this section of the bill. I intend to offer an amendment designed to straighten that out, to provide that on publicly announced terms and conditions, the same as apply to anybody else, the veteran will have first chance to get this housing. That will make this section a veterans' priorities section. Goodness knows, there is little enough in this bill for the veteran. We should make him eligible at least to have a genuine first chance at the housing that is completed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is still no provision in the bill as to the margin of profit which the builder shall receive for that house.

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it is completely within the jurisdiction of the builder as to the price at which he shall offer the house.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to be fair in this matter so I must point out that most of these houses will be completed under title 6 of the FHA, and they are under surveillance in that respect when it comes to insuring the mortgages.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then, if the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer is adopted, it would be an open offering of this house at a stated price and on stated terms to the veteran.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would give the veteran a genuine preference on the house that is completed in the name of the veteran.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman prepared his amendment? I am sure the Committee would be interested in hearing it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would like to go on for a moment with title II of this bill, which is the rent-control section. I make no apology to anyone for my support of price controls during the years.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I am so anxious to hear what the gentleman has to say that under the allotment of time I have been granted 10 minutes, and I would be very happy to give that time to the gentleman, because he is covering all the points I have in mind.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is very familiar with rent control, and so I will only use a couple of minutes.

WEAKENED RENT CONTROL

Title II, the rent-control section, definitely weakens rent control. Let no one say we are going to have as good rent control after the passage of this act as we have today. But having been one of those who saw the Seventy-ninth Congress tear up and wreck the price-control bill, this rent section of the bill is in better shape today by far than any of the price-control bills were at the time they were passed through the Seventy-ninth Congress.

If we can get the bill through with some amendments which will be offered when we start to read the bill, I think you can have a reasonably effective rent control, but with adjustments which are going to cost many, many tenants some more money.

But I think it will also give some much needed consideration that the property owners have not received under price control. Obviously, when everyone else in the economy is freed of controls, it is difficult to square your conscience with maintaining complete rigidity on rent control.

That was the problem of the committee, to try to find a way to provide, without further destroying the purchasing power of the American people who must pay rent, some way to compromise their differences in rates with the landlord.

One of these is the amendment now in the bill by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER]. It provides that if a tenant and landlord mutually agree to a long-term lease, extending virtually a year after the termination of price control, at a rate of not more than 15 percent above the ceiling price, that such agreed increase can be permitted. There is an amendment that is required to prevent evasion of that which will be offered later, in order to avoid phony leases to free the property from all rent control. An amendment will be presented to cover that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment that will be presented will be that if a lease is prematurely terminated, the house goes back to its old ceiling. If the landlord can find a tenant who is willing to agree to a 15-percent increase above the old ceiling price, then that 15 percent above the old ceiling price will be retained. But the house will not be removed completely from all rent control.

There are other things that need to be tightened up. I think particularly we do a great injustice to the people who have rented a housing under rent ceilings for all these years, to free new construction from all rent control. Worse than that, to free houses that have not been rented for two years from all rent control. I think probably there is some excuse for freeing the new construction, because of increasing building costs. But why someone who has not rented a house for two years should be released from all rent control is more than I can imagine. Bear in mind this could open up all kinds of evasions for the landlord who has been living in one house, and moves into a tenant house. Then he has a house, his own former home, that is completely free from rent control, for rent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I favor most provisions in title I of this bill and I am opposed to title II in its present form.

There is no problem before the Eightieth Congress which is more mixed up in politics than the rent-control section of this bill. Rent control is what is known as a political hot potato. That is why it was bounced around so much before it came to the House. But the realities of this problem cannot be evaded.

Here is an item from the Los Angeles Herald with this headline:

JAILED VET TRIES DEATH—HOMELESS WAR HERO SAVED

His pretty wife, Nyra, 21, was arrested early yesterday for ignoring a traffic light and was found to have been driving a car she said she had stolen. She said she and their 17-month-old baby had resided in it 6 weeks. Borgess, however, said he had stolen the car. He said they had been unable to find a home after he was discharged from the Navy and that his family had slept in cars, shows, and public parks.

Mrs. Borgess said her husband was a war hero; that at Tulagi he had tossed a hand grenade into a Japanese landing barge to kill more than 200 Jap soldiers.

Here is a war hero who fought in the far-away places. When he comes home, he cannot get a house to live in. He cannot find a place to house his family. Has this situation, and thousands like it, resulted from a shortage in housing or has it resulted from inequitable legislation by the Congress in the OPA and the Patman housing bills? That is the question before Congress now.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman believe that the repeal of the Patman Act will benefit this poor veteran whose pitiful case he has just called to the attention of Congress?

Mr. BUFFETT. Repealing the Patman Act alone will not do it, but it will help. There is action this Congress can take which will give this young man a chance to get the house he cannot get today.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman believe this bill will help him get a house?

Mr. BUFFETT. Not in its present form; no.

Mr. Chairman, you will be told in appealing fashion that the reason for this unfair situation is that there is a vast shortage of housing. Let us try to get the facts on housing. In 1940, according to the Bureau of the Census, the United States had 34,855,000 occupied dwellings. In November 1945 we had 37,600,000 residential units, or an increase of 7.9 percent in the number of houses. In the same period, population had increased 6.5 percent.

In other words, there were considerable more residential facilities in this country at the end of 1945 than there were in 1940. What happened to those facilities? Why are they not available to the people? Because under the rent-control law we have expropriation of property from those who now own it. Through the operation of present rent control, the rental units in this country are disappearing from the market.

We find that 169 additional rent-control areas have been inaugurated since the end of 1945. In early 1946 there was passed a law that was supposed to end the shortage. But since December of 1945, 169 new defense rental areas have been set up. The problem has been accelerated and intensified.

The sound answer to the housing problem obviously is private rental construction. I looked up the record to find out what was done in private rental construction in the twenties, and I found that in 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927 private industry in this country was supplying about 300,000 rental units a year. Obviously, our construction facilities have increased, perhaps doubled, since the 1920's, and yet last year—I do not know the exact number; I could not find it out—apparently something less than 100,000 private rental units were constructed. There was a great deal of Government construction of trailer-type and substandard housing, but private rental construction could not go ahead last year, and it will not be accelerated under the present bill.

To the contrary, in New York City the department of housing and building reports that since the end of the war demolitions have exceeded new construction of housing units by 3,223. Think of that. Here is New York City with about one-seventh of all the rental housing units of the country, yet New York City demolitions since the end of the war have decreased total residential units by more than 3,000. Is that solving the rental shortage?

You have been told, and you will be told again, that there is provision in this bill for hardship cases. I checked on how that is working in the city of New York. I am informed that last year $40,000,000 worth of rental property was turned over to the mortgage holders, either by straight-out foreclosure or by conveyal of deed, because the people owning the property could not get enough income from it under rent control to even pay upkeep and interest on their mortgage.

I wish I could sharpen that point for you. Let me say it again, $40,000,000 worth of residential property in New York City in 1946 was foreclosed because of a rent control law that claims to give the property owner a fair return on his investment. How would you feel about investing your money in rental property in New York City when $40,000,000 of said property last year was foreclosed? A man who is most familiar with that problem estimates that in 1947 there will be $150,000,000 worth of rental property foreclosed on in New York unless this Congress gives some relief to owners from rent control injustices.

I made a little experiment the other day which is interesting. I took last Sunday's Star and looked at the real estate listings in the want ads. Under the head of "Apartments for rent" there were a total of 79. Those were apartments where you might get in for 2 months, or you might move in with somebody else if you happen to suit them, and, counting all of these hybrid cases there were 79 apartments for rent. Ten years ago on the same Sunday there were 865 apartments for rent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman does not think that is any criterion, does he, with conditions being as different as they were 10 years ago from today?

Mr. BUFFETT. Ten years ago people were needing rental quarters in Washington just as they are today, certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They were looking for rental property, yes, but does the gentleman really believe that a comparison of Sunday last with 10 years ago is a fair comparison to be applied in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. BUFFETT. I am glad that the gentleman asked the question. Obviously, a comparison with 10 years ago or 5 years ago is not going to be absolutely accurate in every detail, but its usefulness in measuring the consequences of rent control is substantial.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How many people were in Washington 10 years ago?

Mr. BUFFETT. Washington appeared to be crowded for housing 10 years ago. The population had increased from 486,000 in 1930 to 616,000 in 1937 for the District proper, without comparable new construction. Certainly the Federal pay roll was rising in Washington in the late 30's.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us see if this does not help the gentleman. Ten years ago we had great unemployment in this country by reason of a depression which was promoted by Mr. Roosevelt saying that prices were too high, that we had to cut prices and reduce profits. We had the most precipitous decline in our economic history, is that correct?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now we have a situation where some ten or fifteen million people have returned from the service, the greatest transformation of human beings in the history of this country. We have along with that same situation some $225,000,000,000 of excess buying power promoted by the fiscal policy of the Government in financing the war. As the Chairman of the Board of Governors has pointed out, we have a potential inflationary base of $225,000,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. BUFFETT. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have had price controls and price ceilings under which we permit people to spread out over the residential units, which the gentleman has so well pointed out. Those are the economic forces now running. So it is in order for the gentleman to bring out the fact that 10 years ago in Washington there were 865 apartment units available for rent and 79 today. Of course, you have a housing shortage. There is no greater housing shortage now than you had 10 years ago, having in mind similar conditions, and there will be no greater difference 10 years from now if we pyramid the situation by having 10 to 15 million people return from the military service, for instance, with a $450,000,000 potential inflationary basis.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Now let us look at another aspect of this comparison, which will serve to make it more striking. Ten years ago there were 344 houses for sale in Washington. But last Sunday with the so-called housing shortage there were 1,215. There were more than three times as many houses for sale. Now, if the shortage is so great, how is it that 1,215 houses are for sale, or three times as many as 10 years ago?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman would not contend, would he, that the market price of houses is not inflated?

Mr. BUFFETT. The market price of houses reflects the general deterioration that has taken place in our money. It reflects the rising cost of building construction that has taken place as the result of 14 years of inflationary government spending.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a well-known axiom of economics that prices in a free economy are governed by the volume of the national currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. Ten years ago we did not have half of the amount of money in circulation that we have today. In 1930 we had $4,426,000,000 in circulation. Today we have considerably above $28,000,000,000. Ten years ago we did not have one-fourth of that amount. That accounts largely for the difference in the prices, and unless there is something done to curb the expansion of the currency, prices are going to continue to rise.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman points out the fantastic inconsistency of this whole business. We have an inflationary situation that has caused all prices to go up, all costs to go up, all wages to go up, and yet the Congress singles out one group of people in this country and says to them "Your investment return has to be kept at an artificially low level, and we are going to keep you there whether you like it or not." Then we wonder in Washington why 2,000,000 rental units have gone off the market in the last 2 years. Two million rental units are off the market. That has accentuated this situation; that has prevented the veterans from getting homes; that has prevented people from taking jobs when they had a chance to move to a new city and take a new job if they could find rental quarters.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the attempt to hold down the small property owner to the economic level of 10 years ago or 15 years ago has not only almost destroyed him, but it has discouraged many people from building property that could be used now; in other words, the program we have followed is preventing the building of homes and at the same time has ground the little property owner into the dust.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is absolutely right. Bureau of Labor Statistics show that since 1939 building costs have increased about 68 percent, yet rents have been allowed to increase only about 4 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like the gentleman to tell the committee what provisions are made in this bill that will be of assistance to the owner whose rents are frozen, say, in March 1942, where the cost of repair, including the cost of labor and materials, has doubled, and many times, in many cases, increased a number of times, so that there can be some relief for those people, all of whose rents go now for repairs.

Mr. BUFFETT. I regret I must report to the gentleman that there is no genuine relief in the bill as it is now constituted. There is a provision that if the tenant agrees to an increased rent, and he and the landlord get together under certain conditions, then there can be an increase in rent of not over 15 percent. It is a voluntary procedure and it would be speculative for me to guess whether or not it will have much effect. It may do well in some cases.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am talking about actual relief for people that now own their property, where they have to make repairs. In many cases the rents are being absorbed in making those repairs because of the increased cost.

Mr. BUFFETT. There is no relief in this bill for those owners of property. That is the reason I find it impossible to support this bill as it now stands. Congress certainly has one obligation to the people of this country, and that is to deal fairly with all groups.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The only way is to vote against this bill and dispense with the continuation of these rent ceilings?

Mr. BUFFETT. It would have that effect.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, after returning to civilian life from military service; after talking to veterans and viewing the conditions under which they were living, I began to realize that America's number one problem was the disgraceful housing shortage. Later I attended meetings where great numbers of veterans were present and all expected action by this Congress to alleviate and remedy the housing situation.

Today the debate begins for the first time in this session of Congress upon legislation that affects the veteran and his housing problem. Notwithstanding the repeated demands of veterans and veterans' organizations, the present bill takes away from the veteran the few remaining safeguards existing under Federal law. Moreover, under title II of this bill, by indirection, the rent control program will be, to a large extent, completely nullified.

On this floor today I have heard the theories and political philosophy of the Members of this body, but the question remains, "What does this Congress intend to do about housing?" To date and after 4 months' deliberation, not a single measure has been passed by this body in connection with the housing program. Almost 2 months ago I called to the attention of this body the urgent and critical need to increase the appropriation to the Lanham Act by $50,000,000 in order that the veterans' temporary housing program be enabled to continue. Other bills of equal importance have been sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but still no action has been taken.

This is the first opportunity we have had to do anything about veterans' housing and what are we called upon to do? We are now called upon to take away from the veteran and his family any remaining safeguard given to him by Federal law under the Patman Act. Title I of this bill does that very thing to the veteran. A majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency have ignored the recommendations of all of the great veterans' groups in this Nation, every single one of whom has testified before the committee in opposition to those matters now contained in title I of this bill. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Veterans Committee, the American Veterans of World War II, the Catholic War Veterans; all of these groups recognize the importance of continuing the few remaining provisions of the original Patman Act for the protection of the veteran, but their advice has not been heeded.

I have been conferring with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] who will present amendments to this bill which will be in keeping with the views of those who seek to preserve the little that is left to the veteran under existing laws. I shall support these amendments and urge upon every Member of Congress that they do likewise.

In addition to the blow that this legislation gives against the veteran in purchasing a home, there is another important aspect of this bill which should merit the consideration of all thinking Members. Under title II of this bill the committee has not had the courage to meet the issue head-on of increasing rents, but has used another device which will do

first, of several things, unquestionably it will increase rents 15 percent; second, it will result in the decontrol of a great number of residential units; and, third, it is designed to destroy any possibility of effective enforcement of control in the field of rent.

The housing situation is so critical in this Nation that even the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency recognize the necessity of continuing rent control. There has been constant pressure by real-estate groups and others similarly situated urging this Congress to increase rents. The testimony before the committee reveals that other groups, labor, consumers, veterans' organizations, and many, many others have been fighting to offset this pressure to increase rents. In not knowing exactly what to do, the majority of the committee have seized upon this hypocritical device, which as I have pointed out before, will not only increase rents 15 percent, but which will ultimately result in no rent control at all. I repeat, they have seized upon this device in order to avoid the political consequence of a straight across-the-board 15-percent rent increase. Anyone familiar with law enforcement knows that the provisions of this bill will provide so many legal loopholes that it will be administratively impossible to continue to have effective rent control. This is another example of expert emasculation. This is another example of doing indirectly what the committee did not dare to do directly because of political consequences.

There is another point I should like to make. The majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have ingeniously tied together in this bill issues which should be treated separately. There are many who would vote for one portion of the bill but would not vote for another portion; and there are those of us who want to have continued existing controls, as meager as they are. For my part, I intend to vote for any amendments which will give strength to this weak and watered-down piece of legislation, and in the event these amendments are not accepted, I shall vote to recommit the bill to the committee for further study.

I should like to register my protest against this type of omnibus legislation. Time after time I have been called upon to legislate or vote on vital issues affecting the Nation and almost always have been denied the clear opportunity of voting on separate issues. Again, we are confronted with omnibus legislation that bodes no good for our Nation.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I assume that the gentleman has read section 4, title 1, of this bill. I believe that would do a great deal toward seeing that modern homes are furnished veterans at a price that they can afford. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. CARROLL. No; I do not agree with that entirely.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. What does that section mean?

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will let me have that particular section, I will be glad to answer him. That is the statement about loans. That is the old statement about loans. I have been talking with economists. They are on both sides of the fence. They say we cannot afford to give 100-percent-insured loans to the people who are going to build homes. So we give 90 percent. What is the effect of it? Today, with a rising market no man is going to invest and take a loss. But I do not have much time and I do not want to get into the question of rent control and I hope the gentleman will discuss this matter on his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, there will probably be no other bill before this Congress upon which so many Members of Congress will feel they are qualified experts. This point of view is not without some justification because the relationship between tenant and landlord is a common everyday one and familiar to all of us. It is for this reason that the only satisfactory and permanent solution of the rent control problem lies in mutual agreements, voluntarily made, between tenants and landlords.

I feel a personal responsibility for a provision to this bill which I offered as an amendment in committee in section 204 (b) and I wish to give you my conception of it. I quote from the bill:

And provided further, That in any case in which a tenant and landlord, prior to March 31, 1948, enter into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title and expires on or after December 31, 1948, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within 15 days after the date of execution of such lease, with the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a), the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the tenant and landlord in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 percent over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section, and such maximum rent shall not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this title. No housing accommodatmions for which a maximum rent is established by a lease pursuant to the provisions of this proviso shall be subject, on or after the date such lease takes effect, to any maximum rent established or maintained under other provisions of this section.

This amendment was voted into the bill by a bipartisan vote of 20 to 3. I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his remarks on the floor this morning favorable to this provision of the bill.

It means, unit by unit, the tenant and landlord may come into agreement not only as to the amount of rent to be paid but as to exactly what the tenant is to get for his rent and the responsibilities of both parties thereto set out in a written agreement. They may agree to repaint or remodel the dwelling unit at a slight increase in rent—not to exceed 15 percent.

This is what happened before we had rent control and it is what will happen after rent control is gone and forgotten. A free negotiation between two parties.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the gentleman on this attempt at a solution of a very difficult problem. It seems to me it does furnish us a very good solution. Has it not been your experience that there are many tenants in this country—and tenants, I emphasize—who will be very grateful to see such a provision as this, because it will give them an opportunity to get some repairs on their apartments and houses that they have not been able to get in the past, and they are willing to pay a little something if the landlord will just do something? Under present provisions they cannot get the landlord, in many cases, to do anything. This will give them an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman is a hundred percent correct. There are many, many landlords and tenants who have been driven apart. The owner of a property would very much like to do remodeling or repainting but he cannot get an increase in rent, so they are not able to arrive at the work to be done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does this provision give the landlord the arbitrary right to increase rent 15 percent?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it does not.

Mr. COOLEY. Suppose a landlord operating a large apartment house takes the position that he is entitled to a 15 percent increase in rent, and fails to agree with any of his tenants for anything less than 15 percent?

Mr. FLETCHER. The tenant remains in the apartment house as long as rent control continues. There is no compulsion.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the landlord cannot arbitrarily force the tenant to increase the rent.

Mr. FLETCHER. He cannot.

Mr. COOLEY. But they can do it by agreement.

Mr. FLETCHER. By mutual agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the tenant will say to the landlord: "I will pay more rent if you will redecorate the house or make necessary repairs."

Mr. FLETCHER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think we should have this in the RECORD: If I understand the bill correctly, if Mr. A who owns the building I am renting says to me: "Mr. B, I will give you a lease until December 31, 1948, at 15 percent increase" and I, Mr. B, refuse to accept that and rent control goes off on March 31, 1948,

then Mr. A, if he wants to, can increase my rent 30 percent from then until December 31, 1948, can he not?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is correct. After rent control goes off there will be no limitation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, my inducement to sign a lease for a 15-percent increase——

Mr. FLETCHER. Or for any amount less than 15 percent, remember that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, or any amount under 15 percent would be that I might be saving rent after March 31, 1948.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The statement was made earlier this afternoon with which I do not find myself in agreement and I would like to have the gentleman's views on it. The statement was made that this provision in the bill gives the whip hand to the landlord. As I see it, as long as rent control continues and the tenant occupies the property if he does not want to agree to an increase he cannot be compelled to agree to it; whereas, if he feels that he can gain an advantage by agreeing to it then he is free to do so, the parties are free to deal as individuals the one with the other.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is entirely correct. I do not agree with the statement made earlier today that either the landlord or the tenant has the whip hand.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am wondering if there is any provision to afford protection so that the landlord cannot bring about an eviction but must deal with the occupant of the property at the time to negotiate this 15-percent increase? If that protection were not in the bill the landlord would have the opportunity of moving someone out in order to get the 15 percent increase from a new tenant.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under the eviction clause the tenant cannot be moved out to make way for that sort of increase. But I should like to continue.

As I was saying, this is an agreement arrived at by free negotiation between two parties. There is no compulsion to force a lease to be made. Tenants can continue to have such protections as are afforded under rent control without entering into a lease with the landlord. But it does afford the tenant a method by which he may guarantee that at least until December 31, 1948, he will pay no more rent than he has voluntarily agreed to pay up to a 15-percent increase, and that he will get such services and maintenance of the property as are agreed to in the lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The December 31, 1948, date is the minimum tenancy. The tenant can ask for another extra year if he wants it for further protection.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The December 31, 1948, date is merely the minimum protection of the lease. It can run for 2 or 3 years and give the tenant further protection.

Rent control has driven tenant and landlord apart—this provision brings them together—it is the American way of doing things. For those who wish to enter into such a lease provision, it is a very simple matter. For 5 cents in any stationery store you may purchase lease forms which only need to be completed as to names, description of the unit to be rented, and the terms.

I confidently believe that under this provision, many leases would be made at no increase in rents, and many at a 5-percent or a 10-percent increase. It does not necessarily follow that all of these leases will be made at the maximum of 15-percent increase. Many tenants and property owners all over the country, have indicated to me that they will have no trouble getting together. One of my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee reports a survey in New York indicated four out of five tenants ready and willing to voluntarily give the landlord an increase in rents for the security of tenancy—but the present rent-control laws prevent it.

Certainly, it cannot be the intention of this Congress to prevent the tenant and landlord from voluntarily entering into a mutually satisfactory agreement.

It will be said that as vacancies occur the landlord will demand the maximum of 15-percent increase before leasing to a new tenant. I maintain that this is not necessarily true—but even if it were—is there anything wrong with that?

What is sacred about the amount of rent a person pays? I am one of the first to agree that it is most important for all people to have a decent home in which to live. But there is nothing sacred about the percentage of one's income spent in rent, any more than that percentage spent for food, clothing, or the other necessities of life. The simple truth of the matter is that the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures indicate rents have gone up but 4.2 percent since 1940 while food has gone up 91.1 percent and clothing 67 percent.

Undoubtedly there will exist, side by side, units paying different rents because of the difference between those who have not agreed on a lease and those who have. What is wrong with that? The tenant with the lease may be paying a little more but is willing to do so for the guaranty of tenancy under his lease. When are we going to stop thinking in terms that the tenant has any squatter's rights to another man's property? Has the demagogic propaganda of socialized housing so weakened the moral fiber of our people that the tenant can virtually confiscate the private property of the owner?

Let us stop trying to control the lives and property of Americans by Federal legislation. Let us give back the control of rents to the tenants and the landlords where it belongs. In this period of reconversion to a free economy, I recommend as a partial solution, this provision which allows tenant and landlord to voluntarily enter into a mutually satisfactory lease for the protection of both parties.

But the only fair and final solution is complete elimination of rent control at the earliest practical date. I expect to offer an amendment, at the proper time, which will definitely end rent control on December 31, 1947, with no provision for extension by Presidential proclamation.

I do not believe in the delegation by Congress to the President of our legislative power to continue rent controls after December 31, 1947.

I, for one, wish to stand up and be counted as faithful to my personal pledge and to the pledge of the Republican Party to set free the property owners of America.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Of course, I think there are inequities on both sides. Sometimes the landlord gets too much, sometimes the tenant gets too much. But does the gentleman think there would be any freedom of contract now in regard to an increase of 15 percent, and would not the tenant be under duress to a certain extent because the landlord would say: "If you do not agree to the 15-percent increase at this time, as soon as these controls are off, as they will be shortly, I will charge you all the traffic will bear." Does not the gentleman think that would have a great influence on the tenant to agree now to that increase of 15 percent? Does not the gentleman think it would disrupt the relationship between the landlord and the tenant? The landlord would want to forfeit the lease, he would want the present occupancy to cease in order that he might be free to impose a 15-percent increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Does not the gentleman believe that under these circumstances it is practically doing away with the present rent control and increasing the rent largely throughout the United States by 15 percent?

Mr. FLETCHER. My answer to the gentleman is that by voluntary agreement these parties can get together. There has been evidence all over the country where they have wanted to; they have expressed themselves of the desire to get together I have more faith in the tenants and the landlords of this country that they will not try to gouge each other.

Mr. SPENCE. That is all right; the law recognizes voluntary agreements; it also recognizes duress. Under the peculiar circumstances that now exist, the landlord can exercise an influence on the tenant that he would otherwise not exercise. The landlord knows and the tenant knows that before long these restrictions will be lifted, and he can impose his will now on the tenant that he would otherwise be unable to do if the conditions did not exist that exist at the present time. You may say that the

landlord could impose on the tenant at any time and tell him that as soon as his lease is over "I am going to raise your rent," but the tenant now is protected against that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman from Kentucky contend that the relationship between the tenant and the landlord is anything but difficult at the present time? They are now only receiving as an average a 4-percent increase over the cost of the commodity, and the strained conditions certainly would not be any more emphasized by the possibility of an increase of 15 percent.

Mr. SPENCE. I think they would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM].

THE NEW TITLE VI PROVISIONS ON FACTORY-PRODUCED HOUSING—HOW THEY WILL WORK

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3203, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, contains an amendment to title VI of the National Housing Act which will stimulate the production of houses at moderate prices through the use of modern production methods. To get moderate-priced housing which the average family can afford, we need to encourage more modern methods of building houses. I believe that the mass production of houses will bring the same benefits in lower prices as mass production methods have in other industries.

I am making this statement for the RECORD to show how this provision would operate.

In brief, this amendment simply makes FHA insurance of loans available to manufacturers who produce houses in factories. It enables them to borrow the working capital necessary to manufacture houses. FHA would insure a bank or other lender against loss on a loan which did not exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of manufacturing houses, exclusive of profit.

Before a loan to a manufacturer would be eligible for FHA insurance, the manufacturer would show that he meets the following conditions:

First. That he has binding purchase contracts for the purchase and delivery of the number of houses to be manufactured from the proceeds of the loan. What this condition contemplates is that a manufacturer have bona fide orders for his houses. It does not necessarily mean that there has to be cash-down payments, but there must be legal consideration which establishes a binding contract to purchase by the ultimate consumer, builder, or responsible dealer. This condition will prevent FHA insurance of loans where there is a mere hope of getting business. The company must have a market, as evidenced by binding purchase contracts.

Second. That the houses to be manufactured will meet such requirements of sound quality, durability, livability, and safety as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

What is contemplated by this condition is the structural approval which the FHA has been giving in the case of houses that have been approved for the market guaranty contracts. Recognizing the necessity for mass production in a factory, FHA has provided an advance review of a house and given an advance approval of its structure. This gives the manufacturer necessary assurances before he puts a house into mass production. It is most important that we meet such problems of mass production in the factory by adjusting the procedures and practices of the administrative agencies to the requirements of uniform production on a production line.

Third. That the borrower has or will have adequate plant facilities and sufficient capital funds—taking into account the loan applied for—and experience to achieve the required production schedule.

This condition recognizes that, besides the cases where a manufacturer already is in a plant and has sufficient capital funds, there are cases where the manufacturer has made arrangements to get a plant or to get capital. In such cases, it would not preclude a manufacturer from also arranging to get an FHA insured production loan for the manufacture of houses. In any large financial enterprise, there often are a number of different types of commitments involved—such as for a plant, enlisting capital for tooling up, employing production experts, and so forth—and each of these commitments may have to be conditioned upon securing other types of commitments, such as for working capital. So long as the sum total of the commitments and arrangements will give reasonable assurance of producing the desired result, the manufacturer would be eligible under this provision. In general, the objective of this provision is to preclude FHA insurance of loans to manufacturers who cannot make a reasonable showing that they will have the necessary plant, capital, and experience to accomplish the result of producing houses with the working capital to be provided by the FHA-insured loan. In this respect, the provision is a conservative one, as it will weed out speculators and irresponsible applicants.

Fourth. That the loan will involve a principal obligation which will not exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of manufacturing such houses.

This condition specifically excludes profit from this necessary cost. In this way, it makes it clear that the purpose of the insured loan is to protect the lender and not to guarantee a profit to the producer. The security to be given for these loans is an assignment of the purchase contracts for the houses and the sums payable under such contracts. Provision is also made that the FHA may require further security, including the right, in case of default, or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses manufactured with the proceeds of the loan, and then owned and in the possession of the borrower. This security language has been carefully phrased after consultation with lending institutions. This provision gives reasonable security for the insured loan. At the same time, it recognizes that we must avoid burdensome restrictions by encumbering the inventory, as this would hamper the day-to-day operations of a factory and the rapid consumption of raw materials on a production line.

Since this is an amendment to title VI, the insurance of loans will be subject to the over-all limitation on the total amount of insurance authorized to be issued and outstanding. It is particularly important that these provisions be administered in a manner which is adapted to the short-term maturity of the loans, which are not to exceed a period of 1 year, except for refinancing not to exceed a further period of 1 year. The intent of this amendment is to treat as a charge against the over-all limitation on title VI insurance the amount of insurance of loans under this section which is outstanding at any one time.

I have discussed with the Federal Housing Administrator the making of additional loans to a manufacturer from time to time as he receives additional purchase contracts. That is the intention of this amendment and I have been assured that this presents no problem under the language of the amendment.

There is also nothing in this amendment which would preclude continuing a loan under this section until its stated 1-year maturity by substituting an assignment of additional purchase contracts for those on houses which have already been sold.

While the language of this amendment refers to houses, I do want to make it clear that it includes housing in its broader sense. If a manufacturer is producing multiple rental housing units which he is going to sell, this amendment would cover those, just as it covers individual houses which are to be sold. In view of the urgent need for moderate rental housing, I hope that more of the companies will concentrate attention on producing multiple dwellings at lower costs.

This amendment will not only be a great stimulus to housing manufacturers, but it will also help material and equipment producers who sell to these manufacturers. They will be assured of payment promptly, because FHA insured production-loans will make working capital available to meet the cost of manufacturing houses. All of this will help contribute to lower costs.

In summary, I want to emphasize that any new legislation intended to meet a new problem will have to be administered with the steady purpose of meeting that problem. I am sure that that is the way the FHA would administer it. I have great confidence that the enactment of this amendment which I introduced in committee, will prove to be of great and lasting benefit to the veterans of this

country by stimulating the production of housing they can afford. It should also help establish a new industry which will contribute to a stable and prosperous economy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the committee for bringing a bill to the floor at this time and in time for it to have plenty of consideration by the House and the other body as of before June 30.

I can fully appreciate that the members of this distinguished committee have a difficult economic and political problem to deal with, and that also goes for all of the other Members of the House as well as the other body. There are provisions in this bill with which I am not too friendly. I understand certain amendments will be offered which I expect to support.

I cannot reconcile myself to the theory that we, as a Congress, should not take specific steps to categorically protect those owners of excess living units—and by that I mean the man or the woman, or both, who have lived simple lives, exercised thrift, accumulated enough money to buy a small shelter in excess of that which they need themselves, and wherein they have gone along and assumed the risk of ownership with respect to taxes, depreciation, insurance costs, decline in market value, and other hazards, the excess ownership in the form of an extra living unit which someone can occupy as a tenant, and who does not want to take on the risk of ownership himself. There are a lot of these little folks, elderly men and women who invested their savings in excess housing facilities over and above their own needs which they have been renting to these other people who are tenants, and who did not want to own a home but who are not perhaps willing to live as simply, who did not exercise the same amount of thrift and have no idea of exercising such thrift but who live and absorb under the umbrella of OPA rent controls and in many instances take property away from the good, thrifty, elderly people along a line which, in my opinion, gets very close to taking property without due process of law.

I think the bill should be made very clear in provisions that protect these little people who have no money in the first place; and in the second place, do not know how to acquire the necessary legal talent to see that they get an adjustment under the somewhat vague language that is in this bill.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The gentleman heard the statement on the floor this afternoon that the bill if enacted would create discrimination between landlords and tenants. The gentleman is aware, of course, that the law as it now appears upon the books does create and cause discrimination between landlord and landlord and tenant and tenant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally I think it is one of the most discriminating, one of the most inequitable, and one of the most unfair programs that has ever been carried on by the Federal Government in its history.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill in its present form takes the ceiling off new construction.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct, as I understand it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It takes the ceiling off a building you are repairing, just so you put a partition in it so you can get more tenants in it. It takes that class off.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It takes ceilings off the fellow who got mad and would not rent in 1945 and 1946.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman let me say it this way? It takes the ceilings off those properties which were owned by people who refused to rent them at a price below the cost of maintaining the property.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is right, the class of people that did not subscribe to the theory of the Government. Therefore, the other people, who went along and rented their homes, now will not get any increase, but the fellow who bucked the Government will get an increase.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; the fellow who had sense and intestines enough to protect his own economic position gets the increase, because there are people who do know something about the cost of maintaining property and who take the position, at least at this moment, that the Government has no right to take that property away from them through OPA rules and regulations and give the property to someone else. That is the issue which is involved in this proposition.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that only 3,670 individual housing units of the 16,000,000 under rent control received an upward adjustment in rent to October 19, 1946, under the hardship provisions of the OPA. This is less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent. I want this class of people to have the same treatment everybody else gets. It is a good idea if you can make these adjustments, but they just do not make them. Therefore, you have to cut across the board so as to give these people relief compared with other people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And by cutting across the board, if I understand the gentleman, he proposes to support an amendment to give an increase in rents all the way across the board.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. The person supporting an amendment like that can point out the fellow who in 1945 and 1946 had his house closed, and turn around and see the other people who rented their homes; and they cannot get their ceiling increased but the fellow who locked the door against the veteran that came back can get it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the man and woman who owned those little places and who went along in the faith and belief that their Government would treat them right, and who have been unable to get an adjustment under the hardship clause as evidenced by the figures which the gentleman has submitted, are entitled to a place in the sun.

It is for that reason that I propose to support the amendment.

I think that the present law has provisions in it which would protect these little people if the little people could get the administrators of the present law to give them fair treatment. But I do not think those little people can get that sort of treatment.

In my own home town, the local regional rent administrator has insulted the intelligence and patriotism of honest men and women who live simple lives and practice thrift and contribute to the tax box and who buy bonds. He carried the matter to the point where he would not even let them talk to him over the telephone, to say nothing about calling at his office. I went into his office and said to him, "You and I are servants of the people. Our salaries are paid by these good taxpayers." Incidentally, I took those taxpayers in with me and he saw us. I read the riot act to him as a fellow can if he gets mad enough. I told him what I thought about it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that there are cases such as the gentleman has mentioned. Probably there are a good many of them. The gentleman has made a very strong plea for the little landlord. But will not an across-the-board increase in rent, in your judgment, create many more inequities than it will cure?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think it will because I do not know of an occupation or profession in the United States where the workers in that particular group or classification have not received substantial rates of increase in pay during the last 4 or 5 years. That goes all the way from the person who performs the lowest stoop labor up to the highest paid professional men and women in the United States. They have had their increases in pay. The plumber and plasterer and carpenter have certainly had their increases. But the person who owns a little home where the plumbing has to be repaired and where repairs and decorating have to be done have had no substantial increases in their rents. They are entitled to those substantial increases along with the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. What study, if any, did the committee make in reference to the possibility of turning this problem over to the States where the States have laws and are willing to shoulder the responsibility? It has always occurred to me that real estate and the handling of

real estate was primarily a local function. It is not movable property such as an automobile that can be driven from one State to another. Where the State has a law which is adaptable to these circumstances and they are willing to shoulder the responsibility, what does the act permit that State to do?

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, let me say I agree with the gentleman that this matter should now go to the States if it is to be continued. Secondly, I would prefer to have the chairman of the committee or the ranking member on the minority side answer the gentleman with respect to such study as the committee might have made on that subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the gentleman believe that rent control should be continued beyond December 31, 1947?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If it was entirely left to me, I would discontinue all rent control not later than December 31, 1947. I would discontinue it lock, stock, and barrel. I would let the people of this country get back to carrying on their own affairs and let the owners and tenants work out their own economic salvation. But, of course, I will not have my way about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. A while ago we were in a colloquy about the prices 10 years ago and now. I got from the Treasury Department the statement for December 31, 1936, and December 31, 1946. On December 31, 1936, we had in circulation $6,542,752,261, and this year we have $28,952,436,702. In other words, we have more than four times, almost five times as much money in circulation as we had 10 years ago. That is the reason prices of commodities have advanced, while rents have been arbitrarily held down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct so far as you go, but still other inflationary forces have contributed to the spiraling of prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BANTA].

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to find myself at difference with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which considered this bill, as well as with other members of the committee who voted to report it to the House in this form.

I am unable to go along with any who believe that this bill will improve the situation in which we find ourselves now, under the present law, and those laws which have been in effect during the time that control has been in effect over those groups of our citizens who are landlords and tenants.

For a great many years either the Congress or the administrative agencies set up by the executive department have been classifying our citizens, placing them into categories, and giving preferred treatment to this category or that category, for one purpose or another. We have complained bitterly about the fact that the administrative agency which has exercised control over the rental properties, as well as control over the construction of housing units throughout the country, has been unfair to the *n*th degree. I have not found anyone to raise his voice in commendation of any of the administrative agencies, successive to one another in this field.

The testimony before this committee shows that there are approximately 16,800,000 housing or dwelling units in this Nation which have, at one time or another, been under Federal control. We all know how unfairly the owners of those units have been treated.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman made a very energetic effort in the committee to find out if the present rent-control law was alleviating the housing shortage. Was he able to get any facts from the officials in that respect?

Mr. BANTA. I not only made inquiry from all officials and witnesses who testified before the committee who could have possessed any information and failed to get it, but I have since reviewed the hearings, and it is not to be found. I think one of the greatest indictments of the program for continued control over rental properties is to be found in the fact that no one who appeared in behalf of the several housing agencies was able to tell this committee how many unoccupied houses there are in this Nation now, while at the same time we are asked to believe there is an acute housing shortage. It is estimated there are from 150,000 to 200,000 houses now unoccupied, but this estimate had to come from a person outside the Government who was admittedly making a guess. Much has been said about what we should do for the veterans to get them into these houses. If I analyze this situation correctly, the very controls which have been impressed and which this bill, if enacted, will continue to impress, will keep the inflationary situation alive. It is forcing rental houses off of the market, forcing them into a market which is a seller's market, and that itself steps up the price, because if you cannot rent shelter you are forced to buy it, and at the seller's price. If you make shelter subject only to purchase, then the price goes up. What are we doing to the poor veteran who wants shelter and who cannot rent it, but must buy it on a seller's market at such ridiculous prices? We are forcing him to buy it at a price he cannot afford to pay, which is wholly unfair and unjust.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the study the gentleman has made of the situation did he find anything like the situation which I have in Cuyahoga County in the matter of single-person units and family units? Did he find any situations that would show the accuracy of facts given me during a study I had made of housing facilities, especially for veterans' families? I found that between April 1940 and November 1945 one-person households in the urban areas of the United States increased 42 percent. This means that 2,372,000 dwelling units were occupied by one person in November 1945, whereas in April 1940, only 1,671,000 were so occupied. In fact, if no more one-person households occupied dwelling units in Cuyahoga County now than in April 1940, there would be ample places for all to live.

Mr. BANTA. The gentlewoman from Ohio is exactly correct. I have a letter this morning from a lawyer in Los Angeles, Calif., in which he makes this significant statement:

> I have a house built to take care of 290 people that is actually housing 142 people. The consideration I got from OPA for increased occupancy is negligible, so that when an apartment becomes vacant I rent it to one person. OPA allowed for increased occupancy in one specific case 12½ cents a day additional for an increased occupancy from one to four persons and furnish everything, including laundering of the linens and weekly maid service. Under the circumstances I rent to one and forego the 12½ cents a day to which I would be entitled if I furnished everything to three additional people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BANTA. This bill continues the present situation which will permit the hoarding of houses. It divides tenants into classes, namely, the tenants who occupy old houses and the tenants who will occupy new houses, to say nothing about placing the veterans into a separate class as well as into the two classes formerly mentioned.

It divides landlords into classes, namely, those who own rental houses now completed, and those who will own houses yet to be completed. It is grossly unfair to the owners of presently completed rental houses, 80 percent of which are owned by small investors who, in many instances have their life savings invested therein, having so invested with the hope that they could have a fair return on the investment which under continued rent control is impossible.

It will perpetuate bureaucratic control of one-fifth of the economy of this Nation and transfer a legislative function to the executive branch of the Government.

If all of the American people are entitled to fair treatment, if they are all entitled to equal rights and privileges under the law if private ownership of property is a right to be cherished, and one that should be encouraged, let us free ourselves from bureaucratic control of the houses in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting in the Chamber listening to

the debate and have come to the conclusion that if we would do the American thing and provide the means or open the gate whereby we could make available additional housing to veterans we should get rid of OPA just as fast as humanly possible. During the war I had the privilege of making an investigation of housing conditions which included my own State as well as others. The last day of the investigation happened to be in Los Angeles. I heard 106 people testify that last day and I was told time and time again by veterans themselves that if we could eliminate Government control houses would be available for veterans. Apartment houses would be available also.

Mr. Chairman, we have had control by the Government of the people's business for so long that a lot of people today are not renting apartments and houses that they own. At the present prices they are getting for homes and apartments they cannot afford to have them picked to pieces, like they are in some instances, without having some protection.

We hear the great plea, "We want to help the veterans." I wish it were possible for some of the veterans who are deceased to return and observe how their own mothers and fathers are being treated today throughout the country. I can cite instances where mothers and fathers, elderly people, who have lost one, two, or three sons, have two, three, or four houses to rent, and that is all they have in God's world to take care of them. Today under Government control they cannot rent their property for the amount of the cost of maintenance. Taxes have increased in some instances as much as 50 and 60 percent, yet these people cannot get an increase in the rent of the properties. We talk about justice. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the greatest un-American conditions that faces the country today. We have not attempted to touch upon the subject of providing additional housing. We have strangled those who would like to make it possible to have additional housing, leaving it to some Government bureau to provide the housing. Many of these men know nothing about the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I could not vote for the pending bill today if it meant my job tomorrow morning, and I would gladly yield my job tomorrow morning if we could get rid of these controls at that time and give the whole business back to the American people and let them provide housing for the veterans. I will gamble with any of you on that.

Oh, yes; a year ago we were talking about increasing our own salaries, yet we do not want to do anything to help the one who owns property, giving them the right to live. I have people in my district who, by the time they pay the taxes, the water rent, garbage disposal charges, and so forth, are losing on each family unit at the present time from $20 to $40 a unit per year. How many of you would stay in business if you operated like that? Can they get an increase? No. The OPA strangles them. How many of you Members know that the Office of Price Administration, and I offer this for the RECORD, have sent out Form 298–49 which contains questions on both sides to be answered by the person who is a renter so that they can get more propaganda and make it possible to keep their jobs a little bit longer, and at the same time strangling the fellow who wants to help the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this OPA Form 298–49 is as follows:

OPA Form 298–49.

Form approved.
Budget Bureau No. 08–R1728.
Approval expires 9–30–47.

TENANT'S STATEMENT

1. Address of premises _____
2. Apartment or room No. ____ Number of rooms in your apartment ____ Number of occupants ____
3. Check type of rental: ☐ Furnished. ☐ Unfurnished.
4. Rent paid $_____ per _____.
(a) When is rent due? _____
(b) To whom is rent paid? _____
(Name) (Address)
(c) Since what date have you paid the above rent? _____
(Month) (Day) (Year)
(d) Do you get rent receipts? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.
(e) Do you pay by check? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.
(f) Check services supplied by landlord which are included in your rent. ☐ Garage. ☐ Heat. ☐ Water. ☐ Gas. ☐ Electricity. ☐ Refrigerator.
(g) When did you move into the above accommodations? _____
(Month) (Day) (Year)
5. If you were living in the above accommodations on May 1, 1945, please state what rent you were paying on that date: $_____ per _____
6. If your rent was increased or decreased during your tenancy:
(a) When did the change occur? _____
(Month) (Day) (Year)
(b) What amount did you pay before change in rent? $_____ per _____
(c) What amount did you pay after change in rent? $_____ per _____
(d) State reason for change in rent_____
7. Has the landlord reduced any of the services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment since you moved into these accommodations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.
If the answer is yes, state:
(a) Service, etc., which has been decreased _____
(b) Date decrease occured _____
8. Did you pay extra money or a bonus to the landlord, agent, or superintendent in order to obtain the accommodations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No. If yes, state:
(a) To whom extra money or bonus was paid _____
(b) Amount of extra money or bonus_____
(c) Date extra money or bonus was paid_____
9. Did you pay a brokerage fee, commission, or reward in order to obtain accommodations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No. If yes, state:
(a) To whom paid _____
(b) Amount paid _____
(c) Date paid _____
10. Did you pay any security deposit in addition to your first month's rent to the landlord, agent, or superintendent? ☐ Yes. ☐ No. If yes, state:
(a) To who security deposit was paid _____
(b) Amount of security deposit paid _____
(c) Date paid _____
11. Did you purchase furniture or other property from landlord, agent, or superintendent in order to obtain these accommodations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.
If yes, state:
(a) From whom purchased _____
(b) Amount paid _____
(c) Date paid _____
(d) Items purchased _____
12. Did you pay for painting or decorating of accommodations? ☐ Yes. ☐ No.
If yes, state:
(a) To whom payment was made _____
(b) Amount paid _____
(c) Date paid _____
13. Has the landlord refunded any money to you? ☐ Yes. ☐ No If yes, state:
(a) Who paid the money to you _____
(b) Amount refunded to you _____
(c) Date refunded to you _____
14. Please give name and address of landlord of accommodations in (1) above
_____
(Name) (Address)
15. If you are not living at address in (1) above:
(a) When did you move out _____
(Month)
_____
(Day) (Year)
(b) Give your present address _____
_____
(Number and street) (City and State)
16. Comments: (Brief)
_____
(Date) (Tenant's signature)

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a minute to read a letter which I received from a man in my district. I have received many of them from my district, but this one is a very fair letter because the writer admits in his letter his own position. It reads as follows:

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *April 12, 1947.*

MR. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT,
Congressman, Tenth District,
Tulare, Calif.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: Of course, I realize that I am in the real-estate business, and therefore possibly prejudiced, but at the same time there is such a thing as justice.

It is probably difficult for anyone to get all of the figures, but tremendous sums are being paid the farmer, as well as others, for the purpose of maintaining prices and/or subsidizing operations. The landlord, however, has taken a terrific beating and still continues to get no relief.

The country's landlords have not asked for subsidies, although the Government has spent outlandish amounts supplying public housing, which is nothing more than a subsidy to renters.

All of the rent-control administrators that I have come in contact with have been of such a caliber that they were just filling in with that particular task until they could get something more stable, as most of them had never held a job of any responsibility.

We have had one here who could tell your landlord or landlord's agent, how the poor tenant should be protected, but at the same time he could spend all of his money betting on the horses.

Now the tenants are receiving the enclosed questionnaire and letter from the OPA Enforcement Division.

It would appear that they are trying to again develop more propaganda and publicity for consumption by the Congress in order to keep their bureau alive.

I personally do not own any rental property that would be affected by the continuation of the OPA rental program. I do have charge of approximately 85 rentals, however, and I can say that if the rents were increased or even doubled my personal income in way of fees from handling of these properties would be no different than it is now, so I am not discussing the mattetr from a selfish angle.

I can also state that momentarily I have actually benefited from the rent control program as many properties that the landlords would have kept as rentals have been sold because of the OPA policy.

I believe this is true over the entire country, and it still gets back to what has been said so many times, namely:

"The OPA has kept rentals from increasing, but there are no rentals."

If you are given an opportunity, I hope you will give some consideration to this subject.

Very truly yours,

WARDE D. WATSON.

Mr. Chairman, in making the statements I have made, I have tried to be fair and consider the facts. As I said, I yield to no Member in my desire to improve the housing conditions in my own State as well as in the other States, and I say to you sincerely that if we can eliminate some of the Government controls and make it possible that people can build like we did prior to the war, we will achieve success.

Now, some people will say that many articles cannot be purchased. I can cite an instance where a gentleman in my congressional district, who manufactures articles from pig iron, was making every endeavor to keep up his pig-iron operation to produce some of the necessities mentioned on the floor today. He was told, "We cannot provide you with pig iron on account of the shortage of coal, and for that reason we will have to deny you the right to have any additional pig iron." That went on until his whole allotment of pig iron was practically shut off, but at the same time that he was appealing to the Federal agencies to get some additional pig iron, in Los Angeles, Calif., there were 15,000 tons of pig iron loaded, on the boat, being shipped to Soviet Russia, and yet we did not have any for our own manufacturers to provide these much-needed essentials for homes for the veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to depart from the subject under discussion today and to talk about another matter of vital importance to the American people.

I am disturbed at reports that funds for the information program conducted by the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs may be eliminated from the State Department's appropriations bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Such action, I believe, would be a false and dangerous economy, plainly against the public interest. Elimination of the Department's international information activities would, I feel, deal a tremendous blow to American prestige abroad, at a time when it is vitally important that the American story be told overseas, and that an even greater effort be made to combat the misrepresentations of the United States which are so prevalent abroad. Withdrawal of the United States from this field will create, in many areas, a vacuum, which will inevitably be filled by some other country, not necessarily interested in telling the truth about this country, or in giving the facts about the United States and its foreign policies.

Created a year ago last January in a drastically reduced merger of OWI and the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the OIC has a staff of approximately 3,000 in the United States, and in the more than 60 countries in which the United States maintains diplomatic missions. Each week it broadcasts approximately 400 hours of news, music and feature programs to Latin America, Europe and the Far East. These programs are carried in 25 languages, including Russian, which has recently been added. It is planned soon to add also Greek and Turkish to the list. These radio operations account for approximately half of the OIC's budget.

The OIC also maintains more than 60 information libraries in 41 countries. Its documentary films produced by the Government, and by such American interests as the United States Steel Corp., the National Tuberculosis Association and the Westinghouse Electric Co., are shown each year to upward of 100,000,000 people abroad. The OIC also sends in Morse code a daily news bulletin to our embassies and legations, some of which is made available to local news services, editors and other interested persons at the point of reception. It also assists in the international exchange of teachers and students. All these, and other similar activities are carried on pursuant to the Presidential directive "to see to it that other peoples receive a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government."

Why is it so vitally important that this full and fair picture of American life be presented to foreign peoples? It is important because misrepresentations of the United States and its policies are widely prevalent abroad. A good example of this is the current misrepresentation and distortion to the Greek and Turkish peoples by the Moscow radio of the purposes of our proposed aid to these countries, and the policies of the United States Government. Since the announcement of the aid program by the President, the propagandists of Moscow and its satellites have spared no effort to misinform the world about the United States policy. The Moscow radio has charged that this country has embarked upon an imperialistic expansion program. Members of Congress who have taken the lead in explaining the aid program have been the targets of Moscow propagandists, in what appears to be a carefully planned policy of impugning the motives of a friendly foreign government.

In many parts of the world, particularly areas lying behind the so-called iron curtain, and in those in which the press is controlled by the government, or in which few people understand English, or can afford to buy American periodicals, private American agencies are unable to operate, or can only do an inadequate job. Through its information service, the Government must continue to do much of the job of presenting the facts about the United States. For this reason, the OIC is an essential instrument of our foreign policy. As Secretary Marshall said in a press conference on February 7:

It seems to me absolutely essential that from somewhere—in this case the United States—we endeavor to cover the earth with the truth, pure truth without any twist or turn or implication in the midst of this riot of propaganda. We should have an establishment—to act steadily and to our credit before the world for making a purely accurate statement of the facts as nearly as can be determined with no leaning to the one side or another.

Last year, as a member of a House Military Affairs subcommittee, I visited the Pacific Far East on a tour of inspection. I saw at first hand there evidence of the extent to which Soviet Russia is moving in that area ideologically. Soviet propagandists are numerous, and their activities cover a wide field. They spare no effort and their funds appear limitless. To meet this propaganda, we need to make a more aggressive effort to sell Americanism, and the OIC is an effective instrument for doing this job.

At this point I would like to insert some excerpts from a recent article by Ernest Lindley, the well-known columnist, in the Foreign Service Journal, Propaganda—Neglected Arm of Policy:

We have an attractive line of goods to advertise—our way of life, including our standard of living, and the kind of world we favor. Our declared objectives seem to be in tune with the aspirations of most of the people of the world. One might say, therefore, that at the top level of planning our propaganda has been sound, and that on the whole it has been well expressed in our major official utterances and actions. Even at this level, however, we have tended to neglect and waste some of our assets; for example, the anti-imperialistic reputation which made so many of the colonial peoples look to us with confidence. Reduction in armaments might also be cited as a problem in which, through lack of alertness or of foresight, we permitted the Russians to score some strokes of propaganda at our expense.

In the main, however, our weaknesses in the realm of propaganda are in the follow-up, in seeing that the facts about our way of life and our purposes get down to the grass roots and sidewalks of the world, in countering the propaganda directed against us. To do this requires machinery and money—not much compared to our Military Establishment—but more than we are using now.

Our propaganda should be based on the truth, as we honestly see it. By being scrupulously truthful we can best exploit the serious potential weakness in so much of the propaganda directed against us. Truthful propaganda, moreover, is the only kind of open propaganda which a democratic government, exposed constantly to examination and criticism at home, can use effectively. Finally, and most important, it will, in the long run, help to build up confidence in us.

American publications and other private agencies can help, but they cannot do the whole job. A big part of it must be done by machinery operated or organized by the Government. The overseas information program of the Department of State seems to me to be a good start. But its resources will need to be expanded and elaborated.

We have tended to underrate propaganda. We need to give it much more thought and attention than we have in the past—both to disseminating our own and to breaking up propaganda attacks on us. We should give the planning and execution of our propaganda policies and much care as we give military policy and international trade and financial policies.

We do not need to take a licking in propagation. But we will unless we realize its potency and exploit it—our kind of propaganda, based on truth—with something approaching the vigor and skill of the

vast propaganda machines being employed against us.

The OIC, I believe, on the whole has done a good job, and this is the judgment of many outside observers who have had an opportunity to survey its operations in the field. Here are a few typical comments:

A small group of 5 Americans and 22 non-American, including messenger boys, comprise the State Department's information service team in Turkey, where it is doing a remarkable job of selling America. (Constantine Brown, in the Washington Evening Star, April 5, 1947.)

For my money, the most effective public servants we have abroad are the men and women who run the United States Information Service. (Edwin A. Lahey, in a despatch to the Chicago Daily News from Oslo, November 22, 1946.)

In Peiping, in Mukden, Singapore, Rangoon, and Saigon I have found that USIS has been quietly but effectively propagandizing the United States as a place where wheat is grown, dams are built, and children are fed milk. The USIS movies are effective. Its news releases are complete and undistorted—when I was in Rangoon USIS issued the complete text of Marshall's statement on China, whereas the agencies offered only a couple of paragraphs. Best of all, I think, are the USIS reading rooms, often the only libraries available to the public of a given country. The eagerness with which the brown and yellow men devour American books and magazines is impressive. (Robert Sherrod, foreign correspondent for Time magazine, in a letter to Henry R. Luce, February 12, 1947.)

We Americans who lived in Paris before the war welcome this little American library on French soil. No longer need we bear the brunt of disseminating the true facts about America answering, often not wisely or well, their strange and laughable questions. (Vaima Clark, from Paris in the Kansas City Star, December 9, 1946.)

Whether it's a load of 60-millimeter film which OIC men are lugging by oxcart and raft to the interior, or whether it is a load of water-purifying equipment which institute doctors are taking to a town in the Amazon valley, these men are making the idea of America stick in the minds of the people. (Frederick Oechsner, Scripps-Howard staff writer, from Rio de Janerio, Washington Daily News, December 6, 1946.)

Through tens of thousands of agencies people in every country are told every day that we are undemocratic, militaristic, reactionary, culturally backward people intent upon an imperialistic adventure. Without any contact or evidence to the contrary or means of knowing anything about what we are doing or thinking or saying, good people everywhere are likely to accept this libel. By daily broadcasts in many languages—by libraries and information centers and use of all modern means of communication and interchange of information and trained personnel, the department is simply spreading the truth. And truth is the very cornerstone of any human understanding of international harmony. (Ralph W. Page, in the Philadelphia Bulletin, March 28, 1947.)

The education of Asia to the values of democracy as opposed to the regimentation of communism is not so large an order as it appears at the first look. At the moment we are only picking at it through the Christian colleges in China, a few exchange scholarships, commercial distribution of a few thousand American books, newspapers, and periodicals, and through the United States Information Service of our State Department, which furnishes news to the papers of Asia and maintains reading libraries in the capitals where we have embassies, legations, or consulates. Expansion of the latter activity and of scholarships would seem to be the quickest and easiest way to reach the largest number. * * * There is no iron curtain between the United States and most of Asia, only the barrier of distance and the lack of funds to buy American newspapers, books, and periodicals or to send students to the United States for study. For the richest country in the world, that should not be an insurmountable barrier to a billion potential friends. (Foster Hailey, editorial writer for the New York Times, reporting on his Far Eastern trip in the New York Times Magazine, April 13, 1947.)

Recently, in an effort to present the American story to the Russian people, the OIC, through the Voice of America, initiated a daily Russian-language broadcast. Reports from Moscow indicate that these broadcasts are getting through and are being listened to.

According to Drew Middleton, in a dispatch to the New York Times on March 27, the Voice of America program to Russia "is winning an increasing number of listeners not only in Moscow but also in the Ukraine, White Russia, and several provincial cities of the Russian federation."

Said the Middleton article further:

Generally the programs are attracting more and more listeners, they are getting publicity by word of mouth, and they are contributing to an understanding of the United States here. If they can increase this understanding then they will help to solve a number of the problems in our relations with the Soviet Union from the Russian side.

A committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, after a study of OIC operations a few weeks ago, concluded that the Russian broadcasts are serving an important purpose. The members of this committee were George Cornish, managing editor, New York Herald Tribune; Ben M. McKelway, editor, Washington Star; and Hamilton Owens, editor, Baltimore Sun. Said the committee in its report:

The work of the OIC in general and the Russian broadcasts particularly are still in the experimental stage. Considering that the assignment given covers the whole world, the expenditure of the Office is modest. There may be waste in some respects, and further experience may suggest that some aspects of the undertaking are ill-advised. That will be a matter for departmental or congressional determination. We are convinced, however, that the Russian broadcasts as at present conducted are serving an important purpose. We believe the State Department would be justified in asking for the funds necessary to provide a clearer signal reaching farther into Russia and less subject to the natural interferences which are now so frequent.

Last summer the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported a bill authorizing a foreign information service for the State Department, but Congress adjourned before action on this legislation could be completed. The State Department some time ago sent to Congress the draft of a similar bill as part of its list of urgent legislation. It is my hope that hearings on this can soon be held and that it will receive early and favorable action. It is essential that Congress assure a continuation of the Department's information activities and that the program be given adequate financial support by the Congress.

As the New York Herald Tribune pointed out in a recent editorial, our whole foreign policy is now committed to a course which renders essential a sound information policy. It would be a false economy that would wreck a basic policy for which nearly everyone recognizes the need and so deprive the American people of an instrument which is increasingly important to the peaceful fulfillment of their postwar aims.

Secretary Marshall needs a vigorous information program in carrying out the objectives of our foreign policy. This program must be regarded as an integral part of our national defense, and if it is eliminated we may well emerge the losers in the war of ideas, a loss that might prove as disastrous to us as actual defeat on the battlefield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, there are some parts of this bill with which I am in full accord. I approve of that portion of the bill which provides for the decontrol of materials so that houses can be built for veterans and other people. I am in full accord with that part of the bill which provides for the voluntary agreement between property owner and tenant for a lease, although I do not think the ceiling fixed is high enough at 15 percent. I approve of those portions of the bill which make conditions between property owners and tenants voluntary. I am unalterably opposed to that portion of the bill which provides for a continuation of rent control without in any way providing relief to the eight or ten million property owners of this country, most of them small property owners.

Rent control undoubtedly served a useful purpose during the war. In a few days we will be in the third year after the war, and still arbitrary rent control remains to plague, irritate, and take away without any chance of recovery the income of a segment of our population, the property owners, a vast majority of them small owners, the most substantial in the Nation.

What have they done that they should receive this kind of treatment on the part of the American Congress? Nothing except in their productive years to work and save and sacrifice and then build a house or two to provide some return, an income in their declining years. They are the self-reliant people who prefer to remain free and independent and have something to remain independent on in their old age, and not become the wards of their Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They paid taxes on that property all those years, to maintain the States, the counties, the municipalities, and the school systems.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Mississippi is right about that. I am coming to that in a moment.

I do not think there is any dispute on the part of any Member of this House, no matter on which side of the aisle he sits,

that the cost of maintenance of property since rent control went into effect has increased somewhere between 70 and 80 percent. We placed a ceiling on rent, but we did not place any ceiling on the tax collector. No ceiling was placed upon the decorator, no ceiling was placed upon the coal man, no ceiling was placed upon the plumber, no ceiling was placed upon the light bill, the gas bill, no ceiling was placed on the water bill, no ceiling was placed on the carpenter, and no ceiling was placed upon the janitor, or the manager of the building, yet the owner of the property must sit idly by and see the savings of his earlier years vanish through an arbitrary rent control that does not recognize the right of the individual property owner of this country. Why should they be asked to subsidize an increase in living costs and the tenants make no contribution to it?

I say that it is a travesty on justice that eight or ten million of our people should receive that kind of treatment at the hands of the American Congress.

I do not know what the experience has been in your part of the country with the administration of rent control, but I do know something about it in my area of the country, in Detroit, Mich., and its metropolitan area. Any home owner or property owner who sought relief had two strikes on him before he even entered the building. His complaint was laid aside to wait weeks and months before it was ever given consideration. But if a tenant went in to complain about even something, that person received immediate attention—indicating of course that the rent-control administration in my area of the country was biased and prejudiced against the property owner. The people in my area became so discouraged, if I am to judge from the communications they sent me, that they no longer made an appeal for relief and simply suffered in silence and saw their income taken away unjustly. This bill intends to continue that thing at least for another 8 months without any relief whatever to these people.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. As a member of the committee, I made the statement that I found in discussing with other Members of Congress and during the hearings that most of the Members found in their districts a great deal of the same arbitrary action on the part of the administration of this law.

Mr. DONDERO. It shows that treatment was quite general throughout the United States.

Unless this inequity is corrected I intend to vote against the bill. There will be no houses or other rental units offered for rent as long as the Government controls rent. Rent control has contributed to the housing shortage, because control has discouraged home ownership and the building of homes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to impress upon the members of this House the importance of this legislation to my district. Just about 99—and as many 9's as anyone would like to add—percent of the people of my district rent apartments, and any increase in rents will hit them extremely hard and right between the eyes. The average income of the people of my district is about $2,500 to $3,000 per year. So, in considering this bill, perhaps I can see even a little better than some of my colleagues who represent farming communities and who might not feel so keenly the effect of legislation such as we are considering, the Hobson's choice we have in this bill. Because that is exactly what it is—Hobson's choice.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the average rental paid in your community?

Mr. JAVITS. The average rental paid in my community would vary between $45 and $60 a month.

In view of the enormously enhanced cost of living which the people of my district in common with the other citizens of the middle class are experiencing now, the margin for any more payment of rental is nil. Living costs have gone up some 60 percent over prewar prices, and rent control is the one thing keeping ends together as far as my people are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The average income, you say, is $3,500?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I said $2,500 to $3,000. If the gentleman will figure out the average city family's budget, he will see exactly what I mean—there is no margin for rent increases. That is the hard fact.

The main point in this whole bill is that it does, in substance, continue the rent-control situation on presently occupied rental housing as is. That situation must be continued—there can be no question about that. With all the discussion that has taken place on the floor about how there can be more housing, the answer is that there is no more housing now and no matter what you do, there can be little more housing until the time when the controls under this bill will have expired. It cannot take less than from 9 months to a year, and will probably take much longer, for anything to manifest itself so far as an improvement in the housing situation is concerned. We have to take care of the people in the more than 16,000,000 rental units which we now have occupied, and must act upon the facts as they are now, not as they will be in the future.

I feel very badly and I think every veteran feels very badly about what I call the American tragedy of housing. The tragedy is that of every veteran living in substandard housing or doubled up with relatives, who can walk down Fifth Avenue and see that a New York department store has put up a new magnificent building, and yet be told that it is impossible to construct an ordinary home for ordinary fellows who fought the war.

One of the great defects of this bill is that it fails to tighten up on that situation. If this whole title I were stricken out of the bill it would be a much better bill. Nevertheless, I would like to point out in fairness to the committee that at least they have done one thing, if nothing else, and that is they have continued to face realistically the rental situation by holding on to the control, a relaxation of which to an enormous proportion of the families of American would mean the difference between economic life and death.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Under existing law, as it has been for some time past, we have had the most drastic Government controls over all of this commercial housing, but despite that you still have all these race tracks and commercial buildings going up. It certainly is not the fault of the committee which brought in the legislation in the preceding session that that condition has existed.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the gentleman that all the ills of which he speaks will only be increased if this very vital question of commercial construction is left out of this bill, as is now proposed. It is not an answer to say that there are ills. We know that. It is an answer to say that the ills will not be increased by this legislation.

Mr. KUNKEL. I do not think that is an answer.

Mr. JAVITS. We talk a good deal about prices coming down. We feel we are headed for a deep depression because of the bad adjustment as between prices and wages. How can we therefore consider anything which will materially increase the biggest single item of the budget of so many American families. Rent constitutes 20 percent of the budget of the average family living in rented accommodations. How can we seriously stand here and talk about any across-the-board increase in the rents of the country? What we have been preaching is that cost of living prices must come down and this is the place to keep them down.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I warned some weeks ago that we might have brought before us in this House a rent-control bill which would in no way control rents. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has described this bill sufficiently clearly to make it plain that if this bill goes through without amendments, and as it is now written, it will be utterly impossible to hold rents in line in this country.

If the bill goes through as it now is, we can expect the same situation so far as rents are concerned, as we had on meat. The lack of any adequate enforcement machinery combined with the decontrols legalized in this bill could mean that about January 1 we can expect such a great number of inequities to exist throughout the country, that there would be an uprising from the people all over the country asking to do away altogether with a rent-control program which is no rent-control program at all.

The result will be that rents will jump not the 15 percent talked about in this bill, but anywhere from 15 to 150 percent. No one can tell where the final ceiling will be.

There is meat on the market today but at what price?

There may be housing tomorrow, but at what price? The evictions of hundreds of thousands of people.

Either we need a rent-control program, or we do not. Passing a bill with the name "rent control" pinned to it is not going to help anybody.

There seems to be those in Congress who are not worried because the cost of living has risen. There seem to be those who do not hestitate now to increase the rent of 16,000,000 American families living in rented units. The welfare of 50 to 60 million people apparently seems to be a matter of little concern to some Members of this House. Some apparently are not afraid of already bursting family budgets. They are willing to take the top off.

The hypocrisy of this bill is sickening. You cannot have rent control unless you can enforce rent control. The bill forces the renter to go to the courts for adjustment of violations in rentals.

Those of you who live in city districts know the tremendous pressure on the housing market in those districts, where people are living, not just doubled up, but in cellars, in garages, in cars, in tents, in the back of lots. To remove rent controls in the face of such a drastic housing shortage is to invite trouble—to invite evictions.

Families will not be able to carry their cases to court in time to prevent evictions. They do not know the economic facts that they should have when they do come to court. The landlord associations will have the facts for the landlords. You can be sure of that. The courts do not have investigators. Cases will be settled on the basis of one-sided facts. Cases will not be brought in many, many instances because renters will not have the money to bring them to court. Or if they are brought, months will elapse before they are heard for there will be rent increases from one end of the country to the other. Where does Congress suggest the evicted families go. If we do not have a rent control system with powers of enforcement, we do not have rent control.

I am going to move to strike out title II and to replace a simple continuation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Why do we need rent control today? We need it today because the same elements that made rent control necessary a year ago still exist. The same problems that existed a year ago are with us today, only added to our housing problems we have the increased cost of living to reckon with.

The Bureau of Census figures for January 1947, showed that 2,200,000 city families—not farm—did not have houses or apartments of their own.

They were living with others. In addition to that 300,000 families were living in rented rooms, hotels, or trailers, garages, cellars, or wherever they could find a place. The Bureau of the Census survey made last summer and fall in 70 cities on veterans' housing conditions shows that in the majority of those cities between 25 to 45 percent of the married veterans had no homes of their own and were living in rented rooms, hotels, and trailers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California three additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We have heard a lot of talk on this floor, we have heard a lot of talk in the country, about the veterans, but there is very little consideration of the veteran here today. No wonder five veterans' organizations are against this bill.

The veterans were away on official business by the will of the American people when the housing that we have filled up in this country. Now they have returned and want a home of their own and we not only wreck our rent-control program but we wreck what is left of the miserable, pitiful, little veterans' housing program. In all decency we have to think of these veterans who have come home, who want to start their own families. They went from home and fought a war so that our families could be protected. Today they are living in trailers, garages, cellars, or living doubled up with their families, living under such pressure and such crowded conditions that their marriages are going on the rocks.

The question before this Congress is the same today as it was a year ago. In a housing market where there are not enough houses to go around, does the Government help the veteran? Are we prepared to say to him, "You went off and fought a war for us, thanks; glad you have come back"? The housing is all filled up, there is not any place for you, sorry; we feel sorry but we have got to get back to normal conditions.

The housing conditions in this Nation are not normal, my colleagues. That is a fact that no amount of arguing on this floor will change; housing conditions are not normal.

They may be normal in some of your rural districts but they are not normal in any city district in this country, and until they are normal, until we do provide homes for the American people by setting up a program that will permit the building of houses within a price range that the great mass of American people who need homes can afford to buy or rent, we are not fulfilling the obligations of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is an old adage that says that history repeats itself. Today on the House floor we are seeing history repeat itself in regard to the wrecking of rent controls, for there is happening now that which happened last year in the wrecking of the Price Control Act. We were promised great things when the Price Control Act was wrecked. We were told that increased production would occur, that increased distribution would occur, and prices would go down. Prices have not gone down and it has been about 9 months since price control was wrecked. We are told in the case of rent control that if we just ease up on rent control we are going to have a lot of houses and all that sort of thing. My prediction is you are not going to have any more success with your program of wrecking rent control, than you did in wrecking price control.

We have heard today on this floor about a lot of empty houses. As far as I know, there is not one in my district. May I say, and I hope this is carried as a headline in every paper in my district, if there are any apartment house owners or house owners in my district who would not take the OPA price ceiling for his apartment or house from a veteran who has returned from the war, I would like to see that man rise before some veterans' organization and explain why he keeps his house or apartment empty. If he was losing money at $40 a month, then he is losing more money by zero dollars per month and I say that he is not necessarily a patriotic American citizen exercising his rights. I should say he is a contemptible coward for not making a home for some veteran who was over there fighting so that he could maintain the title to that piece of property. I will let that statement stand.

In your phony concern for the little landlord you have wept crocodile tears. Why not offer an amendment, and I will support it, giving the landlord with two or three or four houses a justifiable increase? Why do you not bring an honest bill to this floor if you are so concerned with the little landlord? We know that the rents as a whole should be raised some. We know there is a justifiable case for some rent increases, but why do you not bring an honest bill in here which will allow an over-all national increase up to a justifiable percentage, then put enforcement provisions in the bill that will make that much of a raise allowable and no more of a raise? You bring in a phoney bill, a fraud, a hypocritical piece of legislative hokum. You wreck the building materials control, so far as the veterans are concerned, which was designed to accelerate the production of other scarce building items, and you tie that up with rent control, something that it should not be tied to. You have to swallow a bitter pill to get some sweet. I think we ought to have some courage; you ought to bring out a real rent control bill. If a case can be made, and I think it can be made for a reasonable increase, then let us vote it up or down honestly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is making a fine contribution to this discussion and I want to congratulate him. Of course, if this bill is as outlined in the gentleman's remarks I think we better not have any bill at all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right. I think we ought to be honest with the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes. We ought to be honest with them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am agreeable to giving a justifiable increase. I am willing to leave it up to regional boards, if necessary, as to how much it should be

in a particular area. But this phoney lease arrangement whereby a lease can be signed and the person moves out, then from that time on there is no provision for control, along with a lot of other phoney provisions I would like to talk about, makes it no bill at all.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman knows that under the present rent-control law the Administrator can make an adjustment if he sees fit. The trouble is they never do it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman, there are many inequitable cases which have arisen under the present rent-control law, but I think we should cure them rather than to offer a piece of legislation whereby the inequities will be multiplied a millionfold.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman is asking for what is in the present law, but it has never been done.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let us make an attempt to do it instead of destroying the means of having any type of control.

Mr. KUNKEL. They have been attempting to do it for years and years and years and they have never done it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman talks about individual cases. I know there have been some inequities, but there has also been a great saving to the mass of American renters, those who were working in war plants, under the present price-control law.

Mr. KUNKEL. I would like to know whether the gentleman's object is to save money for the renters or to get a just law?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. We have witnessed here on the floor this afternoon one of the strangest debates that I have ever listened to. Except for the chairman of our committee—and I have the very highest regard and respect and admiration for him—there has not been a single Member who has stood here in the well of this House who has not apologized for this atrocious bill which is now before the House of Representatives. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because the members of our committee have not been forthright in the consideration of this legislation. We have attempted to bring out here an omnibus bill which does not face the issue on housing, which does not face the issue on rent control, which does not face the issue on the great problem facing millions of our veterans today.

The net result of it is that the men who do not want rent control are opposed to this bill; the Members who want rent control are opposed to this bill; the people of this House who are justifiably concerned about the pitiful plight of our veterans are opposed to this bill, and the people who do not care about their plight are opposed to this bill. Why? Because we have done a terrible job of draftsmanship, and we have attempted to bring here to the floor of this Congress a bill that every one would have to vote for for some reason or another. Now, I represent a congressional district where it would be the worst type of injustice to thousands of Americans to remove rent control completely. I represent a congressional district like so many of you do where there are countless thousands of veterans looking for places to live and, as the gentlewoman from California has said, who are now living in trailers and in tents and in cellars. Yet, we bring here today a bill which, No. 1, removes what little help we were giving the veterans in the housing program.

It does not matter how long we debate this issue. Any man who honestly considers this bill cannot help but reach the conclusion that if this bill is enacted in its present form then the veterans housing program can be completely forgotten about. Then there is this sop in the bill, this business about you must get a permit to build a race track or a permit to build a honky tonk. Was there ever presented to this body a more pitiful compromise regarding the men who fought the battles for our country for 4 long years, and who demand a place to live in the land which we all love? Yes, I sat during the committee hearings and I followed this bill, and I probably will vote for the bill because I am in the position that so many others are in. We must continue some form of rent control, but this bill, as someone has said, is a travesty upon justice, and I think the American people ought to know about it.

Let us talk a minute about the rent-control section in the bill. I voted in the committee for a 10-percent increase across the board, and I am going to vote here today for a 10-percent-across-the-board increase in rent. And why did I do that? Because the way the bill is now drafted we completely open up ceilings on new construction. We completely eliminate ceilings of the person who has not been patriotic enough to rent his home during the war. Now we say that he can rent it for any amount that he pleases. So the net result is that here is the little man who has patriotically abided by the regulations of his country, who has attempted to live within the law, and he must rent his property under a control ceiling and his neighbor on both sides—well, the sky is the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I ask the members of this Committee, in all fairness, in all honor, in all decency, is this a fair bill? Is this an honest approach to the problems now facing the little man who has invested funds in real estate and in property in this country?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. In connection with this across-the-board increase that has been discussed a little, there have been a good many rental properties constructed since the freeze date. On those properties rentals were fixed by agencies other than the OPA. They were based on current construction costs and on an entirely different basis from the basis under which the rents were fixed that were frozen on April 1, 1941. Would it not promote a perpetuation of inequity to permit an increase on those properties, and, if an across-the-board increase is granted, could it not be restricted so as not to include those properties where rents were fixed by agencies other than the OPA?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I would think so, but I have not studied the subject.

The members of the Committee will be very much interested in knowing some of the things that happened on this bill. On March 16, I believe it was, our committee voted for an across-the-board increase in rents. We were told then that on April 16 the committee would meet again to report out the bill. One week went by, two weeks went by, three weeks went by, and all kinds of huddles were held by my very good and esteemed friends on the other side. Finally, the committee met. The so-called across-the-board amendment was rejected and in its place, again to bring out a bill that everyone was supposed to be for and no one was supposed to be against, was substituted the amendment of my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] which, in effect, as a distinguished minority member of the committee has pointed out, will result in a 15-percent-across-the-board increase. So that this bill is an obvious attempt on the part of the majority of this House to play both sides of the street, to be for rent control and be against rent control, to be for the veterans' housing program and to be against the veterans' housing program.

I wish that it were possible to send this bill back to the committee and make the committee come out with an honest, straightforward bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman offer a motion to recommit the bill?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. A motion to recommit will be offered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this will probably be one of the most unpolitic speeches I have made since I have been a Member of the House, because I, in common with a great many others here, come from a district in which there are thousands of rental properties.

Much has been said about the veterans of the last war, the men who were out fighting and dying for certain principles. Let me say that the continuance of Governmental controls over the destinies and properties of free Americans was not one of the principles for which I fought.

The basic issue before the House today, as I see it, is not only a question of continued rent control but is also a question as to whether or not the legal possession of property carries with it not only obligations but a few long-forgotten priv-

ileges and prerogatives as well. If we are going to play into the hands of collectivist government here at home while we strive to stem communism, statism, and collectivism abroad, then we are certainly working both ends against the middle.

For the first time, and I am sorry to say it, I cannot wholeheartedly support a measure brought forth by the leadership. I want to see the bill amended because I think we are temporizing with legitimate freedom of action under law. I am further convinced that we are temporizing with principle, and the basic principle at stake as I have said, is whether a man's wife, a man's home, a man's automobile, or a man's shirt, is his to have and to hold, or whether they belong to the State. That to my mind is the only question involved in the debate here today.

I am a veteran. Do not lay the housing shortage or all the multitude of the veterans' troubles solely at the door of rent control. Lay them instead at the door of Federal agencies which have permitted the construction of warehouses, cocktail bars, bowling alleys, and every other type of nonvital construction. We can get veterans' construction started in quantity, and no one in this House wants veterans under their own roofs any more than I do. I think the greatest thing this country can do, the greatest achievement it can make in applied democracy, would be to put every veteran under his own roof in his own home. But you are not going to do it by rent control or by completely haphazard assignment of priorities. You are going to keep them out of more homes and apartments than you will ever succeed in locating or building for them under a system of restrictive controls.

It is my considered opinion that unless Government controls are removed as a restriction against private ownership and construction of homes, we are taking the shortest and most direct route to complete all-out collectivism, statism, socialism, and eventually communism.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think these controls deter people from building homes?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I do not think there is any doubt in what the gentleman says. I have people in my district—people who have saved all their lives to get a few dollars together to build two or three units and who are today under the obligation of disposing of that property because they cannot even pay the upkeep on it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the gentleman if he will support an amendment which I intend to offer which will give such relief to the owners of two or three units?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I will tell the gentleman my colleague from California that I will support one thing, and that is the right of the American citizen to own and operate his own property.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am very glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman who has stated he is against controls vote to take away all controls on rent?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Yes; very definitely, and, if necessary, I will sacrifice my political head to a strong conviction that the course of Government control in time of peace is the path of eventual destruction of American freedom.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I want to ask you as a veteran if it is not true that by freezing rents you are also freezing occupancy. Therefore, the people who were overseas during the war cannot secure occupancy when they get home.

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is right, and what is more important is the fact that you are freezing freedom, individual initiative, incentive to new construction, and the hearts of men and women who love this land and its institutions.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Do you think anybody in this country is going to build a house for rent as long as the Government controls rent?

Mr. JACKSON of California. If anyone does, I should seriously question not only his judgment but his sanity as well.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not a fact that statistics show that 36 percent more people are occupying houses where there is one person than where there are two people?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I do not think there is any question about it. I know that in my own district there are homes and apartments standing empty today because they cannot profitably be operated under existing circumstances.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of trying to get clarified in my own mind one or two things in this bill. For that purpose I ask the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

On Monday of this week, the Rent Administrator, through some mysterious process I wholly fail to understand, or possibly through some mistake, in the last dying days of his agency and on the eve of our consideration of this legislation, decontrolled a large number of defense rental areas throughout 22 States. Among those areas decontrolled were 2 counties in my district, both seashore counties, side by side, with precisely the same problems. One was decontrolled. The other was not decontrolled, with the perfectly natural result that the tenants in 1 county feel that they have been discriminated against, and they have, and the landlords in the other county feel that they have been discriminated against, and they have. The question I have in mind is this: On page 12, subsection (d) of your bill there is a definition of "Defense rental areas." It seems to me to mean that any area which was under rent control on March 1, 1947, is under control upon the passage of this bill, notwithstanding this order of April 27. My question is whether, if this act is passed, that will not, in effect, nullify the action of the Administrator, which was taken only 2 or 3 days ago, and which was arbitrary, ill-timed, discriminatory, and unfair. What does the Chairman think about that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the language on page 12 and at the top of page 13 is adopted, it will not change in any respect the authority of the Administrator to decontrol any property which is now under control. The Administrator has always had authority to decontrol an area. He could control, as he has in the case of the gentleman's district, one county, and decontrol another county. An area does not necessarily have to be a county area. This bill continues authority for decontrol of any area, or any housing accommodation within any area.

Mr. HAND. I understand that, but my point is that this bill defines areas which are going to be controlled under this bill, as those which were under control on March 1, 1947. This decontrolled area was under control then.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That language prevents any properties from coming under control which were not under control on March 1, 1947.

Mr. HAND. I am not sure that I agree with the gentleman's view on this. I have one further question. The chairman knows that in seashore or resort areas, seasonal rentals—rentals, we will say between May and October—were not controlled and have not been controlled for the last couple of years. Does this bill in any way change that situation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the property was not under control on March 1, 1947, it cannot be put under control by the enactment of this act.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say briefly that I feel we must extend rent controls for some period, because of the acute shortage in housing in this country. I feel very strongly the strength of the arguments that have been made that landlords have been inequitably treated in many cases. I think the answer is not a flat increase or immediate and complete decontrol, but that we should write into this law definite regulations providing for equitable, fair, and speedy treatment of many owners who have been denied justice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If an area is decontrolled, can they then reassume control over it? Suppose an area is decontrolled, such as the gentleman referred to. Can the rent control authority then reassume control over it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think there is anything that provides that they can put controls back on. I think I should qualify that, however. There seems to be a little doubt about it. If a property was under control on March 1, 1947, and it is decontrolled, there is no language which directly authorizes them to put the controls back on. But I may say to the gentleman that that is not too clear, but inferentially they restore controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I for one expect to vote against this bill.

If it is defeated, then rent controls go off the 30th of June. The present rent control is simply grinding into the dust the people who are trying to own property in this country. Many of them are old people who have bought their homes and paid for them and have paid taxes on them for years. Now they are held down to where they cannot realize reasonable returns on their investments.

In addition to that, these controls have prevented the building of homes. Members talk about veterans. If we did not have these controls the veterans in large sections of the country would build their own homes.

When I came into the Chamber a short time ago they were discussing a comparison of rents today as against 1936. I tried to call attention to the fact that prices of all kinds in a free economy are governed by the volume of the Nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. In 1936, on December 31, we had $6,542,000,000 in circulation. Remember that figure, $6,542,000,000. Ten years later, on December 31, 1946, we did not have $6,542,000,000 in circulation, we had $28,952,000,000 in circulation, or more than four times the amount in circulation in 1939.

Everything else has gone up, but now with this bureaucracy you attempt to hold down the rent that a man may get for his property although everything else has increased in price. As a result that man who is paying the taxes to maintain the community—and do not forget that—is forced to lose money on his investment.

Many of them are war veterans. Do not forget that you are injuring just as many veterans as you are pretending to help by perpetuating the controls, covered by this bill which, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] says, is a monstrosity.

You are therefore preventing the building of homes. Peoples are afraid to build homes. I live in a country where raw materials are abundant and where the people want homes, but when they find the threat of the Housing Authority, the threat of the Rent Control Authority, or the threat of any bureaucracy hanging over them, it frightens them and has prevented, in my opinion, the building of the homes we need.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have deep admiration for the gentleman's logic, usually, but I do not quite follow the gentleman on the statement that he made that he is going to vote against this bill and the argument which he makes that the continuance of controls would be a deterrent to the construction of homes.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to vote against this bill because if this bill is defeated rent controls will stop on the 30th of June.

That is what the American people want. They do not want to be kept in any strait-jackets. They are tired of strait-jackets. The fact of the business is I would have voted 2 years ago, and I will vote tomorrow, to declare the war at an end and put an end to all control and let us get back to the American way of life; so we can make our own living, build our own houses, operate our own property, and let the man who pays the taxes, whose son, or who himself, went to this war and came back to his property that he has owned for years and struggled to pay for, let him continue to enjoy the American way of doing things.

These rent controls ought to have been discontinued long ago. I am going to vote against this bill because I think rent control should be discontinued entirely. If you want rent control, let your State handle it, but let us get the Federal Government out of the business.

I know of one instance where an old person lived in a room or set of rooms. The landlord let her stay on at a meager rental of $10 a month. Finally she passed away. Another party offered $35 a month for that property, but the rent control board stepped in and said: "No, you must go on and rent it for what you have been getting."

No; let us defeat this bill and get back to the American way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], one question. Do I understand the gentleman to take the position that a single unit in a rental area can, under this bill, be decontrolled by the Administrator?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Show me that in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Subsection (c), page 14.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Read it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That provides:

> The head of the department or agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all maximum rents before this title ceases to be in effect.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is the rental area. You cannot pick out one unit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. "Any or all maximum rents" in any rental area.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I know, but that is not a single unit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is it?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. You have not changed the law at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it does not mean a single unit it cannot mean all. "All" means all and "any" means any. What does it mean?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not think the gentleman's interpretation is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the speeches of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Since I have been a Member of the House I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], many times speak about the work of the TVA and various other Federal projects that have aided lowering electrical rates. It seems that if the Government takes a part in lowering electrical rates it is doing a wonderful thing, but if it takes part in providing houses for veterans, it is totalitarian and must be stopped.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman ought to know that the power business is a public business and the owning of homes and houses is a private business, just the difference between public and private enterprise.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has stated that the housing shortage is due primarily to the bureaucrats, but he should know very well that the only time that private enterprise alone anywhere near met the demand for houses was in 1925 when we built about 836,000 units. Between 1930 and 1940, however, we built only approximately 253,000 units annually, which resulted in an annual shortage of about 600,000 or 700,000 housing units. The result was that at the end of the 30's about 17,000,000 families were living in houses for which they paid rent of between $10 and $30 a month. Many of these houses were substandard. During the 6 years of the war, homes were not built for private families so that when the war ended there was a great housing shortage, which was not under any stretch of the imagination, caused by bureaucrats or Government control.

Mr. Chairman, this means, in my opinion, that the Government must take a stand in helping alleviate the housing shortage. The bill that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] proposes, with all good intentions, does not approach solving the housing demand. The housing shortage will not be solved by lifting rent control off of new construction. This will merely mean that houses will be constructed so that the average veteran cannot buy them.

If we are going to solve the housing shortage we must institute a long-range housing program, provided under the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], has excused himself from offering that bill

to the House by saying that the committee has not time, that it must spend 5 or 6 weeks in studying the RFC and other related projects.

It seems to me there is no subject as important as the housing shortage and that this House ought to take action immediately, and that the committee ought to report out a bill that will really do something toward solving this problem. If you think that the problem has gotten any better in the last 6 months so far as building new houses is concerned and since a great many Government controls have been lifted, take a look at these figures: In June, 1946, a typical month of so-called Government control there were 63.6 thousand starts; there were 34.9 thousand completions. In March of this year with many of the controls lifted there were only 49.8 thousand starts while there were 57.1 thousand completions. This means that the trend is downward on starts. If you do not get a house started you are not going to get a house completed. A rate of a million units a year has been been achieved in 1946, so by March 1947 we should have been going at an unprecedented rate, yet the fact is that we reached only 49.8 thousand starts in March 1947 and we will be lucky to get a half-million starts for the entire year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. I think if we in this country go back in 1948 to the veterans, and to the rest of the people, and say that all we did in this House to alleviate the housing shortage was to pass this bill, we are going to have a lot on our conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time simply to call the attention of the committee to an article which appeared in the New York Times in connection with the proposed 15-percent rent increase. The item stated:

> The 15-percent rise has received the support of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation, which stated in its publication: "By plugging for a 15-percent increase in rent ceilings we might be able to kill off rent control entirely."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the minority views as expressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], which appear on pages 36 and 37 of the committee's report on H. R. 3203. The only reason I did not sign the minority report was that I was away from the city at that time on official business and was not available to sign it. But I concur in those views.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent when we get back in the House to insert the report in the RECORD at this point.

I expect to make a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The minority report referred to is as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

Repeal of most of the provisions of the Patman Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, designed to help the veterans secure housing, is effected by title I of H. R. 3203.

Despite the fact that almost all the national veterans' groups were unanimous in demanding the continuance of minimum controls by the Federal Government to help in the veterans' housing crisis, this bill removes virtually all governmental power, priorities, or allocations to do anything about it.

These few necessary controls, still being exercised to channel scarce items into veterans' housing, instead of into unnecessary commercial construction, are virtually swept away under the provisions of title I.

On these salient features of continuing need for Government action, most of the national veterans' organizations agreed:

1. Continued limitations on unnecessary commercial construction.

2. Continued limitation against construction of houses for purely seasonal use.

3. Continued limitation of housing to 1,500 square feet floor space.

4. Continued allocation of scarce raw material, such as pig iron, for residential construction use.

5. Continued assistance to building material producers to secure repair parts, machinery, and supplies.

6. Limitation of new houses to one completed bathroom.

7. Genuine veterans' preference on purchase of new homes.

H. R. 3203 effectively eliminates any Government help or control over these seven points in the programs of these veterans' organizations.

With a commercial backlog of construction waiting to be built, totaling many billions of dollars, this bill will open the floodgates for this gigantic construction program to compete with the small veterans' homes in a market still plagued by material shortages and skyrocketing costs of labor and materials.

This competition with big construction, turned loose without restraint by this bill, would sound the death knell of even a minimum number of new houses, vitally necessary to eliminate acute suffering in hundreds of communities.

In addition to further raising the already high construction cost of homes, this gigantic commercial construction program would create shortages in skilled labor, and sap many of the same materials now vitally needed for housing construction.

Even with the present careful screening by local boards under the nonresidential construction order VHP-1, new nonresidential construction is now running at a rate of more than $57,000,000 a week, and for the year totaled more than $3,000,000,000. Many moderate-sized communities report that their backlog of unnecessary construction, now not being approved, exceeds $60,000,000.

The claim is made repeatedly by the proponents of repeal of even the minimum controls of the Emergency Veterans' Housing Act still being exercised that it is these controls which are holding back the adequate construction of houses. Dozens of articles recently in the press indicate just the contrary by quoting dozens of localities where rising construction costs and shortages of materials and labor are almost universally blamed.

It is difficult to see how the veteran hoping to buy or rent a small $5,000 or $7,000 home can be helped by opening up billions of new commercial construction. It is difficult to see how ending all right of the Government to channel scarce materials into veterans' homes, instead of eating places, showrooms, stores, factories, summer hotels, and beach houses, will help the veteran.

It is difficult to see how repealing any right to allocate pig iron for scarce cast-iron soil pipe, steel for electrical switch receptacles, critical items for wiring, millwork and flooring can make the supply greater to the veteran by relieving him of his present preference.

It is difficult to see how withdrawal of all right of Government to give priority assistance to producers of housing materials for repairs, replacements, or new machinery will encourage more housing materials.

It is difficult to see how the weak and ineffective provisions of the bill, relating to a 30-day so-called veterans' preference period, will insure that the veteran can always get first chance at the same terms of completed houses.

This provision of the bill appears to be particularly weak and ineffective by failing to guarantee that the veteran must be given a genuine preference for sale at the same price and terms as nonveterans are quoted after the 30-day waiting period.

It would be the point of wisdom to continue the few remaining controls now being exercised by the Housing Expediter, to insure that housing for veterans is not frozen out of the picture by competition with unnecessary and nonessential construction.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.
HALE BOGGS.
ALBERT RAINS.
DONALD L. O'TOOLE.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this bill. To me this bill is not satisfactory. I expect to vote for the bill in the hope that the conferees will correct some of the defects if we fail to amend it on the floor I am not going to vote to recommit this bill because I know that means to kill the bill, and that you will not have any rent control after the 30th of June. While I would like to correct a lot of errors and mistakes in the bill, I am frank enough to say that I think a vote to recommit and send it back to the committee would be the end of the bill. I shall join with the chairman in voting for this bill in the hope that we will get something better from the conferees.

I remember when we had up the Patman bill there was one difference between myself and the author of the bill and the Chairman at that time. The difference of opinion was on subsidies. I led the fight, joined by my good friend, the present Chairman, and others, and after we won that fight the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered a substitute. We defeated his substitute and passed the Patman bill, and I am still for the main provisions in the Patman bill, especially those that are helpful to the veterans. The only difference between me and the author and the Chairman was that they wanted subsidies, and the record, as time has shown, has proved that I was right, and that the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and others who joined me were right, because of the $400,000,000 that we had for premium payments placed in the Patman bill by the conferees only $50,000,000 has been spent for building materials.

I think the benefits that were given to the soldiers in the Patman bill ought to be preserved and maintained. Now, as for rents, it may be that we should raise rents across the board to help the little home owners of this country. This bill in its present form carries no rent ceiling on houses to be built from now on. It takes care of those who are in the real-estate field. It takes care of those who are in the building game, but it fails utterly to take care of the little man who owns a little home.

You take another class, the class who failed to rent in 1945 and 1946. Now we say to them, "We will take care of you even if you did not comply with the wishes of the American people and did not open the doors of your houses to returning veterans. We will give you permission by which the sky is the limit for you to raise rents on all including these veterans that are coming home."

We say in this bill to the widow who left her home to live with her daughter in order that she might get enough rent from the little home to pay for her clothing, "We will not help you."

Under this bill we are saying to one class of home owners who are able to change or convert their houses to have more room space, "You are free to rent for whatever price you can obtain and the sky is the limit." Yet you say to the little man with nothing but a little home to rent, whose living expenses have gone up 100 percent since the freeze date, "You must remain under rent control without any increase in your rent."

Let me call the roll of some of these people who desire to help the little home owners. The soldiers of the country desire for them to receive fair play, in view of the fact that many classes and a large percent of the population will not be under rent control. You all remember the expression of President Lincoln to the effect that this country could not prosper long half free and half slave. May I now say this bill, as it is now, certainly will not be well received by the American people when you free so many and keep others, especially the poor class, under rent control, and I venture to say it will be difficult under such class legislation to enforce the provisions of this bill. This certainly is class legislation, with half the people controlled by rent ceiling and the other half turned loose.

Let me call the roll further. Mr. Paul Porter, successor to Mr. Bowles as Price Administrator, in June 1946, stated that should the then proposed extension to the Emergency Price Control Act become law, rents could not remain at their frozen level.

In November 1946, the Housing Rent Industry Advisory Committee to OPA, selected and approved by OPA officials themselves, made an official recommendation to the Office of Price Administration, urging an immediate 15-percent over-all increase in rent ceiling.

I am informed that 2 or 3 months ago, General Fleming, Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, prepared an order providing for an over-all 10-percent increase in the general rent level, but, I am further informed, this order was canceled for some reason by direction from higher authority. I am sure that General Fleming certainly had no political motive in preparing such an order. On account of the high cost of living and the further fact that so many present homes and those homes to be built will operate without any ceiling, it seems to me that a modest increase in the rental levels of the owners is necessary.

We certainly do not want to be placed in the position to be criticized without giving some aid to those whose rents were frozen in some sections of the country when these rents amount to about the same as received in 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

It is true that we have, under the present law today, a provision by which the Administrator can raise the rent in hardship cases and where there are inequities. This is fair in theory but certainly has not proved practical or beneficial in such cases.

According to the testimony of one of the main witnesses, a man who is well known and has a splendid reputation, only 3,670 individual housing units of the 16,000,000 under rent control received an upward adjustment in rent to October 1946 under the hardship provisions of OPA. This is less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent. That is proof that that theory, while it sounds good, is not practical and did not work. Therefore, it is up to this committee to adopt some amendment that will be workable and give equality as much as possible to all classes of people. Therefore, a small raise across the board is the only practical method to do this as the other methods have failed.

You may say that some few people will get too much. Let us admit that those who bought their property at a foreclosure sale might get too much, but this is a very small percent compared with the whole.

An amendment providing for a 10-percent across-the-board raise is about the only way you are going to prevent hardship to the small home owners of our country, and if such an amendment is not in this bill the conferees will not have it in conference, as I understand the Senate bill as reported out by the committee does not have any such provision. If we are sincere about helping the little home owner, now is the time to have such an amendment in this bill.

I know that the returning soldiers themselves want this class of people to be treated fairly compared with other groups because they know, as many of us know, that a lot of small home owners have put every dime of their savings in small homes and now receive rent sufficient only to pay for the repairs that are required monthly.

I asked you to vote for such an amendment to give equality to the needy people. This bill is exactly what the real-estate dealers and the building-material people want. You have opened the door to them. You make the sky the limit to help this class of people, but you are not helping the little man. Such discrimination is wrong. Let us help the little home owners. Now is the time to help them.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order that the Members may have information that I think ought to be available so that you may be able to answer letters and telegrams which you will undoubtedly receive from many veterans who are receiving readjustment and subsistence allowances under the GI bill. There are some 1,120,000 veterans who are now receiving readjustment allowances and there are 1,660,000 veterans in schools and on-the-job training who are receiving subsistence allowances.

Yesterday at 3 o'clock the head of the Veterans' Administration issued a press release and word went out to the country that the veterans who are the beneficiaries of that program will have to wait for a short time for their money. The fellow who owes rent and has to pay cash as he goes along and who is in school and has a wife and two or three kids and is living in a trailer, as hundreds of thousands of them are, needs this money.

Unfortunately, the impression has gone out that the Congress has failed to meet its responsibility. I simply want to say that there will be some delay of a few days in getting these checks out to these veterans. The reason is that the program grew so rapidly that the Veterans' Administration, with all the help and aid and advice that they could bring to bear on the subject, missed the totals that would be necessary by over a billion dollars. The result was they had to come to the Congress for a deficiency appropriation. Between the time they submitted the situation to the Bureau of the Budget and the report to the Committee on Appropriations, the problem still continued to grow so that when General Bradley went before the Deficiency Appropriations Committee he was unable in his first appearance to give the committee the facts that were necessary to determine how much of a deficiency appropriation should be made. It was some 2 weeks later—the actual date of his first appearance was February 11, and the second appearance March 17—before the Deficiency Committee could get the information upon which to base an appropriation. That appropriation was made and it was passed in the House. You voted for it. I have it before me. It was passed in the House on the 1st day of April 1947. It was passed in the Sen-

ate on April 24, 1947. Two days ago and before any notice of the press release of the Veterans' Administration came to the committee, a conference was called to meet this morning. The conference report on the first deficiency bill approves all the money for the Veterans' Administration. I hope it will come before the House today and that the House will adopt it so that this bill can go to the President and be signed and thus provide the money to take care of these several million veterans who will be expecting this check in the mail to take care of their rent and take care of their living expenses.

I want those veterans to know, and I hope the press will give it to the people of this country, that those veterans do not have to worry and they do not have to wire their Senators or their Congressmen. We have proceeded to furnish this money just as rapidly as the processes of legislation will permit and just as rapidly as the tremendously expanded program would permit the Veterans' Administration to give us the necessary information.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Is that the $350,000,000 which the committee said was not necessary in the deficiency appropriation?

Mr. KEEFE. That is part of the appropriation. The whole amount of this item is over eight hundred million. Why does the gentleman ask?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Because the committee at first said that was not necessary and I warned the House at the time that unless it was reinstated that this would happen.

Mr. KEEFE. That what would happen?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That the veterans would suffer by delay in their payments.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not recall any warning that the gentleman may have given. I do know that this House and all the Members on both sides want the veterans to receive the benefits of the GI bill, because, as a matter of fact, that $350,000,000 was put into the bill on the floor of the House and adopted by the House, and when the bill went to the Senate it was agreed to, and whether the three hundred and fifty million was in or out of the bill did not have one single thing to do with bringing about the situation that now confronts the Veterans' Administration, and the gentleman from Illinois well knows it. The gentleman's question is the injection of a sour political note into this discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SECTION 1. (a) Sections 1 through 9, and sections 11 and 12, of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, are hereby repealed, and any funds made available under said sections of said act not expended or committed prior to the enactment of this act are hereby returned to the Treasury: *Provided*, That any allocations made or committed, or priorities granted for the delivery, of any housing materials or facilities under any regulation or order issued under the authority contained in said act, and before the date of enactment of this act, with respect to veterans of World War II, their immediate families, and others, shall remain in full force and effect.

(b) (1) Whenever the head of the department or agency designated to administer the powers, functions, and duties under title II of this act determines that there is a shortage, or that there is likely to be a shortage of building materials, he may by regulation or order require of any person or persons a permit as a condition of constructing any building or facilities to be used for amusement or recreational purposes.

(2) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act in violation of any regulation or order prescribed under authority of this subsection. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this paragraph shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

(3) As used in this subsection the term "person" has the meaning assigned to such term in title II of this act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: Delete from line 5, page 2, of the bill the period and insert thereafter the following: "and provided further, That all the powers, duties, and responsibilities conferred by said sections shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 1947, together with necessary funds thereunder, to permit the head of the department or agency designated to administer the powers, functions, and duties under title II of this act: (1) to continue allocations and priorities (a) for pig iron, shop-grade lumber or millwork, steel, phenolic molding compounds and resins for electrical wiring devices, and for bottleneck items needed by public service utilities and producers of housing and housing materials, (b) for Government-owned surplus, including temporary structures and utilities, and (c) to limit, on not more restrictive terms, nonessential construction and use of housing materials (including the requirement that a dwelling must be suitable for year-round occupancy, not exceed 1,500 square foot floor area, and have not more than one bathroom), (2) to use not more than $65,000,000 of the $400,000,000 previously authorized for access roads and premium payments, and (3) to carry out market guarantee contracts heretofore entered into."

And strike out on page 2 all of lines 6 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment about which I talked earlier in the day. It is an effort to try to put back into this bill something to help the veteran get housing.

I cannot see how this practically complete repeal of almost all the emergency provisions of the Veterans' Housing Act will help eliminate the critical housing shortage that millions of veterans are now undergoing.

By passing title I of this bill if you do not put my amendment in, you will strike out practically every single power the Federal Government has to channel any scarce material, repair parts, or raw products into the housing field no matter how badly a veteran might need that scarce item to complete his house. No matter how much pinch the housing industry might feel in competition with the automobile industry or some other industry no governmental authority can help get houses.

There will be not one thing left in any legislation that will give the veterans' housing program one single bit of Federal allocation help. On top of that by passage of title I without my amendment, you put the veterans into competition with untold billions of unnecessary commercial construction that is now waiting to get started. We are now building each year $3,000,000,000 of necessary commercial construction under present screening and limitations.

This necessary construction is approved by local committees, it is carefully screened not to interfere unnecessarily with veterans' housing. You can thus get the necessary commercial construction done. If you pass title I as it now is, you open the floodgates to many billions of unessential commercial construction without any limitation.

With the limitation that is in the bill as it stands today you can only prohibit construction for recreational and amusement purposes. But under this bill you are going to put the veteran into competition with gigantic commercial projects, despite the section written into the bill limiting only recreational and amusement parks. This is not going to protect the veteran, because there are hundreds of thousands of commercial projects, summer hotels, and beach houses, things like that, that will still be built.

I might add that this amendment has the approval of the American Legion housing committee. I talked to Colonel Taylor of the American Legion a few minutes ago. They are very much interested in it. It is on all fours with the program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and with the program of the American Veterans' Committee. They were united in stating that we must have a minimum amount of restrictions in order to break bottleneck material situations if the veterans' housing program is to be a success.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I had a communication from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In that they did not go as far as the gentleman does. The gentleman has a good deal of language in his amendment treating in great detail about the number of bathrooms various apartments shall have, and so on. Would the gentleman explain how that ties in?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. This spells out all the restrictions that the Government can use in administering this veterans' housing program, and thus it spells out those which are now being used.

I have the statements in my office, in which the American Legion, the American Veterans' Committee, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all came out in favor of every one of these restrictions. These restrictions spell the thing out, and Government can go no further.

These are all restrictions they can put in. We are asking for this minimum authority. I am spelling it out in order that they can do something for the veterans who need houses. I fear then you will go back home and the veteran will see automobile showrooms, eating houses and summer hotels going up and he will say: "It is a funny thing I cannot get material or labor to build a small house costing four or five thousand dollars." That house will be in competition with a five hundred thousand or a million dollar commercial project and the small house will be the last thing completed. They are in competition almost universally for labor and materials as well.

Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be added to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to restore virtually all of the controls under the program which title I would abolish. We are very much interested in what the veterans have to say about this; nevertheless, we have an obligation to the veterans themselves, and we are in an impartial, noncompetitive field here which allows us to think clearly on the issue and analyze it from the standpoint of the national economy. Mr. Cadwallader, who represented the American Legion, is chairman of a committee named at the San Francisco convention to study this matter, and his committee did a splendid job in their study. He said before the committee that priorities were not worth anything, that what the veterans wanted was homes, that priorities would not keep off any rain. So this bill is designed to give the veterans priorities and homes and rental property. It gives him what he wants.

A group of veterans came before the committee, a housing group named by all of the veterans organizations in Michigan with the exception of the American Veterans Committee. The American Legion was represented, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States were represented, the AMVETS and the DAV's were represented. Mr. George Lyle is the head of that committee. Here was a committee made up of all four of the organizations. Mr. Lyle in private conversation told me he thought we should remove all controls and by doing so get homes and rental properties, that the veterans were more concerned with renting homes than they were with the purchase of homes because if it became a question of paying a little higher rental for a short period of time and high prices for a home, the veteran would prefer to pay a little higher rental for a short period of time than to bind himself for 20 or 25 years, the constructive years of his life, to pay from $75 to $100 a month, for shelter which you and I could not afford when we were starting out and which these boys coming back from the war cannot afford at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, the thing which will lick this housing shortage is production. The thing which is going to lick inflation is production and the only way you can get production in this country is to remove the shackles which have prevented construction and which has only left us with this inflationary trend. We tried it out on commodities. I wonder how often the President wishes he had signed that first OPA bill which we sent down to him which would have kept prices under control but which would have encouraged production. Most of the leading economists in the Nation admit the only way we can bring prices and rentals down is by reasonably meeting the demand for commodities and for rentals. That is what we seek to do in this bill. We did not get sufficient homes last year under these controls. The veterans' organizations know that we did not get these homes under Federal controls. Some of them suggested particular controls should be continued as, for instance, cast-iron soil pipe. There is practically no shortage of cast-iron soil pipe, so that there is no more necessity for continuing controls over cast-iron soil pipe than over lumber in general, or roofing or cement blocks. This amendment should be defeated, because it is expressive of the contention of the opposition position which is to continue these controls. In considering this amendment this committee decides whether to continue controls or remove controls. I think you will find in a study of this bill that the Committee on Banking and Currency has given a balance program whereby nobody is going to suffer too much. Some have got to make some sacrifices for the common good. We cannot remove all the inequities by legislation. That is an administration job and this amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 48, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 2, line 12, after the word "for" insert the word "commercial" followed by a comma.

Mr. JAVITS. It will be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the section to which I propose an amendment is nothing but a section of authority. The section states that the officer charged with the administration of this whole title may by regulation require permits to be granted for certain types of construction with authority to institute controls if controls be found necessary.

Now, that authority, as the bill is written, is limited to structures for amusement or recreational purposes, and I propose that that authority be broadened. It does not mean it has to be employed, but that that authority be broadened to include commercial structures so that the officer administering this title may require permits for commercial, amusement, or recreational structures.

All of us know, and I alluded a little while ago in the time generously afforded to me by the chairman of the committee how every veteran feels when he goes into any city in the United States and sees office buildings and department stores being erected, and he knows that homes cannot be built because of the shortage of the very materials which are going into these commercial structures.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman would not call a hotel a commercial structure, would he?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I would not.

Every one of us knows just how a veteran who has fought in the war feels when he sees a department store getting a new building, when we all know they could make it do for a little while longer. Yet he knows the stuff going into that new building could very well have been used to help in the home-construction program. Under the amendment I have proposed there would be authority—that is all that is asked—authority, if needed to require permits for commercial, as well as amusement and recreational structures. If it is found that any of these materials going into commercial construction could better be used in home construction, the authority would be there to adjust what is obviously a maladjustment. I really and honestly think that the committee might well accept this amendment and put it in the bill in order to complete the objectives which they undoubtedly had in mind when they gave this authority in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would give the Administrator of this act the authority which is now contained in law to allocate all materials which are used in commercial construction, which means of course materials which are used in the manufacture of automobiles, home appliances, and many other things. I cannot think of any material right offhand that is not used in commercial enterprise in some manner or other.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the gentleman whether the authority I propose to confer is any greater than the authority the bill itself confers on amusement or recreational structures?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. That is not my intention, I may say to the gentleman. It is my intention only to make the three equal, and that is all I do, I believe.

Mr. WOLCOTT. With the three equal, of course, you give equality to the amusement and the recreational facility along with an automobile factory, we will say, which would employ 40,000 or 50,000 people. I do not know that we want to equalize a beer garden with an automobile factory.

One of the reasons why the committee decided that it was not sound to continue the authority to allocate materials was that the Expediter virtually had the power in his hands to control the American economy through the allocation of materials. There was a time, and I

speak advisedly on the matter, because of the conferences I had with the industry—where because of the stock piling of sheet steel by the Expediter in anticipation of building factories for the prefabrication of sheet-steel enameled homes—in anticipation of building factories; the sheet steel was to be used in the houses to be manufactured in the factories when and if the factories were built—three of the industries in this Nation, because of that practice, were up against the fact that they would have to put over 100,000 people out of employment within 3 weeks.

We have an obligation here to unfreeze this economy. Those of you who are shedding crocodile tears today have in mind that what we are doing is making it possible to balance the economy so that our workers in the factories will not be endangered by any of the mistakes which some bureaucrat makes down here in Washington.

There is a reasonably steady flow of materials into the market at the present time, so that industry and commerce and home building will have ample materials, but in protection against the criticism, in case there is a shortage of materials, that this building material is going into honky-tonks and beer gardens and racetracks, we have written this language in the bill, and it is good language. Before the authority can be exercised, the Administrator must find there is a shortage of materials. Then he can provide that a permit for building these nonessentials must be issued. To add the word "commercial" gives the Administrator unusually broad powers over the whole American economy.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be defeated because the gist of this whole program is to free the American economy so we can stabilize it and assist other countries to do likewise.

We must stabilize the economy of our country very quickly, Mr. Chairman, because the economies of 42 nations and the currencies of 42 nations are now tied to ours. We have an obligation now not only to ourselves but to the world to stabilize our economy, and the only way we can stabilize it is through production, production, and more production.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 35, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: On page 2, after line 13, before line 14, insert:

"(c) No tenant shall be removed from any housing accommodations by action to evict, or to recover possession, by exclusion of possession, or otherwise, upon claim by the landlord that substantial alterations or remodeling will be done unless the head of the department or agency designated to administer the powers, functions, and duties under title 2 of this act determines, (1) that such alterations are reasonably necessary to protect and conserve the property, and, (2) that the landlord does not seek thereby to evict a tenant, thereby to secure a higher rental for the property."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. It may be germane to title 2 but I do not think it is germane to title 1.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MACKINNON. The section in question deals with the authority to control rents, does it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. That is why I make the point of order. The section has to do with certain restrictions upon the use of building materials.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has nothing to do with rents.

Mr. MACKINNON. Speaking on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the country finds itself in a double-barreled situation today with respect to alterations and rent controls. Rents are controlled both by action of the Administrator administering the rent-control law and by action of the Civilian Production Agency controlling the distribution of materials for remodeling and altering rental properties. I am interested in seeing that the situation in that narrow field is not materially changed. Since this aspect of rent control is a double-barreled proposition, I half agree with the gentleman's point of order, but I think it is proper to insert the provision in either section. If the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, would prefer to have the language in title II of the act, I will be glad to defer it until that time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In title II, on page 19, there is a section of the bill devoted to eviction of tenants. I made the point of order that it was not germane at this particular point, but it might be germane with respect to section 209.

Mr. MACKINNON. I will defer to the chairman's wishes and withhold the amendment until we come to section 209.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendment made by such title III, shall, insofar as they authorize the making of allocations of building materials and of facilities relating to the utilization of building materials, cease to be in effect on the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1948."

SEC. 4. Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 609. (a) In order to assist in relieving the acute shortage of housing which now exists and to promote the production of housing for veterans of World War II at moderate prices or rentals within their reasonable ability to pay, through the application of modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure loans to finance the manufacture of housing (including advances on such loans) when such loans are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) Loans for the manufacture of houses shall be eligible for insurance under this section if at the time of such insurance, the Administrator determines they meet the following conditions:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator, providing for the purchase and delivery of the number of houses to be manufactured with the proceeds of the loan;

"(2) Such houses to be manufactured shall meet such requirements of sound quality, durability, livability, and safety as may be prescribed by the Administrator;

"(3) The borrower shall establish to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he has or will have adequate plant facilities, sufficient capital funds, taking into account the loan applied for, and the experience necessary, to achieve the required production schedule;

"(4) The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be necessary current cost of manufacturing such houses, exclusive of profit. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts for the houses to be manufactured with the proceeds of the loan, and of all sums payable under such purchase contracts, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses manufactured with the proceeds of the loan and then owned and in the possession of the borrower. The loan shall have a maturity not in excess of one year from the date of the note, except that any such loan may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe for an additional term not to exceed one year, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"(c) The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the property assigned or delivered as security for the loan, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the security documents may provide for such release.

"(d) The failure of the borrower to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of a loan under this section, or the failure to perform any other covenant or obligation contained in any assignment, agreement, or undertaking executed by the borrower in connection with such loan, shall be considered as a default under this section, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance hereinafter provided upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Administrator within a period and in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator of (1) all rights and interest arising with respect to the loan so in default; (2) all claims of the lender against the borrower or others arising out of the loan transaction; (3) any cash or property held by the lender, or to which it is entitled, as deposits made for the account of the borrower and which have not been applied in reduction of the principal of the loan; and (4) all records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating

to the loan transaction. Upon such assignment, transfer, and delivery, the Administrator shall, subject to the cash adjustment provided for in section 604 (c), issue to the lender debentures having a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"(e) Debentures issued under this section shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in subsection (d) of this section and shall bear interest from such date.

"(f) The provisions of section 207 (k) and 603 (a) of this act shall be applicable to loans insured under this section, except that as applied to such loans (1) all references in section 207 (k) to the 'Housing Fund' shall be construed to refer to the 'War Housing Insurance Fund' and (2) the reference in section 207 (k) to 'subsection (g)' shall be construed to refer to 'subsection (d)' of this section; (3) the references in section 207 (k) to insured mortgages shall be construed to refer to the assignment or other security for loans insured under this section; and (4) the references in section 603 (a) to a mortgage or mortgages shall be construed to include a loan or loans under this section.

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall have the power to assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this section, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such insurance until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection.

"(h) The Administrator shall fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this section, but such premium charge shall now exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such loan, and such premium charge shall be payable in advance by the financial institution and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for examining and processing applications for the insurance of loans under this section, including such additional inspections as the Administrator may deem necessary."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the obvious error at the bottom of page 7, line 25, be corrected, and that the word "not" be substituted for the word "now."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 3, line 9, strike out all of line 9, down to and including the word "necessity" in line 10 on page 8.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out of the bill the section that provides for Government financing manufacturers of prefabricated houses. The section also provides for the financing of the finished product through FHA loans. This arrangement is tantamount to the Government guaranteeing a market for manufacturers of such houses. We had a mandate from the people to remove controls and to take the Government out of business.

I do not believe the American people intended that this Congress should pass legislation to put the Government further into the housing business, or any other business. The section in the bill does just the reverse and my amendment would strike out that section.

The proponents of the provision which I am seeking to strike from the bill have contended that the provision would revolutionize the housing-construction industry. It should be understood that the materials for the construction of the houses under this provision would not be of the convential type but would be composed mostly of steel and other unusual home-building materials. There is no objection to revolutionizing housing if it is done with private money under competition. There is serious objection to the Government revolutionizing the housing industry with the power of the Federal Treasury.

I trust the House will support my amendment.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely strikes out one section of the bill which I feel is one of the very important sections in the bill. We are talking about rent controls. I believe all of us feel that the one real method of getting rid of rent control, which we are trying to do, is to produce more houses at a moderate cost.

We had guaranteed markets, and what did those guaranteed markets do? They said that the Administrator could take a plant that was manufacturing a home or building a home in a factory and he would guarantee to buy them. I did not like that section and I do not think a lot of us did. They are trying to compare this wording with that particular section.

In this section we say to a man who is manufacturing a home or building a home: "We are going to build this house. We are going to give you an order for it, but instead of giving you the order to build it out on this site, we are going to give you, the builder, a chance to build it in your factory." When he is building that house in that factory he is going to build them in large quantities, he is going to have large inventory costs, and we are going to say to him: "You are going to need money to finance your working capital, to finance the purchase of material you will put in this house," just the same as the legitimate builder does when he builds a house. So we say to him: "Go to your local bank." And remember that.

We say to this builder, "You have orders for these homes; binding contracts. You go to your local bank. You borrow the money and the bank then has the privilege of going to the FHA under title VI and have that loan guaranteed." There is no Government money put up. But, in order to get that guaranty, these houses must meet requirements. They must be livable, they must be durable, and if that house meets those requirements, then the local bank makes the loan and the FHA guarantees it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not true that that provision in the bill will make it possible to actually produce prefabricated homes? At least, that is my impression of the amendment, and I know that the gentleman sponsored the amendment before the committee. I think it is one of the real constructive paragraphs in this bill and I would like to commend the gentleman for having had that provision incorporated in the bill.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is this what is known as the Sundstrom amendment? I have had a large number of communications speaking in highest terms of the Sundstrom amendment. I would like to know if that is what this is.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I think that is what they call it.

Let me say this, that we hear about revolutionary ideas in building. What is wrong with a new idea if it is a good one? If somebody can build a better house for me for less money, I want to see him come forth with it, and any conventional builder, any man in the business today that is worrying, you can say to him, "My boy, you do not have to worry a bit if you can build a better house for the same amount of money," because these houses are not going to be financed unless they can meet the public demand. They cannot get any money from the local bank or the Government until they have sold them, and the people are not going out and buy shoddy houses, and they are not going to pay six or eight or ten thousand dollars for shacks. They are going to want their money's worth, and this amendment only gives them a chance, and they have to build a house that is livable and that meets all the requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact, after all, that the provision by the Government to these prefabricated house manufacturers of funds to finance their business plus FHA loans, virtually makes this a guaranteed proposition?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Well, I might say to the gentleman that I had this question asked me in the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I did not finish the question. What I meant to say was:

That is tantamount to guaranteed markets.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. No; it is not at all, if the gentleman had listened to my explanation. And, I might say that we had this question up in committee. We considered it. We had Ray Foley, the Administrator, look this over.

Dr. SMITH said to me one day in committee, "Why, you are backing some industrialist and putting him in business with Government money." And I said, "No, I am not at all, because he has to have plant and equipment," and I said to him, "Dr. SMITH, if you get $10,000,000 tomorrow, I will start in this business with you." Every man has a fair chance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is it not a fact that it is because of the lack of venture capital in the United States at the present time that you are particularly anxious to have this amendment passed; that it is necessary to have these manufacturers with bona fide sales go to the bank and get an industry loan, and thereby make possible this creation of low-cost housing which is going to be the very thing that will solve our problem today in rent control?

Mr SUNDSTROM. I would say that I like to agree to that. You have to compare this to a conventional builder. We will say that I am a conventional builder and I am permitted to build 10 houses, and I go out and I start building those 10 houses. I have some 90-percent completed; I have some 80-percent completed; I have some I am just starting, but I run out of capital. I do not have any more money, so what will I do? I go to the local bank and I say to them, "I have 10 houses under construction. I want to build 10 more but I need some financing, I need some help, I need a loan." The bank gives me that loan, as they do. I am building those houses on the site. There is not a great deal of difference if I am building houses in a factory instead of building them on the site except that it is a little faster. I have orders for a lot of houses, and I am running shy on capital and I go to the local bank. I say, "I want some financing." He says, "Well, what have you got to show for it?" I say, "I have some houses 90-percent complete, some 70-percent complete, some 60-percent complete, and some just started," just the same as a conventional builder. I say to him, "I want to borrow money on those houses." He says, "All right, I am going to give it to you, only in this particular case we are lending only 90 percent of the cost of the house," which is only about 50 percent of the cost of the completed, erected house on the site.

I know you have had letters from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I should like to read a paragraph from a letter I got from them:

> For several months my organization has believed that one solution to low-cost housing would be by using mass-production methods in the building of homes. Certainly, mass production has proven itself in every other phase of the American industry, and we see no reason why this should not hold true in the home-building industry. As we see it, the Sundstrom amendment would place factory producers of homes on the same financing basis with conventional home builders. And, by allowing FHA financing to factory producers, it will, in our opinion, encourage the production of quality homes costing between $5,000 and $8,000. Surely no one could quarrel with an amendment such as you have suggested. We offer our wholehearted cooperation in your endeavor.

We have heard an awful lot of talk about what we are trying to do for the veteran, we have heard a lot of talk about what we are trying to do for those people who have to double up and live with their in-laws, we have heard a lot of complaint by people who pay too much rent and want a cheaper place. My solution is just this: If we can produce enough homes at a moderate cost so that we can say to those three groups of people, "If you do not like where you live, here is a house you can buy or own for about $50 or $60 a month or maybe less," then if they say, "I would rather pay $300 where I live rather than pay that cost," they cannot complain very much. The person who is doubling up with his in-laws is going to have a choice whether he wants to pay the present cost of living or go out and buy one of these houses at a cost that he can meet.

If this meets FHA approval it means that it has to be a house that is durable. They lend money on houses that are going to last 15, 20, or 25 years, and they are not going to approve what we like to term chicken coops. The fact is, that is the one reason I have been so much against this FPHA housing program; it has not met the requirements and given people a decent place to live.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 16, noes 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time solely for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee or my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, whose amendment I am very much in favor of, if they can clarify the language on page 4, subsection 4:

> The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of manufacturing such houses, exclusive of profit.

I do not understand what that "exclusive of profit" means. It cannot mean the profit of the manufacturer himself because when he borrows the money he cannot possibly know what his profit will be. I am a little afraid it may be interpreted to mean the profits of the subcontractors, in which it would cut down the 90 percent that he could borrow. I do not understand that language.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. If you will follow the thing, in the first place a man cannot get a loan until he has a binding contract for the purchase of the house at a price which has already been set.

Mr. MATHEWS. In every case?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. In every case. He cannot borrow money until the house is sold, and then he goes to the local bank. He tells the bank what his costs are, and he can only borrow 90 percent of his costs. Of course, he cannot finance his profits in any sense of the word.

Mr. MATHEWS. Of course, the cost could not include profits in any event.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. It is only the cost, which in most cases would be about 50 percent of the building.

Mr. MATHEWS. If that is the real explanation of it, the rest seems to be surplusage, but I accept the explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the action taken by the Committee of the Whole with reference to section 1, in keeping this section in the bill and having in mind the confusion that exists among members of the committee itself where a majority may agree on this provision and another majority on another provision and another majority on another provision, but no majority on the whole bill, when the motion is made to recommit the bill it is my intention to vote for that motion and send this bill back to the committee in the hope that further consideration by the committee will result in reporting out a bill that will more satisfactorily represent the will of the majority of the committee and the will of the majority of the House so far as the entire bill is concerned.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there was not too much dispute in the committee. It was reported out of the committee by a vote of 20 to 3 and 2 answering present.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation is most pertinent except for the valuable evidence of what went on on the floor today of the various members of the committee expressing themselves one way and the other. What are my serious objections? I seriously object to a provision of the bill which takes away control at this time, on nonessential construction. We can argue all we want to about free competition and the law of supply and demand, but when the demand is many times more than the supply, unless control of some kind exists we are going to have inflation and we are going to have a rapidly rising market and that will seriously interfere with doing the first job that confronts the people of the country today and the Congress from a domestic angle, and that is the building of homes and residences. Only last year we passed the Patman bill stating that there was an emergency existing in relation to veterans and their inability to get homes. By this bill, for all practical

purposes, we are repealing the provisions of the Patman bill and taking away all controls so far as nonessential construction is concerned and placing those who want to build a home, and that includes the veterans, in a position where they must compete with industry in trying to get the materials to build their homes when industry might be engaged in nonessential construction—construction important at some later date, but in competition with homes now it is construction that should be deferred until some later time.

This is a matter of such vital importance to millions of people throughout the country, veterans in particular, who are given preference and priorities, that we should recommit this bill to the committee for further consideration of that important subject alone.

It seems amazing to me that with all the veteran organizations opposing this provision, that a majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency failed to give any kind of consideration to the position taken by representatives of the veterans' organizations and of the veterans' organizations themselves.

Furthermore, the 15-percent increase in rent is something that should be given further consideration. I recognize the force of the arguments of those who say that the landlord has made great sacrifices. There is no question about that. On the other hand, when there is a shortage somebody has to make sacrifices for the common good. On the one hand, where there is a certain bank and the demand is many times greater than the supply, unless there is control somewhere we are going to have inflation as a result of that demand, which is many times more than the available supply. Then, unless we have some method of rationing or control, we are going to have dissatisfaction all along the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. We must realize that the landlord has made sacrifices, but it has been in the common interest and for the general welfare. I cannot speak for other sections of the country, and this is no indictment of landlords, but it is a statement of fact: Up in my section of the country the landlord has been making very few repairs in any of the places where tenants live. Furthermore, the average landlord figures on his income and his rentals, 2 months' vacancies each year. They have had continuous occupation. There have been little if any repairs made. In 98 percent of the cases there have been no repairs made in houses where tenants have lived during the last 4 or 5 years.

The landlord has made sacrifices, but on the other hand the landlord has gained benefits which are of a compensatory nature. Under those conditions, where the demands for apartments are much greater than the apartments available, unless we have some kind of control, we will have inflation in rents which, with the sharp increase in cost of living, will bring about decidedly unsatisfactory conditions.

Because of the veterans' situation, because of section 1, which is absolutely wrong at this time, and which should be considered further, and because of the provision relating to the 15-percent increase where an agreement is made—and you know what the agreement will be; it will be an agreement where the tenant in most cases will have to submit in order to keep his apartment—because of the weakness of those two provisions and their paramount importance in legislation of this kind, when a motion to recommit is made it is my intention to vote for it.

I took the floor briefly to express the reasons why I am going to vote for the motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) In order to assure preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families—

(1) no housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale, prior to the expiration of 30 days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families; and

(2) no housing accommodations, designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be rented or offered for rent, prior to the expiration of 30 days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families.

(b) This section shall cease to be in effect whenever the President proclaims that the protection to such veterans and their families provided by this section is no longer needed.

(c) For purposes of this section (1) the head of the department or agency of the Government designated to administer the powers, functions, and duties under title II of this act shall prescribe by regulations the time as of which construction of housing accomodations shall be deemed to be completed, and (2) the terms "person" and "housing accommodations" shall have the meaning assigned to such terms in title II of this act.

(d) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 9, strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) For the purposes of this section the head of the department or agency designated to administer the powers, functions, and duties under title II of this act shall prescribe by regulations: (1) The time as of which construction of housing accommodations shall be deemed to be completed, (2) that such housing accommodations shall, for said 30 days, be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II, at prices and terms no less favorable than to others during such period and thereafter, and (3) exceptions to this section for hardship cases: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall affect or remove any veterans' preference requirements heretofore established under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and outstanding with respect to housing accommodations completed prior to the date of enactment of this title. The terms 'persons' and 'housing accommodations' shall have the meaning assigned to such terms in title II of this act."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely seeks to tighten up and make effective a genuine guaranty that the veteran will have first chance at the completed housing that is built under this act and pursuant to it. If you will turn to the bill and read page 8, line 13, you will find the following:

No housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale, prior to the expiration of 30 days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families.

Obviously, we have left a loophole a mile wide for evasion and people will blame the Congress for leaving it. Under the bill as it stands, builders do not have to sell to a veteran. If they do not sell to a veteran, they will still not be in conflict with the law because all they have to do is to let the house stand vacant and unsold for 30 days.

Then they can sell it to whomsoever they desire and there is no violation of the law if you just wait that 30 days.

I know the chairman wants to make these houses available to veterans.

In substance all my amendment does is to add to the section that is stricken these words:

That such housing accommodations shall for said 30 days be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II at prices and terms no less favorable than to others during such period and thereafter.

Is that expecting too much to guarantee that the veterans themselves will have an honest first chance to buy at prices and terms no less favorable than to other people, the housing that is built?

Bear in mind there is a demand for this housing. But here you only say that the builder need wait only 30 days without being compelled to sell that house to a veteran, without ensuring that he must offer it at public sale and at publicly announced terms to the veteran.

You have got no veterans' guaranty in the act as it is written that would give the veteran one single bit of help in getting this scarce housing that he needs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the chairman of the committee who was a former departmental commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Michigan wants to do everything for the veterans. I am much impressed with the particular point to which the gentleman from Oklahoma is now addressing himself, but the gentleman paints with such a broad

brush, will he tell us what the other provisions he put in his amendment do?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the gentleman that it is practically all in the bill. The only thing that changes section 2 that is stricken out is the language that I just read in paragraph 2:

That such housing accommodations shall for said 30 days be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II at prices and terms no less favorable than to others during such period and thereafter.

It picks up all of the rest of this section but it does nail down one other thing which the Chairman in the committee hearings said he wanted nailed down.

That is, to continue the existing ceilings on houses that were built with veterans' priorities. I know the chairman wants to do that. He has put it in the legislative history of the act that he wants these houses that have been built under the veteran priorities to be forced to be sold, those that are completed, at the ceilings that were placed on them.

All this does is to tighten up and make effective the stump speech that is now in the bill. I do not think the Congress wants to hand the veterans a sleeper that will mean absolutely nothing and permit widespread evasion. We do not want builders to wait 30 days after the house is completed, then sell it to a brother-in-law or somebody else simply because he has complied with the law by waiting 30 days after the house is completed before selling to a nonveteran.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the Monroney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: Page 9, line 2, after the word "families" strike the period and add the following: "; and

"(3) no housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single-family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale to any person at a price less than the price for which it is offered to veterans or their families; and

"(4) no housing accommodations, designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be rented or offered for rent, at a price less than the price for which it is offered for rent to veterans and their families.

"(5) During the 30-day period referred to in subsections (1) and (2) the availability of such housing accommodations for sale or rental to veterans or their families shall be advertised at least four times on four separate days in some newspaper of general circulation which is distributed in the general vicinity of the place where the housing accommodations are situated, and such advertisement shall include a statement that veterans and their families have priority in the sale or rental of such housing accommodations."

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, offered as a substitute for the Monroney amendment aims at exactly the same hole in the bill that the Monroney amendment shoots at; however, in my opinion it is more explicit and in some respects it goes a little farther.

My suggested amendment provides in substance that these properties cannot be sold at a higher price than they are offered to a veteran. I think it is apparent that widespread abuses will crop up under this act. These abuses presently exist. Houses are built, they are kept for 30 days with veterans being unable to learn of their availability and then they are sold to persons other than veterans.

Section (5) of my amendment seeks to guarantee a public sale. My objective is the same as the gentleman from Oklahoma in this respect and provides that during the 30-day period that homes are held for veterans that a public offering will be made in the newspapers in the locality where the house is located. During this time the advertising sections of your newspapers will carry notices in the form of advertisements stating that veterans have priorities in the purchase or rental of all homes that are covered by this section of the law.

The amendment is simple and direct. I do not think it needs a great deal of elaboration. It is aimed at an abuse which presently exists and which is sure to continue, in my judgment, unless we provide this machinery to correct it.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will favor this amendment.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate and sympathize with the idea of getting publicity on the sale of these houses. Does the limitation of four publications mean that they might be run on four separate dates in any 1 week or four separate weeks?

Mr. MACKINNON. On any of four separate days during the 30-day period.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. What effect will the gentleman's amendment have on a prefabricated house? The man has not got it built and he gets a loan of 90 percent to start up his plant before he gets going, and he has to have a contract, and according to the gentleman's statement, before he sells the house he has to advertise it four times and he has not built the house yet.

Mr. MACKINNON. The 30-day provision of my amendment only refers to the particular provisions of the law that seek to guarantee homes for veterans and to that 30-day period when they are held for veterans under subparagraphs (1) and (2) of section 5 (a) of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am greatly impressed by the gentleman's amendment. It goes further than my amendment does in attempting to insure priorities for veterans on these completed houses, and I urge the House to adopt his amendment instead of mine, because I believe it would more nearly answer and nail down tight the guaranty that the veteran would get these houses.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks as well as the remarks I previously made in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this attempts to restore in a limited way preference for veterans of this past war. I think the language is too loosely drawn for that purpose in order to be effective.

I invite your attention to the fact that this language and the language of the gentleman who just introduced the amendment only refers to houses that are completed after the passage of this act. In other words, if you were a United States district attorney and someone would come to you and make a complaint under the terms of this bill as written, or as amended, the district attorney would say, "Well, can you say that the house was completed when it was sold to a nonveteran?" And if the complainant should say, "No, the house was not completed; it was lacking in certain things"—and very few houses are completed now; they are lacking in certain things—then the district attorney would say, "Under the law that Congress wrote this person cannot be prosecuted because the House is not actually completed."

So you do not have an effective veterans' preference written into this law. There is a way to evade it, and, naturally, you expect people to adopt methods that will not bring them within the terms of a criminal act.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the measures that we have been discussing here today, in my judgment, are more calculated to get votes than they are houses for veterans.

Mr. PATMAN. This is just one of the things in the bill that I invite your attention to that is very confusing; not only confusing, but will be wholly ineffective and will be absolutely worthless, promising the veteran something that cannot be enforced at all. Now, if we want to give them real veterans' preference we should go back to the original act and restore that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Down in our Southwest there are old Spanish missions with two towers, one of which on each is uncompleted, and that was because the builders tried to evade a provision of law and escape taxation. Does the gentleman mean to imply now that by reason of this amendment that there will likely be a lot of houses uncompleted in some minor detail?

Mr. PATMAN. We would expect that to happen. We should expect people to do things that will not bring them within the terms of a criminal act.

When this bill is reported to the House, I expect to offer a motion to recommit, just a straight motion to recommit it to the committee for the purpose of correcting just such loopholes as I have invited your attention to in this one particular instance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the MacKinnon amendment, it makes certain that these properties must be offered to the veteran for sale at no higher price than they are offered to the nonveteran later on, and that the property must be advertised for rent and offered to the veteran. I believe that is in keeping with what the committee intended to do. I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma suggests that we accept the MacKinnon amendment in lieu of his amendment. With that understanding, I think the MacKinnon amendment is quite satisfactory.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the amendment does not go a little further than the gentleman intends there in freezing the price that the house shall be sold for until March 31, 1948. It means freezing it at a certain price.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It surely is not the understanding that it will do that. If it does, there will be a correction. I think it makes clear what we intend to do. If it does what we intend to do, I think it is perfectly all right to accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACKINNON) there were—ayes 107, noes 31.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], as amended by the substitute amendment.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

I would like to know what the intention of the Committee is with reference to completing the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky does not state a parliamentary inquiry, but perhaps the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] may answer the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thought if we might finish title I tonight I would move that the Committee rise. If there are no further amendments to title I, I suggest that the Clerk read in the interest of orderly procedure and that will, of course, close the debate on title I, and after the first section of title II is read I will ask that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby reaffirms the declaration in the Price Control Extension Act of 1946 that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over rents would be inconsistent with the return to a peacetime economy and would tend to prevent the attainment of the goals therein declared.

(b) The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutory objectives of the above-named act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas.

(c) To the end that these policies may be effectively carried out with the least possible impact on the economy pending complete decontrol, the provisions of this title are enacted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members who spoke today in Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 3203 may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25, 26, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the figure "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$282,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,934,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "$164,631,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not exceeding $42,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,925,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,529,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 42.

JOHN TABER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I. GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive, relating to the Senate, provide additional amounts for furniture and repairs, $5,000; for Senate restaurants, $30,000; for mail transportation, $4,500; for stationery for Senators, $29,100; and installation of new telephone equipment, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $408,743 for the Panama Canal construction annuity fund, Civil Service Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $55,000 for certification services, Food and Drug Administration, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $40,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $275,364 for salaries, Howard University, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $600,000 for payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12 appropriate $762,181.66 for payment of damage claims, Public Roads Administration, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $742,814.77 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $15,000 for the Indian Claims Commission instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $60,800 for arbitration, emergency and emergency panel boards, National Mediation Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 appropriates $10,430 for salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17 appropriate $282,500 for control of tree insect epidemics, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $315,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminates language proposed by the House to restrict the area in which appropriation could be expended.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $10,000 for the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20 appropriate $50 for a damage claim, Department of Justice, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21 increases limitation on amount available for printing and binding for the War Labor Board, fiscal year 1946, from $30,000 to $49,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 22, 23, and 24 appropriate $111,136.06 for damage claims, Navy Department, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,509.56 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26 increase, by transfer, amount available for salaries, Hydrographic Office, by $200,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $217,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 increases, by transfer, amount available for salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, by $626,000, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $652,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 increases, by transfer, amount for salaries, Office of Judge Advocate General of the Navy, by $60,825, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $71,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29 increases, by transfer, amount for salaries, Office of Director of Naval Communications, by $200,000, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $216,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 increases, by transfer, amount for salaries, Bureau of Naval Personnel, by $350,000, instead of $275,000 as proposed by the House and $425,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 increases, by transfer, amount for salaries, Bureau of Ordnance, Navy, by $260,000, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $318,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 corrects a total.

Amendment No. 33 corrects the title of an appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 increases, by transfer, the amount available, Medical Department, Navy, by $4,000,000, instead of $3,862,000 as proposed by the House and $4,392,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35 increases, by transfer, amount for salaries, Bureau of Ships, Navy, by $350,000, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $691,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36 corrects a total.

Amendment No. 37 corrects the title of an appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39 correct a printing error.

Amendment No. 40 appropriates $10,000 for salaries, Office of the Solicitor, Post Office Department, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41 makes $17,000 (instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House and $20,000 as proposed by the Senate) for attendance of delegates at the Congress of the Universal Postal Union.

Amendment No. 42 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 43 appropriates $1,769,400 for manufacture of stamps, Post Office Department, as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44 increases limitation on amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Post Office Equipment Shops, from $869,500 to $932,600, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47 appropriate $201,375.28 for damage claims, War Department, as proposed by the Senate instead of $154,130.77 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48 appropriates $1,000,000 (under the heading, "Pay of the Army") for transportation by air to the United States of war spouses and their children, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 limits the amount available for water transportation of relief supplies, etc., in the appropriation, "Government and relief in occupied areas, Army," to $42,000,000, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House, and strikes out language, proposed by the House, relating to reimbursement for such relief expenditures.

Amendment No. 50 appropriates $300 for increased pay costs for detailed police under the Capitol Police, Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51 corrects an appropriation title.

Amendment No. 52 appropriates $400,000 for increased pay costs, Panama Canal, sanitation (War Department), as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II. CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 53 to 78, inclusive, appropriate $22,667,630.64 for claims and judgments, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $18,265,732.57, as proposed by the House.

TITLE III. REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 79 rescinds $210,000 from "Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps," as proposed by the House, instead of $193,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80 rescinds $1,925,675 from "Transportation and recruiting of Naval personnel," instead of $2,147,500 as proposed by the House and $1,738,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81 rescinds $4,529,350 from "Naval Procurement fund," instead of $4,817,350 as proposed by the House and $3,795,650 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 42 authorizes expenditure of fund for expenses of delegation to universal Postal Union on certificate of Postmaster General. The managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment and concur therein.

JOHN TABER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report. The report contains a large number of appropriations for agencies of the Government which are apt to be short of funds, and they are presently supposed to be short of funds and this should be made law as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, does the conference report cover payments for social security to old people?

Mr. TABER. Those items were not in dispute. Those items are in the bill but they were not in dispute so the conference report would not cover them. They are in the bill but the conference report does not cover them because they were not in dispute between the two bodies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the conferees. I have asked that it be considered now because it contains items for some of the agencies that should be made available as soon as possible.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual request, especially this late in the afternoon. Does the gentleman expect to yield time for debate?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman from Missouri desires time, I shall be pleased to yield it to him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was in the committee room and did not hear the gentleman's statement giving his reason for calling up the conference report for consideration at this late hour in the day.

Mr. TABER. It was done because there are some agencies which need the money and it is desired that the funds be made available to them as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CANNON. I heartily agree with the gentleman from New York that the earliest action possible should be taken. As a matter of fact, it is to be regretted that it is so unnecessarily belated. It is true that all the appropriation bills have been delayed to an extent unprecedented in the history of the House or the Congress, but the delay in this particular bill is especially unfortunate in that the lack of funds which it carries makes it necessary for the Veterans' Administration to default in the payment of hundreds of thousands of checks already due veterans all over the country. Former servicemen throughout the Nation are waiting for their allotments. The checks have already been written but the Veterans' Administration cannot put them in the mails until the money is provided by this bill. We have long been fully apprised of the situation, and I am glad to cooperate in pushing the bill up even 1 day, although it is now too late to get the checks to the men who are expecting them at the time they are due.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not only with regard to the veterans, but with regard to social security payments, there are thousands of old people within my State who have been delayed in receiving their checks, and I presume the same situation prevails elsewhere. On this account I should like to see the conference report agreed to as quickly as possible.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to have the gentleman's cooperation. We need all the help we can get in putting these bills through on time, or at least nearly on time as in this instance.

In response to the gentleman's inquiry, failure to get the bill through on time has left the Bureau without funds to pay student veterans their regular allowances, as well as subsistence checks for on-the-job trainees and, of course, all veterans on the unemployment compensation rolls. They aggregate something between two and three million veterans.

Justifications and full data were submitted by the Veterans' Administration in January. As I recall, General Bradley was called before the committee before the middle of February. He was not again called until March 17. If we can, save another day. Tomorrow is the first day of May, and I am glad to cooperate in getting the conference report over to the Senate without further embarrassing delay.

Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite procedure, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 38, line 2, insert "to be expended in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for on his certificate, which certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 42 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain statements and excerpts including minority views of four Members on the bill that was passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. E. M. Elkin, chairman of the Committee on Taxation and Government Expenditures, on Monday night at the Mayflower before the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE and Mr. BLATNIK asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE BATA CO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech I made regarding the Bata Co., of Czechoslovakia, on June 30, 1940, a statement on hide, leather, and shoes of June 3, 1939, and an article appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, more than 5 years ago, before this country became involved in difficulties with the German Nation, I called the attention of the House to the attempt of the Bata Shoe Co., of Czechoslovakia, to come into this country and secure special privileges for the establishment of their factories here. I pointed out that the practices of this company were in violation of the American way of life and that this company was acting as an agent for the Nazis. There were many who sought to secure a special privilege for this company. Some in high office made every effort to persuade the American people that this company had a more advanced technique than the American shoe industry and therefore should be given special consideration to ease their admission into the United States. Fortunately all of these efforts were defeated and I rise to point out to the House that reports from Czechoslovakia state that—

Mr. Jan Antonin Bata, one-time shoe-industry king, went on trial in absentia today on charges of wartime collaboration with the Germans. His lawyer, contending that Bata was now a citizen of Brazil, was overruled by the court.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this up at the present time to show the tremendous importance of keeping from coming into our country those persons who are try-

ing to destroy our way of life, those who are aliens to our way of life—the importance of enforcing our immigration laws. I succeeded in preventing the coming into this country of 500 Czechoslovakians under the guise of instructors, and so forth, in the Bata shoe factory. I succeeded in having a number of the 80 persons who had come into this country illegally under the pretense of being instructors and necessary to instruct the men in the manufacture of shoes deported.

Mr. Speaker, the operations of this concern was very much to the detriment of American labor. Afterward I was instrumental in preventing the exploitation of our children at the Belcamp, Md., plant of the Bata Co., where they were taking over children in child slavery.

At the beginning I did not have the cooperation of the administration, but in the end I did have their full cooperation and the private files on the Bata Shoe Co., Maryland, of the Department of Justice were turned over to me.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a speech I made on June 30, 1940, some remarks in Hide and Leather and Shoes, volume 97, No. 22, June 3, 1939, and also an article appearing in the New York Times of Tuesday, April 29, 1947, as follows:

THE BATA CO.

(Speech of Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts in the House of Representatives, January 30, 1940)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Biggers unemployment census shows approximately 34,000 boot and shoe workers totally unemployed and 15,000 boot and shoe workers partially unemployed, and the fact that the Canadian plant of the Bata Co. is operating with 225 Czechs and only a few Canadians, it seems to me it is very important for us to look over the activities of the Bata Co. insofar as it concerns the welfare of the people of the United States.

I have here a number of pamphlets from the Department of Commerce which show very clearly that Mr. Bata has disrupted the boot and shoe industry in every country in which he has opened plants. I also have some pamphlets showing pictures of the workers, and they are obviously quite young children, demonstrating what that concern would do to our labor market and to our older workers.

I also have a pair of shoes in my hand advertised as made in the Belcamp, Md., shop, which retail at $1.99. I have the advertisement of those shoes and the bill of sale. If you will look at the shoes, you will find they are out of line so far as the heel and toe are concerned. They are simple and of inferior quality, but a temptation for people to buy.

A little over 25 years ago several shoemakers came to this country to study American shoemaking methods. They worked for various periods of time in various shoe districts throughout the United States. Since returning to Europe they have repeatedly claimed that they have copied and followed American shoemaking methods. Today we have the strange experience of having these same workers return to the United States to teach American shoe workers shoemaking methods and techniques.

Of course, to anyone familiar with the shoemaking industry it is apparent that I am speaking of the Bata Shoe Co., of Zlin, Czechoslovakia. The name Bata Shoe Co. has become increasingly familiar to the American shoe industry and those connected with it. And now, because they have come into our midst, I think it would be highly desirable to cut through the fog and confusion that has been created regarding their activities and see what the true facts are regarding this company's development in the United States.

I may say I have checked very carefully the facts I am about to present to you today, so I am sure of the truth of what I am saying.

The Bata Shoe Co. first began extensive activities in the United States in the late twenties when it began the importation of the McKay type shoe in large quantities. This importation was the beginning of a well-planned development of this company's activities here. Soon thereafter the company established the Bata Shoe Co., Inc., in New York and began the establishment of a retail chain of stores in the Midwest, centering around Chicago, Ill.

These stores were in competition with American shoe shops which sold a line and grade of shoe acceptable to the American consumer. In order to satisfy the same demand, it was necessary for them to purchase shoes from the American manufacturers in the domestic market. This was due to the fact that the Bata Co. was forced to pay a 20-percent tariff on all shoes imported into the United States. Twenty percent of a $1 retail pair of shoes was only 20 cents and could be absorbed by the low wage and labor cost which they paid in their foreign factories. It was not as easy for them to absorb 20 percent of their $5 shoes which amounted to as much as $1. Therefore, they purchased the more expensive shoes for their domestic market and imported their cheaper shoes from their foreign factories.

But the domestic manufacturer from whom they purchased their medium-priced and expensive shoes was constantly hard put to it to obtain their orders because subtle propaganda was constantly being spread that "Bata is about to establish a factory in the United States." And it was no coincidence that these recurrent rumors appeared most strongly just prior to the time that the style shows were to be held, at which contracts were to be signed for shoes for the coming season.

Thus for many years in the past decade the American shoe industry and the American shoeworkers have seen the growth and development of Bata's retail chain of stores and at the same time have heard recurring, persistent rumors that Bata and all the dire things he represents to them is about to be brought to the United States.

The rumors served their purpose. The manufacturers, in order to gain an immediate order, would repeatedly cut their cost at labor's expense and justify themselves with the claim and thought that "if we don't accept this order at a reduced rate, Bata will establish his factory here and provide a more serious and more threatening competition than he does now."

The workers in the shoe industry were told each period after style season that they must once again accept a cut in wages if they are to prevent Bata establishing here and throwing the whole shoe industry into chaos.

It was because of these contacts with the Bata Shoe Co. and knowledge of their methods, that the shoe industry opposed so violently the special concessions given to this company in the reciprocal-trade treaty between Czechoslovakia and the United States. At the hearings held in connection with this treaty it was brought out especially by the trade-union representatives, that while they had every sympathy with the democratic government of Czechoslovakia, they opposed these concessions for the shoe industry, because the Bata Shoe Co., representing the only major shoe manufacturer engaged in export to the United States would be the sole beneficiary of this section of the treaty. Anyone who has checked up on the methods and labor standards of this company, as I shall develop at greater length shortly, would agree that this company and its methods was not in sympathy with the true democracy and the progressive methods of government of their country. It was for that reason and for that reason alone that we, who are familiar with the shoe industry and its problems, so strongly opposed the shoe section of that reciprocal-trade treaty. We cannot help feeling, to this day, that our cause was prejudged and that our explanation and facts were given little consideration when the negotiations were concluded.

The treaty would have permitted the importation into this country of some 6,000,000 pairs of shoes, or up to one-quarter percent of the total production of shoes in this country. However, as the opposition pointed out at the time, these shoes, consisting almost solely of cemented women's novelty shoes, constituted a much larger percentage of that class of shoe production, and due to the low-price factor became an important pace setter in that branch of the shoe industry.

Unfortunately, both for the Bata Shoe Co. and our own State Department, as well as for a number of other groups and the peace of the world, Hitler had other plans. In the fall of 1938 Hitler took over the Sudetan lands, and on March 15, 1939, occupied Bohemia and Moravia, thus absorbing both the home plant of the Bata Shoe Co. in Zlin and the basic establishments of the industrial empire of the Bata Co., which were located in the absorbed territories. The direct effect of all this on the Bata Shoe Co.'s plans in the United States was that imports from the home plant in Zlin had to be marked "made in Germany." All the confusion and representations of the Bata Shoe Co. that they no longer had control of the company's properties in the protectorate of Czechoslovakia have since proven false, but at that time and until the late fall of 1939 efforts were made here in Washington, in Czechoslovakia, and Berlin, Germany, to evade the 25-percent countervailing duties imposed upon imports of German products by the President on March 18, 1939.

This action by the President cut off imports from Zlin and hampered the plans of the Bata Shoe Co. for their development of a much larger chain of retail stores than they already had established here. At first they attempted to provide the deficiency by increasing their imports from their factories in neutral countries, such as the Netherlands, but found difficulty in overcoming the tremendous problems created by shipping difficulties due to naval warfare and the sinking of allied and neutral shipping.

These problems gave incentive to the speeding up of the developed plans for the establishment of a factory in the United States, and by April 7, 1939, in the Hartford Democrat and Aberdeen Enterprise, published in Aberdeen, Md., you will find the following paragraph:

"It is understood that recent developments in that country since its invasion by Germany have brought to a head plans for the construction of a similar plant in America."

On April 28 the same paper carried the definite announcement that the Bata plant was to be constructed at Belcamp, Md.

Actually the Bata Co. had planned to establish its American factory at Belcamp as early as the summer of 1934 and late that September made arrangements that the new Philadelphia road pass through its property. They later paid the Maryland State Highway Commission $11,000 for this arrangement. Meanwhile they had arranged for special consideration from local officials and followed this up with a petition to the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor requesting the Department to permit the Bata Co to import 100 citizens of Czechoslovakia to "employ these persons as instructors in the making of shoes in accordance with the particular methods and in the operation of the special type of shoe machinery which will be used by the petitioner

in its new factory." The petition was based on the allegation that the machines used by the Bata Shoe Co. were different from machines used in a comparable American factory. Likewise, the petition claimed that 5 or more years' experience in the Bata factory in Zlin was necessary to develop the skills required to teach their "peculiar" methods.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the machines seem to be exactly like the machines in use here and that may be secured in this country. May I also state that the work can be done by our own already well-trained boot and shoe workers. May I state further that the Department of Labor in making an investigation of the Bata plant at Belcamp, Md., found that only a small number of the Czechoslovakian instructors were needed to in any way carry on the work. I have here a table showing the ages of the so-called instructors on behalf of whom request was made for permission to enter this country. One was 16, two were 17, two were 18, four were 19, and nine were 20, and so on. These were all brought into the country as instructors.

Age distribution of Czech instructors imported by Bata

Age	Number	Date of arrival					Cumulative total
		Aug. 10	Aug. 11	Aug. 17	Aug. 28	Sept. 9	
16	1				1		
17	2					2	3
18	2				2		5
19	4	1			1	2	9
20	9			2	3	4	18
21	5			1	1	3	23
22	6	1		1	1	3	29
23	2	1				1	31
24	1					1	32
25	6	1		2	2	1	38
26	1				1		39
27	4	2	1	1			43
28	3	2			1		46
29	1	1					47
30	2	1		1			49
31	1			1			50
32	2				1	1	52
33	3					3	55
34	5	4		1			60
35	3	1		1		1	63
36	2	1				1	65
37	3	3					68
38	1	1					69
39	1					1	70
40	1	1					71
Total		21	1	11	14	24	

It is possible that the Department of Labor had no way of making an immediate check upon these claims, though I am informed that within the Department were three experts who were familiar with Bata methods, at least two of whom had visited the Bata plant at Zlin. Also, the Department of Labor could have made use of the knowledge of experts in the Department of Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and the Treasury Department, who had familiarized themselves with the methods and business techniques of the Bata Shoe Co.

However, the Immigration Service did not consult these experts nor make any effort to determine the truth of the Bata Co.'s claims beyond the holding of a formal, perfunctory hearing in their New York office May 11, 1939, 1 week to the day after the petition was filed, and without any notice to the industry or the trade-unions who might have appeared and presented the full facts sought by the examining officer before the permit was granted. However, the Department saw fit to grant this permit after a hearing at which the only party represented was the Bata Co. through three officials of their American subsidiary. This hearing definitely established the fact that the Bata Co. had planned to establish a factory at Belcamp and that it took the "minimum of 5 years' experience at the Bata plant in Zlin before anyone could expect to serve the purpose that we wish to put these people to that are coming over."

Another important fact developed at this hearing was the answer to the question:

"Question. In the event it should be required, would your company be prepared to post bond to guarantee the departure of these persons from the United States?

"Answer. While we respectfully request that no bond be asked because of the amount involved and because of the fact that we are taking the responsibility for these people and are willing to guarantee their leaving on a certain date, I can say that if that was the only condition on which they would be admitted, then, of course, we would post the bond."

Though the officials of the Labor Department were aware of the bad faith shown by officials of the Bata Shoe Co., the Department granted the permit in a letter dated June 9, 1939. The conditions of this permit required the Bata Co. to furnish the Immigration and Naturalization Service with "the name of the alien, name of the vessel, the date and port of contemplated arrival, prior to each alien's applying at the American consulate at Prague for a visa and before departure from Czechoslovakia."

These conditions were immediately violated when, on July 6, 1939, some 23 employees of the Bata Co. arrived at Ellis Island without having fulfilled the above requirements of the permit and attempted to cover their entry into the United States by claiming that they were "visitors to the World's Fair." Each of the 23 admitted upon questioning that they were employees of the Bata Co.; that they were awaiting orders from Mr. Bata; and that they had such small sums as $40 as their total cash assets. I am amazed at the effort of this company to legalize later the entry of these aliens by attempting to negotiate with the Immigration Service for the permanent entry of "25 chemists, inventors, engineers, executives, and experts in the manufacture of products by the company Bata." The Department sidestepped this request by pointing out that the immigration laws required "the procurement of a consular immigration visa from the Department of State." As late as November 13, 1939, 7 of these 23 were still in the United States, although they had been granted visitor's visas for a 60-day period only, beginning on July 6, 1939. Two of the 7 applied for extensions, leaving 5 in outright violation of their visas as visitors, and with no effort made to obtain legal extension or entry. Is it possible that the Bata Co. feels that it is above complying with American law?

The Bata Co. further violated the conditions of the permit of entry of June 9, 1939, by claiming that the permit granted for 100 did not include as separte individuals the wives and adult children of the so-called instructors, who were permitted entry by the Department of Labor.

After extensive, lengthy negotiations between the Department of Labor and counsel for the Bata Co., the company was permitted to bring wives and children into the country on visitors' visas.

At this point I would like to make clear the fact that we no longer are involved with only 72 individuals, as the company's inspired publicity claims, but we have 7 World's Fair visitors, 44 visitors accompanying 72 so-called instructors, plus 26 executives and officials here as visitors on business, plus their families, servants, secretaries, chauffeurs, and so forth, a total of more than 200 here in connection with the Belcamp factory alone. The number of alien officials, executives, and workers here in connection with the retail stores in the Midwest, the new chain of retail stores in the East, and those in each of our possessions, including the Panama Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, and so forth—the total number of individuals involved, I feel sure, would easily come to 500 or more.

Last autumn an attempt was made by Mr. Bata to bring 500 workers from Czechoslovakia in addition to the first request for the 100 so-called instructors. In conjunction with others, I worked very hard to prevent these alien workers from coming into the country and apparently we were successful in our efforts.

To me the most amazing fact regarding these aliens, in view of the company's claims of skill, is their youth. I refer you to the above table showing the age distribution of the so-called Czech instructors imported by the company. One expert admitted, Ludmila Rokytova, though listed as an official of the firm, was only 16 years of age. Others ranged through the adolescent years. One-fourth of the total were 20 years or younger. One-half of the grand total were 25 years or less. Look it over.

At what age were these experts employed by the Bata Co. to give them 5 or more years' experience, which according to the company's own petition for admission of these instructors, was necessary to develop the skills required to teach the Bata methods. Is it possible that this company employs such large numbers of youth in their plant at Zlin?

I have here in my hand a booklet published in three languages, including English, by the Bata Co. for distribution to visitors and those interested in the Bata system. On page 29 is a picture of a child learning to use the Singer sewing machine. This child certainly cannot be more than 8 years of age. It is plain from the picture and the caption below it that this child is learning skills involving the use of this machine. I now take up another booklet published by the same company entitled "Zlin, the Place of Activity," and find from pictures on pages 41, 48, and 47 that the use of the Singer sewing machine constitutes a vital part of the production system of the Bata Shoe Co.

It is beginning to seem to me that the claims of trade-union officials, in the hearings before the Tariff Commission, that their opposition to the concessions to the Bata Co. were based on low wages and the exploitation of youth were well founded in fact.

In the petition for the importation of the instructors the Bata Co. stated that their "experience convinces the petitioner that the best results can be obtained by employing young men and women locally, paying them a comparatively high rate of wages."

And then gives the real reason for their importation by continuing:

"Petitioner believes this plan will accomplish better results than can be had by endeavoring to recruit its force from among experienced shoemakers who are not acquainted with the Bata methods."

The company proceeded to follow its plan along this line and early last summer—

"Every member of the 1939 graduating class of Hartford County high schools received a card inviting applications for employment. Soon thereafter, the invitation was extended to 1938 and 1937 graduates."

Thus the company kept the implied promises of Mr. Bata, who when dedicating the laying of the cornerstone said, "I intend to employ no one except high-school graduates and to educate them in my methods"—copied for the most part from American mass-production methods.

Mr. Bata thus absorbs a small section of American youth, but he completely throws on the industrial scrap heap all American shoe workers now unemployed and those who will thus be displaced by the so-called economies of his system.

His statement, just quoted, claims that his system is an adaptation of American mass-production methods, so we should look at those methods to see what they produce.

In the newspaper article already referred to in the Sunday Star of November 19, 1939,

there is the following quotation regarding Mr. Bata's methods:

"These methods are an adaption of the conveyor-belt system perfected in the automobile industry. Rawhides and other materials begin at the top of the building and flow endlessly down and around from floor to floor, past the benches of workers, who have each one a small task to do in the making of the finished shoe.

"One man polishes the leather of the hide. Another cuts the uppers; another cuts the caps; another inserts eyelets; another turns the welt; another sandpapers heels.

" 'And it is fast,' declared an 18-year-old girl, a graduate of Havre de Grace High School last year.

"They assigned me to brushing polish around the edge of the sole and they gave me a whistle.

"RESULTS FROM A WHISTLE

" 'If you can't keep up with the shoes going past on the belt,' they said, 'blow the whistle. The belt will stop till you catch up.' I managed to keep up with the belt all morning, but in the middle of the afternoon I fell behind. So I blew the whistle. All of a sudden it seemed as if about 20 instructors were around me, shouting instructions in Czech and German and English.

"I vowed right then that I would never blow that whistle again—not even if the factory blew up."

It is obvious from this article that the Bata system has adopted the technique of the American mass-production system without the social viewpoint and humane methods of the American use of that system.

This same article points out that these youngsters were employed at the minimum wage required by law. The Bata Co.'s petition for the admission of these so-called instructors alleged that the best results could be obtained by employing young people and paying them a comparatively high rate of wages. Does Mr. Bata think that the minimum established by law is a high rate of wages?

The report of a memorandum by the Immigration Department officials in regard to the second investigation of the Bata Shoe Co., conducted late in November 1939, contains the following:

"Although the petition mentioned above also alleged that the best results could be obtained by employing young men and women locally and paying them a comparatively high rate of wages, it should be stated that the greater part of these new workers are being paid the minimum wage prescribed by the Wage and Hour Division of this Department—30 cents an hour, or $12.60 per week, with a social-security deduction of 13 cents."

In addition, this alien concern is not complying with the minimum-wage standards established by this Congress. In a civil action brought before the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, the Wage and Hour Division charged the Bata Shoe Co. not only with failing to pay the minimum required by law, and failing to pay overtime for hours worked beyond the maximum set for the regular rate by law, but this company likewise, which seeks special favors in our midst, was charged with and later admitted, by a stipulation dated December 19, 1939, the full essence of the complaint. For the short period of 1 year under which we have been operating under the act, this company, to bring itself under compliance with the act, made restitution of $7,000 in wages to 65 of its employees in Chicago.

I am reliably informed that the company is also violating the provisions of the wage-hour law in its plant in Maryland. Trade-unions, representing a number of employees in that plant, have filed complaints with the Wage and Hour Division recently. They were informed that an investigation would be instituted by the Wage and Hour Division, if and when further violations were found in this plant. It seems to me that this visitor in our midst is certainly abusing the hospitality which has been shown him. It is time the administrative agencies of Government required strict adherence to the spirit and letter of their regulations before conceding further favorable administrative decisions to the Bata Co.

The experts and officials of the Department of Labor who have made a thorough study of the methods of this company, of their machinery, of their technique and business methods, have required the company to reduce its alien staff of instructors to a maximum of 10. This ruling was made after a full, fair consideration of all the facts, and all the allegations of the company in its original petition. Now, instead of complying with the regulations of the Department, powerful interests in the State of Maryland, apparently at the request of the Bata Co., are bringing pressure upon the Department of Labor to change its ruling.

In behalf of the American shoe industry, I urge the Department of Labor to stand by its determination in this matter, and I urge the Members of this House to investigate the facts regarding the Bata Co. before they associate themselves in the efforts in its behalf.

You should know the tremendous harm which the methods of this company will work on our already trained boot and shoe people, when the Biggers unemployment census shows that 34,000 boot and shoe workers were totally unemployed and 15,000 were partially unemployed. It also works a tremendous hardship on all labor.

* * * * *

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to give you a few more facts about the Bata situation in this country. Let us have an open investigation of it. I would welcome it. I know the workers would welcome it and the industry would welcome it. Let us face the facts for a minute. Let us look over the whole activity of this company in this country.

I want to show you again that Mr. Bata violated his agreement in allowing these people to come into this country. I also draw your attention to an issue of the New York Times, in which it is stated that Mr. Bata wanted to buy a textile mill in this country. He wanted a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, according to the newspaper story, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation refused that loan because Mr. Bata would not promise to employ American workers.

Let us also face the facts that Mr. Bata later requested that an additional 500—not 100, but with it 600 in all—Czechoslovakians be allowed to come in sometime during last autumn. Five hundred workers would mean their families also, of course; not 100 but 500. That would make 600 that the request was made for, of Czechoslovakian workers, together with their families, to come into this country.

The following is an article in a St. Louis paper on Monday, November 6, 1939, by Mr. Drew Pearson and Mr. Robert S. Allen:

"THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

"(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

"CZECH SHOE LABOR

"The Labor and State Departments have been up against a tough problem recently with the demand that 600 workers and executives of the famous Bata shoe factories of Czechoslovakia be permitted to enter the United States.

"Jan Bata, who has done to shoes what Ford has done to automobiles, is setting up a new factory in Harford County, Md., just north of Baltimore. To start the factory he asked for the admission of 100 Czech workers. This roused terrific opposition from both CIO and A. F. of L. shoe unions.

"However, Bata had the support of Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, whose law partner, Maj. Robert Archer, was arranging for the purchase of Bata's land in Maryland. TYDINGS wrote several vigorous letters to the Labor and State Departments demanding entry of the workers, and they finally consented that 100 workers be admitted temporarily.

"This has aroused the vehement opposition of some of Senator TYDINGS' colleagues, notably Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, Senator Davis, of Pennsylvania, and Representatives Treadway and Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts. They have protested that the admission of shoe workers seriously hurts shoe labor in the United States.

"Despite all this, Bata has just asked to import 500 additional personnel into the United States, and Senator TYDINGS made a personal call upon Secretary of State Hull to urge their admission. Specifically, he urged that the immigration laws be waived to admit these 500 in one lump. He urged this on the ground that this group consisted of shoe executives, chemists, and specially trained men, who would not interfere with American labor.

"United States labor unions, however, again objected, and even more strenuously. They pointed out that the families of the Bata people also would be admitted, which meant nearer 2,000 rather than 500. They also pointed out that Bata was the Henry Ford of Czechoslovakia; that he manufactured a cheap product which undersold American shoes; and that it was impossible for labor to organize his plants.

"Secretary Hull, faced with Senator TYDINGS' plea, consulted his chief of the visa office, Avra Warren, who advised him that if Bata wanted to shift his executive offices to the United States, it should be done through routine channels. Warren urged that if Bata really wanted to set up factories permanently in the United States, his men should get permanent visas, not be given temporary visas.

"He pointed out that the Nestlé's Chocolate Co. was planning to move to the United States to avoid the war; also, the Belgian mines offices and the Belgian diamond cutters. Warren argued that the transfer of Bata permanently to the United States would enrich this country, and that any immigration visas granted Bata should be on a permanent basis.

"Accordingly, the State Department has ruled that the Bata people may receive regular, not temporary, visas if they are able to comply with the requirements of the law."

I am fighting for American jobs and not for jobs for people over there. Our duty is to find employment for the people here.

I know that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is working for his farmers; I realize that, because he is always working for his farmers, and also I know he does not comprehend the very great danger in allowing hundreds of trained aliens to come to this country to compete with our unemployed.

I would like to tell you further that although the officials of the Labor Department were aware of the bad faith shown by officials of the Bata Shoe Co., the Department granted the permit in a letter dated June 9, 1939, but then later withdrew it.

I repeat that Mr. Bata violated the conditions of the permit of entry immediately, for on July 6, 1939, some 23 employees of the Bata firm arrived at Ellis Island without having fulfilled the requirements of the permit, and attempted to cover their entry into the United States by claiming that they were visitors to the World's Fair. Each of the 23 admitted upon questioning that he was an employee of the Bata Co. and that he was awaiting orders from Mr. Bata. They had such small sums as $40 as their total cash assets.

Again I want to say that I am amazed at the effort of this company to legalize later

the entry of these aliens by attempting to negotiate with the Immigration Service for the permanent entry of 25 chemists, inventors, engineers, executives, and experts in the manufacture of products by the Bata Co.

As I stated before, the Department seemed to sidestep this request by pointing out that the immigration laws required the procurement of a consular immigration visa from the Department of State. As late as November 13, 1939, 7 of these 23 were still in the United States, although they had been granted visitors' visas for a 60-day period only, beginning on July 6, 1939; 2 of the 7 applied for extension, leaving 5 in outright violation of their visas as visitors and with no effort made to obtain legal extension or entry.

I also want to emphasize again the fact of the employment of young and inexperienced workers, that they could not keep up with Mr. Bata's method of production. Our methods are better. Our workers are better. They are citizens of the United States. My ambition and purpose is to fight for their protection.

[From Hide and Leather and Shoes of June 3, 1939]

POSTPONE BATA MEETING

The Shoe and Leather News, London, reports that the extraordinary general meeting of the Bata Co., of Zlin, has been postponed from May 2 to a probable date late in June or early in July.

The writing down of the company's share capital was to have been finally settled at this meeting, and one of the reasons surmised for the postponement is the present impossibility of clearing up the question of exports and sources of raw materials.

Although the Zlin factory is now presumably in control Jan Bata under agreement with the German government, the News says it is considered likely that the plant will in the future be used in increasing measure in the interests of the Reich to supply domestic and foreign markets with cheap footwear.

[From the New York Times of April 29, 1947]

CZECHS BEGIN BATA TRIAL

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, April 28.—Jan Antonin Bata, one-time shoe-industry king, went on trial in absentia today on charges of wartime collaboration with the Germans. His lawyer, contending that Bata was now a citizen of Brazil, was overruled by the court. Edvard Valenta, a journalist, testified that Bata had declined to permit his branches around the world to be used as resistance centers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the National Tribune of Thursday, May 1, 1947, entitled "There Is Danger Ahead," which points out that legislation having to do with disabled veterans must be a continuing matter, and not a spasmodic one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker it would appear that almost every conceivable argument on one side or the other had been exhausted in the course of last week's debates on the bill for appropriations for the Interior Department.

Yet, upon reading over the RECORD of those debates and upon further study of the hearings held before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, it strikes me as increasingly evident that many Members on both sides of the aisle still do not have a full understanding of the facts about western reclamation and power-development projects. All of you, of course, are fully aware of my personal, intense interest. It also appears to me to be evident that many assumptions were made in the course of the hearings—and that these assumptions were reflected in the marking up of the bill—which are not fully clarified by the facts as deduced and concerning which the subcommittee, for one reason or another, did not obtain accurate and sufficient information.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can be able to reconsider, in calmer reason, three phases of our present-day reclamation and development program.

The first of these is the proper place of western reclamation in the over-all program of governmental activity.

The second phase that bothers me is the maintenance of a fiction that money expended on western reclamation projects is a subsidy granted to westerners for purely political purposes, rather than because of any valuable contribution to the national wealth.

The third, Mr. Speaker, is the general impression on the part not only of Members of Congress but of leaders of the administration itself that the residents of the area surrounding a development project do not contribute their share toward the cost of such development.

In the course of these remarks I hope to shed some light on each of these three subjects in the hope that they may provide our further considerations with a justification for correcting the Interior Department appropriations and providing for a workable schedule of progress on projects now under construction.

I shall have to base the bulk of my remarks on the two activities of the Interior Department which come most directly within the scope of my interests—the Reclamation Bureau's Columbia Basin project and the Bonneville Power Administration. I think I am making a very fair assertion when I state that, to a great extent, the proper and orderly development of the Columbia River Basin and of the Northwest itself are largely dependent upon the early completion of the essential tasks being carried out by those two activities. They already constitute a tremendous Federal investment and the return of that investment to the Treasury depends entirely upon completion of the projects.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week I introduced into the House of Representatives a resolution which, in effect, calls upon the administration and its Chief Executive to remove the freeze order of last August 2 and carry forward all projects connected with reclamation, river and harbors work, and flood control, for which the Seventy-ninth Congress and the previous Congresses have authorized funds.

I introduced my resolution, House Joint Resolution 177, and I am pleased to note that I have been joined in that purpose by a number of my Republican colleagues, for the purpose of calling the attention of the administration and of the Nation itself, to the fact that, since the end of World War II, the United States Government has already allowed millions of dollars to slip through its fingers and lost further millions of dollars worth of vitally needed agricultural and industrial products as a result of its failure to give a consistent green light to the construction of reclamation and power projects in virtually every part of this country which are so badly needed to support our expanding economy.

Being specific—in my own State of Washington—a direct result of the now famous Truman freeze order has been a crippling and growing shortage of electric power upon which many industries depend as their source of prime energy. Industries in that State could have today been using that power for the purposes of converting our western raw materials, timber, aluminum, clay and the like into wallboard, plaster, and the various construction materials we so directly need for the veterans' housing.

This, Mr. Speaker, is only a slight example of the type of short-sighted economy we are practicing if we accept as final the form of Interior Department appropriation bill which was passed by the House last week.

On the second day of House debate on the Interior bill last week I noticed an editorial in a local morning paper which in effect said that these cuts on western development were all right. It quotes the subcommittee's report that "perhaps in no other appropriation bill is there greater opportunity for sound economy and Government spending than in this bill."

I recall the reaction of this same morning paper to a suggestion of mine a month ago. At that time, before a joint subcommittee of these two Houses, the fiscal condition of the District of Columbia was being aired. Before us then and now was a budget for the District of Columbia that was some $20,000,000 out of plumb. I was very seriously taken to task for suggesting that there were other avenues of revenue raising and expense reduction than the Federal contributior which should be seriously considered.

This same paper that today thinks that western development is not necessary was quite caustic in its comments when I indicated that the raising of the Federal contribution was not necessarily the answer to the District of Columbia's problems.

And so I conclude that it merely depends on one's opinion.

Last week, out in the State of Washington, I attended the funeral of our late colleague, Fred Norman. Last Wednesday at noon I left Spokane and flew westward. In my lap as I flew over the Columbia Basin project was the morning newspaper. One headline read, "Chinese to request a billion-dollar loan"; another headline read, "House today considers $350,000,000 loan to Europe"; another read, "Senate yesterday voted $400,000,000 to Greece." As

I looked down upon the Columbia Basin project and northward to Grand Coulee Dam, I recalled another item in the President's budget—the State Department. In 1941 it received $21,000,000. This item for 1948 is swelled to a total of $276,000,000. But that is not all: the total for all of our activities in the field of international politics in the President's budget for 1948, as it sets today, is $2,800,000,000.

Now I draw no conclusions from that total sum. I do not now criticize that total sum. But I do want to point out that what is in the President's budget is not all. For the $200,000,000 aid to Europe and the four hundred million gift-loan to Greece are outside of that total and so our entire activities involving foreign nations will be better than $3,500,000,000. Furthermore, we are told that $100,000,000 of the Greek loan is for reclamation and river development in that foreign country.

Compared to these sums, the Interior appropriation is a small item in the $37,000,000,000 budget before this House. The controversial items in the Interior bill are far less than one-half of 1 percent, and I submit that at a time when we are playing fast and loose for credits to countries abroad, it comes with rather poor grace for us to be restrictive and unreasonable with our western United States.

As I looked down upon that rich and arid land of central Washington, I recalled a speech I had made on the floor of the House when this bill was before us last year. I pointed out the need for completing this project as soon as possible in order that the time for repayment of the Federal Government's investment might be speeded up. We had the same argument before us then involving the carry-over of funds.

According to the Department's report, the construction schedule which I indicated in my speech last year has been carried out and the carry-over funds available for further construction on Columbia Basin as of fiscal June 30 will be $1,084,000. To carry on the construction schedule at the same tempo as last year would require for this project the total of $29,500,000. It is for this reason, of course, that those of us from the West have complained about the size of the item before us last week. For the amount allowed must mean the abandonment of many projects half completed. In that respect, I consider it highly significant that the President long since released all funds earmarked for Columbia Basin and Bonneville Administration construction, even while holding some other projects frozen. This should be an indication of the measure of importance the administration places upon those projects. That place of importance is fully justified, Mr. Speaker, by the fact the entire Northwest is dependent upon the completion of those projects as the key to their industrial and agricultural security.

I intend to touch upon that subject at length in a few moments. But at this point I want to emphasize this thought: The greatest argument for our participation on the grand scale in foreign affairs is that we today are the last remaining solvent capitalistic nation.

Our solvency, of course, depends upon our ability continuously to produce and, in that light, the people of the Northwest are begging us to recognize the value of the Columbia River developments as a distinct asset to this Nation.

Our future solvency depends upon the degree of imagination and enlightened self-interest with which we undertake the task of capitalizing upon the tremendous resources which are ours in this great country, so that we may continue to be the greatest producing, the highest consuming, the most truly progressive and dynamic country in the world.

No, Mr. Speaker, let us delve beneath the arguments and counterarguments that have been so liberally used in this matter and get at the facts of the case, as they relate to the Columbia Basin project and Bonneville Power Administration.

The general reason given for slashes in amounts granted by the House for development of projects during fiscal 1948 was that the President had not allowed the expenditure of the full amounts appropriated by Congress for this purpose last year. As I have previously stated, the Columbia Basin project was released from this "freeze" almost immediately, and, as of June 30, 1947, will have only $1,058,000 in carry-over funds. Almost all of this money has been expended in partial payment of contracts which extend over a period of years and the full amount requested by the Budget Bureau is necessary to meet the contractual obligations already made.

In spite of this fact, the Columbia Basin allowance was cut to $11,435,000, an amount little more than one-third of the budget request.

Now let us consider what kind of problem that action creates in the Bureau of Reclamation and specifically to the great Columbia River, more specifically, to the so-called Columbia Basin specific subprojects.

Irrespective of the amounts necessary to continue construction on the canals, Low Dam, Potholes Dam and pumping plant of the project, there is necessary an item of $6,000,000 to pay the annual progress payments on the construction of the six new generators for Grand Coulee Dam which the subcommittee report states were "scheduled for installation to meet the increased demand for power."

Mr. Speaker, with this small appropriation for the entire Columbia Basin project, the Bureau of Reclamation cannot hope to meet this $6,000,000 payment and those six generators almost undoubtedly will be placed 1 year behind schedule for their installation.

This, in effect, will mean that we will have a power dam—completed and in actual operation, generating and distributing power but the vital heart that makes it truly wealth-producing will have been left out and the total, cable energy which should flow over the transmission lines—which the bill authorizes to be built—will not be available. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is a prime example of false economy.

Another item drastically reduced was for the operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration from $4,700,000 to $2,500,000. In its report, the subcommittee criticized certain activities of the Bonneville Administration and mentioned that it was eliminating funds or portions of funds used by those activities. The sum total of these criticized amounts could not be more than $700,000. I suggest that a reduction of $2,200,000 based upon an aversion to less than one-third of that amount verges upon emotion rather than reason. I am advised on responsible authority that the Bonneville Administration cannot possibly maintain an operating organization on a budget smaller than $4,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. To attempt operation on the amount scheduled to be appointed can only result in a serious loss to the Government through deterioration and lack of maintenance. This again is an outstanding item of questionable economy.

There is another cut which was made in the Bonneville Administration appropriation which grieves me very deeply. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal purposes in constructing these projects has been to bring the magic of electric power within the reach of millions of little people to whom private utilities have never been able to make it available. The subcommittee eliminated entirely the items amounting to $5,699,500 for construction of feeder line and capital additional substations which are necessary to make power available along rural electrification lines. REA lines serve the small farms and the so-called little people. To me they are vital. I must confess that I question the wisdom of the subcommittee's action. I sincerely hope our future action will keep faith with our farmers by restoring those lines and substations.

I now wish to address myself to the question of long-range economy in the event the proposed cuts are sustained in these projects. The amounts authorized for Bonneville Power Administration and Columbia Basin projects are less than sufficient to keep existing contractual obligations and maintain these projects at their present level. They make no provision for continuing the scheduled construction of these projects in line with the promises made to the people of the Northwest by the Seventy-ninth Congress last year on the occasion when it reduced appropriations below the amounts asked at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the promises made by the Seventy-ninth Congress for completion of these projects, according to a specified schedule, were accepted in good faith by thousands and hundreds of thousands of residents of the Pacific Northwest. They believed in the good faith of our assertions. Acting upon that good faith, they have invested their personal fortunes and their own futures in enterprises and industries which depend upon the completion of these projects on schedule. And, if Congress does not now keep faith with them, thousands of these individuals, among whom hundreds are veterans of this last and of the First World Wars, will lose their stake in the future of this country and may be forced to call upon this Government for relief, necessitated by the short-sightedness of those who would obstruct the development of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the trouble to determine what the effect would be of slowing down the completion of Columbia Basin project to the extent necessitated under the proposed bill.

First, I should like to consider the effect upon the agriculture and rural economy of the area. Work now in progress on some $33,000,000 worth of construction and supply contracts for the irrigation features of the project would have to be reprogramed and work on a number of the existing contracts will have to be stopped. Experience has shown that the stoppage of work during the war years has caused an additional expense ranging from 20 percent to 30 percent of the estimated value of work involved.

This additional expense is the result of dispersion of organization, deterioration of materials, erosion of uncompleted work, the cost of protection on strategic projects and the like. These losses result in an unproductive cost to the water and power users of the projects of about $10,000,000 during the first year that this retarded schedule is in effect. Vitally required repairs to the Grand Coulee spillway bucket probably must be delayed with a resultant loss which is difficult if not impossible to evaluate because of the uncertainties of the erosion which might take place.

Consider the effect of this curtailment of program upon the general economy of the Northwest.

The Northwest has a power shortage on its hands at this moment and unless the Congress permits reasonable increases in generation and transmission this shortage will become more acute.

There are several reasons for this power shortage. The principal cause is the greater use of power among the established customers. Another cause is the unexpectedly large increase in industrial load in the postwar period. A third major cause is the regional lack of generating and transmission capacity. Private-utility companies have agreed that only the Federal Government is capable of financing the kind of construction necessary for harnessing that river.

More generating capacity could be quickly developed from Grand Coulee and the lower dams. Other dams such as McNary and Foster Creek are also possibilities but only for long range power supply because of the time required to build and equip the dams. Grand Coulee and the lower existing dams, already installed, have space available for 20 more generators. These represent the only hope in meeting the current power shortage. At Grand Coulee there is space for 12 more 108,000-kilowatt generators. Three generators are now being installed, three are being manufactured, and three are in the planning stage. These nine generators can relieve most of the power shortage up until 1950, but adequate appropriations from Congress must be made for the 1948 fiscal year to make this possible. The 1948 Interior Department budget estimate contains $27,500,000 to carry on the work for these generators and other work at Grand Coulee, but the House has granted only $11,435,000.

Leaving the power supply question for a moment, let us consider the effect of these nine generators on the finances of the country. The Grand Coulee Dam which was once scorned as a white elephant has proven itself as a supplier of needed kilowatts and is paying its own way. It is now paying back its cost ahead of schedule and would, if permitted, pay out still faster by completing the generator installation as quickly as possible. Nine additional generators would bring in $5,000,000 additional revenue yearly. It is difficult to understand how anyone could turn down as businesslike a project as this.

From both a power supply standpoint and a financial standpoint, full appropriation should be made for additional generators at Grand Coulee.

Without a transmission grid new generators would be useless as the power must be brought to the market. The grid not only serves to bring the power to the market but also provides more firm power by tying together the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants. An additional capacity of from 100,000 to 150,000 kilowatts has been developed in this manner. The Bonneville Act directs that transmission lines be built by existing and potential markets. In the early days of the Bonneville project lines were built to potential markets which have subsequently developed into actual markets far beyond expectations.

With the present power shortage in the Northwest the building of lines to potential markets is out of the question. It will be well if the actual demand is taken care of. All the items in the 1948 budget of the Bonneville Power Administration are needed for actual loads and if the lines are not built, customers will be deprived of power. If the region is to be saved from an impending power brown-out attention must be given to the items covered herein.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to dwell upon the question of economy of operation of our Government finances. I propose to demonstrate that the Government will actually lose money by failing to grant adequate appropriations for Columbia Basin and Bonneville.

The Government will lose very nearly the effect of 1 year's potential earnings from these projects and that amounts to quite a sizable sum—much more than the amount of the requested appropriation.

As two specific examples of direct loss of revenue to the Government resulting from failure to adhere to construction schedules on the Columbia Basin project, I would like to cite the Electro-Met magnesium reduction plant at Mead, Wash., and the aluminum reduction plant at Tacoma, both built by the Defense Plant Corporation during the war and both now standing idle for lack of power to operate them.

The Mead magnesium plant cost the Defense Plant Corporation $15,000,000. It is now appraised at more than $11,000,000 and two private firms have offered approximately that amount to take it off the Government's hands. The War Assets Administration was forced to reject those bids because there is not sufficient electrical power available to the area to operate it.

I would like to stress that the product of this plant is not in competition with any other part of the country. Magnesium is badly needed for many industrial purposes and no other section of the country can produce it as cheaply as the Northwest.

The cost to the Government of maintaining that plant in idleness is $60,000 per year. The Government could earn many times that amount by furnishing power to operate it at a profit to the taxpayers. The plant in operation would provide from 700 to 900 jobs, and the resulting return in income taxes would further help the United States Treasury. I shall not bother to outline the pyramided benefits to the Nation through taxes on fabrication and sale of the products from this one plant.

A similar situation exists regarding the aluminum plant at Tacoma. The contract held by Permanente Metals Co. with the Bonneville Power Administration guarantees firm power to this plant only if the six new generators at Grand Coulee are placed in operation on schedule. I am informed that the rate of construction at Grand Coulee authorized by the proposed appropriation would not only force at least a year's delay in the opening of this Tacoma plant and consequent loss of employment and strategic material but also would force closing down of one-sixth of the capacity of the same company's Mead aluminum-reduction plant.

These, Mr. Speaker, are but two concrete examples of the direct loss occasioned upon the economy of the Northwest and the Nation, as well as of revenue to the Federal Government, if the progress of this one project is slowed to the extent necessitated under the present bill. Allow me to repeat, if you will, that I am quite certain similar results will prevail in the case of most other projects affected, and I join with Representatives of the other Western States in their protests against such a reversal of policy, which cannot be described merely as foolish but as a stupid, if not malicious, effort to throttle western development at a great loss to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to outline briefly what the suggested program will cost the United States Government for the period affected by a 1-year halt to new construction on the Columbia Basin and Bonneville projects alone.

The United States Treasury will lose $7,462,500 in revenues from power sales.

The price to the Government of constructing and installing the six generators at Grand Coulee will be increased by $1,150,000.

The added cost of programmed construction of transmission lines will be $560,000.

These are only the direct losses and do not include the value of interest payments on the entire Government investment to date. This interest must be paid for an additional year while Grand Coulee must sit with water going over the top of the dam which could be earning profits for the Government. The interest on this idle dam capacity would amount to some $420,000 for a year's delay in construction.

Let us consider briefly the indirect costs to the Government and to the economy of the region. The delay would have a tremendous effect upon the thousands of individuals, many of them ve-

erans, who have invested in the future of that project.

In addition to those thousands, there are more than 1,700 industrial establishments, mostly small businesses, which have investments at stake in these projects. They encompass some 48,000 wage earners and a total pay roll amounting to around $62,000,000 yearly. Failure of this Congress to keep faith with those people will result in loss of all the income taxes on those pay rolls to the Treasury. The value of the products they would manufacture would amount to more than $200,000,000 yearly—and the Government will lose all the excise, corporate, and other taxes on those enterprises if it fails to adhere to its schedule of construction.

So much for the economics involved in a considered opinion of H. R. 3123.

I should like to use the remainder of my time to comment upon the principles and the judgment concerned in the conclusions inadvertently arrived at last week as to the value of western reclamation in our over-all national economy.

I have been greatly disturbed in studying the hearings conducted before the subcommittee on Interior appropriations on this bill, at the amount of misinformation that crept into the record of the subcommittee hearings on various phases of the bill.

Besides the subject of the Presidential "freeze order" through which the administration rendered a most severe disservice upon the West and upon the Nation generally, the two principal ideas which seem to have been dominating the minds of those who wrote this bill have been that the power developed by the projects is created only through a subsidy on the part of the Government and that the residents of the areas surrounding reclamation projects contribute nothing toward repaying the cost of their construction. Probably the flood-control concessions prevalent in most of the eastern areas from which the majority of the subcommittee members derive, colored these preassumptions.

Mr. Speaker, both of these ideas are absolutely false and I propose here and now to dispel the doubts of any Member who still entertains such thoughts.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the idea that the Federal Government subsidizes reclamation power and the industries which depend upon it dominated the thoughts of some committee members because it is obvious from the line of questioning and the comments of certain members all through the hearings that they believed that to be the case.

I may cite that portion of the hearings regarding the Hungry Horse project in Montana, in which Mr. Corette, of the Montana Power Co., charged that the aluminum industry in Oregon and Washington was being subsidized through cheap federally produced power—page 1446 of hearings—and I can find no record in the hearings of any attempt to determine whether that charge was true. In justice to the Hungry Horse project, and to all of the Columbia River projects, that charge should have been completely investigated.

On page 1030 of the hearings, the distinguished Representative from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a member of the subcommittee, is recorded to have stated:

> I am sure that everyone in this room knows that 2 mills per kilowatt-hour for power and $85 per acre for water just will not pay the bill under present conditions.

Mr. Speaker, there are other places in the hearings where similar statements have been made and it is quite apparent that a definite misunderstanding existed in the minds of some persons on this subject.

Naturally, it is disturbing to me that in view of such statements and such prevailing opinions, not one word of testimony was taken and not one question was asked, so far as I can find in the hearings, to determine whether there was any actual truth in that impression.

It is even more astounding, Mr. Speaker, to think of this in the face of the fact that there is on record complete proof to the contrary, namely, that the construction cost of the Columbia Basin power features are self-liquidating, and that they are earning for the Government, even at this time, an amount in excess of that necessary to pay off their share of the cost of this project within the time specified by the Congress and the Secretary of the Interior.

This subject was raised 2 years ago in hearings on this same question. In order to clarify the matter I asked the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether the charges were true that Columbia power rates were too low to repay the cost of building the project and that Northwest industrial and rural users of electricity were being subsidized by the Government.

The Secretary of Interior caused to be made a complete study, conducted by an experienced private accounting firm, to determine the answer to that question.

On February 12, 1946, as shown on page 1248 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 1, I appeared before this House and presented a report on repayment of operating expenses and construction costs of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bonneville Dam project, and the Columbia Basin project. This report was made as a result of my request to the Secretary of Interior dated July 6, 1945. It showed that these three projects will pay back to the Federal Treasury all construction costs, operating expenses, replacement costs, and interest on the power-facility investment. Now that a year has gone by the Bonneville Power Administration has issued a supplemental report bringing up to date the original report by including costs and revenues actually experienced during the year. I would like at this time to present briefly the highlights of this supplemental report which shows that the past year's operation has been more favorable than forecasted in the original report, or in other words, the original report was on the conservative side to the extent of $28,000,000.

POWER REVENUES

Revenues from the sale of power have materially exceeded the 1946 forecast. Instead of the $11,573,312 power sales predicted for 1947, $20,389,500 is now indicated from this source. This is due to quick recovery of postwar industrial loads. In addition, the loads of distributors have increased very rapidly. These increases in load will not only affect the current year but will benefit revenues up until 1953. The new estimate is more than $28,000,000 over the old forecast for the years 1947 to 1952, inclusive. It is estimated that beginning in 1950 complete sale of Bonneville-Grand Coulee power in the amount of $25,550,000 per year will be realized but only if the Congress appropriates funds to complete the installation of the nine additional generaters. Therefore, it is evident that it is good business from the standpoint of the Treasury to accelerate Grand Coulee generator installations.

TRANSMISSION INVESTMENT

A saving has been made in the total investment in the Bonneville transmission system as it will be when completed in 1956. The original pay-out report estimated this investment at $163,332,747. The figure is now reduced to $156,510,716. This reduction is made possible by a shift in the location of power loads. The analysis last year estimated that 97,500 kilowatts would represent the loss of the war industry load at Spokane. This has been regained and the power used at Spokane during the war will not have to be remarketed in the Puget Sound or lower Columbia areas. Actually the aluminum reduction plant and rolling mill at Spokane are back into full capacity operation and are being served over the same lines that were used during the war. This eliminates the need for an equivalent number of new lines to Puget Sound and to the lower Columbia.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The total expense of this project to be met from power revenues for the entire pay-out period is estimated at $665,044,190 instead of $660,636,190 shown a year ago. The increase is entirely in the early years from 1946 to 1950. The increases occur in operation and maintenance and replacements due to current price increases. Decreases are shown in interest as a result of greater repayments in the earlier years of the schedule. The net increase in expenses of $4,408,000 for the whole pay-out period is more than offset by greatly increased revenues than was anticipated in the 1946 pay-out report.

THE PAY-OUT SUPPLEMENT FOR 1947

The first supplement to the pay-out report reflects increased costs due to higher prices but on the other hand shows a marked increase in power revenues due to the high level of business activity in the postwar period. The increase in revenues more than offsets the increase in expenses with the result that the three projects are in a much better position than last year. The total power revenues available for complete repayment of all the project costs and legal interest are estimated at $1,898,543,577. These revenues are allocated as follows:

Columbia Basin project	$335,044,189
Bonneville Dam project	178,716,392
Bonneville Power Administration	860,968,056
Total	1,704,723,637

The difference of $193,814,940 is the surplus which is estimated at the end of the pay-out period after all costs have

been paid including interest at 3 percent on the power investment. The $665,044,189 shown above as applied to the Columbia Basin project is broken down into the following components covering the full repayment period:

Power investment	$118,622,815
3 percent interest on power investment	63,994,670
Operation and maintenance of power facilities	142,908,707
Replacements of power facilities	70,856,428
Irrigation subsidy	233,141,793
River regulation	35,519,577
Total	665,044,190

Since preparation of the original pay-out report the Bureau of Reclamation has reestimated the construction cost of the Columbia Basin project at $581,021,000 due to increase in current price levels. The supplement to the pay-out report retains the original cost estimate of $506,459,180. The difference, amounting to $74 561 820 can easily be covered by the $193,814,940 surplus. Of the total construction cost of $581,021,000, $425,878,608 is to be used for reclamation alone. Three hundred and seven million seven hundred and three thousand six hundred and thirteen dollars of power revenues are used toward paying off this irrigation cost. In other words, 72 percent of all the reclamation cost is paid by the power users and 28 percent by the water users.

This pay-out supplement demonstrates even more forcibly than the original pay-out report which I presented last year that power revenues at the $17.50 per kilowatt-year rate will pay all costs including interest on the power investment. The surplus of $193,814,940 compares with the surplus of $160,629,947 for last year, which was shown in the table on page 1250 of the RECORD, volume 92, part 1. This pay-out supplement is designed to answer all questions as to the ability of the projects to pay out. I believe the subject has been covered from every angle in the report. I hope it will clarify the misunderstanding that exists in some quarters to the effect that the $17.50 rate must be raised to pay out. The report shows conclusively that this is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, since the date of issuance of the first pay-out study a year ago, there has never been a challenge made as to its validity. I cited the study in hearings before the Public Lands Committee recently and it went unchallenged. It has not been challenged because it is eminently correct and all statements to the contrary are unfounded.

The other prevailing impression which appears to have adversely affected proper consideration of these projects is that the residents of cities and towns surrounding project areas contribute nothing toward repaying the cost of those projects.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand how anyone can blandly state, on the one hand, that property values, production of agricultural and other products, industrial activities, taxable pay rolls, corporate profits, and all other factors of economic life in a community will be increased through the development of a reclamation project and still naively hold that the persons who benefit from those increased values contribute nothing to the cost.

Have any of those who hold to this theory ever heard of the word "taxes"? Yes, Mr. Speaker, through income taxes on raised wages, through corporate taxes on increased profits, through property taxes on enriched real estate, through excise taxes on nearly every form of economic activity stimulated by that development, every single soul who lives within the area benefited by a project contributes directly in proportion to the amount of his benefit toward the cost of repayment and the support of the banker—the Federal Government—who made it possible.

That, in the proverbial nutshell, Mr. Speaker, is the answer to that charge. And I am yet amazed that the subject could have been seriously discussed, among men conversant with the economics of reclamation and development, without any of them realizing what an obvious answer it was.

I should like to close my remarks with a further reference to our relations with our brother nations throughout the world.

During the past several years, we have fought a tremendous war, costing billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives, to conquer those whom we believed would destroy us. That expenditure can only be considered worth while if we can capitalize on it as an investment in the future of our own people.

We are attempting at the present time to feed one-fourth of the world's population with only 12 percent of its agricultural resources. We cannot possibly succeed in that program if we do not continue to develop and conserve those resources, at least at the rate at which we expend them.

The sum total of grants for aid to other countries since the conclusion of the war, including commitments made by the administration but not yet approved by Congress for 1948, total more than $15,000,000,000. A generous portion of those amounts have been gift-loaned to these countries for the same kind of reclamation-resource development programs which we now advocate for our western United States.

And in this connection it is interesting to note that the Interior budget is but some one-half of 1 percent of the total before us. Something of the swallowing of the camel enters the over-all consideration when we realize that the total of our foreign relations commitments in the present budget mounts to the astounding sum of $3,500,000,000. Current now are reports of upward of $500,000,000 for Mexican loans suggested to be for water and river development below the border. Interesting, too, is the fact that the administrative costs of the State Department have risen from $21,000,000 in 1941 to $276,000,000 in the present budget. Probably we should strain at the gnat—but it depresses westerners to see us swallow such a camel.

I feel that I should point out that I would be remiss in my duty to my constituency and to my country if I did not question the advisability of spending any money at all for the purpose of supporting either the governments or economies of foreign nations or for engaging in propaganda efforts to tell them about the glories of our own Nation before we make absolutely certain that the program we follow for development and conservation of our own priceless treasures is one characterized by sound principle and enlightened national self-interest.

Mr. Speaker, as I recently stated before the Reclamation Subcommittee of this body's Committee on Public Lands, it is not my fault that there are probably more than 45,000,000 horsepower of electricity flowing in the Columbia River. It is there. But I would be seriously at fault if I did not do everything within the limits of my ability to see that that tremendous energy was harnessed for the national good and welfare. I cannot urge too strongly that these principles be considered without regard to fractional prejudice or sectional interest, in making or refusing to make appropriations for the development of our remaining natural resources.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. EATON) to attend funeral of a member of family.

To Mr. CARSON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of serious illness of his mother.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

623. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fifth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

624. A letter from the Chairman, the Textile Foundation, transmitting the annual report of the Textile Foundation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

625. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

626. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the eleventh quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

627. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the progress report for the first quarter of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

628. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

629. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 amounting to a decrease of $1,010,000 for the Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 228);

to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

630. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting report on the survey of the accounting system of the Federal Public Housing Authority for the years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 229); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 2181. A bill relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; with amendments (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3264. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3265. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, relating to actions for civil liabilities for violation of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3266. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3267. A bill to provide for the construction of a country home for the President in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3268. A bill to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3269. A bill to fix the amount of an annual payment by the United States to the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 3270. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3271. A bill to provide for reimbursing Summers County, W. Va., for the loss of tax revenue by reason of the acquisition of land by the United States for the Bluestone Reservoir project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 3272. A bill relating to the computation of length of service, for promotion purposes of certain employees who are transferred from one position to another within the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3273. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and the development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possession of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Dowd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3275. A bill to confer a classified civil-service status upon certain special-delivery messengers in the post office at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Maurice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

405. By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona: Petition of the Arizona State Legislature, relating to lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

406. Also, petition of the Arizona State Legislature, requesting Congress to support certain legislation beneficial to veterans and others; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

407. Also, petition of the Arizona State Legislature, requesting Congress to create the Petrified Forest National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

408. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of the State Legislature of Arizona, relating to lasting world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

409. Also, petition of the State Legislature of Arizona, requesting Congress to create the Petrified Forest National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

410. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Arizona, pertaining to legislation beneficial to veterans and others; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

411. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives in the State of Maine to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, United States Secretary of Agriculture, petitioning against the order of April 9 for further reduction in milk prices because of the increase in cost of milk production due to advances in feed prices in the State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

412. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of El Paso Post, No. 36, American Legion, urging that Public, 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, be amended to extend the time in which veterans who have lost their limbs may apply for an automobile to be furnished them by the Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

413. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 24 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

414. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Tulsa County Bar Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 1639; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

415. Also, petition of the board of trustees of the National Petroleum Association, petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to taxation of cooperatives, taxation of reclaimed oil, and taxation of lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we would not weary Thee in always asking for something. This morning we would pray that Thou wouldst take something from us. Take out of our hearts any bitterness that lies there, any resentment that curdles and corrodes our peace. Take away the stubborn pride that keeps us from apology and confessing fault and makes us unwilling to open our hearts to one another. For if our hearts are closed to our colleagues, they are not open to Thee.

We ask Thy mercy in Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint JOHN W. BRICKER, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BRICKER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 30, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 30, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 547. An act to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers; and

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on

the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 42 to the bill and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JED JOHNSON TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the request of the subcommittee chairman, I desire to give notice that a second public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, May 5, 1947, at 9:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Keefe, resigned. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN CASKIE COLLET TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 8, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. John Caskie Collet, of Missouri, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, vice Hon. Kimbrough Stone, retiring May 15, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, presided over by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with the education bill be permitted to sit tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

HEARINGS BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands will hold hearings starting next week, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be held during the sessions of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Frederick County (Md.) Bar Association, favoring the enactment of House bill 242, to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bar Association of Baltimore City, Md., favoring the principles embodied in House bill 2657, to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by sundry employees of the Railway Express Agency, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the so-called Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NEVADA LEGISLATURE JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada memorializing the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States to support certain legislation beneficial to veterans and others.

Also a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializing Congress to oppose the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior that all federally owned mineral land be kept in permanent Federal ownership.

Also a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializing the Congress to abolish the Civilian Production Administration and to do away with all controls on buildings and construction materials, and on the construction of buildings.

Also a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada memorializing the Congress and the Nevada Representatives in Congress to retain the name "Boulder Dam."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolutions presented by the Senator from Nevada will be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States to support certain legislation beneficial to veterans and others

"Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United State. two certain bills affecting the rights of veterans, prisoners of war, and other persons in territory occupied by the Japanese forces, which are referred to as H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199; and

"Whereas this legislation extends to veterans, prisoners of war, and other persons in territory occupied by the Japanese during the war, certain benefits by way of exemption under and in connection with the internal revenue code of the United States; and

"Whereas the legislation represented by H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199 will be of material benefit to the veterans and other persons therein throughout the United States as well as in the State of Nevada.

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States be memorialized to lend their support toward the passage of those certain bills now pending in the Congress designated as H. R. 881 and H. R. 1199; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved March 27, 1947.

"VAIL PITTMAN,
"Governor."

To the Committee on Public Lands:

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior that all federally owned mineral land be kept in permanent Federal ownership

"Whereas it has been reported that the Secretary of the Interior of the United States has recommended to the Congress that all mineral land owned by the Government of the United States be kept in permanent Federal ownership in such manner as to prohibit the location and patenting of such land, and further to repeal the present mining laws which permit the location and patenting of mineral-bearing land; and

"Whereas the development of mineral-bearing lands by location and patenting under the existing laws has contributed materially to the well-being of the Western States of the United States by making such property subject to taxation and in developing many areas and sections of the Western States; and

"Whereas the proposed recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior will materially affect the economy of the Western States and will prevent the development of min-

eral-bearing areas throughout the Western States; and

"Whereas the proposed recommendation represents an unjust encroachment upon the development of the western mining States and the rights of private citizens to attempt mining ventures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to oppose any recommendation or plan of legislation having as its object the permanent continuance of Federal ownership of mining lands in the United States, or the repeal of existing mining laws which permit the location and patenting of mining lands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Nevada to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

"Approved March 27, 1947.

"VAIL PITTMAN,
"Governor."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to abolish the Civilian Production Administration and to do away with all controls on building and construction materials, and on the construction of buildings

"Whereas the Civilian Production Administration, a bureau of the Federal Government, has promulgated rules and regulations restricting the use of building and construction materials; and

"Whereas the Civilian Production Administration has arbitrarily, and without any foundation in reason or in fact, administered such rules and regulations to suit its own ends, and without regard for the best interests of the United States, its citizens, and the veterans of its wars; and

"Whereas the unreasonable, arbitrary, self-serving and discriminatory rules and restrictions enforced through color of law by the Civilian Production Administration have operated to favor one section of the Nation against another, to set one class of citizens against another, to stir up internal strife, and have in no appreciable way contributed to the welfare of the Nation, nor the needs of its citizens, nor have they provided any portion of the houses needed for veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the Civilian Production Administration, or any similar agency restricting or retarding building or construction, and further to repeal any and all laws in any manner restricting or placing limitations upon such building or construction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, duly certified by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada, be sent to the President of the United Sates and to the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved March 27, 1947.

"VAIL PITTMAN,
"Governor."

Ordered to lie on the table:

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress and the Nevada Representatives in Congress to retain the name 'Boulder Dam'

"Whereas the Boulder Dam located in the Black Canyon of the Colorado River was completed in the year 1935; and

"Whereas prior to its completion it was officially named and designated as 'Boulder Dam'; and

"Whereas because it is the highest dam in the world it has become widely known and heralded, described in current encyclopedias, and delineated upon maps under its official name, 'Boulder Dam'; and

"Whereas Boulder City, located in the immediate vicinity of the dam, and being the city which serves the dam, bears its name because of the official name and designation of the dam itself; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada that the dam, being a national monument of outstanding importance, its name should not be changed or redesignated: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby memorialize and petition that the Congress of the United States retain the name and designation, to wit: 'Boulder Dam'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to our Senators and Representative in Washington, and to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved March 27, 1947.

"VAIL PITTMAN,
"Governor."

FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, yesterday I received a telegram from Dr. Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, which I should like to read into the RECORD. Dr. Seymour says in the telegram:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *April 30, 1947.*

Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
Washington, D. C.:

Abrupt termination of educational benefits to veterans has brought acute financial distress to 5,000 students at Yale lasting until passage of deficiency appropriation bill to provide necessary funds for the Veterans' Administration. Earnestly request your aid in expediting.

CHARLES SEYMOUR,
President.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that before the day is ended the Senate will approve the conference report on the deficiency bill, which I understand was agreed to yesterday by the House of Representatives, so that the situation with regard to veterans' benefits, which is very deplorable, may be relieved.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM—TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR BREWSTER TO HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I sent to Hon. Warren R. Austin, Chief of the United Nations Mission, regarding the Palestine situation and our position in relation to the Jewish agency being represented, a matter with respect to which I am fully in accord with the sentiments expressed yesterday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I ask that this telegram be printed in the RECORD in order to clarify my own position.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1947.

Ambassador WARREN AUSTIN,
Chief, United Nations Mission,
New York, N. Y.:

I believe the American people will be profoundly shocked in any maneuvers which result in five Arab states using the United Nation Assembly for sounding board on Palestine without any comparable opportunity for Jewish agency to reply when the Jewish agency is recognized in the Mandate of the League of Nations and the treaty between Great Britain and the United States as the official agency to represent Jewish interests in Palestine. The United States has tremendous responsibilities to insure justice and fair play in this situation.

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

SAN DIEGO (CALIF.) AQUEDUCT (S. REPT. NO. 149)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report relative to the complaint of the Comptroller General that the Navy Department illegally expended $14,000,000 in constructing an aqueduct for the city of San Diego, Calif., and I request that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL—ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Federal employment, both continental and abroad, decreased 19,603 during the month of March, 1947. The February total of 2,251,746 was reduced to 2,232,143 for March. The reduction is due mostly to the large decreases in War and Navy Departments. By excluding these two departments from the total the reduction shown amounts to only 1,820. Within the continental United States Federal employment decreased from the February total of 1,969,864 to the March total of 1,949,645, a reduction of 20,219. Excluding War and Navy Departments again there was a reduction of 2,378. Outside the United States the employment increased 516 to a total of 282,393 for March.

Twenty-five establishments increased personnel during March. Three of these increases were substantial. Interior Department increase 1,051; Post Office Department increased 2,529, and Federal Security Agency increased 1,427. The most substantial reduction was 15,984 in the War Department. Veterans' Administration decreased 2,117 during the month, the Navy Department reduced 1,799, and the War Assets Administration reduced 2,949. In all, 25 establishments, excluding War and Navy, reduced a total of 8,467, or an average of about 340 per agency.

During the year and one-half since VJ-day the War and Navy Departments have reduced a total of 1,573,649. Yet the over-all reduction during this period is

only 1,417,626. This means that the departments and agencies other than War and Navy have increased 156,023 since the end of the war. Instead of a reduction in personnel resulting from the termination of war functions, new functions were established and old functions were continued under new titles in order to maintain employment and continue the self-perpetuation philosophies as practiced in the executive branch of Government.

Personal services is the largest individual item of cost in Government departmental operation. It is a very important figure in the national budget and in order to reduce the budget the pay roll must be cut. In order to do this it is imperative that personnel be reduced, not to a prewar level, but to a level that is most economical. This also means that unnecessary and overlapping functions be abolished.

I ask unanimous consent that the additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures with respect to the personnel of the Federal Government may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1947

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH FEBRUARY 1947

(All figures compiled from reports submitted by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of March decreased 20,219 from a total of 1,969,864 in February to 1,949,645 in March. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 2,378 from the February total of 1,219,271 to the March total of 1,216,893. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 15,984 from the February total of 428,750 to the March total of 412,766. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 1,857 from the February figure of 321,843 to the March figure of 319,986. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel increased 516 from the February total of 281,882 to the March total of 282,398. The majority of these employees are industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was an increase of 458 from the February figure of 56,028 to the March figure of 56,486.

The consolidated table, presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside the continental United States, shows a total decrease of 19,603 from the February total of 2,251,746 to the March total of 2,232,143. Excluding War and Navy Departments' reductions of 17,783 there was a decrease of 1,820 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the February figure of 1,275,299 to the March figure of 1,273,479. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of March decreased 7,997 from the February total of 618,500 to the March total of 610,503. The War Department figures for employment outside the United States are unavailable for the month of March. War Department reductions inside the United States totaled 7,234. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	77,812	78,116	+304
Commerce Department	34,810	35,343	+533
Interior Department	44,939	45,981	+1,042
Justice Department	23,938	24,127	+188
Labor Department	7,578	7,679	+101
Post Office Department	427,757	430,280	+2,523
State Department	8,485	8,285	−200
Treasury Department	103,060	103,004	−56
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	66	63	−3
Office of Scientific Research and Development	149	110	−39
Selective Service System	8,770	8,502	−268
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	28	41	+13
Office of Government Reports	149	145	−4
Office of Housing Expediter	1,926	1,527	−399
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	133	116	−17
Office of Price Administration	13,458	12,675	−783
Civilian Production Administration	3,835	3,480	−355
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,280	4,189	−91
War Assets Administration	51,418	48,403	−3,015
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Bureau of the Budget	611	610	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	518	526	+8
Civil Service Commission	3,523	3,533	+10
Export-Import Bank of Washington	117	116	−1
Federal Communications Commission	1,351	1,333	−18
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,184	1,188	+4
Federal Power Commission	783	776	−7
Federal Security Agency	31,003	[1] 32,569	[1] +1,566
Federal Trade Commission	592	591	−1
Federal Works Agency	24,551	24,537	−14
General Accounting Office	11,045	10,944	−101
Government Printing Office	8,037	7,973	−64
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,287	2,288	+1
Maritime Commission	11,444	11,081	−363
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,617	5,630	+13
National Archives	396	396	
National Capital Housing Authority	283	284	+1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	18	+1
National Gallery of Art	310	308	−2
National Housing Agency	16,041	15,623	−418
National Labor Relations Board	883	850	−33
National Mediation Board	100	103	+3
Panama Canal	522	526	+4
Railroad Retirement Board	2,788	2,791	+3

[1] Includes 1,071 employees of Howard University and 90 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf, previously not included.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,336	7,964	−372
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,195	1,190	−5
Smithsonian Institution	502	504	+2
Tariff Commission	224	229	+5
Tax Court of the United States	121	121	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,566	13,609	+43
Veterans' Administration	229,014	226,895	−2,119
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,219,271	1,216,893	−8,746 +6,368
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−2,378
Navy Department	321,843	319,986	−1,857
War Department	428,750	412,766	−15,984
Total, including War and Navy Departments	1,969,864	1,949,645	−26,587 +6,368
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−20,219

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	1,283	1,323	+40
Commerce Department	2,498	2,585	+87
Interior Department	4,426	4,435	+9
Justice Department	521	489	−32
Labor Department	97	103	+6
Post Office Department	1,411	1,417	+6
State Department	13,471	13,835	+364
Treasury Department	722	742	+20
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Selective Service System	82	84	+2
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of Housing Expediter	3	3	
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of Price Administration	52	50	−2
Civilian Production Administration	20	18	−2
Philippine Alien Property Administration	62	69	+7
War Assets Administration	400	463	+63
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	75	77	+2
Civil Aeronautics Board	11	12	+1
Civil Service Commission	8	8	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	37	37	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	966	827	−139
Federal Works Agency	308	329	+21
Maritime Commission	339	338	−1
National Housing Agency	54	50	−4
National Labor Relations Board	3	4	+1
Panama Canal	27,234	27,255	+21
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	110	96	−14
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	1,825	1,827	+2
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	56,028	56,486	+652 −194
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+458
Navy Department	52,080	52,138	+58
War Department	173,774	[1] 173,774	
Total, including War and Navy Departments	281,882	282,398	+710 −19
Net increase, including War and Navy Departments			+516

[1] As of Feb. 28, 1947, figure for month of March 1947 unavailable.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	70,095	70,439	+344
Commerce Department	37,308	37,928	+620
Interior Department	49,365	50,416	+1,051
Justice Department	24,460	24,616	+156
Labor Department	7,575	7,482	+107
Post Office Department	459,148	461,677	+2,529
State Department	21,996	22,120	+164
Treasury Department	103,782	103,746	−36
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	96	93	−3
Office of Scientific Research and Development	149	110	−39
Selective Service System	8,852	8,586	−266
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	28	41	+13
Office of Government Reports	149	145	−4
Office of Housing Expediter	1,929	1,530	−399
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	133	116	−17
Office of Price Administration	13,510	12,725	−785
Civilian Production Administration	3,855	3,498	−357
Philippine Alien Property Administration	64	71	+7
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,280	4,189	−91
War Assets Administration	51,815	48,866	−2,949
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	78	80	+2
Bureau of the Budget	611	610	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	529	538	+9
Civil Service Commission	3,528	3,538	+10
Export-Import Bank of Washington	119	118	−1
Federal Communications Commission	1,388	1,370	−18
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,187	1,191	+4
Federal Power Commission	783	776	−7
Federal Security Agency	31,909	[1] 33,336	+1,427
Federal Trade Commission	892	891	−1
Federal Works Agency	24,859	24,966	+107
General Accounting Office	11,045	10,944	−101
Government Printing Office	8,037	7,973	−64
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,267	2,288	+1
Maritime Commission	11,783	11,419	−364
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	5,617	5,630	+13
National Archives	396	396	
National Capital Housing Authority	283	284	+1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	18	+1
National Gallery of Art	310	308	−2
National Housing Agency	16,095	5,673	−422
National Labor Relations Board	886	854	−32
National Mediation Board	100	103	+3
Panama Canal	27,756	27,781	+25
Railroad Retirement Board	2,788	2,791	+3
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,446	8,060	−386
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,195	1,190	−5
Smithsonian Institution	510	512	+2
Tariff Commission	224	229	+5
Tax Court of the United States	121	121	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,566	13,609	+43
Veterans' Administration	230,839	228,722	−2,117
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,275,296	1,273,471	−8,467 +6,647
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			−1,820
Navy Department	373,923	372,124	−1,799
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	428,780	412,700	−15,084
Outside continental United States	173,774	[2] 173,774	
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,251,746	2,232,143	−26,250 +6,647
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−19,603

[1] Includes 1,671 employees of Howard University and 90 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf, previously not included.

[2] As of Feb. 28, 1947. March 1947 figure unavailable.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees [1] of the Federal Government inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Commerce Department	1,159	1,193	+44
Interior Department	5,406	5,621	+215
State Department	320	314	−6
Treasury Department	5,474	5,402	−72

[1] Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled, and supervisory employees on construction projects. Maintenance and custodial workers not included.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during March 1947, and comparison with February 1947*—Con.

Departments or agencies	February	March	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	0	601	+601
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
National Housing Agency	16	11	−5
Panama Canal	2,625	2,492	−133
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,511	6,578	+67
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	21,493	22,204	+927 −216
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+711
Navy Department	258,577	257,103	−1,474
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	201,345	194,113	−7,224
Outside continental United States	137,081	[1] 137,081	
Total, including War and Navy Departments	618,500	610,503	+927 −8,924
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−7,997

[1] As of Feb. 28, 1947, figure for month of March 1947 unavailable.

NEWSPRINT SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION—INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 150)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, I ask unanimous consent to submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, agreed to January 24, 1947 appointing a Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, an interim report on newsprint supply and distribution, and I request that it be printed, with illustrations.

I request that a statement by me as chairman of the Newsprint and Paper Shortage Subcommittee of the Senate Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Indiana, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART (REPUBLICAN, INDIANA), CHAIRMAN OF THE NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SHORTAGE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH THAT COMMITTEE'S PRESENTATION TO THE SENATE OF AN INTERIM REPORT ENTITLED "NEWSPRINT SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION"

The chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee has designated me to present to the Senate an interim report entitled "Newsprint Supply and Distribution," which has

been approved by a majority of the members of that committee. This report was prepared for the committee as a result of recent investigations and hearings conducted by the Newsprint and Paper Shortage Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

This initial inquiry by the committee was directed toward a solution of newsprint "shortage," which was claimed by the many complaints received by the committee to be the most urgent problem—and one that was forcing many smaller publications to the wall.

I believe the Senate will be interested in some of the facts developed in the report and in the conclusions reached by the committee as a result of its investigation.

The newsprint problem which has been causing so much difficulty to smaller publications in this country has been generally termed a "shortage." As a matter of fact, the immediate problem is that of equitable distribution of unusually large supplies of newsprint produced in this country as well as that shipped into the United States from Canada and Newfoundland.

While it is true that there is a world shortage of newsprint—due to war conditions—we in this country are getting by far the greater proportion of the world's supply. Consumption of newsprint in the United States in 1946 totaled 4,236,268 tons—representing an increase of 28.4 percent over 1945, and thousands of tons more than peak consumption in prewar years.

It is also amazing to find that 83 percent of our newsprint consumption is imported from sources outside of our national borders. In 1946 Canada supplied us with 78 percent and Newfoundland with 5 percent of our national supply. United States mills produce only 17 percent of the newsprint we use.

The committee was told by Canadian and American newsprint mills that 95 percent of the newsprint they produce for the United States is sold to newspaper publishers who have contracts with the mills. A few smaller publishers have contracts, but at least 90 percent of the smaller newspapers and other publications in this country must depend upon jobbers who have contracts with the mills—and who receive only the remaining 5 percent of the production.

This division of production might prove adequate under normal conditions, because the newsprint needs of smaller newspapers and publications are only a small fraction of national consumption. But when there is a business boom and the pressure of greatly expanded advertising linage and circulation demands by larger publishers hits the market the smaller publisher find his normal sources of supply disappearing.

A brief check of advertising and circulation figures, undertaken by the subcommittee for a list of 100 leading newspapers in the United States, shows that expansion of advertising and circulation, 1946 over 1945, paralleled the increased production percentage of newsprint to a remarkable degree. For the 100 newspapers checked, the average increase was 26.2 percent in advertising linage and 5.3 percent in circulation. At least 10 of the larger newspapers recorded advertising linage increases ranging from 30 to 73 percent.

These comparisons are not conclusive, but the trend is sufficiently strong to indicate that increased production of newsprint in 1946 went toward gratifying expanded circulations and increased advertising demands—predominantly among larger publications.

Meanwhile, similar jobbers and publishers have reported that they are not receiving any portion of newsprint production increases and are being held to 1945 usage, or lower.

Other factors have also contributed to a lessened supply of newsprint for smaller publishers. Jobbers have cut off regular small customers to sell at higher prices to new buyers; larger publishers have purchased newsprint mills to assure output for their own use; and some newsprint mills have converted to the manufacture of other and more profitable types of papers.

Additional supplies from Europe are unpredictable at this time, and, at any rate, would likely go to fill reviving needs abroad, or be offered to this country at prices prohibitive to smaller publications. New mill construction in the United States and Alaska, if and when undertaken, will require 2 to 3 years to reach a point of production. Canadian mills may produce two or three hundred thousand more tons of newsprint in 1947, but we have no assurance that this tonnage will reach the United States.

In my opinion, as chairman of the Newsprint and Paper Shortage Subcommittee, the quickest solution to the situation is voluntary action by the larger users of newsprint to share the very small percent of newsprint (about 1½ to 2 percent) needed to relieve the distribution problems of the smaller publications. If voluntary action along this line is not taken by the industry, it is my belief that regulatory legislation may again be imposed upon the industry—and this possibility is as undesirable to me as I am sure it is to the businessmen of the publishing and newsprint industry. To ration, in a peacetime economy, a product—83 percent of which is supplied by a foreign country—presents difficulties too numerous to mention at this time. In fact, the committee has been warned by the Canadian newsprint manufacturers that any effort to ration or control newsprint shipments to this country would likely result in their diversion of newsprint production to profitable overseas markets.

The position taken in this interim report is that demand for newsprint will continue high, and emergency conditions, unfavorable to smaller publications, will exist for many months to come. For these reasons it is recommended:

That voluntary action be taken by newspaper publishers, newsprint manufacturers, newsprint distributors and magazine publishers in the formation of an over-all industry committee which will act to relieve hardship cases among all types of publications, investigate such needs, and supply newsprint by means of voluntary contributions from within the industry;

That legislation to implement the organization of such an industry committee and provide for its immunization against antitrust prosecution for a limited period of time be introduced to the Congress.

Such legislation was introduced by me, for myself, Senator WHERRY, Senator CAIN, and Senator MARTIN, on April 9, and has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The members of the Senate Small Business Committee who participate in this report consider the establishment of a voluntary industry committee the most effective and desirable way to handle the emergency situation. The committee has taken steps to lay the groundwork for industry cooperation in meetings and conferences held with representatives of the publishing and newsprint industry over the past month. Over 100 leading newspaper publishers, as well as officials of newsprint mills and newsprint distributing concerns, met with the Senate Small Business Committee a few weeks ago to originate plans for voluntary action. I believe their response to the idea is indicative of a willingness to participate in a voluntary effort to correct their industry's distribution problems without Government control or interference.

The only barrier to such cooperation appears to be a fear of antitrust prosecution, to which an unauthorized industry committee might be susceptible. The bill which has been introduced, S. 1080, is designed to remove this obstacle.

The Senate Small Business Committee will continue its efforts to secure enactment of this legislation, and organization of a voluntary industry committee free to operate in correcting the distribution problems which are threatening the welfare and survival of many smaller newspapers and reducing their effectiveness to the communities which they serve.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1204. A bill to authorize the expenditure of the unexpended balances remaining after July 1, 1947, in the appropriation provided in Public Law 548 of the Seventy-ninth Congress for the payment of premiums for the production of and exploration for ores of copper, lead, and/or zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1205. A bill for the relief of Paul Manesis; and

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1207. A bill to exempt articles purchased for the use of volunteer fire companies from the manufacturer's excise tax imposed by chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; and Royse R. Spring; and

S. 1209 (by request). A bill for the relief of Peter August Escher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. MALONE):

S. 1210. A bill to amend section 27 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 159), an act making appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1211. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. FULBRIGHT each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes. I request that the amendments be referred to the committee to which the original bill was referred.

There being no objection, the amendments were received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war,

was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA—AMERICAN LETTER OF THE WHALEY-EATON SERVICE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a reproduction of what is known as the American Letter of the Whaley-Eaton Service, as of April 26, 1947.

I do this because it contains a very realistic statement regarding conditions in Russia, which I think should be made a matter of record for public information.

This comes from a staff representative of a very reliable service who has made first-hand investigations of the conditions which are discussed in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHALEY-EATON SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1947.

DEAR SIR:

1. Our staff representative at the Moscow Conference is the first American correspondent to return home with an uncensored picture of Russia's position today. His views, based on travels within the great Moscow-Stalingrad-Leningrad triangle—the heart of the Russian homeland—are summarized below. They deal largely with economic and general living conditions and not high policies, which Secretary Marshall will cover in his radio address.

2. People: Russian individuals claim that 20,000,000 people were lost in the war. This may be an exaggeration, but it is true that most heavy labor is now relegated to women and war prisoners; few young men are seen anywhere, and there are great numbers of cripples. Tuberculosis rates are fantastically high in all the cities. Women appear more resistant in this respect than men. The Russian people will require a generation or more to recover their vigor.

3. Production: Production of civilian goods ceased entirely during the war and is being sacrificed to heavy-industry outputs now. But rehabilitation is slow. There has been little effort to clear up war damage, steel and machinery production goes forward in buildings whose roofs are a sieve of bomb holes. Transportation and raw-materials shortages are unrelieved. Literally hundreds of German war plants were boxed up and carted away, but shortages of raw materials, of skilled labor and of technical know-how have prevented their use. Such machinery lies rusting in the fields alongside the railroads. A great tractor plant turns out only 35 finished units a day. It was considered a great achievement when 600 automobiles were completed for the use of conference delegations.

4. It is ludicrous to think of Russia engaging in a major war with the western powers. It has apparently much fine artillery and has developed a tank better than the best the Germans had. Military leaders have great faith in rockets. There are hints, too, of a secret biological weapon that would devastate an enemy. Nevertheless, the production and transportation facilities needed for modern warfare have yet to be built. The Russian man-in-the-street expresses amazement that other countries have any fear of war until the economy is wholly rebuilt—including a new generation of young men.

5. Transportation: The western world has no understanding of how utterly deficient are all forms of transportation in Russia. Rail equipment is poor, far out-of-date, and limited in quantity. The crack Red Arrow takes 14 hours to go from Moscow to Leningrad, an average speed of about 30 miles per hour. Highway transportation is even worse, there are few roads, virtually none paved, and even in the major cities what paving there is consists of some asphalt but is mostly brick or cobblestones. The long periods of apparent inaction during the Russian victory drives in the latter stages of the war were due to lack of roads. Supplies moved up to the fronts slowly in cumbersome carts dragged by horses, oxen, or even manpower. The inland waterways system, though excellent in many respects, is correspondingly slow.

6. Living conditions: A small hierarchy at the top has its automobiles, summer homes, good apartments, and ample food, but the vast majority of the Russians live in conditions approximating those of the American pioneer. Exploitation of the proletariat is almost as brutal as before the revolution, and the poor are just as poor. Living standards are low in every respect. The full time of at least one member of every family must be spent each day standing in line to make necessary food purchases. Average pay of 700 rubles per month is insufficient to support a family. Consequently, either one member must hold two jobs, working 16 hours a day, or others must be gainfully employed. Even this buys only the bare necessities. The average Russian is constantly harassed by crowded living conditions, long hours of work, and other hours spent laboriously going great distances to and from work, by inadequate and unvarying diet, and by harsh police supervision.

7. Reconstruction: It is a common saying in Moscow that only the Kremlin has a roof which does not leak. Eight families will live in four basement rooms. Few efforts have been made at rebuilding the devastated cities. Stalingrad was 85 to 97 percent destroyed in its three major sections; it is only 5 percent rebuilt. Yet 300,000 people are living in its ruins. Underground life breeds tuberculosis. Moreover, even in Moscow a high proportion of the individual buildings are log cabins; in the southern (Crimean) areas houses are of turf and thatch. All buildings, even those undamaged by war, are in a high state of decay. The Russians always used too much sand in their mortar.

8. Background: Foreign observers feel that there has been little fundamental change in Russia or the Russians since Ivan the Terrible. The people live under a harsh feudal system, the government has grandiose plans for modernization, but this is a matter for generations, not years. What the leaders are ashamed of, they hide. Little news has filtered out respecting last year's crop failure in the Ukraine, but it was serious and thousands died of starvation. Visitors are given a few peeks at busy industrial plants, but no real opportunity to analyze production results. The people still live on promises of the Utopia, but the leaders, significantly, no longer promise ample supplies of civilian goods by any specific year.

9. Inflation: Beyond the few basic rationed necessities, price levels in Russia are heavily inflated. Prices of nonrationed goods for sale at special stores bear no relation to production costs. Rubles have one value in one set of Government establishments, quite another in others. Thus, army officers of the rank of colonel and higher (including all top Government officials) are the only permitted customers at certain stores at which very low prices prevail. The ruble is valued officially at five to the dollar, but foreigners generally are allowed to exchange on a 12-for-1 basis; the real value seems to be somewhere around 50 to the dollar. Banks accept savings accounts, but individual checking accounts are unknown.

10. Comment: Conclusions from the foregoing are obvious. It will be years before Russia can wage a modern, aggressive war; the country is in desperate need of the very things the United States can supply and it is elementary that economic cooperation with America should be the prime objective of the Kremlin's diplomacy; communism is not democracy but is, on the contrary, a rigid caste system; a main purpose of the iron curtain is to conceal the deplorable conditions inside Russia. Molotov and the higher officials of the Soviet are much alike.

They are "Oriental traders," accustomed to haggling and completely distrustful of anyone else. They are characterized by slyness and untrustworthiness; their every effort must be to perpetuate their regime.

11. Pressures: Some of his political advisers insisted up to the very last that the President use his New York speech of last Monday to lambast big business. This is reminiscent of the pressure employed 18 months ago to have him denounce industrial establishments as unconscionably greedy, on the grounds that President Roosevelt had promised to do so, postwar, in support of labor's wage demands. No proof was forthcoming that Roosevelt ever made such a commitment, and Truman not only refused to believe it, but would not have felt bound by it, anyhow.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR YOUNG

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on rural electrification, delivered by him at the National Convention of REA Cooperatives, held at Spokane, Wash., April 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS AHEAD IN AVIATION?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Is Ahead in Aviation?" delivered by him before the Advertising Club of Washington on April 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Denunciation of GOP and Program Comes Too Heavily and Too Early," by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of April 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRYING TO DO TOO MUCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to labor legislation entitled "Trying To Do Too Much," from the New York World-Telegram of April 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WALLACE EXPLAINS — EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Wallace Explains," from the Washington Post of April 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR HOUSING LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Ease the Housing Shortage: Pass These Bills," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN RELIEF—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Letting Marshall Down," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TARIFF PROBLEM

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion of the tariff problem by M. E. Cope and Ethel Browning, of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE ON FUTURE GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for submission to the General Assembly, prepared by the Nation Associates, the CIO, the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, the Council for Democracy, the Church of Peace Union, and the Progressive Citizens of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], to insert certain language on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the presentation of the pending bill, no effort has been made by its proponents to place before the Senate the history of the long and bitter conflict between labor and management which culminated in the system of laws now on the statute books regulating labor-management relations. The labor laws which are now in force regulating the relations between labor and management did not spring up overnight. They are not the product of the New Deal. They grew up under many national administrations, both Democratic and Republican. The history of the emergence of American labor from the rule of the jungle—the fight of labor to establish its right in our American economy—shows a long and painful development.

Yet by the pending bill it is proposed in one fell swoop to emasculate and in some instances completely wipe out of existence labor's vital safeguards which were won after years of patient effort and sacrifice.

The bill, of course, is dressed up with many pious protestations and expressions of good intentions. It is stated in the bill that its purpose is the elimination of the causes of industrial strife, the promotion of industrial peace, and the removal of barriers to interstate commerce. In the face of present economic trends threatening deflation, unemployment, and great national danger, the purposes stated should be the hope and aim of every American.

But, Mr. President, I am convinced that the bill in its present form will not achieve the purposes expressed by its proponents. I say this because it ignores the underlying causes of industrial strife and sorely needed constructive approaches to industrial peace. I say this, too, because the net effect of its provisions is to indict the organized workers of the United States, and hold them responsible for many of our postwar dislocations, including the present inflation. I say this also for the reason that by its very language it is designed to weaken and render ineffective the large body of wisely planned legislation which, with great pains, has been built up over the years and which brought to an end the strife and bloodshed which widely prevailed in an earlier period.

Before the proposed legislation was introduced, the country was deluged with propaganda to lay the foundation for a program of vindictive legislation. It was sought to create in the public mind the idea that labor failed effectively to perform its patriotic duty in the war; that labor has set up a monopoly and a dictatorship in the United States, and that it is responsible for the present economic inflation and threatened collapse of our economic system.

This propaganda has sought to create the impression that in the postwar period labor has willfully precipitated wholly unwarranted strikes and has made unjustified demands for wage increases destructive of the national welfare. It has left entirely out of consideration the serious disadvantage workers have suffered through the break-down of price controls and the tremendous increase in living costs.

Mr. President, these harsh and unfounded charges are resented by the workers of the country. They feel that they are being made the victims of a vicious scheme to weaken and undermine their strength and render them powerless effectively to assert and defend their rights in the bargaining processes. Of course, we have had disputes and strikes growing out of wage demands since the war ended, but they have clearly been the result of economic conditions. No intelligent person can say that these industrial disputes have arisen because labor and management want them. Certainly they do not occur, as the pending bill would have us believe, because labor is unreasonable and monopolistic.

No Senator on this side of the aisle will dispute that there is need of some corrective legislation. At the last session of Congress I and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle expressed a desire, as we have at this session, to cooperate in working out sound legislative reforms designed to render justice and equity to both labor and management. In the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, while this bill was under study, the minority members indicated a desire to assist in writing a bill which would carry into effect the President's proposals for a fair, reasonable, and sound program of remedial labor legislation.

In his message to the Congress on January 6, 1947, the President recommended:

> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

The President outlined certain immediate steps to be taken, which will be discussed later during the consideration of this bill.

We all agree with the committee majority that legislation is desirable to remedy a number of evils which have developed, such as jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts; that something should be done about Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interests.

We also agree that there should be some regulation of the right of supervisors to organize and bargain collectively with their employers, providing they do not belong to the union to which the production employees belong, or to any organization under the domination or control of a union to which the production employees belong. It should be admitted, however, that the long history of successful union activities on the part of supervisors in many industries refutes any suspicion of conflict with or betrayal of employers on the part of such supervisors; and that to outlaw such organizations will only lead to industrial unrest. When the bill was before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I supported many provisions designed to clarify and improve the collective-bargaining processes.

But, Mr. President, I reject the extreme features of this bill as destructive of industrial peace. Industrial disputes do not occur because leaders of labor or management want them. They do not occur, as the bill would seem to have us believe, because the National Labor Relations Board has three members rather than seven; or because mediation is carried on by a Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor rather than by a Mediation Service outside it, nor because some employers claim they are deprived of the right of free speech. These are not the causes of strikes, neither are the cures for strikes so simple.

There are those who speak of strikes as though they believed that workers like to strike. Such a notion is utterly without foundation, but, unfortunately, propaganda has led many people to believe this fiction. In any strike, be it successful or unsuccessful, it is the workers who suffer most. Workers do not forego their wages and jeopardize the welfare of their families for light or capricious reasons. To them, a strike is a matter of utmost urgency, to be undertaken only for the most compelling reasons.

Those reasons can be summed up in one word, "insecurity," the fear of want; the fear of unemployment; the fear of illness; the fear of industrial accidents; the fear of an impoverished old age; yes, and the fear that there is a movement on foot to break the the unions which have accomplished so much toward the expansion of industry and improvement of the standards of living of American workers.

The Congress must not make the mistake of making light of these fears. They hang over the American workman as a constant threat to his security and the security of his family. During the Democratic administration since 1933, a start was made toward removing some

of those fears; but only a start; yet, that start constituted a major contribution to improved labor-management relations.

The President has repeatedly called on the Congress to expand and modernize our social security, health, and welfare system; but his recommendations have gone unheeded.

When the average factory worker sees his earnings fall, as they did in 1945, from $47.50 to $40.77, in a few months, while the cost of living crept upward, is it any wonder that he tries to protect the standard of living of himself and his family by any legitimate means? Let the statisticians tell him that his wages were still higher than in 1939; he remembers that in 1939 there were 8,000,000 workers unemployed, with poverty and suffering in every corner of the land. He knows that $47.50 buys many things for his wife and children that $40 will not buy.

When the average worker sees the cost of living rise, as it did in 1946, by 15 percent in a few months, while his earnings rose only half as much, is it any wonder that he looks to a second round of wage increases to restore his lost purchasing power? Critics of workers' wage demands may tell him to wait for prices to come down, but he knows that he lives today by what his wages will buy today.

Last year, the coal miners were severely criticized on the floor of the Senate for demanding, through collective bargaining, a health and welfare fund. Since then, we have seen the tragedy of Centralia. We have heard a report by an admiral of the Navy describing the shocking neglect of health conditions in many of the Nation's mining communities. This comes as no surprise to those of us who for years have advocated modern health and welfare legislation for this country. But the Congress has neglected to pass such legislation.

Is it any wonder that the miners strike against such conditions? And what solution is offered to the country? Nothing to improve the health and welfare of the miners, or to assure their safety; but a prohibition is demanded against collective bargaining for health and welfare funds. As though that would insure industrial peace.

Today, the American workman hears on every hand rumors of pending "recession" or "depression." He hears it freely predicted that unemployment will rise—but maybe "only a few million." Is it any wonder if he takes the short view, if he demands increased earnings now, when industry is earning fabulous profits, rather than wait for the fulfillment of shadowy promises when prices come down? And businessmen, too, although profits are now high, ask themselves how long it will last, and whether they will be able to pay next year the wage increases they grant now. And what solution is offered to us? Nothing to forestall depression; nothing to stabilize our economy, or to cushion the shocks of depression when it comes; nothing to broaden or strengthen the protection against unemployment, sickness, or the poverty of old age. Merely a fruitless effort to blame all our postwar ills on the workers of the Nation; merely a reckless attack on the so-called monopoly of labor; merely a program to hamstring the unions and weaken their efforts to bargain collectively for what they cannot secure individually. As though that would insure industrial peace.

This is the central issue in management-labor relations. Management is uncertain of the future of demand, apprehensive of high costs and high prices, fearful of committing itself to production, price and wage policies based on sustained demand. Labor is insecure in the face of rising living costs and shrunken purchasing power, fearful that a recession may lead to unemployment. There are the basic causes of industrial disputes, and in this sense, full employment with maximum production and purchasing power should be both the objective and the solution of management-labor relations.

Nearly a year ago, in addressing the Senate when the Case bill was under consideration, I pointed out that the ordeal of war is invariably followed by a painful period of reconversion to peace. I reminded the Senate that the years 1919 and 1920 were filled with labor strife and economic disorder. As a matter of fact, there were nearly as many strikes, involving nearly as many workers in 1919 as in 1945–46, although the number of workers organized in unions was far smaller. I pointed out that if we had been wise and more foresighted, we would have profited by that hard lesson. We would have provided means for helping labor to reconvert to postwar conditions as we provided liberal means, at the cost of billions of dollars to the Government, for helping business to reconvert.

But we did not. On the contrary, with haste that was reminiscent of the regime of so-called normalcy in the 1920's, we cast aside our responsibility for an orderly return to a peacetime economy. While we were still in the throes of industrial strife over wages, we ignored the President's warnings and proceeded to cripple price control beyond recognition and beyond recovery. It is not my purpose here to retrace the dreary history of the collapse of price control. When it became evident that control was fatally weakened by the action of the Congress, goods were withheld from the market in the expectation that they would command higher prices later on. Black-market operators became bolder. It became evident that controls were no longer workable and the President reluctantly ordered them abandoned.

What happened then was the most unrestrained burst of price increases that we have any record of in this country. The cost of living shot up 15 percent in 6 months—two and one-half times as much as in the preceding 3 years. Wholesale prices rose 25 percent in the same 6 months—nearly three times as much as in the preceding 3 years. Not only meat—which some people seem to regard as a luxury in this land of plenty—but bread and milk, and clothing prices, rose sharply. Bread is up 35 percent in a year; milk 25 percent; and clothing 20 percent. Incomes did not rise as fast, so there was nothing for people to do but to buy less. Now we see the result: 8 percent less food is being bought now than a year ago; 10 to 15 percent less milk; 15 percent less clothing and other soft goods. By wrecking price control, we have literally taken food out of the mouths of our people.

I remember the prophecies of those who argued for abandoning controls. "Let prices go," they said. "They will go up for a while, and then come down as supply catches up with demand." Well, supplies are at an all-time high and so are prices. Half of the prophecy was right. When controls were lifted, prices did go up, faster than they had ever gone up before, and then they went up some more. And while wages were rising slowly, in hopeless pursuit of relief from high prices, profits soared as never before in time of peace.

Let those who would try to blame the price increases on labor's modest wage gains have a look at the profit statements of the various industrial corporations. The profits of the last part of 1946 show that it was not wages that sent prices up. The profits of industrial corporations before taxes in the fourth quarter were approximately one-third of the wages of all industrial workers. Now add to all this the fact that the profits in the first quarter of 1947 are so much larger than those of 1946 that conservative business journals have referred to them as embarrassing.

As the consequence of these fantastic increases in prices and profits, we are now faced with the threat of recession. In his economic report to the Congress in January, the President said:

> Chief among the unfavorable factors is the marked decline in real purchasing power of great numbers of consumers, resulting from the large price increases in the second half of last year. Maximum production and employment this year would yield a substantial increase in the available supply of consumer goods and services, especially in the area of durable goods. This requires higher real purchasing power to take the goods off the market.
>
> If prices and wage adjustments are not made—and made soon enough—there is danger that consumer buying will falter, orders to manufacturers will decline, production will drop, and unemployment will grow unless consumers resort to large additional borrowing and use of past savings to buy the increased supply of goods. These temporary expedients are limited in power and even if available would merely postpone the day of reckoning.

Recently he has repeated that warning in even more emphatic terms. Businessmen are repeating it to each other, as they wait for the storm to break. And yet prices continue to rise.

Should we expect American workmen to sit supinely by and fail to assert their rights? Indeed no. That is not the way of a free people. Workers have sought through their unions to redress their grievances through collective bargaining. They have asked for increased wages to meet increased prices and costs of living. As the worker sees the situation, industry, after a long period of high prices, had bulging treasuries while labor was being forced to live on a thin diet due to lack of adequate wages.

Yet, in seeking to find relief from some of these problems, labor is attacked by some groups as unpatriotic; labor is being denounced as a vicious monopoly

seeking to disrupt and destroy our American system and substitute in its stead labor dictatorship.

But I tell the Senate this is a misreading of the facts. The danger to free enterprise in our country comes not from labor but from misguided industrial management which fails to recognize and improve its human relations with the public—that is its workers and its customers as human beings.

As long ago as 1938, the editorial columns of Fortune magazine preached a pretty good sermon on this subject. That magazine pointed out that American business, while asserting its rights, has been overlooking some of its responsibilities. In the June 1938 issue of Fortune magazine, I find the following:

The fact is that in operating the capitalist economy, American business has consistently misappropriated the principles of democracy. American business has made use of those principles to its own enormous profit, but it has failed entirely to grasp the social implications of its profit making. As representing the capitalist economy, business has an obligation to build a workable economic system. But by 1932, it was evident that it had failed to do this. It had failed, and it has since failed to provide them with a livelihood, to say nothing of democratic opportunity. And in so failing it has created a class of persons for whom income and sustenance are more immediately important than the preservation of those political assumptions upon which business grew to power.

So, in the break-down of the economics of free capitalism, business is confronted with a realistic political fact: Namely that a majority of the American people, with the penniless third as a nucleus, are beginning to measure the virtue of their Government mainly in terms of the guaranties it makes concerning their income. * * *

The path ahead of American business is indeed a narrow path but it is perfectly clear. If the principles of democracy and of private enterprise are to be preserved, it is evident that private enterprise must admit into its affairs, as representative of the people, a government profoundly concerned with the successful operation of the economic system.

It should in the future be the object of business not to obstruct Government intervention at any cost, but to see to it that the intervening Government is enlightened in economic matters.

Commenting on the foregoing editorial from Fortune, the Washington Daily News of May 24, 1938, said:

Even though Fortune will be charged with being a traitor to its class and with picking on a sick man, we think that the more of those in business who read the article, the better it will be.

Business in this country today is divided into two groups. One, and unfortunately the smaller, has come to realize that the world does move; that the only thing certain in life is change; that we are 20 years behind England for example, in accepting such principles as collective bargaining and social security, and that to go against the tide is to drown. The other is the nostalgic delegation, dreaming of the good old days, yearning for the high-collared past, hating Roosevelt but not realizing that Roosevelt after all is just a potent sign of the times, and serving on the committees that write the resolutions at the annual meetings of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

If the first group could only get busy and vocal to the extent of selling the second that it's time to wake up, the futile fight between business and government might be turned into an harmonious advance toward better days and finer democracy.

But, Mr. President, instead of recognizing the need of sound labor-management relations and aiding in the strengthening of the bargaining processes which have been set up in this country, there are some in this country, aided and abetted by the National Manufacturers Association, seeking to encourage the passage of drastic labor laws which will crush, or at least seriously cripple, labor organizations. While we see these forces at work, we also observe the continued advance of industrial concentration and dangerous monopolistic practices which threaten our system of free enterprise.

As the Federal Trade Commission stated on July 1, 1946, to the House Small Business Committee:

In the opinion of the Commission, the present, and still growing, concentration of economic power in the United States constitutes today's greatest domestic challenge to the American theory of competitive enterprise, and, along with it, all that is embodied in the meaning of the somewhat intangible, but nonetheless real, meaning of "the American way of life" and "freedom of economic enterprise." * * * Large corporate consolidations make cooperation within each industry or trade group easier and lead inevitably to cartel organizations in America as well as Europe * * * We do not have to wait years (when it may be too late to take corrective action) for a practical demonstration of the effects of cartelization on our economic and political life. The experience in Europe, which will be repeated here if monopoly is not adequately controlled, is spread on the record for all to see. The story of the supergovernment of I. G. Farben is a good example of what can happen here.

Also private supergovernment in industry leads almost inevitably to political supergovernment.

Let me cite a few facts, as reported to the Senate Small Business Committee, on how far concentration of economic control had gone prior to the outbreak of the war:

1. The 45 largest transportation corporations owned 92 percent of all the transportation facilities of the country.

2. The 40 largest public-utility corporations owned more than 80 percent of the public-utility facilities.

3. The country's 20 largest banks held 27 percent of the total loans and investments of all the banks.

4. The largest life-insurance companies accounted for over 81.5 percent of all the assets of all life-insurance companies.

5. The 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned about 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the country.

6. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations owned 52 percent of the total corporate assets.

7. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations earned 50 percent of the total corporate assets.

8. Less than 4 percent of all the manufacturing corporations earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all manufacturing corporations.

9. No less than 33 percent of the total value of all manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each individual product accounted for over 75 percent of the total United States output.

10. More than 57 percent of the total value of manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each product turned out over 50 percent of the total United States output.

11. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the firms in the country in 1939 employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 40 percent of all the nonagricultural employment in the country.

12. In manufacturing, 1.1 percent of all the firms employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 48 percent of all the manufacturing employment in the country.

13. One-third of the industrial-research personnel were employed by 13 companies. Two-thirds of the research workers were employed by 140 companies, and the remaining third were employed by 1,582 concerns. About 150,000 industrial corporations were without research laboratories.

These statistics are found in the report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the Senate Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, entitled "Economic Concentration and World War II."

This concentration was still further increased during the war years. In 1939 firms with less than 50 employees accounted for but 34 percent of all the employees of American trade and industry and for 30 percent of the dollar value of the total pay roll. By 1943 the share of these small firms had shrunk to 25 percent of all employees and 19 percent of the total pay roll. On the other hand, in 1939 firms with over 1,000 employees accounted for 30 percent of the total employment and 36 percent of the total pay roll of American trade and industry.

By 1943 these figures had risen to 44 and 53 percent, respectively. The report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation which I referred to a moment ago states:

It is clear that during the war these large companies have come to dominate not only American manufacturing but the entire economy as a whole.

And now big business is using its war-increased strength to attain still greater concentration of power. As recently reported by the Federal Trade Commission, over 1,800 formerly independent competitive firms in the manufacturing and mining industries with assets valued at $4,100,000,000 have disappeared as a result of mergers and acquisitions since 1940.

The merger movement—

Says the report—

has been particularly pronounced since VJ-day. In the fourth quarter of 1945 it reached the highest level in the last decade and a half, and the trend is continuing at a relatively high level.

The Federal Trade Commission report goes on to say:

One of the outstanding characteristics of the current merger movement lies in the fact that most of the actions have consisted of the acquisition of small companies by large corporations.

In this connection, Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning an article discussing the same subject. I refer to a column by Mr. Marquis Childs, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLY

(By Marquis Childs)

The visitor from Mars—and if we accept the word of our more romantic scientists, he may be here any day now—is bound to find many puzzling contradictions on our troubled planet. Here in the United States he is certain to be confused by the way in which the word "monopoly" is bandied back and forth.

It figures largely in the drive for restrictive labor legislation. The National Association of Manufacturers is spending a great deal of money on advertisements hitting at industry-wide bargaining. The public is being told that this is a monopoly of a little clique of labor leaders

But, curiously enough, at the same time, we find the NAM growing red in the face with anger at anyone who dares to say that monopoly in the ownership of business is growing at a new and accelerated pace. It is only "left-wingers' and "collectivists" who would dare to say such a thing.

Specifically, Earl Bunting, head of NAM, attacks a report issued by the Federal Trade Commission. Now, the Federal Trade Commission is a respectable old-line agency that existed long before the New Deal was ever heard of. Yet Bunting interprets the report as sinister evidence that the FTC has been captured by 'left-wingers."

The NAM president has chosen an odd way to refute the FTC report on the growth of monopoly. He, or his economists for him, takes the number of corporations that have been absorbed by merger since 1940 and compares it with the total number of business firms. Thus he reaches the conclusion that, at this rate, it would take a thousand years to monopolize American industry and therefore we are perfectly safe.

In so doing, he ignores the major conclusion of the report. That was the fact that the 1,800 companies which were merged with larger companies represented 5 percent of the total value of all manufacturing corporations. Most of those mergers took place in the last 2 or 3 years.

The total number of companies is not the important point. The important point is that 5 percent, which is not to be derided as the bogey of left-wingers and collectivists. Five percent is a sizable chunk of our economy. The threat of merger and absorption is a very real one to thousands of smaller businesses throughout the country.

Name calling is so silly and futile. It is always the last resort of a man with a bad case or a bad conscience.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, is no left-winger. He has been fighting for the past 10 years to keep the free-enterprise system free by keeping it competitive. He has had the courage to say that the giant corporations are in reality collectivism—a kind of private socialism. And being wise in the ways of politics and human behavior, he knows that private socialism will sooner or later in a democracy become public socialism.

O'MAHONEY and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, have a bill before Congress which would stop one of the loopholes in our antitrust laws. The law, as it stands today, says that one corporation may not acquire the stock of another where that would help to create a monopoly. It says nothing about acquiring the physical assets—plants and machines—of another corporation.

Most of the mergers in recent years have been by the latter method. The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill would close that gap.

If Congress is going to attack the labor monopoly by law, as the NAM wants, then Congress cannot very well ignore the monopoly that exists in many fields of business. There seems to me to be little point in arguing which monopoly came first. Industry-wide bargaining may have grown up because of the existence of industry-wide trade associations and industry-wide price-fixing. But like the argument over which came first, the chicken or the egg, this is irrelevant.

"Now is the time," said NAM President Bunting, "to clean out the system changers from the temple of government." As Senator O'MAHONEY sees it, the system changers are those who would monopolize all business and thereby prepare the way for the all-dominant state.

Mr. MURRAY. Nearly three-fourths of the total number of firms which have disappeared since 1940 have been absorbed by larger corporations with assets of more than $5,000,000. The Federal Trade Commission report concludes:

The figures indicate conclusively that the major impetus behind the current merger movement had been the desire of giant corporations to consolidate their wartime gains and to expand the scope of their domination through acquisitions of smaller, independent enterprise.

It is this type of monopoly, not the so-called labor monopoly, which is the great menace now confronting our free-enterprise system.

On February 17, 1947, on the floor of the Senate, this menace to our country was commented on by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in connection with pending legislation seeking to protect our free-enterprise system, when he said:

Everybody agrees that the concentration of economic power is a menance to what we popularly call the American way of life, but the concentration of economic power proceeds year by year, month by month, and even day by day.

The magazine America, a publication noted for its fairness and impartiality in treating public questions, under date of April 26, 1947, says:

When you stop to think of it, this is an astonishing phenomenon in a country whose businessmen worship at the shrine of free enterprise and whose legislators are never too busy to spare time for the problems of small business. It is doubly astonishing these days when there is so much righteous talk in industrial circles about the huge labor monopolies which are strangling the country, and so much fear about the spread of collectivism abroad. You would think that this competition-conscious country would be exceptionally sensitive right now to the first faint signs of monopoly, that the press would be alert to expose and condemn the slightest tendency toward anticompetitive amalgamations, that politicians would be trust-busting up and down the Middle West as in days gone by, raising the specter of Wall Street.

Mr. President, I think it is clear that if labor has become "big" it is not for the purpose of destroying our American system and substituting in its stead a labor dictatorship. On the contrary, labor has been obliged to grow in size and strength in order to survive—in order to cope with big business and to maintain democratic rights for workers in industry.

Mr. President, this is a subject which has been before the country for many years. Back in 1938, when we were going through a recession, the magazine Fortune made a study of the problem of the growth of monopoly in America and pointed out the great dangers which confronted us in this field. An article on the subject is found in Fortune magazine for June 1938, entitled "Business and Government." It proposes that the trend should be reversed and that means should be found to bring about a decentralization of business in the United States. It reads as follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT—A DIVISION OF INDUSTRY INTO SMALLER UNITS MIGHT RESULT IN SOME SURPRISING PROFITS

In the progress of mankind there are times for everything. There was a time for the Dark Ages another for the Renaissance, another for an industrial revolution. There was a time for the building of America, for the creation of bigger markets and bigger pay rolls, and, inevitably, bigger industrial units. And that is our time. In our time men have been conditioned to the idea of bigness. They believe that to grow big is almost of necessity to progress. They believe that the expansion of American enterprise necessarily involves the corporate expansion of its units. And they are taught that the corporate expansion of the units should result in bigger profits, individually and to the economy as a whole.

But it is possible to question this: not that our time has been wrong, but that it may be time for something else. It may be time to reexamine our ideas of progress in the light of where we wish to go. It may be time to weigh the notion that there is some necessary connection between economic expansion and corporate bigness. It may be time to wonder whether profits and the national income would not be bigger if the corporate units of industry were not so big.

Consider what has been happening.

American business was founded upon the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. But during the era of bigness, when American business was, so to speak, winding up, the units of business became so big that they developed a fear of price wars; they dared not compete against themselves, and no one dared to compete against them. There consequently emerged the superunits — well-defined industrial groups whose members act in concert and whose aim is not price competition but, on the contrary, price stabilization. The efforts of the superunit produce the reverse effect of the competitive effort. When the market falls off the superunit tries to keep prices up. And often it does not consider it advisable to lower prices until recovery actually sets in.

Now, this technique of bigness, involving the artificial control of prices and other basic factors, is a collectivist technique. And the operation of the collectivist technique has created for business a precarious situation. Business has carried collectivism so far in its private affairs that its affairs are no longer private, but by the bigness of their impact, public. It is untenable, indeed, to suppose that the policies of the steel industry with regard to prices, production, and employment are strictly private matters. These policies involve directly 570,000 employees, $976,000,000 of annual pay rolls, and a $5,000,000,000 investment. They have repercussions throughout most of business, affecting at least remotely millions of people and eventually the entire economy. But inasmuch as they impinge upon and invade the sphere of public welfare, they impinge upon and invade the functions of Government. By its very office, Government must intervene. And the method of intervention which is easiest and most obvious, and which was encouraged during NIRA days by businessmen themselves, is the method of direct regulation—of price, for instance, of production, of profit itself.

Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in Government. And if this is not

collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretical steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk and profit; and—all too easily—the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power.

Last month, in the New Deal: Second Time Round, Fortune predicted that new forces within the administration were about to assert themselves. They began to assert themselves, indeed, while the February issue was on the presses, and they have since become known as the New Deal's antimonopoly program. From the beginning, the precise nature of this program has been ambiguous, and the purpose of the two business-and-Government articles in this issue (What Do They Mean: Monopoly? and Robert H. Jackson) is to clear up the ambiguity as far as possible. Whether the program will result in any immediate moves it is impossible to predict—indeed, it would seem that the only prediction that can safely be made concerning the New Deal at present is that it will sooner or later have to spend a great deal of money. But even if antimonopoly is merely a program for the long pull; even if its immediate results turn out to be nothing more substantial than a congressional investigation for the preparation of legislation and the streamlining of the antitrust laws, it merits the attention of business. For the basic purpose of the program is to stop the progress of collectivism and to turn business back to the democratic, competitive order. Only thus, it is argued, can Government also return to its original, democratic principles.

But here it is necessary to state flatly that any scheme to break down American industry into smaller units must inevitably fail if it cannot show a profit. This has been the trouble all along with Government policemanship. It is true that businessmen must operate within the limitations of the public welfare; but they must also and simultaneously operate within the limitations of the profit-and-loss statement. The businessman is of necessity uncooperative toward those regulations that disregard the logic of profits, or that limit so severely (and he might add, unfairly) the possibility of profits that the capital with which he is entrusted is in danger. This is a principle that men sitting in their offices in Washington are prone to underrate, with the result that the laws they promulgate cause misunderstanding, fear, uneasiness, resentment, and elaborate evasions that reach the goal—i. e., profit—by devious and even underground means.

But with this point firmly in mind it is permissible to inquire whether business could conceivably profit by a transformation of itself. And the answer, of necessity perfunctory within the present limitations of space, would seem to be that some of it could. If the winding-up process of the last 70 years has been an extremely profitable process, there is no reason to suppose that an unwinding process could not be profitable too. Indeed, the greatest obstacle in visualizing the possibilities inherent in such a reversal of the economy would seem to lie chiefly in a habit of mind that has conditioned every businessman to think of mergers as inevitably more profitable than the sum of their constituent units.

There is no question but that this has often proved to be true. The making of a merger on paper is one of the most exciting games in the world just because the potential increase in profit is enormous. Comparative balance sheets show that inventories, cash, and fixed-asset requirements for one big company would be considerably less than for several small ones. Expenses can be slashed everywhere—on paper. Managements can be unified, buying can be done in quantity, distribution can be made more efficient. It all yields wonderful copy for the prospectus writer. But the enthusiast forgets how many mergers have failed to work, and how many more have succeeded only after 10 or 15 yeras of disappointing earnings. In 1919 Arthur S. Dewing examined 35 industrial mergers and showed that, after 10 years of operations, the average earnings of 22 of them were less than the previous combined earnings of their constituent units. Only four of them realized promoters' estimates in their first year of operation, and only two of these kept the record unblemished for 10 years.

Dewing's table is too old to be taken literally today, and unhappily the depression makes a fair examination of recent mergers extremely difficult. But the principle is clear that few mergers do what they are supposed to do. There may be water in the capitalization. Management trouble may develop; management loses contact, becomes impersonalized and confused, indulges in grandiose schemes and unprofitable appendages. Almost certainly some of the units develop losses, and these are carried for years because of some special situation in the capital structure, or because the company is obligated, or maybe just because the management refuses to admit defeat. These losing units suck up the earnings. The return on invester capital dwindles from a projected 10 percent to 5, to 3, maybe to less than 1; and if in the meantime a big funded debt has been acquired, the company may become ossified—a problem child of the expansion economy.

In an accompanying article the problem of bigness is discussed from the point of view of Government, and the various schemes there suggested for breaking up bigness are Government schemes. But the theme here is not that of Government, but of business. And the standard here suggested is simply the profit standard. If American industry should undertake to unwind itself it would naturally begin with the unprofitable enterprises. Speaking theoretically, there seems to be no good reason why General Motors, for example, should be in the business of vacuum cleaners and the business of electric refrigerators, besides the automobile business. But General Motors makes a handsome profit, and hence, strictly from the business point of view, the burden of proof lies on him who argues that it ought to be broken up. On the other hand, there are a number of big combines that have not shown decent earnings for years. Their preferred stocks may be in arrears from $20 to $60; they yield nothing to the investor; their very size is a liability. Companies in this fix are hereby invited to examine themselves, to see whether everybody concerned would not profit if they were unmerged into their constituent parts.

Not as a concrete example, but merely to illustrate the general point, imagine a combine, A, simplified by the absence of funded debt. Suppose that it is susceptible to a logical dissolution into three moderate-sized operating companies, B, C, and D. Suppose that the most profitable enterprises are put into B, the medium ones and the losers into C and D. The original shareholders in this event receive three certificates for their old one, the B certificate representing an extremely prosperous enterprise, the C and D certificates representing speculative ones. Suppose that both of these speculations fail and that the C and D certificates become worthless. Nevertheless it is almost inevitable that the B certificate will be worth more than the original A stock. In actual practice, of course, C and D might be set up with special considerations, so that they would not be certain losses, but outside chances. The correct determination of such factors would be a question of proper balance.

But besides a profit to shareholders, there would be other profits. Management would profit in that young men, up till then submerged under a hierarchy, might be given the chance of their lives at the head of the speculative C and D companies. And the chances of survival for these companies would thereby be improved. Wall Street itself would profit, for Wall Street would get the commissions on the reorganization and the reshuffling of the securities. And finally the national economy would profit, for if C or D goes bankrupt, bad investments have thereby been liquidated with the least possible disruption to business as a whole.

This Simon-simple A-B-C-D example is not put forward as a concrete suggestion, but as an illustration of the principle that a redemocratization of industry would not have to be done at a total loss. Moreover, it is important to make firm note of two points. The program suggested here is not aimed at bigness per se. The error of bigness does not lie in the gross sales, but in the net functions. How big does a business have to be to operate efficiently? The answer, of course, varies with every specific case, and in every industry. As a general rule, whenever a business can look into itself honestly and find that its shareholders would profit by a dissolution, then maybe it is too big. And as a general ideal, there should be enough units in every industry to preserve the competitive character of that industry pricewise. But these are highly theoretical considerations and would take years to work out. It has taken 70 years to build business up to its present collectivist peak. It might take 70 years to build another industrial order, the basically democratic order here suggested. The unwinding process would, of course, be enormously complicated by funded debts, debentures, preferred equities, minorities, and a thousand and one variations of each. But it is safe to say that if American business wanted to move in this direction it could move in this direction. And it is safe to say that, if accomplished by private initiative, the unbuilding might be highly profitable, and might indeed stimulate an actual expansion of business and an increase in the national income, comparable to the expansions and increases of the past.

If, on the other hand, businessmen wait for the United States marshal to grab them by the collar, the reformation of the economy is not apt to be healthy. In that event, the unbuilding process will simply degenerate into a dog fight in the courts. The same old cycle will establish itself. Government will sue, courts will hedge, Congress will legislate, and business will evade. And meanwhile what happens to the national income is all too easy to guess.

But, if, finally, neither business nor Government makes any moves whatever in the direction of breaking down industry into smaller, more compact, more mobile, and better earning units; if bigness is allowed to remain as the standard concept of the economy: then the American businessman, and the American politico, and in short all American citizens, must prepare themselves for a different order of things; an order in which the powers of Government are not limited; in which the right to risk-and-profit is not clear; and in which the making, the selling, and even the buying of the products of the biggest show in history are all mysteriously directed from above.

Mr. President, the figures quoted in the Fortune article from which I have just read have greatly increased for the period between 1938 and 1947.

Mr. President, at the hearings on the pending bill Hon. Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and one of the leading Republican candidates for

the Presidency, who probably is one of the best informed men in the country on labor, protested against legislation which might break down labor. He pointed out that in our economy, labor must be maintained in a strong position in order to cope with industry and prevent a lowering of standards of living, and ultimate collapse and unemployment. He recognized, as we all do, that there is need for some legislation to correct abuses and to limit excessive powers, but he pointed out that we must not go too far. Instead of quoting his exact language from the record of the hearings, as it appears on pages 559, 570, 572, 575, and 576 of the hearings, I shall simply point out that on Tuesday, as I recall, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] read into the RECORD in the course of his remarks numerous extracts from the testimony given by Mr. Stassen before the committee, so I shall not undertake to repeat those portions of his testimony at this time.

Mr. President, the wage patterns and the price patterns of American industry are determined, not by small business, but by the giants of industry—Big Steel, the Big Four meat-packing companies, the Big Three auto companies, and so forth—and by the small but powerful group of men who control them. We cannot leave industry big and make labor small without endangering the gains for which labor has fought for many decades, and for which our country is justly proud.

In this connection, I wish to comment briefly on the position taken by certain Senators who wish to prohibit industry-wide or area-wide collective bargaining, a position which the Labor Committee has wisely opposed. Industry-wide or area-wide bargaining is not a novel idea or even a New Deal innovation. Examples can be found as far back as the 1880's. It exists in one form or another in such important industries as the railroads, coal mining, shipping, shipbuilding, and hosiery.

There are two basic reasons for its development. One I have already indicated—namely, the ever-increasing concentration of American industry and business and the need for labor to achieve a bargaining position on a par with that of capital. The other reason is the natural desire of labor to standardize wages and working conditions throughout an industry or area in order to prevent work standards from being undermined by the marginal employers. Here let me quote from the testimony given by Governor Stassen before the Labor Committee:

> Clearly in some industries this is the only basis on which negotiations can be successfully conducted. One group of producers cannot very well make a change in working conditions unless their competitors are to make the same change. If we break up this bargaining it will also tend to cause labor to select some particular segment of a closely related industry, probably a weak segment, to make its test. This segment in turn will practically be prevented from reaching a settlement unless it is certain that its competitors will reach the same settlement. The result would appear to me to be more chaotic than even those we have experienced in the last year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Montana yield so that there may be a quorum call preceding the joint meeting with the House of Representatives? The Senator will be recognized when the Senate returns to its Chamber.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for that purpose.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order heretofore made the Senate was to recess at 12:15 o'clock today for the purpose of enabling Senators to attend the joint meeting with the House of Representatives, but it is necessary that the Senate recess at 12:10 o'clock instead of 12:15, and, without objection, the order will be amended accordingly.

The Chair announces that immediately after the joint meeting is concluded Senators will immediately return to the Senate Chamber, and the consideration of the pending business will be resumed. The Senator from Montana will be recognized. In the meantime, the Chair thinks a quorum should be called.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of his law associate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

In accordance with the order heretofore entered, the Senate will now stand in recess, and proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint meeting with the House to receive the President of the United Mexican States.

Senators will return to the Senate Chamber immediately after the ceremony.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Carl L. Loeffler), the Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to greet and to listen to the address to be delivered by Hon. Miguel Aleman, President of the United Mexican States.

(For the address delivered by the President of Mexico, see House proceedings, p. 4378.)

At 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m. the Senate returned to its Chamber, and, the recess having expired, was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On behalf of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, request is made that the committee be permitted to sit tomorrow morning during the session of the Senate. Without objection, the request is granted

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I find it necessary to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, and I ask that I may be excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the time of the recess I was discussing the situation in the country with reference to centralization of business, growth of monopoly, and the need to preserve labor as a strong bargaining factor. I will now proceed with a discussion of the matters involved in the proposed legislation, such as the problem of collective bargaining and Nation-wide bargaining.

Mr. President, industry-wide or area-wide collective bargaining has generally worked well. A study by the Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, March 1947, reveals, for example, that in the pressed- or blown-glassware industry, one of the branches of glass and glassware having national bargaining, no major strike throughout the industry has occurred since collective bargaining began with an employer's association in 1888. Similar conditions have prevailed in the pottery industry since 1922. The experience of other industries has been equally satisfactory. Where labor disputes have occurred, it has not been because industry-wide or area-wide collective bargaining is practiced but because of the basic economic conditions to which I earlier referred. To eliminate or prohibit this form of collective bargaining would be to destroy the results of decades of experience and to run counter to a natural development inherent in our American economy.

The labor laws which we now have, with some appropriate improvements, such as have been suggested by the President, and in the minority report, can accomplish everything necessary to overcome our present labor difficulties. Of course, Mr. President, the underlying reasons, the basic causes of discontent and unrest among the workers of the country, must be eradicated. In his state of the Union message, delivered to the Congress January 6, 1947, the President recommended that—

> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining but we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

The President went on to recommend a four-point program to reduce industrial strikes. Point 1 was the early enactment of legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes and certain kinds of secondary boycotts, and to provide machinery for settling disputes concerning the interpretation of collective agreements through arbitration.

Point 2 was the extension of facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining.

Point 3 was the broadening of our program of social legislation to alleviate the causes of workers' insecurity. In this connection the President said:

> The solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor relations but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society. * * * The Congress should consider the extension and broadening of our social-security system, better housing, a comprehensive national health program, and provision for a fair minimum wage.

Point 4 was the appointment of a commission to undertake a broad study of the entire field of labor-management relations.

The existing laws have been construed in the courts over the years and have become firmly embedded in our industrial system. The laws being proposed will simply create greater dissension and confusion and lay the foundation for endless litigation and bitterness between labor and management. This was pointed out at the hearings by a number of witnesses whose patriotism and standing in the country cannot be questioned. Such was the testimony of Gov. Harold E. Stassen, candidate for the Republican nomination for President of the United States.

Mr President, no one contends that the labor laws of this country are perfect beyond need of improvement. I voted for proper changes in the committee and will support changes that are designed to correct any recognized weaknesses in our system of collective bargaining.

But, Mr. President, these improvements alone will not prevent the strikes that we all fear—no, nor all the prohibitions and boards and cooling-off periods and financial statements we can devise. Mr. President, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I want the RECORD to show that I sincerely believe this bill will provoke more disputes than it will ever settle.

A year ago, in debating the Case bill, the Senate was told:

> The Senate of the United States could much better afford to spend some time adopting amendments to the social-security laws and to the safety laws * * * than to sit here trying to figure out ways of placing strait-jacket restrictions upon free labor in America.

Those are not my words, but the words of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], one of the best informed men on labor problems in the United States. They are as true today as when he uttered them.

Let us get down to the fundamentals of industrial strife. What have we done to improve labor-management relations or remove the causes of strife?

Has the Congress made a move to ward off the threat of depression? No, it has not. The Joint Committee of the Congress on the Economic Report found the President's warnings too controversial and laid his message aside.

Has the Congress broadened and strengthened our social-security and health laws? It has not. The majority party in Congress has been too much preoccupied with a program designed to make labor a scapegoat in the approaching depression, for which it is responsible.

Has the Congress given genuine tax relief to our workingmen? It has not. It has been too busy trying to keep rash political promises to big business and war profiteers.

Has the Congress raised minimum wages to bring them into line with 1947 living costs? It has not.

Has the Congress enacted a housing program which would give our people adequate shelter? It has not.

Has the Congress made an attack on the problems of real monopoly—the dangerous concentration of economic power and authority in the hands of a few who seek to dictate the kind of labor laws we should have? Of course the answer to that question is no. Economic concentration is advancing day by day.

I ask that a very able discussion of this matter by Robert E. Freer of the Federal Trade Commission appearing in the Washington Post of Monday, April 28, 1947, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think I can confidently say without fear of successful contradiction that Congress will not solve these problems of industrial discord and strife until it first solves the social and economic problems which are the basic causes of labor disputes. It is for this reason that the President has called for a commission to study these conditions before we attempt the enactment of far reaching labor legislation.

Mr. President, the report of the Twentieth Century Fund on Economic Trends which has just been released, points out that maintenance of our economic strength, preservation of our social gains, defense of our democratic system, and success of our foreign policy depend upon the continued growth of our productivity. This in turn depends more upon intangible, psychological factors than upon physical ones. Thus it poses a problem in the human relations of American industry. As a Nation we have spent billions of dollars on research in the physical sciences and have been well repaid in technological progress, but we have done comparatively little to develop the social sciences that deal with human relations and might guide us in finding the true reactions of American workers and consumers to this problem.

Mr. President, a business columnist, Mr. C. F. Hughes, whose column appeared in the business section of the New York Times of Sunday, April 27, 1947, made some serious comments on this subject. He refers to the economic conditions of 1920–37, comparing them to the present conditions now threatening deflation. He then goes on to say:

> What our critics see at present is that business which got into the dog house in 1932 and then retrieved itself so nicely by its war record, is now in imminent danger of being banished again. Business itself can raise the cry against labor and the farmers and the Government but it still cannot erase those profits statements. Last week, however, the labor-management agreements came through which for a time appeared doubtful. The steel settlement was followed by the automobile pact which will set the pattern for the industry. Thus labor peace seems assured in the basic industries in spite of pending legislation in Congress that stirs up furious union resentment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Has it not been the observation of the Senator from Montana that, generally speaking, in view of the fact that most of the strikes of importance occur over wages, when management approaches the wage question in a fair and conciliatory manner, as has frequently been done in recent weeks by some of the major industries, labor and management can get together and we can have industrial peace?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is exactly correct. That has been demonstrated time and again, and I think recent negotiations which have ended so satisfactorily to both sides prove that what the Senator just said is true.

The writer, to whom I referred a moment ago, also points out that the stakes involved now are far greater than in the period of 1920–37 by reason of the fact, as he states it:

> That the free-enterprise system here is engaged in a final struggle against the rival systems of totalitarianism and socialism. The stalling tactics of Russia at the Moscow Conference which has ended without results are attributed with good reason to a Soviet desire to await what happens here.

The columnist I have just mentioned is a well-known and highly thought of writer, a man of great ability, and a profound student of economic problems. I have been reading his column for many years, and I regard him to be very sound in his economic views.

Lower living costs, better and cheaper housing, higher minimum wages, more protection against unemployment and the hazards of illness, accidents, and old age—these are the basic remedies. Many intelligent businessmen recognize this and are calling for a more enlightened program to preserve our free-enterprise system.

In the New York Times of April 2, 1947, I find the following statement:

> In the grand ballroom of a big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management Association that the future of the free-enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations with the public; that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this important and difficult field. In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Mr. President, that is the consensus of opinion of a group of businessmen whose interest in the management-labor problem cannot be doubted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator from Montana referred to that enlightened and forward-looking attitude on the part of some businessmen. No doubt their point of view is that business is already enjoying the highest profits it has ever gained in the Nation's history, and that if anything were done at the present time violently to affect the economy it would probably impair the very unprecedented prosperity which now prevails. Is not that the conclusion drawn by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. That is my conclusion drawn from my observation of the situation and confirmed by the statement published in the press in connection with the management meeting held in Chicago. There is a feeling among the members of management associations that something must be done to improve the relations between management and workers if we are to have industrial peace and high productivity, and a movement exists among them to bring about such improvement. I am satisfied that the forward-looking men in industry realize that if we are to have peace and prosperity and high production it must come about not by laws the purposes of which are to hamstring and break down the power of labor but by bringing about a better understanding and better spirit of cooperation between management and labor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It is admitted, I think by everyone, that the legislation now pending before the Senate represents a violent departure from our past national policy in the management-labor field. I will ask the Senator if it is likely that anyone today would advocate legislation the effect of which would be to increase the profits of management, which are already at unprecedented heights, and is it not almost inevitable that any violent change in the management-labor policy of the country will not only add to swollen profits but will inevitably beat down the wages of the workers, diminish the purchasing power of the workers, and contribute to the very depression which the Russians as the Senator says, are expecting in the American economy?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly not; and that seems to be the conclusion of all reputable economists. It is the conclusion of the Economic Council which has been established by the Congress under laws enacted last year. It seems to me that no one can look at the situation confronting our country today without realizing that unless we curb the expansion of monopoly, unless we make an effort to bring about a better and more equitable distribution of the proceeds of industry, serious conditions will plague us in the future. Undoubtedly if the conditions which prevail today continue, a serious recession, if not a serious depression, will occur which will create a very dangerous situation.

No fair-minded person can deny the conclusions stated in the New York Times article. What we need in this country is an end to the struggle between labor and capital for dominance. Only through a spirit of cooperation will we be able to overcome the dangerous economic difficulties confronting the country today.

Mr. President, let us act now to make those amendments which are justified and required and which the whole country will approve, and leave the questionable changes proposed for a more mature study under the commission to be set up as recommended by the President.

Many businessmen and a large section of the conservative press see this as the correct course to pursue. We cannot afford to mix statesmanship with hysteria. We cannot approach the delicate problem of labor relations in an atmosphere of emotionalism and confusion. Such a course was advocated by the Wall Street Journal when similar radical legislation was proposed in the Case bill, which the President was forced to veto last year. The Wall Street Journal, discussing the extreme provisions in the Case bill, said:

> None of the labor measures recently brought forward deals at all thoroughly with the fundamentals of national labor legislation. Any one of them, if enacted, would leave Federal laws on the subject a patchwork of inconsistent and partly conflicting provisions for the courts to struggle with. The real need is not of more law but of less. Of simpler and more precisely expressed statutes designed first of all to render men and groups of men equal before the law. Federal labor laws should be thoroughly revised and codified. Until it is ready to tackle that job in an atmosphere of relative industrial peace, Congress would do well not to legislate on labor.

Here we see one of the leading journals representing industry fearful that Congress may attempt to go too far in the field of labor legislation.

The truth of the Wall Street Journal observations is exemplified by an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of Friday, April 25, 1947, pointing out the lack of wisdom in the proposed abolishment of the Conciliation Service and setting up an independent agency in its stead. That editorial states:

> The reasons for this move are obscure. One theory seems to be that since the Department of Labor is charged with the duty of representing labor, a subordinate agency of the Department cannot function fairly in a mediatory role. Another argument is that the present set-up brings the Government into labor disputes in a partisan role.
>
> Actually, however, no evidence has been produced to show that the Conciliation Service has functioned either as a prolabor or as a political agency. On the contrary there is much testimony on the record from spokesmen for management and labor that the Service as currently constituted has functioned impartially and effectively. One of the few recommendations upon which the President's labor-management conference of 1946 could agree called for reorganization of the United States Conciliation Service to the end that it will be established as an effective and completely impartial agency within the Department.
>
> The reorganization of the Service within the Department has taken place; its effectiveness is attested by the settlement of more than 13,000 disputes last year, and there is no complaint of partiality. So why take it out of the Labor Department? Another proposed change which deserves more scrutiny is the provision for a 60-day waiting period before a labor contract can be abrogated. At best, the usefulness of this is dubious, and many experienced negotiators believe that it actually makes more difficult the adjustment of disputes. * * *
>
> The Conciliation Service has been doing a good job. But Congress now is considering a reduction in its funds and a complete revamping of its organizational structure.

That is from the Washington Star, which is recognized as one of the leading independent newspapers of the country.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize some of the points which I have made in my remarks so far.

First, let me say no Senator on this side of the aisle will dispute the proposition that there is need of some corrective legislation in the field of labor-management controversy. The minority members of the committee have set forth in their statement of minority views the provisions of the bill which they believe to be constructive and acceptable. We agree with the President that there is need for an investigation of the whole field of labor-management relations. We believe that machinery should be set up for procuring adherence to collective-bargaining contracts. We think it is fair to provide that it should be an unfair labor practice for a union to interfere in the designation of employer representatives. We are of the view that carefully drawn legislation restricting jurisdictional strikes and unjustified secondary boycotts should be enacted. We think that employers in dealing with their employees are entitled to liberty of speech, which does not under the circumstances contain any threat of reprisal or force or offer of benefit. We believe that the clarification in the relations between Federal and State labor relations boards provided for in the bill represents a wise solution to a difficult problem. We recognize that there are other provisions in the bill which, either as they stand or with appropriate amendment, would improve procedures of collective bargaining.

The difficulties with the proposed bill do not arise out of any belief that the problems with which it deals are not proper subjects for Federal legislation. They go rather to the methods proposed for dealing with those problems and the remedies which are provided for violations of the proposed legislation. I think it is a serious mistake, for example, to remove the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. As I have said, I see no need for such a proposal, and I believe that it will have detrimental effects on the functions of the Government's mediation and conciliation activities. The great vice of the bill now before us is that while dealing with legitimate problems it strikes down legitimate rights and sets up illegitimate remedies.

I urge a more constructive approach to this important national problem to the end that we may bring about a spirit of genuine cooperation and an end to the senseless warfare between capital and labor which is demoralizing our whole economic system.

I urge that if we seek industrial peace we should proceed to the enactment of that character of legislation which is soundly devised to remedy clearly established abuses; legislation which will be consistent with the protection of labor's hard-won rights of organization and free collective bargaining.

EXHIBIT A

INDUSTRIAL MERGERS

(By Robert E. Freer)

DANGEROUS TREND TO MONOPOLY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Freer is a member of the Federal Trade Commission and a trustee of George Washington University.)

We have a declared public policy regarding monopoly that is rooted in the principles of the common law and which has been embodied in and implemented by a series of antitrust statutes, including the Sherman and Clayton Acts. But in the dynamic development of industry based on modern technology, the facts of concentration constantly tend to outrun the law.

The factual diagnosis showing the relation of corporate mergers to concentration is as complete and as exact as specialists in the field can make it. Today's choice is one between legislative action recommended by the Federal Trade Commission to plug a loophole in the present laws against such mergers and continued frustration of our declared public policy.

Simply stated, the Commission's proposal is that the Clayton Act be so amended that acquisition by a corporation engaged in interstate commerce of the assets of a competing corporation also engaged in interstate commerce be made unlawful where the result tends to monopoly. Presently only stock (not asset) acquisitions so tending are unlawful under that act, and legal actions against even such unlawful acquisitions easily may be defeated.

More than 1,800 formerly independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up through merger and acquisition since 1940. Their combined asset value was $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing concerns in 1943. Moreover, it was the larger corporations, each having assets of over $5,000,000 (in many instances achieved through earlier acquisitions), that accounted for some three-fourths of these recent 1,800 acquisitions.

The war contributed powerfully to the trend of concentration. Government purchases and Government financing of productive facilities were channeled predominantly into the hand of corporations which already occupied positions of dominance. Surplus profits created by such channeling have contributed powerfully to the trend by providing funds for additional wartime and postwar expansion through acquisition of former competitors. Out of $175,000,000,000 of Government contract awards between June 1940 and September 1944, $107,000,000,000, or 67 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards. During the war 68 corporations received two-thirds of the $1,000,000,000 appropriated by the Government for research and development purposes in industrial laboratories.

The most recent information on the wartime growth of concentration available from the Bureau of Internal Revenue shows that the larger manufacturing corporations, those with assets of $50,000,000 or more each, increased their share of total assets from 42 percent in 1939 to 52 percent in 1943.

The degree of prewar concentration in the economy as a whole and in manufacturing industries in particular was stated in the report of the Senate Small Business Committee, submitted in January 1946:

The 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned about 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the country. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations owned 52 percent of the total corporate assets. Less than 4 percent of all the manufacturing corporations earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all manufacturing corporations.

More than 57 percent of the total value of manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each product turned out over 50 percent of the total United States output. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the firms in the country in 1939 employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 40 percent of all the nonagricultural employment in the country. One-third of the industrial research personnel were employed by 13 companies.

More mergers and acquisitions in the manufacturing and mining industries took place in 1946 than in any of the previous 15 years. In 1946, the number of mergers were 26 percent above the number in 1945, and 225 percent above the annual average of the years 1940–41. Years of greatest business activity and high-price levels are the years in which the greatest number of mergers take place. In 1920, the number of mergers increased more than six times over the number during 1919.

The stock market crash of 1929 which heralded the onset of the great depression was preceded by a great wave of corporate mergers and a wild speculation in their securities. Today speculation in the future of merged concerns, supported by war-swollen profits, is again operating as one of the important causes of the present upward trend in merger activity. This speculation, which stems from the expectation of greater profits resulting from the elimination of formerly competing concerns, leads inexorably to the elimination of our competitive economy and thus to the elimination of the possibility of legitimate speculation.

Assuming as we must that the Government, acting in the general public interest, can, if Congress so directs, prevent the further growth of monopolistic power through mergers of competing corporations, the question is one of ways and means of halting mergers that tend toward monopoly regardless of whether consummated by sale of stock or of assets.

When section 7 of the Clayton Act was passed in 1914, it was assumed that consummated monopolies could be dissolved under the Sherman Act, pursuant to the Supreme Court's decrees of dissolution in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco cases decided in 1911. It was assumed that the only remaining problem was how to prevent the formation of monopoly.

However, about the time that the Federal Trade Commission began to institute a number of proceedings for enforcement of section 7 the Supreme Court interpreted the Sherman Act to mean that huge size and power acquired through acquisition of competing corporations did not necessarily violate the act and that it was only the abuse of such power and not its existence which would make such acquisitions unlawful. A few years later when the Commission's cases under section 7 reached the Court, it was held that the Commission had no power under section 7 to halt the incipient monopolies where the unlawful acquisition of stock was followed by an acquisition of the physical properties without which the stock had no value, and where this was done before the Commission could complete the hearings and enter its order requiring divestiture of the stock unlawfully acquired.

The practical status of section 7 is that no matter how unlawful an acquisition of stock in a competing corporation may be, the remedy provided by the statute easily can be defeated, leaving the acquiring corporation in possession of the assets which are the fruits of its unlawful acquisition of stock. And if the assets are acquired directly without any intervening acquisition of stock, as has become the prevailing method, there has never been any legal ground for a contention that this was prohibited under section 7.

Thus the brave start, under the Clayton Act, has ended in complete frustration. And at the same time, the Sherman Act has been so construed that it seldom has served to unscramble corporate mergers, no matter how great the size and power of the acquiring or of the consolidated corporation. The contrast between the rapid evolution of economic concentration of power and the feebleness and slowness with which effective legal remedies have been and are being applied is striking. It is sufficient to call in question the reality of our faith in the validity of the competition presupposed by the free-enterprise competitive system.

A paradoxical aspect of this problem is that while corporate mergers and acquisitions proceed unrestrained and unrestrainable by law toward an ultimate maximum in unified ownership and concentrated economic power, we still enforce the law against the more transient and more vulnerable forms of trade restraint represented by price agreements and conspiracies among competitors. The process of corporate acquisition proceeds side by side with such forms of trade restraint among competitors. The presence of large-scale unified ownership in any industry is a most powerful guaranty of success in the operation of a price-fixing combination among the competitive units of that industry. The very success of law enforcement against such combinations highlights the advantage of unified corporate ownership as a legally invulnerable means of accomplishing similar ends. Carried to its logical result, there will probably be less and less opportunity to score victories against price-fixing combinations as corporate mergers immune from legal attack take their place.

No one has summarized the danger of monopoly any better than President William Howard Taft, under whose administration some of the most far-reaching antitrust actions of all time were taken. On December 5, 1911, he stated:

"When all energies are directed not toward the reduction of the cost of production for the public benefit by a healthful competition, but toward new ways and means for making permanent in a few hands the absolute control of the conditions and prices prevailing in the whole field of industry, then individual enterprise and effort will be paralyzed and the spirit of commercial freedom will be dead."

The facts of the present situation constitute an increasing threat not only to our traditional antitrust policy but also to the American system of free competitive enterprise which that policy is designed to foster and to protect.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 230)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting so-called Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1947. The message is of considerable length. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, together with the accompanying paper.

There being no objection, the message, together with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 4380.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 231)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The second message from the President of the United States on the same general subject transmits so-called Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD and referred.

The question of reference at this point is not so simple as in the other case. We again collide with one of those situations under the Reorganization Act in which several different references might be argued. In the opinion of the Chair, however, since Reorganization Plan No. 2 refers entirely and exclusively to the Department of Labor, this message should be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, without objection, that order will be made.

There being no objection, the message, together with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 4382.)

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2849, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947. It is important that the conference report be acted on this afternoon, because several payments, such as those to veterans are being held up until the report is agreed to. I therefore ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the report for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25, 26, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the figure "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$282,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,934,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$164,631,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not exceeding $42,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,925,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,529,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 42.

STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the pending amendment simply adds to the restrictive provisions affecting labor organizations which already appear in the bill. It tends to weaken, even to a further extent than does the bill itself, the effective power of labor organizations to represent the workers. It adds an additional harassment to labor organizations in their efforts to protect their members as the working people of the country. Let me affirm that that is the general character of the bill itself, and I shall show what is the background of the bill to which it is proposed that this amendment shall be added.

The majority report, on page 3 thereof, gives a rather fair general summary of the provisions of the bill. I read from the report:

> The bill is divided into four titles: Title I amends the National Labor Relations Act to achieve the purposes to which reference has been made. Title II creates a new Federal Mediation Service, which transfers the functions of the Department of Labor in the field of conciliation, along with the property and personnel of the present Service. It also provides special procedures for the Attorney General and the President to utilize in national emergencies. Title III gives labor unions the right to sue and be sued as legal entities for breach of contract in the Federal courts. Title IV establishes a joint committee of the Congress to make a long-range study of certain aspects of labor relations, concerning which further information was thought desirable by the committee. Title V contains definitions.
>
> The major changes which the bill would make in the National Labor Relations Act may be summarized as follows:
>
> 1. It eliminates the genuine supervisor from the coverage of the act as an employee and makes it clear that he should be deemed a part of management.

Mr. President, I interpolate at that point that what it does, in substance, is to deny to supervisory personnel, whom we usually think of as foremen, the right of collective bargaining, the right of making common cause against management in order to better their wages and working conditions. It denies to the supervisor class what I contend is essential industrial democracy. We have never contended that a foreman should have a right to become a member of the union to which the employees en masse belong. I think of a foreman as related to the industrial organization, as being like a sergeant in the Army; I recognize the necessity for certain distinctions between even noncommissioned officers and those who serve in the ranks in our armed forces; but, Mr. President, to exclude foremen from membership in the union to which the mass of the workers belongs does not mean that we have to deny to the foremen the right to make common cause to better their common lot. Yet that is what this bill essentially does. It denies foremen the right which they presently enjoy in that respect, because, under the present rules of the National Labor Relations Board and under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, today foremen are protected by the National Labor Relations Act. They have the right of collective bargaining. They have the power to require the employer to recognize their rights under the Wagner Act. But they are denied, under this provision as stated in the summary set forth in the report, the protection to which I have adverted.

That does not mean that they do not have the right of bargaining together with the employer, provided he recognizes them or provided they may enforce that kind of cooperation, but it does mean that they do not have the right, which they have today, to become a collective-bargaining group under the National Labor Relations Act. So there is another patent instance of a deprivation, through the measure now pending before the Senate, of the rights of workingmen which they now enjoy under the law, under the practices of the National Labor Relations Board, and under the decisions of the highest Court of the land.

I read again from the majority report:

> 2. It abolishes—

That is, the bill which the committee recommends to the Senate—

> It abolishes the closed shop but permits voluntary agreements for requiring such forms of compulsory membership as the union shop or maintenance of membership, provided that a majority of the employees authorize their representatives to make such contracts.

There, again, the bill does nothing to management; it diminishes no right that management has under the present law in that respect, but it takes away from the workers the right of the closed shop, the right of insisting upon the closed shop in collective bargaining, because the bill, as I have just read from the committee report, abolishes the closed shop.

More than half the collective-bargaining agreements now in effect in the United States are closed-shop agreements. Approximately 4,800,000 workers were covered by closed and union shop with preferential hiring provisions in 1946 compared to 4,250,000 in 1945. Union-shop clauses without preferential hiring covered almost 2,600,000 workers in 1946 compared with 2,000,000 in 1945. The closed shop has come to be recognized as an essential instrument on the part of the workers to protect their standards of wages and working conditions. It is primarily for the protection of the worker. Yet, I read again from the committee report, that the bill presented to the Senate by the committee abolishes the closed shop.

It does permit a kind of union security arrangement; it permits a kind of a union shop; but only, Mr. President, when the majority of the employees authorize their representatives to make such contracts. It does two things: First, it changes the existing law. Under the existing law, if a bargaining agent has been chosen by a group of workers in a lawful way, that agent can enter into a contract with management for a closed shop, if management is agreeable to such a provision in the contract. That is free enterprise; that is freedom of contract; that is truly free collective bargaining The agent of the workers duly chosen as their collective-bargaining agent, and chosen in accordance with the rules of law and under the regulations and supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, labor's representative, speaks for labor in bargaining with the employer; and of course the stockholders' representatives, duly chosen, speak for the stockholders.

Those representative agencies got together in the past and worked out collective-bargaining agreements, and, as I have said, in more than half of the collective-bargaining agreements now in force there is a provision recognizing the closed shop. I say, Mr. President, that the closed shop was arrived at in a democratic way; that management and labor had a right, and they should have in the future such a right, to agree to such a provision in the contract. Yet the bill, as the committee says, abolishes the closed shop. It denies to the parties to the contract the right to write the contract according to their best judgment.

Mr. President, I thought Senators said they believed in free enterprise. I thought they had claimed that they are the champions of the entrepreneur system in our economy, the system of initiative by individuals in working out

things that they deem to be to their own interest and to the public interest.

Yet the pending measure would deny to management and labor the right to write their own contract. Is not that an undue intervention into the affairs of management and labor? There are many instances where management would not give up the closed shop, because it has found it to be to the best interests of the enterprise. Yet, the Senate of the United States is asked by its committee to outlaw that kind of a provision in a contract between management and labor, however freely it may have been entered into between representatives of the two groups.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, first, to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Florida whether such a provision does not in itself have some features of illegality? In effect, that provision of the law would say to you and to me that we cannot write a contract that is legal in itself, thereby denying us our fundamental legal rights.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it seems to me inescapable that that is the effect of the proposal to which I have adverted.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the Senator did not object, however, to the fact that the law prohibited an employer and an employee from writing a contract which precluded the employee from joining a union. That certainly is a limitation of contract. Furthermore we do not hesitate to limit contracts if what is contracted for is against public policy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I contend that it is not contrary to public policy to let the representatives of labor and the representatives of management write a contract governing their relationships and governing employment conditions in a given industry. I think the workers have a right to determine the standards and conditions upon which they will work in an industry; and I think that management, as a proprietor, likewise has a right to determine what the conditions shall be; and when the two agree upon mutually satisfactory conditions, I do not deem it to be in the interest of public policy that the Congress declare what they have done to be illegal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that we have long since outlawed the so-called yellow-dog contract, in which two men, perfectly willing to do so, sit down together and make a contract for the employment of the prospective employee, and he contracts that he will not join a union. We said that was against public policy, so we outlawed it. We limited the freedom of contract in that case.

So why should not we also limit the freedom of contract, if we wish to do so, if we think that is the proper policy, in the case of a man who sits down with a labor leader and says, "I will employ nobody in my plant, I will exclude millions of people who may want to work for me, unless you say I can employ them, unless they are members of your union." Certainly it is perfectly within the range of public policy to say that that limitation on the right of contract, not between the individual workingmen and the employer, but between a man who happens to be president of a labor union and the employer, is against public policy. As a matter of fact, in the pending measure, we do not go that far. But I can see no legitimate argument, from the Senator's point of view, that this is in any way an interference with the free right of contract.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to try to answer that argument of the Senator from Ohio. The yellow-dog contract was, generally speaking, a contract between one prospective employee and management, the heads of which represented all the stockholders, and were chosen by the stockholders, and they represented the concerted power of all the dollars which were invested in the particular enterprise. Ordinarily that was the case, and that one man was required to enter into a contract to the effect that he accepted as a condition of employment in that enterprise the giving up of what I regard as an essential civil right which he had as a citizen to enter into contracts with other people, to enter into relations with other people, that might be desirable to him. In support of my point I cite the opinion of the Supreme Court in *J. I. Case Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (321 U. S. 332):

> The very purpose of providing by statute for the collective agreement is to supersede the terms of separate agreements of employees with terms which reflect the strength and bargaining power and serve the welfare of the groups.

I make a distinction, therefore, and then I wish to make a second point; and then I shall yield further to the Senator from Ohio. I make a distinction between a case where the chosen representatives of management sit down with the chosen representatives of labor and agree to general conditions governing the relationship of those two groups, and the laying down of conditions with respect to other people not parties to the contract, and who, I insist, have no inherent right to become a party to the contract or a member of that enterprise. I distinguish that case from the case set forth by the Senator from Ohio, where management, representing all the dollars invested in the enterprise, makes as a condition to the right of one man to work in that enterprise his giving up of a civil right, which I believe he has, namely, the right to associate himself with other people in a labor union, or the right to do other things he believes to be for his best interests.

Therefore, Mr. President, I lay down the premise and the proposition that the two cases are not analogous, but that there is legitimate reason to strike down the case cited by the Senator from Ohio as being against public policy, because in that case the man signing the contract is made to give up the right which he has to join a union. But in the case to which I refer, the two groups are merely permitted to get together to agree that all the workers in the given plant shall belong to the union, that the management will recognize the union, and that everyone who works in the plant must meet the condition which they jointly have laid down, namely, membership in the union. I submit that that is a valid distinction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me call the Senator's attention to another limitation of contract, namely, the Wagner Act itself. Can the Senator from Florida imagine any greater limitation on the right of contract than the Wagner Act, which says that an employee cannot deal with his employer except through someone whom he may not recognize as in any way representing him? The Wagner Act says that employee A cannot enter into a contract with his employer B, but that the employer must deal with someone elected by a majority of the employees, against whom employee A may have voted when he had a chance to vote on the question of electing persons to represent him. Can the Senator from Florida imagine any greater limitation on the right of contract than an act which says that A, an employee, a free American citizen, cannot even go to his employer and make a contract with his employer about the terms of his employment?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there, again, I urge that there is a distinction; and I remind the Senator from Ohio that before the Wagner Act was passed, an individual stockholder in a corporation had no legal right to negotiate about corporate affairs with the employees of the company. The law has already determined that when the stockholders acted with respect to the employees, they had to act through their chosen representatives; they could not act individually and in that way make a contract.

All that the Wagner Act was doing was putting the two on a basis of parity, recognizing that if $1,000,000 was speaking through the president of a corporation, if an arrangement were not made so that the employees could likewise act cooperatively and speak through their representatives, there would not be equality and fairness of bargaining between the two groups.

On this point the United States Supreme Court pointed out, *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 331), that a single employee generally was helpless in dealing with the employer on whom the employee was dependent for his daily wage for support. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer.

So, Mr. President, I remind the able Senator from Ohio that long before the Wagner Act ever was passed, a stockholder had absolutely no power or right to enter into a contract about terms of employment with the workers in an enterprise in which he was a stockholder.

That right was submerged into the management of the corporation, which had to be chosen in a representative way.

So we did not do for the individual worker anything which had not long before been done for the individual stockholder, except we tried at long last to put the two groups on something like an equal bargaining basis.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the two are in any way analogous. But I wish to say to the Senator that I am not arguing against the principles of the Wagner Act; I am merely pointing out that in the discussion of labor relations we have limited the right of contract in the case of a particular contract which is against public policy. So, on the question of the closed shop, or the limitation of the right of the closed shop, we are not plowing any new ground.

I wish to suggest to the Senator also that the Railway Labor Act has worked very well, and it contained a prohibition against the closed shop. That prohibition has been in effect for years in the railroad industry, and the Senator has never protested, so far as I know, against that provision of the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I have not protested against that, because, apparently, the workers have been satisfied with the law under which they operate. It has had a long history, and evidently it has worked out all right. Nor has the Senator from Ohio offered any amendment to any other provision of the Railway Labor Act, so far as I know. We have accepted that act as it was written, unless some initiative came to us from one group or the other. I think the act is working satisfactorily.

But I also desire to remind again the able Senator that more than half the collective-bargaining agreements now in effect, and there are millions of workers covered by them, contain a provision for the closed shop, and they are also working all right.

I should like to read a paragraph from a bulletin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics called Union Security, published in September 1946:

> The first step toward "union security" may be said to have been accomplished when an employer voluntarily, or following National Labor Relations Board certification, recognizes the union as sole or exclusive bargaining agent of the workers in the bargaining unit of the plant. Following recognition, the employer and union, or their representatives, enter into collective bargaining to determine the terms and conditions of employment, including union security going beyond simple recognition. The position of the union is based upon the simple proposition that all workers who share the benefits of the collective agreement should at the same time share the costs and obligations of the union. Membership in good standing in the union is regarded as the principal obligation. For the most part, management has opposed union security because it has feared that the control over the supply and quality of its labor force would thereby be placed in the hands of the union. However, the thousands of union agreements which contain union security provisions of one type or another afford ample evidence of the fact that employers and unions have, through the process of collective bargaining, found a basis for reconciling their differences.

Just as I am not trying to change the Railway Labor Act, I oppose the effort of the Senator from Ohio and those who are associated with him, to outlaw those agreements which are already in effect, and that principle which has had such wide recognition in industry, and which I believe is meeting the test of experience and efficacy in our economy.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator from Florida is extremely well informed on labor laws and the Railway Labor Act, and I wish to call to his attention an incident that came to my attention regarding the attitude of union leaders.

About 30 years ago, I was told by Mr. Alexander Whitney himself, a large group of railway employees met at convention in Cleveland and a resolution was presented to the convention which in simple terms provided that no one should be permitted to work on a railroad unless he became a member of one of the railroad brotherhoods. The president of the organization was present, and before there was a chance for adoption of the resolution he stepped to the front of the platform and said, "I ask the gentleman who has made the motion to withdraw it, because I consider it inimical to the best interests of the men working on the railroads. The American people do not want the closed shop. They do not want anything forced on anyone. I ask that the motion be withdrawn, or in the event of its not being withdrawn, I ask for its defeat, because in my opinion our great objective in the railroad brotherhoods should be to make our unions so good, and make them deliver so much of value to the membership, that we will not have to force men to join, but they will join because they want to become members and receive the benefits."

I am merely repeating to the Senator what Alexander Whitney, who is well known to him and to me, a man I have known for a number of years, told me himself. He is old enough to have been at the convention, and he recited what happened. The resolution providing that no one could work on a railroad unless he belonged to one of the unions was withdrawn.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He always makes a valuable contribution to a discussion.

I realize that there is a difference of opinion about the matter of the closed shop. I want Senators also to know that I come from a State where a constitutional amendment has recently been adopted outlawing the closed shop. I voted against it, and I declared publicly against it when it was up for consideration. I am still against it. I think it is bad law, that it is undesirable public policy. What rather surprises me about the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and some of the other Senators associated with him in sponsoring the pending legislation, who come from the large industrial States, is that I do not know of any of the large industrial States—and I should be glad to have any called to my attention—which have adopted any constitutional amendment or enacted any legislation outlawing the closed shop. I come from the South, where I regret to say, we have not yet gained as large an organized labor force as I hope we shall have, where our attitude toward labor organizations is not always as sympathetic and understanding as I wish it were.

I readily admit that many of the Southern States have adopted constitutional amendments outlawing the closed shop. But I am a little surprised to see the effort now to outlaw it nationally come from Senators representing some of the great industrial States, which could have outlawed the closed shop if they had chosen to do so, but have not.

As I have said, Mr. President, I do not know of any of the large industrial States where difficult problems of management and labor are constantly dealt with, where there has been a long record of experience in this field, where either by constitutional amendment or by legislation the closed shop has been outlawed. Nor has the Congress done so in the past. We have left it up to the parties.

I am aware, of course, that the present law does not require any employer to enter into a closed-shop agreement. The National Labor Relations Act at the present time does not require any employer to enter into a closed-shop agreement with his workers. It is a matter of free collective bargaining. Freedom of contract is allowed. Freedom of agreement is permitted to management and to labor. But if, in the exercise of their discretion if, because they mutually agree that it is desirable and in the public interest, they put such a provision in a contract, it is legal today, and it will continue legal unless the pending bill shall become the law of the land, in which case it will be outlawed.

Mr. President, I protest against that kind of policy. I protest on the part of management, as well as on the part of labor, because management does not have to enter into the contract unless it chooses to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any evidence before the committee disclosing the position of any part of management upon the closed shop?

Mr. PEPPER. There is a difference of opinion.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood that there was a difference of opinion upon the question.

Mr. PEPPER. In some instances management opposes it very strongly, and in other instances management has the closed shop; its experience has been completely satisfactory, and it would not give it up today.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the question in view of the statement made by the Senator that, after all, it was a matter of voluntary agreement between the two as to whether or not they would have a closed shop.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, as I showed a while ago, that the

proportion is about two-thirds to one-third, but I am correct in saying that more than half the collective-bargaining agreements in force have the closed shop as part of the contract. That fact indicates that the employers must have found it agreeable.

Mr. LUCAS. They can either have the closed shop or they can deny the right of the closed shop, depending upon collective bargaining, and what the two parties agree upon.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly, and I maintain that is as it should be, and that we will have a greater degree of industrial peace following that method than we will have by disrupting the policy which has been in effect for more than a decade, ever since the National Labor Relations Act was enacted. I say that we will have more work stoppages as a result of trying to tear up those contracts and remake them under the restraints the bill contemplates—and I shall refer to them later—than if we leave the situation as it is at the present time, and profit by the experience we have already gained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator has made a very able argument, insofar as those cases are concerned, in which management and labor sit down together and formally negotiate such a contract as the Senator has outlined. That is true collective bargaining. But I am sure the Senator would not want to leave the impression that there have no been situations of a far different kind, in which, instead of there being true collective bargaining, there has been in effect "collective bludgeoning," in which representatives of labor organizations have gone to employers, when every single employee has indicated that he does not care to belong to a labor organization, and by a process of "collective bludgeoning," to use that term again, have told the employer that unless he signs a closed-shop contract there will be no future deliveries of materials to his factory or his plant. That is certainly far from being collective bargaining in the sense that the able Senator from Florida has outlined it here today.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. Yes, of course; the case he puts is different from the one I contemplated. But is not the able Senator from California thinking of the boycott case, in which a group of employees other than employees involved in negotiations with their employer, through the boycott, use their economic pressure upon the employer to make him enter into a certain kind of contract with his employees?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are a number of cases of that kind, but the end result is the same. If, instead of negotiating in the true collective-bargaining spirit, a union agent goes to the employer and lays a contract on his desk and says, "Whether or not a single one of your employees is interested in joining the union, you will sign this, or else," there is not in that case collective bargaining in the sense that the able Senator from Florida has in mind. It is because of that type of situation rather than the type outlined by the able Senator from Florida that legislation is believed to be necessary at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my distinguished friend from California, but I respectfully submit that the Senator overlooks two factors. The first is, he said "The contract is laid before the employer, regardless of whether any member wishes to join the union or not," or something to that effect. I respectfully submit that that case is not likely to occur often, if it ever occurs, for the reason that a collective-bargaining agreement does not result unless ordinarily it is a case in which the union, or the employees, through a free election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board, have chosen a bargaining agent, and then, when they have chosen the bargaining agent the agent has sat down with the employer and entered into negotiations leading toward an agreement. So, as I see it, there is, as a premise, a union. The employees had a union, or they choose a collective-bargaining agent if they did not have a union, and then the agent entered into negotiations with the employer.

The second point is that not long ago the National Labor Relations Board, in a case coming up from Florida, the St. Petersburg Times case, held that labor was under a duty to bargain in good faith with the employer. Although the pending bill recites that it is the duty of employees and employers to bargain with each other in good faith, that is not necessary, and as I understand it it adds nothing to the law as laid down by the National Labor Relations Board in that case. The case made it clear that the employees had to bargain in good faith, in a true collective-bargaining spirit, with the employer. Of course, the Board has in the past required the employer to observe the same standard. I cannot say, of course, what is the discharge of that duty by employees or by employer; that is a matter of degree, but I think we are coming to a recognition of the fact that when any party to a dispute merely takes an adamant position, refuses to hear argument or to consider merit, marches in and throws something down, sits down in a chair and freezes up, and says, "Take it or leave it," that is not collective bargaining or the part of either management or employees.

But I am assuming, and I think I am correct in assuming, that the law today is as I have stated it; and I am saying that more than half the collective-bargaining agreements now in effect evidently have included closed-shop or union-shop provisions, and I suppose most of them have been renewed from time to time; management has found them acceptable and satisfactory. If it has, then it has a right to enter into them again, and should not be denied the right by the pending bill. If it wishes to get rid of the collective-bargaining agreement, it can do so when the contract runs out. If it wishes to get rid of the closed shop, it does not have to renew a contract containing that provision, when the contract runs out; and that is, in my opinion, the privilege which it should have.

If the Senator had in mind that the workers will use their economic pressure upon the employer to get him to enter into that kind of contract, I freely and frankly admit that it is true. But I had a case here, when I spoke, day before yesterday, from which I read the opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Taft. I read it to my able friend from Ohio, so that he might hear it, and hear it again; because I thought as fine a statement was laid down by President Taft, who was then Chief Justice of the United States, as was ever made by any judge, in which he said labor organizations had the right, and workers had the right, to use the economic power that they have, the right to quit work even, to better themselves in their relations with their employer. So I am sure the Senator from California would not deny to workers the lawful use of their economic power, which would include even the right to stop work. I realize, as I said, that there is a difference of opinion about the matter, and I never have intentionally quarreled with anybody who takes a contrary opinion about anything. I ascribe, of course, to other Senators and other citizens the right to their views, and I know they are just as sincere in them as I hope they will credit me with being in respect to mine. I know this is a controversial subject, but I have never seen it exactly the way many see it. I see it largely this way: I see it from the point of view of the great number of working people in a given plant, or in the country as a whole. Other Senators see it in terms of what they believe to be the just rights of an individual man or woman who comes to a plant, wishes to get a job, and is told, "You cannot get a job, unless you belong to a union." If Senators look at the matter from the viewpoint of the greatest good for the greatest number, which is a basic principle of democracy and certainly the faith of my party, then I believe there will be achieved the greatest good for the greatest number by recognizing the right of the greater number to organize themselves into a bargaining unit, to choose representatives, to have their representatives sit down with representatives of capital employed in the particular enterprise, and work toward an agreement which will be mutually satisfactory. In my opinion, such a provision as the closed shop should be a permissible portion of such agreement.

I see, as I said, what it means to the workers. I see better wages, and I see, Mr. President, better working conditions. I do not like to advert to it, but I plowed on a farm for 65 cents a day. I worked in a steel mill 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, and that was minor compared to what many men in the darker days have had to do. I do not claim that mine was any especial hardship, but, as one looks back to the dark economic days in this and in every other industrial country in the world, he looks upon those periods sometimes with shame, always with regret that we did not earlier come to a recognition that we shall all get along better if we give men and women better wages and better working conditions, and a fairer share of the income of an enterprise.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to join the Senator in the statement that any American, or anyone else, engaged in business today who is not interested in the welfare of the workers of the country is not fit to be at the head of an organization.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a characteristic statement by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. The only difference between the Senator's opinion and mine possibly is that I think the result can be accomplished better by maintaining freedom of the right to work. I want to tell the Senator something, if he would like to have me do so.

Mr. PEPPER. Gladly.

Mr. HAWKES. A few years ago—I should say about 7 or 8 years ago—there came to this country the president of the Railway Clerks Union of England. If I remember correctly, his name was Brown. His union had a membership of 90,000, which is a union of considerable size for England. He made a speech in Philadelphia in which he said he was very strongly opposed to the closed shop because, in his opinion, it destroyed the rights of the individual members of the organization to better conditions and improve the quality of leadership. He said, "Unless the members of my union have the power to resign without losing their jobs, they cannot effectively protest against my poor leadership." He further said, "I believe the future welfare of the working people lies in having good, intelligent, law-abiding leadership."

I am sure the Senator from Florida agrees with that statement.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly subscribe to it.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say another thing to the Senator from Florida, because I agree with what he has just stated. We all have our own ideas. I have no feeling against anyone who honestly differs with my viewpoint. Immediately after I was elected to the Senate, not more than 3 or 4 days thereafter, I received a letter signed by 18 union men in Paterson and Passaic, N. J., and this is what they said in their letter:

> DEAR SENATOR: We are glad you were elected. We all voted for you.
>
> We are 18 union members who belong either to the A. F. of L. or the CIO.

The letter continued:

> We want our right to organize. We want our right to bargain collectively. We want our right to strike lawfully in order to show our resistance against unfair treatment.

What follows is the main point of their letter, and I consider it to be a remarkable statement:

> But we do not want dictators in labor leadership any more than we want dictators in the United States Government, and we are looking to you, my dear Senator, to help relieve us of that dictatorship.

The Senator from Florida has a very keen mind, and a very thorough understanding of this subject, and I am always interested in listening to him.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not pretend that every view I may hold or every belief I may entertain is infallibly correct. All of us, I believe, are trying to do a decent job in the interest of humanity and the workingman, who, after all is said and done, is the salt of the earth and the backbone of America. The workingman of today under our great system, if he is thrifty and saving and persevering, can become the capitalist of tomorrow. Mr. Lincoln said that, and if it was true when he said it it is equally true today. But I think the greatest thing we have to do, far greater than any law which may be passed, is to try to reestablish respect between worker and management, employer and employee, and to build it on a foundation of justice. The Senator's ideas and mine might differ as to what would constitute justice, but, in my opinion, it should go just as far as it can go and fit into the economic circle. In other words, there must be profits which are paid upon capital. Capital, if it is honest capital, is nothing in the world but stored up labor. It is something, or ought to be something, that came from work in the past. Some fairness must be found in the economic circle for capital, in order to make it come out for venture investment, unless there is to be resort to Government ownership and socialism. Enough must be found in the economic circle for labor, to stimulate labor and make it feel it is being treated fairly and to make the individual workers believe they are adequately paid for their service. But, above everything else, respect must be established between employer and employee.

I have broken into the discussion without having marshaled my thoughts, but I wish to leave an idea with the Senator from Florida and the other Members of the Senate. I have talked with thousands of laboring men. The thought I wish to leave with the Senate is that after we get through with the pending legislation, which must not be punitive in its purpose, which must not be based upon vindictiveness, hatred, or reprisal, but must be in the interest of the American people as a whole—after we get through with this legislation we, as American citizens, and all other decent Americans who have a just regard for humanity have got to try to reestablish the necessary element I am talking about—a little brotherly love between employer and employee.

Mr. President, I have enjoyed the association and the relationship with my working people more than anything I have had in my life. I have always attended their annual dinners at their request, and as their guest, and I have always spoken to them and tried to speak fairly, tried to help them to be better American citizens, and I am sure they have helped me to be a better one. But I wanted to leave the thought with the Senator from Florida and the Members of the Senate at this time, that after we get all through with this legislation we all must contribute to re-create voluntary cooperation, because in the last analysis the only difference between this great country of ours and the countries which have fallen into the quagmires of socialism and communism is that our people, up to date as a general rule, have worked voluntarily because they wanted to, because they were interested in their work. Their work has been more than simply making a living. In my company, we have had only one turnover in 28 years. More than 40 percent of the workers in my company have been with the company more than 30 years, and that notwithstanding the fact that many were forced to leave our employment by the war. That is a wonderful record. It can only mean one thing, that the workers wanted to stay there, and that is a spirit we must try to establish all over the United States.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I greatly thank the Senator from New Jersey for the very fine sentiments he has expressed. I will say that if all the business executives of the country took the attitude he takes toward management-labor relations, I do not think we would need any laws at all on the statute books. That would be an ideal situation. It would create a situation like that existing in a partnership. When one enters into a partnership with another, the partners are supposed to deal honestly and fairly with each other. Generally no rules are laid down as to how to negotiate and carry on affairs together. So long as the partners deal honestly and fairly with each other they have complete freedom of action.

The Senator from New Jersey is absolutely correct in saying that what we need is to find a new basis of understanding of each other's point of view and problems. Sometimes no doubt labor overlooks the responsibilities which management has, the sleepless nights of the man who has all his savings invested in his enterprise. There is no doubt whatever that there are numerous cases of workers who lack the sympathy they should have for the employer. That is one of the tragic frailties of human nature. On the other hand, there are employers undoubtedly who do not show the concern for their workers they should exhibit. It was only a little while ago when it was customary—and I am afraid I must say that there are a few who today embrace that view—to treat labor as a commodity, to believe that the working power of men and women was something to be sold like potatoes in the market place for the highest price that could be obtained for it. It was not realized that the man standing before the employer applying for work had a wife and perhaps some children; that there might be illness in his home; and that there were medical and other expenses which had to be shouldered; that the children had to be educated; that they had wants and human desires; that they were not potatoes, were not inanimate. They were made in the image of God, Mr. President. They were the heart and soul of the Nation, its strength in peace, its might in war, and their total strength represented the power of the Nation. To deal with labor as if it were a commodity, to buy it for the lowest price for which it can be obtained, is the old attitude, not the new one. That of course is not the attitude of the able Senator from New Jersey.

I hope we can bring about profit-sharing plans and bonuses so that some day in an enterprise the workers will obtain what I like to call a drawing account, such as a traveling salesman has, so much to meet the demands of the day, and then periodically the worker will receive a share of the profits on a fair basis of distribution, and certainly, Mr. President, I hope that the worker will be protected by an annual wage contract. Suppose that a certain enterprise is making a great deal of money. It has, let us say, 100,000 employees. It has great resources and big surpluses. Suppose times become a little bad. It may do as many other enterprises do. Do they cut down the dividends? Do they diminish the surpluses? No. Too many of them let off so many more workers. What is to happen to the workers?

I am not charging that is a pattern in industry. I say that too many follow that practice. Day before yesterday I quoted from a report presented to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In that report it was recited that for 23 years the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. had maintained an unbroken record of a $9 dividend. Those 23 years included the depression. I related an incident which was told to me by a responsible man, to the effect that in the days of the depression, when President Hoover was trying to meet the problem of the approaching depression, trying to diminish its severity, he called Mr. Gifford to Washington and made him chairman of a committee to try to find some way to arrest the falling level of employment, to give people jobs, and keep them in their jobs. After a while Mr. Gifford went back home, resigning the chairmanship which Mr. Hoover had entrusted to him, and let out more than 100,000 employees of his own company.

Mr. Hoover was right. He was calling upon industry to sacrifice, not only for the humanitarian principle of giving the workingmen and their families a chance to live, but to keep America from being hurled into the abysmal pit of a depression, which in many cases wrecked business as well as people. If the story which I have related is correct—and the committee report bears out the essential part of it—Mr. Gifford thought more of maintaining the $9 dividends than he did of keeping more workers on the payrolls and cutting the dividends to some other figure.

We have enacted minimum wage laws. Many employers in my State did not want to pay a fair minimum wage to their workers. Some of them fought me bitterly in 1938 when I advocated the minimum wage law. I was not trying to hurt business. I was merely trying to help fix a floor below which wages should not fall. I thought that in the long run that would be for the best interests of business as well as the workers. Today I do not know of an employer who opposed that legislation in 1938 who would ask that it be repealed at the present time. Employers have seen the wisdom of the principle which the Senator from New Jersey has been discussing, the wisdom of management and labor working together, each dealing fairly with the other.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator probably knows all this, but many persons in the United States do not know that a great deal of thought has been given to the profit-sharing plan. In many cases it is called the wage-dividend plan. I do not know whether the Senator realizes that in 1938, when I was chairman of a committee to study the question of a wage-dividend plan, even then 258 corporations in the United States had already adopted and had in effect a wage-dividend plan in an effort to bring about more harmonious cooperation between employers and employees.

The device of the corporation is not very old. The first corporations came into existence probably 75, 80, or 90 years ago. The old definition of a corporation was that it is an indivisible, intangible being, existing only in contemplation of law, without heart and without soul. I do not agree that a corporation has no heart or soul. A corporation has a heart and soul to the extent that the management makes it possible.

I feel strongly that we must bring more human understanding into the corporate method of operating than we have had in the past; but we cannot bring in any more than we can put into the economic circle. The Senator knows that, and he is not trying to contend otherwise. I know of one company—I shall not mention its name, because it might be embarrassing—which since 1912 has had in effect a wage-dividend plan under which, when the corporation made more than enough to pay a certain percentage of dividend on the capital invested—which was fair—and reasonable going wages in the community, after setting aside a certain amount for surplus to keep the company in good shape, it divided the rest among all the employees, from the lowest paid to the highest paid, on the basis of their past 5 years' compensation as related to each other.

It may be interesting to the Senator to know that the employees of that corporation have never been organized. There is not even a company union or an independent union. The employees elect a workingmen's committee every year, and its membership differs nearly every year. The committee takes up with the company grievances and things which they think should be adjusted. But there has never been a labor union among the employees. All the national labor unions have tried to organize them and have failed. Why? The best labor organizer in the United States might say to the 28,000 employees working in the plant that the union would do great things for them if they would only join it. Their response would be that of any normal man. They would say, "Why should we join a union?" The union organizer might say, "We will get you more money." The employees would say, "We do not want more money. We have a fair deal." The organizer might say, "We will get you vacations with pay." The reply would be, "We have them already."

One of the employees might say to the organizer, "Do you see that little white house on the hill? I paid for it with my wage dividends during the past 15 years with this company. Why should I go into a union and try to upset the efficiency of the plant which is feeding me?"

I wanted to tell that story because to me it is one of the most outstanding things in all American industrial life. It proves that we can better our human relationships voluntarily. But there are some who will not go along voluntarily. In a great organization in the United States I was defeated by only two votes in an effort to recommend that plan to all industry in the United States. I cannot say what the vote would be today. That was back in 1938.

We must do something to bring about a better understanding. The difference between the Senator and me is that he feels that the closed shop is not an improper limitation on the liberties of men. I feel that it is. I feel that we can accomplish the objective without destroying the maximum right of freedom in the individual. I hold that conviction very firmly.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. Obviously, in a case in which the employer deals fairly with the workers there is less incentive for the employees to join a union than in an opposite case. Due to the fact that too few employers took the position which the able Senator has described, we have had a tightening of labor organizations. Undoubtedly in some cases today there are abuses. However, in every industry in which there is complaint that there are abuses on the part of labor, I think it will be found that there are 10 times more abuses on the part of management until the union is strong enough to defend the worker against such abuses. I could name some industries in which it is said that there are labor abuses. Management, by its own failure to observe the high standard of duty and fairness which the Senator from New Jersey has described, has brought such a condition upon itself. If the power of the union were taken away, that kind of management, in too many cases, would go back to the old conditions. But if there were some way to bring about the kind of management described by the Senator, it would be a happy day for industrial relations in America.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I will say to the Senator something which I have said repeatedly throughout the Nation, and in which I believe, that humanity is pretty much the same whether it be in the ranks of labor or in the ranks of capital. If we could take a slice out of the center of labor and capital we would find that each has about the same amount of selfishness. Of course, there are a thousand times as many persons in the ranks of labor as there are in the ranks of capital.

I shall not take up more of the time of the Senator, but I know he will agree with me that the business of the Nation cannot be run with the heart alone, nor can it be run, in my opinion, with the brain alone. The brain is too cold and the heart is too warm. If we try to run

all the business of the Nation with the brain alone it would be so cold that it would not function successfully; and if we should try to run it with the heart alone business would go into bankruptcy. So my philosophy is that somewhere between the heart and the brain—maybe just under the chin—there is a place where the two things must meet in handling the human equation. But we must always use some of the heart and some of the brain in operating the industries of America.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

We all have to admit that it is human experience that, if one man has power and deals with another man who has no power, most of the time the man who has power will get the better of the bargain. When there is comparable power on each side we are likely to get the kind of bargaining and the sort of agreement which represent a fair meeting of the minds of the parties.

The purpose of organization of workers is that in dealing with the employees the worker may have a power comparable to that of the employer in dealing with the employees. But assuming that the worker has power equal to that of the employer—and I dispute the statement that he now has equal power—it does not mean that either party should abuse the power which each possesses. When we hear people say that the workers abruptly, arbitrarily, and capriciously strike, I wonder if we realize which is hurt the more—the striking worker or the company against which he strikes. It means loss of wages to the worker; it affects his weekly pay check, the house rent, the grocery bill, the mother with children. It involves ability to pay the doctor; it involves the right of the family to live. All those things are dependent upon a man's work. On the contrary, the corporation by which he is employed can lose profits for a while, or can even sustain losses for a period. But which can stand it the longest time—General Motors Corp., United States Steel Corp., or the men and women who work for those corporations?

Another common fallacy, Mr. President, is the belief that when a strike has been settled the workers are paid for the time they were off from work. They are not. It may be years before the increase which they receive as a result of the strike will make up for the wages lost during the time they were not at work.

I have previously mentioned on the floor my discovery in Detroit last year, when the General Motors strike was in effect, when I obtained information from a doctor regarding the number of vacant beds in the hospitals in Detroit. The workers when they were not working could not pay for hospital treatment for themselves or for their families. They could pay such expenses out of their weekly pay checks when they were at work. It literally means that the health of the family is involved.

Mr. President, I maintain that even now workers do not have a position of economic strength comparable to the power of the employer.

The able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] raised the question regarding union leadership and union officials. I think we must never forget that union officials are elected by the workers and that they have constitutions and bylaws. Personally, except in an honorary capacity, I never belonged to a union. From personal experience I do not know, but I think the men and women who belong to unions appreciate democracy as much as does anyone else. I think they resent tyranny, pressure, and coercion as much as does the ordinary citizen who is not a member of a union. I doubt that union workers in this country like to be "pushed around" any more than do people who are not members of a union. But I suspect that democracy in the unions of America is just as vital, real, and effective as is democracy in the ordinary political election in this country. Someone says that a little group gets together and runs the union. That may be so. But in many lodges, churches, and fraternal orders a little group gets together and runs the organization, because the membership allows them to do it. A great amount of the legislation which is passed in the Senate is passed by unanimous consent. The Chair says, "Without objection, the bill is agreed to." We do not even vote in such a case. The important thing is that we have the right to vote; we have the right to object and say, "You cannot pass bills in that way if we do not agree to it." That is the important thing. As a matter of fact, I suspect we would admit that a little group of Senators runs the Senate. But if we object, we have the right to vote against it, or we can follow them if we think theirs is wise leadership.

In the politics of this country I have heard—of course, it may be erroneous—that in some of the parties and in some of the cities, towns, and States a little group of persons get together and run politics. I suspect that has happened. The important thing is that every now and then the people become stirred up about it and object to being "pushed around" by a minority. They rebel; they use their power to vote to change the administration whenever they choose to do so. But, Mr. President, there are many places in this country where few people have a great deal of influence; and that is not confined only to labor unions. So we cannot single out labor unions and, because every member does not vote at elections, blame them when every citizen does not vote in every election. I wish they did. They undoubtedly should. We hope they will. But in many elections in this country the decision is made by a minority of the total number of voters. But we do not declare that to be illegal.

Yet under this bill, when there is a union shop, the decision is not permitted to be made by a majority of those who vote in the election and who are elected by a majority vote. They are not elected by a majority of all the eligible electors. The committee recommends to the Senate that, by this bill, we should require the election to be decided by a majority of all eligible to vote. Why do we lay down one standard of democracy under which to elect leaders of a labor union and another standard of democracy under which to elect the President of the United States of America, the governor of a State, every United States Senator, every Representative in Congress, every public official in America? Why do we lay down one standard or criterion of democracy for the workers in electing their officials and another standard of democracy applicable to the members of churches, lodges, fraternal organizations, and societies in electing their officials? Why do we do that, Mr. President? If the worker does not want to vote, if this bill were to become law we would reward, counting his vote in the election, the fellow who stays at home. Is that encouraging good citizenship? Does it encourage good citizenship for Congress to step in and reward the man who stays away from the union meeting or who refuses to participate in the union election, or for Congress to prescribe the standards that must be observed and to lay down one standard for union members and another standard for everyone else in the United States who belongs to a church or a lodge or a society or an organization of any kind, and also for every public office holder elected in the entire structure of the Government of the United States?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am sure the Senator from Florida believes there is a difference between the way voting is done in labor unions and the way voting is done in Congressional and Presidential elections in the United States. In other words, the voting in Congressional and Presidential elections is unquestionably done on the basis of the secret ballot, whereas the voting in labor unions has not always been secret, and threats have been made on the basis of knowledge as to how certain members of unions have voted in elections of the union leaders. In short, the voting in unions has not always been secret, and the union members who participated in such elections did not always vote with the safety which I believe the American people have when they vote to elect Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives, for instance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not prepared to assert that the American people feel the same solemnity when they elect labor union leaders that they do when they elect their public officials. But so far as I know, under the National Labor Relations Act a secret ballot is provided for, and the integrity of the elections is assured by the Board. The Board conducts the election, as a matter of fact; and the Board is a public body. So I do not know of any lesser degree of integrity relative to voting in unions, as compared to voting for public officials.

So far as the worker is directly affected, the votes he casts as a member of a union may affect his wages more directly, for his wages may be affected more directly by obtaining a good group of union officials than by electing a good United States Senator or a good State attorney general or a good judge of a circuit court.

Mr. HAWKES. I must agree with the Senator from Florida that that could be the case if the union members got a good set of union officials; I would have to agree definitely as to that.

But let me say to the Senator from Florida that it seems to me that at the moment the workers are worried about the question of the closed shop and the way in which union elections are conducted. Anyone who believes that the feeling against the closed shop is confined to those who are outside the ranks of the working class is greatly mistaken, I can assure the Senator. A gentleman of whom I know recently spoke to 1,281 workers, most of whom belonged to a certain union. He spoke of the closed shop and the question of the workers being able to resign or not being able to resign from the union. After he spoke on that subject, the entire 1,281 workers rose to their feet and cheered and whistled for a full minute.

So, Mr. President, the resistance to the closed shop and the destruction of individual freedom in connection with the right to work is not confined to Senators or industrial leaders or the so-called people in the upper brackets. I am sure that the Senator from Florida knows that to be so. He must know it.

He is trying to find some way whereby the rights which have been intended to be preserved by means of the closed shop can be preserved in some way that is American, I take it; and that is what I am trying to find.

But surely the Senator from Florida does not support the action of the union which fired one of its members who testified to the truth when he was subpenaed as a witness in a court case. I refer to the union member who saw a union shop steward strike a foreman while in the plant; and later, when the case was presented in court, the employee was subpenaed to testify to what he saw. He testified that he did see the union shop steward strike the foreman of the plant. Thereafter, that employee was discharged from the union—simply because he had testified to the truth; and, in view of the existence of a closed shop, a discharge from the union meant that it would be impossible for that man to obtain any job in that plant. He was fired from the union and lost his job.

Mr. President, the case to which I have just referred has been stated in the record of the committee hearings; and I know of similar cases. The one I have mentioned happens to be the one which is set forth in the record which is now on the desks of Senators.

But I am sure the Senator from Florida does not believe that anyone should have the power to deprive a man of the right to work, simply because he told the truth when he was subpenaed as a witness in a case in court.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the case the Senator from New Jersey has mentioned is, of course, a hard case. I remind him that it is an accepted axiom in the law that hard cases make bad law. The case referred to by the Senator from New Jersey has often been mentioned in the debates on the measure now before us and in the committee. Evidently, in that case a worker testified to what happened in connection with a certain incident. Well, Mr. President, democracy is not perfect. It is not perfect in a labor union, it is not perfect in a municipality, it is not perfect in the county, it is not perfect in the State, it is not perfect in the Nation. There have been instances in which men have been fired from their political jobs because they told the truth or tried to tell the truth. There have been instances in which men have had contracts taken away from them by businessmen, simply because they tried to do the right and because they advocated what they believed in.

I say that because there may have been a case—and undoubtedly there are such cases—in which men or women were ejected from a union, perhaps unfairly, it is not proper for the Congress of the United States to lay down rules governing every election in a labor union and governing the conditions of every ejection from a union or admission to a union or regulating, as an appellate body, the minute details in regard to everything that happens in a labor organization, any more than the Congress should do so in the case of a lodge or a church or any other kind of organization or society in the United States. The fact that some mayor or some city councilman succeeds in having an employee fired for being honest and not helping him to steal—such things occasionally happen—does not mean that the Congress should become an appellate body to review every decision that is made by every political executive or administrator in the political structure of the United States. We have to deal on the basis of what is best for the greatest number, Mr. President. We have to deal with the balance of interest, with what is the best policy, taking into consideration both sides of the case.

I am saying that, if we do not have strong organizations to represent the workers, the workers will generally be exploited by their employers, their wages will be reduced, their living standards will be lessened, their purchasing power will be diminished, and not only will they suffer, and not only will their children and their communities and the organizations with which they are affiliated suffer, but the entire Nation will suffer.

So, Mr. President, if we impair the strength of a workers' organization, we do a disservice to the United States and to every man, woman, and child in it, regardless of whatever economic segment he may fall into.

A while ago the Senator from New Jersey was referring to the corporation as being a relatively new concept in the United States. Just consider, Mr. President, how new the labor movement in this country is in its magnitude. If not all the leaders are perfect, if not all of them are possessed of the skill which they should have, yet, Mr. President, it may also be said that perhaps some of us are not perfect, and that perhaps it would have been possible to improve a little on some of the men who have been elected to public office in the United States—of course, not in the case of the Senate, but perhaps elsewhere in the United States.

But, Mr. President, we are trying to learn and to do the best we can, and, by and large, the labor leaders are in the same category.

I remember that in 1938 I was in London speaking to one of the British Cabinet members. He told me of the long period during which the labor union movement had been vital in Great Britain, and he pointed out that there was only one strike in progress in all of Great Britain on the issue of recognition of a union.

Mr. President, they have out of the long history they have had in the labor-union movement been able to develop a maturity, a competence, and a wisdom in the labor leadership which today has made the labor-union movement of Great Britain the bulwark of her labor government.

Our labor movement mushroomed in the United States during the war from four or five million to twelve or fourteen million. There may have been some men chosen in that mushroom period who were not worthy of the offices to which they were elected. I will trust the members of those organizations to elect better officers, if that is true.

I say, Mr. President, that what we need today is to strengthen the labor-union movement, to better it, to make the labor union a wiser and abler spokesman for the worker. But what is being sought here today? The effort is to strangle it, to weaken it, to turn the clock backward. The attempt is to create distrust and suspicion and disharmony in the ranks of the organizations. Those who advocate the pending legislation are trying to weaken the labor-union movement, and thereby impair the standards of living of the workers who are affiliated with the unions and ultimately to wreck our economy based on high-living standards.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] in our recent discussion referred to some statement made some time ago by Mr. A. F. Whitney relative to certain aspects of labor legislation, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at the end of my remarks four amendments offered to the pending labor legislation by Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the last of which reads:

And provided further, That nothing in this act or in any other statute of the United States shall preclude a carrier, its officers, or agents from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or dominated by the carrier, its officers, or agents) to require membership therein as a condition of employment, if such labor organization is the duly designated and authorized representative of the employees at the time the agreement is made.

I respectfully suggest that Mr. Whitney must have changed his mind on the subject since the conversation to which the Senator from New Jersey referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was discussing the committee report, which referred to the abolition of the closed

shop. I wish to say just one word further respecting the matter of the closed shop.

I have already distinguished the case put by the Senator from Ohio, holding that abolishing the closed shop was justifiable as a public policy, just as outlawing the "yellow-dog contract" was justifiable as public policy. I pointed out that in the one case we were dealing with two groups which were bargaining freely each with the other, whereas in the other case there was organization on one side dealing with the individual on the other, and making him give up the right of a citizen to affiliate with an organization if he chose to do so.

Mr. President, I said that the closed shop was a balance of interest, the interest of the workers collectively in bettering their wages and working conditions, as against the right of an individual to come up to the gate without identifying himself with the organization in any way, and saying, "I want a job."

Mr. President, I have always thought that the closed shop was a proper relationship between the parties primarily concerned, the people working in a plant. I do not know of any inherent right a worker has to get a job in a particular plant. He may or he may not get such employment. But the thing that is commonly overlooked, it seems to me, is that the closed shop fundamentally represents the decision of the worker as to the people with whom he will work. That simply means that a group of workers may say, "We feel it so essential to our welfare as workers that we work together, that we bargain together with the employer, that we make common cause in our relations with the employer, that we will not work with people who will not cooperate with us in that way."

All they do is to say to the employer, "If you will not give us the privilege of requiring a man who comes here and gets a job to join with us and work with us and fight with us for our rights, we will not work for you, because we do not want our rights to be divided between those who will work together and the dissident few who will not work with a majority."

Mr. President, has not a worker a right, first, to determine for whom he will work, and, secondly, with whom he will work? I do not have to work with the man beside me if I do not want to. If I come to the Senate and am not satisfied to associate with the other Senators, I can resign. If I get a job in a plant and I do not like the man who works beside me, I can say to my foreman, "If you don't move that man, I will quit." I thought I had that right as an American citizen, although it seems that some have vastly different concepts as to what are the essential rights of a citizen. I thought a man was the master not only of his money, but of his labor, but I am seeing, in the law of the land, a respect for a man's money, which I construe the advocates of this measure are disposed not to attribute to a man's body, to the very labor of his being.

I say, Mr. President, that what the committee has done is, first, to abolish the closed shop, to make it illegal not to let the employer and the employee put provision for it into a contract, even if they wish to do so, even if they have been doing it in the past. Moreover, it permits the union shop only upon the condition that a majority of all the eligible workers vote for it, not a majority of the workers who participate in the election, which is the way we elect the public officials of this country, and the way we elect the leaders of every private organization of which I have knowledge.

So I say, Mr. President, that there, again, the purpose of the bill is shown, to strike down right after right, power after power, and privilege after privilege of the workers of the country; and yet the employer is touched hardly with the lightness of a feather. If it takes any right away from him, I do not know what it is. If it imposes any new duty, I have not heard of it.

This ought to be called, Mr. President, the pending bill against the workers of America. Then we would be candid about it. Or one might prefer to say, legislation against the labor unions of the country, because, Mr. President, the constriction which it applies is all on one side. It may be said that is necessary, because all that has been done in the past was on the other side. There may have been, and there have been, certain preferences given to workers as against employers, but I do not believe, Mr. President, that the present situation is so one-sided as to justify the Senate in passing legislation that is one-sided, on the other side. And that is what I humbly submit this bill does, and what I was trying to do was to prove that thesis by the committee's own report. I started off by referring to the amendment that it makes to the National Labor Relations Act—the Wagner Act, the charter of the worker in America. It bears the name of that great man, ROBERT WAGNER, who still sits in this body. It came from the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It had the approval of Congress and of the country.

Today, under that law, foremen have a right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. That is held by the National Labor Relations Board; it is held by the Supreme Court of the United States. This bill takes away that right. At the present time, employers and employees can enter into a closed-shop agreement. That right is abolished under the pending legislation. At the present time, workers, in choosing their bargaining agents, do so by only a majority of the votes cast in the election. The pending bill requires a majority of the eligible voters to vote for their chosen bargaining agent, before it can have any efficacy. A majority of the eligible voters are required before they can have a union shop, even.

Mr. President, at the present time labor is as free as stockholders to abide by the action of their respective agents. Today, stockholders have an annual meeting, generally. They elect their directors. Those directors have periodic meetings, and they elect the executives of the corporation; then those executives run the affairs of the corporation. There is not a vote among stockholders every time the management of a corporation enters into a contract with its workers. While we require that the workers vote individually upon the contract that their representatives enter into with management, we do not require the stockholders of the corporation to vote individually upon the contract entered by management with labor. There, again, Mr. President, is a discrimination against the worker in this proposal.

But today the workers elect their officials. They go to bargain with management. Management is the representative of capital employed in the enterprise. The two make a contract, and it is binding, because they have authority; they are the duly authorized agents of labor and of management. Could anything be fairer than that? But now, Mr. President, if this bill should become law, labor may choose their bargaining agent, if they enter into a contract for a union shop with the employer, but it is not binding until they have a second election; the first one being to choose the bargaining agent—another election, at which a majority of those who vote for the matter shall determine it? No; a majority of all those eligible must vote. So I say it makes it more difficult for the representatives of labor to act for labor. The leadership of labor is weakened. There is a premium put on the fellow that stays at home and who will not participate in the election. So I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that in paragraph 2 of the committee report there is another instance of the one-sided character of this legislation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Much has been said about Communist infiltration in the labor movement, and undoubtedly in a few cases there has been considerable Communist activity. In two articles I have read, it is indicated that it is the Communist members who remain at a meeting all night and all day, who wear out the other members, who go home. I was wondering whether or not the provision which penalizes the people who stay away might not bring them to a realization of their duty, and cause them to attend the meetings, and to remain as long as those who perhaps are not inclined to advance the principles of good unionism, but to advance something else.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is a good principle to have everybody eligible to vote in any election discharge that duty. It might even be justified for us to provide that all elections should be invalid unless the majority of all eligible voters vote. That might give us better government; but we have never seen fit to do it, in our national elections, in our State elections, or in our local elections. There are always the busy, industrious few who may outlast their fellows, that may have advantages in other elections. That is true probably in our churches and in our lodges and in our other organizations. But, Mr. President, that fact does not justify us, I believe, in laying down one standard for the making of decisions by labor organizations, and allowing the prevalence of a different standard for

other organizations and for other decisions made by the people.

Mr. President, I read now paragraph 3 of the majority report, referring to the pending bill:

It gives employers and individual employees rights to invoke the processes of the Board against unions which engaged in certain enumerated unfair labor practices, including secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, which may result in the Board itself applying for restraining orders in certain cases.

Mr. President, in the first place, it has been pointed out previously that the President recommended legislation against the jurisdictional strike. We are in accord. The minority report by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Montana, and the senior Senator from Florida, specifically so stated, and we have stated otherwise the same thing upon the floor. But, Mr. President, the so-called secondary boycott that is dealt with in the pending bill is not all that is covered by the language of that provision. It prohibits the primary boycott, as well as the secondary boycott. As a matter of fact, it forbids workers cooperating with one another for the common protection or for the common good—the very thing that Mr. Justice Brandeis laid down as the inherent right of the worker, to give aid to another in a struggle for working standards in a community or in the Nation at large.

Mr. President, I have previously quoted the language of the proposed bill and given this illustration. Here is a group of workers, working for an employer, who refuses to pay a fair wage; he insists upon sweat-shop conditions for those people; they strike. The employer gets other workers to take their places—strikebreakers; he goes on with his business, making exorbitant profits, because he will not pay labor a fair wage. Another man is taking his product, adding more labor and more skill to it, making it more valuable; the first man is profiting by dealing with the second man. Suppose the workers in the first plant go to the workers in the second plant and say to them, "You know what this man has done to us. He won't pay us a decent wage. He refuses to deal with us. He denies us the right to organize; yet you are taking his product and making him rich by working on it. Won't you cooperate with us? Won't you help us make him do what your employer does for you? You have got a good employer; he deals fairly with you; he pays you a fair wage; he allows you to join the union; he deals collectively with you in the bargaining. Now, just come and help us by letting your employer know, and letting our employer know, that you won't work on his product if he does not deal with us in a fair way."

If the first group of workers did that, under the pending measure they would be violating the law. If they went over and talked to the other workers about doing that, they would be violating the law. One could not even go into the house of a neighbor, talk to him at his fireside in the evening, and ask him to do that, without violating the law. I say that that is an invasion of the right of a citizen to address himself in a lawful way to anyone with any decent proposal. That is a violation of civil and civic rights of the citizenry of this country, I respectfully submit.

Moreover, the workers are denied the right to work together to better themselves. Not only is that done, but upon the petition or the complaint of anyone affected, a regional officer or a regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board is duty bound by the law itself, as the bill provides, to go into court and obtain an injunction against an organization doing the kind of thing I described a moment ago. In other words, it is not made permissive for the regional attorney or the regional representative of the National Labor Relations Board to apply for the injunction—it is made mandatory. He must do it. Not only that Mr. President, he may do it even without notice. Of course, the injunction issued would last only, I believe, 5 days in case the injunction were applied for without notice, but the regional representative can go ex parte into a court and secure an injunction for 5 days, which may mean the crucial period in the endeavor which I described in determining the final result.

Mr. President, in addition to that the bill allows the issuance of a permanent injunction against the doing of that kind of thing. It also, of course, makes that sort of thing an unfair labor practice and gives the National Labor Relations Board authority to issue a cease-and-desist order, and then the power to go into a court and require the enforcement of that order.

Mr. President, I say that in the first place the bill strikes down the civil rights of a citizen to address himself to his fellow citizens to a common cause that is lawful in character. In the second place, it denies to workers the right of working with other workers to protect their own working standards. Suppose there are two plants in a community, and suppose one of them observes fair labor standards and the other one does not. Do we not know that workers in both plants have a common interest in the wage scale in that community? In our law we have time after time provided that the Government shall pay the prevailing wage. Senators will recall the statutes. For example, in the Walsh-Healey Act we require the contractor with the Government to pay the prevailing wage. So every worker in the community is interested in the prevailing wage in that community. Yet if a group of workers try to work with another group to hold up a decent wage level in the community, under this bill they would be violating the law of the land. I say again, it does not say anything about the employer in that respect. It simply strikes out the right of the employees to better themselves by cooperation one with another and by the exercise of the civil right of persuasion of their fellow citizens about a matter of common interest.

Those are some of the principal provisions of the bill, Mr. President. Of course the bill changes the structure of the National Labor Relations Board and authorizes the appointment of four new members. I do not say that that is bad. I would not object to that if it were the only provision in the bill or if it were not for these bad provisions. I think, however, the Board is doing a pretty good job as it is, and obviously the proposed change is going to require some difference in administration, some difference in procedure. In fact the bill requires the Board to adopt some different procedure. It abolishes the review boards which are now in existence. It denies to the members of the Board the right to profit by the actions of the review boards as they have in the past, and it makes every member personally read the record and so on, which is preliminary to the decision. Perhaps that is a good thing, but it is, I suspect, going to delay the decisions of the Board more than they are delayed at the present time.

I referred to paragraph 4, which deals with the Board. I now read paragraph 5 of the majority report:

In the interests of assuring complete freedom of choice to employees who do not wish to be represented collectively as well as those who do, it requires the Board to enlarge the rights of petition in representation cases and to give greater attention to the special problems of craftsmen and professional employees in the determination of bargaining units.

Mr. President, I do not have any objection to professional groups associating themselves together in professional unions. Nevertheless, the practical effect of this provision, I submit, is to cause labor strife. It is going to cause discord in labor organizations and units which does not exist today. It is going to provoke more work stoppages instead of less. It will cause more strikes instead of fewer strikes.

I now read paragraph 6:

6. It prevents the Board from continuing to accord affiliated unions special advantages at the expense of independent labor organizations, by requiring that, under identical circumstances, the Board in complaint cases refrain from any disparity of treatment.

Mr. President, my own interpretation is that that is going to encourage company unions, as it, for the first time, recognizes the company union. That, too, Mr. President, is going to mean weaker bargaining units, less effective labor organizations. It is going to mean more strikes, not less. It is going to provoke labor discord in many places where today there is peace between management and labor.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the provisions of the bill. I shall at a later time refer to others. I simply laid that as a base upon which I wanted to impose the pending amendment, namely:

It is made an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to coerce "employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules within respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein."

Mr. President, what does that mean? That means that it is an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce, as the language says, any employees in the enjoyment of the rights accorded them in section 7 of the bill.

Section 7, Mr. President, confers certain rights upon employees. It provides that—

Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

In the first place, what labor union wishes to deny an employee the free exercise of those rights?

This question becomes of practical importance because the word "coerce" is not defined. I predict that, if a group of workers from a given union talks to another group of workers about joining the union, that will be held to be coercion, or it will be charged that it is coercion. That will mean that the organization will be charged with an unfair labor practice. It will mean that there will be a hearing before the National Labor Relations Board, and that there must be a final judgment upon the question. If the complaint is found to be justified there will be a cease-and-desist order. Then the case will go to the circuit court of appeals of the appropriate jurisdiction for enforcement of the order.

The case may also be the subject of an injunction or an application by the National Labor Relations Board for an injunction. This provision puts a weapon in the hands of an employer or of a dissident group in the union or among the employees, to keep the union in court all the time, to make it spend all its money, and to prevent it from effectively representing and protecting the workers in that enterprise.

The bill strikes down right after right, privilege after privilege, power after power of the workers of the country. The inevitable effect would be more strikes, more discord, and less peace. The inevitable effect would be lower wages for the workers.

The day before yesterday I cited the fact that, in respect to their previous earnings and in respect to other income groups, the workers of America are daily, monthly, and yearly receiving less wages, less take-home pay. That will inevitably mean a diminished purchasing power for the people of America, because the people are the workers of the country. As Governor Stassen stated, it will contribute, as a similar policy after the last war contributed, to a depression which may ruin America and perhaps drag the world down into chaos and communism.

In addition, the bill is one-sided. It would embitter workers and cause them to feel that they were not getting a square deal from their Government. It would contribute to a bitterness which could not but impair the marvelous productivity which this country enjoys today, and which could not but diminish the unprecedented profits which business in America is enjoying today.

As against policies of that character, how much better it would be to allow the present prosperity to continue unimpaired. Let the working men and women of America continue to enjoy the right to feel that they have in the Wagner Act a magna carta of workman's liberties no less sacred or secure than the Magna Carta of all liberties which has meant so much to Anglo-American civilization.

EXHIBIT 1

APPENDIXES TO TESTIMONY OF A. F. WHITNEY ON PENDING LABOR LEGISLATION

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Suggested changes are in black brackets]

APPENDIX A

To make the services of Presidential fact-finding boards available before a strike vote is taken, the Brotherhood urges that section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (ch. 8 of title 45, U. S. Code) be amended by changing the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

If a dispute between a carrier and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing provisions of this act, [and the duly designated and authorized representatives of employees involved in such dispute request the Mediation Board so to notify the President, or if, in the judgment of the Mediation Board, the dispute threatens] substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Mediation Board shall notify the President, who may thereupon, in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute.

APPENDIX B

To eliminate excessive delay in cases pending before Railroad Adjustment Board, amend paragraph (w) of section 3 of the Railway Labor Act (ch. 8 of title 45, U. S. Code) by substituting the following for the first sentence thereof:

[(w) In the event any division of the Adjustment Board becomes 3 months or more behind in its docket of undecided disputes it shall establish regional boards of adjustment to act in its place and stead for such period as may be necessary to clear the Division's docket of such disputes.]

APPENDIX C

To authorize the dues check-off when authorized by individual members, paragraph fourth of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (ch. 8 of title 45, U. S. Code) should be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. The majority of any craft or class of employees shall have the right to determine who shall be the representative of the craft or class for the purposes of this act. No carrier, its officers, or agents shall deny or in any way question the right of its employees to join, organize, or assist in organizing the labor organization of their choice, and it shall be unlawful for any carrier to interfere in any way with the organization of its employees, or to use the funds of the carrier in maintaining or assisting or contributing to any labor organization, labor representative, or other agency of collective bargaining, or in performing any work therefor, or to influence or coerce employees in an effort to induce them to join or remain or not to join or remain members of any labor organization or to deduct from the wages of employees any dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions payable to labor organization, or to collect or to assist in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit a carrier [by agreement with a labor organization, national in scope, and under individual authorizations by employees, from deducting from the wages of such employees who are members of such labor organization, dues, fees, assessments, or insurance premiums payable to such labor organization or subsidiary or affiliate thereof;] *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit a carrier from permitting an employee, individually, or local representatives of employees from conferring with management during working hours without loss of time, or to prohibit a carrier from furnishing free transportation to its employees while engaged in the business of a labor organization.

APPENDIX D

To remove prohibition on union security clauses paragraph fourth of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (ch. 8 of title 45, U. S. Code) should be amended by adding the following proviso thereto: [*And provided further*, That nothing in this act or in any other statute of the United States shall preclude a carrier, its officers, or agents from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or dominated by the carrier, its officers, or agents) to require membership therein as a condition of employment, if such labor organization is the duly designated and authorized representative of the employees at the time the agreement is made.]

Repeal paragraph fifth of this section.

APPENDIX E

To resolve jurisdictional disputes before they reach the strike stage.

No formal amendment is proposed, but see the suggestions on pages 12 and 13 of the testimony.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD after the material I presented during the course of my recent remarks from Mr. A. F. Whitney some additional material that is marked in the instrument I send to the desk, representing excerpts from Mr. Whitney's testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF A. F. WHITNEY

Responsible unions want the closed or union shop because it is essential if the union is faithfully to discharge the terms of the contract it signs with management. How can any union guarantee steady production, peaceful relations, an absence of wildcat strikes, or any of the other interruptions to sustained industrial production if a number of the workers affected by the agreement are not a party to it?

Some years ago the vice president of one of the Nation's largest railroads demanded that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen fulfill the terms of its contract in a number of railroad yards torn by bitter quarrels between workers with all their resultant interruptions in yard work. This railroad had encouraged the growth of a rival union to the BRT; it had protected the growth of the other union until it had signed up a considerable number of men. My answer to the vice president was that the BRT had made, and would continue to make, every effort to fulfill its contract. But how could he expect peace in his yards when he was encouraging his employees to join a rival union and then setting one off against the other?

I say the same thing today. How can anyone expect a union to discharge the obligations of its contract when an employer encourages strife and rivalry by inviting another union to come in and start organizing? Unions are anxious to fulfill their contracts, and they usually do. But if you really are concerned with the responsible operation of unions, then give them security so they have the chance.

Many employers themselves want the closed shop for exactly the same reason. They have learned that improved union discipline, higher morale, greater stability in labor-management relations are all fruits of

the union security agreements. Why in the name of common sense should anyone strike at a system which has proved its value?

In the name of common sense, no one would. In the name of profits for a selfish few, some industrialists do. I do not believe they will be successful. But the very fact that the basis of union security is threatened introduces antagonism in the industrial picture. By refusing to strike at union security, the Congress will make a real contribution to lasting industrial peace.

* * * * *

To remove prohibition on union security clauses paragraph 4 of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (ch. 8 of title 45, U. S. Code) should be amended by adding the following proviso thereto: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this act or in any other statute of the United States shall preclude a carrier, its officers, or agents from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or dominated by the carrier, its officers, or agents) to require membership therein as a condition of employment, if such labor organization is the duly designated and authorized representative of the employees at the time the agreement is made."

Repeal paragraph 5 of this section.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF SPEECHES NOT ACTUALLY DELIVERED ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to refer to a question which has been brought to his attention, namely, a recurrence of the habit of Senators asking to have speeches printed in full in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as though they had been delivered on the floor of the Senate.

The Chair prefers to speak of this matter at a time when no such request is pending, so that it may refer to no particular Senator.

At least five times within the past 2 weeks speeches have been printed in full in the body of the RECORD precisely as though they had been delivered on the floor of the Senate. As Senator McNary said on October 1, 1942, when a similar question arose:

> It has been the unbroken practice of the Senate for 150 years that no speeches shall be included in the RECORD of the day's proceedings which have not been actually delivered on the floor.

While former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was a Member of this body he constantly rose to object to the exercise of the privilege of printing speeches in the body of the RECORD as though they had been delivered on the floor. Upon one occasion he called attention to the fact that this exceeds even the privilege to print which is exercised in the House of Representatives, because while the House does permit Members to extend their remarks, it requires that they be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In the opinion of the Chair, it is very important to protect the integrity of the RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate. It is not fair to ask the Official Reporters of Debates to stand guard in this connection and to resist requests to violate this essentially sound precedent.

The Chair takes the liberty of asking that these observations be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, under which there is a Subcommittee on Printing which succeeds to the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Printing, with the request that some resolution of the Senate be suggested which will permanently prevent this practice.

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on House bill 2157, the so-called portal-to-portal bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few minutes in regard to this matter.

I preface my remarks by stating for the information of the Senate that the conference report which we now have under consideration was printed in the RECORD for April 29, where it appears on pages 4209 to 4211, inclusive.

At this time I wish to present a brief summation of what has been accomplished by the conference committee as embodied in the report.

Mr. President, the conference committee adopted in its report the provisions of both the House and Senate versions of House bill 2157, in substance, with respect to past claims. In other words, the conference report in relation to past claims, adopts the theory of both the Senate and the House versions of the bill.

The conference report also adopts generally the Senate rule with respect to future claims.

It bans representative actions, as provided in the Senate amendment.

It contains a 2-year statute of limitations, with modifications as noted in the statement which I put into the RECORD yesterday.

It permits reliance on past and future administrative rulings.

It permits a court in its discretion to award less than the liquidated damages which now are mandatory under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It relieves from liability employers who were exempt under an "area of production" regulation for acts or omissions occurring prior to December 26, 1946.

Mr. President, it should be clearly understood that the conference report in no way repeals the minimum-wage requirements and the overtime compensation requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In relation to past claims, if the action is brought with 120 days after the date of enactment, the applicable State statute of limitations will apply. If the action is not brought within 120 days, then the 2-year statute of limitations applies, or the shorter State statute, if it is shorter than 2 years.

With respect to future claims, a 2-year over-all Federal statute of limitations will be applicable, thus doing away with the applicability of any State statute in the future.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say in regard to the conference report, except to compliment the conferees, who worked like yeomen, night and day, until finally their minds met and agreement was reached on what I consider to be a constructive piece of legislation, which will result in advancing the economic health of this Nation.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, at this time I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate, as one of the conferees.

Of course, I desire to concur in the statement which has been made by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, namely, that the members of the conference committee worked most diligently on the two measures which were before them. I was privileged to be one of those conferees. I regret that in the final analysis, I could not bring myself to sign the conference report. I may say that the defects of the conference report of which I complain are no different than those of which some of us complained when the bill was before the Senate for general discussion prior to its passage.

I reiterate that I think it is a grave mistake for the Congress of the United States to write into the provisions of this measure limitations upon labor laws which heretofore have worked admirably for the welfare of those in whose behalf they were enacted.

Inasmuch as both the House and Senate versions of the portal-to-portal bill incorporated the Walsh-Healey Act and

the Bacon-Davis Act, there was the belief on the part of the conferees that they lacked authority to eliminate them from the conference report. With that interpretation of the authority of the conference committee, I do not agree. I think it was within the province of the conference committee to recommend to the Senate that inasmuch as no portal-to-portal cases had been brought under those acts, there was no necessity, so far as the proposed legislation was concerned, to incorporate them in this final draft.

Mr. President, I regret that the impression has gone abroad to the country that those of us who are sincerely in opposition to the enactment of this legislation in its present form do not desire to see the injustices and the inequities of portal-to-portal suits corrected. I, for one, would be most happy to vote for a measure which would ban portal-to-portal suits, without any limitation or exception whatsoever. But I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that this measure goes far beyond the field of portal-to-portal legislation. To those who speak of the relief it will bring to industry by banning some $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 worth of claims, I desire to point out that the measure now before the Senate, to my way of thinking, merely extends to industry an invitation to pass its own financial obligations on to the Government of the United States, for the conference report provides that where any issue whatsoever remains to a portal-to-portal suit, any issue whatsoever between the parties—and I cannot conceive but that in every one of the suits which we are attempting to outlaw there will remain some question as to whether there was a contract, whether there was a custom, or whether there was a practice—if such question remains in the minds of the parties, the suits are not outlawed, and may be compromised and settled.

This means that any employer can buy the good will of his employees at the expense of the Treasury of the United States, because all he has to do is to say to them, "I recognize that there is an issue between us, and my taxes were so high while these obligations were accumulated that I will make a settlement with you, and I will collect 70 or 75 or 85 percent back from the Government." In the case of the billions upon billions of dollars which were expended in war contracts, where the obligation of the Government is to pay 100 percent of the cost, why should not the contracting party use this law for the building of good will among his employees by saying, "Certainly; I will settle this portal-to-portal suit with you, because it will not cost me one red cent"?

There is that danger. There is the further danger, in the application of the rule that is here written, that one may rely upon good faith, not good faith of an order of the Administrator who has charge of the enforcement of the law, but good-faith reliance upon any ruling or any practice or custom or any letter which might have been written at any time, and to anybody, by any agency of the United States, regardless of whether or not such agency had anything to do with the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Reliance upon that sort of a custom or practice is sufficient to justify a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act by an employer who can come forward and point to some mythical letter or some mythical custom upon which probably he relied. I think there is danger in that sort of looseness in the legislation we are writing.

Mr. President, I do not care to prolong the debate. As I said in the beginning, these arguments have already been made, but I did want to reiterate them upon the floor of the Senate, in order that Senators might know that the errors and the fallacies are still present, and there is grave danger that we have done mortal harm to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and that today, by the adoption of this conference report, we take a terrible backward step in the field of labor legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri very briefly about the conference report adopted a few moments ago.

I am concerned with the good-faith defense provisions of the conference report. I know of one particular case, for instance, in which an employer had one ruling from the Administrator of the act, and a different ruling from the Interstate Commerce Commission. He relied on the one which said he was not covered by the Wages and Hours Act, but he did not have very much faith in it, because, as he was working under a War Department contract, he got the War Department to indemnify him for any possible suit for damages. So he was not relying in very good faith on the particular ruling he had.

Mr. DONNELL. From which department?

Mr. BALL. I believe it was from the Administrator. I am wondering whether this good-faith provision would go so far in that particular case, where the employer obviously did not rely on the interpretation very heavily, as to prevent the employees from recovering.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I assume the Senator is speaking of the Northwest Airlines case in Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That matter has been considered by the committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. It is very difficult, of course, to decide a particular lawsuit upon the floor of the Senate, and I would not undertake to say with certainty the outcome of that case, on the facts submitted by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I will state that unless the employer pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, and in conformity with and in reliance on an administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation of an agency of the United States, or an administrative practice or enforcement policy of any such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged, he is not protected.

In the case which the Senator cites, in which there were conflicting rulings, one department ruling one way, another ruling the other way, I think it is impossible to state with absolute certainty as to whether a court would hold that the employer was relying in good faith upon the one ruling or the other. I think that is a matter which might well require the determination of a court. I think that is as near an answer as I can give the distinguished Senator, on the facts.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator, and I am inclined to agree with him that it is up to the court to decide finally. But it would appear to me that when the employer, in the particular case cited, went to the length of getting the War Department, under which he was a contractor, to indemnify him in case his reliance did not prove very good, it did not indicate that he had very much faith in the ruling on which he was relying.

Mr. DONNELL. I will say, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that reliance in good faith is an essential part of the defense, and unless the employer can show a good-faith reliance in conformity with and in reliance on the administrative regulation, and so forth, he is not protected. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. BALL. Yes; I think that answers what I had in mind.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that Members of the Senate will agree with me that there has been ample debate upon the pending amendment, designated as the Ball amendment. I have consulted with several of those who are interested in the amendment, and I am quite satisfied that all feel favorable to setting a time certain for a vote upon this one amendment, and any amendment thereto. Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that the clerk read a suggested unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska submits a unanimous-consent request which the clerk will report.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 2, 1947, at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered to the amendment, as modified, proposed to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act, 1947, by Mr. BALL, for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH, inserting on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", the following:

"(A) Employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B)."

Then upon the said amendment as modified or amended, if any amendment be made thereto.

Ordered further, That on said day the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 2 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said amendment, as modified, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PEPPER. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the unanimous-consent agreement proposed relates only to the pending amendment which is mentioned in the unanimous-consent proposal, and to any amendment to that amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is correct. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REDUCTION IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS — EFFECT ON THE WEST

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the matter of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill as reported to the House by the House Committee on Appropriations and as passed by the House.

I feel that this is a matter of sufficient urgency to warrant its discussion at this moment. Yesterday afternoon, immediately before the vote on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit the labor bill, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the Republican policy committee, took the time to discuss this question and to yield the floor to other Republican Senators to express themselves on the point he had raised. The Senator from Ohio refused to accede to the request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to yield to him or to other Democratic Senators on the ground that they would have ample time to answer the Republican statements during the later progress of the debate on the labor bill. So, while I hesitate to intrude this subject at this point, I feel that the able Senator from Ohio has left me no alternative.

It is my belief that the House action in cutting the Interior Department budget recommendations of the President by more than 40 percent represents an invitation to mass desecration of the West and its resources.

From the nature of the pending proposal, I should judge that this action represents the policies of the Republican Party.

I should like to call attention to just what this so-called economy action means to the West—yes; and to the Nation.

It is the story of the sabotage of the West. It is a story of a wave of false economy being sponsored by the majority party in Congress which will hasten depression and retard the development of our great region by many, many years.

Mr. Julius A. Krug, the Secretary of the Interior, had this to say about the proposed cuts:

> The proposed budget reductions in my opinion would cause a tremendous set-back in the Nation's economy. That set-back might be enough to set off a major depression.

Mr. Krug went further. He said:

> You can't hope to head off foreign "isms" if we cannot maintain a sound economy in this country.

The Appropriations Committee of the House did no careful job of pruning. Its action gives no evidence of its members having carefully considered each item and the effect of each reduction in appropriation. The members could easily have thrown a wad of gum at a wall chart with the pledge "where the wad sticks—that is where we will cut." The minor increases made by the House were made on a similar basis. That was political expediency rather than economic justification. The two may have coincided, but that was not the fault of the House.

It was only the threat of outright revolt by many western Representatives which brought about those restorations of funds. It was a political deal to prevent those westerners from following their consciences and voting to recommit the entire bill for revision. They went through that budget with a meat ax. They chopped it off just slightly below the head.

Here are some of the effects of the House action, wherein the amount of money available to the Department of the Interior was cut $135,000,000.

In the first place the amount of money available for construction work on projects in Western States was hacked by 57 percent—from $132,000,000 to $57,000,000.

And what does that mean?

It means, for example, that the Palisades project on the South Fork of the Snake River in Idaho was cut from $2,629,000 to $876,000. That is just one-third of the amount of money for Palisades that the President requested.

At that annual rate of expenditure it would take 33 years to complete the Palisades project. Of course, the Bureau of Reclamation had planned to complete the big reclamation dam in 5 years. But at this rate of construction it will take 33 years. It is a good long-term project, that way. A young man could begin work on the dam now and spend his whole life on just that one job. He would never run out of work. It would not help the farmers very much who need supplemental water. But it would be a nice sinecure for some politician who is interested only in making the work last.

There is not much economy in that type of operation. Over those 33 years the people would be paying many times the rental on heavy equipment. And they would be keeping a force of administrators and bookkeepers at work a lot longer than under the Democratic plan of building the dam in 5 years. But then it makes a nice showing on the 1948 budget. Why worry about real economy. Let us make the bookkeeping for 1948 look good.

The Bureau of Reclamation item for investigation of the feasibility of additional projects was practically wiped out. The President recommended $5,000,000. The money allowed by the House is $125,000. That is just 2 percent of the current level of expenditure for such investigations. What does it matter if we do not plan intelligently for the future development of now arid lands? Let us wait for an emergency and do our planning then. No need to look to the future. Why try to build a better State, better region, and better Nation for ourselves and our children?

The Bureau of Reclamation has told me that with only such funds as these for investigation the work would virtually cease. The highly trained technical staffs will disintegrate. The Bureau of Reclamation will be crippled for many years—even if appropriations are restored to higher levels next year, or the year after next.

The House Appropriations Committee heard a very logical presentation of the needs for the extension of Bonneville Power Administration electrical transmission lines into northern Idaho. But apparently arguments as to the soundness of that expenditure from a strictly business standpoint failed to impress the majority of the House Appropriations Committee.

The appropriations bill which was written and pushed through the House completely ignores the recommendation by the President that funds be appropriated for the power line. Not one dime is appropriated to the Bonneville Power Administration with which to build the power line into the Idaho Panhandle. Not only was that money completely hatcheted out of the appropriation, but the House also cut out funds recommended by the President for investigation and planning of a further extension of Bonneville Power transmission lines into southern Idaho.

If that money had been available a start would have been made toward bringing cheap power into southern Idaho for processing farm products in new industrial plants. And most important of all, the power would have been brought to the largest phosphate deposits in the United States, in southeastern Idaho. With that cheap power near the phosphate rock it would have been possible to manufacture adequate amounts of phosphate fertilizer for use on our western farms. The raw materials and the power would have been there. Farm cooperatives such as those sponsored by the Grange and other farm organizations could have manufactured phosphate for

their members. Private corporations could have entered the field, building new pay rolls and solving the fertilizer shortage. We would not need to depend on fertilizer factories in Germany which some Senators have described as dangerous because of the possibility they could be quickly converted into munitions plants. But that did not impress the House Appropriations Committee. The money was stricken out of the budget in the name of economy, as if a power line such as that one would not have paid its way many times over; as if the new taxable wealth created would not have yielded many more dollars to the United States Treasury, and as if the increased well-being of the people of the West would not have offset any momentary out-of-pocket cost even if there would be such cost, which there would not be.

The President recommended a budget of $20,278,000 for the Bonneville Power Administration. The House cut the figure to $6,907,800.

Included in the President's recommendation was four million seven hundred thousand for operation and maintenance of the transmission system. That was cut to two and one-half million. Included in the President's recommendation was $15,578,000 for construction of new transmission lines. That was cut to $4,407,000.

Perhaps this can be defended in the name of economy. Yes, perhaps it can. It is the same kind of economy as would be practiced by a storekeeper who purchased a fine stock of merchandise and then kept it boxed up in the basement of his store because he wanted to save the money he otherwise would have spent in buying attractive display tables and in making the stock available to his customers. That storekeeper would not move much merchandise.

Neither will the great power dams, present and prospective, sell much power to the people for whom it is being produced if the means to transmit that power to the place where it may be used is cut off.

All of our reclamation laws from time immemorial have carried clauses requiring that public power must first be offered to public agencies, to reclamation districts, to REA's, to public utility districts, to municipalities and so on. That is a very fine clause but it has not meant very much to the people of my State and to the people of the West in a great many places.

The reason it has not meant much is that it is impossible for a small municipality, a small rural electric cooperative, or other such agency, to take a bucket to Bonneville Dam and carry back a pailful of electricity. Electricity is usable only when it is available, not at the dam, but at the point of consumption.

None of these small agencies can finance, alone, the construction of a huge transmission line. Therefore, few of them can buy public power in Idaho. Those few that do buy public power must buy it under an exchange agreement with private power companies. That is, it must be carried over private power company lines at greatly increased cost.

The committee did allow some money for building power lines, not in Idaho, however. But even on those lines for which they did appropriate funds they cut out all money for substations to deliver the power to local users. They said those substations should be built by the consumers. Can you not see, Mr. President, a small REA building a huge substation to get its little bit of power from the high line? Of course, the committee knows that except for the Federal Government, no one but a rich private power company could build such a substation.

The committee's action is a deliberate effort to nullify the long-established policy of the Congress with regard to the sale of public power. It effectively prohibits most of the public power distributing agencies of my State from obtaining Columbia River power just as effectively as if it had repealed the law, but without repealing the law.

It is not as if the requested funds were in the form of a gift. That money is no gift. Neither is it running expense. It is a loan which is repaid in cash, and which is repaid many times over by the taxes on the new wealth created.

There is an interesting tie-up in connection with this choking off of public power development. The development of power by these big multiple-purpose projects becomes increasingly necessary for reclamation development. Costs are rising, not only because of the inflationary period which we are undergoing, but because most of the easy projects have been built. The more expensive ones are left. The only reason they are feasible economically for the farmer is that power sales may be used to help defray the cost, and thus lessen the payments of the individual reclaimed landowner.

Thus, by tossing a monkey wrench into the orderly development of the power features of the program, these so-called economizers are going to increase the cost to reclamation farm owners so much that soon it will be impossible to make enough money off the land to meet the high payments, and the House committee, whose action has been endorsed by most of the majority party Members of the House, realizes this.

The committee makes an interesting statement in the report on the bill. I quote from the committee report:

> The committee has requested the Commissioner of Reclamation to have increased construction costs of irrigation facilities reflected in new or amendatory repayment contracts for projects under construction or where work has not started.
>
> Future appropriations for projects in Colorado, California, the Missouri Basin, and elsewhere will depend on the willingness of prospective beneficiaries to assume additional repayment obligations.

That innocent-sounding language covers a multitude of sins. It means, I would judge, that the sanctity of contracts, which some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle defend so righteously in other matters, is of little matter when it is the Government dealing with a small irrigation farmer.

It means nothing, apparently, that the United States of America has entered into a solemn covenant with these water users as to the size of the payments they must make in return for irrigation water. There must be "new or amendatory repayment contracts," in the words of the committee.

Those "new or amendatory repayment contracts" may well push the cost of the water higher than the recognized ability to pay out of the products of that land. When that happens the farmer either will have to give up his land or go broke, and the responsibility will rest upon those who framed this policy.

There is an alternative. Those increased costs must be met and the people of the West want to meet them. They do not want a Government dole or handout. Those increased costs can be met by full development of the power resources of the rivers. But that development will not come when short-sighted policies such as those involved in the bill are followed by the Congress.

I know the farmers of southern Idaho who have signed repayment contracts for water from Anderson Ranch Dam will be very deeply interested in that portion of the bill. I know their reaction will be violent, and justifiably so. Costs of Anderson Ranch Dam have exceeded the original estimates, and the Bureau of Reclamation had plans for working out those increased costs through power revenues.

The Columbia Basin report of the Bureau of Reclamation has a sound suggestion to the Congress in this regard. It contemplates the pooling of power revenues of all the dams on the river or in the basin to establish a set cost for irrigation development.

In the development of irrigation and power projects we all know that the most accessible and easily irrigated lands were developed first. As time went on the more expensive projects were developed. The first projects required merely the building of diversion canals. Later came the construction of small dams. Then the larger dams such as Arrowrock, American Falls, and so on, were built by the Federal Government because they were too big to be built by small groups of farmers. Now we have skimmed off the cream, so to speak, and the projects remaining become more and more expensive.

If those projects had to be repaid out of irrigation repayment revenues alone, most of the projects which we are pushing could not be built. The cost per acre of land irrigated would be more than the production of that land could pay back.

That is where power comes into the picture. The power developed by irrigation projects can be sold and the money used to help defray the cost, thus lowering the cost to the farmer water users. That has been done to some extent on our projects already.

But irrigation dams on the upper Snake River and its tributaries, for example, will not develop much power. The location of these dams for the best irrigation use is such that there is not a steep enough fall nor a sufficient head of water to generate huge amounts of power. On the other hand, the dams

projected in Hell's Canyon of the Snake, on the Snake below Lewiston and on the Columbia can generate terrific amounts of power.

Therefore the Bureau of Reclamation makes this suggestion to the States and to Congress in its Columbia Basin report—and I think it is a good one:

Its plan is to pool all of the repayable costs on all of the irrigation and power projects of the Columbia Basin and add up the amount into one big total for the whole basin.

Then it would do the same thing with revenues. It would set up the amount of money which an acre of new irrigated land could repay. On these upstream projects that amount probably would be far less than the cost. In other words, the project could not be built because it would not pay out if all of the repayment had to come from the irrigated land.

But the Bureau of Reclamation would add up the amount which could be repaid by the water users from their land and to that it would add the revenue from all of the power projects of the Columbia Basin. Thus those big power dams in Hell's Canyon on the Snake, the big navigation dams projected on the Snake below Lewiston, and the big dams on the Columbia River itself would all generate power whose revenues would assist in paying for irrigation projects.

That solution evidently does not meet with the approval of the majority party members who framed this Interior Department appropriations report and who passed this bill in the House of Representatives. They are so interested in preserving the private domain of the private power companies in the West that they will allow the irrigation farmers to go broke before they will see any additional development of public power.

That is their decision. Then let the record be clear. Let the people know of this action. And let the people express themselves on whether they favor such policies in 1948. Let them be heard on whether that is what they voted for in 1946.

Some eastern and midwestern Members of Congress have had much to say about Federal subsidies for the West. They feel that reclamation and public power projects in the West represent an imposition on the people of the Midwest and East. They profess to think it is some kind of a pork-barrel grab.

I should like to call the attention of these Members to an interesting bit of information. It is a Government compilation of all of the money spent by the Government on water conservation and control projects from 1824 to 1944. It shows that in the 17 western irrigation States only about $851,000,000 of nonrepayable Federal money has been spent. But in the rest of the United States $3,300,000,000 of nonrepayable public-works funds have been spent for harbors, navigation, flood control, and the like. I am not complaining about those expenditures. I am simply drawing a comparison, because it is most favorable to the West. In the case of repayable Federal money, true, $919,000,000 have been spent in the 17 irrigation States of the West. But that money will be repaid or has been repaid. All of the repayable money in all of the rest of the United States, however, totals only $499,000,000. Thus it would seem the West is paying its way and the East is not.

As a matter of fact, in many Midwestern and Eastern States none of the money has been repaid. For example, in the State of Ohio $150,000,000 have been spent for such projects by the Federal Government. I am glad they had the developments. But, Mr. President, this is the point. Not one dime of it has been repaid by the people of Ohio. It would seem that the people of the East and Midwest have little reason to look down their noses at us. They had better look down their noses at their own feet.

The bill gives evidence of being the work of plunderers like those who began the dissipation of our natural resources in the days before Theodore Roosevelt. Apparently the majority party members got their Roosevelts mixed up. They thought that reclamation, power development, preservation of natural resources, and so on, were initiated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Of course, we all know what the leaders of the majority party in Congress think of his program. They have forgotten that these sound policies were given their first big impetus under President Teddy Roosevelt. I would wager that he would not recognize his party if he saw it today. Yes; we have turned back the clock to before the days of Teddy Roosevelt.

The over-all cut in appropriations for the Interior Department as passed by the House was about 47 percent under what the President recommended.

This was done in the name of economy, of course.

But the members of the majority party who initiated these cuts consistently refused funds for what they admitted were essential functions. They admitted that the Government was obligated to perform these functions. They admitted that a great many of them paid back dollar for dollar to the United States Treasury.

Let us take another look at the report of the House Appropriations Committee.

Time after time as funds were refused the committee said either that these functions should be performed by local taxing units—States, counties, or cities—or they should be performed by private enterprise.

The Indian Service is an example. The appropriation was cut about $11,000,000—from forty-four million to thirty-three million. Much of this money was for education of Indians. Let me read what the committee had to say about education:

> Much assistance could and should be given to the Federal Government by the States and municipalities. In denying all proposed increases and effecting a substantial reduction, this situation has been taken into consideration.

The committee, after cutting funds and telling the States that they must take over the job, has the audacity to recommend that the Government live up to its treaty obligations and provide school facilities for all Navajo children of school age. The reason the Government has not been doing this has been lack of funds, of course.

I have the word of William Zimmerman, the Acting Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs, that these fund cuts will make it necessary to turn out of school about 5,500 Indian children in the West. As for the Navajos the committee said it wanted to start educating, not only will it be impossible, but 1,000 Navajo Indian children now attending school will be turned out and their schools closed.

I think this is particularly ironical. Our history books tell us that the white man treated the Indian pretty badly in the early days. The white man took the good land away from the Indians and pushed the redmen onto land less and less desirable. Finally they were pushed into the arid lands of the West, which were not even irrigated in those days.

For many years we have recognized that because our ancestors treated the Indians so badly we should try to make amends. Now the House committee changes all that, and even refuses to provide Indian boys and girls with ordinary education, which is supposed to be available to all in this great Nation of ours. The committee says that it is the obligation of our western States where the Indians were pushed in the early days to take care of them. The people in the Eastern and Middle Western States from which those Indians were ousted are supposed now in no way to share the obligation through payment of Federal taxation.

We of the West, of sparsely populated States such as Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, and Arizona—States whose citizens are taxed to the limit of their capacity to pay in order to support present school facilities—are asked, in addition, to educate the Indians who are, by all rights, wards of the Federal Government, of all the people of the United States. It is a unique theory, and it is one to which I object strenuously both as an Idahoan and as an American.

The Republican majority in the committee has displayed the same kind of reasoning as it went through, item by item, the functions of the Interior Department in the West.

It cut out the statistical studies made to give consumers and the public basic information on the coal mining industry. It said the mine owners could provide that information.

It cut out funds for stream gaging by the Geological Survey. Of course such work is absolutely essential for the operation of an irrigation dam or a flood-control dam. But out went the funds, and consternation will reign if the bill goes through in that fashion.

The Federal Fish and Wildlife Service puts out market reports for the fishing industry much as the Agriculture Department does for the livestock, potato and grain industries. The money for that fish-market reporting is cut out. Who cares. Give the big speculators a boost. Gouge the little man by refusing to give him reliable information on where

he should sell his produce. Perhaps that is a taste of what will happen to the United States Department of Agriculture market reports when the Agriculture appropriation bill comes up.

Funds for wildlife restoration under the Pittman-Robertson Act were left entirely up in the air. The committee said they could have whatever income they make from their activities, but they will not know what that amount is for some time. I guess those committee members look upon wildlife restoration under the Pittman-Robertson Act as another kind of New Deal socialism.

Oh, yes, I must not forget the poor old Grazing Service, or rather what is left of it. It is now merged into the Bureau of Land Management. But the funds for grazing-land administration will be about half of the $1,500,000 needed.

The committee said there would be no more money for Federal grazing-land administration until the Bureau increases the fee. The fee has just been increased from 5 to 8 cents, but the committee said that is not enough.

That is a curious recommendation, because I happen to recall why the fees have not been raised. It is because when C. L. Forsling, then Chief of the Grazing Service, proposed an increase to 15 cents per animal unit monthly in 1945 he was met by a great howl from the grazing-permit holders, which howl persuaded the Senate Public Lands Committee to recommend against the increase.

So the Federal grazing people find that by withholding the fee increase, as ordered by the Senate Committee, they are cut off from funds by the House. That is something for those grazing-permit holders who fought the increase to think about, too. The amount of money left for grazing administration is just about sufficient to maintain one district grazing office in each State. Hurray again for the despoilers. Let the Federal grazing lands become overgrazed dust bowls. Why worry about reseeding or preserving this great natural resource in Idaho or any other Western State? Cut the funds and economize. Yes; let us economize ourselves right out of the only real wealth we have in the West, our natural resources.

That same kind of reasoning went into the committee's action in cutting National Park Service funds. The Tri-State Yellowstone Park Civic Association—which includes a lot of civic-minded people in three States—Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana—has asked for funds to keep Yellowstone open for a longer season. Well, here is the answer of the majority party members of the House committee. I will read you their words:

> It is estimated that an all-time high will be reached in the number of visitors to park areas during the travel year 1947. In recognition of this situation, the committee has recommended smaller reductions than in many other activities.

That is what the committee said. There are going to be more people in the parks, including Yellowstone, than ever before. So the committee says, "We will not provide even as much money as the Park Service has been getting to take care of those huge crowds, police the parks, and keep open the facilities."

I have charged that much of this so-called Republican economy action is merely bookkeeping economy.

By that I mean that there are at least two classes of appropriations in our Federal budget. There are those appropriations which might be called running expenses, namely, money that is paid out, upon which no financial reimbursement is expected.

The other class is what might be termed capital investment.

Appropriations for reclamation dams, for power generation, and for transmission lines come under the heading of capital investment.

The money is loaned and is paid back. In making that capital investment new wealth is created far beyond the value of the installations themselves.

How can we justify as economy the cutting off of an investment which returns many times more money to the Federal Treasury and to the people than is expended?

It is entirely misleading to look upon such appropriations as out-of-pocket expense. It is merely bad bookeeping that makes the Republican Party think it is accomplishing anything in the way of economy when it cuts to ribbons such appropriations.

On the contrary, instead of economizing, the Republicans are actually laying the groundwork for a new depression by failing to make proper provision for full employment in future years.

The United States News of April 7, 1947, which is a conservative business publication, carried an interesting article based, it said, on figures of Government statistical experts.

The figures estimated the physical needs of the United States if it is to assure work for all in this country by 1950.

The article starts out this way:

> The job of assuring work for all, in the view of Government planners, is to be too much for the existing United States industrial machine by 1950. These planners figure that full employment will require greatly enlarged capacity in the basic industries that keep the United States plant operating—steel, electric power, oil production, lumber, and mining.

Then the figures are cited. It is shown that 252,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity will be needed in 1950 if our industrial machine is to employ all of the people who are employable at that time. That is an increase of 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours over present electric-power production.

That increased production can come from building the big reclamation and power dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, on the Missouri River, and on the Colorado River. But it cannot be done by starting in December of 1949. It takes years to build such projects. We have not a moment to lose. We cannot delay on these important projects on the ground that they are some sort of make-work projects to be taken up when times are bad and to be abandoned when times are temporarily good. This, Mr. President, is the building of a nation.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me, let me say that I see no reason why the Senate should take a recess at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the roll be dispensed with, and that I be permitted to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. The debate on the labor bill has been extended over several days. I am wondering why extraneous matters should be injected into the debate and brought before the Senate by various Senators, and why Members of the Senate should not be primarily concerned with completing debate on this critical issue.

I am in accord with the sentiments which have been expressed by the senior Senator from Ohio, namely, I think that while the country is demanding some action on the important legislation now pending before the Senate and upon other important legislative proposals, the Members of this body should be present at all sessions of the Senate to discharge their obligations and their duties. I do not know why the debate on the question now pending should be extended over weeks and weeks, while many other vital questions are awaiting action.

I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Ohio, but I think the Members of the Senate should be on the job.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the request of the Senator from Ohio is not debatable.

Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the order for the roll call is rescinded.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that I have very much the same feeling as that which has been expressed by the Senator from Idaho. The debate on the labor bill has now gone on for 6 full days. There have been long speeches, some of them dealing directly with the measure now before the Senate, and in some cases some of them dealing very indirectly with that measure.

It seems to me that the Senate should proceed to debate the pending issue and to decide the various questions which arise in connection with it, and I think the Senate should decide them promptly, as they arise.

We will obtain a vote on one amendment tomorrow under the unanimous-consent agreement; but it seems to me that the Senate will either have to hold a session every evening or else meet from 11 in the morning until 6 in the evening each day, in order that we may finally reach some decision on the questions involved in the proposed labor legislation. They are perfectly reasonable, simple questions, and they can be debated and disposed of in a short time.

Many other matters of great importance are awaiting action by the Senate, and many important measures are now on the calendar. So I do not think the Senate should indefinitely proceed to debate any one measure, even one so important as the bill which is now the unfinished business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In partial reply to the comment made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], giving somewhat of a lecture to Members of the Senate as to why they should be present, I should like to say that, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he has been busily engaged in listening to the expert testimony on the tax bill known as House bill 1, which now is the subject of hearings by the Finance Committee. Obviously it is impossible for a Senator to be in two places at the same time. I dare say that if the Senator from Idaho is interested in a reclamation project in the West and is a member of a committee dealing with it, and if the matter is of considerable importance, he will not be on the floor of the Senate all the time, but he will be trying to protect the interests of his section of the country, as it is his bounden duty to do.

I do not feel that the criticism which has been made is really just. It is rather difficult to keep Senators on the floor of the Senate all the time.

So far as I am concerned, the quorum call can go on; and if the Senator makes another speech on that matter, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I certainly did not intend to deliver a lecture to the Members of this distinguished body. I recognize that much important work is transacted in the various committees, and I have no desire to be critical of the acting minority leader or any other Member of the Senate.

I wish to assure my colleague from Illinois that I, too, am a member of an important committee of this body; and if he will check the records, he will find that the Appropriations Committee and the 12 subcommittees thereof hold daily hearings throughout the entire session, and that the members of the Appropriations Committee are required to discharge their duties the same as Senators who are members of committees which meet infrequently. I certainly had no intention of lecturing the Members of this body.

But, Mr. President, I reiterate that we have heard much about the necessity of having the Senate and the House transact business during the present critical and important session. We have considered the advisability of holding sessions 6 days every week and of holding evening sessions.

I wonder how we can transact all the business we are expected to transact, with only 3 months remaining, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, before we are expected to adjourn or take a recess for the summer. All Senators must realize that there are 10 appropriation bills to be considered by subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and later to be considered on the floor of the Senate, during the next 2 months, because there remain only 2 months of the current fiscal year; and of course the appropriation bills are expected to clear this body and the House of Representatives prior to June 30.

So, Mr. President, I do not think I was out of order in saying what I did. Neither was I desirous of delivering a lecture to the older members of this body. I certainly regret that the acting minority leader found it necessary to make the comment which he did make.

If, on the other hand, I am not in order when I suggest the advisability of holding sessions so that the Senate may dispose of pending matters with reasonable diligence, then I have no other comment to make. Probably I shall learn a little more about the operations and procedures of this body as time goes on; but I am cognizant of the fact that many citizens of this Nation expect some forthright and vigorous action to be taken by this body and by the other branch of the Congress, and I am objecting to conduct which may be regarded as justification for many of the complaints which have been made of us in the newspapers and in radio broadcasts which constantly are critical of this body because we do not continue in session and take the action which the country is demanding of us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this question and I was not attempting to be critical of the Senator from Idaho. If he wishes to criticize any group of Senators, he should criticize the majority, not the minority, because the majority has complete control of what is done in the Senate.

Every so often we receive verbal spankings by some new Member of the Senate. That is perfectly all right, and I think perhaps they do some good. However, if a Republican Senator is going to lecture or criticize any Senator for not being on the floor of the Senate, he should direct his remarks at the Members of his own party.

We on the Democratic side of the aisle will try to help muster a majority on a quorum call any time a Senator wishes to suggest the absence of a quorum. If the Senator wishes to have a quorum call at this time, that will be perfectly satisfactory to me, and I shall try to round up as many Democratic Senators as I can.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Charles F. Uhl, term expired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Charles F. Uhl, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, whose being is without beginning and without ending, and whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, whatever the needs of this day may be, impart to us Thy gracious spirit. Inspire us with the loftiest conceptions of truth and right, that by faith and courage we may hasten the dominion of Thy kingdom of peace and happiness and brotherly love toward all men. Kindle the flames of devotion upon the altars of our hearts, so that in our hopes and aspirations we shall more and more reach out toward Thee.

Grant Thy blessing upon our distinguished guest, as his visitation to our country symbolizes the harmony and understanding between our peoples. We pray that time may intensify and seal the spirit of unity, and that our common interests may be evidenced by mutual cooperation and respect.

In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MIGUEL ALEMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

At 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints on the part of the House as members of the committee to conduct the President of the United Mexican States into the Chamber the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On behalf of the Senate, the President pro tempore appoints the following Senate Members of the same committee: the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United Mexican States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United Mexican States, followed by the President's aides, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United Mexican States.

The President of the United Mexican States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. On behalf of my colleagues of the Eightieth Congress, I am happy to extend to our distinguished guest our cordial geetings and best wishes. We believe that he has honored us by coming to this historic forum to deliver an address to the American people, an act that will strengthen the bonds of friendship and good will which exist between the United Mexican States and the United States of America. Our two countries were united in fighting against the mighty totalitarian forces which threatened the destruction of all freedom in the world. We must remain united to work toward rescuing the world from the chaos, confusion, and misery which are the aftermath of war.

Members of the Congress, it is my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege and honor, to present to you His Excellency Miguel Aleman, President of the United Mexican States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MIGUEL ALEMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

President ALEMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, honorable Members of the Congress, as the President of a country that has unceasingly struggled for democracy, finding in democracy not only a solution for the problem of its own existence but the enduring basis for international peace, I am sincerely grateful for the honor of being received in this Congress where democracy holds sway.

The essential meaning of this ceremony lies in its friendly spontaneity. It proves the firm decision with which our nations have overcome the obstacles of the past. Over and above their differences in temperament, in folkways, and in language, two peoples that profoundly love their independence have found ways to a mutual understanding—ways of living side by side, of sharing life together, without violence or suspicion. [Applause.]

This attitude of reciprocal esteem is, also, an outcome of democracy. A country under a tyrant's rule is not to be trusted, nor can other countries live securely beside it. And when the state curtails individual freedom in order to impose its will or that of a political party, civilization is on the wane, because civilization is the onward march to the full liberation of man, making him fully conscious of his own rights, entitling him to demand the same respect for them that he renders the rights of others, and making him true to himself in his love of country and true to his country in his loyalty to international solidarity. [Applause.]

This is the type of manhood democracies are shaping. We Mexicans are molding it.

Our entire history has been a struggle against want, against intervention, and against despotism. Against colonial despotism we rebelled for independence in the days of Hidalgo and Morelos. Against the greed of Europe, the country arose unafraid in the days of Juarez. And against the prolonged system of personal rule that frustrated much of what the common people had expected from the wars of independence and reform, the men of 1910 started our revolution. [Applause.]

As the son of one of those men, I speak to you now. With the Mexican Revolution many of your people were in sympathy, but others proved reticent. I take great pride in saying this to you: Our revolution preceded by several years many of the social reforms in other lands, the very same reforms in the defense of which our two countries have just fought.

When in the midst of the storm the voice of a great American bespoke an era in which all men would be free from want and from fear, free to believe and free to think, we in Mexico sensed that these were ideals akin to our own, designed to serve best the security of our hemisphere.

War did not change in Mexico our political ideas, the trend of our public thinking, or the structure of our institutions. It did not alter our international policy. Unlike those who had to improvise an ideology to justify their cooperation with the democracies, we Mexicans went to war for the selfsame moral reasons which moved us to condemn all aggression, whether within or beyond our soil. We went to war because the dictators responsible for the conflict sought to destroy elsewhere the rights defended for our people by our forefathers against the oppressors at home and against alien imperialists. We fought because the pledges our Allies made, though spoken in another language, meant liberation, justice, and faith in mankind. For these lofty purposes, my people have always been ready to offer their lives.

I have dwelt on the straightforwardness of Mexico in the conduct of its international affairs, because such a conduct is the best foundation for the unity of our peoples in the period now beginning. So long as this unity rests on right, abides by the comity of nations, and is kindled by cooperation, and sustained by the resolve to reach a just goal—the goal of living with honor and progressing without impairment of our independence—nothing, nothing shall hinder the harmony between our peoples. [Applause.]

Nations, like individuals, work together successfully only when they undertake jointly something they would also wish to accomplish severally. Mexico and the United States have an example to set for the world—the example of two countries, however different in size and wealth, cooperating on a plane of juridical equality above suspicion, and whose relations are not based on power politics.

How could we hope for the democratic solidarity which we so much desire for all peoples, if we ourselves, Americans and Mexicans, were not capable of sharing peace in frankness and in loyalty? How could we expect that noncontiguous countries reach what we, neighbors by reason of history and geography, fail to accomplish in friendship and disinterest? [Applause.]

Fortunately in recent times both of us have learned a few things. We have learned that isolation is not a good formula for living; that it is not good tactics for security. We have learned that if the goal is not domination of one system by another—necessarily a transitory and unjust condition—much more is achieved in a single year of loyal cooperation than in many years of hatred and rancor. We have learned that democracy, if not backed by force, whets the appetite of dictators, and that the most powerful force to uphold democracy lies not in tanks and ordnance but in the conviction of the men who, when conflict finally breaks out, will drive the tanks and fire the cannon. And we have further learned, that in order to give the citizenry confidence in their own strength, we must not fail to impress on them that the power of their country

does not imperil civilization and is no hindrance to the development of man, regardless of race and creed. [Applause.]

This we learned during the war. It will rise against us, should we ignore it in the peace.

All of us accepted an equal responsibility in the struggle. Therefore, we could not now understand a peace for which we were not equally responsible. Having admitted everyone to the most grievous sacrifices in the name of freedom and of justice, it is only meet that all men be entitled to enjoy a victory in which justice and liberty prevail.

The mission of the United States in this joint effort to insure for the democracies a future of justice and freedom has been perfectly understood and appreciated in all its greatness by the Mexican people. [Applause.]

There are times when destiny grants special powers to nations as if to test their fitness. We have seen with our own eyes how the aggressors lost that power when they abused it to further their selfish ends. But we have also witnessed how free peoples grow in power and strength when they rise against the insolence of the war mongers and the lust of the greedy.

What enhances the formidable industrial, economic, and military might of this Nation is, above all, that it is not at the disposal of a personal ruler, as in the domain of Alexander, the Rome of the Caesars, the Empire of the Hapsburgs, or the France of Napoleon, but is controlled by a government as conceived by Abraham Lincoln—a government of the people, by the people, for the people. [Applause.]

Yours is a country that abides by the policy of the good neighbor. I believe that policy to be the truest expression of the will for peace in this hemisphere. And I believe, likewise, that all of us should now, more than ever, implement that policy with performance in the economic and cultural fields.

Amity between governments is short-lived, unless it be the outcome of a genuine desire of their people to cooperate. Were we to limit the efficacy of good neighborliness to the covenants to safeguard the theoretical equality of all states, the respect of territorial integrity, the principle of nonintervention, as well as the joint defense of the continent, we would still be defrauding some of the most cherished hopes of our peoples. The fact that nearly 300,000,000 people live side by side in our hemisphere involves not only juridical problems and not alone problems of military strategy. As much as in the political solutions—and perhaps much more than in the political solutions—those millions are concerned not only with assistance to ward off foreign aggression but also with common efforts to overcome the dangers of poverty and despair in the difficult years of the peace. [Applause.]

The true significance of good neighborliness is cooperation. It springs from the democratic tenets that bind us together. It surpasses the scope of diplomacy. It goes beyond the exchanges of military staffs. It brings our peoples closer to one another, holding fast to their inalienable rights, those very rights your Declaration of Independence sets forth as supreme goals—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let our own hearts be the bulwark to resist all attacks against our hemisphere. But let us indefatigably work to impress upon those hearts that they must throb more and more in unison with the sincerity of our friendship, to make that friendship a living reality.

We are all responsible for adding to the policy of the good neighbor an economy of the good neighbor and a culture of the good neighbor. Whatever Mexico and the United States achieve in this respect will profit our two countries. But it will also benefit all the Americas, for the boundary between the United States and Mexico still is a touchstone for hemispheric solidarity.

Boundaries are what the peoples that define them and defend them wish them to be. Sometimes they are barriers not to be surmounted, between nations that neither understand nor forgive each other. But boundaries like ours also provide close contacts between countries seeking progress in friendship, under the rule of justice.

We are part of a hemisphere where the concurrent action of all is indispensable. Mexico has honored its every duty without ever forgetting any of its rights. Without waiving any of its rights, Mexico will continue to fulfill every duty.

We place a like trust in your country.

And it is here where I can most properly stress the significance of that trust, for under this dome solemn pledges have been made for the unity of the Americas and the brotherhood of man. It was here where President Truman stated that "in this shrinking world, it is futile to seek safety behind geographical barriers" and that "real security will be found only in law and in justice." [Applause.] And it was here also where President Roosevelt announced that he "would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor, the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." [Applause.]

We live in a region of the earth that we call the New World. Destiny challenges us to make it new indeed by virtue of its generosity under democracy, the breadth of its concept of mankind and its undeviating respect for the standards of law.

In the pursuit of that noble purpose Mexico shall never stop. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the President of the United Mexican States retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United Mexican States retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint meeting was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that the House will stand in recess, to reconvene at 1:30 o'clock p. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1:30 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

RECESS PROCEEDINGS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a brochure by Mr. Wilbur M. Smith.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Rabbi Isserman.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial on Hoover Dam appearing in the Washington News.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each an article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the testimony of the Honorable William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia, given before the Committee on Un-American Activities on the evils of communism.

MARY T. NORTON

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the church of St. Catherine of Siena in Norwood, Mass., at a pontifical High Mass, MARY T. NORTON was presented the Siena medal for 1946 by the Archbishop of Boston. This is a mark of national recognition of her noble work for social betterment and her many charitable activities.

Throughout her lifetime, in Congress and out of Congress, Mrs. NORTON has been devoted to humanitarian works. It is fitting that the Siena medal should be awarded to such a distinguished lady, for St. Catherine of Siena devoted her life, in a most turbulent time, toward bringing about social order. She stood out in her efforts to achieve social stability when many people held little hope for the future of the world. Significantly, our eminent colleague, MARY T. NORTON, has been awarded the Siena medal for similar distinguished service.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], in answering the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] on Friday last, pointed to the achievements of many outstanding Americans of Indian blood. One of these was one of my own distinguished predecessors in this body, the late Honorable Charles D. Carter, a Chickasaw Indian, educated in Chickasaw Indian schools. Various Members have pointed to the outstanding war records of our original Americans. I only wish I had the time to cite the many instances of individual heroism that have come to my personal attention.

Mr. Speaker, if evidence of the error of the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon is required, no more convincing proof need be offered than a visit to Statuary Hall in this great Capitol Building in which this body sits. I refer to the statues of those two illustrious sons of Oklahoma and outstanding Americans, Sequoyah and Will Rogers. Sequoyah, the scholar, was a self-educated man. Will Rogers, friend of all humanity, received his elementary education in Cherokee Indian schools. Any comment on the achievements of these great Americans would but detract from the glory of their names. Their place is established in the hearts of all men. Their lives are the answer to every critic of their race.

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I hope every man in this House will take the time to read my extension of remarks in today's RECORD on the squandering of American relief and the American taxpayers' money. These are my personal observations.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, JUNE 30, 1947

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 201, Rept. No. 330, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the language contained in the bill on page 24, lines 15 to 24, inclusive, and on page 25, lines 1 and 2.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That ROBERT N. MCGARVEY, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 230)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1947. The provisions of this plan are designed to maintain organizational arrangements worked out under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act. The plan has a two-fold objective, to provide for more orderly transition from war to peacetime operation and to supplement my previous actions looking toward the termination of wartime legislation.

The First War Powers Act provides that Title I "shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate." Upon the termination of this title all changes in the organization of activities and agencies effected under its authority expire and the functions revert to their previous locations, unless otherwise provided by law.

Altogether, nearly 135 Executive orders have been issued in whole or in part under Title I of the First War Powers Act. The internal organization of the War and Navy Departments has been drastically overhauled under this authority. Most of the emergency agencies, which played so vital a role in the successful prosecution of the war, were based in whole or in part upon this title. Without the ability, which these provisions afforded, to adjust the machinery of government to changing needs, it would not have been possible to develop the effective, hard-hitting organization which produced victory. The organization of war activities had to be worked out step by step as the war program unfolded and experience pointed the way. That was inevitable. The problems and the functions to be performed were largely new. Conditions changed continually and often radically. Speed of action was essential. But with the aid of Title I of the First War Powers Act, it was possible to gear the administrative machinery of the Government to handle the enormous load thrust upon it by the rapidly evolving war program.

Since VJ-day this same authority has been used extensively in demobilizing war agencies and reconverting the governmental structure to peacetime needs. This process has been largely completed. The bulk of temporary activities have ceased and most of the continuing functions transferred during the war have already been placed in their appropriate peacetime locations.

The organizational adjustments which should be continued are essentially of two types. First, changes in the organization of permanent functions, which have demonstrated their advantage during the war years. Second, transfers of continuing activities which were vested by statute in temporary war agencies but have since been moved by Executive order upon the termination of these agencies.

In most cases, the action necessary to maintain organizational gains made under title I of the First War Powers Act can best be taken by the simplified procedure afforded by the Reorganization Act of 1945, the first purpose of which was to facilitate the orderly transition from war to peace. All of the provisions of this plan represent definite improvements in administration. Several are essential steps in demobilizing the war effort. The arrangements they provide for have been reviewed by the Congress in connection with appropriation requests. Since the plan does not change existing organization, savings cannot be claimed for it. However, increased expense and disruption of operations would result if the present organization were terminated and the activities reverted to their former locations.

In addition to the matters dealt with in this reorganization plan and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, there are several other changes in organization made under title I of the First War Powers Act on which action should be taken before the termination of the title. The proposed legislation for a national defense establishment provides for continuing the internal organizational arrangements made in the Army and Navy pursuant to the First War Powers Act. I have on several occasions recommended the creation of a single agency for the administration of housing programs. Since sec-

tion 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945 may cast some doubt on my authority to assign responsibility for the liquidation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation by reorganization plan, I recommend that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be authorized by legislation to continue to liquidate the affairs relating to functions transferred to it from the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

It is imperative that title I of the First War Powers Act remain effective until all of these matters have been dealt with. An earlier termination of the title would destroy important advances in organization and impair the ability of the executive branch to administer effectively some of the major programs of the Government.

I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization contained in this plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1945. Each of these reorganizations is explained below.

FUNCTIONS OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The reorganization plan provides for the permanent location of the functions vested by statute in the Alien Property Custodian and the Office of Alien Property Custodian. In 1934 the functions of the Alien Property Custodian were transferred to the Department of Justice, where they remained until 1942. Because of the great volume of activity resulting from World War II, a separate Office of Alien Property Custodian was created by Executive Order No. 9095 of March 11, 1942. This Office was terminated by Executive Order No. 9788 of October 14, 1946, and the functions of the Office and of the Alien Property Custodian were transferred to the Attorney General except for those relating to Philippine property. The latter were transferred simultaneously to the Philippine Alien Property Administration established by Executive Order No. 9789.

While the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended at the beginning of the war, authorized the President to designate the agency or person in which alien property should vest and to change such designations, subsequent legislation has lodged certain functions in the Alien Property Custodian and the Office of Alien Property Custodian. Similarly, though the Philippine Property Act vested in the President the then existing alien property functions as to Philippine property, certain functions affecting such property have since been established which have been assigned by statute to the Alien Property Custodian.

In order to maintain the existing arrangements for the administration of alien property and to avoid the confusion which otherwise would occur on the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, the reorganization plan transfers to the Attorney General all functions vested by law in the Alien Property Custodian and the Office of Alien Property Custodian except as to Philippine property. The functions relating to Philippine property are transferred to the President, to be performed by such officer or agency as he may designate, thus permitting the continued administration of these functions through the Philippine Alien Property Administration.

APPROVAL OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ORDERS

Section 8c of the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 provides that marketing orders of the Secretary of Agriculture must in certain cases be approved by the President before issuance. In order to relieve the President of an unnecessary burden, the responsibility for approval was delegated to the Economic Stabilization Director during the war and was formally transferred to him by Executive Order No. 9705 of March 15, 1946. Since the Secretary of Agriculture is the principal adviser of the President in matters relating to agriculture and since final authority has been assigned to the Secretary by law in many matters of equal or greater importance, the requirement of Presidential approval of individual marketing orders may well be discontinued. Accordingly, the plan abolishes the function of the President relative to the approval of such orders.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT FUNCTIONS

The Office of Contract Settlement was established by law in 1944, and shortly thereafter was placed by statute in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The principal purposes of the Office of Contract Settlement have been to prescribe the policies, regulations, and procedures governing the settlement of war contracts, and to provide an appeal board to hear and decide appeals from the contracting agencies in the settlement of contracts. A remarkable record has been achieved for the rapid settlement of war contracts, but among those which remain are some of the largest and most complex. Considerable time may be required to complete these cases and dispose of the appeals.

Though the functions of the Office of Contract Settlement cannot yet be terminated, it is evident that they no longer warrant the maintenance of a separate office. For this reason, Executive Order No. 9809 of December 12, 1946, transferred the functions of the Director of Contract Settlement to the Secretary of the Treasury and those of the Office of Contract Settlement to the Department of the Treasury. As the central fiscal agency of the executive branch, the Treasury Department is clearly the logical organization to carry to conclusion the over-all activities of the contract-settlement program. The plan continues the present arrangement and abolishes the Office of Contract Settlement, thereby avoiding its reestablishment as a separate agency on the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION ACT FUNCTIONS

The act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 427) imposed upon the Attorney General certain duties respecting administration and enforcement of the National Prohibition Act. By Executive Order No. 6639 of March 10, 1934, all of the powers and duties of the Attorney General respecting that act, except the power and authority to determine and to compromise liability for taxes and penalties, were transferred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The excepted functions, however, were transferred subsequently to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by Executive Order No. 9302 of February 9, 1943, issued under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Since the functions of determining taxes and penalties under various statutes and of compromise of liability therefor prior to reference to the Attorney General for suit are well-established functions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, this minor function under the National Prohibition Act is more appropriately placed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue than in the Department of Justice.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FUNCTIONS

By Executive Order No. 9069 of February 23, 1942, six research bureaus, the Office of Experiment Stations, and the Agricultural Research Center were consolidated into an Agricultural Research Administration to be administered by an officer designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The constituent bureaus and agencies of the Administration have, in practice, retained their separate identity. This consolidation and certain transfers of functions between the constituent bureaus and agencies have all been recognized and provided for in the subsequent appropriation acts passed by the Congress.

By the plan the functions of the eight research bureaus and agencies which are presently consolidated into the Agricultural Research Administration are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture to be performed by him or under his direction and control by such officers or agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate.

The benefits which have been derived from centralized review, coordination and control of research projects and functions by the Agricultural Research Administrator have amply demonstrated the lasting value of this consolidation. By transferring the functions of the constituent bureaus and agencies to the Secretary of Agriculture, it will be possible to continue this consolidation and to make such further adjustments in the organization of agricultural research activities as future conditions may require. This assignment of functions to the Secretary is in accord with the sound and long-established practice of the Congress of vesting substantive functions in the Secretary of Agriculture rather than in subordinate officers or agencies of the Department.

CREDIT UNION FUNCTIONS

The plan makes permanent the transfer of the administration of Federal functions with respect to credit unions to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. These functions, originally placed in the Farm Credit Administration, were transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Executive Order No. 9148 of April 27, 1942. Most credit unions are predominantly urban institutions, and the credit union program bears very little relation to the functions of the Farm Credit Administration. The supervision of credit unions fits in logically with the general bank

supervisory functions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation since 1942 has successfully administered the credit union program, and the supervision of credit union examiners has been integrated into the field and departmental organization of the Corporation. In the interests of preserving an organizational arrangement which operates effectively and economically, the program should remain in its present location.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

The present organization for the disposal of surplus property is the product of two and a half years of practical experience. Beginning with the Surplus Property Board in charge of general policy and a group of agencies designated by it to handle the disposal of particular types of property, the responsibility for most of the surplus disposal has gradually been drawn together in one agency—the War Assets Administration—headed by a single Administrator. Experience has demonstrated the desirability of centralized responsibility in administering this most difficult program.

The reorganization plan will continue the centralization of surplus disposal functions in a single agency headed by an Administrator. This is accomplished by transferring the functions, personnel, property, records, and funds of the War Assets Administration created by Executive order to the statutory Surplus Property Administration. In order to avoid confusion and to maintain the continuity of operations, the name of the Surplus Property Administration is changed to War Assets Administration.

Because the plan combines in one agency not only the policy functions now vested by statute in the Surplus Property Administrator, but also the immense disposal operations now concentrated in the temporary War Assets Administration, I have found it necessary to provide in the plan for an Associate War Assets Administrator, also appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. It is essential that there be an officer who can assist the Administrator in the general management of the agency and who can take over the direction of its operations in case of the absence or disability of the Administrator or of a vacancy in his office.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 1, 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1947—(H. DOC. NO. 231)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945. The plan permanently transfers to the Department of Labor the United States Employment Service, which is now in the Department by temporary transfer under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act. In addition, the plan effects two other changes in organization to improve the administration of labor functions.

I am deeply interested in the continued development of the Department of Labor. The critical national importance of effective governmental action on labor problems requires proper assignment of responsibility for the administration of Federal labor programs. Such programs should be under the general leadership of the Secretary of Labor, and he should have an adequate organization for this purpose. The provisions of this plan are directed to this objective.

I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization contained in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1945.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The United States Employment Service was established by the Wagner-Peyser Act in the Department of Labor. Later, by Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective July 1, 1939, it was transferred to the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency and administered in conjunction with the unemployment compensation program. During the war the Employment Service was extensively reorganized. The critical nature of the labor supply problem greatly increased the importance of the service and compelled the Federal Government to take over the administration of the entire employment office system on a temporary basis.

Soon after the creation of the War Manpower Commission the United States Employment Service was transferred to the Commission, by Executive Order No. 9247 of September 17, 1942, and became the backbone of the Commission's organization and program. When the Commission was terminated shortly after VJ-day, most of its activities, including the United States Employment Service, were shifted by Executive Order No. 9617 to the Department of Labor, the central agency for the performance of Federal Labor functions under normal conditions. Both of these transfers were made under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act. More recently, the Employment Service was returned to its prewar status as a joint Federal-State operation.

The provision of a system of public employment offices is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor. Through the activities of the employment office system the Government has a wide and continuous relationship with workers and employers concerning the basic question of employment. To a rapidly increasing degree, the employment office system has become the central exchange for workers and jobs and the primary national source of information on labor market conditions. In the calendar year 1946, it filled 7,140,000 jobs, and millions of workers used its counsel on employment opportunities and on the choice of occupations.

The Labor Department obviously should continue to play a leading role in the development of the labor market and to participate in the most basic of all labor activities—assisting workers to get jobs and employers to obtain labor. Policies and operations of the Employment Service must be determined in relation to over-all labor standards, labor statistics, labor training, and labor law—on all of which the Labor Department is the center of specialized knowledge in the Government. Accordingly, the reorganization plan transfers the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor.

FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

The plan transfers the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor to be performed subject to his direction and control. The fair labor standards bill was drafted on the assumption that the Wage and Hour Division would be made an independent establishment. As finally passed, however, the act placed the Division in the Department of Labor but was entirely silent on the authority of the Secretary over it. As a result, the Secretary has lacked an adequate legal basis for supervising and directing the affairs of the Division, and it has had an ambiguous status in the Department. The transfer effected by the plan will eliminate uncertainty as to the Secretary's control over the administration of the Wage and Hour Division and will enable him to tie it into the Department more effectively. This in turn will facilitate working out a sound combination of wage-and-hour, child-labor, and related enforcement activities of the Department, and will permit the Secretary to simplify and strengthen the organization of the Department.

COORDINATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF LABOR LAWS ON FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS

The Congress has enacted several laws regulating wages and hours of workers employed on Federal public-works contracts. The oldest of these are the 8-hour laws fixing a maximum 8-hour day for laborers and mechanics on such projects. More recently the Davis-Bacon Act established the prevailing wage rates for the corresponding classes of workers in the locality as the minimum rates for employees on certain Federal public-works contracts and required the Secretary of Labor to determine the prevailing rates. Another measure, the Copeland Act, prohibited the exaction of rebates or kick-backs from workers on public works financed by the Federal Government and authorized the Secretary of Labor to prescribe regulations for contractors on such works.

The actual enforcement of these acts rests almost entirely with the Federal agencies entering into the contracts. This is proper, since the engineers and inspectors of the contracting agencies are in close touch with the operation of the projects, and, in the case of cost-plus contracts, the pay rolls and accounts of the contractors are examined by the auditors of these agencies.

The enforcement practices of the various contracting agencies, however, differ widely in character and effectiveness. Some agencies have instructed their inspectors thoroughly as to the acts and

their enforcement and have adopted procedures for carefully checking the records of the contractors and the operation of the projects to determine compliance with Federal labor laws. On the other hand, some agencies have failed to institute effective enforcement procedures. As a result, enforcement has been very uneven and workers have not had the protection to which they were entitled. With the return to a normal peacetime labor market the danger of violations will be much greater than in recent years.

To correct this situation, the plan authorizes the Secretary of Labor to coordinate the administration of the acts for the regulation of wages and hours on Federal public works by establishing such standards, regulations, and procedures to govern the enforcement efforts of the contracting agencies, and by making such investigations as may be necessary to assure consistent enforcement. The plan does not transfer enforcement operations from the contracting agencies to the Department of Labor, as the former can perform the work more economically than the Department because of their close contact with the projects. Rather, it assures more uniform and effective action by the contracting agencies.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1947.*

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulations arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, otherwise known in the House as the Gwynne bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk commenced the reading of the statement.

Mr. MICHENER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the statement is lengthy and very technical and that more can be gained from an explanation than from a reading of the statement, that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART I

"Findings and policy

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, has been interpreted judicially in disregard of long-established customs, practices, and contracts between employers and employees, thereby creating wholly unexpected liabilities, immense in amount and retroactive in operation, upon employers with the results that, if said Act as so interpreted or claims arising under such interpretations were permitted to stand, (1) the payment of such liabilities would bring about financial ruin of many employers and seriously impair the capital resources of many others, thereby resulting in the reduction of industrial operations, halting of expansion and development, curtailing employment, and the earning power of employees; (2 the credit of many employers would be seriously impaired; (3) there would be created both an extended and continuous uncertainty on the part of industry, both employer and employee, as to the financial condition of productive establishments and a gross inequality of competitive conditions between employers and between industries; (4) employees would receive windfall payments, including liquidated damages, of sums for activities performed by them without any expectation of reward beyond that included in their agreed rates of pay; (5) there would occur the promotion of increasing demands for payment to employees for engaging in activities no compensation for which had been contemplated by either the employer or employee at the time they were engaged in; (6) voluntary collective bargaining would be interfered with and industrial disputes between employees and employers and between employees and employees would be created; (7) the courts of the country would be burdened with excessive and needless litigation and champertous practices would be encouraged; (8) the Public Treasury would be deprived of large sums of revenues and public finances would be seriously deranged by claims against the Public Treasury for refunds of taxes already paid; (9) the cost to the Government of goods and services heretofore and hereafter purchased by its various departments and agencies would be unreasonably increased and the Public Treasury would be seriously affected by consequent increased cost of war contracts; and (10) serious and adverse effects upon the revenues of Federal, State, and local governments would occur.

"The Congress further finds that all of the foregoing constitutes a substantial burden on commerce and a substantial obstruction to the free flow of goods in commerce.

"The Congress, therefore, further finds and declares that it is in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act be enacted.

"The Congress further finds that the varying and extended periods of time for which, under the laws of the several States, potential retroactive liability may be imposed upon employers, have given and will give rise to great difficulties in the sound and orderly conduct of business and industry.

"The Congress further finds and declares that all of the results which have arisen or may arise under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as aforesaid, may (except as to liability for liquidated damages) arise with respect to the Walsh-Healey and Bacon-Davis Acts and that it is, therefore, in the national public interest and for the general welfare, essential to national defense, and necessary to aid, protect, and foster commerce, that this Act shall apply to the Walsh-Healey Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress in order to meet the existing emergency and to correct existing evils (1) to relieve and protect interstate commerce from practices which burden and obstruct it; (2) to protect the right of collective bargaining; and (3) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts.

"PART II

"Existing claims

"SEC. 2. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act), on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or an account of any activity of an employee engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, except an activity which was compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed, covering such activity, and inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable.

"(c) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employed an employee there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engaged in activities which were compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(d) No court of the United States, of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding, whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, under the Walsh-Healey Act, or under the Bacon-Davis Act, to the extent that such action or proceeding seeks to enforce any liability or impose any punishment with respect to an activity which was not compensable under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(e) No cause of action based on unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or any interest in such cause of action, shall hereafter be assignable, in whole or in part, to the extent that such cause of action is based on an activity which was not compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b).

"SEC. 3. COMPROMISE OF CERTAIN EXISTING CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Any cause of action under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act or any action (whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act) to enforce such a cause of action, may hereafter be compromised in whole or in part, if there exists a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable by the employer to his employee; except that no such action or cause of action may be so compromised to the extent that such compromise is based on an hourly wage rate less than the minimum required under such Act, or on a payment for overtime at a rate less than one and one-half times such minimum hourly wage rate.

"(b) Any employee may hereafter waive his right under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to liquidated damages, in whole or in part, with respect to activities engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) Any such compromise or waiver, in the absence of fraud or duress, shall, according to the terms thereof, be a complete satisfaction of such cause of action and a complete bar to any action based on such cause of action.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall also be applicable to any compromise or waiver heretofore so made or given.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'compromise' includes 'adjustment', 'settlement', and 'release'.

"PART III

"Future claims

"SEC. 4. RELIEF FROM CERTAIN FUTURE CLAIMS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, AND THE BACON-DAVIS ACT.—

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any of the following activities of such employee engaged in on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

"(1) walking, riding, or traveling to and from the actual place of performance of the principal activity or activities which such employee is employed to perform, and

"(2) activities which are preliminary to or postliminary to said principal activity or activities,

which occur either prior to the time on any particular workday at which such employee commences, or subsequent to the time on any particular workday at which he ceases, such principal activity or activities.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) which relieve an employer from liability and punishment with respect to an activity, the employer shall not be so relieved if such activity is compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee is employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it is engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it is so made compensable.

"(d) In the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employs an employee with respect to walking, riding, traveling, or other preliminary or postliminary activities described in subsection (a) of this section, there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engages in any such activity which is compensable within the meaning of subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

"PART IV

"Miscellaneous

"SEC. 5. REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS BANNED.—

"(a) The second sentence of section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Action to recover such liability may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only with respect to actions commenced under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 6. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to enforce any cause of action for unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act—

"(a) if the cause of action accrues on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued, and every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued;

"(b) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act—may be commenced within whichever of the following periods is the shorter: (1) two years after the cause of action accrued, or (2) the period prescribed by the applicable State statute of limitations; and, except as provided in paragraph (c), every such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within the shorter of such two periods;

"(c) if the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, the action shall not be barred by paragraph (b) if it is commenced within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless at the time commenced it is barred by an applicable State statute of limitations.

"SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FUTURE ACTIONS.—In determining when an action is commenced for the purposes of section 6, an action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed; except that in the case of a collective or class action instituted under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Bacon-Davis Act, it shall be considered to be commenced in the case of any individual claimant—

"(a) on the date when the complaint is filed, if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint and his written consent to become a party plaintiff is filed on such date in the court in which the action is brought; or

"(b) if such written consent was not so filed or if his name did not so appear—on the subsequent date on which such written consent is filed in the court in which the action was commenced.

"SEC. 8. PENDING COLLECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS.—The statute of limitations prescribed in section 6 (b) shall also be applicable (in the case of a collective or representative action commenced prior to the date of the enactment of this Act under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) to an individual claimant who has not been specifically named as a party plaintiff to the action prior to the expiration of one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act. In the application of such statute of limitations such action shall be considered to have been commenced as to him when, and only when, his written consent to become a party plaintiff to the action is filed in the court in which the action was brought.

"SEC. 9. RELIANCE ON PAST ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—In any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act based on any act or omission prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of any agency of the United States, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of any such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"SEC. 10. RELIANCE IN FUTURE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.—

"(a) In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any written administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of the agency of the United States specified in subsection (b) of this section, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belonged. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect.

"(b) The agency referred to in subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended—the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor;

"(2) in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act—the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of such Act; and

"(3) in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act—the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 11. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—In any action commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this Act to recover unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in section 16 (b) of such Act.

"SEC. 12. APPLICABILITY OF 'AREA OF PRODUCTION' REGULATIONS.—No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of an activity engaged in by such employee prior to December 26, 1946, if such employer—

"(1) was not so subject by reason of the definition of an 'area of production' by a regulation of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, which regulation was applicable at the time of performance of the activity even though at that time the regulation was invalid; or

"(2) would not have been so subject if the regulation signed on December 18, 1946 (Federal Register, vol. 11, p. 14648) had been in force on and after October 24, 1938.

"SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.—

"(a) When the terms 'employer', 'employee', and 'wage' are used in this Act in relation to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, they shall have the same meaning as when used in such Act of 1938.

"(b) When the term 'employer' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act.

"(c) When the term 'employee' is used in this Act in relation to the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act it shall mean any individual employed by the contractor or subcontractor covered by such Act in the performance of his contract or subcontract.

"(d) The term 'Walsh-Healey Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended; and the term 'Bacon-Davis Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings', approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011), as amended.

"(e) As used in section 6 the term 'State' means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

"SEC. 14. SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 15. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes".

EARL C. MICHENER,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

FINDINGS AND POLICY

Section 1 of the House bill and section 1 of the Senate amendment contained findings and a declaration of policy by the Congress. Section 1 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains findings and a declaration of policy by the Congress in conformity with the substitute agreed on.

EXISTING PORTAL-TO-PORTAL CLAIMS

General rule

Under the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 2 (a)), it is provided that no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (hereinafter in this statement referred to as "the three Acts"), on account of the failure of the employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any activity of an employee engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, except an activity which was compensable by either (1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or a collective bargaining representative, and his employer; or (2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity between such employee, his agent, or collective bargaining representative, and his employer. The above rule is to apply in the case of any action or proceeding (including criminal actions and injunctions) whether heretofore or hereafter commenced. The effect of both the House bill (section 3) and the Senate amendment (section 2) was (as to existing claims) in essence the same as the provisions of the conference bill, except that the House bill did not contain the provision under which an activity, although compensable by custom or practice, is nevertheless not compensable if the custom or practice was inconsistent with the contract.

Clarifying provisions

The conference agreement (section 2 (b)) contains a provision not stated expressly in either bill, that an activity shall be considered as compensable under the above referred to contract provision or custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable. Under this provision, for example, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable only when engaged in between 8 and 5 o'clock but was not compensable when engaged in before 8 or after 5 o'clock, it will not be considered as a compensable activity when engaged in before 8 or after 5 o'clock. So also, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable when engaged in before 8 but was not compensable when engaged in after 5 o'clock, it will not be compensable under the bill as agreed to in conference when engaged in after 5 o'clock. So also, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable during a certain portion of the regular workday but was not compensable when engaged in during other hours of the regular workday, it will not be compensable under the bill as agreed to in conference when engaged in during such other hours.

The bill as agreed to in conference also contains a provision (section 2 (c)) that in the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the three Acts, in determining the time for which an employer employed an employee there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engaged in activities which were compensable, within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. This provision, which is in the nature of a clarifying statement, is for two purposes, (1) to emphasize that employers are not relieved from liability for the payment of minimum wages and overtime compensation under the three Acts for any time during which the employee engaged in activities compensable under the rules above stated, and (2) to make it clear that only such time will be counted for the purposes of applying the minimum wage and overtime compensation provisions of the three Acts, and that it therefore will not be possible by judicial or administrative interpretation to include other time which was not made compensable under the rules above stated. The second above-named purpose was the purpose of that portion of section 2 of the Senate amendment which stated that no judicial or administrative interpretation of the three Acts should have the effect of changing a contract so as to make compensable any activities which the previous portion of the section had declared to be not compensable.

The Senate amendment contained a provision (section 2 (b)) that every claim based on past activities not compensable under contract, custom, or practice would be null and void and unenforceable. This provision has been omitted under the conference agreement as surplusage.

The Senate amendment (section 3) provided that the provisions of section 2 of the Senate amendment which made past activities not compensable if not compensable under contract, custom, or practice, should not be deemed to remove penalty or liability under the afore-mentioned three Acts based on activities other than the ones so declared not to be compensable. This provision is omitted under the conference agreement as surplusage, and as fully covered by the provisions of section 2 (c) of the bill as agreed to in conference, described above under this heading.

COURT JURISDICTION

Under the conference agreement (section 2 (d)) it is provided that no court of the United States or of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding (including criminal actions and injunctions), heretofore or hereafter instituted, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the three Acts, to the extent that such action or proceeding seeks to enforce any liability or impose any punishment with respect to a

past activity which was not compensable under contract, custom, or practice as provided in the preceding subsections. The denial of jurisdiction is of course not applicable to actions or proceedings in which judgment has become final prior to the date of the enactment of the bill.

ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS

Under the House bill (section 2 (f)) no cause of action or interest therein shall be assignable if it is for wages, overtime compensation, penalties, or damages under the three Acts. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision. Under the conference agreement (section 2 (e)) it is provided that no such cause of action which accrued prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, or any interest in such cause of action, shall hereafter be assignable in whole or in part to the extent that it is based on an activity which was not compensable under contract, custom, or practice within the provisions of the bill above described under the subheading "General Rule".

Under the new subsection it will be impossible for anyone (even though permitted to do so under State law) to buy up existing claims which were not compensable under contract, custom, or practice, with the hope of compromising such claims at a profit under the provisions of section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference.

COMPROMISE OF EXISTING CLAIMS

Section 3 of the conference agreement provides that any cause of action under the three Acts which accrued prior to the date of enactment of the bill, or any action (whether heretofore or hereafter instituted) to enforce such a cause of action, may hereafter be compromised, in whole or in part, but only if there exists a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable by the employer to his employee. However, even in the case of a bona fide dispute, the compromise is not permitted to the extent that it is based on an hourly wage rate of less than the minimum required by the Act under which the cause of action arose, or on a payment for overtime at a rate less than one and one-half times such minimum hourly wage rate.

Subsection (b) of section 3 of the conference agreement permits an employee hereafter to waive his right under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to liquidated damages, in whole or in part, with respect to activities engaged in prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

Subsection (c) of section 3 of the conference agreement provides that any such compromise or waiver, in the absence of fraud or duress, shall, according to the terms thereof be a complete satisfaction of such cause of action and a complete bar to any action based on such cause of action.

Subsection (d) of section 3 of the conference agreement states that the provisions of the section shall also be applicable to any compromise or waiver made or given before the date of enactment of the bill.

Subsection (e) of section 3 of the conference agreement defines "compromise" to include "adjustment", "settlement", and "release".

It will be noted that this section of the conference agreement lays down no rule as to compromises or waivers with respect to causes of action hereafter accruing. The validity or invalidity of such compromises or waivers is to be determined under law other than this section.

FUTURE PORTAL-TO-PORTAL CLAIMS

General rule

The House bill in section 3 applied to future causes of action under the three Acts the same rule as in the case of the past, namely, that an activity should not be compensable unless compensable under contract, custom, or practice.

The conference agreement in section 4, subsections (a) and (b), substantially follows the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Senate amendment. It is provided that, subject to the qualification stated below, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the three Acts on account of his failure to pay an employee minimum wages or overtime compensation for or on account of any of the following activities engaged in on or after the date of the enactment of the bill—

(1) walking, riding, or traveling to and from the actual place of performance of the principal activity or activities which such employee is employed to perform, and

(2) activities which are preliminary to or postliminary to said principal activity or activities,

which occur either prior to the time on any particular workday at which such employee commences, or subsequent to the time on any particular workday at which he ceases, such principal activity or activities.

The qualification above referred to is that the employer shall not be so relieved if the above-described activity is compensable by either (1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or (2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee is employed, covering such activity, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such activity, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

Clarifying provisions

The conference agreement (section 4 (c)) contains a provision not stated expressly in the Senate amendment, that an activity shall be considered as compensable under the above referred to contract provision or custom or practice only when it is engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it is so made compensable. The provision is applicable only to walking, riding, traveling, or other preliminary or postliminary activities above described. Under this provision, for example, if under the contract provision or custom or practice such a preliminary or postliminary activity is compensable only when engaged in during the portion of the day prior to the morning whistle but is not so compensable when engaged in after the evening whistle, it will not be considered as a compensable activity when engaged in after the evening whistle. So also, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity is compensable only when engaged in during the portion of the day from whistle to whistle and is not made compensable when engaged in before the morning whistle or after the evening whistle, it will not be considered as a compensable activity when engaged in before the morning whistle or after the evening whistle.

Section 4 (d) of the bill as agreed to in conference contains a similar provision to that contained in section 2 (c) of the bill as agreed to in conference previously described in this statement in connection with section 2 (c), except that it is limited in determining the time for which an employer employs an employee with respect to walking, riding, traveling, or other preliminary or postliminary activities described in section 4 (a). The reasons for and the effect of its insertion in the bill are fully described in this statement in connection with section 2 (c).

REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS BANNED

Section 5 of the bill as agreed to in conference amends section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, by repealing the authority now contained therein permitting an employee or employees to designate an agent or representative to maintain an action for and in behalf of all employees similarly situated. Collective actions brought by an employee or employees (a real party in interest) for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated may continue to be brought in accordance with the existing provisions of the Act. The amendment also adds a new sentence to such section 16 (b), not contained in existing law, providing that no employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The amendment made by this section is to be applicable only with respect to actions which are commenced on or after the date of enactment of the bill. Representative actions which are pending on such date are not affected by this section.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Under the House bill and the Senate amendment there was a statute of limitations on actions commenced on or after the date of the enactment of the bill to enforce any cause of action for unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages under the three Acts. Under the House bill the period was one year and under the Senate amendment two years.

Section 6 of the bill as agreed to in conference provides for a two-year statute of limitations (regardless of the period of limitation provided by any State statute) with respect to any action commenced on or after the date of enactment of the bill to enforce any cause of action for unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, under the three Acts if the cause of action accrues on or after the date of enactment of the bill. If the action is not commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued, it is to be forever barred.

If the cause of action accrued prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, action thereon may be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued or, in the case of a State having a shorter statute of limitations, the period prescribed by the applicable State statute of limitations; but if such action is commenced within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of the bill, the applicable State statute of limitations (whether longer or shorter than two years) will apply to such action. In other words, in such latter case, if a State statute of limitations, applicable to such cause of action, has run, no action on such claim may be commenced within such 120-day period. If the applicable State statute of limitations has not run, action may be so commenced within such 120 days, and may go back as far as permitted by the applicable State statute of limitations whether more or less than two years. If, with respect to a cause of action which accrued under the Walsh-Healey Act or the Bacon-Davis Act no State statute of limitations is applicable, an action to enforce such a cause of action commenced within such 120-day period will not be limited by any statute of limitations.

DETERMINATION OF COMMENCEMENT OF FUTURE ACTIONS

Section 7 of the bill as agreed to in conference provides a rule for determining when an action is commenced for the purposes of the statute of limitations provided in section 6. It lays down the general rule that, for such purposes, an action commenced on or after the date of enactment of the bill under the three Acts shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed. This is the same rule laid down in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. An ex-

ception to the general rule is provided in the case of a collective or class action commenced on or after the date of enactment of the bill under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Bacon-Davis Act (no collective or class action can be instituted under the Walsh-Healey Act). In the case of such a collective or class action (a collective action being an action brought by an employee or employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated, and a class action being an action described in Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure) the action shall be considered to be commenced in the case of an individual claimant—

(a) On the date when the complaint is filed, if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint and his written consent to become a party plaintiff is filed on such date in the court in which the action is brought, or

(b) If such written consent was not so filed or if his name did not so appear—on the subsequent date on which such written consent was filed in the court in which the action was commenced.

PENDING COLLECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS

Section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference provides in the case of a collective or representative action commenced prior to the date of enactment of the bill under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the statute of limitations prescribed in section 6 (b) (two years or State statute, whichever is shorter) applies to an individual claimant who has not been specifically named as a party plaintiff to the action prior to the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of the bill. In the application of such statute of limitations the action shall be considered to have been commenced as to him when, and only when, his written consent to become a party plaintiff to the action is filed in the court in which the action was brought.

Under this provision, the statute of limitations in section 6 does not apply to an individual claimant who has been specifically named as a party plaintiff to the action prior to the date of the enactment of the bill. Nor does such statute of limitations apply to any individual claimant who has been so named within the period beginning on the date of enactment and ending on the 120th day after the date of enactment, if the applicable law provides that the date on which the action is deemed to have been commenced as to him is the date on which the collective or representative action was commenced. If he is so named as a party plaintiff within such 120-day period, and the applicable law provides that the action was deemed to have been commenced as to him when he was so named as a party plaintiff, then the period of limitations to be applied to him is the same as is provided in section 6 (c), namely, the one provided by the applicable State statute of limitations.

If such individual claimant is named as a party plaintiff in any such pending collective or representative action on or after the expiration of such 120-day period, the action shall be considered to have been commenced as to him when, and only when, his written consent to become a party plaintiff to the action is filed in the court in which the action was brought, and the statute of limitations applicable with respect to his cause of action is two years, or the applicable State statute of limitations if less than two years.

RELIANCE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS, ETC.

Section 9 of the bill as agreed to in conference provides that in the case of an action or proceeding (including injunctive and criminal proceedings) heretofore or hereafter commenced, based on any act or omission prior to the date of enactment of the bill, no employer is to be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of an employer to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation under the three Acts, if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of any agency of the United States, or any administrative practice or enforcement policy of any such agency with respect to the class of employers to which he belongs. Such a defense, if established, will be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that after such act or omission, such administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, interpretation, practice, or enforcement policy is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect. It will thus be seen that the administrative regulation, order, etc., does not have to be in writing nor does it have to be a regulation, order, etc., of the Federal agency which administers the act in question. It will be sufficient if the employer can prove that his act or omission was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on an administrative regulation, order, etc., of any Federal agency.

Section 10 of the bill as agreed to in conference, relating to an action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of enactment of the bill, contains a rule which is the same as the rule relating to acts or omissions prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, with two exceptions: (1) The regulations, orders, rulings, approvals, or interpretations, which may be relied on must be in writing; and (2) the regulations, practices, enforcement policies, etc., must be those of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor—in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; of the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act—in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act; and of the Secretary of Labor—in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act.

It should be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 an employer will be relieved from liability, in an action by an employee, because of reliance in good faith on an administrative practice or enforcement policy, only: (1) where such practice or policy was based on the ground that an act or omission was not a violation of the Act, or (2) where a practice or policy of not enforcing the Act with respect to acts or omissions led the employer to believe in good faith that such acts or omissions were not violations of the Act.

However, the employer will be relieved from criminal proceedings or injunctions brought by the United States, not only in the cases described in the preceding paragraph, but also where the practice or policy was such as to lead him in good faith to believe that he would not be proceeded against by the United States.

The effect of the rules stated in the two preceding paragraphs may be illustrated as follows: An employer will not be relieved from liability under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to his employees (in an action by them) for the period December 26, 1946, to March 1, 1947, if he is not exempt under the "Area of Production" regulations published in the Federal Register of December 25, 1946, notwithstanding the press release issued by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, in which he stated that he would not enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 on account of acts or omissions occurring prior to March 1, 1947. On the other hand he will, by reason of the enforcement policy set forth in such press release, have a good defense to a criminal proceeding or injunction brought by the United States based on an act or omission prior to March 1, 1947.

It should also be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 the regulations, interpretations, enforcement policies, etc., which may be in good faith relied on must be those of an "agency" and not of an individual officer or employee of the agency. Thus if inspector A tells the employer that the agency interpretation is that the employer is not subject to the Act, the employer is not relieved from liability, despite his reliance in good faith on such interpretation, unless it is in fact the interpretation of the agency.

LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

Section 2 (g) of the House bill authorized the courts, in their discretion, in awarding liquidated damages under the three Acts to award a lesser amount than the amount specified therein. There was no comparable provision in the Senate amendment. Section 11 of the bill as agreed to in conference permits the court, in its sound discretion, to award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, in any action under such Act of 1938 commenced prior to or on or after the date of enactment of the bill to recover unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or liquidated damages, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of such Act.

AREA OF PRODUCTION

Section 12 of the bill as agreed to in conference is inserted to relieve the situation created by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Addison, et al.* v. *The Holly Hill Fruit Products, Inc.* (322 U. S. 607, decided June 5, 1944), holding invalid certain regulations of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division relating to "area of production", and directing him to issue new regulations, which the Administrator did not do for a period of approximately two and one-half years after the date of such decision.

This section relieves an employer from liability and punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of an activity engaged in by such employee prior to December 26, 1946, if such employer (1) was relieved from such liability or punishment by reason of a valid definition of "area of production" by the Administrator applicable at the time of the performance of the activity, or (2) would have been so relieved by reason of an invalid definition applicable at the time of the performance if such definition had been valid, or (3) would have been so relieved if the definition finally made by the Administrator on December 18, 1946, and published in the Federal Register of December 25, 1946, had been in force on and after the effective date of the sections of such Act of 1938 providing for minimum wages and overtime compensation.

It should be noted that under the above provision the protection to the employer under the foregoing provisions for acts or omissions up to December 26, 1946, will exist even though hereafter the regulation of December, 1946, is held invalid.

DEFINITIONS

Section 13 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains definitions of the terms "employer", "employee", "wage", and "State". It also contains an official short title of the Walsh-Healey Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

SEPARABILITY

Section 14 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains the usual separability clause.

SHORT TITLE

Section 15 of the bill as agreed to in conference provides that the bill may be cited as the "Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947".

AMENDMENT TO TITLE OF BILL

The conference agreement amends the title of the bill so as to read: "An Act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes."

EARL C. MICHENER,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], the author of this bill.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every person connected with this conference will agree that we had a full and a free conference. I shall explain very briefly what is in the conference report, comparing it as far as possible with the provisions of the original House bill.

The first part of the bill has to do with existing portal-to-portal claims which you will recall are defined as causes of action or claims seeking pay for activities which activities at the time they were performed were not compensable, either by custom or practice in the place of employment, or by contract between the employer and the employee or his representative.

The bill as it comes from the conference bans all existing claims of such character.

It provides that the courts have no jurisdiction to entertain suits or enter any judgment whatever in this type of case. That is substantially the same as the original House provision.

There is also another provision relating to existing portal-to-portal claims and causes of action which prohibits the assignment of those claims. That differs from the House bill in this respect: The House bill had a provision prohibiting the assignment of any claims of any kind or character under the three acts in question, which you will recall are the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act. There is also a provision in this bill which allows the settlement and compromise of all claims under these three acts in existence at the time the law becomes effective. They may be settled if there is a bona fide dispute between the employer and the employee as to the amount involved, subject to this provision, that no compromise may be based on less than the minimum provided under the Fair Labor Standards Act. That is the substance of the bill as it pertains to existing portal-to-portal claims.

The next part of the bill has to do with future portal-to-portal claims. Understand, I am talking about provisions having to do with causes of action arising in the future, which causes of action are based on activities not compensable at the time either by contract or custom. There the provision in this bill follows the Senate bill. The House bill made no distinction in treatment between existing and future portal-to-portal claims.

This bill divides them up and provides that, one, riding, walking, and traveling to the place of employment where the principal activity takes place and walking and traveling away from the place of the principal activity, or, two, preliminary activities to the principal activity and activities postliminary to the principal activities; as to those activities at the beginning and end of the day prior to the whistle, you might say, and subsequent to the whistle, the same treatment is given as was given to existing portal-to-portal claims. As to the main part of the working day, as to the principal activity for which any particular employee is employed, this law does not operate. I am not sure I made that too clear, but if you will examine the statement, you will find there a clear explanation of it. So much for the portal-to-portal part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, both the House bill and Senate bill had certain provisions relating to all suits or claims or causes of action under these three acts in question. This bill has similar provisions. For example, there is a statute of limitations provided. The House bill, it will be recalled, provided a 1-year statute of limitations. In other words, every cause of action must be sued upon within 1 year after the cause of action accrued. Under this bill all causes of action arising in the future, and by that I mean after the effective date of the act, must be brought within 2 years after the cause of action accrues. As to causes of action accruing prior to the effective date of the act, action must be brought either within 2 years or within the applicable State statute, whichever is shorter. That provision became necessary when the statute of limitations was raised from 1 year to 2 years in order to protect certain States that now have a 1-year statute of limitations. Any cause of action that has accrued prior to the effective date of this act may be brought within 120 days after the act becomes effective, subject, however, to the provision that any cause of action barred by any State statute, whatever the length of it may be, is not revived. That action remains barred. Another very important feature of both the House and Senate bills is the so-called good-faith provision and that in modified form is contained in this conference report. There again the treatment is not the same for claims which are in existence, causes of action which had arisen prior to the effective date of the act and causes of action arising thereafter. As to causes of action which are in existence when the act goes into effect, we have adopted in substance the House bill which is this: In any suit under these acts—I am not talking now about the portal-to-portal suits—the employer may plead and prove that the act or the omission about which complaint is made was in reliance on a rule or regulation or enforcement policy or practice of any agency of the Government and if he does so plead and prove that to the satisfaction of the court it is a complete defense of the suit. That was, of course, the House provision. One difference between that and the provision relating to future suits is that the rulings and regulations and approvals that can be relied upon in the future must be in writing. Another difference is that the rulings and the regulations that can be relied upon must be rules and regulations out of certain specific agencies, to wit, the particular agency that is enforcing that particular law. In other words, as to the wage-and-hour law it must be a ruling or enforcement policy of the Wage and Hour Administrator. As to the Walsh-Healey Act, it must be a ruling or policy of the Secretary of Labor, or that official of the Government utilized by him to enforce it. In regard to the Bacon-Davis Act it must be a ruling, regulation, or policy of the Secretary of Labor. Now, we have in this bill a provision which was not in the House bill, which was made necessary because of the peculiar situation that arose under the area-of-production rulings.

I believe this provision will afford almost complete protection to the small processors who have in recent years been in a tremendous state of confusion about the rulings and about the decisions of the Supreme Court in that regard. You will recall that in the Fair Labor Standards Act is provided that first processors in the area of production as defined by the Administrator should be exempt; that is to say, there would be no exemption unless there was a ruling defining what the area of production was. Following the passage of that act the Administrator made a ruling and many processors began, of course, to comply with it. That got into litigation and the Administrator made a second ruling and some, of course, complied with that. Eventually the first regulation made by the Administrator went to the Supreme Court, and in 1944 the Supreme Court held that the regulation made by the Administrator was beyond his authority to make. It was, in substance, an invalid regulation. Of course, up to that point any person who had relied on the ruling would be protected under the good-faith clause in the bill about which I have already spoken. But the Supreme Court did a rather unusual thing in that case. They sent the bill back to the trial court with instructions to retain jurisdiction and directed the Administrator to make a new regulation defining what the exemption would be. That was in June 1944. The Administrator did not make any ruling, did not declare who was exempt until December of 1946, leaving a 2-year period in there when no one knew exactly what the situation was so far as the first processor in the area of production was. This provision provides, in substance that any person who was relying upon a ruling in existence at that time is protected regardless of whether or not that ruling was later on held invalid.

In 1946 the Administrator in making his ruling purported to make it retroactive, going back to the beginning of the act, and this bill also provides that any person who at any time came under that ruling, that retroactive ruling, the one which is now in effect, would also be protected.

Now, we had a provision in the original bill having to do with liquidated damages. Under the wage-and-hour law as it is presently being enforced, if the Court holds that an employer has not complied with the law, has not paid the minimum wages or the statutory overtime, it is mandatory on the Court to impose judgment for the amount of wages and overtime due, plus an additional amount for liquidated damages, and he has no discretion whatsoever even though the violation was not in bad faith. This bill provides that if the Court finds, in substance, that the violation was not in bad faith, that the employer had reasonable grounds to believe that his conduct was not in violation of the law, then in that case the Court has discretion to impose any amount of liquidated damages or none; any amount up to the maximum in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There are other features of the bill but those are the main features.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It was not entirely clear to me on the portal-to-portal pay what was done with the future handling of those claims that immediately precede the moment of employment, not the walking and the riding, but the preliminaries to start work. What position did the committee of conference make of that type of claim?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That type of portal-to-portal claim is barred. In existing claims, the entire thing is barred, even though the so-called portal-to-portal claim may arise in the middle of the day, during the hours for which the man is employed. In future claims riding or walking or travel to the principal place of employment is barred, and barred with it are preliminary activities and postliminary activities.

Mr. PACE. Even though it involves the laying out of work the man is going to undertake in the next few minutes, the laying out of garments to work on, that claim would be barred?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. It is barred unless there was an agreement or custom to pay for it.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think that should be handled through collective bargaining?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. The whole thought is that those claims are all barred, I mean as to existing claims as to activities for which the employer has not agreed to pay.

Mr. PACE. I understand that, but I mean in the future; it is barred in the future unless there is an agreement between the employer and the employee?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. An agreement or custom.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any conference report—at least, there have not been many presented to this House for consideration—has received the care that was given this legislation. For what seemed like endless hours, we attempted in plain language to set forth what the House felt should be done when it passed the portal-to-portal bill and compromised the ideas of the Senate with our version. We had assisting us Messrs. Beaman and Craft, of our legislative service, Mr. Rice, of the Senate legislative service, and other experts we called in from time to time in order to endeavor to write in plain English the full intent of Congress so that there could not be another misinterpretation of that intent. If this report does not state the very clear ideas of the two bodies, then I do not think it is possible to state them in the English language.

In the first place, we endeavored to look to the objections raised in both bodies to the original legislation, and where there was any valid reason for modifying the language we endeavored to do that, always having in mind the reasons for the three acts and being careful not to do violence to them. In the latter respect I am certain we have been successful. In the House the principal objection to the bill was as to the good-faith provision. It was charged that with the House provision in the law everybody who was proceeded against would be able to dig up some sort of a regulation or ruling suggested by anybody even in the lower echelons of the Labor Department and set that ruling up as a defense. Of course, during the war there were a great many rulings made by people who were not connected with the Wage and Hour Division, but certainly during those trying times when a contractor was endeavoring to follow out the instructions of his Government, if he received instructions from somebody in a position of authority, then if those instructions resulted in his violating the law that man should have a defense. So we decided to treat this question of good faith in two ways, one, as to existing claims, and two, as to future claims.

As to existing claims it was decided that where an employer in good faith acted on the ruling of any official, apparently acting within the scope of his authority that employer could set up the instructions thus received as a defense, and incidentally an affirmative defense, and if he could prove it then he was relieved from liability. That was the method in which the House treated both types of claims. However, the Senate had a different provision. In order to reconcile the views, we decided the thing to do with respect to all future claims was to provide the defense of good faith, provided the employer acted on a decision or ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator, knowing full well that henceforth both employers and employees will be on notice that there is only one kind of ruling they can rely on without being liable for a violation of the law.

The second matter in controversy was that of the statute of limitations. I felt there should be a 3-year statute. The House approved a bill with a 1-year period in it. The Senate bill provided for 2 years. But this compromise, as worked out, provides a 2-year statute for all future claims. As to existing claims, the statute of the State or 2 years, whichever is the shorter, applied and that claims can only be filed within 120 days, and that 120-day period does not have the effect of extending the statute of limitations.

There are certain provisions of the report which I believe require further explanation and clarification. The first relates to section 2 (c). As indicated in our statement, the purpose of section 2 (c) is to prevent the construction of subsection (a) relieving employers from liability for minimum wages which they now have and to make it clear that time worked includes only that time spent in activities which are compensable under subsection (a). However, neither section 2 (c) nor section 2 (a) is intended to create additional overtime liability in cases where employers now make special payments or allowances for certain specified activities of their employees which are not included in time worked, according to the contract or custom or practice.

I have in mind payments or allowances at straight time, or in stipulated amounts, for clothes changing or washing up, or other so-called fringe awards, directed or approved by the National War Labor Board.

The second point relates to the provision of section 3 (a) permitting compromises if there is a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable. It should be understood that the intent here is to permit compromises where there is a bona fide dispute as to the amount payable based upon an issue of law, not only where the dispute is based upon issues of fact. In other words the intent is to permit a compromise where the dispute as to amount due arises out of issues of law, such as coverage or exemptions, as well as issues of fact, such as the wage rate or hours worked.

The third point relates to the key words in section 4 (a) namely, principal activity or activities. It is intended that these words shall be interpreted with due regard to generally established compensation practices in the particular industry and trade. The intent is that consideration must be given to such prevailing compensation practices in determining what constitutes, or when any particular employee begins or ends, his principal activity or activities. In other words, the realities of industrial life, not arbitrary standards, are intended to be applied in defining the term "principal activity or activities." In this way we will avoid having another portal-to-portal situation in the future.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman remembers the cases known as the stand-by cases which were brought out before his committee in which certain employees might be called upon at some time not during their regular working time to perform some duty and that many suits for wages have been instituted under that type of claim. Is that provided for in the present bill?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; we feel that under the language of section 2 (b) of

this bill that type of arrangement is covered and that the employer is not liable.

Mr. HINSHAW. The case I had in mind was one where there were certain persons who were left to guard electrical distribution stations where they were given a house and so forth and perhaps performed one or two labors per day and yet were paid on a monthly basis. Large suits were brought for time and a half for an additional 8 hours per day pursuant to the ruling of the court.

Mr. WALTER. We hope that we have met that situation and all of the situations that have been brought to our attention, because we had in mind that all of these portal-to-portal suits are in the nature of windfalls. None of the plaintiffs—and I say that advisedly—ever felt they were entitled to compensation for activities which are the basis of these suits. I think I should add to what I said about the defense of good faith. The defense of good faith is intended to apply only where an employer innocently and to his detriment, followed the law as it was laid down to him by governmental agencies, without notice that such interpretations were claimed to be erroneous or invalid. It is not intended that this defense shall apply where an employer had knowledge of conflicting rules and chose to act in accordance with the one most favorable to him. I say that because there must have been literally thousands of instructions sent by the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission and other governmental officials to employers having Government contracts during the war, that were never issued or confirmed in the usual way, but the employer felt that the person giving those instructions was in a position to speak with authority, and in those classes of cases we hope this measure will provide a defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], one of the conferees.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay tribute to the industry of my colleagues who served as your conferees. And I include our diligent and faithful legislative counsel. I marvel at the patience that busy men were able to show, as evidenced in this conference, to spend long hours over a period of several weeks, oftentimes beginning at an hour in the morning before Members customarily start work in their own offices, and with an occasional evening session. I question very much whether any board of conferees ever worked harder, longer, or more conscientiously in an endeavor to bring out a report which would be understandable and as simple as possible, covering a subject which is highly technical and highly involved.

Mr. Speaker, some constituents of mine in the laundry and linen-supply business have expressed concern relative to a particular passage of the statement of the managers on the part of the House—House Report No. 326. The passage I refer to is that set forth at page 16 of the conference report, which purports to explain the circumstances under which employers will be relieved from liability in employee suits where they have relied in good faith on the practices or enforcement policies of a Federal agency.

Mr. Speaker, the situation which the laundries and linen-supply companies in the country find themselves is a most unusual one—one which I feel is entitled to be recognized as being within the scope and intent of the reliance-in-good-faith provisions of this bill. The Wage and Hour Administrator, under date of November 25, 1943—Wage-Hour Release A-2—issued an administrative statement on wage-hour enforcement policy for laundries and linen-supply companies, in which he announced that unless the United States Supreme Court should later decide that the section 13 (a) (2) exemption of the act was inapplicable, he would continue the policy of not instituting enforcement proceedings under the Wages and Hours Act against laundries and linen-supply firms. Apparently the court decisions of the time held laundries and linen-supply companies to be exempt from the law as service establishments, and the administrative policy was prompted by these decisions which, of course, the laundry owners also relied on.

Furthermore, but a year before, the Wage and Hour Administrator in an exchange of correspondence with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page A963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 89—had stated:

> I am very much inclined to the view that all laundries, regardless of whether they do so-called commercial work or not, were intended by the Congress to be exempt, as you definitely state, and regardless of the outcome of the litigation I am inclined at the present time to think that our interpretation should be revised in this regard.

There are other circumstances relating to the laundries' situation which I will not take the time of the House to go into at this time. Certainly, however, the matters to which I have referred would seem to me to provide an ample basis for considering, that sections 9 and 10 of this bill—H. R. 2157—provide a defense to laundry and linen-supply employers against employee suits. Their reliance on the various expressions of the Administrator respecting the nonapplicability of the act to them and his policy of not enforcing the act as to them should provide a legal defense against potentially ruinous liabilities in employees suits. It is my understanding—and I believe it is concurred in by the conferees—it is my understanding of the intent of these provisions that such a defense against employee suits would be provided laundries and linen supply companies.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress a long time and I have never known a more prolonged, yet diligent, conference on any legislation where there was disagreement between the two Houses. For hours and days and weeks, the conferees have constantly sought to bring back to their respective bodies legislation which the conferees could conscientiously recommend. I was just asked by a new Member how conferees proceed and just what they do. Well, it is like this:

In the instant case the House passed the Gwynne bill, H. R. 2157, and sent it to the Senate. This was not done until there had been extensive hearings in committee and adequate debate and amendment on the floor of the House. When the bill reached the Senate, it was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee where careful consideration was given. Thereupon the Senate committee struck out everything after the enacting clause in the House bill and added a new bill in the form of a substitute. The Senate passed this substitute bill.

When the conferees met they had the House bill without amendment and the Senate bill without amendment before them. Under conference rules it was the duty of the conferees to compose the differences between the two bills. After trial and error extending over many meetings, some of the language in the House bill and some of the language in the Senate bill, with new and clarifying language added, resulted in a new bill. The new bill does not suit any one of the conferees in every minute detail. For instance, I favored, and the House favored, a 1-year statute of limitations. The Senate favored 2 years and, in the give and take process necessary to accomplish legislation, this bill contains the 2-year provision. In other words, the House eventually conceded that point. On the other hand, the Senate conceded other points to the House. By this process the new bill, which is now before the House and which is embodied in toto in the conference report was agreed to. Under the rules of the conference the House acts first on this report. If the House accepts the report, then it accepts as a substitute for the Gwynne bill, which the House passed, the new bill as composed by the conferees, and as found in the conference report which is before us. That is all that is before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of the conferees which has been read to the House is a detailed explanation of the conference bill. It is lengthy, it is complicated, and, at first blush, seems hypertechnical. It has been a real job on the part of the best draftsmen from the legislative services in the House and in the Senate to express in understandable language the policy and the intent of the Congress which finds expression in this conference bill. On the whole, they have done a good job. Personally, I never believe in using 10 words where 2 words will answer the purpose. The House bill as it went to the Senate was much shorter and to me was preferable. However, the Senate bill was preferred by the Senate, and in yielding we were simply making the legislative process work. While I have a personal feeling that the same objective might have been accomplished by using many less words, yet this is possibly a case where in numbers there is safety. I hope so. The explanation of this compromise bill made in this debate by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], all members of the Judiciary Com-

mittee and the conference committee, will be most helpful in arriving at the intent of the Congress. In fact, their statements are brief when compared with the prepared statement of the conferees, and are most clarifying.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who desires to speak in opposition to this conference bill, and I predict that it will be accepted by the House by as large a proportionate vote as the Gwynne bill received when it passed the House. There has been some newspaper conjecture as to whether or not the President will sign the bill if it reaches the White House. Surely, the vast majority of the people of the country are not in sympathy with the $6,000,000,000 windfall suits started by claimants, most at least of whom never suspicioned that they had any claim coming for portal-to-portal pay until an unfortunate decision of a district court was rendered. This bill protects the legitimate claims under the three acts referred to in the bill. It is not harsh, confiscatory, or arbitrary. It is equitable and will do much to stabilize the chaotic conditions now prevailing because of these technical portal-to-portal suits. I cannot believe that under all the circumstances the President will veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, as a members of the Labor Committee I have been interested in the good-faith section of this portal-to-portal bill. In several cases which were discussed on the floor of the House it appears that there were conflicting rulings as to employers' obligations.

Is an employer in good faith when knowing of two conflicting rulings he claims to have relied on one of them? The answer must be that having notice of conflict, he cannot be said to have relied in good faith when he picks one of the rulings on which to rely and, particularly, it seems to me, under the language of the bill, when he relies on the ruling that is most favorable to his, the employer's interest.

Can an employer avail himself of the good-faith defense when knowing of two conflicting rulings, he has secured indemnification against the probability that the courts will hold invalid the ruling in accordance with which he is acting?

Under these circumstances, reliance in good faith does not exist, and the good-faith defense is not intended to be made available in such situation.

When there are conflicting rules and interpretations by different Government officials, that is exactly the type of case which must be settled in the courts, and Congress should not and does not intend under this bill to attempt to interfere with final court decision on such questions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although not one of the conferees, I know a good deal about their arduous toil and conscientious endeavor. This House owes them a great debt of gratitude for the prodigious effort and the exceedingly high quality of their performance. It is naturally a sense of gratification to me that they have seen fit to adopt two of the provisions for which I contended when the bill was before us: first, a 2-year statute of limitations rather than 1 year, as to future suits, and, second, the tightening up of the "good faith" provisions so as to insure that this measure will not weaken the Wages and Hours Act.

Mr. DEVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. On this question of good faith, does the gentleman remember the situation regarding which evidence was given before the subcommittee of which he was a member, with reference to the employer in my district who had acted pursuant to two different administrative rulings and the action which is pending by a large number of employees to recover sums which they claim are due under the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I remember the case to which the gentleman refers, and my view would be this, with reference to that.

When this bill was up for its original consideration, I made some remarks as to the good-faith defense. As a member of the subcommittee which drafted the original bill, I do not believe that such defense is intended to apply where an employer had notice of conflicting rulings, but only where he innocently in good faith followed and relied upon a ruling believing it to be valid.

These cases were discussed when the bill was up for consideration on the floor in February where an employee working for the Government on cost-plus war contracts secured indemnification from the Government against the possibility that a ruling would be declared invalid by the courts. In such cases, under the language of the bill, I am sure there could be no good-faith defense because the employer apparently did not rely in good faith upon the ruling but went to the contracting officials and secured a guaranty that he would not lose by following certain rulings.

Where an employer has notice of the invalidity of a ruling or where he has notice of conflicting rulings of different departments of the Government the good-faith defense cannot be invoked.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota to submit a consent request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Walter Lippmann on the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 173, noes 27.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-six Members are present, a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday all of title I had been disposed of and the first section of title II was read. Title II is now open for amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 10, line 3, strike out all beginning with line 3 down to and including line 13.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the objectionable feature of the language which I am seeking to strike out is the following:

At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists—

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], chairman of the committee, has stated that the purpose of this language is to make political control of rents, for which title II of the pending bill provides, constitutional. I submit that this provision is in itself unconstitutional.

I hope the Congress has not reached a point in its thinking where it presumes to set itself above the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that is what this provision does. It appears to be an outright attempt, perhaps made inadvertently, to override or set aside the Constitution by usurpation.

The matter dealt with in title II of the pending bill does not remotely involve a situation that can on true moral and legal grounds be construed a national emergency warranting the setting aside of the Constitution. I trust the House adopts my amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would do just the opposite of what he states. If the amendment is adopted without a

declaration of policy providing that an emergency exists, it is very, very doubtful whether any of the controls in title II could be enforced. I do not think there is any question or there should not be any question in anyone's mind that the reason for continuing any of these controls in title II is that an emergency does exist and will continue to exist until we have met the demand for rental units. We have got to be realistic about this situation, and this Congress cannot, by fiat, change a situation which actually exists.

Now, I do not think that anyone in this Committee would seriously contend that there are adequate dwelling units in the United States, and anyone who thinks, therefore, that knows that there are not enough dwelling units in the United States to house our people, I might say would be intellectually dishonest in voting to the contrary.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Assuming that there is a shortage of rental units, is it not a rather far-fetched position for the Congress to take that because there is a shortage in the country of one commodity that there is such an emergency existing that warrants us to go beyond what we could do under the Constitution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. We only deal with one situation.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We only deal with the situation that there is a shortage of housing units, and for that reason we recognize the necessity of continuing some of these controls.

Mr. RIZLEY. But following the gentleman's philosophy, there is probably never a time in the history of the country that there is not a shortage in some one commodity; therefore, following that idea further, we will always have an emergency in the country, because there will always be a shortage in some one commodity. Is that not the philosophy that the gentleman is adopting now?

Mr WOLCOTT. There is nothing to compel the Congress to act because there is an emergency, but if the Congress does act, and acts constitutionally, then you must find a reason for your actions, and the reason for your actions in respect to rent controls, or the controls contained in title II, is, to be realistic about it, that an emergency exists. So why not say so?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, is it not, to put it in another way, a fair statement to say that the only person who would vote for this amendment would be one who wanted to take all controls off on the 30th day of June?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That would be the effect of the amendment, for the reason that it is very doubtful whether the controls under this law could be enforced after June 30.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think I understood the gentleman to say that the committee had under consideration a bill which would give the veterans a priority in the purchase of permanent Government property. I introduced a bill for that purpose last year. They have not been given a priority in the purchase of Government property thus far. Am I correct that the committee has it under consideration at the present time, or something of the kind?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is a subject being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee at the present time which has to do with the disposition of what we call the Lanham permanents. I think when that study is completed, and if we report out legislation, it will be quite satisfactory to the gentlewoman, because I believe the committee will provide that the veterans will be given preference on the purchase of Lanham permanent projects.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the committee, in order to continue rent controls in peacetime had to find that an emergency existed, and the distinguished chairman of the committee very frankly admits that in order to circumvent established law and the Constitution it is necessary to declare an emergency. By the same token we can keep an emergency in the country always. That is the very thing the New Deal has been successful in doing for about 16 years. Rental houses this year, something else next year, on, on, and on the emergency continues and we keep a program of planned economy. I cannot go along with such a program. And what else does this bill do Mr. Chairman? They set up some other categories. For instance, they say to people who may have been keeping their properties out of rental, That is, if you did not have your property rented between February 1, 1945, and February 1, 1947, you are not under rent control. You can charge as much as the traffic will stand. Nowhere in this bill except by indirection is any attempt made doing equity toward the honest landlords, who have had their property rented and who depend on rents for their income.

Nearly every other industry in the country has had a raise in prices, but this committee says to those folks who have had their houses rented over all this period, "No, we are not going to permit you to raise the rent at all." But if I sat back, if I was smart and did not rent my property, I can come in now and get the current rental prices of today.

What kind of business is this we are doing here today? Do you think the American people expect this Congress to keep on with this sort of class legislation, and that is all it amounts to under this bill? If this is not class legislation, I have never seen a bill brought before this Congress that was class legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. According to a poll made as late as February of this year, nearly 2,000,000 units in this country are away from rent control or have been withdrawn, and they will not come back under rental until rent control is lifted.

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the House does not pass this bill, this rent-control fiasco will end on the 30th of June of this year?

Mr. RIZLEY. On June 30. But they have a bill here that says that if we pass it, rent control will end on December 31, unless the President finds that there is another emergency at that time and it ought to be continued until March. What kind of legislating is that?

Mr. RANKIN. If we go ahead and perpetuate this measure on the American people, I do not want ever to hear another Member of Congress talk about the President creating a crisis or emergency, or finding one.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, we are passing the buck as Members of Congress to the President of the United States. We say we do not want to legislate beyond December 31, but it is all right for the President to legislate beyond that time. I did not run on that kind of a ticket last fall. I told my people I was against Executive directives and decrees having the force and effect of law. This is our responsibility. We ought to have the courage to accept it. We ought to either definitely control or decontrol. We ought to stand for something. Why should we follow this un-American philosophy of planned economy for another 6 months? Last year a Democratic Congress fixed the expiration date for rent control as June 1947.

I have the highest regard for the members of this committee and the chairman of the committee, but I just do not understand this sort of philosophy. The gentleman says, "Yes; but we have to face an emergency." If you follow that philosophy, you will have an emergency in this country from now on. It may not be in rents, but there may be an emergency tomorrow where we may have a shortage of wheat or cattle or sheep or something else, and then all that would have to be done would be to come in and put that item under control because we have an emergency in that particular thing. That is not my understanding of the philosophy that this Government is founded upon.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If you act on the advice of these bureaucrats, they will perpetuate themselves just as they have in the case of the Indian Bureau that you are all complaining about.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is exactly right. Bureau control; I believe the American people were trying to get rid of that sort of thing when they voted on November 5.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the committee which considered this bill. I resent to some extent the fact that those of us who would vote in favor of this amendment might be

charged by our distinguished colleague and chairman with intellectual dishonesty. I could not with intellectual honesty vote for the bill if it contains the declaration that is embodied in this section.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman recognize that an emergency does exist in housing?

Mr. BANTA. Will the gentleman permit me to finish?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman recognize that an emergency does exist in housing?

Mr. BANTA. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, the gentleman would not be intellectually dishonest if he voted for this amendment. But if the gentleman recognizes that an emergency does exist and then voted for it, then he would be intellectually dishonest.

Mr. BANTA. You may argue that point, but I reserve the right to determine whether I am intellectually honest or not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But I claim that you are.

Mr. BANTA. I should like to finish.

This bill declares that there is a national emergency and that Congress recognizes it. I tried with all the diligence at my command in cross-examining the witnesses to require the bureau representatives who appeared before us and who stated that there was an emergency to tell us how many unoccupied houses there are in this Nation now, and not one of them would or could tell us. Our own chairman declared before the Committee on Rules only the other day that we were unable to find out how many thousands of housing units there are in this country today which are wholly unoccupied.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Did they tell you how many were occupied by one or two or three persons that could contain five or six persons?

Mr. BANTA. No; they would not tell us that. I have had some experience in analyzing testimony and determining when a case is made. There was no testimony before the committee on which anybody could base a fair conclusion that there is a national emergency.

There are less houses in this Nation than the people want, but that is a different thing. There has always been fewer houses than the people want. To want is wholesome; it stimulates ambition. But this Congress sholud not declare a national emergency to exist simply because there are fewer houses than the people want.

There is not a word of testimony in this record on which to base the conclusion that there is now a national emergency, and for that reason I support this amendment. I say there is no evidence that anybody can point to in this record to justify a contrary conclusion

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. How is one who is opposed to rent control going to vote for this bill? Is this bill one that will simply extend rent control?

Mr. BANTA. This bill will extend rent control. As far as the Congress is concerned it will extend it until December 31, 1947, and then throw it into the lap of the President and let him extend it, and this Congress next year will have the same cry from the same bureau representatives, that the same old emergency still exists, because all the people in the Nation do not have the kind of houses, and as many of them as they want at the price they want to pay for them. We will never get rid of controls if we continue this same kind of program that this bill will continue.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. It is not clearly a decontrol bill, then?

Mr. BANTA. Not at all. Moreover, there is another declaration in this section which the amendment strikes at that is not a fair statement. There is nothing in the record to justify it. That is, that it is for the prevention of inflation. There are three basic things which the people of the Nation use and must have, namely, food, clothing, and shelter. If shelter may be had at a price which represents a less proportion of their income, than is normally used for shelter, and a disproportionate part of their income is freed to spend in the honky-tonks, in the places of recreation, and in the taprooms that some of the gentlemen on the other side have said the builders will construct if we decontrol materials, then you will contribute to inflation rather than prevent it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BANTA] has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to speak another 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In order that the record may be clear, do I understand that the reason the gentleman favors this amendment is because he believes that all rent controls should be off on the 30th of June?

Mr. BANTA. I believe they should be off now. I think the American people thought so last November.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman will agree that those who differ with him should vote against this amendment? Is that not a fact?

Mr. BANTA. Those who differ with me as to whether or not we should have rent controls may do just as I shall do. They may vote the way they please. But those who think that they can justify a vote for rent control on the theory that there is any evidence of a national emergency in the housing of this Nation, are simply whistling in the graveyard. There is not any evidence of a national emergency.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman will agree that to vote for this amendment will very likely kill this entire measure?

Mr. BANTA. Very good. I hope it will.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman not agree with me that there was no evidence offered in the committee to indicate a stringency in the housing situation being solved? We did have evidence that a lot of rental units were going off the market but we did not have evidence that individual rental units were coming on the market to take up the stringency after that?

Mr. BANTA. We had no evidence. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct. But there was evidence that controls have prevented construction and kept houses off the rental market. You can take the record on all fours and interpret it in the way in which such a record should be interpreted and you will find that there is no evidence of anything resulting from rent-control experience to which this Nation is subjected, which should encourage this Congress to continue the program or any part of it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Rent control is operating to automatically accentuate the stringency in rental housing?

Mr. BANTA. It certainly is.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. It was suggested a while ago by the gentleman from Oklahoma that he would like to see the Republican Party take a position about this rent control and stand by it. I wish to ask the gentleman now if the majority of the Republican Members of Congress did not take a position in the last general election against rent control and against all other controls, and if that was not the principal plank upon which they were elected?

Mr. BANTA. The gentleman knows as well as I what all Members of Congress did, each spoke for himself; but aside from all party politics, Mr. Chairman, and aside from every other consideration, the people in Democratic families and the Democratic voters are as much affected by anything which represents an injustice to the American people as those who are members of the Republican Party.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BANTA. I yield.

Mr. REDDEN. Permit me to say that I took the position that the OPA, including rent controls and all other controls under it ought to be abolished, and I am not offended at the vote I got in the election by reason of it.

Mr. BANTA. That is a very fine contribution and I hope the gentleman votes just the way he talks.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the chairman of our committee does not deserve the scolding that some of the Members are giving him. I share the feeling that I suppose most of you have that this bill is far from perfect and that there must be some apologies made for it. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and others have said, it is the result of compromise; but there is one question we ought to keep in mind, and the gentleman from Ohio in this motion to strike out important language in the bill has raised it, and that is the existence of an emergency.

We cannot go home and tell our people honestly that no emergency exists. An emergency does exist. We ought to face it fairly and fearlessly and then legislate as best we can in the light of the existence of an emergency.

We might as well strike out the enacting clause as adopt the amendment now pending. We cannot afford to do that. We ought to recognize that the pouring of millions of dollars of appropriations into temporary housing for veterans is an effort to meet an emergency, and, as pointed out, we will have on the floor shortly a bill for an additional $40,000,000 to complete housing authorized under the Lanham Act. If no emergency exists, we cannot justify these actions.

I know you are aware of the plight of thousands of veterans. Their interests are identified with the interests of the whole population. We are not trying to designate for special recognition a group that is deserving, to do something for them just because they are deserving; we are simply trying to meet a situation in which the interests of the veterans are identified with the whole population. Whether an emergency exists in your particular district or not, surely you will agree that in many congested areas of America an emergency does exist, and it is because unless controlled it will affect the whole of the Nation that we are obliged to adopt something today to hold down the terrific costs of owning or renting a piece of property.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that wherever no emergency exists locally this bill is broad enough to provide for local decontrols?

Mr. HAYS. It is.

Mr. MONRONEY. So we only need these emergency powers where an emergency exists.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman knows from the record and the testimony before the committee that last summer when controls were removed for a short period of time that there were thousands upon thousands upon thousands of eviction notices for that brief period of 10 or 15 days.

Mr. HAYS. And we will be deluged with the same thing if we make the fatal mistake of leaving the country with no controls whatever.

Mr. Chairman there are not 48 States in the Union in the old sense, there are only 46 States, and the population of 2 States "on the road." This population is in certain congested areas of America as the result of the war effort and various other influences of recent years. We must be fair to all sections and all groups.

Mr. Chairman, I have time to read only one sentence from a statement of one of the fairest and best informed witnesses who appeared before our committee, Mr. William E. Russell, representing mortgageholders and property owners in New York City. He made the following statement:

> We do not know the conditions in other parts of the country, but in a great metropolis like New York I may say to you, gentlemen of the committee, that we fear for the consequences to the industry, as well as to the tenants, if we were to eliminate controls until there have been enough homes built to permit the tenant to operate in a free market, where he has a choice. And he has no choice today.

This is the man who pled with us to provide some relief for landlords but at the same time said that we must above everything else recognize the continuation of this emergency.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Were there any witnesses at all representing the real-estate interests themselves who testified to the effect that all controls should be removed on rentals?

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to have that pointed out. I do not remember any witnesses who appeared before our committee representing the real-estate interests—if I am wrong I want to be corrected—urging the lifting of all controls. As one who has been as critical of some of the practices of OPA with reference to rent control as any member of the majority, as one who has smarted under it and been bitterly resentful in wanting to correct them, I insist that we cannot afford to go home and say there is no emergency in the housing situation in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, another one of those emergencies. Every time we get a bill on the floor of the House and some of us start to show what is in it, there is an emergency. We must finish debate—we must pass it tonight. I came down here in 1935 and went on a committee and began to read bills. I began to vote "no." Members would ask me, "How can you make up your mind so quickly?" That was easy. Every bill had in it a statement at the very beginning: "Whenever the President deems an emergency imminent," followed by a blank check for power and money. Well, somebody in the New Deal administration deemed an emergency to be imminent all the time. Someone always has an emergency. And the New Dealers used one emergency after another as a highway into more and more power.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] asked what kind of business this is, meaning monkey business, I presume. I will tell you what it is. It is "me, too"; it is New Deal under Republican leadership—first in foreign policy, now on the home front. For 10 or 12 years we followed the New Deal theory, we followed along with the philosophy that you could take away from the people who have and give it to the people who have not and everything would be lovely. But along came November last, we had an election, and the home folks said they had had enough and I supposed that the people meant they did not want any more of that kind of government. Then the Republicans came down here, and lo and behold, both here and in the other body, they turn up with the same old doctrine, the same old policy; that is, if you can catch anybody who has worked and saved, who wants to create a business and employment and meet a pay roll, if you can get hold of that fellow take it away from him and give his savings and his profits, if he has any, to someone who has a vote.

Mr. Chairman, I am thinking about the fellow who is ready to give a job to somebody and create a pay roll, not somebody who wants to increase building costs and thereby deprive everybody of building and owning a home at a decent cost. Everything is up, but the landlord who saves his money, and the old lady who lives with him, who have a home and who want to rent it and get a little income, under this bill have at times to rent it for less than the total of the taxes, insurance, and repairs. I do not believe in that kind of a doctrine and, in my opinion, if the Republicans go on with this New Deal policy—the Presidential aspirants call it bipartisan statesmanship—until 1948 they will find themselves out in the cold, because the people have twice said, once to Mr. Willkie and once to Mr. Dewey, you might better let the experts do the job than a lot of amateurs—though I might add that some Republican politicians have had enough practice recently to take them out of the amateur class.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to use these minutes to expound an idea that I have had for some time; and I notice it has been discussed to some extent in the Senate. If it is found necessary to continue these rent controls, I wonder why the committee did not give serious thought and consideration to the matter of turning this over to the several States when the States indicate they are willing to handle the problem and to assume this responsibility? In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter dealing with real estate, and if there is anything fundamental in the operation of our Government, it has been the thought that the National Gov-

ernment should not fool with real estate, should not fool with landed titles and things of that sort. Now, handling rents is not like handling a matter of autos and trailers moving from one State to another. It is local. It is a local problem, local in origin and local in the handling. A good many States already have statutes which will cover such a situation in the event the Federal Government gives up rent control. Some of them, you might say, do not want to assume the responsibility, but I dare say that the State authorities, if they feel like a serious problem is presented to them, will assume their responsibility and handle such matter if it is put up to them in a proper light. I am keenly disappointed that there is nothing in this bill which would permit a State, where it desires or is willing to assume the responsibility, to do so. Many States have legislatures in session now or will have them meet soon, and if they are willing and able to pass the necessary enabling legislation, why not give them a chance if they sincerely believe that such an emergency exists, and controls should continue?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The main difference between Stalin and Hitler was that Stalin took over all the property, and Hitler just took over the control of the property.

Mr. BROOKS. There is entirely too great a tendency, Mr. Chairman, to bring everything to Washington, and I am one who believes, that where a State has such a problem and can and is willing and able to handle such a problem, it should be given an opportunity to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think you will recognize that most of the Members who have spoken in favor of this amendment are in favor of taking all controls off rent on June 30 of this year. I think perhaps we should have this issue crystallized I am glad that they have spoken as they did because, of course, we recognize this problem. We recognized the problem in the committee. I think we were realistic about it in the committee but I do not think there is any justification in any fair-minded person's mind for the contention that there is not a shortage of homes at the present time, and if there is then there is an obligation on the part of this Congress recognizing it, to do something about it.

Now, we have here what we consider a pretty well-balanced bill. If there is not a shortage of houses, then the committee was all wrong in its approach in the matter, but recognizing that there is a shortage of houses, houses for owner occupancy and tenant occupancy, we have done I think, a splendid job in balancing off this situation.

We do not create any new emergency, but we are realistic in finding that the emergency which was created because of the war continues with us and will continue with us until we get enough rental units to lick it. It is not any emergency that we create here under the language of this bill. The emergency was created because of a great endeavor to disseminate American principles throughout the world. If these debates here today mean anything to me and if they mean anything to you, they mean that this is the republican form of government in action, that we are going to prevent thousands and thousands of evictions in this country come June 30. Any of you Members who want to take the responsibility for the untold number of evictions which will result from not continuing some kind of control beyond June 30, are at liberty to kill them and take the responsibility. Speaking for myself, and I hope that I reflect the attitude of a majority of the Members and my party, I am trying to do everything I possibly can to get rid of these controls just as quickly as we possibly safely can with as little shock as possible to our economy, recognizing the necessity for stabilizing this economy of ours, because, and I think I have noted it on several previous occasions, the economies of over 40 countries, the currencies of over 40 countries are tied to the American dollar and the American economy. We have to stabilize them just as quickly as we can. The only way we can do it is through production. Now, in this transition period, we have to continue certain of these controls to prevent hardships and suffering. You have a choice here between continuing some suffering and possibly a lot of suffering. I will take my choice on the side of a little suffering on the part of a relatively few people, rather than to make all of the people of the United States, and yes, perhaps the world, suffer because of the economic and financial dislocations which will result from the chaos here in America if we do not do the job and do it sensibly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 44, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WORLEY: On page 9, line 19, strike out all of title II, "Maximum Rents."

Mr. WORLEY. The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to allow rent control to expire on June 30, 1947. If this amendment is adopted it will permit the owner of a house to have it back in his full and free possession. He will be relieved of Government regulation and regimentation which has always been so obnoxious to our system of free enterprise, or, as some call it, the American way of life.

Hardly a day passes but what I receive letters from veterans who, despite all Government efforts to help them financially, say they simply cannot afford to pay the high price to buy a house but who want a place to rent. You can look in the classified section of almost any newspaper in a rent-controlled area and find house after house for sale but none for rent.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a communication from a man in Detroit who has 75 houses. If rent control is off, he will rent the 75 houses, and he says he will not rent them as long as rent control remains.

Mr. WORLEY. The gentleman's statement is additional evidence that continued control of rents is keeping hundreds of thousands of units off of the market and is working a hardship on thousands who cannot buy under present inflated prices but who can and do want to rent.

During the war, as everyone knows, I supported strict price controls because I knew we had to do it in order to try to prevent inflation and to keep the cost of the war as low as possible. Since then, however, controls on practically everything else in our economy have been removed and it seems unfair for the Government to continue regimentation of a small group of people. It would not be fair for Congress to freeze wages at 1942 levels, as rents are now frozen, and turn everything else loose. It would not be fair to freeze the price of meat or farm products at 1942 levels and turn wages and farm machinery prices loose. And it does not seem fair or democratic to continue to control rents when the cost of labor, building materials, paint, taxes, and practically everything else has gone to unprecedented heights. You cannot control one phase of our economy without controlling all, unless you would do serious inequity and injustice.

Further it seems to me the policy of continued controls now advocated by the Republicans is entirely contrary to their position last fall when they promised the people of this country an immediate return to a government freed of restrictions, red tape, and continued regimentation.

I doubt that this amendment will be adopted, and if it is not then I hope we can later amend the bill to permit the States themselves to determine whether they desire to continue these controls.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I will gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give us who want to speak for this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes after the gentleman from Louisiana has concluded. Counting the gentleman now

standing, that will be divided between about 10 Members.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the able chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency needs no defense on this floor. I have disagreed with him. I disagree with him on some of the provisions of this bill, but if there ever was a fair chairman, a man who permitted all sides to be heard, it is the chairman of this Committee on Banking and Currency the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] I do not agree with many provisions in this bill. I stated my position quite frankly on yesterday, but in the hearings before the committee, which continued for about a month, if I remember correctly, every segment of the economy of this country was heard and it was heard at great length. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] pointed out a few minutes ago, to my recollection and to his recollection, there was not a single responsible representative of the home owners, home builders, and real-estate agents who came before our committee and asked that rent controls be removed completely on June 30 of this year.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Not at this moment.

Now, why was that? Because all of those men who are in the real-estate business, who handle property every day, who know more about the business than any of us can know, because they work with it and make their livelihood out of it, know that if we arbitrarily remove controls on June 30 of this year we would have a situation which would be akin to chaos in the home markets throughout our country. I have the very highest regard and respect for my good friend from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]. He talked about the largest city in his district having a population of 70,000. Possibly the condition that he outlined in a town of 70,000 may be quite different in a city of the size of Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, or Houston, or the other great industrial and commercial areas throughout this great Nation of ours. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] talked about the fact that as he turned to the want-ad section of the newspapers he found very few units for rent, but that he found a great abundance of houses for sale. What accounts for that? Everyone knows that the market on old homes throughout this country is inflated and practically everyone who owns his own home and who wants to sell it knows that it is a temporary condition, that the market is going down, and that if he wants to get a high price for his home he had better get it now because as the building program gets under way these houses that are worth ten, twelve, or fourteen thousand dollars but selling for twenty-five or thirty thousand are going to be selling again for their normal value of ten or twelve thousand. That is why we find so many homes for sale and so few for rent.

Last summer we had a time in this country of 10, or 15, or 25 days when we did not have rent controls, and in every metropolitan center in America I believe without exception the eviction notices flooded the courts, and tenants and landlords were in those courts in a number heretofore unknown in the history of those courts. I have talked to the judges of those courts and they have told me quite frankly that one of the greatest calamities that could occur at this moment would be the lifting of all rent controls.

I voted for and I intend to vote today for a 10-percent across-the-board increase. I think it is fair, but what is proposed by this amendment would be a calamity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten Members have indicated a desire to be heard on this amendment. The Chair will recognize each Member for 2 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I am a firm believer in local self-government and that each locality is best able to solve its own problems. Rent control may be necessary in some of our congested areas. However, the State and local authorities are the ones to decide this and are the ones to take steps to meet it. They are closer to the problem. They know the situation and circumstances prevailing. They can, by appealing to their people, secure wholehearted cooperation in any fair plan adopted by them. Furthermore, those affected do not resent regulations imposed upon them by their own State and municipal authorities who understand their situation as much as they resent being told what to do and what not to do by some bureaucrat in Washington.

Have we not had enough bureaucratic control? We have only to look at the record of the OPA to be convinced that regimentation, regulation, and control creates scarcity. In my opinion, the housing problem will not be solved until we abolish rent control, because many owners of rental property and many people who have space in their homes that they would, under ordinary circumstances, be glad to share in order to relieve the housing shortage, refuse to rent because, by so doing, they must submit to the unreasonable rules and regulations imposed upon them by the Federal bureaucrats.

My home town, St. Joseph, Mo., has many spacious houses that could be divided up into attractive apartments with very little alteration, but the owners refuse to do this as long as Federal rent control continues. Let me quote from one of many letters I have received:

> I know a building contractor who, with his wife, occupies an eight-room house. The upper story is vacant. He tells me he can put in a kitchen sink, do the work himself, and put in a family, but he will not do this as long as there is a vestige of regimentation left in Washington. That is the story. There are plenty of houses here in St. Joseph now to take care of everyone here, but the housing problem will never be solved from Washington. It never has been and never will be. The citizens of St. Joseph will solve it if Congress will give them the green light.

I quote from another letter:

> I know three elderly ladies occupying three houses—total 21 rooms. All have previously rented rooms. None of them will do so now. They say they will not rent and be stuck for 6 months to a year to get an unsatisfactory tenant out.

These are not isolated cases. There are hundreds of such cases in St. Joseph. I have been informed that in this city of 80,000 population there are now 235 vacant homes—vacant because the owners refuse to rent them during rent control.

In further proof of my contention that we will not be able to solve the housing shortage until we abolish rent control, I would like to quote an editorial that appeared in the St. Joseph Gazette of February 10 this year. It reads as follows:

> If anything were needed to show the complete inadequacy and futility of Government control over rentals it has been demonstrated in St. Joseph by the failure of the campaign to convert existing large structures—of which there are many here—into multiple dwelling units for war veterans.
>
> The city's emergency housing committee, the War Dads organization, contractors, and supply dealers made a concerted effort to see if a number of the existing buildings, including many sizable old homes, could not be remodeled into small apartments to relieve the current housing shortage. Facilities for conversion were available, but rents that could be charged were not sufficient, under the Federal ceiling restrictions, to encourage property owners to invest their capital in the projects. No one is going to put money into a venture that is foredoomed to be a losing one.
>
> Thus a St. Joseph chapter has been added to the volume of a governmental failure to provide promised housing to the men who fought the war.

This is not a condition peculiar to St. Joseph alone. It is true in every metropolitan center in these United States, and it will continue to exist until we get rid of this un-American program.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to point out to the House that at least two

speakers have said that no responsible witness appeared to oppose continuation of rent control. I quote from page 566 of the hearings, the testimony of Mr. Harry Hansen, of Des Moines, who represented some 20 or 25 different real estate groups. He said:

I am attempting to show that an extension of rent control would be unwise and unnecessary.

I do not know offhand how many witnesses opposed rent control extension, but there were others. There has been a lot of confusion because of the claim of no opposition which should be cleaned up.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted rent control will terminate June 30 of this year. It should have been abolished long ago. To have done so would have solved the housing shortage, so let us now adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, strike title II from this bill and be done with rent control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have heard several speakers say that the Republican Party pledged itself to do away with rent control. I do not believe that to be so. Some of you may have done so. I did not. I told my people that we must continue controls in my district for a short time. I favor local control. I would like to get controls down to the very lowest level. Let me say that my district started at the beginning of this war with 245,000 people and ended up with some 500,000 people, more than half of whom were brought there by the Government for war jobs. The war may be over, but where are we going to put these additional 250,000 people when we have built only a few houses in the meantime?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that if rent control went off on the 30th day of June there would be complete chaos in the gentleman's district?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I do not know what would happen. I believe we should have hundreds of people out on the street.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy that the gentleman has gotten up and said what he has because that is exactly what I stated in my campaign. I am for free enterprise, but I never said I would oppose a Government control if it became absolutely essential in order to prevent a chaotic economic condition in this country.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Rent control, at least to a certain degree, is essential in my district for some few months to come.

I heard it said a few minutes ago that this is a question of a little suffering as opposed to a lot of suffering. As between the two, I stand for the little suffering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the last session of Congress I voted to unshackle the American people by stopping OPA in its tracks, just as did a lot of you ladies and gentlemen here on this floor today. I promised the people that I was going to do everything in my power to give America back to the people and that is sufficient reason for my opposition to the continuance of rent controls. I know that a good share of the veterans of this country are opposed to this kind of stuff; they did not win the war to lose their liberties. They want the shackles taken off of private industry; I know and you know that until we do take the shackles off the property owners and as long as we have this threat of Government control hanging over their heads, confusion and homes for rent will become worse and worse and less and less. How in heaven's name do you expect these people to go ahead with a fair rental program while they live in fear that maybe next year Congress will impose more controls. So I say, take the shackles off and relieve these people. We have long ago released our prisoners of war. Why not give this segment of good Americans their freedom, I ask you in all sincerity, by letting rent control die a natural death on June 30 next?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

RENT CONTROL UNDER H. R. 3203

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, in my district, which is a metropolitan district, rent control has not provided housing for veterans and others. There are two things that we ought to have as objectives in legislation of this type. One is to provide more rental properties and homes for sale at reasonable prices, and the other is to deal fairly with the people who have their funds invested in this type of property. We are accomplishing neither. During the Seventy-ninth Congress I voted for the legislation and the large subsidies that were intended to help solve this problem. They have not solved it, and, in my judgment, the bill that is before us will not do so. It is a travesty on the people who own property, trying to rent it at a fair rental. They cannot rent it and obtain a sufficient amount to maintain the properties, pay the taxes, and get anything on their investment. Now, that is un-American. It should not be allowed. On the other hand, it is preventing veterans from securing homes.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. Would it not be far more desirable, if we had to have rent control, to have the several States administer it?

Mr. ANGELL. Absolutely. If we are going to have control over one segment of our industry or our economy, let us have it over others and not restrict it to any one single segment and give the others free rein. Under this legislation, you are allowing new houses to go sky high, no limit. You are allowing houses not rented for 2 years to go sky high, but these people who have been honest and decent with their property and have rented it under OPA rules are frozen at what they were in 1942. You have a heel on their necks, and you are going to keep it there under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in common with all of our colleagues in the House, I am deeply interested in maintaining rents throughout the Nation on a reasonable basis so that veterans, as well as all low- or moderate-income families, may be able to secure housing accommodations within their means. Equally desirable is the maintenance of housing construction on a basis that will provide residential properties for these same classes of our citizens at a price which is not only within their means, but which is based on fair values for the properties obtained. Unfortunately under rent control these objectives have not been secured.

Construction of moderately priced homes has been stymied and the grandiose program enacted by the Congress, with heavy appropriation for subsidies, has failed to break the deadlock and provide home for veterans and others. Government controls have prevented construction of these low-cost houses instead of helping it. The rigid controls under rent control have prevented veterans from finding roofs for their families at prices they could afford. Under this new program, rent administrators will permit rental prices for newly constructed homes, or unrented homes, to soar sky high and, at the same time, they will hold down rentals at starvation levels for small family units owned by widows, retired school teachers and other property owners who are dependent on the income derived from these small properties for a livelihood—this inconsistency exists even where the two properties may be side by side in the same block. The Rent Administrator has refused to give any consideration to protests or efforts to remedy this injustice.

In the Portland area costs of operating residential properties has practically doubled, and many items have more than doubled. A recent survey in Portland shows the following increases in the cost of operation:

Fuel oil, price on March 1, 1942, $1.27 per barrel; price on April 1, 1947, $2.20 per barrel, an increase of approximately 80 percent.

Other costs which are necessary to keep a building in operating condition have risen as follows since March 1, 1942:

	Percent
Oil-burner repairs	80
Refrigeration repairs	80
Roofing repairs	80
Plumbing repairs	100
Paper and paperhanging	150
Recovering davenports	100
Cleaning apartments	100
Garbage collection	80
Boiler and firebox repairs	190
Paint	50
Carpets	60
Rebuilding mattresses	120

All other incidental expenses such as janitor supplies, brushes, garbage cans, electrical and plumbing fixtures have all risen.

As I have said, the rent administrators have turned a deaf ear to the protests and requests of owners of property to permit them to charge a fair rental so that they may be able to save their investment. Owing to these hardship conditions, owners of these properties have been unable to keep up repairs such as painting, redecoration, roofing, and other necessary corrective care which is necessary to prevent obsolescence and destruction of property, thus rendering it unfit for occupancy. This does not mean, however, that the funds which would have been spent for repairs was saved, as has been contended by OPA. It means that the evil day is only put off, and when controls are lifted the owners, if they are to preserve their properties from complete destruction, must make not only all the repairs which have been allowed to go by the board from month to month and year to year, but must make them at a considerably increased cost, due entirely to the fact that they were not made when first needed.

In the city of Portland there is a large number of residential facilities which would be available for veterans and others at moderate prices if rent control would permit them to be used for that purpose. OPA has consistently refused to place a rental price on these properties which would permit the owners to rent them without suffering a loss, and as a result they have not been rented. Furthermore, thousands of apartment units in the Portland area are occupied by one tenant, but are suitable for four to five tenants. However, OPA has refused to permit the owners to charge any substantial increase by reason of the increased number of tenants. Anyone familiar with the rental of properties knows that the owner is subjected to much greater expense in furnishing facilities for five persons instead of one, and in many cases he supplies laundry and laundry facilities, water, gas, light, heat, garage, and other services provided in apartment properties.

I call your attention to an instance which came to my personal attention when I was home during the last recess. A modern, five-room apartment was completely refurnished with new furniture, redecorated and repainted throughout, at a cost of some $3,000 to the landlord. The OPA, however, refused to permit an increase of more than $2.50 a month for these additional facilities in an apartment suitable for five tenants. As a result the apartment was rented to one lone tenant.

The Secretary of the Oregon Apartment House Association of Portland, whom I have known for a long time and whose word can be depended upon, some time ago advised me that in the Portland area rental units now available could house in excess of 20 percent more people if taken out of rent control and with a comparatively small increase in rental. He stated that a five-room apartment, now renting to one person for $40, could easily be rented to a family of three for $50, but under OPA regulations this cannot be done. He asks the question, and I quote from his letter:

Why should rental property alone be held to 1941 prices in these days of inflation, with the dollar at about 60 cents, labor prices more than doubled, and most commodities increased at least 40 percent?

An outcry is made if the Negro, the Catholic, any class of foreign-born citizen is discriminated against. Why, then, discriminate against the most patriotic citizens—the property owners—who on many crises were the sole remaining bulwark and support of our country and its institutions? Why discriminate against property?

OPA was justified by the courts, only as a war measure; but the war is now over. Housing control was justified on security of abode for war workers. There are no war workers now. Furthermore, there are 1,800 idle apartments in Portland alone, formerly used by war workers, so all necessitous cases can be now housed. All reasons now fail.

But housing shortage anywhere can be immediately alleviated 20 percent by granting fair charges for increased occupancy. For the good of those seeking housing, as well as OPA employees and the country generally, OPA should be discontinued.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said I want to do everything possible to protect veterans in their right to obtain homes at reasonable rents. Under date of April 29, 1947, I received a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in which he suggests certain amendments with reference to this legislation. The letter is as follows:

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Re H. R. 3203.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, representing some 2,000,000 overseas veterans of World War II, I should like to present our position with respect to H. R. 3203.

There are several amendments that should be made to H. R. 3203 in order to protect veterans and to provide the housing promised them under the Government housing program.

1. Authority to allocate a few basic raw materials, such as pig iron, shop-grade lumber, and steel, should be continued; otherwise we may lose a large volume of veterans' housing construction.

2. The Veterans Emergency Housing Act, passed last May, provided a program of guaranteed market contracts to induce companies to manufacture houses or new types of building materials. Many producers relied on these provisions continuing in force to the end of this year. What they will produce is important to veterans' housing, particularly in building houses at lower costs. Companies who have already filed applications are entitled to have the Government act on those applications and to make contracts, if the companies meet conditions set up in the law.

3. It isn't enough to just limit recreation-type construction. Any nonessential or deferrable construction should be postponed, so that it will not take materials from veterans' housing.

We are heartily in accord with the proposed Sundstrom amendment to title I (p. 3, line 9, sec. 4), which would amend title VI of the National Housing Act and place manufacturers of factory-built homes on the same FHA financing level as builders of conventional-type homes.

Under title II (sec. 204 (b), p. 13, line 21), the second proviso would, in our opinion, permit landlords to force prospective tenants to sign leases at a 15-percent increase, in order to occupy vacant housing units. We suggest that this proviso be carefully analyzed before passage of the bill. On the following page, we have listed suggested amendments to the bill H. R. 3203 for your consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3203

1. Under title I, section 1 (a), end of line 5, on page 2, add: "*Provided further*, That the powers conferred by said sections shall continue in force and effect to permit continued allocation and priorities for pig iron, shop-grade lumber for millwork, steel, and for bottleneck items needed by public-service utilities and producers of housing and materials."

2. Under title I, section 1 (a), end of line 5, on page 2, add: "*Provided further*, That the powers conferred by said section shall continue in force and effect to enable action upon applications for guaranteed-market contracts filed prior to February 1, 1947, and to enter into guaranteed market contracts with such applicants when the necessary conditions for their approval are found to exist."

3. Under title I, section 1 (b) should be amended by adding the following words: "or any nonessential or deferrable nonresidential building or facilities, including tourist or residential construction not suitable for year-round occupancy."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to give consideration to these suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, the objective we are seeking is to take a course of action that will, as far as possible, provide housing both for rental and purchase by veterans and other moderate-income citizens at levels within their financial limitations. This is not possible under the existing controls of OPA. The Seventy-ninth Congress passed a number of laws and provided large appropriations in an attempt to bring relief in the housing emergency, but to no avail. Whatever action we take should be with the objective, first, to protect the rights of our people in need of homes for themselves and families. We should not, however, overlook the fact that our citizens who have invested their money in properties for residential purposes are entitled to the same consideration as any other group of citizens. The great percentage of these owners are people of small means—in many cases their only income is from the rental of these small units. They have been frozen at prewar prices which, in most instances, were distressed prices based on depression conditions, and now the income is wholly insufficient to maintain the properties and provide any return to the owners on their investments. There is no reason, in my judgment, why these owners should be singled out in a class by themselves, to have the return on their investments frozen, whereas every other segment of our national economy has been given substantial increases in income ranging from 25 to 75 percent over prewar income. There seems little doubt that the present bill we are considering will not provide rea-

sonably priced housing for veterans and others, and it will still keep the heavy hand of war controls on owners of rental residential properties. It is not a solution of either horn of the dilemma. Under it owners of newly constructed properties and unrented units of 2 years standing have the right to rent at any price they like, but the thousands of others who have maintained their properties through the prewar depression, through the war and now through the postwar period at starvation prices, are given no relief.

Mr. Chairman, a veteran who buys a new home at present prices which are 50 to 100 percent above prewar values is buying a gold brick. Five, ten or fifteen years from now in all likelihood its value will have shrunk to prewar values and the veteran will have lost all moneys invested therein. Many of these homes are poorly constructed, much of the material therein is of inferior quality and the houses rapidly deteriorate.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is also objectionable for another reason in that the Congress surrenders its power to legislate to the President. We are passing the buck to the President.

The Congress should face its duty itself, pass legislation as provided by the Constitution. Let us not delegate any more of our constitutional duties.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will work a great injustice on veterans and other renters as well as upon the landlords.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes under the latest national emergency is not very much, but I am here to express exactly the same thought I expressed yesterday—not rent control or noncontrol, but the more basic issue as to whether we are going to live under the terms of our Constitution or whether we are going to abridge the fundamental rights set forth in that great document.

Now, this legislation and any legislation which mitigates against one section of the public is class legislation, and the moment we open the door to class legislation we open it up to legislation against Catholics, Protestants, Jews, or any other group, creed, or color. The door is open.

Due process of law is assured under our Constitution. This legislation and any legislation like it does not accord this due process of law. It is not due process to confiscate property by legislation, when you make it impossible for the man who owns that property to maintain it. That is not due process of law.

Go out here, gentlemen, and look at the painting on the staircase wall which pictures the signing of the Constitution. I say they were signing a great Magna Carta of personal freedom under law. They were not signing a mandate for confiscation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote on this. I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from California who just left the floor, the Constitution also says that citizens shall have the right to be secure in their property. I want to shed a few tears, real tears, and a few synthetic tears, for the tenant who cannot find a home, except at what he considers excessive rent. Then I want to shed a few more tears for the veteran who last week wrote me a letter, for the woman who is a widow who also wrote me a letter last week—maybe I can put them in the RECORD so you can be sure to have them; they both owned property which each wanted to rent, but neither could rent—one was in South Bend, Ind., and the other in Niles—neither could rent the property to a tenant whose wages were double what they had been prior to the war, and keep up the taxes, insurance, and repairs—when forced to accept the rent fixed by the Federal agency.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, feels more sorrow for the tenant or for the veteran who had the house for rent, or for the widow But to me it certainly is repugnant to think that the old man and the old woman who worked and saved and bought a home—maybe the husband died, maybe the widow is there alone, she has the old home, there are more rooms in it than she can use and she wants to rent some of them, and she would like to get enough rent so that she can pay the taxes and pay for the repairs that are absolutely necessary, keep the roof from leaking, if you please. She would like to rent for enough for all that; but no, the Government says—because the Congressman says—"You cannot do that, even though the man who is in the apartment with his family is receiving twice the wage he received a few months before." No, even though the old Constitution says you shall be secure in your property, Congress now declares you must bear a part of the tenants' rent. To me that is unjust.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it has been my habit never to say anything when silence would do as well, but strange things have happened, when the claim is made that there is not a need for housing in the United States of America. I remember just a little bit differently from the statement made by some of my friends. One man who was excited, and I thought was so intense about things that concerned him personally, made the statement that there was no housing shortage in this country. Every person in the room was astonished at such a statement. Men who were in the real-estate business, men who were representing rental agencies, men who were home builders—every one of them testified to that committee that there is yet a serious shortage of houses and that if you take the rent ceilings off in this country you will have a state of chaos.

What is it for? To keep the man of small income from being turned out in the street by the bidding of somebody financially able to turn him out into the road. I am standing by this committee on this proposition.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. With thousands of such people in this country today, does the gentleman need any long figures to prove to him that there is a serious emergency existing in this country?

Mr. FOLGER. Not at all. We are going upon the testimony, and every bit of it, except in that one instance, was to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think all of the arguments which were made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] apply equally to this amendment. As I understand it, this amendment has a similar if not identical, purpose and likewise should be defeated.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WORLEY: On page 9, line 19, strike out all of title II, "Maximum Rents."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr WORLEY) there were—ayes 60, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this motion will simply mean that this crazy rent-control program will end on June 30. You talk about democracy; you talk about constitutional government. The only difference between communism and fascism between Stalin and Hitler, when it came to taking the property of the people of Russia and Germany, was that the Communists took over all the property in Russia, and Hitler took over control of all the property in Germany.

I am surprised to hear men get up here and talk about the house owners as a little minority. Who constitutes this little minority? They are the sound patriotic people back in your districts who are trying to own their own homes and who want to control their own property. I have heard them get up and talk about

veterans. I have been the author of more legislation for the benefit of veterans in the last 16 years than any other man who has served in the Congress of the United States. This thing is injuring the veterans. If you will go back to your districts, you will find that the majority of them want to get rid of it and get back to constitutional government and get rid of these regimentations.

If this bill is passed, in my opinion, you will have the same trouble next year and the next year and the next year. If you were back home and owned a house, you would not want to rent it to anybody, for the simple reason that the moment you did you would get the hands of this bureaucracy on it and you would never know where you were from that time forward. You will have more houses for rent and more rooms for rent and more apartments for rent if you adopt this motion and kill this measure and let this rent control die on June 30.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that in those congested areas where they might need some control the local authorities would be best able to cope with that?

Mr. RANKIN. Let the local authorities do it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Let the States do it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] talks about his own State. I cannot think of any way the State legislature can regiment the people of New York any more than they have regimented them under that crazy FEPC law that they have up there. If they can stand for that they can stand for anything the Legislature of the State of New York can put upon them. But in those States and those areas where they want this regimentation, let them have it, but let the States do it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman stated that if he had a house he would not rent it. That is not because he would be afraid of the renter, but because he would be afraid of the bureaucrats.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. I would not want one of these bureaucrats to get his fingers on it. That is exactly what I am talking about. When I say that, I am expressing the views of thousands and thousands of people throughout the United States—hundreds of thousands of them, and probably millions of people, who own property and who have held it back because they do not want the hand of some bureaucrat on that property and have somebody in Washington telling them what to do.

This thing will swell and grow until it will be a worse scandal than the present Indian Bureau. Look how it has grown. Bureaucracy grows on what it feeds on. We have just fought a war against Hitler and against Japan. We were fighting against the very thing that this bill exemplifies; that is, dictatorship; totalitarianism. Who do you think will tell the people of California what to do with their property? Who do you think will tell the people of Michigan or Mississippi or Alabama or Tennessee? It will not be somebody there who knows what they are doing. It will be some long-nosed bureaucrat behind a desk here in Washington.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. On page 245 of the hearings there is recited the testimony of Herbert Q. Nelson, in brief, as follows:

> Altogether the net result of rent control and the drive to create new rental properties has resulted in a loss of approximately 2,000,000 rental units.

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely. It has done more harm than good. Here we are, 2 years after the war has closed, regimenting the property owners, including the veterans who fought the war to end such dictatorship.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think it should be brought out that the gentleman who gave that testimony is executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, does the gentleman think that disqualifies him to testify?

Owning a house ought not be made a crime in this land of the free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that if the gentleman's motion prevails, all of the controls on the allocation of materials, including the payment of subsidies, including guaranteed markets, including directions by the Expediter to all other agencies of the Government in respect to materials—in other words, controls over our entire country will be continued until December 31, 1947.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. If the committee does its duty, it will bring in another bill relieving us of that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The committee has done its duty.

Mr. RANKIN. You are piling one monstrosity on top of another.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The committee has done its duty. In addition to that, I should call attention to the fact that if the motion prevails rent controls will be continued on new properties until June 30, 1947. Of course, the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi should be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is continuation of rent control the consideration that must be paid to get these other controls ended that are no obnoxious?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, I assume the committee has already acted on that, and they have already passed, without deleting it, title I, which has to do with the controls other than rent. The committee in its judgment has already accepted that provision. So the provision before us now is title II, having to do with rent controls. The orderly procedure, of course, would be to take it up and either vote it all up or down. I assume anybody will be given an opportunity to offer amendments to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming there is a shortage of homes and that the rents are exorbitant, how do you justify putting the whole burden of helping the tenants on the property owner, instead of on the taxpayers at large? Why not let the Federal Government pay subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman recommend paying home owners a subsidy to keep rents down?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not the home owners, no. I am asking if you must give the tenants relief, why not let all the taxpayers do it through the payment of subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. What have the taxpayers got to do with rent control?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, what you are proposing to do is to make the home owner make concessions so that the tenants can get cheaper rent. I say that if that is the position, why not let the public do it? Why make a goat out of the home owner?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 56, noes 153.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 202. As used in this title—

(a) The term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

(b) The term "housing accommodations" means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming- or boarding-house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

(c) The term "controlled housing accommodations" means housing accommodations as defined in subsection (b), except that it does not include—

(1) those housing accommodations, in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone, and secretarial, or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service; or

(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively, or any part thereof; or

(3) any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which or the conversion of which from existing residential use into

housing use providing additional housing accommodations, is completed after the date of enactment of this act, except that contracts for the rental of housing accommodations to veterans of World War II and their immediate families, the construction of which was assisted by allocations or priorities under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved May 22, 1946, shall remain in full force and effect, or (B) which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations.

(d) The term "defense-rental area" means any part of any area designated under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, prior to March 1, 1947, as an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations inconsistent with the purposes of such act, in which maximum rents were being regulated under such act on March 1, 1947.

(e) The term "rent" means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the use or occupancy or the transfer of a lease of any housing accommodations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 11, line 10, strike out the semicolon and the word "or"; strike out all of lines 21 to 25 inclusive, and on page 12 strike out all of lines 1 to 10, inclusive

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an effort to prevent authorizing uncontrolled rents for a large segment of property owners, those new builders or people who have not rented their houses for the last 2 years. It is an effort to put all of the people in the rent-control areas on a more equal basis.

We had a good deal of testimony, I am willing to admit, that was given to the committee that by removing all ceilings on rents on new construction and on houses which have not heretofore been rented, that we might bid out an additional supply of housing.

I cannot go along with that line of reasoning.

I think you are going to increase and magnify inequalities within the same rental areas by giving uncontrolled rent ceilings on new houses which will sit next door to or across the street from houses that have been under rent control since 1942. I have, in the past, received a great amount of correspondence from people who have houses to rent complaining against the high-rent prices that have been allowed for new construction.

You are not subjecting people who have new construction for rent to the 1942 ceiling or at rates that are comparable to the 1942 ceilings. Most of the testimony from those connected with the administration of the program was that people who do build new housing, either apartments or single-family dwellings, are satisfied with the higher rent ceilings given them because their costs are a great deal higher.

Mr. Creedon, the Housing Expediter, and Mr. Foley of the FHA stated they have had practically no complaint against the ceilings that have been established on newly constructed houses.

But now under the bill as written, if my amendment is not adopted, you are going to say to these people who build new houses: "Boys, the sky is the limit. You can come in and charge anything that the traffic will bear, not the high ceiling as granted by FHA, but you can use your own judgment and get any rate that you can."

Across the street and down the street 95 percent of the people are under price control who must stay there and take that degree of inequity. I do not think it is fair to the people who have had to put up with the difficulties of rent control to free these others from the act.

There is one other thing I want to call your attention to and that is the Government help in new construction which I think is highly important. Under title VI that is continued in this bill, we give what amounts to 100-percent insurance of investment for any rental project under FHA. Can you imagine any better deal that has ever been given to the constructors of housing than what you are giving them under a hundred percent Government insurance to build housing at this time?

I think we are entitled to expect these builders to live under some kind of a reasonable ceiling. The testimony has been that these ceilings fixed for new construction are reasonable. I do not think it is asking too much, and I think it would be very wise, to strike out the language in the bill that gives this carte blanche exception to anything that has been newly built after the passage of this act.

One other thing I would like to especially stress and that is the complete exception given by this bill for anyone who has held a house off the market for 2 years. If you have been opposed to rent control for 2 years, if you have denied a veteran a chance to find a roof to put over his head for 2 years after he came back from the war, then we are going to reward you with an uncontrolled rent ceiling; you can charge anything you want to charge simply because you have been obstinate enough to take your house off the rental market for the past 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the kind of reward we ought to give the people who have denied the veterans much needed housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear in the bill—I am sure it is not intended—but this 2-year exemption, which means that if your house has not been rented for 2 years you can rent it and not have a ceiling on it might result in this: If a landlord owns two houses, one in which he lives and the other which he rents, he can, if he wishes, get possession of the house he has been renting, then turn around and rent without any price ceiling at all on his own home. I think you are going to upset considerably the status of the tenants who have been living in these houses simply because of this key switching to avoid any ceiling on the house from which the owner has moved.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The 100-percent guaranty under title VI is in my estimation, one of the greatest detriments that this country ever imposed on the veterans, for the very reason that the veteran goes in and says: "I want to build this house, which will cost $8,000." The banker says, "Well, he is a veteran and we have to be good to him." So the veteran builds an $8,000 house. It is the most inflationary thing we have. It is the thing today that is raising the prices of houses away beyond all reason and that is a detriment to the veteran. This week a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is considering a bill in which housing appears. When that bill comes to this floor we will prove to you what title VI has done to the American veteran.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is talking about houses for sale. I am talking about houses that are built for rent, large apartments built by nonveteran contractors for rent to veterans with a hundred percent Government insurance. We now take the ceiling off and tell them they can charge any price for rent they want.

Mr. JENSEN. But the gentleman was talking about title VI.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a little while ago something was said about intellectual honesty. Over the years we have been paying subsidies to milk producers, to farmers on many crops. We have been paying on cotton on meat, on butter—to others—many others.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Tell the House what the difference is between intellectual honesty and any other kind of honesty.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And a moment ago I asked a hypothetical question. I want to ask it again, and it is this: Assuming that there is a shortage of housing; that rents are excessive. Just accept those two statements as facts. There is not enough housing, and the greedy landlord in overcharging. Inasmuch as over the years the Government has subsidized practically—well, first this group and then that group here in America, and spent something like so many billions, I do not know how many, to subsidize the people of other countries, the poor Greeks and the Turks, and a half dozen other peoples, in fact almost everybody everywhere in the world, so we have now this great emergency here in America where the poor folks, some of whom are getting twice what they got before for the same work, still cannot pay the rent without inconveniencing themselves, we

say we must give them homes and apartments at a lower rent—accept all that as true.

Then, my question is this, and I say again to the chairman of the committee—being intellectually honest. I am just returning the compliment—inasmuch as you insist upon giving the tenant cheaper rent or, at least, no higher rent, are you going to make the man who owns the home, the veteran, or the widow—are you going to make that individual come down on the rent or hold it down at a figure which is below actual cost of repairs and taxes? Do you intend to put the whole burden on the home owner instead of on the Nation or the taxpayer? If tenants must be aided, why do you not pay it out of the United States Treasury as you do the subsidy to the milk producer, to the cotton farmer, the wheat farmer, and the people of Europe, Asia, and Africa? What particular thing was in the minds of the committee or of the Members who support this bill that induces them to make the home owner shoulder the whole burden? What grudge have you, I want to know, what grudge have you against the man who owns property?

What grudge have you against the men and the women who worked and saved and denied themselves until they could purchase rentable property? He pays taxes, he supports the Government, and in return the Congress makes him share his property with a class—with tenants. Now, you come along and say, "Oh, well, the tenant cannot afford to pay, so you must stand the loss and make good a part of his rent." Why do you not be fair about this thing; at least, as I see it, why do you not be fair about it and let the Government pay to the tenant whatever is necessary to enable him to obtain a place to live? Give him a subsidy, if you must, but do not load it all on the home owner. Why soak the individual who has been industrious, who has been thrifty? What have you against him?

Now, think that one over tonight, and if you cannot sleep because of something you ate, not because of your vote that you intend to cast which will deprive a man of a part of his property, but because you had too much for dinner; if you cannot sleep, think that one over and tell me sometime privately—I would not want you to tell me publicly—what is the answer to that question—to the question: Why soak the landlord for the benefit of the tenant? Why, if tenants need help, not let the Federal Treasury absorb the cost? It cannot be because there are more tenants than landlords, can it? It cannot be because votes are needed? That cannot be the answer. What is the answer?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled and disturbed by the antics of many Republicans on this bill. I am unable to understand why many who were loud in their cries to get rid of controls last year are today vigorously supporting this mongrel bill.

How so many can change their colors in a year's time, especially in view of the action of the people in the election last November, is unexplainable. A year ago when the question of extending rent control was being considered in this body most Republicans stood shoulder to shoulder and fought legislation offered by the Democrats. We told the people that the war was over and that we were going to end all controls and get rid of the bureaucrats and government by emergency. The people believed us. They said they had had enough.

Today some of the same Members who last year fought continuation of controls are today supporting this mongrel bill. A year ago, at the same time, those Members on the other side of the aisle demanded and voted for continuance of controls. What happened to them last November is well known. Many of them were retired to private life. Now, Mr. Chairman, just because the Democrats were crazy a year ago, why would we be crazy this year?

I have attended many committee meetings since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress during which extensions of this and that control have been considered. I have heard one bureaucrat after another testify that there are still emergencies and that controls must be continued. I am convinced that the testimony I have heard is a part of the New Deal technique to defeat the Republicans in 1948. This is how they are planning. They want the Republicans to fail in their promises to remove controls and they want all controls to continue at least until June 30, 1948. Then they themselves will join the movement to decontrol. They know that there is certain to be a temporary increase in prices following the removal of controls, and they want those increases to prevail just prior to the 1948 election. Then they can blame the Republicans for them.

I say, now is the time to take off controls. Prices will then level off in the next 6 months and government by emergency and fear will be history. Wait until next year to remove controls and you can hold the first Republican caucus of the Eighty-first Congress in a telephone booth.

That prices will level off is shown in the meat situation in the United States today. Since the removal of price controls the price of meat has been steadily leveling off and meat is becoming more and more plentiful. Prices are certain to come down.

Let us defeat this bill before us today I have never seen a worse piece of legislation. No matter how much you amend it, it will still be a bad bill. Let us do away with it. Get rid of those bureaucrats who have proven they are unable to use common sense in administration of controls. Let us give the country back to the people. Take off rent and building controls and we will get houses in America. Controls are the reason we have a housing shortage in the country today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would continue rent controls on newly constructed units, units constructed after the effective date of the act, and those which are made available through conversion. It also would continue controls on properties regardless of whether they had been rented between February 1, 1945, and February 1, 1947. In other words, the effect of the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would be to continue rent control on all units. The purpose of taking rent controls off units completed after the effective date of the act is really the meat of this title. We seek by taking these controls off to encourage production, and through production, which we think will result from the removal of these controls, we hope to get enough rental units so that it will be safe to take controls off all units even before the expiration date of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to propound an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. Did I understand you to say a while ago that if the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to strike out the enacting clause carried, that the Committee on Banking and Currency would not reconvene and pass title I which frees practically all building materials from control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not remember saying anything like that. The gentleman from Mississippi said that we should reconvene and do that, but I did not say whether we would or not. I do not recall that.

We are considering the bill in Committee of the Whole and that is past.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman did not intend to say what certainly some of us understood him to imply.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have not reached that point because the House did not adopt the motion.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish, if I may, to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, but first I would like to make this statement.

I recognize the force of much of what I have heard here on the floor this afternoon. I, too, have learned that many old people and others in my community who have spent their lives getting a little property accumulated now depend upon rentals of such property for a living and they feel they have been unduly hurt because of the situation existing under present rent control. We all know how all costs have gone up to the hurt of landlords. I further understand that some rents have been reduced in the last few months to create additional elements of hardship for them.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, or someone on the committee, what the provisions are in existing law relative to adjustment of inequities, or what provision is in this bill that would take care of hardship cases. Would the gentleman answer both questions, please.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On page 13, line 18, we provide that whoever is designated as the administrative officer shall make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has finished his answer.

Mr. WORLEY. The very fact that you changed the word "may" to "shall" is an admission that the OPA has not worked fairly and equitably, is it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you want me to admit it, I surely shall.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand then from the colloquy that has just taken place that injustices have occurred and that there have been hardship cases that have not been remedied under existing law but that this bill would provide for a remedy? Is that what I am to understand?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that is a very strong declaration that it is the intent of the Congress that any inequities shall be corrected and that the administrator will not be doing his duty as we intend it to be done if he does not correct inequities. The question was asked me the other day as to what might constitute an inequity. I am going to state my own opinion on that. I am not speaking for the committee because the committee does not attempt to define "inequities."

My own thought is that if the landlord is not receiving rent which covers the cost of maintenance, plus a reasonable return on his investment, an inequity exists which should be corrected.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. I recognize that the landlords as a class have necessarily suffered under existing law and I want them to suffer as little as possible in the general welfare. I do not want to remove all controls and thus create chaos and terrible suffering occasioned by all of these hundreds of thousands of evictions which I am sure would follow. Such a condition, I believe, would not only cause suffering but would probably cause disorder.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think this may give us some light on it. Let us take this language which the chairman has just read to us. Go to your own town and select a certain block where there are four or five houses being rented. That block constitutes a rental area. One of your friends has a home on one corner of the block which is rented. I own a house on another corner of the block. Yours may be a 6-room house, well finished, well painted; mine is a 6-room house, run down. I will wager dollars to doughnuts you could not get an adjustment from the standpoint of an inequity, because it would be claimed that my house was worth just as much as yours, and if you wanted an increase in rent I do not think you could get it under this language.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have a feeling that most of the inequity and injustice caused by the operation of the necessary rent control law for the past few critical years has grown out of lack of adequate adjustments in inequities and hardship cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DONDERO. I could not resist yielding to my genial friend.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I listened with interest, and satisfaction, to the statement made by my able friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] that he proposed to offer an amendment allowing an increase in rents of 10 percent, straight across the board. I have an amendment on the desk for a 10-percent increase to small property owners of 10 units or less, exclusive of janitor or manager space. Perhaps I am too modest. If that amendment is defeated, I will vote for the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for a 10-percent increase, straight across the board.

The committee that brought this bill to the House has pleaded guilty that this bill is inequitable and unjust, and they did it by indirection. First, they say that for 1947 small property owners shall have no increase in rent, but for 1948, next year, they are entitled to an increase of 15 percent under the provisions of this bill.

The second way in which they plead guilty to the fact that this bill is inequitable and unjust is that if anybody builds a house in 1947, he can have $60 a month for a five-room house, while his neighbor, with the same space exactly and the same modern conveniences, now under rent control and getting $30 a month, can have no increase. How can you justify such a situation as that?

Somebody has expressed a great fear that if rent control is terminated we would have many evictions in this country. There would not be many evictions if a fair and just rent was established between the property owner and the tenant.

One thing more. What would a 10-percent increase amount to on $30 a month rent? It amounts to $3 per month. It would not absorb the increase in taxes alone. Taxes have increased nearly 40 percent since rent control was established. How can anyone reconcile the present rent level of 1941 when nobody denies that the maintenance of property has increased between 70 and 80 percent since rent control was established?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman does not believe that real-estate taxes have increased 40 percent, does he?

Mr. DONDERO. Very nearly that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I mean real-estate taxes.

Mr. DONDERO. Nearly that much. I have tax receipts presented to me from some areas showing that the increase has been nearly that much.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the gentleman desires to help that class of people which has been discriminated against in this bill, it is entirely correct that this bill does not give any relief to that class of people. That class of people under present law has received an upward increase of only three-hundredths of 1 percent—3,670 out of 16,000,000 renters.

Mr. DONDERO. And there are more than 15,000,000 people in that class.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Now they say they want an amendment in there, they want the word "shall" substituted for the word "may." The word "shall" is no stronger than the word "may" in the hands of an unsympathetic administrator. The word "shall" does not give relief to the class of people under consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. That would not give relief if we depend upon the administration of this act for relief of the small-property owners, because they will get none.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time on this section has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL UNDER EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

SEC. 203. After the effective date of this title, no maximum rents shall be established or maintained under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to any housing accommodations.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the chairman of our committee. He is capable, he is industrious, and he is sincere, but I think in this particular instance the mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse.

I voted with reservations and misgivings and some regret to report this bill.

I voted for it because of the alternatives: Either rent control would be discontinued on June 30 or we would have this bill which would continue it to March 31, 1948. I am not one of those who believes that we can do away with rent control at the present time.

I believe there is an emergency, and the courts place a high regard on the findings of fact in a legislative body and will not go behind them. We have said there is an emergency in this case, and there is. Ten million men have been away. We have had to figh a war. All of our energy and our industry was used in fighting that war and homes were not built. Now these men are coming home. This is the biggest question that can present itself to the American people. "House" does not mean shelter. It means a home; it means comfort and the satisfaction of our citizens. That is the greatest force against subversive activities, because none of them are born in the home. It is the very pillar of our Republic and when the American people have not sufficient homes you weaken the very structure of our Government. It is a great question.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this bill will do what it proposes to do. You do not like regimentation, you do not like control, but the profit system is almost as strong as the desire for self-preservation. Men are going to build things from which they think they will realize the greatest profit. The home is not always the most profitable investment. It is a stable investment and a good investment, but men, particularly in these times when there is plenty of money and great opportunity, will channel their materials into other fields and they will not build homes. That, it seems to me, is obvious.

How can you make under our free institutions a man build any kind of a structure that he does not desire to build? The only way is by the allocation and priority of materials and in consideration of those materials he promises to build a certain character of structure. That is out of this bill. Allocations and priorities are gone. You may say that is regimentation. Well, maybe it is, but it is temporary regimentation for a very meritorious purpose.

Then we come to the question of controlling rents. It has been demonstrated that a weak price-control bill is worse than no price-control bill at all and a weak rent-control bill will be worse than no rent-control bill. If you are going to control prices on rents you must control them adequately and entirely. This bill does not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted a straight across the board increase of rents of 10 percent. Then after long deliberation it revoked that decision and in lieu of that was placed the amendment that gives the landlord, if he can persuade the tenant to agree to it, after the effective date of this act and before March 31 a 15 percent increase in a lease that will expire on or after December 31, 1948. I agree that many landlords are entitled to an increase. It is not a one-way street. I agree there is nothing so fine as justice to be done to the rich and the poor, the weak and the strong. But what is that amendment going to do? The hard landlord is going to say to his tenant: "I want you to agree to an increase of 15 percent. If you do not agree to it, very shortly these controls will be off rents and I am going to give you all the traffic will bear." What is the tenant going to do? The tenant will say: "Why, of course, I will do that." If the tenant does not say that, it is going to create a strained relationship between the landlord and tenant.

Then, as I read the bill, if that first lease expires or is forfeited, the landlord can make any increase he pleases. Now, you cannot shut your eyes to the fact that there is a lack of housing in America, everybody knows it, and when there is that condition a landlord who has no regard for his tenant can impose what conditions he may see fit upon the tenant. But, the good landlord will not do that. So, this is not a bill having to do just between landlord and tenant or to take care of the hardship cases and to help the hardship cases. Many landlords are fine people, but there are some men who get the tenants in their toils in that respect and just give him all they can. Those are some of the things that this act does.

Another thing, instead of taking the responsibility ourselves we pass the buck to our great hard-working and overburdened President and tell him to decide whether or not it should continue after December 31. That is a legislative function and that is a legislative duty that is our responsibility, and I do not think that ought to be in the bill. I think we ought to decide when these controls should cease. I do not think there is any doubt that the same conditions that exist now will exist on March 31, and I am not so much enamored of statistics. I know the conditions that exist. You know the conditions that exist. There is a shortage of housing in America, and every man who has had an opportunity to observe conditions knows that. I do not care what these statistics show or that there may here and there be an increase of housing over the demand. Wherever there is, the controls may be taken off even under this bill. But where those conditions exist these controls ought to continue until normal conditions somewhat return, not only for the benefit of the veteran. The veteran is not a segregated class of the American citizens. The veteran has not an interest different from the rest of the people of America. Prosperity and happiness are shared by all the people and we should be interested in the welfare of all the people, including the veterans. I think that we ought to consider this thing.

I am going to vote to recommit this bill in the hope that a bill may come out of the committee that will serve the purpose we desire to achieve. The proper solution of the housing problem is not only of the greatest importance to our people now, but to future generations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 13, line 2, after line 2 and before line 3, insert:

"On the termination of rent control all records and other data used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a) and all predecessor agencies shall, on request, be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials or any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent-control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Speaking only for myself, may I say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment if I understand it correctly, that the records are turned over to a State upon request of the State, upon the termination of the Federal rent control.

Mr. KEATING. That is right, in those States which still have a rent-control program. This amendment is offered for a twofold purpose: First, in order to have the records covering all properties in their State in the hands of those who may need them for administrative purposes if rent control should continue in a particular State; and also to serve another purpose. If these records are in the hands of the States, it may prevent the Office of Temporary Control or some other agency from coming in and asking us for a couple of million dollars to write a history of what they have been doing. If they do not have the records they cannot engage in that boondoggling operation at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman give the House the number of States that have rent control?

Mr. KEATING. I am not able to do that. I know that my State has, and Minnesota, but I am not familiar with all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT CONTROL UNDER THIS TITLE

SEC. 204. (a) The President shall designate the head of a department or agency of the Government, other than the Office of Price Administration or any other temporary agency, to administer the powers, functions, and duties under this title.

(b) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled hous-

ing accommodations greater than the maximum rent established under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and in effect with respect thereto on the date this title takes effect: *Provided, however*, That the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall, by regulation or order, make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or to further carry out the purposes and provisions of this title: *And provided further*, That in any case in which a tenant and landlord, prior to March 31, 1948, enter into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title and expires on or after December 31, 1948, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within 15 days after the date of execution of such lease, with the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a), the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the tenant and landlord in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 percent over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section; and such maximum rent shall not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this title. No housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established by a lease pursuant to the provisions of this proviso shall be subject, on or after the date such lease takes effect, to any maximum rent established or maintained under other provisions of this section.

(c) The head of the department or agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all maximum rents before this title ceases to be in effect, in any defense-rental area if in his judgment the need for continuing maximum rents in such area is no longer required due to sufficient construction of new housing accommodations or when the demand for rental housing accommodations has been otherwise reasonably met.

(d) The head of the department or agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e) On or before December 15, 1947, the President shall make a determination, and shall declare by Proclamation, whether the controls authorized under this title should or should not be continued beyond December 31, 1947. Such determination, together with the current facts and reasons for such determination, shall be certified to the Congress and copies thereof filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House. If the President determines that the controls authorized under this title should not be continued then such controls shall cease to be in effect on December 31, 1947. If the President determines, and by Proclamation declares, that the controls authorized under this title should be continued beyond December 31, 1947, in order to carry out the policy declared in section 201, then the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect on March 31, 1948.

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of section 204 be dispensed with and that the section be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLETCHER: On page 13, line 22, strike out "prior to March 31, 1948," and insert in the lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1947,"; and on page 15, line 8, after "(e)" strike out the remainder of the subsection and insert in lieu thereof, "The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect on December 31, 1947."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I am convinced that the only final and completely fair way to end rent control is to terminate it as soon as practicable. I have listened to the comments of the other members of the committee with a great deal of interest. I do not want to question their integrity but I do want to say that there were many, many instances where men appeared before our committee and gave testimony to the effect that rent control could very properly be ended right now. I refer to Mr. Carr, of the National Association of Home Builders, Arthur Binns, of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation; George West, of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Herbert Nelson, of the National Realty Board; and a great many others that I can recall.

Of course, there is a shortage in housing, everyone will agree to that, but I do say there is not a national emergency. I have voted for all of these amendments which have been offered which would terminate rent control on June 30, and I shall continue to vote that way.

However, I can see there is a very definite cleavage here. There are some who feel that would be too abrupt. I am inclined to think that possibly there is some wisdom to a short period before which rent control should be terminated. I feel also there are certain provisions in this bill which will give an orderly termination. I refer to an amendment which I had the privilege of offering in committee which makes it possible by voluntary agreement between tenant and landlord that the two parties can agree to a lease which will carry through December 31, 1948, and the lease will be binding on an increase of rents not to exceed 15 percent.

I believe the indications are that a great many tenants and landlords will get together and voluntarily to all intents and purposes decontrol a great many units and that by December 31, 1947, we will have a problem which will be quite simple and there will not be this great clamor for extended controls at that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the amendment which the gentleman offers leaves the responsibility entirely in the Congress and we say in this bill that rent controls shall positively end on December 31, 1947.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And there will be stricken from the bill the language which, as it has been expressed, in passing the buck to the President and lets the President determine whether or not rent control shall run from December 31, 1947, to March 31, 1948.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman puts it squarely up to the Congress and the people by his amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman from Michigan is correct.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ends rent control on December 31, 1947, with only one proviso, and that is the big proviso. I want to call your attention to it if you have not already come upon it. It says where the President by proclamation filed with the House and Senate shows that there is an affirmative need for the extension of rent control, rent control may be extended to March 31, 1948.

Gentlemen, I am unalterably opposed to this Congress giving legislative powers to the President. I feel we must stop passing the buck. We should face this issue squarely. It has been shown that it is not a partisan matter. A great many of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle are ready to vote for the final termination of rent control, but they do feel that possibly June 30 is a little abrupt. Why give the President an opportunity to extend rent control if you want to see it end? You and I know that as of December 31, 1947, there will be an extension of rent control under the plan which we now have in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I merely want to point out to the Committee that we want to get along with this bill. I understand we are going to finish the bill tonight. Of course, I do not object to the gentleman proceeding for three additional minutes, but I think we should have in mind that if we are going to finish tonight we will not be able to take longer than the time provided under the rules of the House, and that hereafter objection should be made to any extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it takes away from the President the discretion of continuing rent control. I am heartily in favor of that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think we ought to pass the buck or pass the legislative responsibility to the President. I think we ought to assume that responsibility, and I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman. It will only become a political football in the 1948 elections. I have a feeling that this Congress has to stand up and be counted and stop passing the buck. I think we have got to have the

courage to set free the property owners of this country. Even if you are against this bill, I say if you want June 30 as the date and you propose to vote against the bill, I believe by all means that in the perfection of the bill we should pass the amendment which will definitely end and terminate rent control as of December 31, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Senate is sending over a message on the deficiency bill, and for that reason I move that the Committee do now rise. I think I should inform the Members that the Committee will resume its sitting immediately after the message is received.

I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 3203, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2849) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) entitled "An act to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3203.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3203, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY to the amendment offered by Mr. FLETCHER: Strike out "December 31, 1947," and insert "March 31, 1948."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute. I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] against the delegation of authority to the President, on his finding alone, to continue rent control.

I think the Republican Party is on solid ground against the designation of this legislative authority to the President in this case. But I want to call attention to the fact that you are going to take grave chances by discontinuing rent control abruptly on December 31 while the Congress is not in session and can do nothing about continuing it, even though they might find need for its continuance. My amendment merely tries to give us enough time after we return to resurvey the situation so that action can be taken by Congress, if needed. But to discontinue it on the 31st of December, when the Congress is not here—the Congress will not return until the 6th of January—and rent control has been dead for 6 or 7 days, you will create a chaotic situation. So I think at this time we should try to avoid that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I agree with the gentleman to this extent—that the Congress should not be passing legislation back to the President of the United States, but the Congress will be in session on June 30 of this year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; it will. That is true.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then, why not let this bill go along until June 30 and see what happens?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to my friend that our past policy of waiting on price control last year until June 30 gave us the highest level of consumer's prices in history.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite odd that when the Clerk was reading the amendment offered by the gentleman from California I thought it was my amendment because it was the same, word for word. I therefore think it is a very important amendment. The reason I believe it is important is because I represent the largest district in the United States, with over a million people. There are more tenants in that district than in any other district in the United States, and I believe I can speak for a district which has a large number of renters. In other words, if there is any head being put on the political block I am placing mine on it right now because I truly believe that if I have to return to Congress because of an injustice to any segment of our population I would rather stay home, for I would not be at ease here at any time during the remainder of my term in Congress. When, however, my constituents write me—and they write by the thousands, I say by the thousands—concerning this matter, so much so that I virtually had to have a form letter printed, thousands of them, I reply promptly giving them my opinion. I sign each letter but in those letters I tell them that I believe that Congress, which was responsible for the condition which now exists, should give the people a reasonable time in which to release themselves from that position, and a reasonable time, of course, would not be 1 month and could not be 2 months; but I tell them that I believe that if we put an end to controls by not later than the end of the year the various States would have an ample opportunity to pass laws to take care of their local situations; and giving them that much advance notice we could not have anyone saying we turned any tenants out in the middle of winter. I would not be in accord with such action. From now until the end of the year every State ought to be able to take care of its local problems. I therefore believe that is the time we should fix as our limit.

With respect to the matter of the President, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that those who believe they are doing something clever politically may be in the same position Goliath was when he went out to meet David. I do not believe I need tell you what happened, but you may find that Goliath is going to meet a David again when you try to place that responsibility on the shoulders of the President. I think it is entirely wrong and I do not believe you should do that. I believe you should place the limit at December 31 and leave it there, without trying to shift your responsibility on the theory that Congress will not be in session.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. At the risk of meeting the gentleman's Goliath, may I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the factual situation in November or December of this year may be such that it would cause less hardship to end these controls at the end of March than at the end of December in the middle of winter?

Mr. OWENS. You are a part of the Goliath of which I spoke. I believe I have just answered your question by saying that the various States will have sufficient time to adjust their local situations. We are the Congress and we should act like a Congress, and stop delegating our legislation prerogatives to others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the section under consideration is 204 (a). It reads:

The President shall designate the head of a department or agency of Government other than the Office of Price Administration or any other temporary agency.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is in evidence on all sides, it seems to be universally admitted, that the OPA, which had control of rent ceilings, was a colossal blunder and a maladministration from start to finish. I do not believe

there was any more obnoxious, unpopular bureau among all our many bad Federal bureaus, and yet Mrs. Roosevelt on April 30, 1946, in her syndicated column entitled "My Day" said:

It has been a long fight to place the economy of our country in the hands of the Government.

She censured all Members of Congress for criticizing Mr. Bowles, then Stabilization Director, and Mr. Porter, then OPA Administrator. She said that unless the people would come to the rescue of those bureaucrats the bureaucrats were likely to be defeated by the Representatives of the people in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much said about changing this to another bureau or another administrator. In other words, just take the group because they are trained in this Gestapo method of administration and put them under some other head. A rose smells just as sweet by whatever name it is called.

I want to suggest to you that everyone admits the administration has been bad, yet all the indications are that we shall have the same group in control, that is, at our level, maybe not at the President's level. We have no confidence in the present group of personnel and the transfer will not help the situation.

The present law and this act is unfair, confiscatory, discriminatory, and is not in any sense an American approach to the problem.

We have no complaints, if you will notice, from towns and cities where they do not have rent control in force. Somebody said, "Well, that is because there is no congestion there." Think for yourselves. There is not a town or a city in the country to speak of where there is no rent control but what the occupancy is at a higher level and at a higher percentage than it is where you do have rent control. We do not have it on the farms and we do not have it in commercial buildings, and in industrial sections.

As the father of four sons and one son-in-law, all veterans of World War II, I think I know how the veteran feels.

I want to call your attention further to the fact that I have made a canvass of the veterans of World War II. I polled the adjutants and the commanders and the service officers of every post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in my district, and they are against this. As an example of the views of many veterans of my district I quote the following letter which I just received from Mr. George J. Overmyer, commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Tulsa Post, No. 577:

OVERMYER-PERRAM GLASS CO.,
Tulsa, Okla., April 28, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
United States House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Why is it that one class of citizen is singled out for one of the worst cases of injustice and discrimination ever to be visited upon any group of citizens of any nation, including totalitarian ones.

I am referring to the continued imposition of rent control on a certain class only; and within a certain class, too. This rent control is the most vicious discrimination ever perpetrated. Only a portion of landlords are subject to rent control. Those whose money is invested in office buildings or commercial buildings (mostly big capitalists or insurance companies by the way), have no restrictions whatever upon their rental property. Other landlords whose residential rental property lies outside certain areas also have no restrictions whatever upon their property.

How do those advocates of rent control figure this can be constitutional when it is so flagrantly discriminatory, not only between landlords and other classes of citizens, but discriminatory as between different classes of landlords themselves? To say it is constitutional is rank hypocrisy. It denies that fundamental right of any American—"equal justice under law."

I notice that the House and Senate committees have both refused to permit or recommend a blanket raise in rents despite the fact that the second round of wage increases is now underway; and despite the fact Congress has seen fit to raise the salaries of Congressmen themselves. Every landlord under rent control has taken a big reduction in his rental income because the rent dollar he is now getting is worth only about 70 cents or less as compared with the dollar at the time he rented his property. Not only that but the situation is worsened because the cost of hiring plumbers is now almost twice what it was when he rented the property, also plasterers, and capenters, and painters. Other maintenance costs have gone up 60 percent.

Those whose life's savings is in residential property in rent control areas are getting the rawest deal ever handed out by any legislative body of any nation. The war is over, so why doesn't Congress please let up on those who sacrificed all during the war financially as compared with other groups, except servicemen? Now our tenants thumb their noses at us when we ask for possession of our property in order to place it in decent condition after their misuse; to try to sell it in order to put the sorely needed funds into a new business. I'm sure you will vote against extension of rent control because I know your aversion of these Government controls; therefore, I hope you will persuade others to vote against its extension.

Yours very truly,
GEORGE J. OVERMYER.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know as we should be so greatly concerned about whether the President does or does not continue rent controls by Executive order beyond December 31. You are delegating to him the authority to terminate rent controls at any time he sees fit by Executive order. Now, we are just meeting a situation which might develop in the dead of next winter. He must make an affirmative finding if he continues rent controls, and must find the necessity for doing so. He must find, make a determination, and issue a proclamation which must be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives giving his reason for finding that it is necessary for rent controls to be continued.

Now, you do not give him carte blanche authority to continue rent controls for an indefinite period of time. We put a limitation on here March 31, 1948. Why do we do that? Is the Congress going to be in session on December 31, 1947? I do not think we will be in session on December 31, 1947. I do have in mind that on December 31 of almost every year it gets mighty cold up here in the North, and people do not like to sit out on sidewalks because they have been evicted from their property. The Congress will not be in session to prevent that condition, and I do not want to take the responsibility for even one mother and a little baby sitting out on a snow bank after the 1st of January because nobody in the Government was given authority to adjust the situation which made it possible. Do you want to take the responsibility for that?

Now, if you want to do the job otherwise, if you have any qualms of conscience about giving the President authority to continue these controls for a matter of 90 days, then you should vote to continue controls until March 31, 1948. From the remarks made here by some Members you would think we were setting up a permanent agency for the permanent control of rents, but have in mind that this is just a temporary arrangement. If it has been other than temporary since 1942, it is because this Congress acted in the matter, and we can act again in the matter in any way we see fit. They say that we have no assurance that the controls will come off on March 31, 1948. Of course, we have no assurance that any of us are going to be here, but we do have assurance that if we are here under the rules of this House we can act to continue them or not just as we please. So, all of this talk about whether we have any assurance or not, whether controls are going to be continued, depends on the action which we ourselves take next year.

Now, I think in the interest of the public welfare we should either continue these controls until March 31 next year or we should give the President the authority to continue them on a finding of fact that it is necessary beyond December 31. That is the only sensible, humane way to act, and I think both of the amendments should be defeated and the bill left as it is as a happy compromise of a very difficult situation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. GWINN, to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. FLETCHER: Page 15, line 8, strike out line 8 and all down to and including line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the words "The controls authorized under this title shall expire October 1, 1947."

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to cure this shortage of space until we begin to move. Our economy requires mobility. We have not

moved for 5 years. The people of this country now are just as anxious to move into other houses that are already built as they were to get rid of OPA in April last year. We Republicans did not take the lead then. We left it to the President, and he took the credit. We have a diamond-studded horseshoe here. The people want to move, not into new houses which they cannot build with the laboristic monopoly, but into some of the 38,000,000 houses we now have.

The people know that there are 800,000 houses surplus now lived in by one person. They know that the wife has died or the husband has died, and the survivor lives on there. Why? He cannot move. The people know, or should know, that we have 10,000,000 houses or living units that are occupied by two persons. That is a surplus of nearly 2,000,000 houses occupied by two persons. This means that the husband and wife, with the children gone to school or married, continue to live in their old houses. So we have a total of 2,800,000 old units available for those in need if we could only move. But we cannot move. The low-income group, the veterans, the young growing families could move into some of these old one- and two-tenant houses. These old tenants will normally move into rented rooms or smaller space. That is how freedom cures our ills. Control worsens every situation.

October 1 is the moving date for most people. We have new jobs but we cannot move. We have new employment in other places but we cannot move from where we are.

The other evil thing that is upon us is the cry from the people, especially the low-income group, saying, "Oh, godstate, you are managing our houses but we cannot move. Then, godstate, build us new houses." Build new houses, with the laboristic prices that are so high that half the families cannot even contemplate building new houses? Even if we have this rent control eliminated as of March 31 we cannot look to new houses for relief. We must look to the adjustments in the spaces we have.

Finally, while it is true that we have a shortage of houses, we have an increase per person of 9 percent in the rooms that we have. Instead of having 1.45 rooms per person, as we had in 1940, we now have 1.58 rooms per person. Let us make people free to adjust the space we have to their needs as a free economy alone can provide. We will move into the places we have as we move into old automobiles, waiting for the prices of the new ones to come down so we can buy them. Let us have the courage of our faith in freedom. The people want it. They are in rebellion against petty Government compulsions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GWINN of New York) there were—ayes 55, noes 114.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLETCHER) there were—ayes 65, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 13, line 21, after word "title", strike out the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 18 on page 14.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this section referred to was offered originally and is included in the bill and has since been referred to as the hidden clause in title II which permits a voluntary arrangement between landlord and tenant for a 15-percent rent increase. May I quote from the minority report that once such a lease is entered into the housing accommodations covered by the lease are forever after decontrolled? This provision has a certain surface plausibility for it can be argued that tenants will benefit by exchanging fear of decontrol after December 31, 1947, or March 31, 1948, with resulting skyrocketing of rentals, for the certainty that they will have if they agree to this 15-percent increase in rent.

I think that this section is outright subterfuge, that it gives to the landlord a club over the tenant in that if he does not enter into this agreement, which is tantamount to a 15-percent across-the-board increase and that on and after December 31, 1947, you can vision what the situation will be so far as the relationship between landlord and tenant is concerned. It is either 15 percent now or any amount after that particular period. I think this is outright duress and coercion and is playing on the fears of the tenant. I think it should be stricken out. I ask you to support my amendment to strike it out.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 19 and page 20 under "Eviction of Tenants" you will find that the landlord can tell this tenant, "If you do not sign this lease for a 15-percent increase,"—the terms of the lease are not set forth here and the landlord will write the terms of the lease—he can remove the tenant and take the property for his own use; he can remove the tenant and sell the property, or he can remove him to alter or remodel the building. He can give any one of these reasons and he can tell the tenant, "If you do not give me a 15-percent increase I will have you removed for one of these purposes." The tenant would not have a chance. It means a 15-percent increase right straight across the board.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. This would not preclude an amendment to the original Fletcher amendment? This would mean that amendments could be offered to the original language in the bill? I mean the language in the bill which incorporated the Fletcher amendment. Only the Buchanan amendment will be affected by the request. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, people from all parts of the United States come to California. I cannot say that I blame them, for—with due apologies to Florida—I believe California is the very best place in which to live.

A great many of those who come to California are people who have sold their farms or business and have a small amount of capital. They are older people. They put their funds into small homes for rental or into a four-apartment building—sometimes living in one unit and using the rents of the other three for enough income to get along in simple comfort. They join the former small property owners of the State. All of them are deserving of every consideration.

The small property landlord in southern California has had and is having a hard time of it. His every expense has gone up. His taxes have been increased.

Some of these landlords, even though they came to California with ample funds for their old age, are having a very difficult time to get enough income to keep their houses habitable and to live.

I have many letters from tenants who state that they are not paying enough rent to give their landlords a square deal. They ask a change of law so as to permit them to do so.

I want to protect the widow, the pensioner, the so-called little man, and I recognize the need of rent controls for some months more, but I do believe that when tenant and landlord agree on higher rates—up to 15 percent—they should be allowed to do so, and I cannot see how this program will break rent control in any way. To me, to give some relief to the little landlord seems only a decent thing to do.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel there is probably no more simple part of this bill, no part more easily understood, nor more fair than this particular section. It simply

brings together the tenant and the landlord in a voluntary agreement. There is no compulsion. There may be some remodeling that has to be done, a room painted. What has happened in the past? Both the tenant and the landlord have been driven apart by rent control. For the first time we are offering them the American way of getting together. There is nothing about this that is compulsory. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] said it meant a 15-percent increase. It does not. I will tell you it is purely a matter of agreement between the landlord and the tenant. It may mean no rent increase. I can conceive of a case where by painting a room or two or redecorating an apartment, the owner could very possibly get the tenant to sign a lease until December 31, 1948, at a 15-percent increase; or it could mean a 5- or 10-percent increase. But that is the beautiful part of this amendment. There is no compulsion at any set percentage increase.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman agree that this country has come to a pretty pass if we have got to the place where two good Americans, an owner and a tenant, are forbidden to get together and arrange a mutual agreement which is satisfactory to both?

Mr. FLETCHER. I certainly do.

I would like to say further, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] made the statement that this means the decontrolling of this property.

I wish to read at this time a memorandum by assistant counsel, Allen H. Perley, relative to that particular matter, and read it into the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C. May 1, 1947.

Memorandum for Mr. FLETCHER:

In response to your inquiry, regarding my opinion as to the effect of the last proviso to section 204 (b) of the bill H. R. 3203, I do not read it as providing for decontrol of housing accommodations except in the limited sense that it provides a method by which, through mutual agreement between a landlord and tenant, the maximum rent for particular accommodations may be increased to an amount not more than 15 percent above that which would otherwise apply.

In my opinion the maximum rent fixed by the lease becomes, for purposes of title II of the bill, the maximum rent for the housing accommodations, and will continue to be the maximum rent for such accommodations during the life of rent control, even if there is a change of tenancy.

Also, as I read the proviso, it does not prevent the prohibition and enforcement provisions of title II from operating in the case of the particular housing accommodations where the maximum rent fixed by the lease is not observed.

ALLEN H. PERLEY,
Assistant Counsel.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. This may be a minor point, but I have had letters from 12 tenants who state that they would like to pay more rent because they realize that the landlord is not receiving sufficient money for his property, and asking that this provision be put in some control bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. I have had dozens and dozens of letters from tenants and landlords after they saw this proviso stating that they felt it was the only basis on which they could get together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an identical amendment at the Clerk's desk. I therefore rise in support of the Buchanan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, unless the Buchanan amendment is adopted rentals in the city of New York and in every other city of America where a housing shortage exists will increase by 15 percent within a month after the President signs this bill.

I, of course, am speaking for the city of New York which embraces some 8,000,000 people and which has the largest concentration of people who rent their homes of any city in the country. Due to our land values and to the nature of our housing it is simply impossible for housing to catch up with demand before December 31, 1948. There is serious housing shortage in the city today. I had a letter only recently from a man who spent 2½ years in a Japanese prison camp, who married following his discharge, whose wife is expecting a baby in the near future and who has been unable to find any housing on Staten Island or in nearby Manhattan despite a 6 months' search.

To say that this 15-percent increase is voluntary is a ghastly joke. Where there are no surplus housing accommodations available the landlord will say to the tenant: "I want you to sign this lease or else"; and the tenant, unwilling to face the certainty of ouster by December 31, 1948, will take pen in hand and sign the lease with the 15-percent increase. Thereby inflation is served.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I prefer to continue my statement.

Some say that this provision in the bill is a cushion against still greater rent rises with the expiration of rent control. I say that the means by which that should be met would be for the States to enact rent-control laws similar to those of the State of New York. Speaking again from the standpoint of New York, it would be far better for Federal rent control to end immediately, thus permitting the State law to take over, than to subject New Yorkers to the 15-percent increase enacted into law by this bill.

I urge all who want to prevent rents from increasing 15 percent to vote in favor of the Buchanan amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that the landlord will be in a perfect bargaining position because he can tell the tenant: If he does not sign, why, first, he will use the place for himself, he wants it for his own use; second, or that he has a purchaser and wants the property for that reason; or third, he wants to alter or repair the building. He has a number of different reasons either of which he can use to force the tenant into signing the lease.

Mr. BUCK. There is no bargaining whatever. The landlord is absolutely in the driver's seat. In every city the landlord will get his 15-percent increase.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman will agree that this increase will in effect be a straight-across-the-board increase?

Mr. BUCK. It will be an across-the-board increase in every city where a housing shortage exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—ayes 49, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 14, line 13, after the period, strike out the balance of line 13 and all of lines 14 to 18 and insert: "Housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established by a lease, pursuant to the provisions of this proviso, shall be subject to former maximum rent ceiling rates in case of premature termination of such lease, or may be re-leased under the limitations of this proviso, upon mutual agreement of landlord and tenant, at a rate not in excess of the maximum rent which could have been provided for by the original lease made under this proviso."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to clarify what has proven to be quite a misunderstanding as to how the so-called Fletcher 15-percent lease provision will work. Many authorities who have studied this bill claim that once the 15 percent lease is entered into that house is then forever decontrolled.

In an effort to avoid evasion of the idea of this 15-percent lease agreement by phony lease arrangements, thereby decontrolling that property or that apartment forever this proviso merely spells out that if the lease does not run to its termination or as long as rent control is in effect, that if the lease is voided by mutual agreement of landlord and tenant, the property goes back to its previous ceiling, or, if the landlord and tenant wish to sign up a new lease, then it is at the 15 percent provision above the former original ceiling.

I would like to say that I cannot agree with many of my friends who have severely condemned the lease provision. I think that it is an effort to begin the renegotiations between landlord and tenant; that it will not provide a blanket 15-percent increase across the board, but

will only provide for an increase where a tenant wishes to agree with his landlord for a 15-percent increase in exchange for security after the end of price control.

I think there are benefits that flow both ways, and I do not think you have to regard the landlord and tenant as mortal enemies and that the Government must always stand between them. I think they should be permitted to bargain on a lease arrangement.

But I do want to make it crystal clear that if you provide for this 15-percent increase that landlords not be permitted to make a lease and then void it to take their house out from under control of all rentals.

I would like to see if the majority members of the committee would accept this provision, to clarify the section against such evasion.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FLETCHER. In effect what the amendment does, when you have negotiated a 15-percent lease on a voluntary basis, mutually between landlord and tenant, and if that lease for some reason or other is disturbed, it takes the property back to the rent ceiling it had prior to the increase of 5, 10, and 15 percent, or whatever it was.

My point is this, that where a property has met the test of landlord and tenant, where two people have in an honorable way gotten together that this property is worth so much in its present condition I do not see any reason why the property should then revert back to its former natural rent because, after all, it may be that the apartment needed painting, the apartment needed remodeling, and that was the consideration for the increase in the rent.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the gentleman then admits that the house will be out from under future rent control. What I am trying to do is to see it revert to its original ceiling, or if a tenant is willing to sign a new lease, then he pays only the 15 percent from the original ceiling again. I think the Fletcher provision distinctly needs this help to make it fair and to prevent evasion through phony lease arrangements.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REDDEN: On page 15, line 22, after the period, insert "Provided the governing body of any county, city, or town may in their discretion terminate rent control earlier by a finding that the necessity therefor no longer exists."

Mr. REDDEN Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, this amendment does one thing. It takes the right of rent control or the privilege of rent control back to the people of the municipalities affected thereby; in other words, they are the people that ought to know more about it than anybody who might be attempting to administer it in Washington. They are the people who govern your city or your county and they are the people who ought to have the knowledge of conditions existing with respect to the necessity for rent control.

If this amendment is passed, the governing body can find as a fact that whatever conditions did exist necessitating rent control no longer exist, and therefore terminate rent control earlier than March 31, 1948. I think that is where it ought to be. I ask you to support this amendment and let the governing authorities, the municipalities, say when rent control ought to terminate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REDDEN) there were—ayes 73, noes 85.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. REDDEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 129, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 13, line 16, after the colon insert "*Provided, however*, That an increase of 10 percent on existing rent is hereby authorized on all residential buildings consisting of 10 dwelling units or less, exclusive of janitor or management space."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes because I explained this amendment a short while ago and I think it speaks for itself. I make no pretense in saying to the Committee that 10 percent in no way equalizes the disparity now existing between the income of property and the expense of maintaining property. The amendment is offered to bring some relief to small property owners. You will notice it is limited to 10 residential units or less. That includes the income bungalow or the income type of property of one, two, or three dwelling units, but not exceeding 10. I cannot possibly foresee anybody objecting to this amendment when it is admitted on this floor that the maintenance of property has increased about 80 percent since rent control was established. How can anybody object to partial relief extended to small property owners to help them preserve their life savings and safeguard their modest income?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder, if this amendment is adopted, if the Administrator would say in all of these cases of inequities, that this is the maximum; that Congress has fixed a maximum of 10 percent, and no more will be granted. The gentleman knows as well as I do that there are many cases where 10 percent will not meet the disparity. Let me give you one example. In a town in my district the taxes alone between 1946 and 1947 have increased 40 percent. Take a property with an assessed value of $5,000, rented at $30 a month. The tax increase alone on that property is $8 a month this year. Ten percent would not help him very much.

Mr. DONDERO. I admit that, yet I am trying to bring some relief to a segment of our people who have been penalized for being thrifty and self-sustaining. I hope this amendment will be adopted. I have stated before today that taxes throughout the Nation have increased nearly 40 percent since rent control was established. How can anybody deny to these people at least partial justice and equity?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes: I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would gladly support the amendment. It gives them a little something, but I am afraid it will mean a freezing of all increases, regardless of the inequities involved.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. Has the gentleman any idea how many housing units this would affect? Has the gentleman any figures on that, as to the number of housing units that will be affected throughout the country?

Mr. DONDERO. No, I have not. I am trying to provide some relief to small property owners by giving them at least 10 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I desire to say to the gentleman that those witnesses who appeared before the committee said we should show some consideration to this class of people, and they all ask for a 10-percent raise. They say, just like the gentleman from Michigan has stated, that that is not enough, but certainly if we are going to take off the ceiling on everything else, we ought to show some consideration to the little man. They all say this will be just a gesture, but we ought to do something for them.

Mr. DONDERO. It is only a small gesture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to remedy some of the obvious injustices of a legislative and economic maverick. A 10-percent blanket increase has inequities, but it does represent a measure of justice to the people who have their savings in rental property.

There has been some loose talk about intellectual honesty on this bill. In the last 4 years we, as Members of Congress, have raised our pay 50 percent presumably because of increased costs.

If there is someone who can explain to me how we can raise our own pay 50 percent, and yet say to the people who have their savings in property in this country, "You are entitled to no relief because of increased costs," I hope they will come around to me after this session and explain it carefully, because I am afraid I will have a hard time understanding that kind of acrobatics.

We had a great many witnesses before the committee. Perhaps the most valuable testimony we had was from the American Legion housing committee.

An American Legion housing committee went all over America studying this problem. They came before us and favored a 10-percent across-the-board increase on rents. Thus the American Legion went on record for a 10-percent blanket increase.

Let me show you the socialistic aspect of this situation in the minute or so I have remaining. Over in Europe Communists come up to a little fellow who has invested his savings in a cow. They take his cow and may give him some kind of phony money, but they take his cow. They lead it away and his investment is gone. In this country under rent control the Government of the United States is saying by its actions to the small property owner, the frugal person who has put his life savings in a rental house, "We will not confiscate your property outright. We will but take it away from you over a period of years by fixing rents under which you will lose your investment." That moves toward communism by the silk-glove route, with drawing-room finesse. It certainly has no place in a Congress that wants to give a square deal to the frugal people who have placed their savings in rental properties.

I hope this amendment, a gesture of fairness to property investors, is passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment on two grounds: No. 1, it is inflationary; we are deliberately implementing the upward spiral of the cost of living. No. 2, I do not feel that landlords generally have been doing so badly. They no longer have the vacancy problem for which they normally allow 10 percent of their gross. Again, interest rates have come down substantially in the last dozen years and property can be carried for very much less than formerly. Furthermore, the bill already provides that in the event of inequity the Administrator shall make appropriate adjustments.

I feel that it is not a proper function of this Congress to contribute to the inflationary spiral by direct action.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what we want to do is to give justice to all groups. We have seen now the placing in this bill of a provision that those who build new houses from now on will not have any ceilings, nor will those who refused to give shelter in 1945 or 1946; nor is there any limit on ceilings to those who are able to increase the accommodation of the present building by erecting a little partition and making one more room. All these people are out from under the ceiling, and the sky is the limit.

In addition to that we have all the hotels now out from under ceilings. Furthermore on a lot of apartment houses there will be no ceilings under this provision, those housing accommodations in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel service such as maid service, furnishing linen, and so forth, telephone and desk service, will be exempted. Therefore it will leave a little helpless group for which we have done nothing.

This 15-percent amendment on which the landlord and tenant are supposed to agree will not be workable. They will never agree and you know it as well as I do. A 10-percent across-the-board raise means something to that group of people, confined principally to the little fellow, not benefited by the bill. Certainly we want to make some gesture to this class. Practically all the witnesses who testified said that the increase in the cost of living, in taxes, and on building materials for repairs had gone up so much since the freeze date that certainly some raise should be given to these people who have practically nothing except a small home to rent. In view of the fact that almost half of the population will not be under a ceiling, it is nothing but fair that we should raise the rent for the small fellow to help defray a part of this increased cost since the freeze date.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan should be adopted in order to give justice to a class of people, many of whom are receiving barely enough to repair their homes and pay the taxes imposed on them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment very obviously should be defeated. A long time ago when we were considering this matter and milling over the relief which might be given landlords, it was suggested that we increase the rates horizontally 10 percent. This appealed to some Members until we found that we would have to at least date the base period back to the time when rent controls were put on to make it at all equitable, because in many of these apartments adjustments have already been made. In units of 10 or less many have gotten adjustments, the same kind of adjustments which you seek to make here in order to correct an inequity.

The thing you have to be careful of is that you do not create just as many hardships by this amendment as you seek to correct and if you do create a hardship by this amendment what machinery is there in the law for the expeditious review of a petition on the part of a tenant for relief of this hardship? None whatsoever. He cannot sue the landlord and he cannot sue the Government. There is no machinery set up for the alleviation of those hardships, so you cannot do this equitably and fairly unless you set up some machinery for the expeditious relief of the hardships which might be created by it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What assurance have the people of this country that they will get any equitable adjustment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that all of the deficiencies in this law are administrative, not legislative. This Congress cannot administer the law. Under the system of government we have, the Executive has the responsibility of administering the law in accordance with the intent of the Congress. We say in this declaration of intent that hardship cases shall be corrected. We cannot administer the law. We have no way of knowing whether 10 percent is going to create more hardships than it seeks to correct. The gentleman cannot give me any figures on the number that will be affected by this, either on the negative or positive side.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 104, noes 127.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 14, line 11, after the semicolon, strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert the following: "*And provided further*, That such leases under this section shall apply to a maximum of four rental units owned by any landlord."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon a limitation of debate on all the remaining amendments. I understand there are eight of them. I also understand that most of the controversial amendments have been disposed of. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent

that the balance of the bill be considered as read and that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. How many amendments are on the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. Eleven altogether. Some of these amendments may be similar to others, and the Chair cannot tell how many other amendments will be offered.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hate to object to a request of the chairman of the committee, but I know there is one very important amendment on the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BUSBEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the balance of the bill be considered as read and that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 6:45.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not in order to move to dispense with the reading of the bill. If it cannot be done by unanimous consent, it cannot be done at all. It is not in order to move to dispense with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 6:45 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as having been read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the bill must be read. Somebody must know what is in it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as having been read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request is not in order, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the time that has just been taken out of my 5 minutes I may have 5 minutes in the event that I need it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] understands that it was not my purpose to take the gentleman off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I realize it is getting late. I will try not to take too much time.

I have offered this amendment to strike out from line 11, the balance of the section at the top of page 14. This amendment accomplishes the following purpose.

It insures that the 15-percent rent raise to the landlord from the original signer of the lease will be guaranteed. It also provides that the property shall not be rented for more than 15 percent above the present rate for the duration of rent control. That is the first purpose which it is designed to accomplish. It applies to the landlord holding up to four rental units and allows him to obtain this 15 percent which is already provided for in the bill. We have heard a great deal of talk on the floor about the small landlord. This is your opportunity to help the small landlord who depends on his rent to take care of his livelihood. It assures that the small landlord owning up to four units of rental property will be allowed to have the 15-percent raise. In the name of the small landlord, I appeal to you to support this amendment.

Mr. OWENS. You are to be complimented on this amendment because this strikes at the crux of the whole problem. Those are the people who have suffered the greatest.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. The people who really need the help, and I agree that a great many of them do need help, are the small people who have labored a lifetime to acquire three or four pieces of rental property and who are depending upon this income to pay their grocery bill and other expenses. Those are the people who are more entitled to the raise than anybody.

The language which I have asked to be inserted in the bill guarantees the small landlord that he will get his 15-percent raise. That applies to the landlords who own four rental units.

The amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] applied to 10 units and gave them a 10-percent raise. This provides a guarantee of a 15-percent raise and applies to landlords owning four units or less. It protects the public against over-all raises by the mass rental agencies who have hundreds of rental units.

This is an attempt to improve a bill which I fear cannot be made workable.

Unless clarifying amendments are adopted, I shall vote to recommit this legislative monstrosity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD) there were—ayes 64, noes 86.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the motion.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 45, noes 131.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: On page 13, line 16, just before the colon insert a comma and the words, "except that where the real-estate taxes levied against such housing accommodations have been increased since such maximum rent was established or are increased during the effective period of this title, the maximum rent shall be subject to an automatic upward adjustment by the landlord not in excess of the amount necessary to offset such tax increase for the future period covered thereby."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much of the time of the committee, but I believe this is an amendment which can be accepted.

Not long ago the committee declined to accept an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], because there was some question that perhaps a 10-percent straight across-the-board raise in rentals might freeze rentals. The amendment which I have offered provides that if there has been a raise in the levy of real-estate taxes since the maximum rental was fixed, the landlord may, in his discretion, raise the rent by an automatic upward adjustment not in excess of the amount necessary to offset such tax increase.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this particular raise on the part of the landlord is one that is just, that it is fair, that it cannot be considered to allow some increase in fraud, but one which every landlord is entitled to if he has had an increase of his taxes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman has a good amendment. If we had better administration of the rent-control law that would take advantage of the opportunities in the present law where we could recognize these hardship cases then we would not have all this turmoil on the floor of the House today.

In the State of Massachusetts this year some of the tax rates are going up as high as $10 on a thousand, or an increase of 20 to 30 percent. If, as I say, the administrators under the present law would recognize those hardship cases there would not be this turmoil on the floor of the House today.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I wish to say to the Committee that from a survey recently made in 70 groups from 59 cities embracing 24 States it shows that taxation on the buildings covered by the study have increased a minimum of 20 percent since the institution of rent control. The increase has been 50 percent in some of the cities. The highest increase reported in any of the cities was 116 percent.

This is the increase which the gentleman said a moment ago should have been permitted if the administration of this law had been properly carried out, but which has not been allowed in the past. If this is permitted the rent increase allowed the landlords will not be 10 percent, or 15 percent, or 20 percent,

it will be the fixed amount by which his tax levy has been increased, a basic substantial figure to which no one can object.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Does not the gentleman think that is one reason why we should turn it back to the municipalities or those agencies which are raising the taxes, for instance?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I do not quite agree that we should turn it back to the municipalities.

Mr. POULSON. They are the ones who raised the taxes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I believe that would cause more trouble than the gentleman might think. Nevertheless, I believe this particular amendment is a good one. I therefore hope the Committee will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. I understand that all debate on the bill closes at 6:45. There are about 10 amendments at the desk. Has there been any agreement or arrangement as to the division of the time amongst those who have amendments to offer?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no arrangement whatever as to dividing the time.

Mr. KLEIN. What happens to those who have amendments pending but no chance to argue them?

The CHAIRMAN. Those who offer any amendment after 6:45 will not have an opportunity to debate the amendment but the amendment will be voted on.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not the practice for the Chair to recognize only those who have amendments at the desk rather than those who do not have amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair expects to do, but it is not the province of the Chair to be arbitrary.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The chairman of the committee stated that he thought all controversial amendments had been disposed of. I do not consider my amendment free from controversy. I would like to have 1 or 2 minutes to discuss my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state that the Chair understands the gentlewoman's amendment applies to striking out the whole title and that would properly come after the bill had been read. A request to dispense with further reading of the bill was dispensed with so the bill must be read. This being the case the gentlewoman's amendment could not be in order until after the bill is read.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] because I believe the time has come when hardship cases ought to be given some recognition. The great difficulty up to the present time is that we have, for the most part, political boards determining questions involving the flexible provisions of the law. These cases involving hardship should be determined and given consideration.

Mr. Chairman, under the present law there are flexible provisions that permit the administrators of the law to recognize hardship cases where there are unusual expenses involved in the administration of the property. In the bill we are today considering there is provision also for adjustments in maximum rents which can be made where it is necessary to correct inequities. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency this question: In view of the fact that we have substantial increases in tax rates and the tax bills all over the country and in every community, whether or not in his opinion in the administration of the law as now proposed by the committee these excessive increases in tax rates and the tax bill can be considered inequities? I would like to ask the gentleman, What is his interpretation of the bill and those provisions?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman had asked me if I thought an inequity would be created under those circumstances I would answer in the affirmative, because I have already stated that I thought where the income from the rented property is not sufficient to reflect the cost of maintaining the property, plus a reasonable return on the investment, an inequity existed and should be corrected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, in the administration of the act up to the present time those principles have not been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all those having amendments at the Clerk's desk may be recognized for 2 minutes and that those in opposition to the several amendments may be recognized for 2 minutes within the time previously agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 14, after line 18, add a new section to read as follows:

"In view of the desperate housing situation the American people deserve our sympathy."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 9, line 19, strike out all of title II and insert:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, insofar as rents are concerned, shall be continued until June 30, 1948.

"No general increase in rents shall be granted under authority of that act except as may be required under the provisions of section 2 (b) thereof."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have asked to strike out all of title II and to put in its place an amendment to continue the control of rents, as we have them now, for another year. In the face of the rising cost of living and in the face of the most acute housing shortage in the history of our country, to do away with rent controls, as this bill proposed even before it was amended, is to invite the American people to the dizzy waltz of inflation.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency said that he did not want to be responsible for one picture appearing in one paper of a mother with her little child in her arms sitting in the street—evicted from her home—with nowhere to go. I say that this bill, if passed, guarantees that there will be thousands of mothers in the streets—evicted from their living quarters—with their children in their arms—and with nowhere to go.

This bill legalizes blackjacking; this bill legalizes the use of fear to obtain higher rents; this bill legalizes decontrols; this bill guarantees that rents will skyrocket; this bill guarantees that there will be no rent control. This program legalizes evictions.

We either believe we need rent controls or we do not. We should stand up and be counted.

We are concerned over the rising cost of living or we are not. We should stand up and be counted.

I hope that this House will vote for my amendment.

I hope that this House will vote for the millions of men, women, and children who need their protection today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. DOUGLAS) there were—ayes 52, noes 195.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: On page 20, line 13, after the comma strike out "and" and insert "that the altering or remodeling is reasonably necessary to protect and conserve the housing accommodations and cannot practicably be done with the tenant in occupancy, and that the landlord."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Although I think the gentleman's amendment goes to the good faith of the transaction and that it is covered in the first sentence, I do think perhaps the gentleman spells it out a little more completely. As far as I am concerned, the language is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAIL:

On page 13, line 16, after the colon, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall authorize an increase of 10 percent, effective on and after the effective date of this title, in the maximum rent in effect on that date for all controlled housing accommodations in all defense rental areas."

And strike out the second proviso of section 204 (b) beginning on page 13, line 21, after the colon through page 14, line 18, and change the colon to a period on page 13, line 21

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment affords a measure of relief from the punitive provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 in their application to investors providing housing to others who by choice or necessity elect to rent rather than to own. This amendment is also intended as a substitute for the provision for 15 percent maximum increase by agreement between landlord and tenant, which can only serve to accentuate inequities if successful and create rancor and resentment if unsuccessful

When the Government arbitrarily established in 1942 a ceiling on existing rents, it also assumed the implied obligation to protect the investor in housing facilities from losses through mounting costs. Either costs should have been frozen or normal net earnings assured through subsidy, but no such provision was made and no action for relief has been taken, and through the years 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, and thus far in 1947 each succeeding year has brought with it increased costs and added hardship to investors in a vital public service.

News of the failure of the committee to provide adequate consideration in the reported bill for relief of the situation came to me, and I believe to you as well, as a severe shock. It seems to me that the issue here is more far-reaching than the proposed amendment itself. We, of the Congress, are on trial to determine whether we are legislating for right and for equity or if we intend to follow the philosophy of subordinating those factors to political expediency—to the sacrifice of fairness to minorities in the quest for votes from large numerical groups.

No other minority group providing a vital service to the public has been so punished. Through sharp wage and material increases already low net rental incomes of 1942 have been in effect confiscated by Government decree to a point where extension of normal services to tenants is jeopardized. Through the war years and up to the present time labor and materials have not been available and properties could not be maintained by normal repairs. Investors are now faced by major cumulative repair cost without income from which they may be met. The landlord has borne the burden of sacrifice long enough—he is entitled to relief now—not sometime in the indefinite future. The 10-percent across-the-board increase in rents can only serve to alleviate, not cure completely, a distressing and discriminatory condition. It must be remembered that the landlord's dollar, too, buys less today than in 1942.

Not only do the landlords appeal to you for justice and fair play, but the right-thinking tenants of the country—and they are the majority—support their plea in the knowledge that the cause is just. The House has achieved a splendid record to this date and it is my hope that its action upon this amendment will be such as to fully establish the confidence of the American public in its intent to hew firmly to the cause of justice let the chips fall where they may.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 14, line 18, insert the following: "This proviso shall not apply with respect to housing accommodations constructed with priority ratings or under specific authorization from the United States or any agency thereof for which the rent has been approved by the United States or any agency thereof in connection with the granting of such priority rating or such authorization."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, since I am not too concerned about getting a statement in the RECORD for home consumption, I do not think I will even use all of my 2 minutes. I do want to explain, however, just what this amendment is proposed to do. Its purpose is to prevent the accentuation of certain flagrant inequities that now exist.

I do not know whether in your districts you have the same situation that I have. But during the war we had a great many defense rental housing projects constructed. The rents for those projects were not fixed by the Office of Price Administration, but they were fixed by the agency which granted the priority which enabled them to construct those projects. In every case the rents in those projects are far in excess of rents for comparable properties owned by private individuals locally and which properties were constructed prior to the beginning of the war. There is no justice in a man having property on one side of the street getting twice as much rent as a man with comparable property on the other side of the street.

I hope the Committee will approve this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 53, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS:

On page 20, line 20, at the end of section 209, insert "*Provided, however*, That any court of competent jurisdiction may stay any proceeding or action by virtue of paragraphs 2, 3, or 4 of this section, or any order, judgment, or decree of eviction issued therein for a period of not to exceed 6 months if the tenant for good cause shown is unable to vacate such controlled housing accommodation."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment gives the courts power to stay eviction in a case in which eviction is permitted under this act for acts that the tenant has nothing to do with; that is, in the case where a landlord seeks the tenant's premises because he has sold the building or because he wants to move into it himself or because he wants to remodel it. My amendment gives the tenant enough time to find new quarters in those circumstances and does not leave it to State laws alone. The figures show that an enormous shift has taken place in the country from rental to ownership occupancy. The shift is from 41 percent owner occupied in 1940 to 51 percent owner occupied in 1946 of the aggregate number of rental units in the country and shows that this amendment is essential. As you are going to stop a galloping inflation by keeping a roof on rentals without an across-the-board increase, you should also take this additional precaution regarding repossession of premises in the event of sales or for personal occupancy of the landlord, and give the tenant added protection in those cases. I believe the courts of New York will do their best in such cases, but it is a very useful safeguard to have it in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 16, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Are there any further amendments to section 204? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECOVERY OF DAMAGES BY TENANTS

SEC. 205. Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of ent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 (b) shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided*, That the amount of such liquidated damages shall

be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation. For the purpose of determining the amount of liquidated damages to be awarded to the plaintiff in action brought under this section, all violations alleged in such action which were committed by the defendant with respect to the plaintiff prior to the bringing of action shall be deemed to constitute one violation, and the amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with such one violation shall be deemed to be the aggregate amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with all violations. A judgment in an action under this section shall be a bar to a recovery under this section in any other action against the same defendant on account of any violation with respect to the same plaintiff prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered.

PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to offer, solicit, demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 (b).

(b) Whenever in the judgment of the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a) any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of subsection (a) of this section, he may make application to any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction, for an order enjoining such act or practice, or for an order enforcing compliance with such subsection, and upon a showing by the head of such department or agency that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

MAINTENANCE OF ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN ALLEGED PAST VIOLATIONS

SEC. 207. No action or proceeding, involving any alleged violation of Maximum Price Regulation No. 188, issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be maintained in any court, or judgment thereon executed or otherwise proceeded on, if a court of competent jurisdiction has found, or by opinion has declared, that the person alleged to have committed such violation acted in good faith and that application to such person of the "actual delivery" provisions of such regulation would result or has resulted in extreme hardship.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 208. (a) There are hereby transferred to the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a), (1) all records, property, or other data of the Office of Price Administration and/or the Office of Temporary Controls used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents; (2) so much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the Office of Temporary Controls in the establishment and maintenance of rents as the Director of the Budget shall determine; and (3) such of the personnel employed by the Office of Temporary Controls in connection with the establishment or maintenance of maximum rents as the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a), subject to the approval of the Director of the Budget, certifies are needed in connection with the administration of this title.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

EVICTION OF TENANTS

SEC. 209. No action or proceeding to recover possession of any controlled housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant in any court, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled unless—

(1) under the law of the State in which the action or proceeding is brought the tenant is (A) violating the obligation of his tenancy (other than an obligation to pay rent higher than rent permitted under this act or an obligation to surrender possession of such housing accommodations) or (B) is committing a nuisance in such housing accommodations or using such housing accommodations for an immoral or illegal purpose or for other than living or dwelling purposes;

(2) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for his immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations;

(3) the landlord has in good faith contracted in writing to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser for the immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations by such purchaser;

(4) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing them and replacing them with new construction, and has obtained such approval as may be required by Federal, State, or local law for the alterations, remodeling, or any construction planned; or

(5) the housing accommodations are nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house and the remaining portion of which is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family.

APPLICATION

SEC. 210. The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States, but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF TITLE

SEC. 211. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted.

TITLE III—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. WOLCOTT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, since the bill cannot be made any worse than it is, I withdraw my objection.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALMOND:

Page 20, line 22, strike out "The" and insert "(a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the."

And after line 25 insert the following subsection:

"(b) Whenever the governor of any State advises the head of the department or agency designated pursuant to section 204 (a), hereinafter referred to as the "administrator", that the legislature of such State has adequately provided for the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents with respect to housing accommodations within defense-rental areas in such State and of the date on which such State rent control will become effective, the administrator shall immediately make public announcement to the effect that he has been so advised. At the same time all rent controls under this title with respect to housing accommodations within such State shall be terminated as of the date on which State rent control is to become effective; and the administrator shall make available to the proper officials of such State any records and other information in his possession with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents for housing accommodations in such State which may be requested by such officials. Any such records and other information shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purposes of this title or any other law. As used in this subsection, the term 'State' means any State, Territory, or possession of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 200, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3203 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 157, noes 147.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 197, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—189

Abernethy	Gary	Mills
Albert	Gordon	Monroney
Allen, La.	Gore	Morgan
Almond	Gorski	Morris
Anderson, Calif.	Gossett	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Granger	Murdock
Angell	Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.
Arnold	Gregory	O'Brien
Barden	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Toole
Barrett	Hardy	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Battle	Harris	Peden
Beckworth	Harrison	Peterson
Blatnik	Hart	Pfeifer
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Philbin
Bonner	Hays	Phillips, Calif.
Brooks	Hébert	Phillips, Tenn.
Buchanan	Hedrick	Pickett
Buck	Heffernan	Poage
Buckley	Hendricks	Powell
Buffett	Hoeven	Preston
Burleson	Hoffman	Price, Fla.
Busbey	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Priest
Cannon	Hull	Rabin
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rains
Chapman	Jarman	Rankin
Chelf	Jenison	Rayburn
Clark	Jensen	Rayfiel
Coffin	Johnson, Okla.	Redden
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Tex.	Rizley
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Rockwell
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Courtney	Kee	Russell
Cox	Kelley	Sabath
Cravens	Kennedy	Sasscer
Crosser	Keogh	Schwabe, Mo.
Cunningham	Kilday	Short
Curtis	King	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Somers
Deane	Lanham	Spence
Delaney	Larcade	Stanley
Dingell	Lea	Stefan
Dolliver	LeCompte	Stigler
Domengeaux	Lemke	Teague
Donohue	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Dorn	Lucas	Thomason
Doughton	Lusk	Trimble
Douglas	Lyle	Vail
Durham	Lynch	Walter
Eberharter	McCormack	Wheeler
Elliott	McMillan, S. C.	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Whittington
Evins	Mahon	Williams
Fallon	Mansfield, Mont	Wilson, Tex.
Feighan	Marcantonio	Winstead
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Fisher	Meade, Md.	Worley
Flannagan	Merrow	Zimmerman
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	
Forand		

NAYS—197

Allen, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Case, N. J.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolton	Case, S. Dak.
Andresen, August H.	Boykin	Chadwick
Arends	Bradley, Calif.	Chenoweth
Auchincloss	Bradley, Mich.	Chiperfield
Banta	Brumbaugh	Church
Bates, Mass.	Brehm	Clason
Beall	Brophy	Clevenger
Bell	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Kans.
Bender	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Bryson	Cooley
Bennett, Mo.	Burke	Corbett
Bishop	Butler	Cotton
Blackney	Byrnes, Wis.	Coudert
	Camp	Crawford
	Canfield	Crow
Dague	Jones, Ohio	Richlman
Dawson, Utah	Jones, Wash.	Riley
Devit	Jonkman	Rivers
D'Ewart	Kean	Robertson
Dondero	Kearney	Robsion
Drewry	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Elsaesser	Keating	Rohrbough
Elston	Keefe	Ross
Engel, Mich.	Kerr	Sadlak
Fellows	Kersten, Wis.	Sadowski
Fenton	Kunkel	St. George
Fletcher	Landis	Sanborn
Folger	Latham	Schwabe, Okla.
Foote	LeFevre	Scoblick
Fulton	Lewis	Scott, Hardie
Gamble	Lodge	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gathings	Love	Scrivner
Gavin	McConnell	Seely-Brown
Gearhart	McCowen	Shafer
Gillette	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Gillie	McDowell	Simpson, Pa.
Goff	McGarvey	Smith, Kans.
Goodwin	McGregor	Smith, Maine
Graham	McMahon	Smith, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Griffiths	MacKinnon	Snyder
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mathews	Springer
Hagen	Meyer	Stevenson
Hale	Michener	Stockman
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Conn.	Stratton
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Taber
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Talle
Hand	Muhlenberg	Taylor
Harness, Ind.	Mundt	Thomas, N. J.
Heselton	Murray, Wis.	Tibbott
Hess	Nodar	Tollefson
Hill	Norblad	Towe
Hinshaw	O'Hara	Twyman
Hobbs	O'Konski	Van Zandt
Holmes	Owens	Vorys
Hope	Pace	Vursell
Horan	Patterson	Wadsworth
Jackson, Calif.	Ploeser	Weichel
Javits	Potts	Wigglesworth
Jenkins, Ohio	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Jenkins, Pa.	Ramey	Wolcott
Jennings	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton
Johnson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Johnson, Ill.	Rees	Youngblood
Johnson, Ind.	Reeves	
	Rich	
	Richards	

NOT VOTING—45

Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	Mason
Bakewell	Gerlach	Meade, Ky.
Bland	Gifford	Mitchell
Bloom	Gross	Morton
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Nixon
Carson	Herter	Norrell
Celler	Howell	Norton
Clements	Judd	Plumley
Clippinger	Kefauver	Sarbacher
D'Alesandro	Kilburn	Sheppard
Dirksen	Knutson	Sundstrom
Eaton	Macy	Vinson
Ellis	Maloney	Welch
Ellsworth	Manasco	West

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Sarbacher against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Maloney against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Howell against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Mansfield, of Texas, for, with Mr. Bakewell against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Macy with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Allen, of Illinois, with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. West.

Mr. Meade, of Kentucky, with Mr. Norrell.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Manasco.

Messrs. BATES of Massachusetts, BROPHY, BROWN of Ohio, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, BELL, BURKE, JOHNSON of Illinois, OWENS, BISHOP, CHURCH, and MILLER of Nebraska changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'BRIEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 182, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—205

Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Muhlenberg
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Mundt
Arends	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Arnold	Gillie	Nodar
Auchincloss	Graham	Norblad
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien
Battle	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Beall	Gregory	Patterson
Beckworth	Gross	Pfeifer
Bell	Hale	Phillips, Tenn.
Bender	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Potts
Blackney	Halleck	Poulson
Boggs, Del.	Hand	Priest
Boggs, La.	Hays	Rains
Bolton	Hébert	Redden
Boykin	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Calif.	Hendricks	Reed, N. Y.
Bramblett	Heselton	Rees
Brehm	Hess	Reeves
Brooks	Hinshaw	Rich
Brophy	Hobbs	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Richlman
Bryson	Hope	Riley
Burke	Horan	Rivers
Butler	Hull	Robertson
Camp	Jackson, Calif.	Robsion
Canfield	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Javits	Rohrbough
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rooney
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Pa.	Ross
Chadwick	Jennings	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Sadlak
Chelf	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Chiperfield	Jones, Ala.	Scoblick
Clason	Jones, N. C.	Scott, Hardie
Coffin	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Jonkman	Seely-Brown
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Sheppard
Cooley	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cooper	Kearns	Smathers
Corbett	Keating	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Keogh	Snyder
Crow	Kerr	Somers
Dague	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Stevenson
Davis, Tenn.	Kunkel	Stockman
Dawson, Utah	Landis	Stratton
Deane	Latham	Taber
Delaney	Lea	Talle
Devitt	LeFevre	Taylor
D'Ewart	Lodge	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Love	Thomas, Tex.
Doughton	Lusk	Thomason
Durham	McConnell	Tibbott
Elsaesser	McDonough	Tollefson
Elston	McDowell	Towe
Engel, Mich.	McMahon	Twyman
Engle, Calif.	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Fallon	MacKinnon	Vorys
Fenton	Mathews	Wadsworth
Fernandez	Meade, Md.	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Michener	Wolcott
Folger	Miller, Conn.	Wolverton
Foote	Miller, Md.	Woodruff
Fulton	Monroney	Zimmerman
Gamble	Morrison	
Gary		
Gathings		

NAYS—182

Abernethy	Barrett	Burleson
Albert	Bates, Ky.	Busbey
Allen, La.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrne, N. Y.
Almond	Bishop	Byrnes, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Blatnik	Carroll
Andresen, August H.	Bonner	Chenoweth
Andrews, Ala.	Bradley, Mich.	Church
Angell	Brown, Ohio	Clark
Banta	Buchanan	Clevenger
Barden	Buck	Cole, Mo.
	Buckley	Colmer
	Buffett	Combs

Cotton	Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Calif.
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Pickett
Cravens	Johnson, Tex.	Poage
Crawford	Jones, Ohio	Powell
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Cunningham	Kee	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Rabin
Dingell	King	Ramey
Dolliver	Kirwan	Rankin
Dondero	Klein	Rayburn
Donohue	Lane	Rayfiel
Dorn	Lanham	Rizley
Douglas	Larcade	Rockwell
Drewry	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Eberharter	Lemke	Sabath
Elliott	Lesinski	St. George
Evins	Lewis	Sanborn
Feighan	Lucas	Sasscer
Fellows	Lyle	Schwabe, Mo.
Flannagan	Lynch	Schwabe, Okla.
Fogarty	McCormack	Scrivner
Forand	McCowen	Shafer
Goff	McGregor	Short
Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Gordon	Madden	Simpson, Ill.
Gore	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Gorski	Maloney	Smith, Ohio
Gossett	Mansfield, Mont.	Smith, Va.
Granger		Spence
Griffiths	Marcantonio	Stanley
Gwinn, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Gwynne, Iowa	Merrow	Stigler
Hagen	Meyer	Teague
Hardy	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Harness, Ind.	Mills	Vursell
Harris	Morgan	Walter
Harrison	Morris	Weichel
Hart	Murdock	Wheeler
Havenner	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Hedrick	O'Hara	Whittington
Hill	O'Konski	Williams
Hoeven	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman	Owens	Wilson, Tex.
Holifield	Passman	Winstead
Huber	Patman	Wood
Jackson, Wash.	Peden	Worley
Jenison	Peterson	Youngblood
Jensen	Philbin	

NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fuller	Mason
Bakewell	Gallagher	Meade, Ky.
Bland	Gerlach	Mitchell
Bloom	Gifford	Morton
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Nixon
Carson	Herter	Norrell
Celler	Howell	Norton
Clements	Judd	Plumley
Clippinger	Kefauver	Sarbacher
D'Alesandro	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Dirksen	Knutson	Vinson
Eaton	McGarvey	Welch
Ellis	Macy	West
Ellsworth	Manasco	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Mansfield of Texas against.

Mr. Sarbacher for, with Mr. Clippinger against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Manasco.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Plumley with Mr. Norrell.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Howell with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. West.

Messrs. LEWIS, CRAVENS, and BRADLEY of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROONEY and GARY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, through an error someone else answered to my name. I intended to vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the minority report on H. R. 3203.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter from William J. Overmire.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts and correspondence.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Labor News.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a resolution which I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution in support of legislation to immediately increase Federal wages.

The following Members of Congress have joined with me in introducing identical bills: Mrs. DOUGLAS, of California; Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. HUBER, of Ohio; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FRANK KARSTEN, of Missouri.

An immediate wage increase for Federal employees is necessary and justified on two major counts:

First. The wage increase of 14 percent granted Federal employees in 1946, which was an inadequate increase at the time it was granted, has since then been more than wiped out by price rises and increased living costs. Federal workers' real wages are lower today than they were a year ago, and lower than before the war. The relative position of Federal wage rates, as compared with those in private industry, is worse today than in January 1946, and considerably worse than before the war. Wage increases are needed, both to offset price rises, and to provide equitable treatment for Federal workers as compared with workers in private industry.

Second. The country is faced with economic recession and unemployment unless effective purchasing power in the hands of consumers is immediately and substantially increased. In practical terms, the required increase in purchasing power can now be accomplished only by downward price adjustments plus a rise in wages. The Federal Government, even after current staff reductions, will employ approximately 2.5 percent of the total working force of the Nation—more people than the steel industry—and thus wage adjustments for Federal workers will have an important and salutary effect on the whole economy.

The type of wage increase granted should be designed primarily to meet quickly the present emergency situation. It should effectively ease the situation of workers whose living standards have been most sharply impaired by price rises and it should be distributed so as to create the maximum increase in consumer demand for goods. In line with these requirements an across-the-board increase of a flat sum to be added to the annual pay of all employees is recommended, rather than a percentage adjustment, which would probably prove inadequate in the lower brackets and would on the other hand, tend in the higher brackets to increase savings rather than consumer purchases. Such legislation would not obviate the need for a long-range study and readjustment of Federal wage and salary rates.

INCREASES REQUIRED TO OFFSET LIVING COSTS AND PROVIDE EQUITY WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY—A CHRONOLOGY OF FEDERAL WAGE ADJUSTMENTS SINCE 1923

The basic law establishing wage and salary scale for Federal workers in the departmental and the field services is the Classification Act of 1923. The only major groupings of Federal employees not covered by this act are the employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, whose pay rates are fixed by Congress under separate laws, and the per diem workers in navy yards, arsenals, and other industrial establishments, whose pay rates are adjusted from time to time by wage boards or other administrative authority. The Classification Act covers virtually all clerical, professional, and administrative employees; it covers hospital workers, prison guards, custodial workers, technical and scientific employees, laboratory assistants, inspectors of all kinds, and many mechanical workers and skilled tradesmen employed in maintenance functions.

For the past 10 years the median salary rate for all employees covered by the Classification Act of 1923 has been approximately the salary rate for a grade 3 clerk—CAF-3. From 1923 until 1945 this rate remained unchanged at $1,620 per annum. Half of all employees earned more and half less than this rate. In the following summary of adjustments which have been made in the Classification Act scale, this median employee who receives the CAF-3 salary rate, or its equivalent in the custodial or subprofessional services, is used as an example.

1923 TO 1945

Basic salary rates for nearly all Federal employees remained unchanged except that during the depression, in 1933, all rates were cut 15 percent. These cuts

were fully restored in 1936. Minor upward adjustments in a few classes of positions were made in 1930 and in 1942, raising the lowest classifications in the custodial service to a $1,200 minimum, but these laws affected only a comparatively few workers; they resulted in only a 1-percent increase in the average Federal salary outlay per worker. No overall adjustments in salaries were made during the period, except for the temporary depression cut.

1943

In December 1942, after Federal workers' hours had already been increased from 39 to 44 per week, the Congress passed a law permitting further increases in the workweek and granting Federal workers overtime pay at approximately straight-time rates. This, of course, became effective in 1943. The workweek was then lengthened to 48 hours per week—or 22 percent—and pay was increased 21.6 percent. This situation continued until July 1945. During the entire war up to and after VE-day, Federal workers received no base-pay adjustments whatever.

1945

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 increased basic wage rates an average of 15½ percent. The increase was accomplished by a sliding scale percentage adjustment, giving a 20-percent increase on the first $1,200 of salary, a 10-percent adjustment on the next $3,400 and 5 percent on any part of salary over $4,500 per annum. The pattern was similar to the methods used during the war in industry of dividing up an over-all 15 percent—Little Steel formula—increase so that lower-paid workers received more than 15 percent, and higher-paid employees less. This 1945 act also provided for payment at true time and one-half rates for overtime work in excess of 40 hours per week, but virtually all overtime work was eliminated administratively within the first 2 months after the bill's passage. On the effective date of the bill, July 1, 1945, the BLS index was up 29 percent—without allowances for quality deterioration, and so forth. Passage of this bill raised the median Federal salary, CAF-3, from $1,620 per annum to $1,902 per annum, or 17 percent.

1946

From November 1945 until May 1946 Congress had under consideration a bill to increase Federal salaries. This was the period of the big strikes in industry which finally resulted in a national pattern of wage increases of 18½ cents per hour. In May 1946, Congress passed a pay bill granting Federal workers increases of 14 percent or $250, whichever would be greater, effective July 1, 1946.

For the median Federal worker, CAF-3, this meant an increase from $1,902 per annum to $2,168 per annum, or 13½ cents per hour—5 cents short of the raises in basic industry. It brought the salary approximately in line with living-cost increases between 1939 and January 1946, though workers did not begin to receive it until July.

Thus it will be seen that between any given prewar date and the present—April 1947—the median Federal salary—CAF 3 or equivalent—has been increased $548 from $1,620 per annum to $2,168 per annum, or 33.8 percent. The fact that salary increases have invariably lagged far behind rises in the cost of living has prevented most Federal workers from accumulating savings and has forced them to wage a losing struggle to maintain prewar living standards. Their consumption of goods has been forcibly and substantially reduced.

With respect to postal workers, the pattern has been very similar—no raises for a long period of years prior to the war, then wartime increases which lagged behind cost of living rises. All of the increases for postal workers, however, were flat sum increases—plus some readjustments in salary schedules. The 1946 increase, $400, equalled the 18½ cents per hour granted industrial workers at that time. The total wartime increases for postal workers was $800—prewar to date—and this represents a 42 percent increase over the approximate prewar median salary of $1,900 per annum.

COMPARISONS WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

It has already been noted that the increase granted Federal employees—except postal workers—in 1946 equaled only 13½ cents per hour at the median salary level while industrial employees received 18½ cents per hour. It is worth noting, moreover, that prior to that date the average wage in all manufacturing industry had already increased 57 percent, from $1,385 in January 1941 to $2,140 in January 1946.

Thus we find today that between January 1941 and February 1947 industrial wages have increased from 61 to 76 percent and have overtaken and passed Federal wage scales which have increased only 33.8 percent in the same period.

The following table shows this clearly:

	January 1941	February 1947	Percent increase
Federal employees median salary	$1,620	$2,168	33.8
Postal employees approximate median	1,900	2,700	42.0
All manufacturing industry, average	1,385	2,433	76.0
Durable goods, industry, average	1,385	2,257	61.0

It is not suggested that the increases in wages in manufacturing industry are excessive. The prewar average wage in industry was far too low, reflecting sweatshop conditions still existing in many plants. Many industrial workers are not yet receiving adequate wages. It does seem proper, however, that the average wage in manufacturing industry ought not to exceed the median wage in the Federal service. Yet ever since January 1946 average wages in manufacturing industry have been higher than the Federal median. Note the actual money relationship as of February 1947 shown in the table above.

During the past 2 weeks a new pattern of wage increases for industry has emerged as a result of the settlements in steel and electrical manufacturing and the virtual agreement in auto between the General Motors Corp. and the UAW-CIO. This pattern calls for increases of 15 cents per hour or $312 on an annual basis. This would bring the average annual wages in all manufacturing industry to $2,745 per annum, and in durable goods to $2,896. These industry averages would then exceed the present Federal median salary by $577 and $701 respectively.

It is recognized that most industrial workers are not on annual salaries and that the above comparison is therefore not fully legitimate. As a projection for basis of comparison it is useful, however, and if steady employment conditions in industry are assumed, the comparison is entirely fair.

Both the average wage in industry and the lower Federal median wage would still fall short, even after the new 15-cent-per-hour increases, of the $3,545 required to maintain a wage earners family of four in health and decency according to the latest Heller commitee budget.

COST OF LIVING

On March 15, 1947, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' consumer price index stood at 156—56 percent above the 1936–39 average. The index does not pretend to measure all the factors affecting a worker's cost of living. Government economists estimate that factors such as the disappearance of many low-cost lines of merchandise and quality deterioration require the addition of another 5 points to the index to make it reflect the true increase in living costs. Thus the cost of living on March 15 was actually 61 percent higher than before the war.

Between January 1946 and March 15, 1947, the price index increased 20 percent, from 129.9 to 156—5 points added to each figure gives true cost of living, but would not materially affect the percentage of increase.

Thus we arrive at the following comparison of Federal wages with living costs:

	1939	January 1946	March 1947	Percent increase, January 1946 to March 1947
Price index	100	129.9	156.0	20
Cost of living (5 points added to price index after 1943)	100	134.9	161.0	20
Median Federal salary (prewar salary equals 100)	100	[1] 133.8	133.8	0

[1] Salary index for July 1946, when last 14-percent raise became effective. That raise was based on January 1946 living costs but workers did not benefit from it till 6 months later.

Thus we see that a 20-percent increase—$433 per annum—would be required to bring the median Federal salary in line with present living costs.

As this memorandum is being written a national campaign has been launched for a voluntary reduction of prices. It is too soon to evaluate what, if any, permanent effects this campaign will have on workers' living costs. During the first 3 weeks of this campaign, its results on average price levels, according to BLS, were negligible—approximately 0.1 percent decline in wholesale prices being recorded. Apparently the campaign will not materially affect such

cost-of-living items as rent and durable goods and has so far had little effect on food prices. Rents, in fact, may be expected to rise under present administrative decontrol policies. Pending rent-control bills in the Congress threaten further rent increases.

From the standpoint of a healthy economy, however, both price decreases and wage increases are necessary.

WAGE INCREASES REQUIRED TO AVOID DEPRESSION

It is not intended to burden this memorandum with an extensive review of the dangers to the health of our national economy which the present wage-price-profit trends represent. The facts are set forth in detail in the President's economic report to the Congress. The main central conclusion which must be drawn from the report is that effective consumer demand and purchasing power must be increased if full employment is to be maintained. A few selected figures give the broad outlines of the situation:

Corporate profits in millions of dollars after taxes

1936-39 average	$3,900
1945	11,800
1946 estimate	12,000
1947 estimate	[1]17,000

[1] This is the latest estimate by Wall Street Journal and Chicago Journal of Commerce. All other figures are Department of Commerce figures. The Commerce Department's estimate for 1947 was made 2 months ago and at that time 1947 profits of $15,000,000,000 were predicted.

Corporate profits before taxes increased 230 percent between 1939 and 1946, while total wages and salaries increased only 169 percent.

The share of the national income going to wages and salaries between 1942 and 1945 averaged 68 percent, with 32 percent going to all other sources. In 1946 the share going to wages and salaries dropped to 62 percent, with 38 percent going to other sources.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has recently published a survey entitled "Full Employment Patterns in 1950." This survey reveals clearly that if we are to have full employment in 1950, two difficulties must be overcome:

First. Our national plant capacity must be increased. Our plant is not now large enough to afford jobs for all who will need them in 1950.

Second. If present trends continue, there will not be sufficient consumer demand or purchasing power to absorb products of our industry—assuming the probable increase in foreign trade, Government expenditures, and so forth.

Obviously, a key to solution of both problems is an immediate increase in consumer demand—which would encourage investment of capital to enlarge plant capacity, and which would, in turn, increase demand for products of the new plants. Other steps, such as the curbing of monopoly, are, of course, desirable for accomplishment of the necessary industrial expansion, but in our economy, consumer demand will always be a key factor determining business policy.

AMOUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL WAGE ADJUSTMENTS

The foregoing facts establish the need for immediate Federal wage adjustments. The questions remain, how large should these be and how should they be distributed?

Considering the second half of the question first, it is recommended that the adjustments be in the form of a lump annual increase for each worker. Such an increase would have the effect of distributing the total increase so as to produce the largest increase in effective purchasing power and consumer demand, and give most aid to the lower-paid employee who needs aid the most. This would also be cheaper for the Government.

For example, if it were decided that a 20 percent increase were justified, and it were applied on a percentage basis for all employees, the cost to the Government would be around $700,000,000. The other method would be to decide on a flat increase equal to 20 percent of the median salary, or $433, and give this increase to all employees. Cost to the Government would then drop to less than $500,000,000.

Obviously the basis for determining the amount of increase which should be provided, ought to be: First, cost of living; and, Second, comparability with private industry. The following figures are submitted without recommendation:

COST OF LIVING

Living costs have increased 20 percent since January 1946, the base period for the last Federal salary increase.

Twenty percent of Federal workers median salary—$2,168 per annum—equals $433.

Twenty percent of postal workers approximate median salary—$2,700—equals $540.

COMPARISON WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The median Federal worker received a pay increase in 1946 of 13½ cents per hour, while industrial workers received 18½ cents per hour.

Due Federal workers to establish equality as of January 1946, 5 cents per hour; annually, $104.

A 1947 pattern for wage increases in industry is now being established at 15 cents per hour.

Due Federal workers 15 cents per hour; annually, $312; total, $416.

If the above total $416 were added to the median Federal salary the result would still fall $161 per annum short of equaling the present average wage for all manufacturing industry provided the latter were increased 15 cents per hour above the February level, and assuming continuous employment. The result would fall $285 short of equaling the present average wage in durable goods manufacturing plus the 15-cents-per-hour adjustments now being made.

A rough estimate of the amount necessary to bring the Federal median wage in line with the average wage in manufacturing industry is $600.

FEDERAL WORKER DEMANDS

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the demand raised by the wage policy committee of the United Public Workers of America, CIO, and by the executive council of the Federation of Post Office Clerks, AFL, the only organizations which have publicly adopted a wage policy, is for increases of $600 per annum. This figure was based on the fact that the rise in Government wages did not keep pace with the wage increases in industry during the war, and on the rise in living costs. Both demands were raised in the late winter of 1946.

In view of the present economy drive on the part of the Republican leadership I have arbitrarily inserted a lower figure—$500 in the resolution which I introduced today—than the $600 figure which I believe is justified. I make this reduction in the hope that the leadership will give consideration to the plight of the Federal employees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEARNEY, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2157. An act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

631. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $644,000 for the Office of Defense Transportation (H. Doc. No. 232); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

632. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 with reference to payment of taxes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

633. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

634. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 18, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and mouth of the Ohio River, submitted in House Document No. 669, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with a view to determining if any modification of the existing project in the vicinity of Hastings, Minn., is advisable. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

635. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December

13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Little Black River and tributaries, Michigan, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

636. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 30, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of Androscoggin River, Maine and N. H., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 27, 1936, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 28, 1936; and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 25, 1936; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 329. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 201. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3245, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 331. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 332. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LATHAM: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 673. A bill to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3278. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3279. A bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3280. A bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3281. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 3282. A bill to permit distilled spirits of Puerto Rican manufacture to be entered in customs bonded warehouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3283. A bill to amend sections 2800 (f) and 3360 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3284. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the development of the mining resources of the United States," approved May 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 92), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3285. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3286. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 3287. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3288. A bill to provide that periods during which members of the armed forces were assigned to certain training programs may be counted in determining eligibility for the educational privileges of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 3289. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3290. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3291. A bill to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in this country in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 3292. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3293. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution relative to conditions in Palestine and that the United States take all steps necessary to reaffirm and urge Great Britain, the mandatory government, to live up to its mandate and immediately admit 100,000 displaced persons to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of volumes 1 through 5 of the hearings held before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, current session, relative to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3294. A bill for the relief of the Doehler-Jarvis Corp.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3295. A bill for the relief of Joseph John Gmurczyk, Jr.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 3296. A bill for the relief of F. M. Arends; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3297. A bill for the relief of Richard Kuhloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3298. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Lander Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Martin A. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

416. By Mr. COTTON: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives in the State of New Hampshire to the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, United States Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

417. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of a number of residents of Mabton, Grandview, Anatone, Asotin, and Clarkston, Wash., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, or broadcasting over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

418. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of 65 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Hazelton, Kans., urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

419. By Mr. JONES of Washington: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient hunters to kill off and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wildcats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks within the State of Washington, or to set aside a small area within the national parks in the State of Washington as a complete game sanctuary and allow hunting in the remaining portions and provide adequate boundaries to attract sufficient hunters to exterminate such predatory animals; to the Committee on Public Lands.

420. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Council of the City of New York, urging that there be made available immediately to the Government and people of Eire the necessary assistance in the form of food, fuel, and medical supplies to protect the welfare and safety of the Irish people during this crucial period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

421. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, expressing its opposition to the adoption of any legislation pending in the Congress which would tend to nullify gains made by labor in recent years, and calling upon Congressmen from the city of New York to use their efforts to prevent the enactment of any legislation that would be unfair to labor or against the interest of the public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

422. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the trans-

portation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prevent the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

423. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of New Jersey Vocational and Arts Association, urging appropriations of the full amount of money authorized under the George-Barden Act for the further development of vocational education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

424. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring the creation of a national park at Alamance battlefield, North Carolina, to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou dost know the secrets that will remake Thy world, for Thou art the way. Help us to see that the forces that threaten the freedoms for which we fought cannot be argued down, nor can they be shot down. They must be lived down. Give to the leaders of our Nation the inspired ideas that shall lead this country into making the American dream come true.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1947.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 1, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2157) to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities fo. the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], inserting on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", certain language.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement reached by the Senate yesterday afternoon, the time between now and 2 o'clock, when the pending motion is to be voted on, will be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment, and will be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. BALL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO SENATOR WAGNER BY SHEIL SCHOOL OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on April 17 in the city of Chicago I was very highly honored by having conferred upon me by the Right Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of that great metropolis, the Pope Leo XIII award. This high award is conferred annually for outstanding contribution to Christian social education.

I think it is significant at this time, when the act which bears my name is the subject of so much criticism and abuse, that Bishop Sheil, in asking me to accept the award, referred to the Wagner Labor Relations Act as an example of what he characterized as an "inestimable service to this Nation and the world."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation accompanying the presentation of the award and my speech accepting it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS — INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an estimate of appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit report of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation and its subsidiary, Warrior River Terminal Co., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Eighth Guam Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Joint Resolution 1

"Whereas the United States of America acquired the Island of Guam as a result of the Spanish-American War under the terms of the treaty signed at Paris on December 10, 1898; and

"Whereas article IX, paragraph 2, of the said treaty provides that the Congress of the United States of America shall determine the civil rights and political statutes of the native inhabitants of the territories thereby ceded by Spain to the United States of America; and

"Whereas the United States of America has created a tradition for its respect and adherence to the sanctity of treaties, said tradition having been consistently maintained upon numerous occasions, including that of determination by the Congress of the United States of the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, the other territories ceded with the island of Guam by Spain to the United States of America under the terms of the said treaty signed at Paris, on December 10, 1898; and

"Whereas the people of Guam have consistently proven their love for and loyalty to the United States of America during times of peace and throughout the horrors of a

terrible war wherein faith in God and country, upheld the said love for and loyalty to the United States by a helpless people; and

"Whereas the people of Guam owing permanent allegiance to the United States have always aspired to be recognized as citizens of their own and beloved Nation the United States of America, and having honorably served said Nation in war and peace; and

"Whereas in the service to God and country to which the people of Guam have uncomplainingly contributed their all many families have been honored by having a member or members thereof become unsung hero or heroes, having made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this joint resolution be adopted by the Eighth Guam Congress, in joint session, for presentation to the Congress of the United States of America for appropriate action in the determination of the civil rights and political status of the citizens of Guam to the effect that a law be passed by the said Congress of the United States, granting full citizenship of the United States to the aforesaid citizens of Guam, together with the enactment of an organic law for the government thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy of this joint resolution signed by the Honorable B. J. Bordallo, chairman of the house of council, and the Honorable E. T. Calvo, chairman of the house of assembly, be forwarded by the way of the Honorable Governor of Guam, and other official channels to the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy each of this joint resolution be furnished the Civil Administrator, naval government of Guam; the Honorable Governor of Guam; the Honorable Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Secretary of State; the Honorable Secretary of War; the Honorable Secretary of Interior; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Honorable Speaker, United States House of Representatives; the Honorable President, United States Senate; the Honorable chairman and members, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs; United States House of Representatives; and any other person deemed to be friendly to Guam and people

"Done at Agana, Guam, this 4th day of January 1947.

"The within resolution was passed unanimously by both houses of congress on the date indicated therein."

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution for requests for amendments to the Charter of the United Nations resulting in a limited world federal government

"Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

"Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law and some measure of world government; and

"Whereas the United Nations is an organization in being and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of world order; and

"Whereas the people in 255 cities and towns of the commonwealth, by a vote of 586,093 to 63,624 favored strengthening the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to direct our delegates to the United Nations to propose or support amendments to its Charter which will strengthen the United Nations and make it a limited world federal government able to prevent war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the preparation of such amendments our delegates should advocate:

"1. Delegation to the United Nations of limited but adequate legislative, executive, and judicial powers:

"(a) To maintain such world inspection police and military forces as are necessary to enforce world law and to provide world security;

"(b) Gradually and progressively to eliminate national armaments (other than those necessary for internal policing); and

"(c) To provide for dependable revenue.

"2. Balanced representation of each nation in the General Assembly upon a just formula which will recognize influence in the world, natural and industrial resources, literacy, population, and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.

"3. Adoption of a bill of rights assuring fair trial and other adequate protection of persons affected by the Charter and laws enacted thereunder.

"4. Reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social and religious institutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the calling of a general conference under article 109 of the United Nations Charter to review the Charter and to recommend appropriate amendments thereto; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution shall not be construed to advocate unilateral disarmament by the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the delegates of the United States to the United Nations.

"In house of representatives, adopted, March 26, 1947.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 31, 1947."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A petition signed by 403 citizens of the city of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 200 citizens of Columbia, Mo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KEM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment; without amendment; and

H. R. 493. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22: 3204, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); without amendment.

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 854. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 151).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 1212. A bill relating to the completion of Everglades National Park, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1213. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946;

S. 1215. A bill to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels;

S. 1216. A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1217. A bill to amend the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944," in order to terminate eligibility for mustering-out payments;

S. 1218. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; and

S. 1219. A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1220. A bill to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1221. A bill to make retrocession to the State of California of jurisdiction over certain land to be used in connection with operations of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr MORSE (for Mr. CORDON and himself), by request, introduced Senate bill 1222, to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing permission to be given for the erection in Washington, D. C., of a monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United

States Forces in World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'DANIEL (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 14, line 12, after "ing", insert the following: "including not to exceed $628,769 for the following-named hospitals and sanatorium in the State of South Dakota: Crow Creek Hospital, $41,422; Pine Ridge Hospitals, $121,320; Rosebud Hospital, $146,571; Cheyenne River Hospital, $70,912; Sioux Sanatorium, $197,424; and Sisseton Hospital, $51,120."

On page 16, line 11, after the word "Washington", insert the word "South Dakota."

On page 27, line 1, after the word "Nevada", insert a comma and the words "South Dakota."

Mr. ECTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 16, line 10, strike out the word "Montana."

On page 16, line 15, after the word "Nevada", insert a comma and the word "Montana."

On page 27, line 1, after the word "Nevada", insert a comma and the word "Montana."

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENCES IN COSTS OF SPONGES

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 109), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed, under authority conferred by section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and for the purposes of that section, to investigate the differences in the costs of production of the following domestic articles and of any like or similar foreign articles: Sponges.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Federal aid to education prepared by Senator KILGORE, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT—ADDRESS BY CHARLES P. McCORMICK

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on international transport, delivered by Charles P. McCormick before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington on April 30, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURES MARKET—ARTICLE FROM FARMERS' GUILD NEWS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Several Pertinent Questions Regarding Futures Markets," quoting a letter from Ernest D. MacDougall, published in the February-March 1947 issue of the Farmers' Guild News, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is detained appearing before a committee. He called me up this morning and told me that if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wanted to proceed he could speak in the time of the Senator from Florida, and would be granted 45 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is, therefore, recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I wish to say that I prefer not to yield, because of the limitations of time. However, if any Member of the Senate feels that any point raised by me so involves an argument made by him in previous debate that he does not care to wait until I conclude my remarks in order to ask a question I shall endeavor to oblige him by yielding. However, to the extent possible I should like to have my colleagues refrain from asking me to yield until I get through with my main comments, and then I assure them that I shall be as accommodating as I always try to be in carrying on an interchange of views with them.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is a very difficult one against which to argue, and no one is more keenly aware of that fact than is the junior Senator from Oregon. It is difficult to argue against it because on its face it appears to be a most reasonable and fair amendment. Certainly all of us are opposed to coercive tactics. If I felt that the amendment would be at all helpful in promoting better labor-industrial relations, I, too, would like to go along with the proposal, which on its face, and by its terminology, seems to be fair and plausible. I read it:

On page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", insert the following: "(A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B)."

Mr. President, I shall now argue against the adoption of the amendment, for a series of reasons. One reason in a way stands off by itself, in a class by itself. It is a reason which goes to my viewpoint as to what the policy of the Senate of the United States should be in passing upon labor legislation at this particular session of Congress.

I wish to point out that we had weeks of public hearings before the committee, followed by prolonged executive sessions, in which reasonable men, including each one of the 13 members of the committee, tried hard to reach a common agreement on a fair and workable labor bill. The members of the committee were motivated only, I assure my colleagues, by a sincere desire to prepare and report a committee bill which would greatly improve labor relations. Acting in complete good faith, they entered into many conscionable compromises of their differences in original points of view. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished chairman of the committee, whose fine work on the committee I have commended heretofore, and I repeat the commendation this morning; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], all of whom had views somewhat at variance with some of my views, and vice versa, compromised many times, as did all the other members of the committee, in the interest of reaching an agreement on a fair and reasonable committee bill and report.

I think our labors brought forth such a bill and such a report, because when the vote was actually taken in the committee the vote was in fact 11 to 2 for the committee bill. The two dissenting members, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I think would stand on the floor of the Senate today and admit—in fact, I think they have admitted, in effect, in their speeches heretofore made—that many features of the bill as reported are desirable and sound. They objected to certain provisions included in the final bill to such a degree that they found it impossible to go along with the final report.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] voted for the bill. Then he filed a special concurring opinion, I may call it, expressing in some instances, views somewhat at variance with those of some of us in the majority. After

voting with the majority to report the bill, the Senator from Utah joined also with the signers of the minority views. As I understand his position, he feels that if we are to have any legislation, it should be in the form of the committee bill rather than in the form of a more drastic bill.

The point I want to stress, Mr. President, in this first argument today against the amendment, is that I think the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare performed yeoman's service in reaching an agreement, so far as reasonable men can agree when differences of opinion as to certain objectives in labor legislation exist between and among them. I think we agreed upon the best possible bill that could be written by the committee. It is true that, at the time of the vote, members of the committee, including the distinguished chairman, reserved the right that Senators always have to offer amendments to the bill on the floor of the Senate. He has seen fit to exercise that right; as has my good friend the Senator from Minnesota. I do not quarrel with that; but I do want to emphasize the point that if the Senate should pass the bill as it came from the committee, it would be passing a bill which 11 out of 13 members of the committee said should be passed when they voted to report it. It is true that some said additional provisions covering other subjects should be included in the bill, but, as a result of the give-and-take process during the weeks of work by the committee, there came forth a bill with which a very preponderant majority of the committee found itself in agreement.

I feel that if the desire is to write some good labor legislation on the statute books, the Senate should take the committee bill and stop there. It should accept a report which 11 members of the committee believe represents a bill so good that they could vote for it. In fact even though some members of the committee want additions to it they are willing to admit on the floor of the Senate that if the bill in its present form should be passed it would be very helpful in the promotion of harmonious industrial relations.

I think a difficulty arises when an effort is made on the floor to go over the head of the majority of the committee with a series of amendments. I do not question the right of Senators to propose the amendments but, in my judgment, by so doing a division is created in the Senate which will make it very difficult if not impossible to override a veto if the President should decide to veto the bill as amended.

What I fear is that our committee bill will be amended in such a way on the floor of the Senate as to make it necessary for some of us to vote against the bill in its final form as it leaves the Senate. The next step in the process of trying to secure final passage of workable legislation will be to send whatever bill is passed in the Senate to conference with the House. If we pass a too drastic bill—and the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are too drastic, in my opinion—we will be in a weakened position in conference because in all probability the House will want to add to any bill we send to conference some of its extreme proposals. When such a bill comes back to the Senate from conference, I think there is a very great possibility that not even a majority of the Senate will go along with such legislation. At least, I am going to continue to hope that sooner or later a majority of the Senate will come to appreciate, more fully than I fear it does at the present moment, the serious mistake that will be made if we finally vote for legislation that contains the amendments now pending in the Senate and the even more extreme proposals of the Hartley bill.

However, if the Senate should vote to approve the type of conference report I have just described, the bill will then go to the White House for consideration by the President as to whether he should sign it or veto it. I cannot speak for the President. I do not know what he will do. However, as I said the other day on the floor, I just cannot imagine the President signing such a bill as one containing the pending amendment plus the extreme features of the Hartley bill. If he should sign such a bill, it would, indeed, be unfortunate for the economy of the country.

The placing on the statute books of such legislation would work great injury not only to the rights of free workers but to the economic welfare of industry itself. Instead of protecting the public from industrial strife, I am certain it would cause industrial strife.

Assuming that the President should veto such a bill, it would then come back to the Senate for action upon the veto. I think there are enough of us in the Senate who have no intention of making the type of mistake which would be involved in the final passage of such a bill as I have described, to sustain the President's veto. We will have to vote in accordance with our convictions and our knowledge of labor problems.

That is why I said on the floor the other day that I think when so much hard work has gone into a bill as has been put into the committee bill, and when men have been as reasonable as I think the 13 of us on the committee have tried to be, the Members of the Senate ought to try to accommodate each other on the floor of the Senate by accepting the compromises which were made in committee and pass the bill as reported to the Senate. By so doing, I think we would find ourselves in a very strong position in conference, too.

I am afraid that the result of adding the amendments would be most unfortunate. I do not think the votes are available in the Senate to override a veto of a bill with the amendments in it. I say that, if I can count noses accurately, though I have been working so hard on this matter, Mr. President, I sometimes wonder whether I can even count noses any more, especially after the vote on day before yesterday. I comment on that vote by saying that it was a surprise to me in view of the fact that so many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle had indicated a different attitude by their actual votes in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or by statements made at Republican conferences. Further, many of my Republican colleagues came to me in private and said to me, "Wayne, you are right about the principle of not having an omnibus bill but rather seperate labor bills." I am becoming used to being told on many of those controversial issues that I am right as a matter of principle, but dead wrong as a matter of politics. Apparently I was dead wrong as a matter of politics the other day when I made the motion to recommit, with instructions. But time works wonders occasionally, Mr. President. I do not believe that time will prove me wrong on the principle which I advocated. I did not go along with party regularity at that time. I shall never go along in the name of party regularity when the policy of the party does not coincide with the public interest. But I want to plead now with my Republican colleagues for a little party regularity in supporting the report of a committee that has been worked out in in good faith and good conscience by all members of the committee. It is in line with the public interest, so it is good party regularity to go along with it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator of course does not question the fact that five out of eight Republicans on the committee were for this amendment, and were voted down by three Republicans in combination with those who were wholly opposed to any bill at all. So that when it comes to a question of party regularity, I think the Senator's argument is not very sound.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, the Senator from Ohio has a very strange definition of party regularity, apparently, because I am willing to say that down in their hearts a majority of Senators on this side of the aisle, if they could have considered ab initio the motion to split up the omnibus bill, would have voted to split it into several parts. However the Republican Policy Committee, of which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is chairman, and the Republican leaders in the House got busy and took action contrary to that which would have permitted Senators to have carried out their personal convictions as to the type of labor legislation the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress should have submitted to the President in behalf of the American people. So I want to say to my friend from Ohio that I do not think he can make much of a test of party regularity on the basis of the principle of majority rule, if he considers those two situations. I think a majority of my Republican colleagues would have preferred separate labor bills if the Republican leaders had not pushed as an issue of party regularity the omnibus bill proposal. After all, should not the test of party regularity be decided according to what is best for the party in terms of what is best for the country, rather than in terms of whether or not the leaders of the party in the Senate by an appeal to party regularity can carry enough votes in their pockets to play politics

with an issue as vital as this one. I think the procedure which has been followed in this instance will prove to be unwise, both from the standpoint of the Republican Party or of the people of the country.

I prefer my interpretation of party regularity to that which I think is implied, at least, in the suggestions of my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator was appealing to party regularity to drop this amendment, and I was only answering that my appeal for the amendment is based on the merits of the amendment, because it is something against which there is no sensible argument, and because it is something which in labor relations is required to balance the similar provision in the bill against employers. If the Senator will argue on the merits of the proposition, I certainly am making no appeal on this question for party regularity. I am only asking everyone to vote on the merits of the amendments as they are presented.

Mr. MORSE. I shall deal, Mr. President, with the so-called merits of the issue, as the Senator from Ohio sees the merits of the issue, but I am not going to be diverted from at least expressing my point of view as to what I think would be good Republican Party regularity in connection with this matter. I repeat it, and then I shall move on to the next issue. I say, here and now, that just as I felt it would have been good Republican policy not to have reported an omnibus bill but separate bills based on the titles which I included in my motion the other day, so, now, I say it would be good policy for the Republicans in the Senate to say, "After all, with all the work that has been done on this bill, after reasonable men working in good faith reached fair compromises in accordance with their conscience and by a vote of 11 to 2 reported out this bill we better support it without adding to it highly controversial amendments." I think the committee bill is the bill that we should send to conference, in the hope of preserving most of it at least, and then send it on to the President. If we could do that—and I want to make my position clear—I would vote to override any veto that the President might affix to the bill. If it is not changed materially I would vote to override a veto because this is a good bill in its present form. What I am saying, in essence, is that, as one member of the committee, I have tried to modify my views in a great many respects so as to bring about the passage of a bill which would be very constructive in the solution of labor problems.

What I fear will happen is that all the work we did will go for naught, and the Senate will pass a bill for which a good many of us cannot vote and, if it should be vetoed, then a good many of us will have to vote to sustain the veto. I do not like that. If the Senator from Ohio thinks I do, he is mistaken. If the Senator from Ohio thinks that I particularly enjoy finding myself on labor issues in a position apparently out of step with the leaders of my party in the Senate of the United States, he is very much mistaken. I would like to support a sound Republican labor program but the Senator from Ohio is not now proposing a sound labor program.

But there is one thing I cannot forget, one thing I cannot put into the background, and that is my experience in the field of labor relations. Out of that experience and out of the cases I have handled in the field of labor relations I have reached the honest conviction that if we go further than the bill as reported by the committee we will not help promote harmonious industrial relations. Rather to the contrary we will continue the present conditions of strife and strain and stress which are doing such damage in the field of labor relations to the economy of the country. That is the only reason why I say to my friend from Ohio that I am making this plea this morning out of my conviction that it would be good Republican policy, it would be good for the country, it would be constructive so far as labor relations are concerned, if we went forward with this bill without amendment. I care not how sound an argument may be made for certain amendments to the bill, let us forego any changes in it, write it on the statute books as it was reported by committee and see then what the effect will be after a year of actual operation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand the Senator to suggest that because I thought the bill was inadequate I should have voted against it if I wanted to bring up any additional proposals in the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, not at all. As I have said, I recognize the right of the Senator from Ohio to offer any amendments of the bill he wants to.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the suggestion is that because we voted for the bill, therefore we cannot deal with additional problems which were before the committee, fully considered by the committee, and I suppose in at least a dozen instances in the committee, three Republicans and four Democrats, who now appear to be absolutely opposed to any bill at all, voted us down time after time by a vote of 7 to 6. Does the Senator suggest that under those circumstances I should take the position that the Senate should not pass on four important matters voted down without any compromise? The committee never compromised on them. It voted against them to the last. The only compromise suggested, as I recall, was that we should vote finally for the bill. I have no objection to the bill, only it does not cover three or four matters which are vital, in my opinion, to any solution of the problem of labor relations. I can see nothing in the Senator's suggestion that here is a compromise to which we ought to agree. The bill was no compromise. We were voted down time after time by a minority of the Republican Senators, and other Senators who were absolutely opposed to any bill at all.

I think the Senator's suggestion that the Senate itself should be deprived of an opportunity of voting, or determining its own opinion about a matter in which there was as close a vote in the committee, is absolutely contrary to the legislative process and to the free right of Senators to express their own opinions.

If I should urge the withdrawal of the pending amendment I do not know whether the authors of the amendment would favor such action, and if they should favor it, I suppose other Senators would offer amendments of the same type; in fact other Senators have offered amendments far more drastic than the amendments proposed by a minority of the committee.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I want first to reply to the Senator from Ohio, and then I shall yield.

I wish to make two points in reply to the Senator from Ohio. In the first place, I think he knows that no one is going to put any words in my mouth. I am perfectly willing to let the recorded transcript stand as I made my statements this morning. At no time have I suggested that the Senator from Ohio is not entitled to do exactly what he has done in regard to these amendments. He is perfectly welcome to offer any amendment he wants to, and I would not take that right away from him. I am saying, however, that in view of the fact that the committee has reported as good a bill as the one which is now before the Senate, which the Senator from Ohio admits, insofar as it goes is a good bill, and in view of the situation which exists in the Congress in regard to labor legislation, considering the House action, considering the possibility of a veto, considering the vote situation in the Senate, I think that this year we should stop with this bill. Let us put this bill on the statute books and see how it works before we consider amendments. If the Senator from Ohio would go along with us in that program, I believe that in the long run it would prove to be the best policy for the country. Of course, this is a matter of prediction, and one should not try to be a prophet, but I believe that in the long run such action would result in more sound labor relations than will be the case if—and I underline the word "if"—if we end up with no legislation at all.

The second point I want to make in my reply to the Senator from Ohio is that I am willing to let the record speak for itself as to whether we compromised. We compromised in a great many ways. We compromised on a multitude of points. In this particular instance the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Minnesota, as I recall, wanted this amendment. We could not reach any compromise on that point, and a majority of the votes in the committee were against adopting the amendment.

Mr. President, I never seek to speak for anyone else, but I think the Senator from Ohio will let me speak for him when I say I am sure he does not question that there were many compromises made in

the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when considering this bill. Many compromises were reached under the persuasive arguments of the Senator from Ohio himself, agreed to by the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I certainly have had no similar experience in the limited time I have been in the Senate to observe the working out of fair and reasonable compromises in connection with proposed legislation of such vital concern to the country. I tell the Senate that the bill is the product of compromise and naught but the product of compromise. It is not anything else but a series of compromises, and it ought to be. On March 10, when I addressed the Senate at length, I said that that was the type of bill which should be reported and passed.

Hence I am at a loss to understand the Senator from Ohio when he seems to imply that the bill is not the result of compromises. The fact that he was not able to work out a compromise on his proposed amendment does not change the fact that on many issues compromises were reached. Nor does it change this important fact that the rest of us on occasion agreed to drop some of our proposals for inclusion in the bill. However, we are not proposing additional amendments to the bill simply because we did not have our way at all times in committee.

I shall move on to the next point. I believe the RECORD has been made clear, at least with respect to the difference of opinion the Senator from Ohio and I may have on the first point which I advanced as a reason for adopting the bill as we have reported it without change.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I simply want to clear up one point in which I seem to be concerned, and that is that with respect to my own position, the action in committee was a matter of compromise and a matter of yielding. I recognize that the bill as it now stands is not a perfect bill. I know that the junior Senator from Oregon feels the same way about it. I fully concur in what he has had to say about the question of compromise.

As to the Senator from Ohio, perhaps he has not compromised on some points, but I want to say here and now that he has been extremely fair all the way through in the way in which he has considered the whole matter, and I have nothing but commendation for his attitude and position.

I feel, however, that it is most unfortunate that by indirection at least the idea seems to exist here that any Democrats who voted with the three Republican Senators against certain provisions in the bill as it now stands were in favor of no legislation at all. That was not my understanding of the situation at any time. The very fact that an amendment is allegedly being prepared which, I assume, may be offered in substitution of the bill we are now considering—an amendment which in itself is a bill—and which it is alleged would go to a considerable extent in meeting some of these problems, would indicate that they, too, realized the situation with which we were confronted.

In that connection, Mr. President, I want to point out one thing which has dominated my own attitude throughout the consideration of the proposed legislation, and that is that partisan politics has no place in the consideration of this matter. It would be most unfortunate if such a situation should develop. We should settle this question on the basis of its own merits. We are never going to arrive at a sound solution by any other process. That has been the attitude I personally have taken, and I think it has been the attitude which those voting as I voted in the committee have taken in the consideration of the pending bill.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for allowing me this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one clarification?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With regard to the question of compromise, we might divide it into several categories. There were a number of matters which were argued, and on which a compromise was reached. There were a number of other matters on which argument was made and no compromise was reached, but we were voted down 7 to 6. When such matters were of lesser importance, we did not press the question, but accepted the decisions as they came.

As to these four particular matters, there was no compromise; and there certainly was no compromise on the bill as a whole at any time. We are merely presenting one of the four more important matters on which there was no compromise in the committee, and on which we were voted down by a vote of 7 to 6. If the Senator from New York has not understood the attitude of the Democrats who voted against certain amendments, he might read the minority views, which clearly show that so far as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are concerned, they are against any legislation dealing with labor relations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to move on to my next point. Commenting on what the Senator from Ohio has just said, I cannot quite follow his reasoning on the compromise point. We are dealing with a bill which has a multitude of points in it. The Senator says, in effect, that he was defeated on certain points. On those points there was no willingness to compromise or modify. We could not get together on those points. There was no compromise, and he was voted down. That is a statement of fact.

The next jump in his reasoning by way of inference is that because of that fact the bill itself is not the product of compromise. There were a great many points on which the Senator from Ohio won in the committee, in that he talked us into modification of language. I think he not only was persuasive when he did so, but he was sound, and we went along with his sound proposals for compromise. However, a bill does not have to be compromised as to each one of its points to be a bill which was produced as the result of fair and honest compromise.

To say that there are some points in the bill that were not modified in the committee discussion certainly will come as no surprise to Members of the Senate. I am sure that Senators would be surprised if every single line and thought in a bill were modified in some respects during committee discussion and debate. If the Senator from Ohio means a compromise bill in that sense, it is not a compromise bill. No such bill will ever come on the floor of the Senate compromised in that fashion.

As I have previously stated, the bill in its totality is the product of reasonable minds trying to seek conscionable compromises in an effort to bring forth the best possible final action.

One further point, and then I must move on. It is a slight point, but one that needs to be made clear for the record. One of my colleagues said to me the other day, "How do you explain the fact that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who voted with you in the committee many times when the vote was 7 to 6, left you when it came to the final vote?" Let me say for the record—and I am confident that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] can underwrite with absolute certainty what I now say—that at no time was there any so-called understanding between the Democratic members of the committee and the Republican members of the committee as to the type of bill we should report. In fact, I had only two conversations with Democratic members of the committee aside from discussions with them in full committee meetings. I am perfectly willing to have the RECORD show what I said in those conversations. I said, in effect, "I hope you gentlemen will give careful thought and analysis to the proposals which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York are making for labor legislation which we think would be sound and constructive. We hope that you will at least study them; and if you can agree to the merits of our position, we hope that you will approve our recommendations."

As I understand their position—and they can speak for themselves—they found themselves in agreement with us on a great many points, and so voted. They found themselves in disagreement with us when they came to vote upon the bill as a whole, and they so voted. But let the RECORD be perfectly clear that there was no collusion, no understanding, no "gentleman's agreement" or any other type of agreement between the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Oregon, or, so far as I know, any other Republican member of the committee. That is why, in the Republican conference, when the question was put to me directly by the Senator from Ohio, as to whether I thought the Democrats would vote for reporting the final bill from the committee, I said "I do not know. I should be surprised if they did not, because all I can see from their discussion and action in committee is that they agree in the main with the principles for which I am

fighting in title I, and the principles for which the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is fighting in the Ives bill." I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. President, it is important, in considering the proposal made in the pending amendment, which seems so fair and plausible on its face, to consider the history of identical proposals.

In 1932, when the Congress was considering the bill which was subsequently enacted as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it was proposed that the bill in its statement of policy should provide that employees have the right of self-organization free from interference, restraint, or coercion from all sources. This proposal was made by Walter Gordon Merritt, counsel for the League for Industrial Rights, an employers' association, before the House Committee on the Judiciary. The proposal was not adopted.

When the National Industrial Recovery Act was being considered, Charles R. Hook, president of the American Rolling Mills, suggested that section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act be amended so as to prohibit coercion from any source. This proposal was not adopted.

In the Seventy-third Congress a proposal was made that the Railway Labor Act be changed so as to accomplish a similar purpose. Again the suggestion was not adopted.

In 1934 the Senate was considering the Labor Disputes Act, which later became the National Labor Relations Act. James A. Emery, general counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, contended that the bills should be revised to prohibit interference, restraint, and coercion from any source. Both the House and the Senate committees rejected the proposal.

Later, when the Wagner bill was being debated on the floor of the Senate, an amendment was proposed making it an unfair labor practice for any person to coerce employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization. The proposal was debated and the amendment rejected by a vote of 50 to 21. Interestingly enough, the yea-and-nay vote shows that some Senators who favor the pending amendment voted against a similar amendment in 1935—see volume 79, part 7, page 7675, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

It would seem clear that when a proposal has been considered so often by Congress over a period of 15 years and consistently rejected, it should be viewed with a great deal of skepticism.

Let me point out that basic to the whole question which we are considering is the problem of organizing unions, the problem of going into a plant and trying to persuade and educate fellow workers to an understanding that their best economic interests can be promoted through unity, through unionization. I do not have to tell my colleagues in the Senate that organizational drives are rather strenuous affairs, because antilabor interests are at work in America against unionization. It is a sad commentary, in my opinion, that there are still too many employers in America who would like to see no unions at all. Oh, yes, they pay lip service to collective bargaining and to unionization. Such employers pretend that they want free men to have the right to form unions; but I say, on the basis of my experience, Mr. President, that too frequently such employers mean that they want to see workers organize only in weak unions, not in strong unions; not unions which can meet the economic competition with employers when it comes to collective bargaining. They want weak unions, and the weaker the better. In fact, one great industrialist in this country—and I am happy that his attitude does not represent that of industrial statesmen generally, because they think and talk in different terms—one industrialist, somewhat in the heat of anger, I admit, and in criticism of my stand on labor matters, told me that what we need is a depression to put unions into their proper place. It was his argument to me that unemployment and some empty bellies would teach workers to be thankful for their jobs. He argued that if we had to have a depression to put unions in their place, the sooner we had it the better. I am afraid, Mr. President, that he is not singular in that point of view. I am afraid there are too many employers who think that their long-time interests will be served by a successful drive now against unions while the public is aroused and, may I say, for the most part justly aroused, against certain labor abuses. However, in contrast with such antilabor employers, I would that more industrial statesmen in America would come forward now and say publicly what many of them have told me privately about the rights of labor. They have told me that it is not in the interest of our private enterprise system to pass in the Eightieth Congress drastic labor legislation which will force labor to do but one thing. Let us keep that course of action in mind at all times.

What is it? This is my judgment on labor's course of action if we pass such amendments as are pending, which I give to you for whatever it is worth. Time will have to pass judgment on whether or not I talked fact or fiction here this morning. I am willing to let time pass upon that question. But, in my judgment, if we adopt the pending legislation with drastic amendments added to it we will set labor back on its haunches for a couple of years. I should be the first to say that that would have a salutary effect, in that it certainly would make very clear to certain labor-union leaders who have been guilty, in my judgment, of unpardonable abuses in some instances, that an aroused public seeking to protect itself, will strike back, sometimes too drastically for the best interests of both labor and the public itself. But that will be only a temporary thing, because I think there is a great psychological and physiological law that as legislators we should not overlook, namely, that we cannot maintain a mass of people, any more than we can maintain an individual, for very long on a high-pitch emotional attitude. There is always a relaxation from a high-pitched emotional attitude; and if we make a mistake in passing legislation here based upon emotional attitudes, the legislation will still be on the books after the public has come to realize that it went too far in passing drastic labor legislation. The public, which is basically fair, will regret the passage of unfair legislation even though it wants to discipline certain labor leaders for action contrary to the public interest. What shall we do with the law after public support of it begins to weaken? I wish to state what I think will happen then. When more and more people on the sidelines begin to be sympathetic with labor's protests against and resistance to unjust labor legislation, that legislation will soon become unworkable and unenforceable. Great shifts of public opinion will occur, carrying with them significant consequences, both politically and in the field of law enforcement. Resentment will be developed against employers and businessmen and more fuel will be added to the fire of class consciousness in America. Labor will carry on an intensive campaign against such unjust legislation and against those responsible for it, including the political party most responsible for it.

Mr. President, I never have and I never shall condone defiance of the law but neither you nor I, Mr. President, nor the entire Congress is vested with the power to change human nature by the mere passage of a law. Workers being human beings are not going to take kindly to legislation that they are satisfied is unfair and unjust and so they will unite in action which seeks to undermine defy and make unworkable such a law. The creation of such a situation as that in our industrial order will produce anything but industrial harmony.

So at least I want the RECORD to show that at this hour I said in the Senate of the United States that the passage of too drastic labor legislation by the Eightieth Congress will leave the workers of this country with but one course of action to follow, namely, to dig in for the next decade, if necessary, to see to it that any unjust and unfair labor law becomes impossible of enforcement.

Is that a revolutionary statement? Not at all. It is the pronouncement of a great Jeffersonian principle of democracy, Mr. President. Thus Jefferson said:

> The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God.
>
> What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance?

Let us not forget that when we pass a law which results in injustice, a law which stirs up the opposition of a large minority of our people, the workability of that law becomes an impossibility. Labor will feel that the only way to educate the public into an understanding that such a law is unworkable is to make it unworkable. So I say—and I use my words advisedly, being aware of all the misinterpretation that can be made of the sentence which I now utter—that one of the great rights of a free people in a democracy is to resist an unjust law. They always will so long as they have any freedom left.

Let it be understood that I neither condone nor advocate resistance to nor defiance of law. I only point out that in the last analysis that right is vested in free people whenever rightfully or wrongfully they reach the conclusion that the only way they can get justice is to challenge the enforceability of an unjust law.

We saw it in a mild way in prohibition days. It took a variety of forms. Some communities boasted that juries would not convict for violations of the prohibition law. In other communities, law-enforcement officers looked the other way at violations because they knew that a large segment of the community was completely out of sympathy with the enforcement of the law. In some areas the unenforceability of the law manifested itself in exceedingly undesirable ways that at times took on the characteristics of almost open defiance of law enforcement.

The only point I am seeking to make is that if we pass labor legislation which increasing numbers of workers in this country and their sympathizers consider to be unfair, unjust and exploiting in its effects we are certain to see such a law increasingly challenged by a variety of forms of resistance. I do not think that there is any legislative statesmanship involved in the passage of such legislation. I believe that the type of labor legislation that is now being forged in the Congress of the United States will produce great labor strife in this country resulting over the years in an organized determination of an increasing number of workers to challenge the administration of such a law. As I see it they will do it in a variety of ways including hundreds of cases of litigation so long as they see any chance of knocking out the law through litigation. Of one thing I think we can be certain and that is that it will all add up to labor trouble and not to labor peace. It will all add up to more economic headaches for employers, not less.

Then, too, I think it needs to be emphasized at this point in the debate that American employers should never forget that it is much easier to enforce legislation against a few employers than it is against hundreds of thousands of workers that think that a certain piece of legislation is unjust. This matter of drastic legislation works both ways. It can be used to cut down the rights of employers as well as the rights of workers but there is this great difference and that is it can be used much more effectively against employers than it can against many thousands of workers. What I am trying to do in the legislation that I am fighting for is to so amend the Wagner Act so that its application will be equalized in its effects upon labor as well as employers but in a manner which will be workable. I think that is what American employers want and I think that is all they want.

However, I am satisfied that those who are proposing extreme legislation in this Congress are not speaking the voice of the overwhelming majority of American businessmen and industrialists. It is because I want to maintain a system of Government by law which can be enforced that I am pleading with the Senate today not to pass a type of labor legislation which will cause American workers and their sympathizers to resort to all available means, methods and devices for undermining the enforceability of a bad law. Let us not pass legislation which is so unworkable and unenforceable that its injustices will cause free men to refuse in the last analysis to comply with it.

As to what will happen by reason of the type of legislation which apparently will emerge from conference and will pass the Congress and go to the President, I predict that, if he signs it—which I doubt—it will result in labor in this country digging in along a united front for as many years as may be required to prove to the American people that such drastic legislation cannot be shackled upon free workers.

That, together with my great desire to see government by law carried out in its most majestic sense, is why I am pleading here today for the passage of a bill which will be workable, for the passage of the bill which has come out of the committee and which I think will bring great relief to the employers of this country who have suffered from labor abuses.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does that mean that I have been allotted a certain amount of time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understood it, the Senator was allotted 45 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Florida I shall take the privilege of yielding myself some more time, and I shall continue to talk until the Senator from Florida appears on the floor, unless I finish before that time. I hope I shall.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he use half the time.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I shall speak within the amount of time remaining.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the absence of the Senator from Florida the time be allotted by the Senator from Oregon on that side of the question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MORSE. With the understanding that I shall hand the privilege back to the Senator from Florida as soon as he arrives.

Turning to the amendment, Mr. President, I desire to point out:

First. That coercive practices by unions or their agents, which constitute a violation of local criminal laws, are and should be subject to correction by local authorities. No substantial evidence was presented to the committee that local police agencies had been lax or derelict in their duty of enforcing local and State police measures. I am one who believes—and this point was made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] in his argument—that upon a showing of force, or coercion, or intimidation the local police authority should exercise the primary jurisdiction over that type of practice.

Second. The proposal before us would tremendously extend Federal power into areas that have heretofore been regarded as the sole concern of State, county, and local authorities. It would require a tremendous expansion of the investigative staff of the board and make the board into a national police court.

Third. The proposal is not necessary to insure that employees can exercise a free choice in the selection of representatives. I say that because other sections of the bill make it possible for employers as well as employees to obtain elections. The bill also defines as unfair labor practices boycotts, including organizational boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes which probably most frequently give rise to coercive union practices. Hence I say, Mr. President, that to the extent that it is feasible and practicable to check union abuses through the procedure of an administrative law tribunal, such as the National Labor Relations Board, we have done so in our committee bill. To place upon the National Labor Relations Board the task of functioning as local police officers is both unwise and impractical.

I think the amendment will accomplish only one purpose and that is to make it increasingly difficult to carry on honest, good-faith organizational drives free of coercion because the amendment will provide fertile opportunity for the bringing of false allegations and false charges against the union in an endeavor to prevent it from gaining that support of public opinion in a community, which is always the most effective organizational aid which a union can have. Here again the Senate ought to get down to the grass roots of a union organizational drive and take cognizance of what is necessary for a successful drive. The greatest aid a union can have is a sympathetic and understanding community; but, mark my words, this amendment will provide antiunion employers and their company-dominated workers ample opportunity to poison public opinion in a given community by seeing to it that false charges are brought before the National Labor Relations Board charging coercion and intimidation. The bringing of the charges will cause a natural slowing up of the organization drive. It will put the union on the defensive. It will play into the hands of dilatory tactics and delay.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Oregon suspend so that the course of procedure may be determined? The Senator from Florida has entered the Chamber, and the Chair will state to him that during his absence, by unanimous consent, the time allocated to his side was placed under the control of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to very quickly make this statement to the Senator from Florida. I have found myself involved in a running debate, which was perfectly proper, because I desired to clarify the points that were raised by my

colleagues. However, I have not concluded the formal remarks I had prepared on the pending issue. I think it will take me about 20 minutes more. Will the Senator from Florida yield me that time?

Mr. PEPPER. With pleasure. The Senator from Wyoming has expressed a desire to speak, but I think perhaps his remarks might be deferred until later this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] wishes to speak on the subject, and I want him to have some time, and I shall conclude my remarks just as rapidly as I can, but I do want to get them into the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair informs the Senator from Florida that there are about 41 minutes remaining of the hour and a half to which his side was entitled.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that if the Senator from Oregon takes the 20 minutes he has indicated he desires, that will be all right.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, let us consider how labor organizations and their agents may coerce employees.

In the first place, they may, and unfortunately sometimes do, engage in physical violence.

Secondly, they may use threats of violence.

Third, they may engage in name calling, such as terming persons "scabs," "strike breakers" or other opprobrious names.

Fourth, they may use the closed shop or contracts providing for other types of compulsory membership as a means of bringing economic pressure to bear upon employees.

Threats of violence are adequately covered by local and State criminal law. The same applies to name-calling, and use of other language that may be considered to interfere with or coerce employees. The closed shop is abolished under the bill. Moreover, the union shop is closely regulated by section 9, and by section 8 (b) (2). Unions cannot obtain a union shop contract unless a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit have voted in favor of such a contract in an election conducted by the NLRB. That is quite a different thing from an election conducted by the union itself. Once a union shop contract is secured, the union cannot deprive an employee of his job except for clear and specific reasons. Membership must have been available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members. During the period of the contract the employee can be deprived of his job as the result of action of the union only if he fails to tender the regular dues and initiation fees required, or if he engages in activity on behalf of another labor organization when the contract still has a substantial period to run.

It seems to me that these regulations of the compulsory membership contract effectively free employees of any real possibility of economic coercion by unions, and are a complete answer to the pending proposal. So far as physical intimidation and coercion are concerned, I repeat the suggestion made earlier, that we must have local police forces take over questions of breaches of the peace. We certainly do not want the Federal Government, either through the National Labor Relations Board or any other agency, substituting itself for the police activities of the local law enforcement officers of our various communities.

It seems to me that these regulations of the compulsory membership contract effectively, as I have said, free employees of any possibility of economic coercion by unions, and are a complete answer to the pending proposal.

It must be recognized that a union or its agents are in an entirely different position from that of the employer insofar as being able to make effective threats of economic coercion that do not constitute infractions of local criminal law is concerned. The employer has it within his power to deprive the employee of his job. That is the greatest economic weapon, coercively used, that could be leveled by an employer against a worker. In this connection it is worth noting that after almost 12 years of administration of the Wagner Act, the most frequent type of unfair labor practice charge brought is the one alleging discrimination by employers against employees for engaging in union activity. This fact bears out what I said earlier in my remarks, that there are still too many employers in America who do not want to see their plants unionized, who do not want to put into practice their professings about unionization. Unions do not have such job control over the workers. They cannot take the workers' jobs away from them especially in view of the protection we have provided under our bill as far as the closed shop is concerned. However, employers do have the power of work or no work constantly hanging over the worker's head.

To the extent that there have been abuses by unions of the closed shop, the bill in other sections, as I have stated, provides ample protection against such abuses. Consequently, statements by union agents threatening employees with loss of their jobs if they do not join the union will be ineffective and empty threats. In any case, the employer will be free, as he is now, to answer false statements and extravagant claims.

In his statement last Friday the Senator from Minnesota stated that the purpose of the pending amendment was to make unfair labor practices of false promises and false statements by unions. The assumption seems to be that if a statement is false it is also coercive. It seems to me that it is too clear for argument that a statement or argument is not coercive merely because it is false.

I certainly hope, Mr. President, that we have not reached the point where it is going to be deemed desirable to have the National Labor Relations Board take jurisdiction of complaints as to whether a union's statements at the time of organization are true or false. We certainly do not want to make the National Labor Relations Board the guardian, as it were, of the intellectual integrity, at the time of an organizational drive, of the statements made by either labor or employers.

In a case involving the validity of a Board order the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that an employer's statement did not become coercive because it was inaccurate. The court found, contrary to the Board, that the employer was justified in believing and stating that the union had been responsible for a protest to a State agency, which resulted in the agency's rescinding its approval of overtime. The court said:

> The right of free speech does not depend upon the accuracy of the ideas expressed. (*N. L. R. B. v. Brown-Brockmeyer Co.*, 143 F. (2d) 537, at 542.)

The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals has correctly stated that—

> The trend of judicial decision since the Virginia Power Co. case supports the view that an employer may disseminate facts within the area of dispute, may even express his opinion—

Which he certainly should be allowed to do—

> on the merits of the controversy even though it involves labor organizations, may indicate a preference for individual dealings with employees, may state his policy with reference to labor matters, and may express hostility to a union or its representatives. (*N. L. R. B. v. J. L. Brandeis & Son*, 145 F. (2d) 556, 564.)

Those are not my words, Mr. President. Those are the words of the Circuit Court of Appeals, as found in the Brandeis & Son case.

The court went further, and in overruling the Board's contention that "the repetition and vehemence of statement" rendered the employer's statements coercive, stated:

> Certainly effectiveness of statement is not a test of its constitutionality; neither is accuracy of the views expressed. * * * One may descend to vilification, false statement, or exaggeration and still be protected in his right of free speech. (Id., p. 566.)

Thus, Mr. President, court rulings make it plain, it seems to me, that the pending amendment could not properly be applied to punish false statements by union organizers.

Moreover, it is rather alarming to contemplate a situation in which the National Labor Relations Board will be deciding the truth or falsity of employer and union propaganda used in connection with bargaining elections and organizational campaigns.

They are no tea party affairs, as I have indicated before, Mr. President. There is a lot of puffing that goes on, such as is typical of American advertising and salesmanship, as practiced in all the leading periodicals by the great concerns of America when they offer their goods for sale. I have no doubt that many puffing statements are made by union organizers in order to persuade workers to participate in unity of action through a union. But certainly I do not want to see the National Labor Relations Board made the police organization for the United States, to pass on the statements or actions made or taken by either employers or union organizers. The real function of the Board should be to make its election machinery speedily available so that employees can make their decisions by secret ballot, so that employers will know where they stand in this union

organization business, because let us not forget that it is not only the workers who suffer from long delays in getting a certification of a collective-bargaining representative, but the employers suffer, too. Employers suffer because during months of delay in obtaining a final certification production usually declines in the factories, as the workers and the employers carry on their campaigns for obtaining or preventing the union organization of the plant.

The Senator from Minnesota mentioned the case of a small employer in New York whose employees had been pushed around and threatened by a so-called goon squad in an effort to force them to join the union. Such practices, of course, are not to be condoned, and the junior Senator from Oregon condemns them. It would be much more effective, however, if the local police were called in to correct such a situation, rather than to make it possible for the employer or the employees to bring unfair labor practice charges before the NLRB in connection with disputes of that type.

Moreover, under the present bill, the employer in that situation could petition the Board for an election to determine whether or not his employees wanted the union to represent them.

My good friend the Senator from Minnesota also called attention to a letter he had received from an employer in Salem, Oreg., my home State, who operated a small sporting goods store and employed only one employee. This employer stated that the labor organizers had forced him and his employee to sign up by threatening personal violence.

Here again such threats can be corrected under existing State laws. If measures sufficient to accomplish that result are not on the statute books, the States should pass police measures to correct that type of abuse. In any case, I seriously question whether such a small enterprise, consisting of the employer and one employee, would be subject to the National Labor Relations Act, since it would appear to be a business entirely intrastate in character.

That point must not be overlooked, Mr. President, because when all these cases are put together, I think it will be found that an overwhelming majority of them, even of those in which it is alleged that there have been intimidation and coercion, are cases which do not involve interstate commerce at all, but involve intrastate commerce, and fall, not within the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, but within the jurisdiction of State law.

Hence, some of the examples that have been cited by my colleagues who are proponents of the amendment now before the Senate are examples which would not possibly be touched by the amendment, even though the amendment might be made workable.

The Senator from Minnesota also stated that, so far as he knew, the Board—

> Has never set aside an election because of any kind of action taken by the union in its organization campaign, regardless of how coercive or threatening it may have been. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 25, p. 4017.)

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the Board has set aside elections because unions have engaged in improper action. For example, in the Sears Roebuck case in Minneapolis—47 N. L. R. B. 291—the Board set aside the election on the ground that the CIO union had issued a campaign dodger improperly indicating on its face that the Board was in favor of the CIO.

In other cases the Board has set aside or postponed elections where the union has engaged in serious misconduct. See, for example, *National Tea Company* (41 N. L. R. B. 774), and *LaFollette Shirt Company* (65 N. L. R. B. 952). In the *Kilgore Manufacturing case* (45 N. L. R. B. 468), the union engaged in the following type of conduct: Its organizer was present at the polling place, and spoke to one of the voters waiting in line to cast his ballot. The Board said that violated the assurance that the election would be free of any undue influence; and because of the fact that the union organizer had gone beyond the so-called neutral boundary line, the election was set aside, even though the union had won it.

Other examples given by the Senator from Minnesota indicate, in my judgment, that there is no necessity for adopting the pending amendment in order to settle the problems those examples present. Thus, on page 4017 of the RECORD, he cites an instance in which the teamsters' union was found guilty of contempt of court for picketing an establishment in an effort to coerce employees into joining the union. If such activity constitutes a violation of State law, as it apparently did in the case cited, there seems to be no occasion for adopting the amendment, and thus requiring the NLRB to correct the same abuse.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that a union or its agents should not be free to threaten employees with loss of their jobs if they do not join the union. He points out that if an employer made such a threat he would be committing an unfair labor practice, and, consequently, similar threats by a union should constitute unfair labor practices. But, as I have endeavored to point out, the employer is in a much better position to make good his threat. He has it entirely within his power to terminate the employment of the worker. On the other hand, the union obviously has no such power when it does not have a contract with the employer, and employees would be less than intelligent if they did not recognize that the union could not deliver on its threat.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the Senator from Oregon to suspend for a moment in order that the Chair may state that the time of the Senator from Oregon has expired. However, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] suggests that the Senator from Oregon may have any part of an additional 10 minutes, leaving 10 minutes remaining for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair and the Senator from Florida.

In any case, Mr. President, if the employer felt that employees were being misled into believing that the union would deprive them of a job if they did not join, the employer would be entirely free under other provisions of the bill, as well as under present Board and court decisions, to answer any such statements or claims.

In the exercise of their right to freedom of speech, employers are entirely free under present Board and court decisions, and certainly under section 8 (c) of this bill, to answer all statements or extravagant claims, and even to make derogatory statements about the union, its leaders, and its policies. Hence, I see no occasion for empowering the Board to act as censor of employer and union propaganda. Acts or threats of violence, as I have said, are prohibited by local law, and until we have had convincing proof that State and local law-enforcement officers are unable to enforce the law we should not inject the Federal Government into local police problems. With greater freedom to employers and employees to obtain collective-bargaining elections, and with the provisions in the bill defining unfair labor practices by unions, the types of coercive practices on the part of unions which presently do not constitute violations of State or local law are adequately regulated, I believe. The pending proposal, in my judgment, would only serve to create a national police force and harass unions and employees in their efforts to organize.

I digress long enough to say it would do something else. It would slow up the organizational activity of unions. There are some employers who work behind the scene when a union seeks to organize their plants. They have their own worker stooges who are encouraged by the employer not to be in sympathy with the union. They would have such workers bring false charges, which would have to be taken cognizance of by the National Labor Relations Board, resulting in a great deal of publicity as to such false charges, and making it possible to run advertisements in the local newspapers to stir up public opinion against the union. This is the way it would work in reality: the National Labor Relations Board would have under consideration a charge from X, Y, and Z, employees, that union organizers A, B, and C were attempting to use coercive methods on certain employees. What would be the effect of that? I should not have to say that the effect will be to slow up the organizational drive. So, an amendment which seems plausible on its face, I say can be, and undoubtedly will be, used as a great instrumentality for weakening organizational drives.

Mr. President, last Friday the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] outlined his objections to the pending amendment as it was originally proposed, and in the course of his remarks stated that the amendment was "definitely antilabor"—April 25 RECORD, page 4019—that it was "wholly out of order"—page 4021.

As I read the Senator's argument, he made four points against the original amendment:

First. He stated that it would lead to "protracted litigation, because of the difficulty of determining who are agents of labor organizations and what consti-

tutes interference and coercion"—April 25 RECORD, page 4019. I agree with him.

Second. He made the entirely valid point that insofar as the amendment covers violence and physical coercion it is entirely unnecessary as these offenses are punishable under local law. I agree with him.

Third. He stated that the amendment is impractical because the effective remedy for coercion by labor organizations and their agents is quick arrest and trial rather than an administrative hearing leading to a cease-and-desist order. I agree with him.

Fourth He argued that adoption of the amendment would require the Board to increase its staff tremendously in order to investigate countless charges of interference and coercion on the part of unions or their agents. I agree with him.

The Senator also adverted to the tremendous possibilities of abuse arising from the amendment, and suggested that the provisions of the bill prohibiting the closed shop and regulating the union shop would eliminate a great deal of the difficulty sought to be corrected by the amendment. I have sought this morning to reenforce everything the Senator from New York said on that occasion.

We now have before us a modified version of the amendment originally offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], one which seeks to eliminate the words "interfere with." The effect of this would be to proscribe acts of unions or their agents which restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], proposed an additional modification of the amendment, intended to insure that labor organizations have the right to prescribe their own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership.

I wish to make it clear that I believe the modifications improve the amendment considerably. As the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] remarked, the words "interfere with" are somewhat vague and might be construed to make it an unfair labor practice for any person to attempt to persuade another to join a union. However, I do not believe that the elimination of the words "interfere with" answers in any substantial respect the other objections which the Senator from New York made last Friday and which I have made in my speech this morning.

The amendment as modified would still lead to protracted litigation as to what constitutes restraint or coercion on the part of a labor organization or its agents. It would still invade the jurisdiction of State and local governments with regard to violence and physical coercion. It would still provide an entirely impractical remedy and would require the Board to increase its staff of investigators.

So, Mr. President, I submit that the amendment as modified in no substantial respects answers either the objections made by the Senator from New York last Friday, or the objections I am making now. I think it should be made clear, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated—April 30 RECORD, page 4271—the elimination of the words "interfere with" would not make any substantial change in the meaning. I am sure it will make no substantial change in the final effect of the amendment, should it become law. Its effect will not, in my judgment, be in the interest of good labor relations.

Decisions of the National Labor Relations Board and the courts interpreting the present phrase in section 8 (1) of the Wagner Act, which makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer "to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7" do not, so far as I am advised, distinguish between acts that constitute interference and acts that constitute restraint or coercion.

In other words, Mr. President, there are no cases holding that employer conduct amounts to interference but does not amount to restraint or coercion. Whenever the Board finds that a violation within the meaning of section 8 (1) has been committed, it finds, in the language of the statute, that by the particular acts or conduct the employer has interfered with, restrained, and coerced his employees. No court decision, to my knowledge, has undertaken to distinguish between interference and coercion.

I fear also, Mr. President, that if the pending amendment, as modified is adopted it will have the effect of outlawing organizational strikes and strikes for recognition. In fact, it could easily be construed to prohibit all types of strikes in situations where some of the employees are opposed to the strike. In section 8 (b) (4) (B) of the bill we have made it an unfair labor practice for a union or its agents to engage in a strike or to induce or encourage employees of any employer to engage in a strike for the purpose of forcing "any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as a representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a)."

On page 22 of the majority report we state that—

> It is to be observed that the primary strike for recognition (without a Board certification) is not proscribed. Moreover, strikes and boycotts for recognition are not made illegal if the union has been certified as the exclusive representative.

Thus the committee did not intend to outlaw all types of primary strikes; in fact, it was careful to point out that organizational strikes were not prohibited, because sometimes they are justified.

Since it has frequently been held that strikes are a form of coercion, it follows, Mr. President, that the pending amendment would outlaw all strikes designed to further organizational activities. While I am of the opinion that unions should utilize the election machinery of the act wherever possible, rather than resort to strike action in an attempt to solidify organization, it must be recognized that organizational strikes have a legitimate place in some situations.

So long as human beings remain human beings, so long as the various types of motivation that sometimes influence men when they believe that an employer has been unjust continue to motivate men there is going to be that type of strike. If it be sought by this amendment to outlaw it, then the Congress is only buying trouble.

I conclude by saying that I sincerely hope the Senate, by a majority vote, will reach the conclusion that we ought to go along with the bill as reported by the committee. Let us try it for a year. Let us find out whether those of us who are convinced that it will greatly improve industrial relations are right or wrong. If we are wrong, Mr. President, I shall be found ready and willing, when the Congress reconvenes next year, to compromise further, if further compromise is necessary, in order to prevent labor abuses. However, I plead with the Senate to turn down this and the other proposed amendments so that we can have a fair, just, and workable law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Chair inform me how much of the time under my control remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has remaining between 12 and 13 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] I should like the affirmative side to use some of its time, as we would like to retain our remaining time to be used later.

Mr. BALL. I yield myself the time I may need, but I will say to the Senator from Florida that I do not think we on our side will use all our time, and if the Senator from Florida needs a little more time I think it can be arranged.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the address delivered by the Senator from Oregon. I was particularly interested in the early colloquy between him and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] regarding the way the bill was written in committee and the position of the Senator from Oregon respecting amendments. It seemed to me that what he was saying in effect was that he would not accept one single change in the bill as it came from the committee; that if it were changed he would vote against it, and that he was confident the President would veto it, and that the Senator from Oregon would vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I will permit the RECORD to speak for itself, but at no time did I say I was confident that the President would veto the measure. I do not propose to speak for the President.

Mr. BALL. Perhaps not. The Senator expressed the conviction himself that the President would veto the measure, but I agree that the Senator did not express confidence or knowledge of the President's intention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this will be my last interruption of the Senator. I think the RECORD will show that I expressed the view that the President should veto it.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator said that also.

Mr. President, it seems to me that when Members of the United States Senate are working on legislation which

most of us agree is needed, the legislative process is one of compromising conflicting views. I know that in the 6 years I have served in the Senate I have many times voted finally for measures containing provisions which I did not like and with which I disagreed, or to which proposed amendments which I had favored had been defeated. It seems to me that to take a flat position that if any amendments, regardless of their merits or regardless of the position taken by a majority of the Senate on their merits, are adopted one will then vote against the bill in its entirety, is to take rather an intransigent position. If every Member of the Senate took such a position I do not think we could pass much legislation. It has always been my attitude that while I like my own convictions I grant that my colleagues also have plenty of knowledge and that sometimes their wisdom may be even superior to my own.

I expect to support the bill whether the amendments I propose are all adopted or not, because I believe that some major corrections in our present labor policy are essential to the welfare of the national economy.

Mr. President, I listened to both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who spoke last Wednesday on this particular amendment, and it seemed to me that they both argued from somewhat of a misconception of the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act which the pending measure proposes to amend. They both, it seems to me, confused the welfare and the rights of unions and the welfare and the rights of individual employees. I think very often they are two different things.

Both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Utah made quite a point of the fact that when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was considered in 1932, and when the National Labor Relations Act was considered in 1935, amendments similar to the pending amendment were defeated by the Congress; that in its judgment, then, such amendments were not necessary. It seems to me that that is hardly a valid argument for rejecting the amendments now.

I think one reason why we are in the present difficulties in labor relations is that we have made no change in our national labor policy in 12 years since the passage of the Wagner Act, so-called. When the Wagner Act was passed the American labor movement had a total membership of between three and four million members. In many segments of American industry it was struggling even for recognition, against tremendous odds. I can remember that at that time strikes which had continued for weeks were finally settled by the employer's mere agreement to sit down and negotiate with the union and recognize it. Now a strike is considered lost if the unions do not win at least 15 or 20 cents an hour increase in wages for the employees.

The situation has greatly changed since then. Unions in America claim at least 15,000,000 members. They hold contracts as exclusive bargaining agents for some 20,000,000 workers in American industry. They are enormously wealthy. Quite often some of the budgets of the international unions are comparable to those of a fairly good sized municipality. They have large research organizations, and some of them very large reserves. They are by no means in the same relative position in American industry which they occupied 12 years ago when Congress made its last change in the national labor relations policy.

There is no question about the fact that today individual employees are kicked around in American industry even more by unions and their agents than they are by employers. As I said, the opponents of the amendment seem to confuse the rights and welfare of the individual employee with the rights and welfare of the union. They are two different things.

The National Labor Relations Act which the pending bill proposes to amend in section 7, which the bill does not touch, does not say anything about the rights of unions. It says that—

> Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other usual aid or protection.

Mr. President, if, as has been charged on this floor—and I think the charge is true—unions today are using coercive practices in their organization and election drives then it seems to me individual employees in the free exercise of their rights guaranteed by this act are just as much entitled to protection from such activities of unions as they are from the same kind of coercive activities on the part of employers.

I agree with the Senator from Utah that there may possibly be loopholes in this measure of which employers can take advantage to go on a union-busting campaign, and there are probably some employers who would like to do so.

In my experience—and I know many employers and union leaders—they are very much the same kind of people. In fact, they are like all the rest of us. Give either one of them too much power and they tend to be corrupted; they begin to like the exercise of power just for the sake of power. Union leaders very often tend to think a great deal more of the strength and the funds of the union which pays their salaries than they do of the welfare of the employees whom they are supposed to serve. As the Senator from Oregon said, organizational campaigns are no pink-tea parties. Many union leaders will admit quite frankly that very few American employees organize themselves. They have to be organized, and some of the methods by which unions have organized employees in recent years are all too similar to the same kind of methods by which employers a few decades ago tried to prevent employees from organizing themselves.

I should like to emphasize also that the pending amendment and all the proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act make absolutely no change in the duties and obligations of employers. The unfair labor practices of employers defined in section 8 (a) of the pending measure are identical with the unfair practices defined in the present law. Not one is changed. In fact, we have added one definition. We make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement. If in spite of our care in trying to avoid it, lawyers discover loopholes in this bill by which employers can engage in a union-busting campaign, I shall be the first to try to plug those loopholes and to correct the situation by adding new definitions of unfair labor practices on the part of employers, if they are needed. I think one reason we are in trouble today is that for 12 years the National Labor Relations Act has been a "sacred cow," which could not be amended in the slightest degree. The longer we waited to change that policy and correct the situation and give the rights of employees some additional protection which clearly was needed, the tougher the job became. That is why drastic antilabor proposals are being made today. Some of the abuses of the special privileges and immunities of unions have themselves been drastic and have been extremely punitive on the employees whom the Act is supposed to protect.

For example, I have before me a clipping from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of April 18, 1947, which tells about two World War II veterans who were fired from their jobs and dismissed from the union because they refused to buy $2 tickets on a $1,700 car which was being raffled off by the union leadership to raise funds. They had jammed through a resolution requiring every one of the 7,000 members of the union to buy tickets in the raffle to raise funds for organizational purposes which, of course, they would spend. These two veterans were thrown out of their jobs under the closed union-shop contract prevailing, because they would not go along with that kind of a deal.

It is true, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, that some types of union coercion, including the violence of the mass picket line, visits to the homes of employees, such as have taken place in the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee, and other such tactics are violations of State law in almost every State. I believe that the main remedy for such conditions is prosecution under State law and better local law enforcement. But I believe that one reason why we have had weak law enforcement in labor relations is that the Federal Government, through the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, has in effect taken the position—and it has been so interpreted by the Supreme Court—that no Federal law restrains labor unions in any kind of activity in which they wish to indulge, including secondary boycotts, all kinds of monopolistic practices, and clear abuses of the original intent of the closed shop and union shop.

It is no wonder that local communities and their peace officers have been reluctant vigorously to enforce law when they saw that the great Federal Government was holding the unions exempt from any kind of Federal regulation. The only laws we have had restrain employers and not unions. So it may well be

that many of the types of activities of unions which we are seeking to restrain somewhat by this mild amendment are the kind of activities which would be corrected by good local law enforcement. But I think we shall encourage that kind of local law enforcement if the Federal Government, acting through Congress, states clearly its position that individual employees are entitled to their right of self-organization free from coercion from any source, whether it be the employer, the union, or some outside source.

The cases which have been cited show that in a great many organizational campaigns union agents make threats. If an individual is not willing to join, they threaten that when they get a majority and obtain a contract they will charge him twice as high an initiation fee, or higher dues. In some cases they simply make the threat that when the employees are organized and the union becomes the exclusive bargaining representative, they will take care of the recalcitrant employee. In a great many shops quite often that threat is sufficient. The railway unions are not permitted to have a closed shop or union shop, or anything like it. We have had presented to us several cases in which there was retaliatory disciplinary action by union leadership against employees. So the threats really mean something.

Mr. President, we accepted a modification of the amendment which states that—

> This subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein.

That modification is designed to make it clear that we are not trying to interfere with the internal affairs of a union which is already organized. All we are trying to cover is the coercive and restraining acts of the union in its effort to organize unorganized employees. However, the proviso would not go so far as to permit the union to adopt rules authorizing its agents to threaten and coerce nonunion members in an effort to persuade them to join. The modification covers the requirements and standards of membership in the union itself.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In line with the statements which the Senator is making, I should like to ask him if he disagrees with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who pointed out the vast possibilities for abuse in that particular connection. I thought that the Senator from Oregon developed a very powerful case. I should like to hear an answer to it, but I have not heard any forthcoming. Does the Senator disagree with the statement of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BALL. Is the Senator referring to the possibility of harassing a union organization campaign by persuading employees to file charges with the Board, and that sort of thing?

Mr. IVES. I am referring to litigation which might ensue, and everything in that connection which might serve as a stumbling block to legitimate labor organization. I believe that was the case which the Senator from Oregon was making.

Mr. BALL. I have in mind that the administrative-law approach to these problems always opens up the possibility that the administrative agency will be used to harass some groups in society. I think that unquestionably the present National Labor Relations Act has been used by the NLRB to harass employers and their employees on behalf of either the CIO or the AFL in their organizational campaigns. For instance, in the Thompson Products plant in Cleveland they themselves ordered their eighth election in 6 years, although time after time the employees have voted by an overwhelming majority for no union. I think that when we use the administrative-law approach there is always the possibility that it may be used to harass one group or another.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. By the same line of reasoning are we given to understand that if the attitude of the Board changes subsequently, the Board itself may employ this weapon to harass, to use the word employed by the Senator, legitimate attempts on the part of labor to organize?

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes; I think they could use the present act.

Mr. IVES. That seemed to be a matter about which the Senator from Oregon was worried. It has been disturbing me. I have been trying to find out what the effect of this proposal might be.

Mr. BALL. As the Senator from New York well knows, the great weakness of the National Labor Relations Act is that no employee under that act can go into court to protect the rights supposedly guaranteed by the act unless the National Labor Relations Board so permits. He has to get the Board to issue a complaint before he can proceed. That is true of any union or of individual employees. Obviously if we had a board that wanted to make a dead letter of the act and violate their oaths, they could do so, just as the early Board clearly, I think, perverted the act and used it as an instrument of the CIO.

Mr. IVES. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator feels that this provision might open up a condition in which an employee would be particularly susceptible to that kind of treatment?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think it would do so. I think we have improved it, because we provide for a Board of seven members.

Mr. IVES. I thought the amendment agreed to the other day improved it.

Mr. BALL. I mean, our whole approach to this administrative set-up. In the committee bill we enlarge the Board to seven members, and I think we are bound to get a much more judicial and fair approach to the administration and enforcement of the law than we have had in the past.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator think that seven members would be more fair than three?

Mr. BALL. Yes. I think seven individual quasi-judicial officials are much less likely to become the rabid proponents of a certain point of view than would be a group of three.

Mr. IVES. Assuming that at the beginning they were of the same type of mind?

Mr. BALL. Yes; assuming that a good board is appointed.

Mr. IVES. With reasonable minds?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The only point I was making was that with this administrative-law approach I hope that sometime we shall reach the stage in our labor relations when we can abolish the NLRB completely and write the rights, duties, and responsibilities of employers and employees into the law to permit anyone to go freely into court to protect his rights, and perhaps have a division in the Department of Labor which will conduct the elections, if necessary. That would be all that would be essential. But we are always in danger, with the administrative-law approach, that the authority granted will be abused as it was in the early days of the NLRB, when that Board used its discretion and power under the act to harass employers with one election after another until finally, in disgust, many of them organized. As the Senator knows, they carved departments out of plants because the CIO had organized those departments and were sure they could win in them. All kinds of practices of that nature were possible under the language of section 9, which I think we have improved by the pending bill.

Mr. IVES. I recognize those abuses and the conditions which have arisen. What I am bothered about in this instance is the effect this amendment may have on a legitimate attempt to organize workers. I think the Senator has already answered that that danger is present.

Mr. BALL. Of course it is. I will say to the Senator from New York that if any legitimate organizing drive is coercing and restraining individual employees in the free exercise of the rights guaranteed by this bill, I think the union ought to be slowed down a little bit. I do not know why they should not play according to the rules and recognize the rights and the dignity of the individual employee and his right to a free choice of bargaining agent such as the employer has.

Mr. IVES. I think the Senator and I agree perfectly, so far as that is concerned, but that is not what I am driving at. It is the next step.

Mr. BALL. Yes; the danger is that the Board undoubtedly, if it wanted to, could stretch the provision perhaps to cover legitimate persuasion, democratic persuasion, just as I think in the past the NLRB has stretched its authority virtually to deprive employers of any freedom of speech or any right to discuss affairs of mutual interest with their employees. I think we can have a Board which will give that matter more consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The purpose of the provision, which changes the rules of evidence, is that any such abuse shall be

subject to correction by the courts of the Nation.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If in the law we require substantial evidence on the entire record, then it seems to me that we not only meet the abuses of the past against employers, but make it infinitely more difficult to use the law improperly against the labor unions. It seems to me very clear that so long as a union-organizing drive is conducted by persuasion, by propaganda, so long as it has every legitimate purpose, the Board cannot in any way interfere with it. If it does, certainly a court, under our rules of evidence, can correct such an abuse.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. We have protected it a great deal. I am distrustful in general of the administrative-law approach, because I have in the past few years seen too many administrative agencies granted, without discretion, quasi judicial powers which have been abused.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am glad to have that explanation from the Senator from Ohio. I think the provision in the bill does do all of that. But is it the Senator's idea that this amendment would in any way interfere with misrepresentation on the part of employees?

Mr. BALL. Misrepresentation?

Mr. IVES. Yes; on the part of labor organizations which might be attempting to organize employees.

Mr. BALL. No.

Mr. IVES. They can misrepresent as much as they want to, can they not? I should think the free-speech provision would take care of that.

Mr. BALL. I think it would depend on the nature of the misrepresentation. It seems to me that if in an organzing drive it were claimed that the union seeking members would be competing only with an independent union, that it would be only a union that would be recognized by Government agencies, I doubt whether it would be coercion or restraint.

Mr. IVES. I think it is very important to have that made clear, because I think misrepresentation certainly is something we need to have interpreted.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator; I think he is correct. What we are talking about is threats of violence or of reprisal and that sort of thing in an organization campaign, or perhaps in an organizational strike, such as the Senator from Oregon was referring to. A mass picket line certainly would be coercion and restraint in this picture.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it the Senator's idea that machinery would be established under the control of the National Labor Relations Board to stop mass picketing?

Mr. BALL. No; of course not.

Mr. IVES. The Senator's idea is to have the police power of the Federal Government exercised?

Mr. BALL. No. But I think that a mass picket line would be an unfair labor practice. We would not stop it, of course. The Senator knows that the process of filing an unfair labor practice charge and getting a hearing before the Board would be a completely impractical way of dealing with a mass picket line. It might perhaps restrain unions in the use of the particular weapon, and I think that would be all to the good. It might discourage them a little, because it would be an unfair practice.

Mr. IVES. They would be accused of an unfair labor practice; would they?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps this point has already been covered, but I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota or, through him, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], whether there have been any court interpretations of the words "coerce" or "restrain" in connection with this section?

Mr. BALL. I think there have been many interpretations of the words in the present section 8 (1) by the courts, because many unfair labor practice charges have been upheld against employers on the ground that they were restraining and coercing employees in the exercise of their rights. So the words have been interpreted in judicial decisions. I do not know whether they have been explicitly defined.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator to say that he thinks it is possible to bring within the meaning of the amendment, as an unfair labor practice, mass picketing. I simply wish to say that if that is one of the objectives, I think it would have been much better—and it is one of the things, as I said on March 10, that I would have been perfectly willing to compromise on—to have had a particular provision in regard to mass picketing in interstate commerce cases. I think we shall eventually have to come to it. I would have been perfectly willing to come to it in connection with this bill, if it were put in as a separate provision and if it had been made a part of our discussions in the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I am not sure that I agree with the Senator from Oregon that I wish to see the Federal Government police picket lines all over the United States. I do not quite see how that could be done.

So far as that goes, the mass picketing situation is not a major objective. What we are trying to reach here, it seems to me, is the coercive activity in which some unions and their agents indulge in their organizational and election campaigns; and, as the Senator from Oregon himself has said, those do not tend to be any tea parties; they frequently become rather rough.

It seems to me that if they indulge in the same threats and coercion which, on the part of an employer, would be held to be unfair labor practices, they should be held accountable before the National Labor Relations Board for that activity. It might not have been necessary to do that in 1935, when the original act was passed; but I submit that the position of unions and their leaders and business agents in American industry today is infinitely different from what it was in 1935. Today they have very great power. Most of the manufacturing industry today is covered by union agreements. The business agents and the unions are the exclusive representatives of all the employees, and I think it is generally accepted throughout industry that the ultimate objective of the labor movement is to organize every plant in the country. Knowing that, the individual employee is very likely to be easily influenced by any hint of coercion on the part of a union organizer, and any threats made by that organizer carry much more weight today than they would have carried 10 or 15 years ago.

Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in discussing this amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, I wish to refer briefly to a statement which I made 2 days ago in discussing my attitude toward this entire proposal for labor legislation. In that statement I tried to point out that in title I of the pending measure, which is an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, we are really making a profound change or, I may say, an evolutionary change in the policy of the act. When the act was originally passed it was intended, and I think at that time it was properly intended, to protect workers in their right to organize and bargain. Under the original Wagner Act or National Labor Relations Act the National Labor Relations Board was looked upon as—and since that time until today has been—an enforcement agency, really, for that act, protecting the workers in their right to organize and bargain.

Our committee in considering this matter and in thinking in terms of amending the act, recognized that in our thinking on this subject we have matured, and now we have reached the place where we believe that the act, which is supposed to cover management and labor relations, should go far enough to say that there are unfair labor practices on both sides in such controversies and should include definitions of those unfair labor practices, which it would be the duty of the future National Labor Relations Board to take care of.

In the committee we enlarged the Board from three members to seven members. We took away from the Board what might be looked upon as its prosecuting attitude and we made the Board more of a judicial board to determine unfair labor practices, regardless of whether they are performed by either an employer or by a union.

It is because of that new attitude and new change in policy which the pending bill brings about that I think this first amendment, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and myself and other Senators, is so important, because it emphasizes the point I have just been discussing, namely, that by this bill we are covering unfair labor practices on both sides, regardless of whether indulged in by the employer or by the labor organization.

In order to make my position clear, I wish to read into the RECORD the relevant sections of the act which bear on this point.

Section 7 is the key section. It reads as follows:

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS

SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

Then section 8 follows. As the Senator from Minnesota has said, we have not changed section 8 insofar as unfair labor practices by employers are concerned. Section 8 formerly simply defined the unfair labor practices of employers. Under the pending bill, which proposes to make changes in and is an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, we also have provided for the recognition of unfair labor practices by labor organizations and their agents. To make this issue clear, I wish to read into the RECORD the way section 8 will read, bringing it under the head of both unfair labor practices by employers and unfair labor practices by labor organizations. As changed by the proposed amendment, section 8 will have both subsection (a) and subsection (b). Subsection (a) has to do with the unfair labor practices of employers and subsection (b) has to do with the unfair labor practices of labor organizations or their agents. Subsection (a), covering the particular point now under discussion, would read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

Those are the rights to organize and bargain collectively, to which I referred a moment ago.

That is all I need to read from part (a), because I am only discussing subparagraph (1).

Now, turning to subsection (b), of section 8, which represents the new theory of the bill that we are defining in section 8, which defines unfair labor practices and wrongs on both sides of the shield, it will read as follows—and this is why the amendment is so important:

(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

(1) to restrain or coerce—

Mr. President, I stop there, because in the draft as submitted by the committee, we made it apply only to actions restraining or coercing an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances. In the committee we discussed whether we should prevent a labor organization or its agents from restraining or coercing employees. The vote in the committee was very close—7 to 6, as I recall—against imposing restrictions on labor organizations insofar as restraining or coercing employees was concerned.

Those of us who did not agree with that action have offered this amendment, in order to make it balance with exactly the same provision in section 8 (a), which prevents an employer from interfering with or restraining employees in the exercise of their rights. With such a balance in the theory, in the practice and in the philosophy of the bill, which brings in unfair labor practices on both sides of the shield, as I have said, we felt employees should be considered as possible victims of coercion by labor organizations or agents.

The pending measure is designed to protect employees in their freedom to decide whether or not they desire to join labor organizations, to prevent them from being restrained or coerced. So, under the amendment, subsection (b) on this point would read as follows:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents

(1) to restrain or coerce (A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

There is a further proviso there which I need not read for the purpose of my argument, because we protect the union in its right to prescribe rules, and so forth, with regard to membership. We are simply saying that we think it is equally as wrong for a labor organization or its agents to restrain or coerce employees in their relationship as it is for an employer to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the word "agent" as used sufficiently broad to cover a fellow employee? Or does it mean an agent of the labor union?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know how it would be interpreted, but my judgment is that it would be construed to mean an agent of the labor union who had been appointed to solicit membership.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not apply to a fellow employee?

Mr. SMITH. I would not think so at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the legislative history should make it clear that it is not the intent of the proposers of the amendment that "agent" should cover every employee.

Mr. SMITH. I think the suggestion is entirely correct. But perhaps the Senator from Ohio would comment on that.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the word "agent" used here, as used in the contract section, and as used in other places in the bill, means an agent under the ordinary rules of agency, an agent of the labor union, the organization, as such. The fact that a man was a member of a labor union in my opinion would be no evidence whatever to show that he was an agent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have that explanation in the RECORD, to make the history of it very clear, particularly as to the word "agent" as used in the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I can see nothing in the language used which could possibly be construed as interfering with the right of solicitation of membership, with legitimate rules being laid down as to how members should be solicited.

The words "to interfere with" appear under section 8 (a), so far as employers are concerned, and on request of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], 2 days ago by unanimous consent we eliminated those words, because we were afraid they might imply that if a fellow member or an agent did something entirely legitimate, the words "interfere with" might be construed as being sufficiently broad to prevent that happening.

There is no intention whatever to prevent the legitimate building up of a union organization. The only intent is to prevent restraint or coercion by a labor organization or by employers, and we think the rules should be the same for one side as for the other.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Minnesota yields the rest of his time to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield. I shall be glad to yield the Senator some time, if he wishes it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following up my question to the Senator from Minnesota, I would appreciate very much, in order to make the matter clear in my own mind, if the Senator from Ohio would give an example of a restraint he would consider an unfair labor practice, an action which would not be a restraint, an action which would be coercion, and an action which would not be coercion, within the meaning of the words of the bill and the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Answering the Senator from Massachusetts, I would say, in the first place, that I understand the present section against employers has been used by the Board to prevent employers from making threats to employees to prevent them or dissuade them from joining a labor union. They may be threats to fire the man, of course, in the extreme case. They may be threats to reduce his wages, they may be threats to visit some kind of punishment on him within the plant if he undertakes to join a union. Those are the usual types of coercion which have been held to be a violation of the section on the part of the employers. In the case of the employers, there have also been some cases of threats of violence, perhaps, though they have not been so common since the National Labor Relations Act came into effect.

In the case of unions, in the first place, there might be a threat that if a man did not join, the union would raise the initiation fee to $300, and he would have to pay $300 to get in; or there might be a threat that if he did not join, the union would get a closed-shop agreement and keep him from working at all. Then, there might be a threat of beating up his family or himself if he did not join and sign a card. I think, when we get to the case of unions, there might be the actually violent act of forcibly, by mass picketing, preventing a man from working.

Let us take the case of mass picketing, which absolutely prevents all the office

force from going into the office of a plant. That would be a restraint and coercion against those employees, an interference with their right to work. The Senator from Minnesota suggested it might not be a very effective right. I think it would be an effective right. What happens is this: In some small plant in which the labor is not organized, a man comes and says, "I represent the employees." The employer says, "How do you know you do? You have to show me something." So the man goes out and, by one means or another, he gets cards signed up by more than half the employees. The Board then says to the employer, "You have to bargain with this man." So the employer sits down with the man, and perhaps cannot reach an agreement. His demands may be reasonable; they may be wholly unreasonable. In any event, they do not reach an agreement, and the man immediately calls a strike, he pickets the plant, he keeps out the employees. When the employer goes to the Board, the Board says, "Oh, yes, we made you deal with this man, we made you recognize this union, but, so far as the way they are acting is concerned, that is not our affair at all. We have nothing to do with that under the act."

The effect of the pending amendment is that the Board may call the union before them, exactly as it has called the employer, and say, "Here are the rules of the game. You must cease and desist from coercing and restraining the employees who want to work from going to work and earning the money which they are entitled to earn." The Board may say, "You can persuade them; you can put up signs; you can conduct any form of propaganda you want to in order to persuade them, but you cannot, by threat of force or threat of economic reprisal, prevent them from exercising their right to work." As I see it, that is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. President, the amendment is founded on what I consider to be the basic theory of the entire bill, that is, an attempt to create equality between the employer and the employee. If anyone can point to anything in the bill which would impose on the labor union something not imposed upon the employer, certainly I would be in favor of amending it to create equality.

Men have come to me and said, regarding the question of an injunction for 60 days against a Nation-wide strike, "You enjoin the strike, but you do not do anything to the employers." The opposite is the fact. Anyone who will read the section will see that there is the right to enjoin a lock-out just as well as there is a right to enjoin a strike. If a Nation-wide industry says, to its employees, "We cannot go on any longer, you will have to agree to a reduction of your wages at the end of this contract, or we will have to shut down," the President can get an injunction to compel the continued operation of that industry, under the status quo, until efforts to mediate have been made. There is equality. We have tried to effect equality in every other respect that I know of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to say that I think it would be a very interesting case if a court undertook to compel an employer who says "I cannot pay the wages" to continue to operate his plant, even though he does not have money with which to pay the wages. I think there would be some very interesting questions raised with regard to due process of law under such an injunction.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator that under the emergency section I think there will be very serious questions of due process of law raised on both sides. But I can personally see no difference between the court for 60 days compelling an employer to operate his plant and compelling employees, without a contract, to work in a plant. Certainly that is the effort of the particular provision with which I am dealing. I think it would be upheld by the courts in such a case. Senators must remember that it relates to an entire Nation-wide industry. I think a Nation-wide industry can afford to continue to work for 60 days rather than starve its employees and thus force a strike.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been so kind, I do not want to interrupt him unnecessarily, except to say at this point that I think any such action as that would certainly result in legislation to reimburse an employer who had had his property taken away from him by such a court order.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. I rather disagree with the Senator. It would be true if it were permanent, but I do not think it would be true of the 60-day provision, where the alternative may be shutting down the plant and losing the money, anyway. I do not think there would be enough loss in any event to make any difference.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think it makes any difference whether a man is forced to undertake a legal obligation that he does not have financial resources to undertake, or whether a piece of property is taken without due process of law, and without compensation therefor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the particular section, of course, is exactly parallel. The effort is to make it parallel. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has argued that this provision would open up a large number of suits and actions before the National Labor Relations Board. Of course, the theory of the bill is that the National Labor Relations Board should be open to suits by employers as well as to suits by employees. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, himself, and the other members of the committee, have listed a long series of unfair labor practices on the part of employees and of labor unions. Undoubtedly those various unfair labor practices may result in actions being filed, on the refusal to bargain collectively, and on the various kinds of organizational, jurisdictional, and secondary-boycott strikes. The distinguished Senator has said it would open up the question of the violation of the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement, so that every violation of contract may be the subject of an unfair labor proceeding. Like the Senator from Minnesota, I am not very fond of the administrative procedure, but it is believed that if we retain the unfair labor practice procedure against employers, an effort should be made to bring about some measure of equality by defining unfair labor practices on the part of labor unions. Undoubtedly any such procedure is subject to abuse; but I think it will be largely controlled by court-review provisions. I see no reason to think it is any more difficult for the unions than it is for the employer. We have, of course, written it clearly. The act for years has contained the provision:

> It shall be an unfair labor practice on the part of an employer—
>
> To interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights to work and organize.

All that is attempted is to apply the same provision with exact equality to labor unions. There is a provision against persuading or attempting to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee whose membership in a union has been terminated on some ground other than nonpayment of dues. Of course, the Board will have more to do. I see no reason why the Board should not be expected to dismiss harassing suits by employers just as rapidly as they would dismiss harassing suits on the part of employees. I see no reason to believe that if any unfair labor practice is to be legislated against, the prohibition of this particular unfair labor practice will add materially to the labors of the Board.

The Senator says it will slow up organizational drives. It will slow up organizational drives only if they are accompanied by threats and coercion. The cease-and-desist order will be directed against the use of threats and coercion. It will not be directed against the use of propaganda or the use of persuasion, or against the use of any of the other peaceful methods of organizing employees.

Mr. President, I can see nothing in the pending measure which, as suggested by the Senator from Oregon, would in some way outlaw strikes. It would outlaw threats against employees. It would not outlaw anybody striking who wanted to strike. It would not prevent anyone using the strike in a legitimate way, conducting peaceful picketing, or employing persuasion. All it would do would be to outlaw such restraint and coercion as would prevent people from going to work if they wished to go to work.

Incidentally, it would not induce strike breaking, because there is a law against strike breaking, which prohibits the employment of anybody at a wage higher than is already being offered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. On that point I think it will be found that under the amendment there will be a great deal of collusion practiced between employers and company-dominated employees. Charges of coercion and intimidation will be filed, and I think it will have the effect of making a great many strikes completely ineffective, because it will take

time to determine such matters on their merits. It is not like pressing a button and having a petition dismissed automatically.

Mr. TAFT. However, all that is filed is a petition alleging that a man is using coercion and threats against particular employees. All the union has to do is to cease doing those things, and whether they are charged with doing them or not it would seem to me makes very little difference. They are not enjoined through the filing of an unfair labor practice charge. It will likely be a considerable length of time before any order is issued, and, when the order is issued, it will relate only to such practices, and not to the continuation of an organizational drive or strike.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator please, I think that the last point is not so easy of solution as he suggests, because with such a provision on the statute book, there will be a vast amount of litigation on the question of whether or not an injunction will lie. I am inclined to think that a very substantial argument can be made, once the Board issues its cease-and-desist order, in support of an injunction at that point.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. There will be a recurrence of all the evils connected with blocking a strike by the injunctive process, at least until such time as the Supreme Court passes upon the issue.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator suggests that after a hearing the Board may find that threats and coercion have been used, and may issue a cease-and-desist order against the further use of threats and coercion. Then in what way does that prevent the union from going right ahead with its strike and with its organizational activities?

Mr. MORSE. I am even taking a step before that. I am of the opinion that experience will prove that even before a hearing, the filing of the petition, itself, with certain allegations, will cause judges in some sections of the country at that point to interpret the law in such a way that it will serve as the foundation or bottom for an injunction.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator that if a case is filed alleging that the union threatens a man personally, or sends threatening letters to him, saying it is going to beat him and his family if he does not join the union, and the Board then finds that that was done, and issues a cease-and-desist order, it may be it would encourage a district attorney, or some of the local courts, to take unwarranted action. But in such a case the union ought to be punished. An injunction ought to be issued to prevent such a procedure.

The Senator from Oregon a while ago said that the enactment of this proposed legislation will result in duplication of some of the State laws. It will duplicate some of the State laws only to the extent, as I see it, that actual violence is involved in the threat or in the operation.

Mr. MORSE. I believe with the Senator that that sort of action should be stopped. It should be stopped through State laws and not through a Federal law. The point I am seeking to make is that with this amendment on the statute books I think it will be found that the very filing of the allegations will cause courts to proceed to issue injunctions. That is why I say I think it will be a tremendous handicap to legitimate strikes and legitimate organizational activities.

Mr. TAFT. The bill does not in any way change the right of the Federal court to issue an injunction. The Senator is suggesting that the enactment of this proposed legislation will bring about a condition which will compel the local court to do its duty. If that will be the result, I believe it will be a beneficial effect.

Mr. MORSE. No; my position is that we will not know until the Supreme Court passes upon the measure whether it changes the right of the Federal courts; and I think there will be Federal courts which will issue injunctions under the terms of this amendment prior to any finding on the part of the Board.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely disagree with the Senator. I do not think, except as we have anywhere specifically changed the Norris-LaGuardia Act, that anything in this amendment or any finding of unfair labor practices against the union will in any way enlarge the jurisdictional power of the Federal courts in issuing injunctions. I do not understand the legal argument made by the Senator, and I do not see any basis for it.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator is correct; but I suggest that after the enactment of the amendment into law he will soon find the issue before the Supreme Court

Mr. TAFT. I am sure the Supreme Court will hold that I am correct in my interpretation of the law, because I think the provision is entirely clear, and I do not believe there would be any justification for an injunction of the character to which the Senator refers.

Mr. President, I may say further that one of the arguments has suggested that in case this provision covered violence it duplicated State law. I wish to point out that the provisions agreed to by the committee covering unfair labor practices on the part of labor unions also might duplicate to some extent that State law. Secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and so forth, may involve some violation of State law respecting violence which may be criminal, and so to some extent the measure may be duplicating the remedy existing under State law. But that, in my opinion, is no valid argument.

The Senator from Oregon, when speaking about paragraph (5) on page 16, stated clearly that for the purpose of enforcing the collective-bargaining agreement we were duplicating the two remedies, one by lawsuits in court for violation of an agreement and the other by making the violation of the agreement an unfair labor practice. I do not think that is a legitimate objection to such an amendment.

Mr. President, I want to say a word with regard to the suggestion that this is a so-called tough bill. I do not think it is a tough bill. I do not think we have done anything in this bill except to correct injustices and try to bring about equality. That is also the purpose of the pending amendment. We have not prohibited the union shop, which is urged by many. We have not abolished Nation-wide bargaining or prohibited Nation-wide bargaining either in the bill or by the proposed amendment. We have particularly failed to impose compulsory arbitration on the parties. We have not outlawed public-utility strikes, although many think we should. We have felt that the very basis of any bill must be free-collective bargaining. We have felt that basically there must be a right to strike if we are to maintain a free economy governing the relations between employers and employees. We have refused to set up any system of labor courts to impose upon workers the behest that they must work for certain wages fixed by the Government and not fixed by their own representatives.

It is not the purpose of the bill to discipline labor leaders, as suggested by the Senator from Oregon. It is a bill intended to try to equalize the relations between employer and employee. That is the very purpose of the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I am urging only amendments that seem to me clearly necessary to correct particular abuses when one party has obtained some advantage over other parties.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we might go so far in legislation as to make it unworkable. I agree that if we attempt to prohibit absolutely all strikes we may find that we cannot prohibit strikes. We may find that a hundred thousand men cannot be placed in jail if they are really determined and have confidence in the justice of their cause. But I do not believe any feature of the bill is unworkable. I do not see why the amendment should be in any way unworkable. For years the courts have been deciding that employers cannot interfere with, coerce, or restrain their employees. It is exactly as possible and logical to say to the union, "You shall not restrain or coerce employees in their right to work." I see no reason to think that that is any more unworkable than the provision which has actually worked.

So also with the other amendments we are going to propose. I am very confident that all those amendments simply try to work out on an equitable and fair basis the relationship between employees and employers. I do not believe any labor union can have a legitimate argument with which to go to the people and say, "Here is something in which you have discriminated against us, which you passed to punish us because you have not liked the way we acted." If there is any such provision I at least would be glad to remove it from the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has used up all his time?

Mr. BALL. I still have some time left, but the Senator from New Mexico may proceed if he wishes.

Mr. HATCH. I had no desire to proceed. I thought the Senator from Ohio

would consume the time remaining under the control of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Ohio has concluded, and time is now open to the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to know how much time the opponents of the amendment have left. The Chair previously stated that we had only some 12 or 13 minutes. I should like to know how much time the other side proposes to give to us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from New Mexico that the time remaining under the control of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is 12 minutes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I indicated to the Senator from Florida that I might yield him some time if he needed it for discussion. I yield 10 minutes of our time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I do not think I shall need it. I shall make my remarks as brief as I can because I understand that other Senators desire to speak, and the time is limited.

Mr. President, in beginning my remarks, I should like to discuss from a practical standpoint the situation in which we now find ourselves. I wish that for a while we might forget that there is any middle aisle in this Chamber, and consider the proposition before us without regard to whether we are Republicans or Democrats. I make that statement simply because charges have been made back and forth that political considerations are entering into the debate. I wish they might not enter into it. I think it is quite true that everyone in this Chamber, except possibly those who hold extreme views, realizes that the country expects the Congress of the United States to enact constructive labor legislation, and I think all of us are under a duty and a responsibility to meet the situation, to accede to the wishes and the desires of the entire country.

The other day, Mr. President, I spoke in favor of the motion made by the Senator from Oregon to divide the bill. I said then—and I repeat now—that my vote on that occasion was simply an effort to obtain some measure of legislation upon this subject. I did not discuss then—and I shall not discuss now—the merits of the bill or the merits of any of the proposed amendments. I stated on that occasion that if the bill were loaded down with restrictive amendments, in my opinion—and speaking only on my own responsibility—it would surely meet with a Presidential veto. I am still of that opinion. In that connection I wish to say that again I speak only my own opinion. I have not conferred with the President, nor with any member of the executive department. But from what has gone on in the past, and the well-known views which have been expressed, I am quite sure that a measure which is loaded down with too restrictive proposals will surely meet a Presidential veto. So I wish to discuss again, most briefly, the practical situation.

Let us agree that the objective of each of us is to obtain constructive legislation. How can we best obtain it? I am of the opinion, as I have stated, that with each amendment that is adopted the chances of a Presidential veto increase; likewise, the chances to override the veto decrease.

What will happen? No matter how meritorious amendments may be, if we load the bill down with so many amendments and so many subjects that it is vetoed by the President, and we do not have the votes to override the veto, what shall we have accomplished? We shall have accomplished absolutely nothing. We shall have failed in our obligation to the public and to both labor and management. We shall have failed ourselves as lawmakers.

Who would gain by such a condition? Shall I mention politics? Would the Republican Party gain if a bill were passed and the President should veto it, and his veto should be sustained? I think not. Possibly a few votes might be gained by such practices, but probably as many or more would be lost.

Would the Democratic Party gain under such circumstances? I think not, Mr. President. Probably some votes would be won by a Presidential veto under such circumstances, but others would be lost and, in my judgment, so far as the political situation is concerned, we would have a stalemate

Would labor gain by the failure to enact reasonable corrective legislation? I think not. I believe that reasonable, fair, and just legislation is actually in the interest of the cause of labor. I believe that the failure to enact reasonable legislation would not constitute a gain for the cause of labor.

Would management gain? I think not, Mr. President. I think management needs fair, just, and reasonable legislation. If we pursue a course by which no legislation is obtained, management will not gain. Neither of the political parties would gain under such circumstances. Neither labor nor management would gain.

But something would be lost. The Congress would have lost an opportunity—and it now has such an opportunity—to enact some legislation which can become the law of the land. Moreover, in the event we fail to enact legislation which can become law, the entire American public will lose by our failure. So from a practical standpoint I urge that the bill as reported from the committee, without the addition of amendments, regardless of their virtues, be enacted into law.

Do I say that the committee bill itself would be assured of Presidential approval? I have not made such a statement. I do not know. The President may even feel called upon, for what he considers to be good reasons, to veto the bill if all the proposed amendments are rejected. I do not know about that.

But I am not speaking alone with respect to Presidential vetoes. I am speaking about enacting legislation. I know that, if the bill as reported by the Senate committee is passed without further amendments, there will be a far better chance for it to be passed over the President's veto than if we add such amendments. I know of Senators on this side of the Chamber—and I presume there are such Senators on the other side of the Chamber—who, if the President should veto the committee bill as it has been reported, would not hesitate to vote to override the Presidential veto. It is my judgment that, if the bill is enacted in that form, it can become the law, Presidential veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I have a minute or two more?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I think I have already expressed my position on the pending measure. I have stated why I shall vote against the amendments as they may be offered. I am trying to obtain legislation which can become law, even though the President of the United States should determine, according to his judgment, that he should veto the bill. My judgment is that if we confine ourselves to the bill which has been reported by the committee, that measure can be enacted into law.

I am equally convinced that if further amendments are added, we shall enact no legislation whatsoever. As I stated yesterday or the day before, we shall simply have marched up the hill, turned around and marched back down again.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate upon Senate bill 1126 with the closest attention and interest. I have been impressed with the zeal and the seriousness of purpose shown by the able gentlemen who are the proponents of this measure as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have been equally impressed by the sincerity of those who are dissatisfied with the bill as it now stands and who desire to impose more vigorous restrictions upon the activities of organized labor.

The sharp conflicts which have found expression during this debate are testimony to the troublesome times through which we are now passing. But it seems to me that the industrial unrest for which we are seeking a solution by law does not spring fundamentally from a struggle for power between warring groups in our national community—it springs from the efforts of management and labor to protect their interests in the face of certain hard economic facts.

Today the American worker is faced with the highest living costs in the history of this country. The cost of the staples of existence— bread, butter, eggs, meat, milk, vegetables—food that appears on every American table—has risen higher than at the end of the First World War. The American dollar will buy less on the market today than at any time

within the memory of the speaker—or of anyone here present—and in the face of these conditions the American people are demanding lower prices, or a larger share in the profits of production so that our standards of living will not become lost forever.

These conditions have had an alarming effect upon the industry of this country. Although we have built through the efforts of free enterprise the greatest and most efficient system of production which the world has ever known, the costs of producing have reached an all-time high. The secret of our success has been the know-how of American mass production—large volumes of goods produced quickly and ingeniously at a low unit cost—bringing increased profits as the reward. The profits are low on the individual item—but they increase because of the great quantities of items which we are able to manufacture and sell. This calls for a very delicate adjustment of selling price to production costs in our competitive system—and American business must constantly meet the threat that the costs of production will drive the product off the market. In fact, I believe that this very thing is happening in a few industries today—production costs and price levels have risen so high that large volume operations have become unprofitable. The American public has become unable or unwilling to pay the necessary price.

I know that every one of us will agree that these conditions call for great patience and understanding upon the part of the American people—and, above all, for cooperation in every community of this country. It is essential to our continued prosperity as a nation that American business and American labor continue to work harmoniously together. It is essential that they find a peaceful solution to their problems over the conference table—and not on the picket line. I have a great faith in the ability of the American people to work together for the common good. The tremendous achievements in production which turned the tide of victory in the last war show how much we can do when we are solidly united with a common purpose. And even as we are meeting here today thousands of citizens in cities and towns throughout the country are joining together voluntarily—merchants, shopkeepers, housewives, wage earners—with the common purpose of reducing prices for the benefit of all.

Mr. President, we cannot legislate cooperation between management and labor. Indeed it is not necessary to do so because cooperation is part of the lifeblood of the American people. Why, I have read only the other day of agreements reached by friendly bargaining in four of our largest industries resulting in wage adjustments covering hundreds of thousands of workers—reached over the conference table without industrial strife of any kind or degree.

Our object, Mr. President, should be justice for the wage earner and for the employer without creating and fomenting the very elements of industrial strife which we seek to avoid. Now one of the most effective ways of creating immediate unrest would be to deprive the worker of his right to join with his brothers in the use of his only weapon—economic force—to secure a fair wage. We have declared by law that he has a right to organize and bargain collectively and I believe, that no matter how peacefully that right is exerted—its effectiveness will always depend upon the recognition by both parties—management and labor—that each holds the power to stop production in enforcement of their just demands. If the employer has the right to lock the doors of his mill at any time, it seems to me that workers should be able to exert a corresponding right. These convictions of mine have not come from books. They have come from 11 years of experience working in a cotton mill. I therefore believe that I know whereof I speak.

Let us consider, for example, the lot of the unorganized worker in the cotton-textile industry. A good deal more than one-half of the manufacturing wage earners in the State of South Carolina are employed in this type of work and in related industries—making broad woven cotton goods, cotton yarn, and dyeing and finishing textiles. In this industry the labor costs are a very high percentage of the value of the product and manufacturers are understandably very sensitive regarding any increases in wages which might adversely affect the sales position of the product.

Now about 75 percent of these mills in my State are largely unorganized. That is, the wage earner has been greatly dependent upon his own individual efforts and upon the fluctuations of the market for the type of wages he receives for his work. I have noticed almost without exception that—in the absence of legal restraint or collective action—the wages tend to seek the lowest level imposed by the most highly competitive employer. I believe I demonstrated this point some days ago during the discussion of the portal-to-portal pay bill. In July 1933, for instance, before the National Recovery Administration almost all workers in the cotton-goods industry in the South averaged less than 30 cents an hour. After the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed, however, establishing fair practice codes for the various industries, the number receiving less than 30 cents an hour was reduced to 7 percent by August 1934. Then as soon as wage controls were removed the percentage doubled; and, just before the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 went into effect, 25 percent of the wage earners in the cotton-goods industry in the South were averaging less than 30 cents an hour.

Of course, since that time wages have risen sharply not only because of the Fair Labor Standards Act but also because of the high wages in competing war production and the general Nation-wide increase in wage and price levels. In the absence of broadly effective organization, however, the textile worker in South Carolina would be unable to prevent a slump in wages to the minimum required by law whenever the competitive situation changes. Mr. President, I submit that we cannot condemn the worker eternally to wages no higher than 40 cents an hour—the legal minimum. We cannot deprive him of his right to use economic force, if necessary, to raise those wages.

Even though the right to use direct economic force is a fundamental right, I find proposed amendments to this bill which, as I read it, would utterly destroy the right to strike. I refer to the amendment of the senior Senator from Minnesota which would make any union subject to the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts if it combined to restrain interstate commerce for the purpose of restricting competition. The Norris-LaGuardia Act would again be repealed so far as it now applies to prevent injunction of such activities by the Federal courts.

The legal effect of this language might well be to make each labor union liable to injunction, to criminal sanctions, and to treble damages if it is seeking a wage increase from an employer in whose plant the union is effectively organized and certified to bargain collectively. I say this because, for the first time in the history of the antitrust laws, they would be applied to the restriction of competition by a union combination regardless of whether the means chosen by the union are ordinarily lawful. In other words, the mere fact of a peaceful walkout in an industry in interstate commerce because the employer and the union are unable to agree on a wage increase would very likely constitute a violation of the antitrust laws.

Now, I am not sure exactly what the Senator from Minnesota means in his proposed amendment by the words "restrict competition." I am reasonably sure, however, about the interpretation which the courts have placed on these words in cases involving unions under the antitrust laws. In Apex against Leader the late Chief Justice Stone stated, and I quote:

> A combination of employees necessarily restrains competition among themselves in the sale of their services to the employer. * * *
>
> Furthermore, successful union activity, as, for example, consummation of a wage agreement with employers, may have some influence on price competition by eliminating that part of said competition which is based upon differences in labor standards. Since in order to render a labor combination effective it must eliminate the competition from non-union-made goods, an elimination of price competition based on differences in labor standards is the objective of any national labor organization.

I wish to emphasize this point I am making by adding another quote, this time from the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Allen Bradley Co. against Local Union No. 3:

> It must be remembered that the exemptions (contained in the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act) granted to unions were special exceptions to a general legislative plan.
>
> It is true that many labor-union activities do substantially interrupt the course of trade and that these activities, lifted out of the prohibitions of the Sherman Act, include substantially all, if not all, of the normal peaceful activities of labor unions. * * *
>
> Thus, these congressionally permitted union activities may restrain trade in and of themselves. There is no denying that many of them do so, both directly and indirectly.

Now, I am certain of the sincerity and of the ability of the Senator from Minnesota, and, although I disagree with him as to the steps which should be taken in these matters, I am confident that he conceives himself as sincerely interested in the welfare of wage earners as any Member of this Senate. Yet there it is; he would subject labor organizations to criminal penalties and crippling damages for restricting wage competition and, indirectly, price competition by a walk-out to enforce fair wage demands made against an employer with whom the union ordinarily deals.

An example comes to my mind concerning a manufacturing company in my home State of South Carolina employing some 1,200 workers. During the war this company, which was then engaged in war production, was involved in a dispute with a labor organization ultimately resulting in the plant being seized by the Federal Government. The plant was then operated by the Government until VJ-day under a union agreement calling for a 55-cent minimum wage and a 5-cent an hour general wage increase. After the plant was returned to the owner, he announced that the plant would be run on the basis of the wage scale in effect prior to the Government's operation, which meant a reduction in earnings. As a result the employees went on strike, charging a refusal to bargain by the employer. As far as I know that charge is still pending before the National Labor Relations Board which as late as 2 months ago was unable to process the case because of lack of personnel. The strike continued for a year or more—in fact it was not officially declared by the Conciliation Service to have ended until April 22 of this year.

Now, none of the provisions of S. 1126 as reported by the committee would have prevented this strike, nor would they aid in bringing about a settlement. The present conciliation and mediation services of the Government which at all times have been available to the parties, have not attained a settlement and I see no reason to believe that a newly established Federal Mediation Service would be more successful. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota not only would fail to result in a settlement but would impose upon the union in this case heavy penalties for striking to prevent a decrease in wages even if the employer had been guilty of a failure to bargain collectively with the union. The result, Mr. President, would be either a ready accession to the employer's wage policy or the utter disintegration of the union. I do not believe that any fair-minded man can condone, let alone actively support, a measure which would have such disastrous results.

Another suggested amendment to this bill would prevent unions from bargaining for employees who are in more than one county or metropolitan area. I cannot see the benefit of this proposal. Rather than aiding in the settlement of disputes I believe that this provision would encourage them. This feature would prevent the often conciliatory efforts of the international union from being brought to bear upon strikes by its affiliates for the purpose of exercising a moderating influence where the local union has acted rashly in its relations with the employer.

I believe it is true, on the whole, that the most effective negotiation has involved the guidance of international officers. I know that amicable settlement of wage questions has frequently resulted from negotiation at a top level rather than at a plant level where several plants throughout the country may be involved. And I remember that, with isolated exception, the disputes which reflected adversely upon labor during the war resulted largely from the erratic policies of a few local unions.

Moreover, Mr. President, we cannot ignore the undoubted fact that millions of workers are now covered by agreements negotiated upon a regional basis, or larger, nor can we overlook the disrupting effect which this proposal would have upon these agreements which now have a stabilizing effect upon the economy of our Nation.

As to the bill as it now stands, I find it extremely difficult to perceive any sound reason for depriving supervisory employees of the rights guaranteed by the Wagner Act and, I find it equally difficult to see why these employees should not be held to the same high standard of conduct which would be required of organized labor by the provisions of this bill. I realize that this is a subject upon which there are violent opinions both for and against the organization of supervisory employees. I have encountered few experts on industrial relations who did not take a strong and uncompromising position on one side or the other.

Two factors greatly influence my opinion on this subject. First, in many industries supervisory employees have been organized for years. An example of what I mean is the Order of Railway Conductors of America. This organization has bargained successfully in the railroad industry side by side with unions composed of rank-and-file workers. Yet insofar as the operation of a train is concerned the conductor is in charge, and must deal with other employees who are also union members. The conductor must enforce safety rules of the strictest nature and must initiate disciplinary action wherever there is an infraction of regulations endangering the train. But I have never heard a complaint that conductors were lax in carrying out disciplinary functions because of their community of interest with other organized workers whom they supervise. Nor have I ever heard it said that the railroads do not desire to have conductors join unions. I therefore cannot accept the argument that organization of supervisory employees conflicts with the position of trust which is imposed by their relations to management.

Second, I feel that supervisory employees have as much to benefit from organization as rank-and-file workers. Those desiring to organize are not likely to be the high-paid executive staff—they are the foremen and supervisors in the plant—whose wages, hours, and working conditions are proper subjects for collective bargaining and whose security is as much in need of protection as that of other workers. Now, if there is a union of supervisors, I believe that their interests should equally be protected by law and that these unions must be held to the same degree of responsibility as other unions.

In defining a line of demarcation between supervisory unions which would be included and those which would be outside of the act, it seems to me that the test of affiliation is a sensible compromise between the extreme demands of opposing factions. If a supervisory union is in any way affiliated with a rank-and-file union it should be outside the act. But I cannot agree with the position of this bill that all unions among supervisory employees must be placed beyond the law.

Lest anyone may misconstrue my remarks today, I wish to say that I am seriously concerned and earnestly determined about enacting fair measures which will correct evils in industrial relations without injustice to American labor. I deeply feel that many jurisdictional strikes and many boycotts constitute unjustifiable invasions upon the property and interests of management and I am convinced of a firm and pressing need for eliminating them. I have also felt for some period of time that amendments to the Wagner Act are in order.

I wish to commend the able members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare regarding many provisions of this bill because many of these provisions are in accordance with my views. I cannot help but feel, however, that there are also provisions in the bill that do a great injustice to the laborers of this Nation and which will do them and this country a great deal of damage if they are enacted into law. For these reasons I cannot support all of the provisions of the measure as it now stands any more than I can agree to the restricting amendments. I am convinced that the provisions which I have discussed would have a very disturbing effect upon industrial relations without curing evils which exist upon the American labor scene. I very much fear that they would permanently blight the spirit of cooperation needed more today than at any other point in our peacetime history since the period of reconstruction.

I again warn the Members of this body of the unjust amendments of this omnibus labor bill, so-called, and that it is utter folly to attempt to secure industrial peace through the enactment of such vindictive legislation. Should this bill become law, we must expect to enter upon an era of industrial strife, dissatisfaction, and even violence; the like of which our peace-loving people have not seen on this soil since the War Between the States.

Like most other Members of this body, I desire to see the enactment of legislation that will protect the general public, and labor and management alike, from the excesses and the abuses of ruthless, unscrupulous labor leaders. An avaricious and selfish labor tyrant is as great a danger—or greater—than the capitalist exploiter whom he denounces and condemns. Labor racketeers admittedly are a threat to the democratic process and to

the liberties of the individual. Unless controlled, or eliminated, they can destroy our industrial economy and undermine our governments. I hold such individuals in great contempt. Yet, in the passion of our desire to protect the public from such monsters, are we willing to plunge foolhardily into legislating unworkable, unjust and unconstitutional law.

I avail myself of the opportunity to again point out that I know and understand the feelings of the man who earns his living through manual toil. I know that he would not accept, even grudgingly, the yoke which such a law would place about his weary neck. I speak not in the interest of any labor union or any labor leader. As I have said the workers of my own State are unorganized to the extent of 75 percent of those now employed in industrial and business establishments and I say with all candor and honesty that I have been besieged by letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from constituents urging me to vote for this bill. It would be a popular stand for me to take. Yet I believe they do not understand the serious dangers inherent in some of the provisions of this legislation, just as the workers in my State, from whom I have heard in only relatively small numbers, do not understand the invasions upon their civil rights.

Practically all of us want restrictive legislation which will protect the welfare of the general public against strikes of far-reaching consequence to the health and safety and necessary convenience of our people. We are opposed to violence in picketing, opposed to secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional disputes; opposed, in short, to many of the provisions of this bill. Yet, for the good which it would accomplish we are unwilling to subject ourselves to its dangers and its injustices.

On Wednesday, an opportunity to recommit this bill for revision by the committee and separation into four different bills was refused by a majority vote. Now, the only hope to prevent the obliteration of certain legitimate rights of our working people lies in a Presidential veto, and that same stroke would wipe out also the beneficial and desirable features of this bill—features sorely needed by the American public, and desired by us all. I sincerely doubt the wisdom; yet, I would hesitate to question the good faith of those people who insist on lumping every single phase of the most complex problem confronting our Nation and our peoples today into one quack cure-all.

For the reason that I shall be unable to accept the iniquitous and the obnoxious, I fear that I shall have to vote to reject also that which would be beneficial and worth while. This is a regrettable legislative circumstance into which we have been forced. However, there are some things so offensive that when grouped with other matters desirable and necessary the whole collection must be refused.

Naturally, I have no information or suggestions as to the President's decision when this legislation is handed up to him. Yet, we must only inspect his record in the Senate, review his veto message on the Case bill during the last session, and read again his recommendations to this Congress on the subject of labor legislation, in order to ascertain what is his thinking and his attitude toward these questions. I think it is inconsiderate and unfair, and against the best interest of the people of this country, to serve to the Chief Executive an omelet he cannot unscramble and consequently must take or throw away. The end result would be futility and waste.

Certainly, no one can profess a constructive effort in deliberately drafting legislation that is reasonably certain of veto.

There is still time to recommit this proposal and, while I cannot with good grace so move, I wish sincerely and honestly that its proponents would request that the bill be referred back to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for revision in accordance with the President's recommendations and the sentiment of the majority of the Members of Congress. Such a course would, in the end, result in a great saving of time and would expedite the enactment of that constructive and protective legislation which our peoples cry out for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORSE CODE

Civil war was fought among the Republican members of the Senate Labor Committee. The respective factions were led by ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. Mr. TAFT wanted an omnibus labor bill sent to the White House. Mr. MORSE wanted four separate bills. The Senate rejected the Morse proposal by 59 to 35.

Mr. TAFT, while realizing the danger of Presidential veto of a stiff omnibus bill, doubtless felt that by killing all labor reform Mr. Truman would be forced into a suicidal political blunder by flouting public impatience with labor abuses. Mr. MORSE believed that the important matter is getting labor legislation enacted, not playing partisan politics.

The code of the Oregon Senator makes excellent sense.

The bill passed by the Senate Labor Committee has provisions for delaying strikes by injunction, creation of a new mediation agency, making labor unions financially responsible, defining as unfair certain union practices and providing for a special Senate-House labor study.

Additionally Senator TAFT and three colleagues have offered amendments outlawing jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, banning unilateral union administration of health and welfare funds, forbidding national unions to dictate contract terms to their locals and making it an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce a worker in collective bargaining.

Now, there is little doubt that realistic businessmen will welcome each of these provisions—as well as those of the more rigorous House bill. Big labor has been shooting up the town for long enough. If the sheriff halts the spree it will not be a case of fascism or a labor slave act, as some of the unionists have been wailing.

But the question here doesn't depend upon the validity of the various provisions. It is simply this: Shall we have some bill or no bill? The extremists grumbled that submitting the legislation piecemeal is, in effect, letting the President write his own law. Perhaps. But Mr. Truman, having publicly acknowledged the need for certain labor reforms, can hardly renege altogether.

He is almost sure to sign into law the bans on jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, for example. And probably several of the other provisions. Senator MORSE realized this. According to his code, public service, not party politics, has first call.

An omnibus bill, turned down by the President, will probably die. The Senate can hardly summon enough votes to override a Truman veto. Does Senator TAFT want such a death on his conscience? Although some of the Republican tacticians may feel that the public, deprived of protection against rampant labor skulduggery, will vent its wrath on Mr. Truman, they may be wrong.

It may be the Labor Committee spurners of the Morse plan, who will feel the anger of long-suffering businessmen, are condemned to added months of bullying from big labor.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for the purpose of permitting the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
George	Morse	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent, because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a few days ago, when the pending amendment was earlier under consideration, I moved to amend the bill as it was originally presented to the Senate in such a way as to strike out the words "interfere with" which appear on line 6, page 14. I am merely rising to propound an inquiry, to ascertain whether that amendment is in effect, and whether the bill before us is accurate or inaccurate, or whether it is to be construed as not including the words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York has been agreed to.

The time for debate having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], inserting on page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", certain language. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 6, after the word "coerce", it is proposed to insert the following: "(A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Fulbright	Overton
Ball	George	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Hoey	Russell
Bushfield	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Smith
Byrd	Jenner	Stewart
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Cooper	McCarthy	Umstead
Cordon	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Conor	Wilson
Flanders	O'Daniel	Young

NAYS—28

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Downey	McCarran	Taylor
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Wagner
Hayden	Magnuson	
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—7

Bricker	Maybank	White
Kilgore	Myers	
McClellan	Tobey	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL on behalf of himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, after the word "employers", where it appears the second time in the line, it is proposed to insert the following: "in the same metropolitan district or county."

On page 5 strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(4) The term "representatives" whether used in the singular or plural means any individual or a labor organization irrespective of whether or not it is a constituent unit of or an affiliate of an organization, national or international in scope, composed solely of employees of one employer, or of employees employed in the same metropolitan district or county by different employers.

On page 16, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(6) To coerce or compel or attempt to coerce or compel (irrespective of whether or not such coercion or compulsion is authorized by any provision in its constitution or bylaws) a labor organization which is a constituent unit or an affiliate of such labor organization, or any other labor organization, which acts as the representative of employees for collective-bargaining purposes to include or omit or to seek the inclusion in or omission from any collective-bargaining agreement of any particular terms or provisions relating to wages, hours of work, or other conditions of employment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment just read is the one lettered (B) at the bottom, which is on the desks of all Senators. Briefly it deals with one of the major problems in the whole field of labor relations, namely, the tremendous growth of, and tendency toward, industry-wide bargaining, on both sides of the bargaining table, which has been noted within the last few years. Such industry-wide or regional bargaining is in no way prohibited or restricted. It does, however, vest bargaining rights of unions in the local union, making it an unfair labor practice for the international or parent body to coerce such union in the exercise of its rights in bargaining with an employer. It makes it an unfair labor practice for an international union, irrespective of any provisions that might be contained in its constitution and bylaws, to prevent the local union from making a settlement and forcing the local to insist upon inclusion of any particular terms in a contract.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to complete his statement?

Mr. BALL. I was going to describe briefly how the amendment would fit into the bill, and its effect on the present law. I should then be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The first part of the amendment inserts certain language in the definition of "employer," on page 4, beginning in line 7 of the bill:

The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

A list of exceptions follows. The proviso is new. It is not found in the present Labor Relations Act. As stated in the bill, the proviso reads:

Provided, That for the purposes of section 9 (b) hereof—

Section 9 is the section dealing with the elections held by the NLRB to select bargaining agents for the employees—

the term "employer" shall not include a group of employers, except where such employers have voluntarily associated themselves together for purposes of collective bargaining.

At present, as Senators will recall, the law restricts the bargaining unit. The language of section 9 of the bill provides that the Board may determine the appropriate bargaining unit in which the election shall be held, to select bargaining representatives for the employees. It says that it may be the plant unit, the craft unit, or the employer unit. The debate on the floor, when the act was passed, indicated clearly that it was the purpose of Congress to provide that the maximum unit should be the employees of a single employer. However, in practice, the Board acting under the language which reads, "The term 'employer' includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly," held that an "employer" could mean an association of several employers.

In certain cases where there has been a history of regional or industry-wide bargaining, such as the logging industry on the west coast, or the shipping industry, the Board has considered an association of employers organized and acting in the interest of the employers in collective bargaining a single employer unit. Consequently it will hold elections to deter-

mine a bargaining representative covering all employees of all employers within the association, as a single unit.

The effect has been that, particularly in the canning industry on the west coast, 30 companies may be lumped together as a single unit. In half a dozen of the plants, the employees may vote for an AFL union as their representative, while the employees in the other 24 plants may vote overwhelmingly for the CIO. Because they have an over-all majority the CIO then represents all employees in the 30 plants, even though the employees of 6 of the employers have actually voted for a different union to represent them. The first amendment merely inserts in the proviso, on line 16, after the word "employers," the following: "in the same metropolitan district or county."

This phrase would confine the Board's discretion in certifying an association of employers as an employer-bargaining unit, for the purpose of holding an election, to employers who are in the same metropolitan district or county. If employers outside the metropolitan district or county are included, separate elections must be held.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, this is the amendment which is described on page 51 of the report under the heading "More autonomy for local unions." Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand the amendment, it would require the National Labor Relations Board to certify as bargaining agent unions containing only the employees of a single employer, or of different employers within the same metropolitan district or country?

Mr. BALL. Yes. It would prohibit the Board going beyond those limits and certifying, as a single bargaining unit, an association which included employers outside the single metropolitan district or county. They could certify a single employer within the county. They have that discretion now, and they will continue to have it.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the change this amendment would make would be to prevent the certification of a union, or group of unions, of employees of more than one employer, covering an area outside the metropolitan district or county. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The effect of it would be to prevent the Board's holding a single election on a multiple-employer basis outside the prescribed geographic limits. It is primarily designed to deal with elections, and of course with the certification which follows the election. It prevents treating as a single bargaining unit the groups of employees of different employers, unless these employers are within the same metropolitan district or county. The Senator may be thinking of the textile industry. A number of employers in one metropolitan district or county could be certified, if the employers had voluntarily organized for purposes of collective bargaining as a single city-wide unit. Mills in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and North Carolina could not be included in a single unit.

Mr. LODGE. They could even go outside a certain metropolitan area in one State?

Mr. BALL. That is correct, in the certification of bargaining representatives. There is nothing in the amendment which, so long as bargaining representatives are chosen, would interfere in any way with the unions chosen as bargaining representatives voluntarily getting together for purposes of regional or even industry-wide bargaining with employers.

Mr. LODGE. I think we understand each other so far. I appreciate that the certification of a national or an international union is prevented only when the local union voluntarily desires its own certification. Is that not correct?

Mr. BALL. Under the present law, or what?

Mr. LODGE. No; under the proposed amendment.

Mr. BALL. Under the proposed amendment bargaining rights would be vested in the local union, or in the local union representing employees of a single employer.

Mr. LODGE. If the local union desired to do it?

Mr. BALL. Yes, that is because—if I may add this—the Board in the case of certain internationals, particularly the steelworkers of the CIO and the United Auto Workers, has gotten into the habit of certifying the international union as the bargaining agent regardless of which particular local organized the employees of the plant concerned. Thereby bargaining rights are vested not in the local union or in the union representing the employees of that particular employer, but in the international union.

Mr. LODGE. I realize that under the amendment, certification of a national or an international union is prevented when the local union voluntarily desires its own certification. I ask whether the word "voluntarily" should not be put in quotation marks, because we must recognize that while there has been a well-known abuse, and we ought to correct it, in certain places the local union can be acting under outside pressure, and would not be a free agent, and that the conditions which have permitted bargaining over a wider area have had some beneficial results.

Mr. BALL. The word "voluntarily" appears in the proviso on page 4, and that relates only to an employer. The present language of the bill gives any individual employer the right to insist that unions deal with him rather than an association. I refer to the provisions in section 8 (b) (3) which require unions to bargain collectively. In other words, this bill makes it an obligation of unions as well as employers to bargain. All that the language in section 2, subsection (2) does, is to give to each individual employer the right to decide for himself whether he wants to bargain through a group, through an employer association, or to bargain for himself. Our amendment places only one limitation on that right. It restricts the bargaining through employers' associations to employers doing business in the same metropolitan district. The effect of the language now in the bill is to give every individual employer freedom of choice as to how he wants to bargain. All we seek to do in the second part of the amendment is to give the local union that same freedom of choice as to whether it wants to bargain individually for itself, or whether it wants to associate itself with other constituent units of its parent body in some regional or industry-wide union-bargaining committee.

Mr. LODGE. The point I make is that that is all very well when the local union is a free agent, but can we not conceive that when the local union may be responding to some outside pressure, it may not be all right.

Mr. BALL. May I ask, what kind of outside pressure is the Senator talking about? Pressure from the international or from one of the employers?

Mr. LODGE. I was thinking about pressure from an employer, for example. Let me give a specific illustration. Take the question of shoe workers in a given area. I am advised by a well-informed source that at the present time there is one union organization of shoe workers that covers parts of New England in bargaining matters, and that since it has been in effect there have been fewer strikes than when they were all acting independently. My question to the Senator is this: If the pending amendment is agreed to will there not be an inevitable tendency in these unions to break off into small segments, with the added tendency to drive the industries out of the relatively high-wage areas into the relative low-wage areas, and then with the reverse tendency, to lower the wages everywhere?

Mr. BALL. No; I cannot agree with the Senator that that would be the effect of the amendment at all. If the local unions in New England are now organized to bargain on an industry-wide basis they can continue to do so under this amendment, but the choice would then be up to the local unions. If they do not want to do it, they do not have to.

Mr. LODGE. But would not this amendment change the situation? Otherwise there would not be any point in having it.

Mr. BALL. Absolutely; it changes the situation. It prevents the National Labor Relations Board from certifying as the bargaining agent of the employees, not the local, which the employees themselves control, but the international union. We leave it up to the local. If the local voluntarily wants to go along with a national union in bargaining, it can do so; but if it has a peculiar local situation and thinks it can do better for itself, it can act for itself.

Mr. LODGE. If that happens, does it not necessarily follow that the plants in which the local union bargained would have a higher wage than the plants in which the union operated under some outside influence? Would not the almost inevitable result be that some industries would move away from the high-wage localities to low-wage localities, thus creating a differential, not between the North and South or the East and West, but between high-wage communities and low-wage communities?

Mr. BALL. No; I think the Senator's correspondent is completely misinformed about the effect of the amendment. It might very well result in some local plants being well above the national average. Some companies, for instance, have an incentive-wage and profit-sharing system and all kinds of things that enter into the compensation of the employee that the local may want to preserve, perhaps for a somewhat lower hourly rate than the other companies, but in order to make the total compensation of their members higher. Yet if the international comes in and supersedes the local—we had a case of that kind in the UAW, which had served notice on employers that the national union was going to eliminate any kind of incentive systems, a plan which I think is good in industry, on the whole—the local bargaining committee now has no choice in the matter.

Furthermore, there may be a plant in a rural community where the procedure is under a freight handicap and competing with companies which are located in larger metropolitan districts. On the other hand, if the employer is in a community with lower living costs, he may have a slight wage differenial to put him on an even competitive basis and compensate somewhat for the freight differential. If there is industry-wide bargaining under the terms and the kind of practices we have seen in the case of the steel workers and the auto workers, the international will insist then on identical contracts in the great metropolitan cities and in the small rural communities. The result is that the international union will force out of business the plants in the smaller rural communities. It is my conviction that the unions representing employees of those plants have a right to determine for themselves the kind of contract they want. I do not think the international or the employees or employers in other plants have any business dictating to them the terms on which they shall work.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's statement in effect seems to mean that he thinks this amendment will correct some of the evils which have developed, and that it will be in the interest of the small rural communities. I want to correct the evils that have developed, and I want to help the small rural communities; but I do not see why, in order to correct the evils which have arisen and in order to help the small rural communities, we have to undo whatever good has been done by the uniformity in wage making, and why we have to interfere with the nonrural communities where the general interest has been served by people being able to get together on wage matters. It seems to me that the job of statesmanship is to correct one evil without causing another evil.

Mr. BALL. We already give the individual employer the option of bargaining in concert with other employers or bargaining for himself with the representative of the employees. He does not have to join in industry-wide negotiations. The Senator from Massachusetts is then taking the position that if we give the employee exactly the same freedom and independence of choice that somehow we are going to destroy something of value in the system. I cannot see his point.

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not taking that position. I am trying to ask the Senator—and I think all my statements have been in the form of questions—I am trying to ask the Senator what effect his amendment is going to have in industries like the shoe industry and the textile industry where industry-wide bargaining in some instances is reported to have had a generally stabilizing and beneficial effect. I am seeking information. The Senator replies by citing cases in the steel business and the logging business, which I am sure are justifiable, but he does not deal with the situation which I am discussing.

Mr. BALL. I do not recall that we had any testimony relating to the shoe industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. In a moment. Let me say that if the members of local unions in the shoe industry are convinced that industry-wide bargaining is to their interest, they are at perfect liberty to continue it under the proposed amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As to the shoe industry, it never has had Nation-wide collective bargaining.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that it had.

Mr. TAFT. There has never been more than 35 percent of the entire industry in any collective-bargaining agreement. None of the Ohio plants have ever been in a Nation-wide bargaining agreement; so it is not a parallel industry to that of steel.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Ohio is unwittingly putting words into my mouth which I did not use. I am talking about parts of the New England shoe industry. I did not say that it was in a Nation-wide bargaining arrangement.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to finish briefly, if I can, because I understand that the Senate is about to take up an appropriation bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point which he has discussed?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in that subject, and particularly in the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to localizing bargaining for wages or improvements of conditions.

I have in mind the situation pertaining to some of the glass industries. The employees in that industry make their agreements with an association of glass manufacturers. Some manufacturers are not members of the association. Separate agreements are made with those who are not members of the association. What effect would the Senator's amendment have on the case of which I speak?

Mr. BALL. I am familiar with the glass-blowers' industry. The amendment simply means that the bargaining rights are vested in the local union of employees of the individual employer in the particular community. If all the local unions wished to bargain with a Nation-wide association they would be perfectly at liberty to do so. But no international union would have the power to coerce them or force them to enter into industry-wide bargaining if they did not wish to do so. At the present time the employer is free to refuse to enter into industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the amendment, if enacted into law, disturb the situation which I have described in the glass industry, where the organization may deal with members of an association en bloc?

Mr. BALL. I believe it would somewhat change the pattern. As bargaining is now carried on, bargaining rights are in the international union. Under my amendment the bargaining rights would be vested in the local union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that the arrangement which I describe has been very satisfactory in that particular industry up to the present time. There have been no work stoppages for years among the glass workers.

Mr. BALL. I am familiar with the situation in that industry. Bargaining has been carried on in that fashion for 50 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why disturb a situation which is so satisfactory?

Mr. BALL. It would not be disturbed in the least. If the local unions think it is satisfactory, they can continue it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that in the glass industry the system of industry-wide bargaining long antedated the Wagner Act and does not depend upon a certification. Bargaining has been carried on, generally speaking, without certification, a situation which is also true of the coal industry. Nothing in this amendment would prevent it, except that if the local union wished to bargain for itself with a particular company, it could do so. Suppose that a strike had continued for a long time, and the local union thought it was utterly ridiculous and without basis, and wanted to sign up with a certain employer. It could sign up with that employer. That is the effect of the amendment. Whether the union is certified or not makes no difference. The local unions could still associate themselves in a Nation-wide collective bargaining agreement with the employers if they saw fit to do so. The Wagner Act is not based upon Nation-wide bargaining. The largest unit contemplated by the Wagner Act is the unit of employees of a single employer. That is all the Wagner Act was ever aimed at. It never protected Nation-wide bargaining. It has been held in some cases that where employers have voluntarily associated themselves together for collective bargaining, one bargaining agent on the labor side may be certified to deal with the employers' association. But if the employers no longer wish to associate themselves together, then there is no Nation-wide bargaining today by law. Nation-wide bargaining is not protected by the Wagner Act, and this amendment does not change the present condition, except in one respect. The international union

cannot say to a local, "We refuse to let you sign a contract unless you do what we say." That is what the steel union is doing today. That is what the auto workers' union is doing today. More than a thousand strikes were called last year in the steel industry because the international union insisted that every steel workers' union should strike unless it obtained the $2 which the international union insisted upon. That situation continued until Mr. Murray settled with Big Steel.

All this amendment does is to provide that unions which wish to settle with their own employers may do so if they are dissatisfied with the progress of Nation-wide bargaining, or have never been in it, as may frequently be the case.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then in the situation which I have described there is no limitation which would compel bargaining within the metropolitan area or county?

Mr. BALL. Not in this amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And in the instance of the glass workers they could carry on their present method of bargaining with the association or with individuals, as they might choose?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. Of course, the outstanding example of industry-wide bargaining is the United Mine Workers in the coal industry. So far as I know, Mr. Lewis never went before the National Labor Relations Board to obtain a Nation-wide certification for the mine workers. This amendment would affect that situation only if there were an individual coal operator whose local employees did not wish to go along on a Nation-wide strike, but wished to settle with him That is about all it means.

The second part of the amendment redefines the term "representative." Of course, that takes away from the National Labor Relations Board its present discretion to certify the international union or any other kind of union organization it wishes to certify. The amendment simply provides that a representative must be a union or organization composed solely of employees of one employer, or of employees employed in the same metropolitan district or county by different employers. All the amendment does is to vest collective bargaining rights in the local union, in which the employees whose rights are affected, and who have to bear the brunt of any dispute which develops, can participate in making the decisions so vital to them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to clarify one point?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Such an arrangement would not be compulsory upon the employees, would it, unless they elected to adopt it?

Mr. BALL. It would be compulsory on the National Labor Relations Board. The National Labor Relations Board could certify only a local union as the bargaining representative. Then if the local union wanted to call in the international representative to do its bargaining, it would be perfectly at liberty to do so. But the bargaining power would be vested in the local union, and the NLRB could not, as it has been doing, certify, not the local union which is composed of the employees directly affected, and who voted in the election but the international union—the UAW, the United Electrical Workers, or the steelworkers' international union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. However, the local union could elect to have the international organization act for it.

Mr. BALL. Yes. One abuse which the amendment would tend to curb is this: Among the steel workers, who in some places have a union shop and in some places maintenance of membership with the check-off, the dues go not to the local union, but to the international, which then sends back the local's quota. The same thing is true in the coal industry. The check-off goes to the headquarters of the United Mine Workers of America, and they send a part of the funds back to the local. Senators can see how much real power the locals have in that kind of a situation, when their funds are completely dependent on the international union.

The final section of the amendment simply inserts on page 16 a definition of a new unfair labor practice for labor organizations. It is made an unfair labor practice for the international union to seek to coerce or compel a local union, which has the bargaining rights, to insert any particular provision in a contract or to omit any particular provision. It makes such action an unfair labor practice regardless of any provision in the union's constitution or bylaws.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the language of the amendment provide a method of procedure for the local, depending upon whether it desires the international or larger unit to act for it? Is there any method provided whereby the local can object and make its objection final?

Mr. BALL. The local could protect itself through the regular procedure of filing a charge. If the international attempts to dictate to the local against its wishes, the local can file an unfair labor practice charge with the Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean that the local would be compelled to file an unfair labor practice charge with the Board, otherwise the Board would have no jurisdiction over it?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The Board never acts except on the filing of a charge.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will give the Senator a hypothetical case. The international union as a rule arbitrates cases in which a local becomes involved in a dispute. The international union sends a representative as an arbitrator or as a mediator. Can the local then determine that it does not desire the international arbitrator or mediator to act?

Mr. BALL. That is an unusual hypothetical case. I never heard of using an international organizer——

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not talking about an organizer; I am talking about a representative of the international union.

Mr. BALL. A number of years ago the International Typographical Union had an agreement to arbitrate grievances on the national level with the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Every local signing the same contract was bound by it so they would go right along in that case. Another situation developed in the ITU last year. Its convention adopted a resolution which required all locals to insert in their contracts, and to require all employers to agree to it, which would have made it a part of the contract, a provision compelling employers and employees to conform to the constitution and bylaws of the ITU, past, present, and future. The intention was to compel all locals to go along with that provision. Of course, the employers objected to signing a blank check. They did not know what the bylaws would be in the future. As a matter of fact, several strikes resulted. Under the amendment the International could not threaten a local with any kind of retaliatory action if the local said it would not go along and insist that its particular employer would have to accept such a contract provision.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose, without coercion, a contract is brought about in the regular bargaining way providing that the international shall be the arbitrator of disputes between the negotiators. When can the local determine that it does not want to continue that contract, but wants to change it and become its own sole bargaining agent?

Mr. BALL. It can do so whenever the contract expires. If the local union delegates its authority to the international to negotiate a contract, the local would be bound by the contract for its duration. Whenever it expired the local autonomy would again prevail and the local could make its own decision.

Mr. FERGUSON. And make a new contract?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This rather practical phase addresses itself to me. If this amendment should be adopted we would see the situation of one local bargaining and fixing wages at one level in a community, while close by another local might be bargaining in the same industry, fixing the wage. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That might possibly happen.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will ask the able Senator whether, if the amendment should not be agreed to, the bill would still permit the National Labor Relations Board to appoint the over-all union, the national organization, as the bargaining agency.

Mr. BALL. Yes; there is nothing in the present law to prevent it. As the Board has been doing it, I assume it would continue.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. If I correctly understand the

statement of the Senator from Minnesota, he is explaining the new amendment on the basis of a voluntary arrangement on the part of everyone concerned. Under the amendment will conditions be any different from what they are today, if everyone acquiesces in the arrangements as they exist; or must we in some way upset the present arrangements?

Mr. BALL. Of course, if everyone acquiesced, the amendment would produce no change, but I think things would be very different. For instance, one difficulty in the steel strike last year was that the international was the bargaining agent in its negotiations with Big Steel. The international ordered all the locals out on strike, even though many of them were bargaining with companies which were manufacturing products having very little or no relation to steel. Some were fabricating companies; they were not basic steel companies. The locals were all ordered out on strike. Under the orders of the international, none of them could settle except on terms agreed upon with Big Steel, even though conditions might be totally different. I think that situation could not have occurred under the amendment, because the locals would have preferred to exercise the bargaining power themselves. If the international ordered them not to settle, they could do so or not do so, as they pleased.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would that change actually come about if the organization in the steel industry should continue as is and if the unions acquiesced?

Mr BALL. Yes. If all the locals wanted to delegate all their power to a policy committee, there would be exactly the same situation as we have today, except that I think that under further language of the bill it is made an unfair practice for the union to refuse to bargain with an individual employer. So there would be a little more latitude for an employer in getting the union to bargain with him than he had in 1946.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In other words, the employer would have more strength in arguing for an individual union to use its voluntary right to break with the understanding or agreement it had with the international union?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think he would have any more than he has under the language of the bill without this amendment. He can argue now. But, as a matter of fact, as the Senator knows, we were told in the hearings that eight locals of the steelworkers' union in the Cincinnati area were so disgusted with dictation from the international that they have broken away and become an independent union. They had a difficult time in doing so, because the NLRB had certified the international as the bargaining agent and they had to go through quite a fight.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It left them without a certified bargaining agent, did it not? That is about what happened.

Mr. BALL. What happened was that they had to start over again as an independent union and win an election, when actually they had won it in the beginning.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think I have an understanding of it, but I should like to know if this conclusion to my understanding is correct: If everything is on a voluntary basis—I will use the steel organization as an illustration—things may remain just exactly as they are, providing the individual local unions want the big union to be certified and to bargain for them?

Mr. BALL. No; the big unions could not be certified. They could go on and have their bargaining relationship remain the same. They could still turn over their bargaining to the international officers. I am sure that under this language the NLRB could not certify the international as the bargaining agent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then the amendment is strong enough to break up the present bargaining arrangements in the steel industry; is it not?

Mr. BALL. I do not know what the Senator means by "break up." As a matter of fact, the steel industry does not bargain through an employer committee; I mean there is not really industry-wide bargaining in the sense that the employers have a bargaining association, or even desire to bargain in concert. In the steel industry the International Steel Workers' Union has union-wide contract terms which they insist upon with all the employers with whom they have bargaining rights, no matter what industry they are in. Some of them, I think, have even organized a baked-bean company.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be clear that there is no Nation-wide bargaining in the steel industry.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I referred to the steel industry because the Senator from Minnesota had referred to it. I am anxious to have an explanation so that we can understand exactly what the amendment will do to the present arrangements. The Senator has referred to the steel industry as an illustration. Probably we could refer to the coal industry as an illustration. But if we understand how the coal industry's bargaining arrangements grew up, getting mine after mine and mine after mine to come in, and if we then decide to go back to the old arrangements, I should like to understand about that. I am simply trying to get information so that we may understand what the consequences are to be.

I can see one consequence. Under the National Labor Relations Act, the theory is that the majority shall rule. Under this amendment it seems to me there would be brought about an arrangement whereby the majority of individual units would rule, instead of the whole.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think that is what was intended in the original National Labor Relations Act. In the Senate version of the bil there was a provision permitting a multiple employer unit for bargaining purposes. But this provision was stricken out because the Congress wanted the maximum unit to be no larger than a single company.

All we say in this amendment is that the employees of an individual employer shall have the right to decide for themselves, by a majority vote, whether they want to go along with an international union's recommendations or whether they want a autonomous arrangement which they believe is best suited for them.

As the matter now stands, in the case of the steel workers and the automobile workers of the CIO, the local union cannot change the terms laid down by the national policy committee of the international union, except with the express consent of the international union.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In reference to the steel industry, let me say there is no Nation-wide bargaining but what the steel union does is to say, "No one can act until we settle with Big Steel, and we thereby shall set a pattern; and since we are then the certified bargaining agent for a thousand companies throughout the United States, we shall insist on those same terms with every other company."

Once they are the certified agent, the local union is utterly helpless if the employer will not give it what it wants or even if the local union is satisfied or is perhaps better off with what it already has; regardless of that, it is utterly helpless, because the international union will not permit any contract agreed upon by the local to become effective, until the international signs the contract.

The Senator from Minnesota has said, correctly, that what we are doing here is implementing the exact idea of the original Wagner Act, which was to say that the employees in dealing with the employers shall not be at the disadvantage of being a thousand men on their side, dealing with one man on the other side. Instead of that, the act intended that one man representing the union should deal with one man representing the employer. But the Wagner Act did not contemplate that an employer in an industry that is not even a part of the steel industry should have to bargain, not with its own employees as one, but with a union of 500,000 men bossed from Pittsburgh or some other place in the United States.

The result of what is worked out under present conditions is absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Wagner Act. Such practice is not collective bargaining. It has prevented collective bargaining.

There is case after case, in the smaller companies in the steel industry and in other industries, where the employees have told the employer, "We cannot and will not bargain with you because we are told by the international that we cannot sign except on the terms dictated by Mr. Murray, and we know you cannot agree to those terms."

So what we are correcting is an abuse which has grown up, contrary to the theory of the Wagner Act, to frustrate collective bargaining. Today every small company in the United States is utterly at the mercy of a union perhaps 20 times as big and 20 times as powerful as the

particular company, whereas originally the situation was the other way, when individual employees sometimes found themselves dealing with companies much larger and much more powerful than themselves.

So I believe I have stated the general theory of the purpose of the amendment. I shall explain it more in detail as time passes, in answer to questions which Senators may ask.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to propound this question: At the present time, do the various locals of the United Mine Workers have individual contracts with their employers, or is there one contract? As I recall, John L. Lewis had signed a contract with Mr. Krug for all the units. Would that be permitted under this amendment, provided each union consented?

Mr. BALL. Yes; it would be, provided each union consented. As a matter of fact, in the coal industry there is a master contract, and then I think there are district contracts, and perhaps individual employer contracts, making some adjustments for different types of mines, and so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. But there could be a master contract, provided each union consented; could there?

Mr. BALL. Yes; provided both the employers and the local unions voluntarily went along in regard to that kind of arrangement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. I also wish to know whether an employer could prohibit such an arrangement, or whether the discretion would be solely in the local union either to provide for or to prevent such an arrangement.

Mr. BALL. We are giving both the individual employer and the local union freedom of choice.

Mr. FERGUSON. In that case, is it not true that there would no longer be——

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, the employer has such freedom now, theoretically, although it does not amount to much in the case of Mr. Lewis. But today under the present act, theoretically, the employer has freedom of choice. He cannot be forced by the National Labor Relations Board into a bargaining association. But the National Labor Relations Board can force the employees or the employer into an association-wide unit, even though they may not want to go into it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I understand that the present contract with Mr. Lewis, covering the entire field, exists because the individual employers desire to have it so at the present time.

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, there is an industry-wide agreement in the coal industry because the United States Government practically forced the southern operators to go along with it about 4 years ago. That is the only reason that it is in existence, and the Government is trying its best to make the southern operators go along with it now—against their will. Both Mr. Krug and Captain Collisson, according to the information which I have received, which I believe to be authentic, are compelling and forcing the southern operators, against their will. The southern operators do not think they have any business negotiating a contract at the same time and in the same negotiation with their competitors in the northern fields. They do not want to do it. But the Government, through Mr. Krug and Captain Collisson, is doing its best to force them or persuade them to abandon that position, and to go along on industry-wide bargaining, in spite of the fact that the House of Representatives, by a vote of 308 to 107, went much further than this amendment does and prohibited any industry-wide bargaining. Nevertheless, the executive branch of the Government is still trying to promote it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask another question. If this amendment becomes a part of the law, would the present situation, insofar as Mr. Krug and Captain Collisson are concerned, be prohibited, provided the various mine owners objected?

Mr. BALL. Yes; absolutely—assuming that the Government ceases to be the employer. The language in the bill as it stands, even without this amendment, provides that the employer must voluntarily associate himself. If he wishes to act independently, or if any group of them wish to separate from the Nation-wide committee, they would have a perfect right to do so, under the bill, if it is passed in its present form. But even though individual operators would be free to withdraw from the association and act individually, there is nothing in the bill, unless this amendment passes, to prevent Lewis, contrary to the wishes of the locals, from insisting that all operators sign the national agreement. Then the executive branch of the Government would be violating the law if it told the operators to ignore the wishes of their locals and sign a uniform contract.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it tried to have one over-all contract?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator, in answering the Senator from Michigan, has developed a point in which I was very much interested, and it summarizes itself, does it not, as follows, that before any bargaining can be done with respect to any individual employer, both the individual employer and the local union jointly must consent to the bargaining?

Mr. BALL. I would say that is its legal effect, but as a matter of fact, where there is industry-wide bargaining, actually the parties proceed just as they are doing now, except in the case of an individual local union or an individual employer who objects and says, "I don't want to go along."

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to, the local union must bargain with the individual employer, unless the employer consents, along with the local union, to go to the national organization?

Mr. BALL. That is the law now, for the employer. It is a one-sided obligation under the present act, on the employer, to bargain collectively, but there is no obligation on the employer to bargain collectively through an association of employers if he does not care to, under the present law, although in one or two cases the NLRB has rather stretched it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that in the coal industry there never has been any certification?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The locals of the United Mine Workers have authorized John L. Lewis to make a contract with all the employers together, and they have been able to do that, if they wish, because at present there is no certification. If the pending amendment were adopted, I would think the condition would be exactly the same. The local union would be certified, but they would be perfectly free to say to their employers, "We deal through John L. Lewis. You meet us through John L. Lewis."

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the point I raise; if this amendment shall be agreed to, can the local still designate a national officer to represent them?

Mr. TAFT. They can.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And can the national officer represent them without the consent of the employer?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Absolutely. They can send anyone they desire to negotiate, they can send John L. Lewis. There is a difference in the coal industry, as I see it. Let us take the case of the Ohio workers. Suppose they said, "John L. Lewis has gone too far. He is calling a strike absolutely without justification, and we do not want to go along with him any more." They can sign up with their own employer if they wish to do so.

The effect of giving the power proposed is that we will force the national representatives to be reasonable in dealings, to be reasonable in calling strikes, and so long as they are reasonable, I see no reason to think that a local union would break away from any national union of which it is now a member. But it would have that right, and I think it would exert a very wholesome restraint on the national representatives who lay down fiats and insist that unless their particular views are complied with, there will be a strike throughout the entire United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question, although it may be repetitious?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The local can designate any national officer, who may act for the local or any group of locals designating him, without the consent of the employer?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if he does not think that the effect of the amendment would be to break down the present tendency toward a Nation-wide wage scale. I will apply that. I see that there are on the floor at the present time many Senators who come from industrial States of the Union. Some of those States have lost industries to the South. I want to see southern industry grow, but I never have advocated any appreciable disparity between southern wages and northern wages. I think our workers are worth as much as the workers in any other section of the country.

Under the present system, where there is a national union as the bargaining agent for all the unions in an industry, Nation-wide, is there not a greater tendency to keep something like a uniform wage scale throughout the country, and to give employers no incentive to take advantage of a competitor by beating down the wage rate in a given area or in a given industry, whereas under the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, for all practical purposes there would begin to be a greater discrepancy and a greater disparity in the wage levels throughout the Union, and would not employers seek advantage of their competitors by trying to get a lower wage scale in their particular plants, rather than, as at the present time, having to gain their market by improvement in techniques and in managerial superiority, rather than at the expense of the wage scale in a particular plant?

Mr. BALL. I think the situation will remain just about as it is now, when there are certain patterns, sometimes regional differentials, but generally in a given area wages for a given type of work are about the same, except in certain marginal plants which, for various reasons, are not able to compete without certain differentials.

The only effect of the amendment would be to give employees in the marginal plants, in the North or in the South, in a rural community, perhaps, a chance, if they do not want to go along with the rigid national wage scale, to make some changes in it. I do not think that in the long run it would lead to wage cutting or deterioration of wage standards in the least. I think it would tend to arrest the tendency of the great international unions to impose a single contract on an entire industry and all its segments, regardless of tremendous differences in operating situations, in living costs, costs of raw materials, and rate costs, in different areas of the country and in different locations. I think there is just as much danger—indeed, far more danger—in that tendency than there is in the possibility that, under the amendment, here and there an individual employer might get a little better deal than some of his competitors. There is also the possibility that here and there a union may get a better deal than it got elsewhere.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BALL. I yield; but I will say to the Senator that I should like to conclude so that the Senate may take up the Labor appropriation bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not an inevitable effect, and is it not a corollary of what the able Senator from Minnesota has just said, that if the situation he envisages prevails there will be a tendency on the part of industry to try to move away from the areas where there are strong unions and high-wage rates to areas where there are weaker unions, and where they could get a lower-wage rate, and take advantage of a competitor through the low-wage scale they will be able to enjoy in such an area?

Mr. BALL. Today there is only one area in the country, that from which the Senator from Florida comes, where unions are not strong and growing in strength, though even in the South I think they are growing in strength. I do not think the union situation would be a major factor in any industry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks the Senator from Minnesota if he wishes to have the pending amendments considered en bloc.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire just what that means?

Mr. BALL. The amendment is in three parts, but it deals with one problem only.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it in reality only one amendment?

Mr. BALL. It is one amendment, but it is in three parts. I suppose under the rules it could be separated if any Senator desired.

Mr. TAFT. Even though we agree to consider the amendments en bloc, a motion to separate might be in order later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. LODGE. There are three amendments, and all three of them together embody the subject matter treated on page 51 of the report under the title "More Autonomy for Local Unions." Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2700, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2700?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed this afternoon with the consideration of the appropriation bill, which involves the appropriation of nearly $2,000,000,000, to be expended upon a great many different items? If so, I shall certainly object; and I do object, unless it be understood that the bill shall go over until the convening of the Senate on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is the intention of the junior Senator from California, who is in charge of the appropriation bill, to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill. It was reported to the Senate on April 22, and it has rested on the calendar during the intervening period. Other appropriation bills are to follow immediately upon the heels of this bill, and, unless it is possible to expedite them, there will be a jam of appropriation bills. For that reason, it is the intention to proceed forthwith.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada objects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Preisdent, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2700, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2700. The motion is debatable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration of the bill this afternoon, but I certainly have some objection to continuing with it next week. I ask the Senator whether, if protracted debate develops, he will object to a motion to restore the labor bill to the position of unfinished business?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my colleague from Ohio that if there are any unnecessary or undue delays, I should certainly not object to recurring to the consideration of the important labor legislation which the Senate is considering at this time. However, I believe that if we proceed with diligence to the consideration of the appropriation bill, we can conclude it, if not this afternoon, certainly early on Monday.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McKellar
Baldwin	Fulbright	McMahon
Ball	George	Magnuson
Barkley	Green	Malone
Brewster	Gurney	Martin
Bridges	Hatch	Millikin
Brooks	Hawkes	Moore
Buck	Hayden	Morse
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Hill	O'Conor
Byrd	Hoey	O'Daniel
Cain	Holland	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Overton
Capper	Jenner	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cooper	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Langer	Russell
Downey	Lodge	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lucas	Smith
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarthy	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taft
Ferguson	McGrath	Taylor

Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Williams
Thomas, Utah	Wagner	Wilson
Thye	Watkins	Young
Tydings	Wherry	
Umstead	Wiley	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2700.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with reference to the pending motion, I made the statement on the floor of the Senate and I repeat it, that I have no desire to interfere with consideration of the appropriation bill at a proper time. It is the intention of some of the minority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to file this afternoon minority views bearing on some of the controversial items in the bill.

The bill has had extensive hearings at the hands of the Senate committee. The bill reflects very serious and severe cuts in the appropriations for all the bureaus and divisions of the Labor Department, from the Secretary's office on down. It reflects very serious cuts by the House of Representatives in the Federal Security item. During the consideration of the measure by the Senate Appropriations Committee we presented amendments which would restore appropriations allowed by the House to the amount of the Budget recommendations.

Mr. President, this is not a trivial matter. It is a matter which affects the entire Labor Department of the Government and seriously affects the operations of that Department. It is not as though merely a few dollars were cut off here or there. That would not make so much difference. But we are advised by the Labor Department that the reductions made in the appropriations will seriously cripple the work of that Department.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I have been discussing with other Senators the possibility of obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement regarding House bill 2700, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1948. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request that when the Senate convenes at noon on next Monday it temporarily lay aside the unfinished business to take up House bill 2700 and proceed to a final vote on that bill not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that when the Senate convenes on Monday next at noon it proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2700 and continue consideration of the bill to a final vote not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on the same day?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say I have no objection to the motion to proceed with the appropriation bill. I think we should proceed with it and should dispose of it, but I do object to fixing a time for a final vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon objects to the unanimous-consent request.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I will say that the bill could very well be proceeded with on Monday at noon, and it would go through very expeditiously, as other bills of this nature have gone through in times past. We might not have the bill completed early in the afternoon, but it seems to me that by giving the attention of the Senate to the bill beginning at 12 o'clock or thereabouts we could complete action on it before adjourning that evening. I see nothing to delay action on the bill, and certainly I, for one, would not delay it. The object of my now objecting to unanimous-consent request is not to delay action on the bill, but rather so that minority members of the Committee on Appropriations may have an opportunity to file their views this afternoon.

It might well be said perhaps by the Senator from California that we have been somewhat remiss in not having filed the minority views before. I do not know that my argument against such a statement would be very strenuous. Perhaps by reason of excessive work in committees we have not been on our toes, so to speak, in filing the minority views.

The minority views will reflect the attitude and desires of the minority members of the Appropriations Committee. They will be ready and will be filed sometime this afternoon. Then we shall be ready to proceed with the consideration of the bill. So far as the presentation of our views, item by item, as the items on the bill are considered by the Senate on Monday, it is not our intention to delay the matter for any considerable length of time.

Mr. President, during the afternoon it has been said that there would be no further business conducted by the Senate this afternoon excepting a discussion of the pending matter. Many Senators have left the city, so I am advised. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who appeared before the committee and presented very strenuously his views on a certain item in the bill, is not present this afternoon. There may be other Senators who will not be able to be here.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say that the able Senator from Nevada, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, was a very close attendant at all the meetings of the subcommittee and of the full committee of the Appropriations Committee, as he always is, and he took a great interest in the subject. The majority have filed the committee report. Such members of the minority as may wish to file minority views have had from the time we filed our report until the present to file minority views.

So far as Senators being absent from the Chamber is concerned, I respectfully suggest that on any day the Senate meets Senators on one side of the aisle or the other will of necessity be absent. If we are to continue to postpone public business because of the absence of Senators, we shall never accomplish the business of the public.

Other appropriation bills are coming along. The able Senator from Nevada is a member of other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Committee hearings will be under way next week and the week following. I think the time to proceed with this matter is now.

Under the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act we have let the matter lie over from the time of our report not only the 3 days required, but 5 days. So there should have been ample time to file a minority report, or for Members to study the bill and the report of the Appropriations Committee.

For that reason I suggest to the able Senator from Nevada that we proceed. I am sure that he is quite able and competent to present the views of the minority to the Senate this afternoon, so that we may proceed with the public business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in regard to the request made a while ago, to which objection was made, it seems to me that it is a little unusual to ask unanimous consent to take up a bill on a day in the future, and, before it is taken up, agree upon a time when it is to be voted upon. No one knows what amendments will be offered or how long the controversial questions will require in the Senate. I am sure that in all likelihood the bill could be disposed of Monday afternoon. The Senate ought not to bind itself—and I am satisfied it will not bind itself—to take up a bill on Monday and vote on it at 2 o'clock. I doubt whether it is wise to agree to vote at any time until the bill is taken up and we can see how the debate proceeds. I think it would be easy to agree that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside on Monday and the appropriation bill taken up. As we proceed, we can then determine whether or not to fix an hour at which to vote. I do not think that anything would be gained by trying to take up the bill this afternoon.

Regardless of whether or not a minority report ought to have been filed a day or two ago, it has not been filed. I am not saying that it should have been or could have been. We have all been busy with pending legislation. It seems to me that it is not unreasonable to ask that the bill be not taken up until the minority have had an opportunity to file their views. I am satisfied that there will be no ultimate delay in the consideration of the bill if we wait until such a report is received.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I happen to be a member of the subcommittee. I appeal to my friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to let the bill go over until Monday. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was a member of the subcommittee. I am afraid that I did not give him as much support as he should have received in the committee, as members of the committee know. I think he ought to have an opportunity to file minority views, and I hope that the bill will go over. I appeal to my friend to let that be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that time would be saved by letting the bill go over until Monday. The hearings before the Senate committee are exceedingly voluminous. They cover every item in the bill in extenso. It seems to me that it is the part of wisdom to continue with the debate on the unfinished business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 12 o'clock noon on Monday, or at whatever time it may reconvene, the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of House bill 2700, the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minority views of the Committee on Appropriations may be filed during the adjournment of the Senate which is about to be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Subsequently,

Mr. McCARRAN (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. HAYDEN), members of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted minority views to accompany the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 146.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise simply for the purpose of discussing certain statements appearing on pages 2 and 3 of the report on the Labor and Social Security appropriation bill. On page 2 the following sentence appears:

> The Senate committee, on the contrary, recommends that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

On page 3 the following appears:

> The Senate committee recommended that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

Those sentences may be all right, or they may not be all right. I shall not talk about the law or the appropriation; but regarding the item for the Bureau of Labor Standards, I should like to have the RECORD show that although the bill calls for continuance of services for promoting employment stabilization and amicable relations between employees and employers, such work is forbidden by the recommendation in the report that no labor education be conducted by the Department of Labor. In effect we are witnessing the summary execution of the very small labor education unit in the Bureau of Labor Standards. This unit has produced materials and has assisted employees and their union officials in the field of peaceful and reasonable adjustment of plant grievances, collective bargaining, and shop practices. The House proposed $63,000 for the continuance of this work. The Senate Appropriations Committee proposes to wipe it out.

This action is taken in the midst of debate upon labor legislation in which the sole question is whether such legislation shall be "tough" or even "tougher." I suppose that this striking down of a service to labor and to the cause of industrial peace is consistent with the trend shown in the debate. I simply wanted to point out the consistency of attitude and policy and to register my protest against the action. I hope that there will be another day in which we may discuss the value of this service and its proper location. That discussion, in my view, should be held, in the first instance, not by the Appropriations Committee, but by the Labor and Welfare Committee, which has responsibility for both labor and educational matters.

Mr. President, this is merely a protest against two sentences in the report. Last year I introduced a bill providing for setting up extension divisions on industrial labor relations. The bill was not acted upon. It was put forward as an idea, and from one end of the country to the other industrial labor problems are becoming more and more a part of the curricula of our universities, and are being studied by extension divisions not under the auspices of the Department of Labor, not under the auspices of the Federal Government at all, but under the auspices of various institutions.

We are preparing to go on with that sort of thing, and I expect we will do so, because in great institutions such as the University of Syracuse, the University of California, the University of Washington, and other institutions these divisions are being set up.

What I am personally afraid of is that it may be implied by these two sentences that it is the will of the Committee on Appropriations to strike at what necessarily will become the only agency which will make it possible for us to have decent industry-labor relations through educational processes.

If these sentences should be interpreted strictly by the legal authorities in the Department of Labor they might strike down something which the House itself has appropriated money to continue. The ill that would come to general industry labor relations might be so great with these two simple, little, innocent sentences, if we do not protest, as to impair and damage seriously one of the finest movements that is developing in our industry-labor relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I missed the first part of the Senator's statement, and I am not sure whether what he just read was his views on the situation, or whether he was reading from a letter which had been sent to him.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I was stating my views, trying to make them as brief as possible, merely protesting the two sentences to which I have referred, so that they would not be enlarged into the law of the land, and cut down a work which has already been started and which is proceeding satisfactorily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I should like to say to the able Senator that I certainly do not agree with him that there is shown any animosity on the part of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations or the full committee, so far as the Bureau of Labor Standards is concerned, or in the field of education. I wish to point out that the House struck out the entire appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards. The Senate committee restored an item of $400,000 for the Bureau of Labor Standards, and made adjustments in the Department of Labor appropriations increasing them over what had been allowed by the House of Representatives by the amount of $4,000,000. From Secretary Schwellenbach on down, every person who appeared before the committee expressed appreciation for the very fair and open-minded attitude the committee had taken in dealing with the various matters which were before it.

I may say further to the able Senator from Utah that if we are going to create what in effect are bureaus of education in the Department of Labor, in the Department of Agriculture, and in the Department of Commerce, it seems to me not very sound governmental practice. If there is to be labor education, then it seems to me it should be through the facilities of the Office of the Commissioner of Education, who can work with the Department of Labor in distributing the pamphlets, who can work with the Department of Agriculture, if there is a similar situation, but certainly we should not duplicate, in an already overgrown Federal Government here in Washington, and have what in effect will be another bureau of education.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, no one wants to see a bureau of education established in the Department of Labor, of course. I think I have made it plain that what I am frightened at, what I really fear, is that the great advance which has been made, not by the Federal Government but by the various educational institutions of the country in setting up industry labor studies, and of course getting information from whatever sources they can reach, shall not be maintained. These two sentences might cause someone in the Department of Labor to make a ruling which would retard this sort of work, and stop what has been going on. I think that with that explanation, and after protest has been made, that sort of thing will not be done.

Before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare several education bills are pending. If the Department of Labor wanted to establish an educational department, it should endeavor to have it established by law. The same statement applies in a way to the Committee on Appropriations, for if it desires to strike down an activity which has become worth while to the people of our country, the subject matter should be first referred to the proper legislative committee. I think that in each case someone is playing out of bounds.

INTERPRETATION OF THE GOOD-FAITH CLAUSE IN PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since the passage of the portal-to-portal bill last evening a great number of questions have been asked me concerning that measure. For that reason I should like to ask the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] or the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] a few brief questions as to their interpretation of the good-faith provision of the portal-to-portal bill. Since the Senator from Kentucky was a member of the subcommittee and of the conference committee which had charge of the bill, I should like to ask his view, and if the senior Senator from Missouri cares to comment, I should also like to have his view.

My question pertains to the following state of facts:

An employer, under the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator, believed himself to be subject to the Wages and Hours Act, and then an official of the Railroad Retirement Board ruled that the employer was not subject to the Wages and Hours Act. The employer acted in accordance with the latter's ruling. In fact, the employer secured indemnification on its Government contacts against an adverse judgment by the courts.

Could an employer under such circumstances be regarded as having acted in good faith in his reliance on the subsequent ruling of the Railroad Retirement Board? Would the defense of good faith under the terms of the bill be available to the employer under such circumstances?

I should like to have either the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Missouri comment on that question, for the sake of the employer and employees in the State of Minnesota who are directly affected by the act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday a similar question was propounded to the senior Senator from Missouri by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and I thought at the time that the answer was in conformity with the intent and spirit of section 9 of the act, entitled "Reliance on Past Administrative Rulings."

As the Senator from Missouri stated yesterday, it is difficult to say what a court will do in a particular situation. It will be remembered that the purpose of this section is to provide a defense for an employer who has not brought himself under the act if the employer pleads and proves that his failure grew out of reliance upon the ruling of some governmental agency; and further, that his reliance was in conformity with that ruling, and that it was in good faith. So it would seem that the essential factor in such a decision would be the question of good faith.

The Senator's question is specific. The purpose of this section is general, and each case must be determined upon its particular facts.

I gather from the Senator's question that it is the same case which was discussed by the committee at various times in relation to this section. It is my personal opinion that a court should interpret this section strictly. The burden of proof is placed upon the employer. I believe that the courts should require proof of reliance and proof of good faith. It is my own opinion that in the case which the Senator has stated that is an arguable question. Personally I think that if two situations were presented to an employer as they have been stated in the Senator's question, where it was possible for an employer to rely upon the ruling of one agency or upon the ruling of another agency, the question would of course arise as to whether he had a right to rely upon a ruling of the Railway Labor Board.

Secondly, the Senator has stated that in this instance the employer did rely upon the ruling of the Railway Labor Board and, as I believe, asked indemnification from the Treasury. So it seems to me that the question could properly be considered as to whether it was a good-faith reliance or whether the employer was simply choosing a course which was most favorable to him.

As the senior Senator from Missouri said yesterday, and which I must repeat, in every case it is a question of fact for the determination of the court. It is my own opinion that it should be interpreted strictly and that in a case where an employer chose a course which was to his own advantage it would be a question as to whether he acted in good faith.

I do not know whether the Senator from Missouri agrees with that statement or not.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the junior Senator from Minnesota to repeat the specific question he has asked?

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator want me to repeat the entire question?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The question, very briefly, is as to the interpretation of the good faith provision of the portal-to-portal pay bill which passed the Senate yesterday. The question has been asked me, and that is the reason why I propounded the question to the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Kentucky. It pertains to a set of facts such as this: An employer, under the rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator, believed himself to be subject to the Wages and Hours Act. Then an official of the Railroad Retirement Board ruled that the employer was not subject to the Wages and Hours Act. The employer acted in accordance with the latter ruling. In fact, the employer secured indemnification on his Government contract against adverse judgment by the court. Could an employer under such circumstances be regarded as having acted in good faith in his reliance on the latter ruling? Would the defense of good faith, under the terms of the bill be available to the employer under those circumstances?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think the question propounded by the Senator is substantially if not identically the same as the question which was asked yesterday by his colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the answer which I would make today is identically the same as the answer which I made yesterday. In my judgment it is precisely the same answer as has been made by the junior Senator from Kentucky. [Mr. COOPER]. It seems to me that it is a question of fact, under all the circumstances, a question to be decided by the court, first, whether or not the employer has sustained the burden of proof by showing that he acted in good faith and in conformity with or in reliance on an administrative regulation, ruling, order, or interpretation. All the facts in the particular case must be taken into consideration. Indeed, the securing of indemnification to which the Senator has referred is undoubtedly a fact, in my judgment, which any court would take into consideration in determining whether or not the employer was in fact acting in reliance upon the ruling. I am not undertaking this afternoon to pass upon a particular question of fact. I do not believe it to be practicable or advisable so to do. I shall not this afternoon undertake to decide this particular question. It seems to me that when the question is presented to the court, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has so well stated, the court will have before it the fact that the burden of proof rests upon the employer; second, that every fact within the cognizance of the court, the evidence in the case, must be taken into consideration. Even the demeanor of the witnesses will be required to be taken into consideration in the matter; third, that the court in determining whether or not the employer was or should be considered to have been protected by the provisions of section 9 which was approved yesterday, must find, first, that the employer has pleaded, and, second, that he has proved, that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with and in reliance on the ruling of the Railway Labor Board official to whom the Senator has referred.

I do not think it is possible or advisable to attempt to say here that judgment should be rendered for the defendant. It is a question of fact to be determined by the court under all the facts of the case.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the case referred to is not the question one of fact to be determined by a judicial body? If it were before a jury it would be submitted to the jury on a charge by the court concerning the doctrine of good faith, and if the jury found that the facts came within the rule of law laid down it could determine that the party acted in good faith or not, as it might desire. It is one of those indefinite things about which it is always difficult to legislate. It is like the law on the question of negligence. In the law of negligence it has been impossible to lay down a specific and certain definition of negligence, so the law allows the question of fact to be presented as to whether what was done was what an ordinarily prudent person would do under the same or similar circumstances. So we have here the question, Did he act in good faith relying upon the order, or did he act in bad faith and so use the order that he might benefit by it? If he did, the jury or the

court would naturally decide against him. Is not that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I should like to suggest one thought in connection with the question of whether he used an interpretation or statement of a Federal representative or a Federal agency to his own advantage. I would say that in the particular instance if a Federal agency renders a ruling affecting an individual it is assumed that the maker of the ruling spoke with authority, and therefore the individual would be most likely to accept the ruling of the Federal agency on the question as coming from someone in authority.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have had in the law for many years the question of a purchaser in good faith, and we have discovered that the law has worked very well over many years in determining whether a purchaser was a purchaser in good faith. Is not that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So I see nothing here about which we should be disturbed. It is a question of fact to be determined by the judicial branch of the Government, and I think we shall find that the act will be, as a rule, well administered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to add, to what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said, that I think his analysis is precisely correct. I think it is in entire harmony with the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky a few moments ago, and is in entire harmony with the statements I made yesterday and today.

What I am about to suggest is doubtless known to substantially all Members of the Senate, but I think it important to have it made a matter of record; namely, that the two distinguished Senators who have thus far expressed themselves upon this matter, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan, both have had extensive judicial experience, in that they have served upon the bench. I think it is well to state that fact for the RECORD, in order to indicate the significance of the judgment which they have presented this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest to the Senator that if uncertainty results from the rulings of two Federal agencies, would not the question of the jurisdiction of the respective agencies be a very important factor in determining good faith?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it would be. However, I wish to say so that there may be no misunderstanding, that section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act does not give to one agency the right to rule, as against another agency. But if an employer has, for instance, obtained the opinion of the Wage and Hour Administrator in regard to a particular matter, and also has obtained in regard to that matter a ruling of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, for instance, who, with all due deference to his distinguished duties, is not at all connected with the administration of the act, so far as I know, I think the fact that, on the one hand, the employer has consulted with an agency which has information on the subject, and, on the other hand, has consulted with a particular official who may not have had any connection with the act, should be and would be taken into consideration by the court in determining whether the individual employer acted in good faith. I take it that is the question which was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether there is anything further which the Senator from Minnesota wishes to mention on this question.

Mr. THYE. No; I thank the Senator from Missouri.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly the effect of the amendment which is now before the Senate. I shall discuss it more at length next week.

In the first place, I think it should be understood that the Wagner Act has no relation to Nation-wide bargaining. Nation-wide bargaining exists because it has grown up as a practice in particular industries, but not because it was nurtured in any way by the Wagner Act. In fact, I think it is contrary to the Wagner Act.

The committee bill recognizes a rule made by the National Labor Relations Board, namely, that where there is an association of employers, the National Labor Relations Board may treat that as one unit and may certify a bargaining agent to deal with such association of employers. But even in that case, it is entirely dependent upon the wish of the employers to have that kind of Nation-wide bargaining.

So today the employers may veto Nation-wide bargaining, exactly as they may do if this bill is enacted into law. The bill does not in any way affect that particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the present practice, something like that effect is achieved, I am sure the Senator will admit, because the National Labor Relations Board does certify a national union as the bargaining agent for local unions.

Mr. TAFT. I was coming to that point.

Mr. PEPPER. So for all practical purposes, at the present time there can be Nation-wide bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the House bill provides that there cannot be Nation-wide bargaining; in other words, just as a number of employers cannot associate themselves together to fix prices, the House bill provides that a number of unions shall not associate together for the purpose of fixing one wage pattern. The House bill takes the position that that is a monopoly practice and should be prohibited.

The Senate committee has not attempted to take such a position, and I myself would not favor such a position.

However, what has happened is this: There is no Nation-wide bargaining in the steel industry, but a national union or the head of a national union has been able, in two ways, to insist upon a Nation-wide pattern in his particular industry. In one way, he may persuade the National Labor Relations Board to certify his national union as the agent of a local union to deal with the local union's employer, who may be either a small employer or a large employer. That is one method by which the national union obtains control, so that the local union cannot sign a contract, but the representative of the national union must sign it for the local union.

Another method by which the national union has been able to insist upon a Nation-wide pattern in a particular industry is by inserting into its constitution and by-laws a provision that the local union, although the bargaining agent—and I may say that, taking the Nation as a whole, the national union is not usually certified as the bargaining agent, but the local unions are usually certified as the bargaining agents——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Missouri mind if I complete my statement? I shall be through in a minute.

Mr. DONNELL. Then let me ask the Senator's indulgence, if I may, to request the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to remain on the floor for a few minutes, if he will.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is nearly always on the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the second method is to write into the constitution and bylaws of the national union a provision that the local union cannot sign a contract without the approval of the national union. In that way, the national union has exercised control over the local unions.

Our proposal provides that, in the first place, the national union shall not be the certified bargaining agent, but that the party who finally signs the contract with the employer shall be the local union, representing the employees of the particular employer. In the second place, we have provided that the national union may not impose a condition to the effect that the local union cannot sign a contract with its own employer unless the national union approves. Those two powers are removed by this amendment, and that is all the amendment does.

Therefore, the effect of the amendment is to permit a union representing the employees of a particular company to sign a contract with its own employer if it wishes to do so.

In the course of the bargaining, it may say to the employer, "You must deal with the head of our national union; he is the man with whom you must talk." The local union will have a perfect right to take that position, and the head of the national union may deal with all the employers at once; or if the employers wish to associate themselves, he may negotiate with a particular employer or with a number of employers.

But if the local union becomes dissatisfied with that agency, it may revoke

that agency; and then it may sign a contract with the particular employer. That is the purpose of this amendment.

I myself feel very strongly that that was the purpose of the Wagner Act, namely, that the employees of a particular employer should be able to act as one man in dealing with one man representing their employer, and that it was not the purpose of the Wagner Act that a national union should be able, through its tremendous control of all the men in an entire industry, to dictate terms to a particular employer, through the power which is given to it by the National Labor Relations Act.

So, Mr. President, I feel that we are merely restoring the original purpose of the act, and the reason for doing so is the number of strikes which have occurred because of the practice of the national union in trying to dictate to the local unions. That story is a longer one than I care to present at this time.

INTERPRETATION OF THE GOOD-FAITH CLAUSE IN PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY BILL

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the purpose of my requesting the Senator from Texas to remain on the floor a few minutes, which called forth his comment that this is his accustomed place, was that in the illustration which I used in response to his question I referred to the Sergeant at Arms. I do not wish by any statement made in the illustration to leave the inference or conclusion or suggestion that the Sergeant at Arms would be an agency within the meaning of either section 9 or section 10 of the portal-to-portal act of 1947. It was simply an offhand illustration I thought of. I think the point the Senator made is exactly correct, namely, that the fact that a person may consult with a particular agency which has to do with the administration of a particular act, and then consults with some official who has nothing or but little to do with the administration of the act, is a fact which the court should and would take into consideration in its determination of whether or not there was a good-faith reliance, in conformity with the particular regulation.

I thank the Senator for remaining.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Missouri. Let me suggest to him that my interrogatory was prompted by the fact that frequently we have constituents who have complaints against the Government, and who say, "Why, So and So told us when he was down there, that he would guarantee that we would get so and so," when as a matter of fact the person reputed to have made the promise had no authority, no jurisdiction, and nothing to substantiate the so-called promise. My point was merely that reliance on an agency which by law has jurisdiction over a subject matter is one thing to be determined in weighing a man's good faith. If he consults another agency that has only an incidental relationship to the problem, that would not have as much weight.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I call to his attention, in that connection, the following observation in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, pages 16 and 17 of Report No. 326. The particular language of the statement of the managers on the part of the House reads as follows:

It should also be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 the regulations, interpretations, enforcement policies, etc., which may be in good faith relied on must be those of an "agency" and not of an individual officer or employee of the agency. Thus if inspector A tells the employer that the agency interpretation is that the employer is not subject to the act, the employer is not relieved from liability, despite his reliance in good faith on such interpretation, unless it is in fact the interpretation of the agency.

I thank the Senator for his comment.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit out of order an amendment to the bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, if that conforms with Senate rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BREWSTER to Senate bill 1038 is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

"SEC. 8. Section 6 (a) of the Federal Airport Act is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'One and one-half percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State may be used with or without State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State.'

"SEC. 9. Section 14 of the Federal Airport Act is amended by inserting at the end of such section the following: 'If the Administrator shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects undertaken pursuant to this act, he may advance to any State from funds heretofore or hereafter made available the Federal share of the cost thereof to enable the State airport agency to make prompt payments for work as it progresses. The funds so advanced shall be deposited in a special trust account by the State treasurer, or other State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid airport funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State airport agency for work actually performed in accordance with plans, specifications, and estimates approved by the Administrator under the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balances of funds so advanced shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds have been advanced. Any advance made to any State under the provisions of this section and not repaid shall be deducted from any apportionment allocated to such State under the provisions of this act for the year next succeeding the year in which such advance is made, and no grant agreement made in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be valid for any pro rata share of the cost of construction in excess of such apportionment less such advance.'"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in relation to the proposed amendment, asking the indulgence of the Senate to listen to my voice, in view of the requirement that all speeches shall actually be delivered upon the floor. The President pro tempore is calling this down upon his head.

The bill I have introduced would amend the Federal Airport Act to conform to certain tested provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act.

On Tuesday I conferred with the executive committee of the National Association of State Aviation Officials. These proposed amendments grew out of that meeting. In brief, the first amendment provides that 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State may be used in combination with State funds for making advance surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in each State. This provision is similar to provisions in the Highway Planning and Research Section of the Federal Aid Roads Act. It contributed greatly to the growth and development of our highway system.

The second amendment provides for advances to any State of the Federal share of the cost to enable the State airport agency to make prompt payments for work as it progresses. Proper safeguards are provided to protect the Federal interest. This amendment would make it possible for airport projects to proceed without delay. It would permit construction to proceed while awaiting formal approval of other aspects of the project.

This amendment is similar to the Advance of funds amendment in the Federal Aid Highway Act.

It is apparent to me and to the State aviation officials that the more the Federal Airport Act is made to conform to the thoroughly tested Public Roads Act, the better it will be. During my 4 years as governor of a State, I witnessed at first-hand and had something to do with the administration of our Federal-State highway construction program. It was successfully and economically operated because its administration was based on a firmly rooted principle of Government, namely, Federal-State partnership in carrying out grants-in-aid programs.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that if the Federal Airport Act is to be made effective, it will be through the action of the States. Current reports indicate that many cities will not be able to build new airports without additional assistance from the States and the Federal Government. That is why it is so important for Congress to enact S. 1038, which gives the States a definite place in the program by providing for State channeling of Federal airport funds, as is the case in other grants-in-aid projects. The importance of adopting that amendment is even more warranted than it was a year ago, when the Senate adopted such an amendment, which was later eliminated in conference.

The adoption of these amendments will go far toward conforming the Federal airport legislation to the Public Roads Act. It will restore a long-recognized principle of good government, result in a more effective airport program, and in far more airports, in my judgment.

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the RECORD, will the President pro tempore state the pending question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the series of amendments to Senate bill 1126 submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and ordered to be considered en bloc.

EXTENT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND UNION RECOGNITION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a release by the Department of Labor dated April 21, 1947, the subject being Extent of Collective Bargaining and Union Recognition, 1946. It supplements similar material which I had printed in the RECORD on March 10 of this year, when I delivered my major speech on labor legislation. It brings up to date the data I submitted on that subject.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND UNION RECOGNITION, 1946 [1]

UNION AGREEMENT COVERAGE

Approximately 14,800,000 workers were employed under conditions determined by written collective-bargaining agreements in 1946, an increase of 1,000,000 workers compared with 1945. The workers covered by agreement represent 48 percent of the 31,000,000 [2] engaged in occupations in which the unions have been organizing and endeavoring to obtain written agreements. The percentage covered was the same as in the previous year, but fewer workers—approximately 29,000,000—were eligible for agreement coverage in 1945. Nonmanufacturing industries accounted for much of the increase in employees eligible for agreement coverage.

About 7,900,000 production workers in manufacturing were covered by union agreements in 1946 (69 percent of those employed) compared to 8,000,000 (67 percent) a year earlier. In the nonmanufacturing industries 6,900,000 workers, or 35 percent of the potentials were employed under union agreements. Part of the decrease in total coverage in the manufacturing industries can be accounted for by changes in employment in such industries as aircraft and shipbuilding, in which a large proportion of the workers are covered by union agreement. In the nonmanufacturing industries the increase in the number of workers can be accounted for by higher employment in such industries as construction, in which the proportion of workers covered by collective bargaining is very high.

The extent of union agreement coverage in the various manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries is shown in table 1.

Because each group covers a range of 20 percent, it is possible for the proportion of covered workers within an industry to increase several percent and still remain within the same group. During 1946 the percentage of workers covered by agreements in the dairy-products industry increased enough to bring it from the 1 to 19 percent into the 20 to 39 percent category. Chemicals, excluding rayon yarn and the paper-products industries moved from the 20 to 39 percent into the 40 to 59 percent group. Canning and preserving foods, dyeing and finishing textiles, and leather gloves increased in the proportion covered so that they shifted from the 40 to 59 percent to the 60 to 79 percent column. Moving from the 60 to 79 percent into the 80 to 100 percent group, were the elecerical-machinery and the rayon-yarn industries.

TABLE 1.—*Proportion of wage earners under union agreements in 1946*

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

80–100 percent: Agricultural equipment; aircraft and parts; aluminum; automobiles and parts; breweries; carpets and rugs, wool; cement; clocks and watches; clothing, men's; clothing, women's; electrical machinery; furs and fur garments; glass and glassware; leather tanning; meat packing; newspaper printing and publishing; nonferrous metals and products, except those listed; rayon yarn; rubber; shipbuilding; steel, basic; sugar.

60–79 percent: Book and job printing and publishing; coal products; canning and preserving foods; dyeing and finishing textiles; gloves, leather; machinery, except agricultural equipment and electrical machinery; millinery and hats; paper and pulp; petroleum refining; railroad equipment; steel products; tobacco; woolen and worsted textiles.

40–59 percent: Baking; chemicals, excluding rayon yarn; flour and other grain products; furniture; hosiery; jewelry and silverware; knit goods; leather, luggage, handbags, novelties; lumber; paper products; pottery, including chinaware; shoes, cut stock and findings; stone and clay products, except pottery.

20–39 percent: Beverages, nonalcoholic; confectionery products; cotton textiles; dairy products; silk and rayon textiles.

1–19 percent: None.

NONMANUFACTURING

80–100 percent: Actors and musicians; airline pilots and mechanics; bus and streetcar, local; coal mining; construction; longshoring; maritime; metal mining; motion-picture production; railroads; telegraph; trucking, local and intercity.

60–79 percent: Radio technicians; theater stage hands; motion-picture operators.

40–59 percent: Bus lines, intercity; light and power; newspaper offices; telephone.

20–39 percent: Barber shops; building, servicing, and maintenance; cleaning and dyeing; crude petroleum and natural gas; fishing; hotels and restaurants; laundries; nonmetallic mining and quarrying; taxicabs.

1–19 percent: Agriculture; [3] beauty shops; clerical and professional, excluding transportation, communication, theaters, and newspapers; retail and wholesale trade.

EXTENT OF UNION RECOGNITION BY TYPES

Approximately 4,800,000 workers were covered by closed and union shop with preferential hiring provisions in 1946, compared to 4,250,000 in 1945. Union shop clauses, without preference in hiring, were specified for almost 2,600,000 workers in 1946 and 2,000,000 in 1945. The number of workers covered by maintenance of membership decreased from more than 3,900,000 in 1945 to 3,600,000 in 1946.

Table 2 indicates the changes in the proportion of workers under each type of union recognition from 1941 through 1946. During the war there was a major shift from sole bargaining and bargaining for members only to maintenance of membership. The 1946 figures indicate a trend away from the latter type, and to the union or closed shop.

Table 3 lists the industries in which at least half of the workers who are under agreement are covered by the type of union recognition specified.

A few industries (such as shipbuilding and iron and steel products) which were listed in the 1945 report do not appear this year because 50 percent of the workers in those industries are no longer covered by any one type of recognition clause. Carpets and rugs and woolen and worsted were both listed under maintenance of membership in 1945 but in 1946 over half of the workers in those industries who were covered by union agreements were under union-shop provisions.

The most marked change has taken place in the automobile industry. In 1945 over half of the covered workers had maintenance-of-membership provisions in 1946 a little over 10 percent had such provisions, while a third were covered by union-shop requirements, a fourth by sole-bargaining arrangements, and another fourth by maintenance-of-union-dues requirements.

The proportion of workers under the different types of union security for a selected group of industries is shown in table 5, while the approximate number of workers in each of the major census groups for manufacturing and the totals for nonmanufacturing are given in table 6.

TABLE 2.—*Changes in union recognition in the United States, 1941–46*

Item	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Eligible for union-agreement coverage:						
Number (in millions)	31	31	31	30.25	29	31.2
Percentage under agreement	30	40	45	47	48	48
	Percentage distribution [1]					
Workers under agreements providing for:						
Closed shop	40	45	30	28	30	33
Union shop			20	18	15	17
Maintenance of membership	(2)	15	20	27	29	25
Preferential hiring	(2)	5	2	2	3	3
Other [3]	(2)	35	28	25	23	22
Total	----	100	100	100	100	100

[1] Percentages not strictly comparable, year by year, because of slight changes in volume of employment during the period.
[2] No data.
[3] No membership or hiring requirements are mentioned in these agreements, which have clauses specifying sole bargaining, maintenance of union dues, and bargaining for members only.

TABLE 3.—*Industries with 50 percent or more of the workers under agreement covered by specified types of clauses*

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Closed or union shop with preferential hiring: Baking; breweries; canning and preserving foods; clothing, men's; clothing, women's; dyeing and finishing textiles; gloves, leather; glass containers; hosiery; printing and publishing; shoes, cut stock and findings.

Union shop: Carpets and rugs, wool; flat glass; knit goods; paper and allied products; sugar, beet; woolen and worsted textiles.

Maintenance of membership: Aircraft and parts; cigarettes and tobacco; chemicals; cotton textiles; electrical machinery; machinery, except electrical; meat packing; nonferrous metals; petroleum refining; rubber; steel, basic.

Preferential hiring: Pottery.

Sole bargaining: Cement; sugarcane.

[1] Prepared in the Bureau's Industrial Relations Branch, Boris Stern, chief with Philomena Marquardt in immediate charge of assembling the information.

For similar data for previous years, see Monthly Labor Review, April 1946, April 1945, April 1944, February 1943, May 1942, and March 1939.

[2] This estimate of 31,000,000 includes all wage and salary workers except those in executive, managerial, and some professional positions, but excludes all self-employed, domestic workers, agricultural wage workers on farms employing less than six persons, Federal and State Government employees, teachers, and elected or appointed officials in local governments. It should be noted that the number of workers covered by union agreements is not the same as union membership. Except under closed or union-shop conditions, agreements cover nonmembers as well as members employed within the given bargaining unit. On the other hand, some union members may be working in unorganized plants and many civil-service employees and teachers are members of unions but are not employed under the terms of bilateral written agreements.

[3] Less than 1 percent.

NONMANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Construction: Trucking and warehousing.
Coal mining.
Crude petroleum and natural gas; metal mining; public utilities, electric light and power, water, and gas; telegraph.
Longshoring: Maritime.
Railroads, telephone.

TABLE 4.—*Proportion of workers under agreement covered by different types of union security in 1946*

	Total	Closed shop and union shop with preferential hiring	Union shop	Maintenance of membership	Other
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Total	100	33	17	25	25
Manufacturing	100	28	19	38	15
Nonmanufacturing	100	38	16	9	37

TYPES OF UNION RECOGNITION

(Definitions)

Closed shop: Under this type of union recognition all employees must be members of the union at the time of hiring and they must remain members in good standing during their period of employment. The following is the simplest form of a closed-shop provision:

"The employer shall employ none but members in good standing in the union. All employees shall remain members in good standing as a condition of continued employment."

Hiring through the union, unless it is unable to supply the required number of workers within a given period, is required under most of the closed-shop agreements, and those employees who are hired through other procedures must join the union before they start to work.

Union shop: Workers employed under a union-shop agreement need not be union members when hired, but they must join the union within a specified time, usually 30 to 60 days, and remain members during the period of employment. A characteristic clause setting up a union shop generally reads:

"All present employees not on the excluded list (outside the bargaining unit) who are not now members of the union, must become members within 30 days after the signing of this agreement. All persons employed, after this date, must become members of the union within 30 days after date of their employment. All employees will remain members of the union in good standing as defined by the constitution and bylaws of the union as a condition of employment or the duration of this agreement.

Union shop with preferential hiring. When the union-shop agreement specifies that union members shall be given preference in hiring or that the hiring shall be done through the union the effect is very much the same as the closed-shop agreement.

"When the company is in need of a new employee, the union shall have the first opportunity to supply such employees. If the union shall be unable to supply such employees within 1 week, or if the union waives the right to supply such employees, the company may hire any person it desires.

"Any new employees hired by the company who are not already members of the union shall become members of the union within 2 weeks of the date of their employment. Only members in good standing of the union shall continue in the employ of the company."

Modified union shop: In some cases the union shop is modified so that those who were employed before the union shop was established are not required to become union members. This type of union security is sometimes referred to as a modified shop.

"(a) All employees hired after the date of execution of this agreement, must, after a 6-week probationary period, become and remain members of the union in good standing as a condition of continued employment. In individual cases the employer shall have the opportunity of negotiating with the union with respect to a longer probationary period.

"(b) It is agreed that present employees, who have not and do not desire to join the union, need not do so as a condition to their continued employment with the company. It is agreed that all employees who are members of the union, or who may become members of the union, shall remain members in good standing during the life of this agreement."

Maintenance of membership: This type of union security requires that all employees who are members of the union a specified time after the agreement is signed and all who later join the union, must remain a member in good standing for the duration of the agreement. Following the pattern of the maintenance-of-membership clauses established by the National War Labor Board, most of the agreements with this type of union security clause provide for a 15-day period during which members may withdraw from the union if they do not wish to remain members during the life of the agreement.

"It is agreed that all employees who, 15 days after the signing of this agreement, namely (date), are members of the union in good standing in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the union, and all employees who thereafter become members of the union shall, as a condition of employment, continue to remain members in good standing as long as the union specified above remains the collective-bargaining agent.

"Members of the union who are delinquent in dues payments shall pay all dues before they shall be permitted to avail themselves of the 15-day escape period provided for above.

"Members of the union in good standing for the purpose of this provision shall be all persons who are members in good standing as of (date) or who subsequently become members and have not resigned or withdrawn and so notified the union in writing prior to (date)."

Maintenance of union dues: During 1946 a few agreements covering workers employed by large companies which had specified maintenance of membership in 1945 were modified, to provide sole bargaining with the check-off of union dues for all union members as a condition of employment. Clauses of this type (which specify this form of irrevocable check-off) are found in agreements negotiated with the General Motors Corp., the Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, the International Harvester Co., East Moline, Ill., the Western Electric Co., and Yale & Towne. An example of this maintenance of union dues clause is as follows:

"All employees who, 15 days after the beginning of the first pay-roll week following the date of this agreement, are members of the union in good standing in accordance with its constitution and bylaws, and all employees who become members after that date, shall, as a condition of employment authorize the company for the duration of this agreement to deduct from their pay and transmit to the union an amount equivalent to their union dues as currently established by the union in accordance with its constitution and bylaws."

Preferential hiring: No union membership is required under this type of clause but union members must be hired if available. When the union cannot supply workers, the employer may hire nonmembers and they are not required to join the union as a condition of employment.

"Members of the union shall have all of the work pertaining to the rigging up of ships and the coaling of same, and the discharging and loading of all cargoes including mail, ships' stores, and baggage. When the union cannot furnish a sufficient number of men to perform the work in a satisfactory manner then the employer may employ such other men as are available."

OTHER TYPES OF UNION RECOGNITION

Sole bargaining: Under some agreements no requirement for union membership or for hiring through the union is specified. The union is the sole bargaining agent for all employees and negotiates the agreement covering all workers in the bargaining unit whether they are members of the union or not.

"The company recognized union No. ——— as the exclusive bargaining agency for all production and maintenance employees of the company, exclusive of executive, administrative, office, clerical employees and employees within the jurisdiction of the ——— union, and all supervisory employees with the authority to hire, discharge, discipline, or effectively recommend changes in the status of employees as to factory wage rates, hours, and working conditions."

Members only: A few agreements stipulate that the union shall act as bargaining agent for its members only, and the agreement does not cover other workers.

"The employer recognizes the ——— union as the collective bargaining agency for its production and maintenance employees who are members of the union, at the employer's ——— works and mine."

TABLE 5.—*Proportion of workers under union agreement by union security in selected industries and occupations, 1946*

Industry	Total	Closed or union shop with preferential hiring	Union shop, no preferential hiring	Maintenance of membership	Preferential hiring	Other
MANUFACTURING	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Agricultural machinery	100	1	4	74	....	21
Aircraft and parts	100	6	8	62	....	24
Aluminum	100	5	14	79	....	2
Automobiles and parts	100	1	35	12	....	52
Canning and preserving foods	100	64	11	19	....	6
Chemicals, excluding rayon yarn	100	3	24	52	....	11
Cigarettes and tobacco	100	1	35	54	....	10
Cigars	100	43	12	43	....	2
Clothing, men's	100	90	6	....	4	....
Clothing, women's	100	97	3	....	....	....
Cotton textiles	100	32	8	52	....	8
Dyeing and finishing textiles	100	56	20	22	1	1
Electrical machinery	100	9	15	57	1	18
Furniture and finished lumber products	100	20	29	37	1	13
Hosiery	100	59	12	25	....	4
Leather tanning	100	18	23	36	....	23
Meat packing	100	11	12	75	....	2
Paper	100	7	53	39	....	1
Petroleum refining	100	1	7	57	....	35
Rayon yarn	100	1	3	69	....	27
Rubber	100	2	15	66	....	17
Shipbuilding	100	32	11	48	....	9
Shoes	100	50	5	42	....	3
Silk and rayon textiles	100	37	26	23	....	14
Steel, basic	100	....	3	93	....	4
Steel products	100	11	33	47	1	8
Woolen and worsted textiles	100	2	66	18	....	14
NONMANUFACTURING						
Coal mining	100	....	100	....	....	....
Construction	100	94	....	....	6	....
Railroads	100	....	....	....	....	100
Telephone	100	3	1	28	....	68

TABLE 6.—*Approximate number of workers covered in 1946 by the type of union security listed*

MANUFACTURING

Industry	Closed shop	Union shop with preferential hiring	Union shop	Membership maintenance
Food	210,000	130,000	90,000	185,000
Tobacco	8,000	3,000	15,000	32,000
Textile	40,000	120,000	165,000	180,000
Apparel	515,000	320,000	50,000	8,000
Lumber	25,000	90,000	60,000	76,000
Furniture	20,000	20,000	55,000	70,000
Paper		15,000	126,000	70,000
Printing and publishing	250,000			
Chemicals	1,000	4,000	60,000	125,000
Petroleum		5,000	15,000	50,000
Rubber		3,000	30,000	140,000
Leather	40,000	61,000	20,000	60,000
Stone, clay, and glass	5,000	45,000	75,000	35,000
Iron and steel	30,000	40,000	235,000	725,000
Nonferrous metals	30,000	15,000	40,000	185,000
Electrical machinery	15,000	25,000	70,000	260,000
Machinery, excluding electrical	15,000	15,000	90,000	460,000
Automobile	1,000	10,000	240,000	80,000
Transportation equipment	55,000	17,000	50,000	250,000
Miscellaneous	15,000	12,000	20,000	40,000
Total	1,275,000	950,000	1,506,000	3,031,000

NONMANUFACTURING

Total, all groups [1]	2,082,000	547,000	1,091,000	664,000

[1] Included in this group are employees in construction, trucking, warehousing, services, clerical, sales and professional occupations, mining, transportation, communications, and public utilities.

CHECK-OFF ARRANGEMENTS

Approximately 6,000,000 workers (41 percent of all under union agreements) were covered by some form of check-off provisions in 1946. This is an increase of close to three-quarters of a million from the 1945 total. Automatic deduction of dues was specified for a little over half of these workers while the others specified check-off of union dues only for employees who give the employer an individual written authorization. Some of these may be withdrawn at any time; others remain in effect for the life of the agreement.

In the manufacturing industries 4,700,000 workers (61 percent) had their dues checked off compared to the 4,000,000 (about 50 percent) in 1945. The number of nonmanufacturing workers covered by check-off arrangements remained at about 1,300,000 for 1946, but this was not quite 20 percent of the workers under agreement; in 1945 with 13,800,000 under agreement the same number of workers covered brought the proportion to 24 percent.

Changes in check-off arrangements from 1942 through 1946 are given in Table 7 and they show a gradual increase in the number of workers covered by such provisions. Table 8 lists the industries which have at least half of the workers under agreement covered by one type of check-off. A few industries listed for 1945, such as chemicals, steel products, and men's clothing, no longer have 50 percent of the covered workers under a single type of check-off.

The proportion of workers under agreement by type of check-off for selected industries is given in Table 9, while the approximate number of workers covered by check-off in 1946 for the major manufacturing industries as for nonmanufacturing is shown in table 10.

Below are definitions of the two types of check-off and examples of union agreement clauses providing for each. Table 11 shows the proportion of workers under agreement by each type of check-off during 1946 for manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries.

TABLE 7.—*Changes in check-off arrangements in the United States, 1941–46*

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Number under agreement (in millions)	10.3	12.5	13.8	14.3	13.8	14.8
	Percentage distribution [1]					
Workers under agreements providing for—						
Automatic check-off	(2)	12	18	21	23	24
Voluntary check-off	(2)	8	14	20	16	17
No check-off	(2)	80	68	59	61	59
Total	----	100	100	100	100	100

[1] Percentages not strictly comparable, year by year, because of slight changes in volume of employment during the period.
[2] No data.

TABLE 8.—*Industries with 50 percent or more of workers under agreement covered by specified type of check-off*

MANUFACTURING

Voluntary: Cement; clocks and watches; glass, flat; petroleum and coal products; sugar, cane; textiles, except carpets and rugs (woolen) and hosiery.

Automatic: Aircraft engines; aluminum; automobiles; carpets and rugs (woolen); cigarettes and tobacco; electrical machinery; hosiery; leather, except gloves and shoes; meat packing and slaughtering; nonferrous smelting and refining; rubber tires and tubes; steel, basic; sugar, beet.

NONMANUFACTURING

Voluntary: Crude petroleum and natural gas products; telephone.

Automatic: Coal mining; iron mining; telegraph.

TABLE 9.—*Proportion of workers under union agreement by type of check-off in selected industries, 1946*

Industries	Total	Voluntary check-off	Automatic check-off	No check-off
MANUFACTURING	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Agricultural machinery	100	13	41	46
Aircraft and parts	100	35	47	18
Aluminum	100	15	80	5
Automobiles and parts	100	6	59	35
Canning and preserving foods	100	26	11	63
Chemicals, excluding rayon yarn	100	46	22	32
Cigarettes and tobacco	100	1	84	15
Cigars	100	23	36	41
Clothing, men's	100	25	43	32
Clothing, women's	100	3	6	91
Cotton textiles	100	77	21	2
Dyeing and finishing textiles	100	67	20	13
Electrical machinery	100	19	65	16
Furniture and finished lumber products	100	32	28	40
Hosiery	100	30	63	7
Leather tanning	100	49	20	31
Meat packing	100	8	76	16
Paper	100	33	14	53
Petroleum refining	100	46	20	34
Rayon yarn	100	36	45	19
Rubber	100	32	44	24
Shipbuilding	100	17	43	40
Shoes	100	33	23	44
Steel, basic	100	2	94	4
Steel products	100	21	43	36
Woolen and worsted textiles	100	68	20	12
NONMANUFACTURING				
Coal mining	100	----	100	----
Construction	100	----	----	100
Railroads	100	----	----	100
Telephone	100	66	----	34
Silk, rayon textiles	100	83	14	3

TABLE 10.—*Approximate number of workers covered in 1946 by type of check-off specified*

[In thousands]

Industries	Automatic	Voluntary
MANUFACTURING		
Food	160	84
Tobacco	43	6
Textiles	178	349
Apparel	240	133
Lumber	5	49
Furniture	53	60
Paper	33	63
Printing and publishing	----	----
Chemicals	61	97
Petroleum	19	53
Rubber	92	66
Leather	60	59
Stone, clay, and glass	43	88
Iron and steel	702	147
Nonferrous metals	142	91
Electrical machinery	297	87
Machinery, excluding electrical	251	177
Automobiles	415	41
Transportation equipment	219	103
Miscellaneous	39	24
	3,032	1,777
NONMANUFACTURING		
Total, all groups [1]	605	726
Total	3,637	2,503

[1] Included in this group are employees in construction, trucking, warehousing, services, clerical, sales and professional occupations, mining, transportation, communications and public utilities

CHECK-OFF ARRANGEMENTS—DEFINITIONS

Automatic check-off: Many agreements specify that the employer shall deduct the union dues from the pay of all union members. In addition they may specify that initiation fees and assessments shall be checked-off.

"The company will deduct from the pay of each employee covered by this agreement all union initiation fees, dues, and assessments."

Voluntary check-off: A number of agreements specify that the employer shall check-off union dues or assessments only for those employees who sign individual authorization. In most cases the employee may withdraw his authorization whenever he wishes.

The company agrees that any member of Local ——— may, upon written instructions to the company with a copy of Local ———, request the company to deduct his union dues from his pay check once each month and the company agrees that such collected dues will be turned over monthly to the Financial Secretary of Local ——— with full accounting thereof. It is understood that any union member may rescind such deduction instructions at any time provided the company is given written 30 days notice with a copy to Local ——— on a form provided for that purpose. Unless rescinded, authorization for deduction of all dues shall continue for the duration of this agreement.

TABLE 11.—*Proportion of workers under agreement by types of check-off in 1946*

	Total	Automatic check-off	Voluntary check-off	No check-off
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Total	100	24	17	59
Manufacturing	100	38	23	39
Nonmanufacturing	100	9	10	81

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES UNDER EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has today re-

leased an organization chart showing detailed personnel assignments in the various Federal departments and independent and emergency agencies of the Government.

The chart was prepared in accordance with duties assigned under provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which specifically instructs the committee to make a study of the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency. It is the purpose of the committee to issue similar charts at 6-month intervals, at the end of calendar- and fiscal-year periods. These periodical charts will clearly and concisely reflect organizational and personnel changes in each of the units in the Federal structure during the preceding period.

The data was compiled as of December 31, 1946, totaling 2,285,570 employees in 2,369 units of personnel assignments, not including the judicial or legislative branches of the Government, such as the Library of Congress, General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office.

The chart presents a factual picture of governmental structure which should prove to be of great assistance to individual Members of the Senate, and especially to congressional committees considering legislation dealing with the departments and agencies. It clearly demonstrates the ramifications of the executive branch and will provide basic data necessary to the objectives of the Congress in simplifying the operations of the Government and in the development of a uniform and more efficient organizational program.

The chart is drawn to emphasize the varying organizational structure, headed by the Executive Office of the President, then the executive departments, on down through the independent and emergency agencies. A separate section covers existing Federal corporations, indicating the date of formation and when they are to terminate under present authorizations, and showing the department or agency through which each corporation functions.

This chart is tied in with specific activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and it is the intention of the committee to assemble complete information on structure and staffing as a constructive supplement to the economy measures now being considered in the Senate, and an aid to Members seeking to solve organizational and fiscal problems confronting the Congress.

The over-all objective is to eventually bring the executive branch under a uniform Federal departmental structure, to eliminate as rapidly as possible emergency and independent agencies, and to establish uniform departmental bureaus to replace many of the varying designations and divisional units. A more detailed study is being made of the problem by the committee at the present time and will be made the subject of a later report. A copy of the chart will be sent to each Member of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the report may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This report is submitted to the Senate by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, requiring this committee to make a study of the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. With the report is submitted a chart showing the organization of, and personnel assigned to, the executive departments of the Government as of December 31, 1946. The chart was prepared in an effort to reflect a complete résumé of Federal activities under the executive agencies, and to provide a basis for carrying on the duties assigned to this committee under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

After investigation of all existing charts on the organization of the executive branch, the staff of this committee found it more desirable to prepare an entirely new chart rather than to attempt to bring others up to date or to correct their inaccuracies. The task has been sizable but the rewards, in terms of Nation-wide use, seemed so large that it has been pushed with vigor. All departments and agencies have freely provided the statistics required, and the Bureau of the Budget has lent hearty approval to the project as representing work useful in the management of the executive branch.

Scope of the chart: The chart includes every organization within the executive branch without exception. Each organization is divided into its principal parts on the basis of information supplied by the organization itself. Personnel assigned to each part is also shown, and the total indicated. No break-down of field offices or agencies is included, except as one field unit, regardless of the number of branches or personnel assignments.

Where, under the supervision of a department or agency, corporations are listed within the framework of that department or agency, independent corporations are shown under independent agencies, and all active Government corporations, of whatever type, are consolidated in a single chart, which indicates the agencies through which it functions, and its present status.

To emphasize the diversity of nomenclature of parts of departments and agencies, a separate table, entitled "Nomenclature Summary," is included. This shows more than 2,300 units, based on detailed data submitted by each of the agencies, and points out the need for simplification and uniformity. Even these totals are incomplete, since it is apparent that some agencies submitted more detailed break-downs than did others, although each was specifically requested to furnish complete details.

No reports were compiled on agencies under the judicial or legislative branches of the Government, including the following: The Supreme Court, the Congress of the United States, the Architect of the Capitol (920 employees), the Library of Congress (1,775 employees), the General Accounting Office (11,098 employees), and the Government Printing Office (7,969 employees).

Presentation of material: The following groupings have been made:

1. Departments.
2. Independent agencies.
3. Emergency agencies.
4. Corporations.
5. Nomenclature summary.
6. Totals.

All data presented are as of December 31, 1946.

Schedule of future work: The chart will be completely revised and brought up to date twice a year, to show data as of June 30 and December 31, and, if this schedule is found to be inadequate, reports will be provided on a quarterly basis.

Objectives: This work was undertaken not only to serve the purposes of this committee in surveying expenditures and appraising administrative management, but also to aid other committees and all Members of the Congress in their daily work with the executive branch.

It is also felt that a forceful, dramatic, and easily understood presentation of the world's most complex Government structure will serve to emphasize, everywhere, the need for simplification and economy, which is one of the prime objectives of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The accompanying chart will provide a basis for study and development of a uniform organizational program.

Each succeeding chart will indicate clearly all organizational and personnel changes occurring in the preceding period, and permit Congress to have a clear and accurate picture of the growth or reduction of Federal activities. It is hoped also that the picture presented through these reports will encourage the various Federal departments and agencies to adopt uniform standards of organizational set-up and to effect personnel reductions where functions are duplicated or overlap.

Information and assistance: The bicameral nature of our Congress breeds a certain amount of duplication. However, the amount of duplication within the legislative branch can be reduced if committees will follow certain prescribed and well-known avenues of work. In this connection your committee feels that it should establish itself as the authority, at least within the Senate, on the structure and organization of the executive branch as required under the Legislative Reorganization Act. The preparation of this chart is one step in that direction. We intend to assemble information on structure and on staffing, which will be the most complete in existence. The staff will be prepared to answer any and all questions on these two subjects.

We feel that we will be able to serve the committees and the individual Members of the Senate if they will refer all questions on these subjects to us. This offer of service we should like to have publicized as widely as possible. Such a procedure would prevent the duplication of requests for personnel data to the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, and the duplication of requests for structural and functional information to the various departments and to the Bureau of the Budget.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I request permission to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] had to leave the Chamber on committee business, he asked me on his behalf to introduce a bill, in the introduction of which I am joining. It is a bill that relates to the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, which in most particulars is similar to a bill which we introduced last year.

We want the RECORD to show two or three things very clearly: first, that the bill is being introduced at the request of a certain group, and, I think, properly described as a certain faction, within the Indian reservation, that it is being introduced at the request of certain officials of the county, including the county judge,

and is being introduced in behalf of certain civic bodies, who at least want the bill introduced for the purpose of hearings.

The senior Senator and the junior Senator from Oregon do not take any final position on the merits of the bill. We are introducing it because we are in agreement that it is a bill which ought to go to hearing, and because we need, it seems to us, the judgment of the subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Public Lands Committee. In fact, two of the Senators on that committee, including the chairman of the subcommittee, have said to us that it is very difficult for them to proceed with the consideration of the problems of the reservation, as they pertain to the subject matter of this bill, in the absence of the bill itself being introduced. I want that explanation in the RECORD.

Speaking for myself, I think it only fair to say, however, without particular application to this reservation alone, but to the whole problem of Indian affairs, that I think the time has come when the Government of the United States ought to hasten the day when the Indians shall cease to be wards of the state. I think that in regard to our Indians we ought to see to it that they are permitted as rapidly as possible to assume all the rights, prerogatives, and privileges of all other citizens. I think there are a great many Indians who are ready now for those rights, and I think that we ought to think in terms of reducing year by year the functions and the power of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, rather than to permit that Bureau to expand into an ever-enlarging bureaucracy.

We have been now for a good many years educating the younger generations of Indians. I think that through our educational processes they are just as capable of proceeding to take charge of Indian affairs as are other citizens. I think we should look to the day when no longer will the American Indians be the wards of the state.

I think an investigation will show a great many things about Indian affairs that amply support that for which I am arguing this afternoon. But, be that as it may Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon and the Representative, Mr STOCKMAN, in whose district this particular reservation is located, all have joined in having this bill introduced, primarily for the purpose of having hearings on it, and investigation by means of it, so as to ascertain what the facts are concerning the conflicting allegations as to affairs of this particular reservation. I introduce the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1222) to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for Mr. CORDON and himself), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 5, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr., of Pennsylvania, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Peyton Ford, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of the living God, without which nothing is pure and nothing can abide, constrain us to greater zeal and devotion that evil may be diminished and that the good of life may be accentuated. Grant that peace with justice may prevail in every part of the Union, for anything less than fidelity to the tenets of a free people sullies the pages of our national history. Blessed Lord, remain Thou within our midst and bestow upon us mutual understanding in all that we are called to do. Take our moral natures and sanctify them; take our minds and broaden their range; take our pride and chasten it; and take our love and purify it. Do Thou safeguard our wills and discipline our habits and tendencies, that we may rise to that plane where the crosses and the losses of life have enriched us for wise service for Thy glory.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Seattle, Wash.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the El Dorado (Kans.) Times.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations in reference to the operation of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered on yesterday by the Honorable SAM HOBBS at the unveiling of a portrait presented to the Committee on the Judiciary by the citizens of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

THE MAY DAY PARADE AND CONGRESSIONAL SOMERSAULTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a page advertisement from the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily addressed to the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, someone asked me this morning if I went out and saw the May Day parade on yesterday. I said I did not have to go out; I saw it in the House—in reverse. I have never seen such turning of mental somersaults in my life.

It reminded me of a school of sick minnows in a crowded stream. I thought of the drunken Irishman who went out to see the circus parade and while they were all watching and wondering which way it was coming this Irishman looked down the street and saw the elephants turning the corner. He said, "Begorry, here comes the whole kaboodlement of them backards."

That is the way I felt when I saw this spontaneous turning of mental somersaults on the roll call on the rent-control bill on yesterday.

It reminded me of Mr. Wingo's snake railroad. He said:

> It wiggled in and wobbled out,
> And left the people all in doubt,
> Whether in its zigzag track
> It was going west or coming back.

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Jacksonville Times-Union 2 or 3 days ago that the Japanese in the Peleliu Island in the Pacific had finally surrendered to the United States marines.

We have always known that the marines were the first to fight, but this is evidence that the marines are also the last to fight. For 170 years they have rendered distinguished service to this country, and have proven to be an effective and efficient fighting unit, even though small in numbers.

The Congress is getting ready to consider the merger bill. It is the hope of all marines, their friends, and, I believe, the public generally, that in that merger bill the functions of the United States Marine Corps will be spelled out. Because it is such a small organization there is a great possibility that in the

merger bill they are liable to get lost in the shuffle, and we do not want that to happen.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. The gentleman does not feel that the Marine Corps should be only a police outfit, does he?

Mr. SMATHERS. Absolutely not. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it not a fact that the Marine Corps is recognized internationally as the greatest fighting force in the world?

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope so. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that when proper provision is made for the Marine Corps, as I certainly hope it will be made, the gentleman will support the bill for the unification of the armed services?

Mr. SMATHERS. Absolutely.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the AAA.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include two letters that I have just received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS IN SECTARIAN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, due to increasing tendencies on the part of State governments and the Federal Government to circumvent the article of the Constitution written by our founding fathers establishing a wall of separation between church and state, it now seems necessary to give further expression to the meaning of the constitutional barriers against the appropriation of money for and to be used by sectarian educational institutions.

Therefore, I am today introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that neither Congress nor any of the several States shall aid any educational institution wholly or in part under sectarian control, except for educational benefits heretofore or hereafter granted to veterans or their dependents, and except for such aid or support of scientific research projects as may be authorized by the Congress in the interest of national security.

This amendment is not directed for or against any particular faith or creed, but applies to all faiths and creeds alike as was the original intent of the first amendment and is in keeping with our traditional precepts of the absolute separation of church and state. Not only should this separation be maintained, it should be made more definite and distinct. It is believed that the proposal that I am introducing would accomplish this purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered last evening.

Mr. HALE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article by Senator BREWSTER.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper excerpt.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, of California.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a United Press article setting forth the views of his British namesake.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the newspaper PM entitled "Fair Play on Palestine."

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence between himself and Hon. Warren Austin.

INCOME TAXES IN NON-COMMUNITY-PROPERTY STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent districts in non-community-property States very generally favor the equalization of the income-tax burden between those States and the minority of nine whose residents benefit from this law. We all contend that this inequitable situation ought to be corrected.

I was amazed the other day to pick up a paper with a press dispatch, three-quarter column length, announcing that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, had introduced a bill to make this community-property principle apply to the tax returns of residents in all the States.

Of course I favor such a proposition, but my amazement arose from three sources. First, he is quoted as having said, "I will insist on action in the present Congress." I attended the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means and remember the united opposition of our friends across the aisle to any plan of tax reduction. I am happy, therefore, that the gentleman who occupies such a strategic position has now changed his viewpoint. My second cause for surprise arose from the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina did not take this step during the many years when he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to remove this unfair burden from the taxpayers of 39 States.

But my chief bewilderment was experienced when I took the gentleman's bill H. R. 3228 dated April 28 and compared it with H. R. 1759 introduced by my able colleague from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] on the 6th day of February and found that there was not so much difference as a semicolon or comma between the two bills with the single exception that the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee has added the word "hereby," by that action scarcely meriting, it seems to me, the accolade so deservedly earned by the author of this far-reaching and far-sighted proposal.

I hope this bill will meet with favorable consideration both by the committee and this House and that it will be known for what it is, not as the Doughton bill but the Reeves bill.

VISITING STUDENTS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, our National Capital has been graced this week by the presence of many students from all over the Nation. We welcome them and trust that their short stay in Washington has been enjoyable, inspiring, and educational. At this time, I particularly desire to say a word of greeting to those students who reside within the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which district I have the honor and pleasure to represent. They have been visiting here with their companions from various high schools of Chicago, including Amundsen, Austin, Hirsch, Roosevelt, Schurz, Senn, and Taft, all schools of renown in that great city. I have had the pleasure to meet many of the students. They are a fine, clean group of young men and women of whom we can be justly proud. I can say with certainty that we do not have to worry about the future of our Nation.

Mr Speaker, I wish to answer the comments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] regarding the vote yesterday. All I can say to him is that if he can prevail upon the Members of his side of the aisle to sit as gentlemen should in Congress and respect the votes of others, rather than level boos and catcalls at a Member who was exercising a prerogative such as was being done by a gentleman from Ohio yesterday, they may succeed in their purpose. However, they are not going to achieve that result by arousing the Irish in the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Such action made it a purely party issue and evoked the proper penalty, if any.

Mr. RANKIN. That is a poor excuse for voting wrong.

Mr. OWENS. I did not vote wrong. Look at the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

RUBBER STAMPS AND REGIMENTATION

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, before I came to the Congress in 1943, I had read and heard considerable about rubber stamping and regimentation. As days and years went by Member after Member on the Republican side of the aisle arose and hurled the charge of rubber stamping in the direction of the Democratic Members and they sorely lamented the regimentation under which our people were compelled to live. On yesterday I saw both genuine rubber stamping and regimentation in action for the first time. It was the real thing.

What was the picture? The House had just voted on a motion to recommit the rent-control bill. The vote had not been announced but everyone knew that the motion had prevailed by 25 or 30 votes or more. At that moment we saw the distinguished majority leader go into a huddle with other Republican leaders. From the huddle he came, snapping the whip of the ringmaster and as he did his steeds promptly answered the call. One by one they marched up and changed their votes. The majority leader checked the vote and signaled that more changes were needed. His followers answered the signal without hesitancy until the required votes had been changed.

Mr Speaker, if one can correctly say there are any rubber stamps in the House today, I do not think he would cast his eye toward the Democratic side. And furthermore, if there is a group in the country which is truly regimented, it is the Republican membership in the House of Representatives.

My sympathy goes out to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

COORDINATOR OF INFORMATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 183 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created the office of Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives. The Coordinator of Information, hereinafter referred to as the "Coordinator," shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and his compensation shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The provisions of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall not be applicable to the compensation of the Coordinator.

The Coordinator, under the direction of the Speaker, and utilizing so far as possible the results of work already done by public or private agencies or organizations, shall assemble, analyze, coordinate, and make available in digest, compilations, and otherwise, data with respect to legislation, proposals for legislation, and legislative problems, for the use of the committees and Members of the House, without partisan bias in selection or presentation.

The Coordinator, with the approval of the Speaker, shall employ and fix the compensation of such assistants, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary in the performance of his duties.

The expenses of the Coordinator, including salaries of the Coordinator and his assistants, shall, until otherwise provided by law, be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. He is chairman of the Committee on House Administration. I notice the resolution he has called up is No. 183. I have a resolution, No. 83, that I introduced on February 5 asking for the book Fascism in Action to be made a public document, and I was wondering what the status of that resolution was, if I may inquire.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That resolution has been referred to the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. PATMAN. I was told on Tuesday that it had been reported to your committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has not been reported as yet. We have not had a meeting of the whole committee.

Mr. PATMAN. It was recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday that it had been reported by the Subcommittee on Printing to your committee; and that is the occasion for my inquiry now.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Let me say to the gentleman that that may be, that it has been agreed to by the Subcommittee on Printing but it has not reached the full committee because we have not had a meeting of the full committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman propose to take it up with the full committee?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am going to invite the Subcommittee on Printing to bring up any subject it may wish to present at the next meeting of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the passage of this resolution the gentleman is calling up help us get rid of some of those Red propagandists in the Library of Congress?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am going to present this resolution. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions about it.

Mr. RANKIN. If it will, I will go along with the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution does not mean to authorize the printing of these documents to which the gentleman from Texas has called attention.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is House Resolution 183. The gentleman from Texas referred to House Resolution 83, an entirely separate resolution. He took this occasion to make inquiry about House Resolution 83.

Mr. SABATH. His resolution requests this House to have printed certain documents with reference to the activities of the Fascists in this country just as the gentleman from Illinois succeeded in having printed certain other documents.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The title of the document which the gentleman from Texas referred to is Fascism in Action. I guess that it is 1,600 pages. I have not had an opportunity to read it myself but I would hazard a guess that it would be a book of 1,500 pages in length and maybe longer. That is just my guess from glancing at the manuscript.

Mr. PATMAN. For the gentleman's information I asked the Printing Office to give me an estimate and I find their estimate compares favorably with the estimate of the book Communism in Action.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The estimate is a great deal more. It is many times as large as Communism in Action.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is mistaken, but even if it does develop to be that much it will still be worth while. I believe the gentleman expressed doubt that people would pay a dollar a copy for 1,500 copies, yet I believe he has already received a greater number of requests at a dollar a copy.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman knows that his resolution calls for the expenditure of $1,500 or $1,600 for the printing of about a thousand or twelve hundred copies.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not ask for the printing, I just asked that it be made a public document.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But the gentleman wants it printed as a document, does he not?

Mr. PATMAN. We will pay for it then.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, was this resolution reported by any committee?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman refers to House Resolution 183?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It was reported and the report appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 3 or 4 days ago.

Mr. SABATH. Does it have the unanimous vote of the committee?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, it was not reported out unanimously, but it was reported out by a majority of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. SABATH. And the majority asks for it, desires it, and feels that they ought to have such coordinator?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We are asking to bring it up by unanimous consent, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, insert after the third word in the line the words "not more than."

Page 1, line 12, strike out the words "so far as possible."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "proposals for legislation and legislative problems."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

NON-COMMUNITY-PROPERTY STATES

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, I have just discussed with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], his comparison of H. R. 1759 and H. R. 3228 and have discovered his third reason for consternation regarding the introduction of the second bill, namely, H. R. 3228. On the 6th of February, this year, the gentleman from Missouri, my distinguished colleague [Mr. REEVES], introduced a bill covering this subject and on the 24th day of February addressed the House at length in explanation of his bill, H. R. 1759. Since my discussion with the gentleman from New York, I have taken the trouble to compare this bill with the one since introduced—H. R. 3228—and find that they are identical to the last comma, except for the inclusion in the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina of the rather inconsequential word "hereby."

I hope—and in expressing this hope, speak out for all my colleagues newly arrived in this House—that when this matter comes before the Ways and Means Committee, it will receive favorable consideration and that the bill which emanates from that committee will be what it properly should be, the Reeves bill and not the Doughton bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us at least a majority part of the program for next week?

Mr. ARENDS. I may say to the minority leader it is expected the Rules Committee will report out a rule on the Greek-Turkish bill this afternoon some time and contemplating that the following program for next week will be taken up:

On Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar. Immediately thereafter we will start general debate on the Greek-Turkish loan bill, H. R. 2616.

On Tuesday, we will consider bills on the Private Calendar, thereafter continuing debate on the Greek-Turkish bill.

On Wednesday we hope to conclude discussion of the Greek-Turkish matter.

On Thursday we will take up the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill, concluding consideration of that bill on Friday.

Saturday is as yet undetermined.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. On the Greek-Turkish bill, we had asked for 3 days general debate.

Mr. ARENDS. Not knowing exactly what report will come from the committee, we assume that possibly 8 hours of general debate will be granted, but we hope to conclude it by Tuesday night.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the language contained in the bill on page 24, lines 15 to 24, inclusive, and on page 25, lines 1 and 2.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order against section 400 of the second deficiency appropriation bill. This section starts on page 24, line 15, of the bill, and continues through line 2 of page 25, and prohibits the use of appropriated funds for increased cost resulting from the reallocation to a higher grade of positions in Government agencies. The Appropriations Committee wrote this section into the bill to curb the increasing cost of personal services in the executive agencies. Upgrading of positions has nothing to do with increasing the salary of a particular employee who is deserving, but refers to the changing of the grade and salary of a whole class of employees. For example, a Government agency needs someone to file papers and do other work around the office. This work has always been done by a clerk in grade CAF-2, receiving a salary of $1,954 a year. But the department is unable to find anyone who will work for this salary, so they change the title of the job from clerk to administrative assistant, grade CAF-7, and raise the salary from $1,954 a year to $3,397, but the duties and responsibilities of the job are not changed.

During the past few years there has been a constant upgrading of positions in the Federal service by advancing positions from grade to grade. This practice is unnecessary, as periodic promotions and salary increases are insured Government employees under the Ramspeck law. Without upgrading positions, Government departments can hire persons within a specific grade and pay a varying salary, depending upon the qualifications of the prospective employee. Section 400 of this bill was not inserted to discourage initiative by denying it reward. Deserving individuals can still be promoted to more responsible and more lucrative positions, and a wide range of salaries can be paid to employees within the same grade. Therefore, no individual employees will suffer because of this provision. Section 400 merely prevents an agency's changing the title of a specific position and increasing the salary without a corresponding increase in duties and responsibility.

Most of the increased salaries resulting from these upgradings show up finally in a deficiency appropriation. This happens because reclassifications of positions become effective immediately upon their approval, instead of postponing the effective date until the new position can be included in a regular budget request. Section 400 provides that such increases must be presented in the regular appropriations' request before they can become effective and that they must be justified as an increase over prior appropriations.

This section of the bill is legislation and could not ordinarily be included in an appropriation bill, as it is a violation of clause 2 of rule 21 of the Rules of the House. This rule merely protects section 400 from points of order. I am sure that every Member of Congress is in favor of this move by the Appropriations Committee to curb unnecessary expenditures by Government agencies, and I expect there will be no opposition to this rule.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. What are the questions that need waiving points of order?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The purpose is, it prohibits the use of appropriated funds for increased cost resulting from the reallocation to a higher grade of positions in Government agencies. The Appropriations Committee wrote this

section into the bill to curb the increasing cost of personal services in the executive agencies. Upgrading of positions has nothing to do with increasing the salary of a particular employee who is deserving, but refers to the changing of the grade and salary of a whole class of employees. For example, a Government agency needs someone to file papers and do other work around the office. This work has always been done by a clerk in grade CAF-2. But the department is unable to find anyone who will work for this salary, so they change the title of the job from clerk to administrative assistant and raise the salary, and sometimes double and triple them, so the purpose of this is not to permit that to be done.

Mr. PACE. That is the only point?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is all.

RULE SHOULD BE ADOPTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, although this appropriation bill contains legislation to which I have always been opposed, I do believe that in this instance the legislation is in the right direction and should receive favorable consideration.

It has been my experience for many, many years that in the last 2 or 3 months of the fiscal year, when the departments find they have not expended all their appropriations, they spend most of their time contriving ways of spending the unexpended balances. This legislative rider, though involving a practice I deplore, will keep the various agencies from getting rid of their money by increasing the salaries of employees.

I am not opposed to paying better salaries to Government employees; in fact, I think we should be more liberal with some of the men and women of vast experience and ability who have served faithfully for 6, 8, 10, or 15 years. It appears that under existing law they cannot be promoted in accordance with their deserts. The result is that private industry—corporations, trade associations, big law firms, and the like—step in and offer these faithful and capable public servants two and three times as much as we are paying them, and take them out of public service, to the detriment of the public interest and governmental efficiency.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SHOULD GET BIGGER SALARIES

For instance, in the Department of Justice we have an able and outstanding Attorney General, the Honorable Tom C. Clark, of Texas, and just the other day many of us went down there to help swear in as a new Assistant Attorney General the genial assistant to the Attorney General who has helped us so long, the Honorable Gus Vanech.

But no matter how capable and willing the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorneys General are, nor how hard they themselves work, they cannot handle personally all the legal actions for or against the Government. They must have a trained and capable and willing staff of assistants on whom they can rely absolutely.

Yet, in that Department we have trained lawyers getting $3,000, $3,600, or sometimes $4,600 a year, obliged to go up against corporation lawyers who receive $25,000 or $50,000 a year.

Much the same holds true in such specialized services as the internal revenue service.

I believe that we should pay the skilled professional people in Government service fair salaries commensurate with their training and ability so that we can keep them in public service and get the benefit of the experience and knowledge they have gained.

That end should be gained, however, by proper legislation from the appropriate committees. The Committee on Appropriations cannot, of course, and should not, legislate on that matter; but when such a request comes along I hope it will be supported by all the Members including those of the Appropriations Committee so that the salaries of these deserving and hard-working public servants can be increased.

I feel that we may be able to save some money under the provisions of this bill, and that of what we save we can at least allocate a small portion to these deserving, underpaid employees of our Government.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that that means that in the event the debate can be sooner concluded we will not be required to use the entire 2 hours.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and we will begin to read the bill as soon as the debate is concluded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3245, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for a total of new funds out of the Treasury of $95,478,658.70. It also calls for other amounts that come out of various other funds required to meet the provisions of the pay increase act of last year, Public Law No. 390. It winds up the requirements for that bill. In connection with that bill there have been other items of very large sums of money which have had to be provided. The total increased cost of the different pay acts was estimated by the budget in January to be $598,986,000. Of this the budget required $235,323,097 to be absorbed.

The Committee on Appropriations has been over those items very carefully. We have had hearings on them. We have had consultations with representatives of th Budget and the agencies. We have managed it so that the agencies have absorbed $53,819,000 more out of that pay increase than the budget estimated they would be able to do. The amount that is shown below the budget estimates is as low as it is, about $7,000,000, because the budget, following our operations, has reduced the various estimates so that our net savings are only about $7,000,000.

The bill provides insofar as is necessary for the activities of the Government for the balance of the year after the funds can be available as they need them.

In almost every case there has been a complete agreement with the agency represented, as to the amount of the savings. As to most of the others, I believe there is little opportunity for difference.

The largest items involved are $75,000,000 for the War Assets Administration. I might say that as a result of the pressure we were able to put on, and the hearings which we held, an estimate of $20,000,000 for pay act increase money was withdrawn. That $75,000,000 goes to the War Department and the Navy Department for the handling of surplus property.

There are various smaller items, most of them running into less than a million dollars, the large item being for the Post Office Department. The total for the Post Office Department will represent approximately $60,382,000 out of the $95,000,000 involved in the bill. $4,195,000 is for the operation of the United Nations, and represents an increase in the assessment against the United States, which was agreed on last fall, after the committee had made its regular appropriation.

In the Department of State, the item included there is very largely a pay item.

In the Coast Guard they have absorbed in another fund, about $1,060,000 of their pay increase.

The entire bill has been presented here with a report from the committee the other day, and in it we have included this provision, which, frankly, is a provision for which, in this one bill, we require a rule. That appears on page 24 of the bill:

> No appropriation or fund made available by this or any other appropriation act to the executive departments and establishments, including corporations, for personal services shall be available to pay any increased cost resulting from the allocation or reallocation hereafter of a position to a higher grade, or resulting from the creation of a new position, if such increased cost would result in an increase in the total obligations on an annual basis under such appropriation or fund: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not apply to the initial creation of positions to carry out new programs or functions for which specific appropriations are made available.

That was brought to my attention by reason of the enormous number of reallocations of positions that were made, and the continuous demand upon the Appropriations Committee resulting

from reallocations, a large portion of which we found were not justified, all the time.

In one item alone that was presented to us here this year of $25,000 for one agency, every dollar resulted from reallocations of positions, and it was without regard to merit, because some of those reallocations resulted in enormous increases in the salaries of these people and in many cases with no justification whatever.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES. Would the gentleman care to disclose the agency he just mentioned?

Mr. TABER. It was the Second Assistant Postmaster General's office under Mr. Gael Sullivan, the present blight in the Democratic National Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is there anything in this bill affecting the work of the Corps of Army Engineers?

Mr. TABER. I think not. If there is it is a very minor item. It would be some little thing like an audited claim which would not amount to anything. I cannot remember anything and I cannot find anything. The hearings on that office will come under the civil functions bill of the War Department. The appropriation for the Army engineers will be carried in that bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is the chairman of that subcommittee?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

I have here, if anyone is interested, a table which shows the tremendous percentage of employees who have been moved into higher grades in these different agencies. This is an over-all picture. It shows the tremendous upgrading since October 1942. I will not go into detail on it at this time unless it is desired.

There has been some criticism by some people about the operations of the Appropriations Committee with reference to veterans' appropriations, and the speed with which they have operated. Perhaps it might be proper at this point to tell the House just exactly what has happened.

On January 31 a budget estimate was sent up to Congress asking for certain funds. On February 11, just as soon as we were able to do so, we had hearings lasting for a long time and were unable to find out the things we needed to know in order to pass on the budget estimate. We did carry a part of the estimate totaling $165,000,000 in the urgent deficiency bill, which was supposed to carry them through until March 31, and it has met their obligations through April 30.

Large volumes of intricate justifications were presented by the Veterans' Administration, and after the urgent deficiency bill had been passed on February 17, as soon as we were able, we had the Veterans' Administration up again and held hearings all day. We later had them up for further hearings, and just as fast as the bill could be written up it was reported to the House, and it was passed April 1, 1947.

That bill was in the Senate and did not come back to us until the 25th of April. A conference was held as quickly as we were able to arrange it and the conference report was passed on Wednesday, April 30. The conference report went through the Senate, May 1, and was signed by the President.

Where there was any delay on the part of the House Appropriations Committee, I do not see.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, membership in the American Congress—in any American Congress—has always involved great responsibilities. But there have been milestone Congresses which have been called upon to determine critical issues which have changed the course of world history.

The Eightieth Congress is such a Congress. Never before in the annals of the American Republic has the Nation faced so many vital problems as confront this Congress.

In this generation we have fought victoriously two world wars, the two greatest wars of all time. We have come through virtually unscatched. Of all the nations which participated we alone have been uninvaded and continue production today without interruption. Not a brick is out of place, not a railroad rail removed, not a bridge destroyed, while throughout the territory of allies and enemies alike, there is destruction, devastation and destitution.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has stated that not a bomb dropped on our country. What about the Federal Treasury; would the gentleman say that it was not hit by a bomb?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, our Federal Treasury is today in relative better condition than any country engaged in the war. Some have no treasury left at all. In Germany and Japan, formerly among the greatest industrial nations of the world, treasury and all governmental assets have been completely wiped out. Every other nation that participated in the war after expenditure to the utmost of their national resources have nothing left to compare with our rapidly recovering economy. We stand today upon a pinnacle of opportunity such as has never been afforded any other nation in all the tide of time.

We have today billions of dollars worth of the most modern manufacturing plants, with equipment geared to mass production.

We have the trained personnel to operate them. Throughout the length and breadth of the land we have pilots, navigators, technicians, artisans, engineers, men trained to every branch of modern mechanism and scientific research. We have the plants, we have the equipment, we have the personnel, and we have the power.

We produce in America more electric current than all the rest of the world combined. We have electricity, oil, coal, and, last but not least, we have the secret of electrical energy which our scientists tell us will revolutionize the application of power to machinery in the next 10 to 25 years.

And we have the raw materials channeled to the points of consumption.

Last, we have the transportation facilities. We have not only the highways and railroads, with trucks and rolling stock, but we have merchant fleets and air fleets unequaled by any nation or all nations combined. We can produce the goods and we can deliver them.

We possess the plants, the personnel, the power, the raw material, the transportation, and the know-how.

I think it was generally conceded—I know I grew up with the idea—that Germany produced the most advanced scientists and technicians of modern times.

But in this war we demonstrated the superiority of the American scientists in the indubitable crucible of a war of extermination. Had it not been for the proximity fuze, radar, the atomic bomb, and a thousand other technical developments which flowed from the laboratories of American scientists, under the encouragement and direction of this Congress, we would still be fighting the war today.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Can we claim along with all these things, which are accurately and correctly, I think, referred to, that we also have the disposition for production and peace in the world?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to have the gentleman suggest that.

Never before in the history of human conflict has any nation emerged victorious from a great war without developing a plan of world conquest and imperialistic control evidenced in the seizing of trade advantages and territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

America, after winning two wars, has not asked for a single advantage. She has not sought trade concessions. She has not asked for a single square foot of territory. She asked only that she be allowed to live in peace and comity with all nations under conditions which afford every man individual liberty and a high standard of living.

We have the plants, we have the personnel, we have the power, we have the raw materials, and we have scientific attainment, and we have the market, such a market as was never dreamed of.

Prior to this war Japan was outselling us in our own markets. Germany, in every market in the world, was offering goods at a price that staggered American competition. England, with her vast empire and her legislative and economic control all but closed many colonial markets to American goods.

Today competition has vanished. We can produce goods more rapidly and more cheaply than any competing nation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman says it has never happened in America. What about the CPA?

Mr. CANNON. Some of our friends seem to have an obsession on that subject. They cannot talk about anything from nadir to zenith without bringing in OPA.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How could it be otherwise?

Mr. CANNON. The recent rise in the price of commodities throughout the country demonstrates that without OPA we could not have come so successfully through the war years. It rendered an incomparable service. It was one of the immediate factors in winning the war. Throughout the long struggle we maintained stability of prices and supplies unequaled by any other country.

We are at the crossroads. We inherit not only these opportunities but the responsibilities that go with them, and we have but to glance back in our own history to appreciate the difficulties which beset us.

Aaron Burr with his overweening ambition menaced Jefferson's plan for a united continent. He was a man of exceptional ability. Few American statesmen have surpassed him in ability. He may have been honestly mistaken, but at that critical time in the history of America he was a menace to the Government and the principles on which it was founded.

Again, in those tragic days preceding civil conflict two groups represented by Jefferson Davis at one extreme and William Lloyd Garrison at the other through their refusal to follow legislative processes and their insistence on resort to the arbitrament of the sword turned back the clock of American history 100 years.

And in the reconstruction period there came to untimely power men like Thaddeus Stevens whose vindictive provincialism not only desolated the South but indefinitely retarded national progress.

And within the memory of men sitting here today Henry Cabot Lodge made the Second World War inevitable.

When we look back upon these tragic pages of American history and note the mistakes made—mistakes made honestly, I am certain—mistakes made with patriotic fervor, no doubt, it behooves us to pause and reflect, however clear our course appears to be, however high our principles and unimpeachable our motives, that we should move only with the greatest caution.

There is so much at stake, we cannot afford to make a mistake. It is not a time for pettiness, for partisanship, for provincialism.

The bill before us conforms in every respect to the requirements of economical legislation. It economizes where economy is needed. It provides adequately for the essential functions of government. I commend the chairman and the committee on its provisions. It should be passed without amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in his kaleidoscopic description of world facts. He was very interesting. I heard the gentleman again denounce Henry Cabot Lodge, a former Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as making inevitable, as he said, the Second World War. I assume the reason for that was because it is alleged by some people that he was responsible for the collapse of the League of Nations, due to our failure to enter the League of Nations, as requested by the then President, Mr. Wilson. It is because of that that I desire to take just a few minutes to place in the RECORD some facts in which I think you might be interested which I developed in the hearings on this bill. They are in the hearings, but few people have the opportunity to see them.

We now have a United Nations organization. I think it is safe to say that there are few Members of this Congress and few people in America who do not share the hope that out of this organization there will ultimately evolve a program that will guarantee the future peace of this world. I think it augurs well that at least on paper we have the large number of sovereignties that have signed the Charter of the United Nations.

I note in accordance with the testimony on this pending bill the percentages allotted to the various member states of the total expense of organization and maintenance of the United Nations. When we get back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a statement showing the percentages of liability of the various member nations for the support of that organization, of which I note the United States is assessed 39.89 percent of the total cost as against 6.30 for China; 6.30 for France; 6.62 for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and 11.98 for the United Kingdom. This ought to demonstrate clearly that the United States is in a dominant position as far as payment of costs and expense of maintenance and organization of the United Nations is concerned.

Contributions scale, United Nations 1946 budget

	Percent
Afghanistan	(1)
Argentina	1.94
Australia	2.00
Belgium	1.42
Bolivia	.08
Brazil	1.94
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	.23
Canada	3.35
Chile	.47
China	6.30
Colombia	.39
Costa Rica	.04
Cuba	.30
Czechoslovakia	.95
Denmark	.81
Dominican Republic	.05
Ecuador	.05
Egypt	.81
El Salvador	.05
Ethiopia	.08
France	6.30
Greece	.17
Guatemala	.05
Haiti	.04
Honduras	.04
Iceland	(1)
India	4.09
Iran	.47
Iraq	.17
Lebanon	.06
Liberia	.04
Luxemburg	.05
Mexico	.66
Netherlands	1.47
New Zealand	0.52
Nicaragua	.04
Norway	.52
Panama	.05
Paraguay	.04
Peru	.21
Philippines	.30
Poland	1.00
Saudi Arabia	.08
Sweden	(1)
Syria	.12
South Africa	1.15
Turkey	.93
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	.83
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	6.62
United Kingdom	11.98
United States	39.89
Uruguay	.18
Venezuela	.28
Yugoslavia	.34
Total	100.00

Footnote at end of table.

[1] Members admitted in 1946 are assessed a fraction (at least 33⅓ percent) of their percentage of assessment for 1947 applied to the 1946 budget. Amounts thus allocated are credited to the 1947 budget.

See the following table:

	Percentage assessment	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.0166	$3,192.18
Iceland	.0133	2,557.59
Sweden	.7833	150,628.59

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think it might be interesting to set alongside those figures the figures showing the loan and grants which the several countries composing this organization are receiving from the United States through the International Monetary Fund, through the Export-Import Bank, through the International Bank and so forth. I believe it will be clearly shown by doing so that in reality the United States is paying the whole amount.

Mr. KEEFE. Those figures might possibly reflect the situation which the gentleman discloses. I do not have those figures in tabular form, however.

The next table I seek to bring to your attention is a table showing the payments to the United Nations for the working capital fund and for the 1946–47 budget. I commend this table to your attention and study as indicative of the interest of the various states in maintaining the United Nations organization and the amounts that have been paid by the various states to the original working capital fund and to the assessments that have been levied in the 1946 and 1947 budgets.

Statement of payments to the United Nations for the working capital fund, and the 1946 and 1947 budgets, Apr. 1, 1947

[Amounts rounded to nearest dollar]

Country	Working capital fund		1946 budget		1947 budget		Payments made in excess of assessments	Total payments
	Assessed advances	Payments	Assessments	Payments	Assessments	Payments		
Afghanistan	$10,000		$3,192		$13,725			
Argentina	370,000	$370,000	373,062	$373,062	507,825	$2,688		$745,750
Australia	394,000	394,000	384,600	384,600	540,765	270,382		1,048,982
Belgium	270,000	270,000	273,066	273,066	370,575	370,575		913,641
Bolivia	16,000		15,384		21,960			
Brazil	370,000	370,000	373,062	373,062	507,825	507,825	(1)	1,250,887
Byelorussian S. S. R	44,000	44,000	44,229	44,229	60,390	60,390	35,881	184,500
Canada	640,000	640,000	644,205	450,500	878,400			1,090,500
Chile	90,000	90,000	90,381	20,272	123,525			110,272
China	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,211,490	400,000	1,647,000			1,600,000
Colombia	74,000	74,000	74,997	74,997	101,565	3,503		152,500
Costa Rica	8,000	8,000	7,692	4,250	10,980			12,250
Cuba	58,000	58,000	57,690	57,690	79,605	36,810		152,500
Czechoslovakia	180,000	174,205	182,685		247,050			174,205
Denmark	158,000	158,000	155,763	155,763	216,855	2,000		315,763
Dominican Republic	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Ecuador	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Egypt	158,000	158,000	155,763	155,763	216,855	60,487		374,250
El Salvador	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Ethiopia	16,000	16,000	15,384	15,384	21,960	21,960	10,656	64,000
France	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,211,490	200,000	1,647,000			1,400,000
Greece	34,000	34,000	32,691	32,691	46,665	31,809		98,500
Guatemala	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Haiti	8,000	8,000	7,692	4,250	10,980			12,250
Honduras	8,000	8,000	7,692	7,692	10,980	10,980		26,672
Iceland	8,000		2,558		10,980			
India	790,000	790,000	786,507	786,507	1,084,275			1,576,507
Iran	90,000	90,000	90,381	62,500	123,525			152,500
Iraq	34,000		32,691		46,665			
Lebanon	12,000	12,000	11,538	250	16,470			12,250
Liberia	8,000	8,000	7,692	4,250	10,980			12,250
Luxembourg	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Mexico	126,000	126,000	126,918	126,918	172,935	150,832		403,750
Netherlands	280,000	280,000	282,681	77,000	384,200			357,000
New Zealand	100,000	100,000	99,996	99,996	137,250	48,504		248,500
Nicaragua	8,000	8,000	7,692	167	10,980			8,167
Norway	100,000	100,000	99,996	99,996	137,250	120,004		320,000
Panama	10,000	10,000	9,615	2,250	13,725			12,250
Paraguay	8,000	8,000	7,692	4,250	10,980			12,250
Peru	40,000	40,000	40,383	40,383	54,900	54,900	17,217	152,500
Philippines	58,000	58,000	57,690	6,000	79,605			64,000
Poland	190,000	190,000	192,300	117,750	260,775			307,750
Saudi Arabia	16,000	16,000	15,384	15,384	21,960	21,960	20,406	73,750
Sweden	470,000		150,629		645,075			
Syria	24,000	24,000	23,076	23,076	32,940	2,174		49,250
Turkey	182,000	182,000	178,839	178,839	249,795	249,795		610,634
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	168,600	168,000	169,224	139,750	230,580			307,750
Union of South Africa	224,000	224,000	221,145	221,145	307,440	307,440		752,585
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,268,000	1,268,000	1,273,026	455,000	1,740,330			1,723,000
United Kingdom	2,296,000	2,296,000	2,303,754	2,303,754	3,151,260			4,599,754
United States	7,978,000	6,153,500	7,670,547	5,000,000	10,949,865			11,153,500
Uruguay	36,000	36,000	34,614	34,614	49,410	49,410	5,476	125,500
Venezuela	54,000	54,000	53,844	53,844	74,115	17,656		125,500
Yugoslavia	66,000	66,000	65,382	65,382	90,585	53,118		184,500
Total	20,000,000	17,631,705	19,386,378	12,957,526	27,450,000	2,455,202	89,636	33,134,069

[1] Not known.

Another table that is of interest in connection with this situation is a statement of arrears of contributions to the United Nations for the working capital fund and for the 1946 and 1947 budgets. These three tables are of considerable interest.

Statement of arrears in contributions to the United Nations for the working capital fund a nd for the 1946 and 1947 budgets, Apr. 1, 1947

Country	Working capital fund		1945 budget		1947 budget		Tota arrears or credits
	Assessed advances	Payments in arrears	Assessments	Payments in arrears	Assessments	Payments in arrears	
Afghanistan	$10,000	$10,000	[1] $3,192	[1] $3,192	$13,725	$13,725	[1] $26,917
Argentina	370,000		373,062		507,825	505,137	505,137
Australia	394,000		384,600		540,765	270,383	270,383
Belgium	270,000		273,066		370,575		
Bolivia	16,000	16,000	15,384	15,384	21,960	21,960	53,344
Brazil	370,000		373,062		507,825		(1)
Byelorussian S. S. R	44,000		44,229		60,390		[2] (35,881)
Canada	640,000		644,205	193,705	878,400	878,400	1,072,105
Chile	90,000		90,381	[1] 70,109	123,535	123,525	[1] 193,634
China	1,200,000		1,211,490	811,490	1,747,000	1,647,000	2,458,490
Colombia	74,000		74,997		101,565	98,062	98,062
Costa Rica	8,000		7,692	3,442	10,980	10,980	14,422
Cuba	58,000		57,690		79,605	42,795	42,795
Czechoslovakia	180,000	5,795	182,685	182,685	247,050	247,050	435,530
Denmark	158,000		155,763		216,855	214,855	214,855
Dominican Republic	10,000		9,615	7,365	13,725	13,725	21,090
Ecuador	10,000		9,615	7,365	13,725	13,725	21,090
Egypt	158,000		155,763		216,855	156,368	156,368
El Salvador	10,000		9,615	7,365	13,725	13,725	21,090
Ethiopia	16,000		15,384		21,960		[2] (10,656)
France	1,200,000		1,211,490	1,011,490	1,647,000	1,647,000	2,658,490
Greece	34,000		32,691		46,665	14,856	14,856
Guatemala	10,000		9,615	7,365	13,725	13,725	21,090
Haiti	8,000		7,692	3,442	10,980	10,980	14,422
Honduras	8,000		7,692		10,980		
Iceland	8,000	8,000	[1] 2,558	[1] 2,558	10,980	10,980	[1] 21,538
India	790,000		786,507		1,084,275	1,084,275	1,084,275
Iran	90,000		90,381	27,881	123,525	123,525	151,406
Iraq	34,000	34,000	32,691	32,691	46,665	46,665	113,356
Lebanon	12,000		11,538	11,288	16,470	16,470	27,758
Liberia	8,000		7,692	3,442	10,980	10,980	14,422

Footnotes at end of table.

Statement of arrears in contributions to the United Nations for the working capital fund and for the 1946 and 1947 budgets, Apr. 1, 1947—Con.

Country	Working capital fund		1945 budget		1947 budget		Total arrears or credits
	Assessed advances	Payments in arrears	Assessments	Payments in arrears	Assessments	Payments in arrears	
Luxembourg	$10,000		$9,615	$7,365	$13,725	$13,725	$21,090
Mexico	126,000		126,918		172,935	22,103	22,103
Netherlands	280,000		282,681	205,689	384,300	384,300	389,981
New Zealand	100,000		99,906		137,250	88,746	88,746
Nicaragua	8,000		7,692	7,525	10,980	10,980	18,505
Norway	100,000		99,996		137,250	17,246	17,246
Panama	10,000		9,615	7,365	13,725	13,725	21,090
Paraguay	8,000		7,692	3,442	10,980	10,980	14,422
Peru	40,000		40,383		54,900		[3] (17,217)
Philippines	58,000		57,690	51,690	79,605	79,605	131,295
Poland	190,000		192,300	74,550	260,775	260,775	335,325
Saudi Arabia	16,000		15,384		21,960		[3] (20,406)
Sweden	470,000	$470,000	[1] 150,629	[1] 150,629	645,075	645,075	[1] 1,265,704
Syria	24,000		23,076		32,940	30,766	30,766
Turkey	182,000		178,839		249,795		
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	168,000		169,224	29,474	230,580	230,580	260,054
Union of South Africa	224,000		221,145		307,440		
U. S. S. R.	1,268,000		1,273,026	818,026	1,740,330	1,740,330	2,558,356
United Kingdom	2,296,000		2,303,754		3,151,260	3,151,260	3,151,260
United States	7,978,000	1,824,500	7,670,847	2,670,847	10,949,805	10,949,805	15,445,152
Uruguay	36,000		34,614		49,410		[3] (5,476)
Venezuela	54,000		53,844		74,115	56,459	56,459
Yugoslavia	66,000		65,382		90,585	37,467	37,467
Total	20,000,000	2,368,295	[1] 19,386,378	6,428,852	27,450,000	24,994,798	[4] 33,791,945 [5] 89,636

[1] Rounded to nearest dollar.
[2] Credit to 1948, if any, not known.
[3] Credits indicated by figures in parentheses. Any excess of payment for the 1947 budget is credited to member's contribution for 1948 or refunded to the member if so requested. These credits result from excess advances to the working capital fund, which were more than enough to cover the respective member's contributions for 1946 and 1947
[4] Arrears.
[5] Credits.

It has always been my idea that the greatest way for any individual to express his interest in a program is to make an investment in it and lay the money down on the line. To have an assessment and to pay it without question, and to pay it on time, is the best evidence of the real interest of an individual in any worth-while project. I trust that the evidence of delinquencies that are apparent in this table that I shall introduce into the RECORD, furnished by the State Department will not be any evidence of a lack of interest on the part of these nations that are in arrears in their payments to the United Nations original fund or in their arrears in payments for the 1946–1947 budget.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to have a working United Nations organization that will effectively deal with the international problems and be an effective deterrent to another world war, it seems to me that one of the fundamentals is that each nation that is a signatory and member of the United Nations shall without question and without stint meet its full and complete obligation each year as the assessments are made in order that Uncle Sam may not be called upon as the years go on to bear the entire or a large portion of the expense of the maintenance of the United Nations organization. I believe that the nations of the world that are members will maintain their fair share, as has been estimated in the table of percentage contributions which has been placed in the RECORD as table No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a fervent hope, in face of the situation described by the gentleman from Missouri who keeps repeating, as I have heard him for the last 10 years telling the Congress that America is now at the crossroads, that this will be cleared up. We are at the crossroads and have been at the crossroads for the past 10 years, if I am to believe the speeches made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in that period. I wonder when we are going to get off the crossroad and get on the avenue leading toward peace and prosperity and when we are going to get away from the fear that the Atlantic Charter was supposed to drive out of the hearts of men and women throughout the world.

When are we going to get on the broad avenue of commerce and allow these great plants that the gentleman has described to get into operation? When are we going to have production and more production in America to drive away the specter of inflation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is high time that we get off the crossroads in America. I am interested in seeing the type of road we propose to travel in the future when we do get off the cross road.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I want to refer the gentleman again to the statement made by our friend from Missouri when he said he wanted to be nonpartisan, then blamed, significantly enough, a Republican Senator. If he will read Mr. Beard's recent book on the development of American foreign policy, he will find there a more reliable indication than speeches made at Jackson Day dinners.

Mr. KEEFE. We all love the gentleman from Missouri.

We know how nonpartisan his approach always is to every public question. We know how nonpartisan he was in his approach to this conference report which came in here just a couple of days ago. We know how the gentleman, when he spoke on that conference report, evidenced such a lack of pettiness and such a lack of partisanship when he tried to make it appear in his discussion of that conference report that the Republican Congress was to blame for the failure to send out the checks to the veterans of this Nation and those who are dependent upon the social-security funds of the Nation. Oh, no. My friend from Missouri is not entirely free from political implications, should I say, and I do not know as I blame him. That is his job. That is a part of the deal that is now going on. That is part of the conspiracy: Smear the Republicans whenever you can. Smear them at all hazards and at all costs. The end justifies the means. Always attain the desired end and do not care a tinker's dam about the means used to get there.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I am surprised at this unprovoked and uninvited tirade from the gentleman from Wisconsin.

And still I suppose I ought not be surprised. It is in keeping with the proclivities of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I recall that the last time I had a colloquy with him here on the floor, he charged me with practicing piddlin' politics and then took refuge behind the previous question moved by the gentleman from New York so that I could not answer him.

Why, Mr. Chairman, of all the piddlin' politicians that ever piddled piddlin' politics on this floor, my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin is the greatest piddler that ever piddled. And his flamboyant performance here this afternoon is no exception to the rule.

The gentleman characterizes my remarks as partisan and an attempt to to smear the spotless escutcheon of his party. Mr. Chairman, I pause now to give him an opportunity to point out any such word or sentence or inference in my

remarks. His fevered statement is both irrelevant and gratuitous.

The sum and substance of all I said—as all who are sitting here will corroborate—was that the Eightieth Congress has great opportunities and corresponding responsibilities; that this Congress, more than any other Congress, is confronted with questions, the solutions of which will affect the welfare of this country and the world for a hundred years to come; that in their consideration there should be no pettiness, partisanship, or provincialism. The observation was addressed to no person or party in particular but to such Members, on either side of the aisle, as might happen to be listening. There was no such implication as the gentleman has attempted to read into it. And that is borne out by the fact that reference was made to the pending bill as in keeping with the best traditions of American statesmanship.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman from Missouri is making a fine statement and an accurate statement. The other day the gentleman from Wisconsin made some reference to the deficiency bill now being discussed, and he inserted some remarks in the RECORD accusing the gentleman from Illinois now addressing the House of playing politics. I am sort of in agreement with the gentleman from Missouri that the gentleman from Wisconsin is very adept at that art himself. I brought to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin during his discourse that the item which caused the delay in the payment of the veterans' checks was originally left out in the deficiency bill by the committee, that is, the majority of the committee. The error was called to the attention of the committee by myself. The following day the committee reinstated the item in the bill. It was another one of the long delays in the consideration of the bill by the subcommittee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as far as that is concerned, the fact remains that the money for the veterans was not provided in time to meet the deadline—the first instance in which the Government has defaulted in its payments to the veterans within my recollection.

There can be no misapprehension about the facts or about where the responsibility rests. It is only necessary to consult the dates printed in the hearings. The estimates and the justifications were received by the committee in January. General Bradley was called before the committee the second week in February. He was not called again until March 17. In response to the gentleman's unwarranted strictures, why was not General Marshall called, and when he was called why was the bill not reported?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is a member of the House Committee on Deficiencies, is he not?

Mr. CANNON. That is rather a superfluous question. And my attendance on the first hearing of General Bradley was also rather superfluous. After an exhaustive examination of General Bradley by the majority members of the committee, the meeting was adjourned without my being given an opportunity to question the General. And he was not again called before the committee until March 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes in order to give the gentleman from Wisconsin an opportunity to get the facts. I was ready and anxious to cooperate in seeing that the veterans were paid their money on time. There was no legitimate reason why they should not have been paid on time. Will the gentleman tell us why they were not paid on time?

Mr. KEEFE. They were not paid on time because the bill did not pass through the Congress.

Mr. CANNON. And why did not the bill pass through Congress?

Mr. KEEFE. It did not pass through the Congress, may I say to the gentleman, because, the gentleman well knows, General Bradley himself and not General Marshall was not able from week to week to give to the Congress a real estimate as to the needs. He undershot the mark on the regular appropriation bill $1,200,000,000. That is not his fault. The program grew so rapidly in this period of time that neither General Bradley nor the gentleman nor I nor anybody else could tell with assurance how much money was needed. Was the gentleman able to?

Mr. CANNON. That statement is admirable in every respect except that it does not conform to the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. That is what the gentleman thinks.

Mr. CANNON. It is only necessary to consult the printed hearings to be convinced that the statement does not conform to the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman states what he thinks when he says it does not conform to the facts.

Mr. CANNON. I am giving the gentleman the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened to the gentleman's facts many times on this floor.

Mr. CANNON. The printed hearings, which are available to anybody, show that General Bradley was only called before the committee once between January and March 17. On March 17 further data were requested and were supplied, in full, 4 days later. It was evidently satisfactory, as he was not called again and was not asked to submit further evidence. There is the official record. Why was not the bill reported to the House in February or March? Why was it not reported in time for the veterans to get their money?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I did not inject partisanship into this debate today; the gentleman from Wisconsin is the man who insists on talking partisanship. All right, if he wants to talk partisanship, let us talk partisanship. I shall not object. I shall be glad to humor him. If he insists on going a mile, I am ready to go with him twain.

Never before in the history of this Congress from the administration of Washington down to this day have we been so far behind with the annual appropriation bills. Failure to provide money for the veterans is not an isolated instance. Never before have we been so far behind with the legislative program of the Congress. Why, we have not even complied with the provisions of the Reorganization Act directing action on the legislative budget. Under the law, it should have been adopted long ago.

The Republican National Committee sent a letter back to the newspapers in my district abusing me because I did not vote for the $6,000,000,000 cut in the legislative budget. The truth about the matter is that, if I had not voted for it, it could not have been submitted to the House. When we met in committee and the question came up as to whether we would report out a four-and-a-half billion dollar cut or a $6,000,000,000 cut, eight of us voted to report out a six-billion cut, and five voted to report out a four-and-a-half billion cut. If I and my colleague had not joined the eight, the vote would have been six in favor of the six-billion cut and seven in favor of the four-and-one-half-billion cut, and nobody in either House could have voted on a cut of $6 000,000,000.

And yet the Republican National Committee writes to the newspapers of my district and asks why I do not vote for the six-billion cut. Why do not the Republicans of the House and Senate themselves vote for a $6,000,000,000 cut?

Incidentally, the Republican National Committee also wrote to the newspapers of my district and claimed that I defended Russian policies on the floor. I wired them to telegraph me collect and quote any such statement. They have never replied. There is no such statement.

And the other day the Republican National Committee wrote the newspapers of my district that I had not voted on the tax bill. They neglected to say—as everybody knew—that I was in bed with the flu. If you want "piddlin'" politics, the Republican National Committee will give it to you with a capital P.

Now, I ask the Republican National Committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is so anxious to inject partisanship into this debate, why does not his party, in compliance with its campaign pledges to reduce the budget $6,000,000,000 and fire a million-and-a half Government employees, report out the resolution on the legislative budget and give us an opportunity to vote on it?

Why do you not bring out the legislative budget?

Mr. KEEFE. What is the gentleman's question: Why do we not bring out the legislative budget?

Mr. CANNON. Why does not your party bring out the legislative budget and comply with the law?

Mr. KEEFE. I wish they would, so far as I personally am concerned.

Mr. CANNON. You are a member of the party in control of the Congress, are you not?

Mr. KEEFE. I would vote to report it out. Why do you not report it out? You are member of that committee.

Mr. CANNON. I did vote to report it out.

Why does not your party report it out? I did not bring up this question of partisanship. Why does not your party report it out?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, you never bring up anything of a partisan nature. You did not make a partisan speech yesterday in the RECORD, did you, when nobody was here to challenge you? You made one of the worst partisan speeches yesterday when only a handful of Members were on the floor so that nobody could challenge you.

Mr. CANNON. Your chairman was here. I resent the reflection on the chairman of the committee, the distinguished and able gentleman from New York.

But you are trying to evade the question. Why do you not bring out the legislative budget and vote to cut $6,000,000,000 from the budget? Why do you not comply with law and redeem your campaign pledges? I am ready to vote on it.

Mr. KEEFE. If you are asking me, I am ready to vote for it, and I have voted for it, so we are in agreement on something, are we not?

Mr. CANNON. Neither of us has voted on the conference report because your comittee will not report it out and give us a chance to vote. It is pigeonholed. While we are raising the question of responsibility for failure to pay the veterans on time, who is responsible for failure to cut the legislative budget? In other words, who is long on promises and short on performance?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion has been made that never before in the history of Congress have the appropriations been so far behind as this year—not since last year. The actual fact is that our committee has devoted more time to strenuous hearings than has ever been devoted by any committee in the same lengths of time. We have terrific trouble getting the truth out of these agencies. They would not even do their fifth-grade arithmetic before they came up to see us, and it has been necessary to spend hours and hours and days and days to find out the truth and to find out what the real requirements and needs of these agencies are. That is what we have been busy doing.

Now, they want to know why we have not brought out the legislative budget. It is because it has not been possible. There has not been any indication that the Senate would agree to the cut of $6,000,000,000 in the expenditures of the Government for the next fiscal year.

For my part, I do not believe in compromising on a question that is right.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. With all due deference to the gentleman from Missouri, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I think what he meant to imply by his statement that never since the days of Washington has the Committee on Appropriations been so far behind was that never before has the Committee on Appropriations trailed so far behind the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget by making such sharp cuts toward economy. I think that is what he meant.

Mr. TABER. I think it is true that we have made very substantial and satisfactory cuts and that the result of our operation has given heart to the American people at this time.

We intend to go down the line. We intend to persevere in these hearings, and we are going to make every cut that can be made consistent with the proper operation of the American Government.

There are tremendous burdens that are unnecessary. There is a great duplication of employees throughout the Government. These must be weeded out. There are activities recommended that are not justified. They must be weeded out. The whole situation must be gone over so that the American people and the American taxpayers may have a chance to survive.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES. Has it not been a great deal easier to bring out bills when you go along with the agencies and give them what they want, rather than to try to cut them down, as the committee has tried to do this year?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. REES. And is it not a fact that you have not had the cooperation to which you are entitled from these committees in the attempts to cut down the expenses?

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] referred to the gentleman from Wisconsin as a piddler—the greatest piddler he had ever known. I do not know just what he means by "piddler." It is apparently a term of abuse, which the gentleman from Missouri is very capable of passing out. But may I say that in the years I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I had great training in the art of piddling. The greatest teacher of them all in the art of piddling, as every Member of this Congress knows is the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the gentleman from Missouri and those who have spoken, I thought it might be well to take just 2 or 3 minutes to talk about this bill.

This is a deficiency appropriation bill that comes to the floor because the departments appear to have failed to estimate the amount of money they were going to need. I am not criticizing the departments too severely. I realize that in some cases unforeseen conditions come about whereby additional money is required to be spent. But from my experience in this House, many times agencies have come to the committee asking for deficiencies because they were unable to figure the amount of funds they thought they should have.

However, I want particularly to call attention to section 400 which is in this bill. I am not objecting to that particular section, except that I do want to call the attention of the Appropriation Committee to the fact that in times past, and again today, we find legislation on an appropriation bill. All points of order have been waived. Even if they were not waived I think this particular feature ought to have been in the law before this time. So while I criticize the manner in which it is presented, I do commend the membership of that committee for calling attention to the situation involved here.

I wish to speak briefly about this question of up-grading that is going on in the departments of our Government. Very few Members have given that any particular attention. It is extremely important, because after all it not only affects the pay of the personnel in Government, but it involves the job where they are employed. So I am going to follow through just a little farther than the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and indicate to you some figures on that particular question.

I want to call your attention to a table I have before me. These figures were secured from the Civil Service Commission.

The total number of people employed in the classified Civil Service in grade 1 in 1942 was 13 percent. By 1946 the jobs had been upgraded until only 1 percent were in grade 1. If you want to know where your money is being spent, you should follow these figures.

In 1942, 37 percent of those employed in the classified service were in grade 2, but in 1946, 22 percent of those in classified service were in grade 2.

In 1942, in grade 3, there were 19 percent in classified service, but 4 years later we find 27 percent in grade 3.

In grade 4, in 1942, 9 percent were in classified service. In 1946 it was 14.8 percent.

I am talking about grades 3 and 4 because that is where more money is paid. The increase in these grades is about 50 percent. That is the way the thing has been operating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. REES. Now, let us look into the professional service. That is where they pay considerably more money. Whereas in 1942 there were 19.8 percent in grade 1, in 1946 we find only 11.9 percent.

When we move to the second professional grade, we find they had 25.8 percent in 1942 and about 22.7 percent in 1946.

Then the situation changes, and when you get up to the fifth grade, where there were 14 percent in 1942, it jumps to 18.7 percent in 1946.

Then in the next grade, where there is still more money, you find that where they had 8.8 percent in 1942, they had 12.5 percent in 1946.

As a matter of fact, in the top grades, where they had only 1.4 percent in 1942, you find twice that number in 1946. So when you talk about upgrading, I think it might be well to observe how the thing is being handled. I want it understood this is different from the questions of promotions to which employees in Federal service are entitled.

I am in favor of every Federal employee getting paid for his services, getting paid what he earns, but I do think this Congress is entitled to know something about the manner in which the upgrading has been going on in the civil service during the past few years. After we get back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to include the entire table I have before me that contains figures that were procured from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Would the gentleman also include in his extension just who does this and how it is done?

Mr. REES. I shall be glad to. It is done, as I understand it, by the departments of Government and the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What particular people are responsible for all this?

Mr. REES. It is my understanding that upgrading is done by the heads of the departments by and with the consent of the Civil Service Commission. My attention has been called to situations where one department will do a great amount of upgrading and another will stay within bounds and try to keep within bounds.

Here is a copy of the table I mentioned a few moments ago:

Employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by service and grade, 1942, 1944, 1946

1. CLERICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FISCAL SERVICE

	October 1942		Dec. 31, 1944		July 1, 1946	
	Number of employees	Percent	Number of employees	Percent	Number of employees	Percent
Total	762,903	100.0	911,454	100.0	719,810	100.0
Grade 1	99,522	13.0	28,362	3.1	7,243	1.0
Grade 2	285,029	37.4	244,754	26.9	158,720	22.1
Grade 3	147,296	19.3	235,815	25.9	194,080	27.0
Grade 4	69,706	9.1	129,904	14.3	106,854	14.8
Grade 5	52,841	6.9	73,620	8.1	64,361	8.9
Grade 6	20,478	2.7	42,092	4.6	29,772	4.1
Grade 7	32,470	4.3	52,827	5.8	61,951	8.6
Grade 8	6,458	.8	20,910	2.3	14,949	2.1
Grade 9	20,112	2.6	34,789	3.8	36,276	5.0
Grade 10	4,506	.6	8,375	.9	6,339	.9
Grade 11	10,919	1.4	19,232	2.1	17,901	2.5
Grade 12	8,012	1.1	11,978	1.3	12,454	1.7
Grade 13	3,519	.5	5,544	.6	5,490	.8
Grade 14	1,349	.2	2,278	.2	2,495	.4
Grade 15	686	.1	904	.1	945	.1

Employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by service and grade, 1942, 1944, 1946—Continued

2. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

	October 1942		Dec. 31, 1944		July 1, 1946	
	Number of employees	Percent	Number of employees	Percent	Number of employees	Percent
Total	94,928	100.0	80,653	100.0	97,983	100.0
Grade 1	18,805	19.8	7,954	9.9	11,679	11.9
Grade 2	24,509	25.8	19,613	24.3	22,287	22.7
Grade 3	23,671	24.9	21,520	26.7	25,083	25.6
Grade 4	14,096	14.8	15,679	19.5	18,311	18.7
Grade 5	8,327	8.8	9,363	11.6	12,209	12.5
Grade 6	3,787	4.0	4,377	5.4	5,585	5.7
Grade 7	1,286	1.4	1,565	1.9	2,052	2.1
Grade 8	477	.5	582	.7	777	.8

3. SUBPROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Total	131,238	100.0	67,210	100.0	75,860	100.0
Grade 1	8,860	6.7	1,134	1.7	489	.6
Grade 2	13,607	10.4	7,986	11.9	14,919	19.6
Grade 3	13,898	10.6	10,071	15.0	13,515	17.8
Grade 4	21,777	16.6	9,656	14.4	9,782	12.8
Grade 5	23,619	18.0	17,338	25.8	15,076	19.8
Grade 6	21,786	16.6	9,064	13.5	11,336	14.9
Grade 7	12,387	9.4	6,696	9.9	6,701	8.8
Grade 8	15,304	11.7	5,265	7.8	4,045	5.7

4. CRAFT, PROTECTIVE, CUSTODIAL SERVICE

Total	152,684	100.0	161,865	100.0	139,885	100.0
Grade 1	2,390	1.6	281	.2	572	.4
Grade 2	40,064	26.2	31,380	19.4	27,794	19.9
Grade 3	38,223	25.1	30,882	19.1	27,275	19.5
Grade 4	20,041	13.1	16,917	10.5	20,613	14.7
Grade 5	21,404	14.0	14,761	9.1	11,567	8.3
Grade 6	15,795	10.3	45,173	27.9	32,925	23.5
Grade 7	8,868	5.8	15,721	9.7	13,153	9.4
Grade 8	3,652	2.4	4,058	2.5	3,819	2.7
Grade 9	1,572	1.0	1,667	1.0	1,352	1.0
Grade 10	675	.5	1,025	.6	815	.6

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to invite the attention of my colleagues to an important event in the history of my home State of Rhode Island. On next Sunday, May 4, Rhode Island will observe the one hundred seventy-first anniversity of its Declaration of Independence, having severed all connections with Great Britain exactly 2 months before similar action was taken by the Continental Congress.

Although small in area, Rhode Island has led the way on many occasions. She has the honor not only of having shown the courage to sever all ties with the mother country, while the remainder of the colonies was considering such action, but she also led the way in the establishment of religious liberty and tolerance.

Rhode Island is a glowing example of how people of different races, colors, and creeds can get along together, and I might cite as one example a city in my district, Central Falls, the area of which is only 1.27 square miles and whose population of 26,000, includes, according to the 1940 Federal census, 28 different nationalities.

In these troublesome days, when every effort toward the establishment of a just and enduring peace throughout the world seems almost fruitless, either because of greed, selfishness, or unwillingness to understand, it is most appropriate to go back 171 years in our Nation's history to May 4, 1776, when the then residents of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations courageously and resolutely declared their independence of Great Britain by a solemn act, abjuring all allegiance to the British Crown.

Although this act of itself was of momentous importance insofar as it served as a model or pattern in the drafting of our National Declaration of Independence, which was adopted by the Continental Congress 2 months later, the thought which should predominate today is that this great achievement was obtained as the result of a spirit of resolute and almost defiant independence and determination of our State's founder, Roger Williams, who sought to establish a colony upon the foundation of full liberty in civil and religious affairs, a doctrine then thoroughly foreign to all the provisions contained in charters of the other American colonies.

Roger Williams was the first man to found a State on that principle of separation of state and church, a State whose fundamental compact was a promise of allegiance and obedience in civil things only. This ideal was the basis of the original compact, and was incorporated into the charter granted by King Charles of England in 1663, that "no person within said colony at any time hereafter shall be in anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any difference of opinion in matters of religion, who does not actively disturb the civil peace of our said colony."

Roger Williams' principle was not the fruit of logic; it was with him a primary conviction. It was the fundamental principle of puritanism full, understood and heartily followed. Because of this conviction, which brought upon his head the wrath of the then Governor of Massachusetts and the threat of deportation to England, he fled to the nearby shores of Narragansett Bay, where he founded Providence, and through the application of his doctrine surrounded himself with a group of God-fearing, honest, and determined pioneers who in later years were to defy alone the might of England, to establish its own Navy, which, under Commander Whipple, fired the first cannon upon the seas in defense of American liberty against the King's Navy in 1775, and subsequently gave to the Continental Navy of this country its first commander in chief, Esek Hopkins. This was the origin of the United States Navy. In addition, Rhode Island furnished three captains and seven lieutenants, they being more than three-quarters of the commissioned officers for the four large ships, and probably the like proportion for the four smaller craft of the Continental Navy.

Williams' most pronounced characteristic was his love for his fellowmen, whether English or Indian, and he had implicit faith in democratic government—the rule of the people—and all

through his life his appeal for the settlement of every dispute was to reason and not to force. His profound thinking had a deep effect on his contemporaries, as well as on the generations to follow him, as evidenced by the brilliant and heroic accomplishments of patriots such as John Clark, whose hand traced the shining words cut deep in the marble front of the Rhode Island statehouse, "To hold forth a lively experiment that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernments"; as Samuel Gorton, sturdy champion of soul liberty; as Canonchet, last sachem of the Narragansett Indians, who fought to the end for the life and freedom of his people; as Mary Dyer, Quakeress and martyr for conscience sake, who was hanged by the authorities of Massachusetts in 1660. When Mary Dyer was offered the sparing of her life if she would but depart and cease her protest against injustice, she replied, "In obedience to the will of the Lord I came, and in His will I abide faithful unto death."

As Jonathan Arnold, author of Rhode Island's Declaration of Independence; Gen. Nathaniel Greene, warrior, brave, wise, patient, resourceful, hero of Trenton, Brandywine, Germantown, Guilford, and Eutaw Springs; a gallant, knightly man, second to but one among the heroes of the Revolution. He was loved and trusted by Washington; Oliver Hazard Perry, brilliant graduate of the Rhode Island School of Seamanship, hero of Lake Erie, author of that dispatch which has been the motto and inspiration of America's gallant seamen to the present hour. "We have met the enemy and they are ours."

Still others, Gilbert Stuart, Quaker, son of Narragansett, citizen of the world, associate and friend of kings, but best of all, he who caught and fixed in unfading color the noble features of the great Virginian, the Father of his Country, George Washington; Ambrose E. Burnside, who in the great struggle for the Union, on weary march, on stricken field, in prison pen, offered freely all that men have to give for freedom and the unity of this Nation which their Rhode Island fathers did so much to create and glorify.

Is it not appropriate, therefore, that we should look at this time to Roger Williams and all the other great leaders of our State, the circumstances and conditions surrounding whom are not foreign to the problems confronting the entire world today? Were the leaders of the nations today to adopt and put into practice the principles of tolerance, honesty, trust, and equality for all, in short, the application of the Golden Rule, as enunciated by our forefathers, there would be no problems to solve and the difficulties now existing among nations to agree on the methods of establishing peace would disappear into thin air. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case and for that reason we must redouble our determination that there must be no compromise on principles. If we are to attain a just and lasting peace and not only empty settlements devoid of equity, such as was the case following the First World War, we must stand our ground.

We should be fortified, however, by the valiant stand taken by our representatives since the opening of peace deliberations. Imbued as they are in the great doctrine handed down to posterity by Roger Williams and his noble followers, they have refused categorically to compromise on principles, despite the fact that they fully realized that their determination would probably cause the conferences to adjourn without definite accomplishments. Yet, if nothing else was achieved, the world has been placed on notice as to just where we stand and we may rest assured that further negotiations will be undertaken on the assumption that, like Roger Williams, we will tolerate no shackles upon the human spirit and no limit to the freedom of human rights.

We are most fortunate, yes, we should be most thankful that our country from its very inception was blessed with men such as Rhode Island's Roger Williams and we should strive to emulate their devotion to God, country, and to every living person the world over not only in this great crisis but also in all our future decisions that this country may continue to be the great Nation which our forefathers meant it to be from its birth. Finally, let us pray God to continue to grant His guidance and strength of character and soul not only to our national leaders but also to all who may be called upon to decide on the destiny of mankind.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in his discussion of the abuses that have taken place in some of the departments with regard to the upgrading of personnel. I can well understand that in many cases there have been good reasons for some of this upgrading but I am confident that there have been abuses and that the provision which has been inserted in the bill is in the public interest.

I do not know that I ever rose on the floor to defend the departments of Government, but I do think in fairness it should be said that the departments are not wholly responsible for most of these deficiencies which are in this bill. In March and in May of last year, as well as upon other dates, we passed legislation increasing benefits to veterans and increasing the pay of Federal employees. By reason of those acts which were passed by the Congress, it was necessary for the departments to comply with the law and pay these additional sums and they had to come up here for money to pay the obligations which we authorized. It was necessary therefore to go through this procedure.

Mr. Chairman, it should be said in commendation of some of the departments that they were very successful in absorbing many of these increased costs which we, the Congress, imposed upon them. I direct to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas, page 13 of the bill, title II, which reads as follows:

Increased pay costs: For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 to meet increased pay costs authorized by—

And then there are cited the various acts of Congress passed last year and the additional sums of money required. So it was necessary for the committee to do a lot of work and the departments to do a lot of work in order to comply with these acts of Congress. That is the major reasons why it is necessary for so many of these things to be considered and this situation is not adequate cause for criticism on either side of the aisle, as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the committee and the House the situation in veterans hospitals. I have made inquiry and I am told there is nothing in this bill with reference to hospitalization.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has had General Hawley, the chief medical officer, before the committee twice lately, last week and again this week. He advised us that he had 5,714 beds which he could not now operate because he did not have sufficient personnel to do it. The beds are in some 17 States and the number not in operation runs all the way from 15 up to as high as 700 per hospital.

This information was rather startling to me. I doubt that the membership as a whole has this information. It was not known by the Veterans' Committee until a few days ago.

General Hawley told us that he has these 5,714 beds now that he cannot operate because he does not have the personnel, the nurses, doctors, the attendants, to operate them. They are in hospitals scattered all over the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that must have attention. General Hawley also advises us that under the ceiling of employment according to which he has to operate now after July 1 and in the ensuing fiscal year there will not only be the 5,714 beds empty, of no use to anybody because he cannot operate them, but that this number will be increased to 9,700 approximately. I bring this up at this time to ask the Appropriations Committee to give consideration to this hospital situation. I earnestly appeal to that great committee to ascertain from General Hawley the amount of money he needs now to secure the necessary personnel to operate all of these 5,714 beds for the remainder of the current fiscal year and also to ascertain what sums will be necessary, in addition to present budget estimates for the coming fiscal year, to operate not only the 5,714 not now operated but also the additional beds which he says he will have to close under present budget estimates. As matters now stand, his testimony is to the effect that he will have approximately 9,700 beds lying idle after July 1 unless Congress provides more funds to operate them. That places the responsibility clearly on Congress to do something about it, and Congress must look to the Appropriations Committee to bring the proper bills to the floor to meet the situation. That is why I am urging

it now, and I appeal for early action by the Appropriations Committee.

I have asked General Hawley to give our committee the exact figures of the number of beds that will not be operated in the next fiscal year and also the amount of money which in his opinion will be required to operate those beds. The information I have just given you was elicited at our hearings and please do not blame General Hawley. He answered questions. The information he gave us was startling, and that is why I am revealing it to you. But he tells us frankly that the trouble is twofold. He does not have the help and he does not have the help because he has not got the money. He thinks he could get the help if he had the money.

Now, gentlemen, I believe in economy, but I do not want this Congress to fail to provide the Veterans' Administration with enough money to staff the beds in our hospitals for veterans. We are trying even to build more hospitals. We want to do that. We have about 103,000 beds now and we are trying to build more hospitals and get more beds for the veterans, and yet we do not have the money to staff the beds that we now have. That is a serious situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Navy was requested by the Veterans' Administration to make some beds available to it last year sometime, approximately 10,000, and that the deficiency bill on which we adopted the conference report a couple of days ago carried funds to reimburse the Navy for 7,000 unused beds for which the Navy had provided the attendants to take care of the veteran patients, only to find that the Veterans' Administration then said they did not need them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I will say to the gentleman that it is entirely possible that these beds do not meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration in peacetime. I doubt these hospitals meet the standards for the Federal Board of Hospitalization; in other words, they do not meet the standards for care for veterans, and what the Veterans' Committee is trying to do—and let me say right here parenthetically that there is no blame attached to the Veterans' Administration. General Hawley, in my opinion, is one of the finest medical men in the United States. In my opinion, he is one of the greatest men in the entire Federal service, and I do not blame him for one thing that has happened, because he had his hands tied by the ceilings on employment which have been placed upon him. As I understand it, there all the trouble lies. Of course, the ceilings were placed because of the limitation of funds. What we are trying to do, may I say to the gentleman from South Dakota, is to establish a solid veterans' hospitalization program here with hospitals that will meet the standards, hospitals that will not be firetraps for our veterans. We are trying to provide them with the best hospitals that we can. And when these hospitals are provided, we want them staffed with sufficient doctors, nurses, attendants, and other necessary personnel to operate all the beds in every hospital. There is no point in building hospitals unless we make provision for the full operation of all beds.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just want to say to the gentleman that the expenditures for salaries and expenses for this fiscal year figured up on the basis of $887,000,000; the appropriation was $894,000,000, or a $7,000,000 margin, and General Hawley told us that his difficulty in filling up those beds and keeping them operated was that he could not get the help to do it. He said that at the time he was up before us. Now, we have had no budget estimate, no ceilings have been placed upon it by the budget, and we have had nothing presented to us by the Veterans' Administration. There is not a single request there of any kind from anybody that has not been acted on with reference to the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is probably true that General Hawley has not gone to the Appropriations Committee, of which the able gentleman is chairman, but I think I can answer that by saying this, that General Hawley has had a ceiling placed upon his employment, and he has not asked for more for that reason. If the Appropriations Committee will call General Hawley before it, I am sure he will give it the same information that he did our committee and I urge that that be done.

He has had a ceiling. I think it well here to quote from the record of the hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee just a few days ago, April 25. General Hawley was testifying and had been asked by me about this bed situation. I quote:

> Mr. ALLEN. You have indicated, you have not said exactly, but you have indicated that you are simply not getting enough money, that is what it amounts to, to do that.
>
> Dr. HAWLEY. We won't under the ceilings.
>
> Mr. ALLEN. You are operating under a ceiling, and you are not going to be able to operate the beds you have got until Congress gives you more money.
>
> Dr. HAWLEY. I think that states it rather exactly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask the gentleman whether it was not the budget that placed the ceiling?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I want to be perfectly fair. I think there is a lot in what the gentlewoman indicates.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think there is everything in it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am not trying to lay any particular blame anywhere, but I say this: If the blame lies upon the Budget Bureau, if the blame lies upon this Congress, upon either side of the aisle in this Congress, then let the blame fall where it belongs. We have got to see about these veterans. When General Hawley says he must close nearly 10,000 beds unless he gets more money to operate them, it is time to do something about it. That is why I hope very much that the Appropriations Committee of the House will lose no time in getting from General Hawley the information it desires and bringing to this floor legislation to prevent closing beds.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, who has always done so much for the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Congress is not bound by what the Budget Bureau says, at any rate. This is a legislative body. We are not a subbureaucracy.

I was very much surprised at one statement made by General Hawley that I think the House ought to know. It was estimated a few years ago that it cost $3 a day to hospitalize a veteran in a veterans' hospital. General Hawley said yesterday, if I heard him correctly, and the gentleman from Louisiana was listening and he can correct me, that it now costs $8 a day to hospitalize a veteran in one of our veterans' hospitals.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Eight dollars and thirty-four cents, I think.

Mr. RANKIN. A little more than $8, and that it costs $14 a day to hospitalize a veteran in one of these hospitals that have been taken over from the Army and Navy. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That was substantially his testimony.

Mr. RANKIN. So you may say that the expense of hospitalizing veterans has gone up by leaps and bounds. General Hawley was complaining, and justly complaining, that he was unable, owing to this ceiling to which the gentleman from Louisiana refers, to secure the medical and nursing staff to supply this number of beds—I believe, 5,700 empty beds.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. This Congress represents the people. We are elected by the people. I never have subscribed to the philosophy that the Congress of the United States—the direct representatives of the people—should be bound by what a set of men down there who constitute the Budget Bureau tell us we should do or should not do. I have always taken that position when my party was in power, and I still take that position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was very much interested in what the gentleman from South Dakota said about these unused beds that the Navy Department offered General Hawley. What

I am going to say may be rank heresy here, but I only wish I could have the high admiration for General Hawley that the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Mississippi have. I have gone over to him repeatedly trying to get him to use a naval hospital that is lying idle in Oklahoma, when we have 700 veterans down there. He tells me that there are no veterans awating hospitalization, but I know there are 700 of them. I want him to get his own house in order. I told him, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that if it is a question of money we will get it for him, but let him get his facts straight and come up here and present them in such a way that we can do something for the veterans of this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. There are two sides to that question. I have great admiration for General Hawley. I think that he is one of the very best medical men in the United States. I have confidence in him as a man and as a doctor. I have worked with him closely since he assumed the great responsibility in the Veterans' Administration of looking after the great hospital program, and I propose to back him up with my vote, if I have an opportunity, to provide him funds to operate the hospital beds fully.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I want to go back to the budget a little bit and ask whether it is not very difficult for a department or a division of a department to approach congressional committees after the Budget has cut them. There is a wall between the department and the Congress at that point that is most difficult to leap over. I have been up against that same wall when the Budget was cut. It is very difficult to find why the Budget cut it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. What the gentlewoman has been referring to has been sort of a muzzle that has been placed upon them. I do not like that. She does not like it, and I do not think anyone likes it.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say how grateful I am to the gentleman for expressing himself in that manner.

Mr. RANKIN. The Budget just submits estimates.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the only ceiling that the Congress has placed directly upon the Veterans' Administration that I know anything about was the ceiling that we placed upon their publicity men in the deficiency appropriation bill that was passed here a few weeks ago.

Members of the House will recall that testimony before the committee showed that prior to July 1, 1945, there were eight men employed as public-relations men with the Veterans' Administration. As of January 30 of this year, we found that the Veterans' Administration had 281 public-relations men. The Deficiency Committee suggested to the Veterans' Administration a ceiling of 100 public-relations men.

That is the only instance that I know anything about where the Congress or the Committee on Appropriations has put any personnel limitation upon the Veterans' Administration.

I would like to suggest to the Veterans' Administration and General Hawley that if they would make a little better application of their personnel ceiling, instead of putting on 281 public-relations men they should put on hospital corpsmen or attendants, and they might have some of the hospital services that the gentleman from Louisiana says they need.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Were the 281 public-relations men entirely for the hospital organization?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They were for the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, but that is General Bradley. That is not for the hospitals. That is why I am inquiring to make that clear.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The lady is making it clear that if General Hawley wants to do something about the ceiling problem, he should take up with the Veterans' Administration the application of the ceiling which the Bureau of the Budget placed on them.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The ceiling that the Veterans' Administration has is given them by the Budget Bureau and not by the Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am talking about the men in the hospitals. I am not talking about the publicity agents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, but I am saying that if the Veterans' Administration is allowed only so many employees by the Budget Bureau, they had better allocate them to General Hawley and to the hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration rather than to the publicity branch. I must decline to yield time further. If the gentleman wants to go further into this, he might find out why it is that in some of the hospitals where they had only 16 janitors a while ago they now have 64. He might find out why the Veterans' Administration increased the allocation for janitors out of this personnel ceiling instead of making the allocation for hospital corpsmen. There may be a good reason; I do not know.

He might also go back to the Bureau of the Budget and ask the Bureau of the Budget why they do not increase the Veterans' Administration ceiling instead of giving more to some of the other agencies of the Government. But that is not a matter that has been fixed by the Congress. I repeat, the only instance in which the Congress has acted so far as a ceiling for the Veterans' Administration is concerned is to put a ceiling upon the public relations personnel.

Going back to this matter of Navy beds, so far as I am concerned I want to see every veteran who needs hospitalization get it. But, if there is a shortage of veterans' hospital personnel and General Hawley finds himself unable either by reason of the Budget Bureau's ceiling or by reason of a shortage of competent men to man the hospitals I do not see why he should have refused to use the 7,000 beds which the Navy got ready for him and had the men to service them to the extent the Navy had to come before the Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation to pay the men who manned these 7,000 beds. There is no dispute about that. The House approved the conference report providing the funds day before yesterday. In that bill there was money for the Navy to take care of the salaries for the nurses, doctors, and other attendants in these hospitals and these empty beds for which the Veterans' Administration had not reimbursed them. They got them ready as a part of 10,000 requested for the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration did not use them. Consequently, the Navy found them still a charge against their pay roll. So, the admirals had to come in and ask for extra money to take care of them. That is the situation and that is the record.

Now, while we are straightening out a few records, I want to go back to the discussion which took place a little earlier, with reference to the record that is being made by the Appropriations Committee.

There are four things which I think should be set forth definitely in the RECORD as a part of the discussion about the status of appropriation bills. Four things that should be known by Members of the House.

The first thing is that we had a reorganization of the Congress, which was not the responsibility of this particular Congress. Under the Reorganization Act which was passed by a preceding Congress, the Congress had to reorganize its committee. This should also be said for the record, that the new majority of this House, the Republicans, completed their committee assignments under the Reorganization Act 4 days before the minority members completed their committee assignments. The committees on the Republican side were organized, and their assignments were completed 4 days earlier than those on the minority side.

The second thing is that when you have a new Congress, Appropriations Committee hearings are necessarily held over until the new Congress is organized. That, of course, would be particularly true where you have a change in administration. This coming winter, I assume that some of the appropriation subcommittees will conduct hearings in December. That has been true, customarily. Ordinarily, when the Congress assembles in the January of a midyear of a congressional term, we have two or three subcommittee bills that are ready to go. That is because the members of those subcommittees come here in December and conduct hearings so that their bills are ready. That is possible in a midyear of a congressional term because you know who the members of a committee are going to be. But when you go from one Congress to another, the members of the committee are not fixed. Members

of a committee in one Congress have no jurisdiction to conduct hearings on a bill and report it to a new Congress. You might have some informal hearings but you could not be certain who would be on the committee in a new Congress.

With a change in the control of the Congress, obviously the chairmen of the subcommittees in the Seventy-ninth Congress would not be the chairmen of the subcommittees in a Republican Congress. So, consequently, no hearings could be held in December or until the new committees were organized.

Then, when we came into session with the Eightieth Congress, we were confronted with the results of the Reorganization Act. The first thing it required was that the Appropriation Committee, not later than the 15th of February, should report a resolution to the Congress proposing a legislative budget ceiling. Upon completion of the committee assignments, the members addressed themselves to the preparation of that report. Personally, I believed, and I said at the time, that I thought we should have considered that responsibility ended when that resolution was reported to the Congress. The act did not require the Congress to act upon it. The act did not require either body of the Congress to consider it. It merely required the Appropriations Committee to report a resolution to the Congress with recommendations, which we did. But, in any event, as a result of that situation, time was taken until the 15th of February, approximately, before the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee could address themselves to the task of conducting hearings on the several bills. And this delay in hearings due to setting up under the Reorganization Act is the second thing to be kept in mind.

Then a third thing interfered with the work of the Appropriations Committee this year. I am sure, in all fairness, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would be one of the first to admit this.

That was the necessary change in the clerical staff of the committees. During the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Appropriations Committee suffered the loss of a man who had been an employee of the committee and its trusted chief clerk for a great many years. That is Marc Shield, a man whose contribution to the work of the Appropriations Committee through a number of years can never be measured or adequately rewarded, in my judgment. He was succeeded by a very able man, John Pugh, also of long experience. It was assumed, of course, that when this Congress convened and the committee organized, we would have the services of John Pugh and the staff he had developed during the latter part of the Seventy-ninth Congress. But shortly after Congress assembled, due to a personal situation which was beyond the control of anyone, Mr. Pugh found it necessary to resign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That resulted in calling in Mr. Harvey, who is an experienced man, who is a very able man, and who is doing a splendid job, but it meant a reorganization of the clerical staff of the committee all along the line. We had also lost the services of Jim Scanlon, the chief editor. Necessarily, these changes, not one of which was sought by the committee or its chairman, resulted in interruptions of the work of the various subcommittees, and reorganizations within the clerical staff of the Appropriations Committee. Each shift required some time for readjustment.

The fourth thing that should be taken into consideration in considering the reporting of bills by the Appropriations Committee is that we are now trying to sift these bills and get back to a peacetime basis. I think this morning was the sixth day that the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department has spent on the job of marking up the appropriation bill for the War Department since we concluded several weeks of hearings. The budget estimate for the War Department bill this year is about $5,700,000,000. I can remember in the old days when the Congress had such a majority on one side that it generally passed appropriation bills about the way they came up, that we marked up much larger appropriation bills for the War Department in a single forenoon's session. Now we are getting away from that and considering projects, item by item. That takes time.

When the record is written at the end of the session it will be found that we have gone into the budget estimates very carefully; yet you will find that the appropriation bills will have cleared this Congress as early as they have in Congresses of recent memory in spite of the fact that we were able to have no hearings in December and that we had the Reorganization Act to contend with the first 6 weeks of the session.

When the whole story is written, I believe the people of the country will be pleased with the record of the Appropriations Committee of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], who is chairman of the subcommittee that was hearing General Hawley on yesterday, is not present. I do not understand that it was the Congress that placed the ceiling of which General Hawley complained.

Mr. TABER. No; it would be the budget which placed the ceiling upon employees. The budget, however, has not fixed any ceilings on the Veterans' Administration. They have on other agencies but not on the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not understand that he was complaining of any ceiling placed by Congress, because I do not understand that we placed any ceiling on the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I do not think I said a ceiling had been placed by Congress, but General Hawley did tell us that he was operating under a ceiling. I think the ceiling probably was fixed by the Budget Bureau if it was fixed by anybody.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have in my hand a copy of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, which carried the so-called Dirksen amendment which established a personnel ceiling for the various branches of the Government. It will be recalled, however, that we did not place a ceiling on the Veterans' Administration. I read from subparagraph 3 of section 14 of this act. It reads as follows:

> The provisions of the said paragraph shall not apply with respect to officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department or the officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been my position ever since I have been on the Veterans' Committee—and I am the only Member of Congress who was on it when it was first organized—it has been my contention that our first duty is to the disabled veteran. I take no stock in this idea that any Member of Congress is against the veteran because every Member of Congress I have ever known had sympathy for the servicemen of the country. It is a question of doing what is best for them and at the same time doing justice to the taxpayers of the Nation. My understanding is that General Hawley was complaining that under this alleged ceiling he was not able to employ the physicians and nurses necessary to man these extra 5,700 empty beds that ought to be in operation at the present time. As far as I am individually concerned if General Hawley will let us know how much is necessary for these doctors I shall be glad to vote for it. The fact of the matter is I would rather do that than to establish a TVA along the Danube or a flood-control project on the Ganges or an irrigation program along the Orinoco. I think it is about time we got back home and looked after our own people. And of all the people we should look after in this country it is the disabled veterans.

I think that is the way every other Member of Congress feels. I do not say that in criticism of anyone; I say that from what I know of the situation. As I see it, the Veterans' Administration, probably under direction of the Budget, has fixed a ceiling that Congress is not bound to respect. When General Hawley shows us the amount of money that is necessary to secure the physicians and nurses to carry on and to man those 5,700 extra beds, I am sure the Congress will be glad to see that he gets the money.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I sat in on the hearings held yesterday by the subcommittee on hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs presided over by the gentleman

from New York [Mr. KEARNEY]. I believe General Hawley meant the ceiling placed by the Budget Director as a result of President Truman's order to cut the various departments 6 months ago. But certainly in cutting the various departments the veterans should not be hurt.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. His statement in substance to us was this, that he did not have personnel to operate the 5,700 beds that are now vacant. When I asked him why he could not operate them he told us he did not have the money. He testified that he could get the personnel if he had the money. Without undertaking to say specifically where the ceiling blame lies, it was plainly indicated he was operating under a ceiling that would not now permit him to get the personnel and after the new fiscal year starts on July 1 he will have to close more beds and there will be a total of about 9,400 beds that he cannot operate after that time unless he gets the money.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. We have not had hearings on the appropriation for the next fiscal year and nobody has attempted to fix any ceiling on it. They have not even got their final budget estimate up here for us yet.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the Administrator has a great deal of difficulty with those budgets. For instance, with reference to estimates that are sent to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding costs, I will read some figures that were given to our committee as the costs of the Kearney bill, H. R. 246, reported unanimously quite a good many weeks ago by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and for which the committee has been trying to secure a rule. The Rules Committee has promised a hearing. It should be granted at once.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the cost of increasing the ceiling provision would amount to $149,688,000. Their basis for this estimate is that they anticipate 675,000 veterans per month in on-the-job training for the fiscal year 1948. They studied 20 percent of the veterans in the present program as of July 31, 1946, or about 120,000, and they arrived at an average unit increase of $18.48 per man per month under the provisions of H. R. 246. They have multiplied $18.46 by 12 months by 675,000.

The Veterans' Administration points out that the resulting figure of $149,688,000 does not include an unknown number of additional veterans who would be attracted to on-the-job training because of higher ceilings. The estimate of 675,000 veterans in on-the-job training under Public Law 346 for the fiscal year 1948 may be high, and I am inclined to think that it is. The average for January, February, and March, 1947, is 626,994 veterans in training. If this average prevails throughout fiscal 1948 the estimated cost of the ceiling provision in H. R. 246, based on the Veterans' Administration own increased unit-cost figure, would be $139,042,189.

I find this discrepancy in amounts in a great many reports coming from the Veterans' Administration. General Bradley takes the figures of his statisticians, and the amounts are always high, and clearly, I think, they are high in this Report No. 77, on H. R. 246. It is important to take the Veterans' Administration figures, if possible, in reporting Veterans' Administration bills to the Congress, but not if they are inaccurate.

Then the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has another report which goes with the Wheeler bill, H. R. 2181. The gentleman from Kansas, Congressman MEYER, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman JOHNSON, introduced companion bills. H. R. 2181 came out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously some time ago; the subcommittee reported it first and then the main committee. I have had a statistician working on these figures which I have quoted and they are not figments of my own imagination.

As to institutional on-farm training, there is no difference in the cost of the present law and the proposed bill, namely, $117,000,000, but the Veterans' Administration states that if a new bill were made to conform with General Bradley's directive of August 26, 1946, since rescinded because of public disapproval, the cost would be reduced $48,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman two additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is fantastic the way the Veterans' Administration goes about saying why it costs more, and the costs are not more under the directive they are operating on. The Veterans' Administration admitted before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs that with this directive now in force and upon which the bill is based we would simply be enacting into law what the Veterans' Administration is doing today—and if I am incorrect I will ask the authors of the bills to correct me.

Mr. WHEELER. Merely stabilizing the present program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct, and that is costing an average of $117,000,000 per year. On top of all this, the Veterans' Administration's 1948 budget calls for $117,000,000—exactly what they are operating on today.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachuetts. Yes; I shall be glad to yield. We are all very much interested in this bill, and I know that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a former member of this committee, Judge CUNNINGHAM, is very much interested in it also.

Mr WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. In the bill to which the gentlewoman refers there is no justification for its costing any more money whatsoever. It merely spells out for the Veterans' Administration the present law in such a way as to stabilize the vocational-training program for veterans. There is no justification for any increased expenditure whatsoever.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have other reports here which I will not give, but I have had a feeling that if the Veterans' Administration were made into an executive department and given backing and stability you would have a very much happier personnel—a much more efficient organization. The Veterans' Administration would have much more prestige—much more standing. The head of the department would undoubtedly be a Cabinet member, and that Cabinet member would sit in on the Cabinet meetings. They perhaps would borrow personnel from other departments. I have a great liking for General Bradley and I feel that he is being pushed here and pushed there and pushed the other place. There is new personnel coming in and I think they do not get on too well with the personnel of the old Veterans' Administration. As a result, General Bradley is caught in the middle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Salaries and expenses," War Assets Administration, $75,000,000, to be derived from the special fund account in the Treasury established by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word about the item in this bill providing a $75,000,000 deficiency appropriation for the War Assets Administration.

In my opinion we would be doing a greater service to the veterans, to the taxpayer, and to everyone concerned if we would take this provision out of the bill, order the War Assets Administration liquidated at once, and turn the sale of surplus property over to the Army or Navy or some other agency that can do a good job of it. The reason I say that is this:

I have evidence that the War Assets Administration is not aiding the veteran. I placed in the RECORD today, and it will appear in the Appendix tomorrow, a letter from a veteran of World War II which shows clearly just how the veterans are being given the run-around in their attempt to buy surplus property from the War Assets Administration. The experience of this veteran, I find, is the same as the experience of many others. In the final analysis, the only place he could get what he wanted to buy from his own Government that he fought for was from a speculator to whom it had been sold by the War Assets Administration.

Several months ago a garage operator and automobile distributor in the town of Knoxville, Iowa, received a circular

from the War Assets Administration, or a branch of it in Chicago, itemizing equipment that they were to sell on a certain day. It specified the room number, the building, and the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning. This garage operator sent one of his men into Chicago at his own expense to bid on these articles. When he arrived at this particular room a little before 10 o'clock there were several dozen other men there just like him, representing their employers from throughout the Middle West. The office door was locked. There was no one there. They waited until about 11 o'clock. Then a man showed up and said the sale was being held in another room in another building several blocks away. When they got to the building it was all over, the surplus property had been sold to speculators. He went back home. A few weeks later his employer got another circular advertising more material. His employer again sent him back to Chicago and again he had exactly the same experience. He went back home. His employer was disgusted and would not pay any attention to any more circulars.

A few days later he received a circular from an outfit in Chicago that had purchased this material from the War Assets Administration offering to sell it to him for several times what it had been advertised for by the War Assets Administration. I say the War Assets Administration operating along those lines is not giving any service to the taxpayers or businessmen or anyone who is supposed to be benefited by it, and we would be better off if we liquidated the War Assets Administration at once.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Have you ever heard of a case of a veteran ever getting anything from the War Assets Administration?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have not.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I know of a case where a veteran paid $750 for a truck and when he came to get it, it did not have any wheels or motor in it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I know of cases where veterans have pooled together and acted as a combine for someone behind the scenes and they have gotten material that way. But the individual veteran cannot get anything. The purpose of the Congress in establishing the War Assets Administration was to help the veteran.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman stated that the War Assets Administration was doing a poor job for the veteran. I would say that they are just doing a poor job, period.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They are not doing any job at all for the people.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I overhear the gentleman from Wisconsin on the side asking whether I am rising to defend the War Assets Administration. Not particularly, I will say to the gentleman, but I think the record should be clear with respect to what the $75,000,000 was for, in view of the statement that has been made. During the Seventy-ninth Congress the War Assets Administration submitted a budget estimate for $105,000,000 to permit them to reimburse the War Department and the Navy Department and other agencies of the Government for taking care of property after it has been declared surplus until disposed of. That was the amount of money they estimated last year would be necessary for the War Assets Administration to reimburse these other agencies of the Government.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Seventy-ninth Congress thought that figure was pretty large and that some money might be saved on it. So they suggested, and it was incorporated in one of the deficiency bills passed last year, the third deficiency appropriation bill for 1946, I believe, that the War Assets Administration should go ahead and incur the caretaking obligations but try to keep them down as low as possible and then report their needs to the next Congress for the amount of money necessary. It develops that the War Assets Administration is able to take care of about $25,000,000 of the obligations out of their other funds and that the total amount of obligations is about $100,000,000 instead of $105,000,000. So, they are taking care of $25,000,000 out of funds otherwise appropriated to the War Assets Administration and they are here receiving $75,000,000. In other words, the action of the Committee on Appropriations heretofore in handling it in this way has resulted in a net saving to the Government of $30,000,000.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But there is nothing in this appropriation bill that would compel the War Assets Administration to do the job as it should do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that would require legislation, if it could be done at all, and this is an appropriation bill. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, however, that during the hearings on the War Assets Administration I presented a tentative draft of a bill to the Director, Major General Littlejohn, proposing that the War Assets Administration should conduct auction sales and terminate its entire activities and liquidate by the 30th of June. The gentleman may be interested in seeing the comment that was made on that proposal. I share with the gentleman from Iowa the feeling that there is room for great improvement in the handling of surplus property.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. From the experience with the War Assets Administration I have been led to believe that they do not want to dispose of anything bigger than an Army blanket because that would eventually lead to the dissolution of their empire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman may be interested in reading the hearings and seeing how they sought to sell some large Constellation planes, by putting five-column advertisements in newspapers of general circulation. I suggest that a reading of the hearings would be enlightening to many Members. There is no question but that the handling of surplus property is a difficult job and I am not sure that Congress made the job any simpler by the large number of objectives stated in the basic act. Personally, I think there is much to be said for winding up the operation at an early date.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I should like to speak with regard to this War Assets Administration also. I do not know exactly where the fault lies, but the first bill which gave veterans priority in the purchase of surplus property was introduced in the Senate by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and by myself in the House. It finally came out as the Manasco bill in the House. I, too, agree it is very difficult for the veterans to get any priorities in purchases from the War Assets Administration. Also, it is very difficult for the veterans to secure priority on the Lanham Act in the purchase of permanent Government housing. I tried to secure some legislation last year for that purpose. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Judge WOLCOTT, says that his committee is considering a bill giving the veterans priority in the purchase of Government-owned apartment buildings, for instance here in Washington. After the agitation that went on here, veterans were allowed to pool together to buy the Fairlington Apartment project, but they never were able to buy McLean Gardens. I should be very sorry if the War Assets Administration should sell property without giving the veterans a priority opportunity to purchase or that the Congress should authorize that that be one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my experience with the War Assets Administration has not been as disastrous as that indicated by some of my colleagues.

At Prairie in the district I represent, the Gulf Ordnance plant was located during the war. It was a shell-loading plant. When the war closed they had some of the finest machine shops there I have ever seen. The Mississippi State College is about 28 miles away, and they asked me to help them get some of that machinery. I went over and looked over the plant. I called the board of trustees of the institution, I communicated with the Governor, and I said the best thing I saw to do was to get that entire plant transformed into a training school for veterans, and also for other young men who were to come on in the future.

You know, we have become top-heavy with our education in this country. We have trained our students how to keep from work for a long time. I wanted a place that would train the young men who had to work. Well, we had a great deal of correspondence and several trips were made to Washington by the interested men, but we finally succeeded in getting that plant set up, and today there are between 700 and 1,000 ex-servicemen

there getting the training they need to prepare them to make a living with their own hands in the years to come.

I do not know about these individual propositions that have been mentioned. I have had complaints from men who tried to get automobiles and trucks and so forth. I have also assisted them as best I could. Some of them were successful and some were not. But I want to say to you that the one thing I worked most on was to get this training school, these buildings and the machinery, the waterworks, the sewage system, fire department, and everything else that was already there, to get it for the benefit of these young men who were coming back from the war and who needed training to prepare them for their avocations in life. I succeeded, and I had the full cooperation of the War Assets Administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman should be commended upon the success he attained. I think what he proved is that it is easier to get the War Assets Administration to give something away than it is to sell something to a veteran.

Mr. RANKIN. If you have a plant in South Dakota it would not hurt the War Assets Administration and it would not hurt the Federal Government for them to donate that plant to help train servicemen in South Dakota, who are going to need that training for their future avocations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that in South Dakota the State superintendent of public instruction put a man on his staff to act as an agent for the several schools of the State which pool their requests and operate through him. I think they have been doing about the same thing the gentleman suggests.

Mr. RANKIN. That is a very fine program and I commend the gentleman on it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I wish to commend the gentleman on his success in that instance, but I also want to say that I have interceded for teachers' colleges in my State who wanted a part of the equipment that War Assets had and they were unable to get it because War Assets was too anxious to sell it to these other fellows.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I have heard similar reports from others also, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, but I merely wanted to relate to the House my experience in trying to get an institution established; and it was not altogether a donation either, the State has some responsibilities, but I am getting an institution established that will help train the man who has to work for a living in the years to come.

Unless we have institutions to train the young men and women of America who are going to have to do the work in this complex mechanical age, we are not going to make the progress we should make in the years that lie ahead of us.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Relief of needy Indians (tribal funds): For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Relief of needy Indians (tribal funds)," $50,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of the particular tribe interested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 8, line 7, strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That surplus potatoes purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture may be made available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for seed and for the relief of needy Indians and that any funds appropriated for the welfare or relief of needy Indians shall be available for the transportation of potatoes so supplied."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have submitted this amendment to the chairman of the committee and also to the ranking minority member, and I believe it is agreeable to both. It does not provide for any additional appropriation, but merely for the use of surplus potatoes the Government has already purchased.

As everyone knows, the Government has bought large quantities of potatoes under the support program. Some of them are being used for overseas relief, but shipping costs are such that only a limited number can be used efficiently that way. The committee was told by Mr. Herbert Hoover and others that it was cheaper to buy wheat than to use these potatoes owing to shipping costs and relative food values. Much of the potato is water, as everyone knows, and the potato is bulky and heavy.

On the other hand, large quantities of these potatoes will go to waste and eventually spoil or be disposed of for fertilizer use. Under existing law, these potatoes can be made available for certain relief clients and many tons are so being handled. Large quantities remain, however. In my own State, at Watertown, for example, we were told a few weeks ago that 800 000 bushels were stored and that a large amount of them would go to waste. Inquiry at the Department of Agriculture developed that a limited quantity could be made available to feed people who were receiving assistance, but that existing law would not permit them to be supplied to persons for planting.

On one Indian reservation in my district the superintendent estimated that they could use one carload for relief if it was required that they be used for food only, but that they could use six carloads if they could also be used for seed. These potatoes otherwise will spoil and eventually the Government will pay someone to haul them away to get rid of the rotting mess.

It only makes common sense to permit the Indians to use them for seed as well as relief feeding, thereby contributing to a probable lessening of relief needs next winter.

The amendment makes such use possible. It does not appropriate a single dollar of new money. It seeks to salvage money already expended.

The chairman and the ranking minority members of the Appropriations Committee have already assured me they had no objection to the amendment, and I feel sure the House will concur in approval. I appreciate the favorable consideration that has been given.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there being no amendments, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and to include some tables.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Inglewood Daily News of Inglewood, Calif.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROPHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next immediately after the reading of the Journal I have 1 hour allotted me which will be used in observance of Polish Constitution Day. If any Members of Congress want to participate in that observance they will be welcome to use part of the hour.

Mr. Speaker, I have a speaking engagement in the Dominion of Canada on Sunday and I doubt that I shall be back on Monday in time for this observance. I ask unanimous consent that the hour allotted to me be allotted the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] who will act in my stead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 205, Rept. No. 335), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 9 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 2616 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 2616.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anything said on the floor of this House since the Congress convened on January 3 about Federal aid to the public schools of this Nation.

All over the country we are impressed almost daily with the need for Federal aid, and yet there seems to be a spirit of complacency and inaction among those in the Congress who should rise up in support of legislation for this important movement.

I might say that the school teachers of America and the parent-teacher associations have long been the principal factor in molding favorable public opinion on this subject, and it seems now that they will probably have to come into play once more in a very active way to remind Congress of these educational needs.

It is argued by opponents of Federal aid that they do not approve of Government interference in our State school system. This argument is nullified by the fact that there are bills now pending in the Congress which clearly forbid Government interference. In fact, I should say that the proper construction upon this legislation should be unrestricted Federal contribution to schools for the reason that it amounts to a contribution to the school system without any right to dictate school policies. It is an outright unconditional gift.

I know that all of us realize the need for such a gift now to a great number of the States.

In the last Congress bills substantially the same as are now pending in this Congress were under consideration, but for one reason or another the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned without approving a single bill on this subject.

One of the educational committees of the Seventy-ninth Congress did hold hearings on these bills. I wish every person in this Nation could read the report of the committee. It is astounding in many respects, yet no one will dare challenge its truthfulness.

A significant statement of the report says:

> For the country as a whole 2 percent of the young men registered between May and September 1941 could not sign their names. In five States from 8 to 14 percent marked their registration cards with an "X." All five of these States were among those with limited educational opportunities.
>
> In August of 1945 the Selective Service System reported that 676,300 men between the ages of 18 and 37 were rejected for educational and mental deficiencies. On the basis of earlier statements of Selective Service it can be estimated that at least 300,000 of these were rejected solely for educational deficiencies. Among the remainder the principal cause for rejection was educational deficiency but it was accompanied by other disqualifying defects. Thus in the hour of the Nation's greatest need there was an equivalent of 20 combat divisions unable to serve because of illiteracy and other educational deficiencies. General Marshall's report shows that we used 22 combat divisions in the South Pacific operations.

It will be further observed that as high as 22 percent were rejected in some States by the selective service because of educational deficiencies.

Are these facts alone not sufficient to demand action now in behalf of proper educational legislation?

It is argued by some that the cost of Federal aid is so great that we cannot afford it at the present time. I take issue with this holding.

One of the bills provides for an initial appropriation of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $200,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $250,000,000. It will be noted, therefore, that beginning in 1950 an annual appropriation thereafter will be made by the Congress in the sum of $250,000,000, to be apportioned among the States according to wealth and number of school students.

In terms of appropriations for many things of no greater import, these figures are comparatively small.

This country has contributed more than $3,345,000,000 to foreign relief, of which $2,700,000,000 was given to UNRRA. Of this vast sum, practically every suffering nation on earth received a substantial portion. This included nearly $500,000,000 in goods of various kinds, including food and medical supplies to Yugoslavia, some of which was actually delivered there after American soldiers were shot down on the flimsy pretense or excuse that they had veered from their course and were trespassing upon the sovereignty of the country America spilled her blood to save.

Another $500,000,000 went to Russia in like goods, some of which may have gone to sustain the Russian Army that now poses a threat to world freedom and is directly responsible for billions of dollars of expenditure of American money in the present, as well as the past succeeding appropriation bill.

Were it not for this Communist Army, that is, the Red Army of Russia, there would be enough unused money in the present appropriation bill as requested by the President to give Federal aid to public schools in an amount exceeding $5,000,000,000.

Were it not for the influences and danger of this communistic element outside the Russian borders, America could give more than $1,000,000,000 to our public school system without increasing appropriations.

The country that maintains this danger has ever since VE-day been engaged in stripping Europe of its valuables in the name of reparations. Russia has taken machinery, guns, ammunition, tools of war of all kinds, food, clothing, and every type of human necessity back to her native land. She has retained a number of ships, the property of the United States, and declined until recently to negotiate with respect to a return of them. She owes this country approximately $12,000,000,000 in lend-lease and does not have the slightest conception of paying one cent of it.

Russia's policy has broken the last economic straw of the British Empire and we find England today almost prostrate and at the mercy of this enemy of freedom.

Our President has called on this Congress to appropriate $400,000,000 for one purpose only—to save a comparatively small nation from being engulfed in communism.

I understand another $500,000,000 will be requested for Korea for the same purpose.

In addition to these expenditures, we have already loaned England and France billions of dollars and have spent untold millions in every corner of the earth, not alone to save the world from starvation but to save it from communism.

After considering all these facts, when I am told that the present Congress cannot afford to appropriate money for Federal aid to public schools, I am reminded

of the sailor's words, "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink."

It seems that we have money for every purpose except to build up our school system and educate the youth of America. Just recently I listened to a very interesting argument on the floor of this House, where some of the most influential Representatives of the majority party argued that we could not afford to appropriate money for the Federal school-lunch program.

We are economizing at the expense of the health and education of the school children of America.

I believe in the principles of charity. I am proud of the fact that my country has given substantial aid to the starving people of the world. No nation, nor any race of people, can say that America is lacking in the spirit of charity. However, I argue that it is unfair to our own home folk, to our children and to our needy when we say that we must send all these billions to other lands and yet are not in position to spend a few million dollars to stop the expansion of communism right here in our own land. I take the position that while it is well to be charitable, an even greater virtue requires that we must be just before we are charitable. It is not just to deny to our own people the greatest need in America today, the education of our youth, on the excuse that we must spend our money abroad.

All over this country of ours the school teachers, whom most of us know as the classroom teachers of America, have been required to take a most embarrassing position in order to be reasonably compensated for services rendered as a teacher. For the first time in my recollection I heard that teachers were on strike for better pay. I know this must have been a bitter pill to every one of them. I know that they would not have gone on strike had there been any other way to have brought to bear upon the proper officials the circumstances under which they labored. They are the poorest paid class of people in the United States when considered in the light of public requirements.

In the light of these requirements and the small salaries received it is interesting to observe that the school teachers paid into the Treasury approximately $200,000,000 in Federal income tax last year. Actually they did not have one single dollar to spare, yet they made these payments without complaint and in keeping with their usual spirit of patriotism. However, I think the time has come when they are entitled to be heard on their complaints. Their appeals are not alone for themselves but for your children and mine and for all America. I hope they will not go unheard and unheeded by this Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 1, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

637. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation and its subsidiary, Warrior River Terminal Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 234); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of United States Spruce Production Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, and for the period July 1, 1946, to December 12, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 235); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

640. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the conversions of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

641. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

642. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

644. A letter from the Comptroller General, United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

645. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, 1947, through March 31, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

646. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving a decrease of $20,750,000 for War Assets Administration (H. Doc. No. 236); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Senate Joint Resolution 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conference to be held in the United States in 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 205. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. R. 3301. A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators, receivers, and other fiduciary officers to take charge of the affairs of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3302. A bill to reestablish the original eleventh and twelfth Federal home-loan bank districts and to reestablish the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3303. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3304. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3305. A bill to make eligible for naturalization Japanese persons and persons of Japanese descent who are residing in the United States and whose sons died while serving in the armed forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 3306. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3307. A bill to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3308. A bill to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 3309. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that neither Congress nor any of the several States shall aid any educational institution wholly or in part under sectarian control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States forces, World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRADLEY of California:

H. Res. 203. Resolution requesting the President to remove from office John H. Fahey, Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and Harold Lee, Governor, Federal Home Loan Bank System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 204. Resolution to authorize the United States Tariff Commission to investigate the differences in costs under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on sponges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting United States citizenship for certain citizens of Guam and the enactment of an organic law for the government of the island; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to lasting world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to create the Petrified Forest National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support certain legislation beneficial to veterans and others; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BRAMBLETT introduced a bill (H. R. 3310) for the relief of Max Schlederer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

425. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Petition of 56 citizens of Athens County, Ohio, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio, and to support any other bills of a similar character; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

426. Also, petition signed by 29 employees of the Chesapeake & Ohio and the New York Central Railroads, requesting that the House of Representatives vote against H. R. 2169, H. R. 2310, and S. 670; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

427. By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to set aside forever certain tracts within the present boundaries of Vancouver Barracks, Wash., as a national monument under direction of the National Park Service, and to appropriate adequate funds for the immediate acquisition, research, and construction of buildings reproduced in detailed dimension and exactness to those previously constituting old Fort Vancouver; to the Committee on Public Lands.

428. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of approximately 450 railroad employees, urging certain amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

429. Also, petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., pertaining to the Palestine situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

430. Also, petition of New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., endorsing and urging the enactment of H. R. 1613; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

431. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. H. R. Hovde, M. D., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to change of Government policy and redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

432. Also, petition of Josef and Eugenie Geiger, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Nation-wide passive defense against atom bombing and germ warfare; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, facing the activities and the opportunities of another week, may we be eager and not reluctant. Keep us ever alert to the need for change, and open as channels for divine power. Help us to keep keen the edges of our minds, to keep our thinking straight and true. Give us the will to keep our passions in control and the common sense to keep our bodies fit and healthy, that we may be able to do what Thou hast called us to do.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 2, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE BILL

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, announcement is hereby made that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which consists of Senators SMITH, IVES, MURRAY, ELLENDER, and myself, of which subcommittee I am chairman, and which is to consider Senate bill 984, will begin open public hearings with respect to the bill on Wednesday, June 11, 1947, at 9:30 o'clock a. m. The hearings are scheduled to be held in the office of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, old Military Affairs Committee room, in the Capitol. It is hoped that the hearings may be completed in a period of 6 days, consisting of June 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 20.

Senate bill 984 is entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry." It is the desire of the subcommittee to hear both sides relative to the bill. Anyone desiring to suggest the name of any person to appear before the subcommittee should communicate with Mr. Philip R. Rodgers,

clerk of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked when the next call of the calendar for the consideration of noncontroversial bills would be had. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m. it proceed with the call of the Legislative Calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 50)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of State in the form of an amendment to the Budget, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS (S. DOC. NO. 48)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Selective Service Records amounting to $5,103,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION (S. DOC. NO. 49)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN CUSTOMS LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unlading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth report of the Attorney General covering the period from December 31, 1946, through April 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PANAMA RAILROAD PENSION FUND

A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the Panama Railroad Pension Fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF UNITED STATES SPRUCE PRODUCTION CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit report of United States Spruce Production Corporation (in liquidation) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, and for the period July 1 to December 12, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1 through March 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FROM MRS. FRED NORMAN AND FAMILY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from Mrs. Fred Norman and family, of Raymond, Wash., acknowledging receipt of expression of sympathy on the part of the Senate on the death of the late Representative Fred Norman of the State of Washington, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution to memorialize Congress concerning appropriations for forest conservation

"Whereas the forest resources of California are of inestimable value to the growth of the State; and

"Whereas extensive areas of forest land important for the continuous production of timber, forage, water, and wildlife are located within the national forests; and

"Whereas these national forests are also important for the opportunities they afford for healthful sports and outdoor recreation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress to provide ample appropriations for the adequate protection and full development of the resources in these public forests of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to relieve the State of California's taxation problem created by the presence in the State of vast amounts of federally owned tax-exempt real property

"Whereas the fiscal problems of the State of California, and its political subdivisions, are vitally affected by the vast amount of federally owned tax-exempt real property located in the State; and

"Whereas this fiscal problem arises from the following facts:

"California has experienced population increases in the last two decades which have literally transformed the State. In addition, during the war years the migration of population to California, which is largely remaining in the State, has been enormous.

"This population growth and the accompanying industrialization and general development of business activities in the State has resulted in increased burdens in providing protection of persons and property, in the maintenance, construction, and improvement of streets, roads, and highways, in the provision and maintenance of parks, playgrounds, and recreational facilities

"During the war years when the expanding population brought large increases in the demands upon the services of many departments, there were other services which could not be maintained at a level similar to that established in the years prior to war. Nor could the demands from large parts of the electorate to expand government services be met.

"There is imperative need to provide the deferred maintenance, to provide the deferred capital improvements, to provide expanded government service. Major expenditures must be made for sewage disposal, street and highway construction, expansion of office and agency facilities, purchase of new equipment, and for a variety of other capital improvements.

"The revenue sources have not increased in proportion to the increase in expenditures. The principal reliance for funds, especially by the State's political subdivisions which bear a large share of such expenditures, is upon the general property tax. The yield of property tax depends upon assessed valuation of property, and upon the tax rates. Tax rates have already reached such very high levels as to be a burden on taxable property. In attempting to adjust assessed valuation of real property, the problem of tax-exempt real property becomes acute. The federally owned tax-exempt real property located in the State of California is estimated to be of the assessed value of $319,000,000. This so seriously affects the property-tax base as to require adjustment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such action as is necessary: (a) To dispose immediately of all real property located in the State of California not essential to the conduct of permanent and established functions of the Federal Government so that said property can be returned to State and local taxation; (b) to refrain from the acquisition of additional real property in the State of California not essential to

the conduct of permanent and established functions of the Federal Government; (c) to reimburse the State for the loss of tax revenue on property owned by the Federal Government in an amount equivalent to that which would be derived were the property subject to State and local taxation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to enact S. 172, providing for the creation of a commission to consider claims that released prisoners of war may have against the Japanese Government

"Whereas the plight of thousands of former prisoners of war, their widows and families present a grave problem challenging the response of all the people of the United States.

"Whereas this group of former prisoners of war, were subject to inhuman treatment, all their property confiscated, they were separated from their families, and in many cases were stricken with incurable diseases. No agency has been created to consider their just claims against the Japanese Government, and it is imperative such an agency or commission be created to give relief to this group.

"Whereas to meet this problem there is now pending before Congress S. 172. This bill provides for the creation of a commission to consider the claims which former prisoners of war may have against the Japanese Government.

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature hereby endorses S. 172, and respectfully memorializes Congress to enact this meritorious measure at as early a date as possible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 43

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to investigate the freight-car shortage

"Whereas there exists today in the Western States a serious shortage of railroad freight cars—a condition which has existed since the close of hostilities in World War II, and which is creating a disastrous industrial situation and imperiling western postwar economy; and

"Whereas this serious and threatening situation has been well known to the responsible interests, the American Association of Railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission who, despite the pleas of industry, the press and the people, have wholly failed to remedy the matter; and

"Whereas Interstate Commerce Commission figures indicate that there no longer exists any legitimate argument or circumstance for a shortage of freight cars; and

"Whereas the damaging conditions which are threatening the progress of industry in the several Western States should be eliminated at the earliest practicable moment by effective legislation or such other measures as will insure an even and equitable freight-car distribution of quantity sufficient to encourage and permit maximum production and full development of our vast natural resources and the progress of economy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to make an immediate investigation of conditions causing or contributing to the present shortage of freight cars in the Western States, and to take such steps as may be necessary to insure adequate and permanent relief; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 30

"Joint resolution relative to remains of Americans fighting with Allied forces killed in action in World War II

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation which provides for the return for reinterment in this country, upon the request of the next of kin, of the remains of Americans serving in the armed forces of the United States killed in action in World War II and interred in foreign countries; and

"Whereas there were killed in action in World War II many Americans who prior to the entry of the United States into the war, voluntarily enlisted in the fighting forces of powers allied with the United States, and whose remains are now interred in foreign countries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby urged and memorialized to enact such legislation as will permit, upon the request of the next of kin, the return to the United States and the reinterment of the remains of American volunteers who lost their lives while serving in the armed forces of powers allied with the United States in World War II; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution relating to memorializing Congress and the President to retain the identity of the Marine Corps in any unification of the armed forces

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress the administration's plan for the unification of the armed forces of the United States—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, under one head or department; and

"Whereas this plan if carried into effect without due provision being made for its retention may eliminate or destroy the identity of the United States Marine Corps, those gallant soldiers of the sea who have been the advance guard, the intervening force, the landing party, the first to fight in every war in which the United States has been engaged from the year 1775, when, contemporaneously with the birth of the Nation, the Marine Corps, as we now know it, was born, on down to the recent World War II, where with modern equipment, its amphibious landings of scouting and combat forces, its tanks, flame throwers and its air squadrons, have brought new glories to American arms on scores of battlefields all ove. the earth and particularly in the islands of the Pacific; and

"Whereas to absorb the marines into any general military force which would destroy their identity or disrupt the separate organization under which heretofore they have always trained and fought would tend to destroy their morale—their esprit de corps, and render them less valuable and effective in attaining their objectives in the future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges and memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, in any unification program for the armed forces of the Nation which may be put into effect, that the identity and present tables of organization of the Marine Corps be retained, to the end that its manifold usefulness may be insured and preserved; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 20

"*To the United States Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the United States Army for military purposes recently constructed a road from Haines, Alaska, to connect with the Alaska Highway at a place called Dezadeash to Yukon Territory, Canada; and

"Whereas this road going in a northwesterly direction from Haines traverses approximately 42 miles of American territory—a part of the Territory of Alaska—and then passes through northern British Columbia and southern Yukon Territory to the main United States-Canadian boundary on the one hundred and forty-first meridian; and

"Whereas the area through which this route passes in British Columbia and Yukon Territory and lying southerly and southwesterly therefrom is virtually unpopulated and is not known to be of any special or considerable value of importance; and

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada and Alaska now embrace hundreds of thousands of square miles of similar terrain of which practically no use is being made; and

"Whereas the Canadian Government to the present moment has not made any commitment as to the maintenance of any part of the highway lying in Canada; and

"Whereas, it is deemed desirable that the entire length of the road between Haines and the main United States-Canadian boundary lying on the one hundred and

forty-first meridian should be brought under the jurisdiction of the United States in order that there might be direct communication between the people of the United States and people residing in the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas it has been suggested that a transfer might be effected between the Governments of the United States and Canada so as to give the Canadian Government ample compensation for that part of their land which we desire, either in cash or by conveyance to Canada of a tract of land of approximately the same area lying north of 66 degrees north latitude and east of the one hundred and forty-fourth meridian.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, does respectfully pray that negotiations be entered into immediately with the Canadian Government for the exchange, sale, lease, or transfer of so much of the territory lying in British Columbia and the Yukon Territory as may be necessary in order that the whole road for its entire length might be brought under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 23

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Delegate from Alaska and the Secretary of the Interior.

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Territory is undergoing expansion of population and is on the verge of the greatest development in its history, which is compatible with the interest of the Federal Government in seeing Alaska become a strong buffer State; and

"Whereas pursuant to the recent request of the people of Alaska by a referendum vote of three to two in favor of statehood for Alaska, Congress is presently considering enactment of appropriate legislation for that purpose; and

"Whereas extra financing to implement development programs and provide capital for the new State in establishment of State institutions would be to the advantage of all concerned, including the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas it has long been the custom to refund to Porto Rico internal revenues derived from that possession, without similar consideration for Alaska, although Alaskans have likewise long paid Federal taxes without voting representation:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Alaska Legislature in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully petitions Congress to favorably consider both the advisability and equity of refunding 50 percent of the income taxes paid directly to the Federal Government by Alaskan taxpayers, which would amount to over $5,000,000 per year, and to enact appropriate legislation for that purpose.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 33

"To the Secretary of the Interior, the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the present existing laws prohibit the white race to own reindeer in Alaska; and

"Whereas, the reindeer herds are fast becoming depleted and unless immediate and appropriate steps are taken the industry will soon become extinct; citing such instances in the second judiciary division of Alaska as Unalakleet, Shaktoolik, Elim, Koyuk, Mountain Village, White Mountain, Council, and Nome where large herds once existed, but are now nonexistent; and

"Whereas, this industry is vitally necessary to Alaska and especially the second judiciary division; and

"Whereas many of the white race have expressed a desire in this industry; and

"Whereas it will encourage veterans to participate in this worthwhile venture:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that immediate steps be taken to repeal existing laws whereby whites are restricted from owning reindeer in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Petitions of the members of the Sarasota Townsend Club, No. 1, and the Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Joseph and Eugenie Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to a Federal building program in the interest of national defense and safety, and to protect the civilian population against atom bombing and germ warfare; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 57

"Whereas the use of live decoys while hunting ducks is now prohibited by act of Congress; and

"Whereas this situation is quite satisfactory in the Northern and Southern States where ducks are so numerous that hunters can easily bag their limits without using live decoys; and

"Whereas the ducks which arrive in Illinois and the other Central States are so gun-shy and blind-shy that it is impossible to enjoy the sport of duck hunting when live decoys are prohibited; and

"Whereas, according to a recent survey at the beginning of the season, ducks are very tame in the Northern States, and in the Southern States are often destroyed by many methods to save the crops; and though the game authorities of the Northern and Southern States have and would oppose any legislation that would permit the use of live decoys in their own areas, they are quite willing to support any bills that would permit the use of such decoys in the Central or migratory States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we request Congress to enact legislation that will zone the United States, the same as the State of Illinois is zoned, namely, northern, central, and southern zones, and to permit the use of at least six live decoys to each blind in the central zone, or migratory States, while continuing the present prohibition in the northern and southern zones; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, April 28, 1947."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. M. M. Ward, president of the New Mexico WCTU. With Mrs. Ward's letter was enclosed a petition regarding the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio, bearing 200 signatures, with addresses. The original petition has already been referred to the proper committee. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Ward's letter, together with a copy of the petition, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, together with a copy of the petition, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1947.

Hon. SENATOR HATCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please find a petition in regard to the Capper bill, S. 265. You will find around 200 signatures and addresses.

Please have this petition recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. M. M. WARD,
President of WCTU at Alamogordo, N. Mex.; also New Mexico Secretary of WCTU.

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 340 residents of the District of Columbia, urging favorable action on my anti-liquor-advertising bill, S. 265. The petition reads as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946, as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 125. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with performance of their duties as such reporters; without amendment (Rept. No. 152).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; with an amendment (Rept. No. 153).

NEWSPRINT SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. No. 150)

Mr. MURRAY submitted the minority views of himself and Mr. TAYLOR'S as members of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, on the subject of newsprint supply and distribution, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Osika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1224. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1225. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1226. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1227. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 1228. A bill to permit the Administrator of the National Housing Agency to sell war housing project Tonomy Hill (RI-37013) to the city of Newport or to the housing authority of the City of Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1229. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 1230, to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate bill 1231, authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings, to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 1232. A bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1233. A bill for the relief of Basir Bin Kadis; and

S. 1234. A bill for the relief of Dasoeki Soerachman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1235. A bill for the relief of Merchants Motor Freight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the McMillan Fountain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended. I request that the bill, together with a statement by Raymond M. Foley, National Housing Administrator and Federal Housing Commissioner, in support of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill together with the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence the following: "and prior to July 1, 1947."

SEC. 2. Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of the second proviso "June 30, 1947" in each place where it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1948."

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND M. FOLEY, NATIONAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR AND FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER, IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO EXTEND THE AUTHORITY TO INSURE MORTGAGES UNDER TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT FROM JUNE 30, 1947, TO JANUARY 31, 1948

It may be recalled that in May of last year the Congress, recognizing the difficulties of securing in a period of high construction costs the large volume of housing so urgently needed under the veterans' emergency housing program, extended the authority to insure mortgages under title VI of the National Housing Act until June 30, 1947. For this purpose, an immediate authorization of $1,000,000,000 mortgage insurance was made available, with authority granted to the President to make available an additional $1,000,000,000. The President made an additional $1,000,000,000 mortgage insurance available in December of last year, indicating that it would be used primarily for the financing of rental housing.

The emphasis this year is on rental housing for veterans, and I have every confidence that we will be able to achieve much progress in our effort to stimulate its production in greater volume. The volume of rental units for which applications were received under section 608 of title VI during January and February alone equaled the volume received during the entire 7 months of 1946 in which the veterans' emergency housing program was in operation. At the end of February we had committed or had in process of examination under the title VI program, mortgages involving approximately 101,000 units for a dollar-mortgage amount of $632,000,000. Of the 101,000 new dwelling units, 22,200 were in large-rental projects under section 608; 9,500 in two-, three-, or four-family dwellings and 69,300 in single-family homes under section 603. While some of the single-family dwellings will undoubtedly be available for rent, the units in the rental projects, plus those consisting of two-, three-, and four-family structures, represent about one-third of the total.

There are prospects of declining cost levels in 1947, due largely to a more adequate volume of building materials, with resulting greater efficiency and reduced building time. The Federal Housing Administration has taken policy and procedural steps to make its rental-housing procedure more practicable and feasible, and to give the developers of rental-housing projects every aid that is permissible in the terms and spirit of the present law. The interest manifested, both within and without industry, has been so great that the Federal Housing Commissioner is allocating the second billion dollars of mortgage insurance authorization exclusively to such rental housing.

Necessarily, this means there is a great deal of work to be done in planning, submitting, and processing rental applications. In order that it may be done in an orderly fashion by industry and Government, and may be spread over the year so that neither the supply of building materials nor costs will be affected by an undue concentration of starts in any brief period, it is recommended that the present authorization to insure mortgages under title VI of the National Housing Act be extended from the present expiration date of June 30, 1947, to January 31, 1948. In my judgment early action upon the requested extension is necessary in order to secure the benefits anticipated.

It is our hope that a resumption of normal mortgage insurance operations under title II, with its requirement of economic soundness, may become feasible by the end of this year but since the Congress would presumably not be in session during the latter part of 1947, it is felt desirable that the extension be granted to January 31, 1948. If a further extension should then appear to be desirable, the matter could at that time be reexamined by the Congress in the light of conditions then prevailing.

A draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose is enclosed and I am informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to its submission.

Respectfully submitted.

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

FIDELITY BUILDING IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the housing problem is one of the most difficult and baffling facing the country today. It is particularly distressing that veterans who have returned from serving their country at home and abroad are unable to find adequate living quarters for themselves and their families. Another phase of the general problem is the shortage of adequate commercial space for business and professional activity. In the city in which I live—Kansas City, Mo.—these two phases of the problem

have been, and are, the subject of careful and earnest thought by everyone who has the well-being of the community at heart.

A recent action of the Federal Government has been far from helpful. A few months ago, the United States, through the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, purchased for cash one of Kansas City's largest downtown buildings, the Fidelity Building, at the corner of Ninth and Walnut Streets, standing 32 stories high and containing 234,000 square feet of office space. The Government is dispossessing private tenants as rapidly as their leases expire. Most of these tenants have no idea where to turn. The Government's action has resulted in a crisis in the downtown area in Kansas City.

The action of the Government is most surprising in view of the fact that the Government has, standing practically idle, a building containing over a half million square feet of office space, of which only 150,000 square feet are presently occupied. This is the Pratt and Whitney Building, fireproof, air-conditioned, and modern in every respect.

How can the Government justify its purchase and occupancy of first-class downtown office space and its action in ejecting tenants who have no other space available, when the Government owns and maintains acres of new office space at the edge of town? The excuse given for the purchase of the Fidelity Building was the argument that the Federal agencies in the Kansas City area could be consolidated and centralized in the Fidelity Building, with increased efficiency and at reduced cost. But the fact is that of the 8,000 Federal employees not already housed in the Post Office and Federal Court buildings, not more than 2,000, or 25 percent, can be accommodated in the Fidelity Building. Upon examination the "consolidation" argument blows up in thin air.

It has now become apparent that the purchase of the Fidelity Building was ill-advised, and is a mistake that should be promptly rectified. With this idea in mind, the Honorable ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., Representative in Congress from my district, has introduced in the House a bill for the purpose of authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, and to receive bids for the purchase thereof.

I now ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference an identical bill in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield for a question, I did not hear his opening statement, and I wish to ask him for what purpose the Federal Government purchased the building to which he has referred? I should like to know what the alleged purpose was.

Mr. KEM. The alleged purpose was to consolidate the Federal agencies in one building in the downtown area.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Missouri has said that the Government already owns several acres of office space, I believe.

Mr. KEM. Yes; the Federal Government already owns a building containing more than a half a million square feet of office space on the edge of the town. That building is fireproof, air conditioned, and modern in every respect.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1231) authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEM, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Insert on page 19, after line 4, the following:

"Hunter School District, Sawyer County, Wis.: $80,000 to implement Public Law 667, Seventy-ninth Congress."

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FISCAL MATTERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MILDRED R. JOHNSON ET AL.

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 110) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mildred R. Johnson, widow, Jeannette J. Moore, sister, and John M. Johnson, brother, of Goldsborough M. Johnson, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances, to be paid as follows: To John M. Johnson, $250, the remainder to be divided equally between Mildred R. Johnson and Jeannette J. Moore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate tomorrow by reason of public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that during the last Congress a resolution presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was agreed to, directing the Committee on Finance to make an investigation into the subject of social security, including old-age pensions, and that so far no report has been made.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an address delivered by William H. McMasters, president of the National Old Age Pensions, Inc., before the Boston Pension Group No. 1, on Sunday, April 27, 1947, together with the article re-

ferred to in the address, Our Present Dishonest Federal Old-Age-Pension Plan, by John T. Flynn, which appeared in the May number of the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. M'MASTERS, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL OLD AGE PENSIONS, INC., BEFORE THE BOSTON PENSION GROUP, NO. 1, ON SUNDAY, APRIL 27, 1947

In the May issue of Reader's Digest, that has the largest circulation of any regular publication in the United States, there is a strong article written by John T. Flynn, the eminent economist. Those of us in the pension movement, who have given serious thought to the set-up of the social-security program, will welcome the analysis that Mr. Flynn has given to the country. He points out in a dignified way the utter hoax that has been played on the country by this so-called social-security program.

The weak voices of men like myself have gone unheard. But the powerful voice of John T. Flynn, through the sounding board of the Reader's Digest, will go far and will certainly produce results. I would like your attention for a very few minutes so that I may indicate what may come from this challenge of the basic weakness of the present Social Security Act in its old-age and survivors' title.

As I have told you on many occasions over the years and as Mr. Flynn now points out, in a confirmation of my ideas, the collections from the pay rolls and the employers of the country have now amounted to $9,000,000,000. The amount paid out to those who come under the provisions of the act has run to approximately one and one-half billions. There is a surplus of seven and one-half billions. This surplus, according to the Treasury Department, is a trust fund, held against some future date when it might be needed to take care of men and women who will eventually retire. But, as Mr. Flynn so ably points out, what use is a big pile of United States bonds held in the Treasury of the United States? They are just so much waste paper. True, they are good for their face value in the open markets of the country, but until they are sold over again they might just as well be used for papering the walls of the Treasury. In the hands of the Treasury they are not assets. They are not liabilities. They are just evidence that they were authorized by Congress under the Social Security Act, and the Treasury has expended the entire market value of them under a system of bookkeeping that has not yet been questioned by the Comptroller.

I have repeatedly called attention to the gigantic hoax. But it remained for John T. Flynn to make it an atomic bomb in the financial world. Members of the Ways and Means Committee and one or two Senators on the Senate Finance Committee, before both of which committees I have spoken on many occasions, have told me in confidence that they realized that the whole Social Security Act, from the financial angle, is so fantastic in its absurdity that they were afraid to call it to the attention of the country. Now that we have hit the $250,000,000,000 debt bracket, the few billions of worthless paper assets in the trust fund may not create any disturbance, if they are wiped out for good. I am not certain whether the bookkeeping experts in the Treasury are putting these bonds in the red or the black division. Maybe we will need another article by Flynn to straighten out that phase of the matter. Meanwhile, those citizens over 65 years of age who require help are in dire straits. But money collected for them has been diverted to other purposes. Don't write your Congressman. He has already heard from John T. Flynn.

OUR PRESENT DISHONEST FEDERAL OLD-AGE-PENSION PLAN

(By John T. Flynn)

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—In 1939 the old-age-pension tax was due to be increased from 2 percent on workers and employers to 3 percent and then an additional 1 percent every 3 years. At this point, John T. Flynn, author of the following article, presented in Harper's magazine for February 1939 an extensive argument to freeze the tax at 2 percent. The article attracted the attention of the Ways and Means Committee of the House then considering the subject. Mr. Flynn was invited to appear and present his case. After he had spent a full day before that committee, opposed by the Treasury, the committee decided immediately after the session to freeze the tax, but served notice on the President that it would give him an opportunity to approve the plan. The tax has remained frozen at 2 percent ever since at a saving to social-security taxes of $7,000,000,000 to the workers and employers of America. In this article, Mr. Flynn describes the flagrant misappropriation of most of the money that has thus far been collected for old-age pensions.)

(Since the inception of the plan, $7.50 out of each $9 paid by employees and employers has been spent by the Government for other purposes. An individual guilty of such malfeasance would land in the penitentiary.)

For years I have been an ardent advocate of public old-age pensions. I was a member of the national organization that worked for social security. My purpose is not to oppose public pensions but to expose the indefensible methods by which the plan is being rendered ridiculous.

We have heard much of the great friendly state that would produce security for all. One form of this is the old-age pension plan. Now, after 10 years of the experiment, we find that families of the retired workers got an average pension last year of $6.40 a week.

The Government has collected $9,000,000,000 in taxes for old-age pensions and survivors' insurance. It has paid a billion and a half in pensions. It has borrowed and spent the other seven and a half billion on other things.

Not only is it dishonest, it is poor administration besides, to collect taxes under one guise and spend them for another purpose.

Workers and their unions sense this inadequacy and are again appealing to private business concerns for pensions. As a result over 10,000 plans for retirement benefits have been established by private corporations under carefully guarded trusteeships that guarantee that all benefits go to the worker.

Let us have a look at the dishonesty in the Federal old-age pension plan. The original plan proposed to lay a tax of 2 percent of the wage a year on employer and employee (1 percent each) beginning 1937; 3 percent in 1940; 4 percent in 1943; 5 percent in 1946; and 6 percent in 1949, at which point it would remain. However, in 1939 Congress, convinced that the rates were excessive, froze the tax at 2 percent and has repeated this action each year since. But unless action is taken, extortionately high rates will go into effect next year.

Had Congress not stepped in, the Government would have collected $16,500,000,000 since 1937 out of which it would have paid only one and a half billion in pensions. The Government would have collected last year in old-age taxes $3,000,000,000 out of which it would have paid only three hundred and twenty million in benefits. Thus Congress saved the workers and employers over $7,000,000,000 in social-security taxes by resisting the demand of the Executive for higher rates. Even at the 2-percent rate at which Congress has held the tax since 1939, the Government has collected nearly nine billion of which it has borrowed seven and a half billion to pay running expenses of the Government. Instead of social security for the workers, this looks like political security for the politicians.

How does the Government get away with this? It is done by means of a very plausible and tricky fiction. Here is the theory. Employed workers who are protected by the plan will collect pensions after reaching 65. The number will be small at first, but will grow and in time will be so numerous that the highest tax of 6 percent will not pay all the pensions. The Government, therefore, should collect more than it pays out while the pensions are few and save the surplus. This cash is exchanged for United States bonds, and the bonds constitute the old age reserve fund. In time this fund may reach forty, fifty, or, it is estimated, even as much as ninety billion. The interest on the bonds when added to the taxes will pay all pensions. To the untrained mind this may seem plausible. It was thought up by untrained minds and opposed by all the experts. A moment's reflection will show why.

At present the old-age fund holds nearly eight billion in United States bonds. That means the Government has collected eight billion more than it paid out in pensions. If in 30 years the old-age fund should hold forty billion in bonds, that would mean it had collected forty billion more than it paid out. The eight-billion surplus has been appropriated by the Government in exchange for United States bonds and the money is gone—spent on all sorts of things except pensions. No matter how big the fund gets, the money will be gone, having been spent by the Government on current expenses.

But you ask, Are these United States bonds not gilt-edge securities? Are not the savings of the workers and employers thus safely invested? The answer is "Yes"—if the Government ever plans to borrow more money in order to redeem these bonds. But it has no intention of ever paying these bonds. That would be contrary to the plan. The plan is for the old-age fund to hold the bonds forever in order to collect interest on them from the Government. Now, you say, Is not the interest on their savings a legitimate method of producing pension income for the workers? That seems plausible. But consider it a moment and you will see it is a pure fiction.

If I own a United States bond, then all the taxpayers owe me the interest, but when the old-age fund owns a United States bond the situation is different. The fund is set up for the benefit of the workers. It is created by payments from workers and employers. Now, if the bond belongs to this fund, before the Government can pay interest on it the money must be collected in taxes from the taxpayers. And the taxpayers are the workers and their employers. The Government will again have to collect taxes from workers and employers in order to pay the interest on the bonds in the old-age reserve fund.

All this is done because, we are told, the number of persons drawing pensions after a number of years will be so great and the amount of money required so large that the highest tax of 6 percent will not produce it. In theory the workers and employers will pay a 6-percent tax, leaving a large sum still to be raised to meet the pension rolls. The Government is supposed to supply this in the form of interest on the bonds. But actually the interest money must be collected largely from the same people who pay the old-age taxes.

To put it differently, let us suppose that in 1970 the old-age taxes will fall a billion short of paying the pension rolls. The difference

will be made up by the interest paid on the Government bonds owned by the fund. Therefore the pensions will all be paid (1) by the old-age security taxes and (2) by the interest on the bonds. The old-age security taxes will be paid by the employers and employees. But the interest taxes will also be paid very largely by the employers and employees.

At present the reserve fund is nearing eight billion. That means the workers and employers have been charged nearly eight billion more for old-age pensions than they cost. No matter what year in the future you select where there is a reserve fund of twenty or forty or fifty billion, it will be because the workers and employers have been charged twenty or forty or fifty billion more for pensions than they cost.

But, you will say, what about insurance companies? They have reserves. But an insurance company does not pay policy benefits out of reserves. The reserves are required by law because an insurance company is a voluntary association which the policyholders may quit or which may get into trouble for some reason. And they spread the cost of a bad year, such as the influenza epidemic of 1918.

A man has a life-insurance policy for $10,000. He pays a premium every year. The company uses that premium and all other premiums each year to pay the death benefits which fall due that year. Insurance is reduced to a scientific basis. Experience informs its operators that so many people will die in a given year and so much insurance will fall due. Insurance rates are arranged so that the premiums collected in any year will cover all the death benefits that will normally be paid in that year. The benefits are not paid out of reserves. In the worst depression years premiums always covered death and other insurance claims. And so in 20 years from now—in 1967—should that man with the $10,000 policy die, his widow will collect his insurance benefit—$10,000—but the company will that same year collect in premiums from the surviving policyholders the money to pay it. It must be so.

Our politically minded social-security operators refuse to face the one great central fact in this problem. The Government old-age security plan is merely a Government insurance agency. Therefore, old-age benefits, like life insurance and other contingent benefits, must be paid out of the income of the people concerned, earned by them in the very year when the benefits fall due. If there are 50,000,000 workers employed and 5,000,000 retired, the 50,000,000 must each year, by their contributions, pay enough to support the 5,000,000 on pensions. There is no other way. The payments may be masked or disguised in whatever form a timid politician wishes to hide them. But that stern fact must be faced. And any honest system of old-age pension must be built on it. The Government does not provide the money. Its only role, like that of the insurance company, is to act as the agent which collects from the employees and employers and pays the benefits to those who are retired.

In the case of old-age pensions the great role which the Government can play is in bringing all workers into it, giving it the permanence essential to the plan and protecting it from disintegration by making it compulsory on all.

The benefits paid now are small. They will increase as the plan grows older and pensioners accumulate higher wage averages as the basis of pensions. Whether the pensions are increased or not it must always be kept in mind that they must be paid for by the workers and employers. There is no other way. Any slick scheme to fool the worker into believing the Government is paying any part of it should be swept aside.

The Government's course is clear:

1. The plan must be on a pay-as-you-go basis. The taxes collected should be sufficient to cover the pensions of that year and no more.

2. The idea of a reserve fund greater than that already raised should be abandoned. When the present plan of the reserve fund was adopted the three distinguished actuaries called in as advisers protested against it. In addition to the arguments against it already mentioned there are two others of grave import: (a) It is a plan to add a billion or two every year to the national debt which we are supposed to reduce. (b) It entangles the whole social-security system with the fiscal difficulties of the Government which are bound to increase. The old-age plan should be kept clear of that.

3. The present arbitrary system of increasing rates should be by law abolished without delay and rates for from 2 to 3 years should be fixed on a rigid actuarial basis.

4. The system should be enlarged to include all workers, save civil-service workers of Federal, State, and city governments already protected by public retirement plans.

5. Benefits should be kept as they are for the time being until the country arrives at a state of reasonable postwar stabilization.

Finally every effort should be made to protect the whole system from politics—the politics of the politicians and the politics of the dreamers. We must close our ears to the politician in either party who uses social security as a vote-getting racket and who beguiles the workingman with his tales about all the wonderful things the great benevolent state can give him.

The state can give him nothing. It has nothing to give. It has no way of getting money save by taxing someone, including himself. If it hands him anything it must first take it from him or someone else. The idea that it may take it from him and give it to someone else does not seem to have occurred to him. Yet this is precisely what the old-age pension plan is doing.

AMERICA'S PATENT SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's patent system, delivered by him before the Patent Office Society, on May 2, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS. MESSAGE BY THE PRESIDENT AND ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the message sent by President Truman to the Thirty-seventh Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, May 2 and 3, 1947, and the address delivered by himself on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Faith of the Fathers," delivered by him at the Cape Henry Day program commemorative service, Cape Henry, Va., April 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL CONSERVATION—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Soil Conservation," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICISMS OF PENDING LABOR BILL BY BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen entitled "Major Defects in the Taft-Ball Bill, S. 1126," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS IN ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Congress in Action," delivered over the radio by Senator FERGUSON on May 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS — ADDRESS BY SENATOR OVERTON

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on appropriations for reclamation, flood control, and river and harbor work, delivered by him before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington May 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S LOYALTY ORDER—LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter published in the New York Times of May 4, 1947, from A. L. Pomerantz, on the subject of the President's loyalty order, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S LOYALTY ORDER—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Loyalty Order," published in the New York Times of April 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the unfinished business, Senate bill 1126, is temporarily laid aside, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2700, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes. The Clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary, on page 2, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$819,500" and insert "$866,900."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the bill now under consideration is the first of the regular appropriation bills to come to the floor of the Senate at the present session of the Congress. That, I believe,

makes it perhaps more important than even the sums of money involved. It is very easy to discuss the benefits of economy in government in the abstract. The real test of whether we are going to be able to economize in government is in the specific appropriation bills. There is no other way by which we can demonstrate to the people of the United States that the vast governmental system we have can be cut down to a more normal size.

Before entering upon a brief explanation of the appropriation bill, which covers the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, I wish to point out a few facts to the Senate. In 1917 the total cost of the Federal Government amounted to $1,628,000,000. By 1919, after the First World War, the cost of Government had increased to $27,065,000,000. By 1925 it had decreased again to $3,748,000,000. In 1933 the cost of the Federal Government was $5,692,000,000. In 1939 the cost had gone up again, and it stood at $12,118,000,000. In the year before the war, the year in which the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, 1941, the cost of government amounted to a little more than $19,000,000,000.

The President's budget, as submitted to the Congress of the United States this year, while considerably less than the wartime expenditures of course, as it should be, still amounts to $37,500,000,000.

Some time ago when considering the legislative budget the House of Representatives in its judgment determined that there should be a reduction in the expenditures below that contemplated by the President of the United States in an amount approximating $6,000,000,000, which would have brought the cost of Government down from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000. The Senate, after considerable discussion of the same legislative budget, determined that, in view of the critical international situation and our obligations abroad, it would be impractical this year to reduce the expenditures contemplated by the President's budget by more than $4,500,000,000, which, using the Senate figures, would mean that the cost of Government for the fiscal year would be $33,000,000,000. But in either event, whether the Members of the Senate supported the House $6,000,000,000 figure or the Senate $4,500,000,000 figure, the fact remains that in each and every one of the appropriation bills which will come to the floor of the Senate there will have to be substantial reductions made beneath the amount requested by the President in his budget message.

We must face the fact that a reduction even to the Senate figure of $4,500,000,000 would require a reduction in the cost of Government beneath the budget figures of approximately 12 or 13 percent, and the House figure requires a considerably greater reduction.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations and its Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security approached this task with an open mind. We recognized that by reason of the time element involved, greater reductions might have been made in some branches of the agencies covered by the bill than should actually have been made. So we went into our hearings and asked the various agencies involved to come before us and give us factual information. We frankly told them that we were not going to rubber stamp the figures sent over to us by the House of Representatives, but at the same time we had no intention of rubber-stamping the amounts which had been recommended by the Director of the Budget.

It seems to me that we cannot surrender our obligation as a policy-determining body of the Government, and surrender the power of the budget into the hands of any Federal executive agency.

After the hearings had been held, the witnesses had been heard in public sessions, as is provided for under the so-called La Follette-Monroney plan, and the committee had deliberated, the net result was that the bill as passed by the House carried appropriations of $1,684,586,780. The Senate committee recommended a decrease of $8,388,700, bringing the amount of the bill which is now before the Senate to $1,676,198,080. So our committee has reported a bill to the Senate which carries approximately $8,000,000 less than the bill which came to us from the House of Representatives.

In arriving at that figure we made, I believe, a modest reduction in certain grants-in-aid, and we made certain increases, which we felt were justified by the testimony, in the Department of Labor and in the Federal Security Agency. But I merely wish to point out to the Senate once again that even with the figure $1,676,198,080 contained in the Labor and Federal Security bill reported to the Senate, which is only one of 12 bills which will come before this body for action, that figure is greater than the total cost of the Federal Government for all its activities, Army and Navy and everything else, in 1917, when the expenditures amounted to $1,628,411,644.81. It is greater than the total receipts of the Federal Treasury in the year 1917. So we have come a long way.

The minority views, copies of which are on the desks of Senators, might be termed the views of the minority of the minority, because of the nine Members on the minority side of the aisle on the Appropriations Committee only three of them have signed the minority views. In their views the minority state:

> In general, the minority feel impelled to report that the undiscriminating ruthlessness of some of the cuts recommended by the majority is indefensible except on the premise that it is desirable to put the Labor Department in a position where it cannot do the job which the Congress, by substantive law, has imposed upon it.

I categorically deny that statement. On the contrary, every witness who appeared before the committee recognized that he was receiving a fair hearing, and recognized that the committee, to the best of its ability, with the obligations we have imposed upon us, was bent upon a sound and constructive economy, and not upon doing anything to the Department of Labor or to any other function of the Federal Government which would cripple it in its operations.

In the Department of Labor alone we have restored a little more than $4,000,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, dealing with Labor and Social Security, I wish to commend the Senator from California for the able and fair manner in which he handled these appropriations in his capacity of chairman. The minority could help its cause a great deal by defending the increases which our subcommittee made in these appropriations. Any different action might greatly hurt the cause of the minority and the department affected. If we can hold these increases in conference with the House, I think we shall have served well the department and agencies involved. I believe that the appropriations we have recommended are absolutely fair, and that the various agencies can operate efficiently under them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He was one of the very active members of the subcommittee. He attended almost all the hearings, except when he was necessarily absent, which was very seldom. He took a very active part in studying the appropriations in the bill.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the total recommended for the Department of Labor itself, $79,862,900, is $10,000,000 under the amount allowed by the House. A reduction of $14,345,600 is recommended in grants to States for employment offices, and an increase of $4,344,300 is recommended in the operating funds of the Department, to provide it a total of $22,480,500 in its operating funds.

The total amount recommended by the Senate committee is below the budget estimate by $23,817,391, or 22.9 percent, and is below the appropriations for 1947—the supplemental pay act having been provided for out of available funds—by $31,550,391, or 28.3 percent.

We found a number of places where we rather violently—if I may use that word—disagreed with the House. With respect to the Division of Labor Standards, your committee recommends that the Division of Labor Standards be restored, and we have provided funds for that purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is very ably describing the provisions of the bill. On page 5 it is indicated that the Senate Appropriations Committee substantially increased the amount of funds available for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and also for the United States Employment Service. Can the Senator indicate how near those increases over the House figures approached the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget? Were the increases substantial?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall indicate those as we move along.

With respect to the Division of Labor Standards, your committee recommends that the Division be restored, and that an appropriation of $400,000 be provided.

In the case of the Commissioners of Conciliation, the committee recommends a slight increase of $120,000 for the Commissioners of Conciliation. In that respect the committee does not differ so much with the House allowance of funds, but it does disagree with the language in the House committee report, which sought to tie the hands of the executive branch of the Government. We did not feel that that was appropriate either in an appropriation bill or in a committee report; and while there was grave question as to whether or not the action by the House committee in placing such language in its report, seeking to tie the hands of the Secretary of Labor, would be effective, it certainly would place the Secretary in a rather embarrassing position should he ignore the language in a report of a committee of one of the two Houses of Congress. I wish to make it crystal clear that the committee believes in its recommendation to the Senate, that there should be no restrictive language tying the hands of the Secretary of Labor so far as the Conciliation Service is concerned.

With respect to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of course that is an important agency of the Department of Labor. Your committee fully recognizes the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is supplying information of value to labor, of value to management, and of value to the country as a whole. I do not believe that there is a single member of the appropriations subcommittee or full committee who would wish to report to the Senate a bill under which the work of that Bureau would be so hamstrung that it could not continue to function. We do not believe that such is the case. The committee recommends an increase of $1,376,000, which will provide a total of $3,750,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

To answer the question of the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the amount of the budget estimate was $6,700,700, but in arriving at that figure the Bureau of Labor Statistics has incorporated into its regular peacetime budget all the wartime appropriations which it had. I think this is very important because a number of Members have received letters—I know that the chairman of the subcommittee has received a great many letters—indicating that the people are uninformed as to the facts. Let me give the Senate some of the facts.

In 1937 the total regular appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics was $850,000; in 1938 it was $784,000; in 1939 it was $829,960; in 1940 it was $1,012,000; in 1941 it was $1,107,580; in 1942 it was $1,080,590; in 1943 it was $1,207,203; in 1944 it was $1,312,300; in 1945 it was $1,312,300; and in 1946 it was $1,492,420.

During those later years they received certain national-defense funds, which, as a matter of fairness, of course, should be brought into the picture. In 1942 the agency received $287,000 of national-defense funds; in 1943 the amount was a little more than $1,000,000; in 1944, $1,365,400; in 1945, $2,672,400; and in 1946, $2,780,576. In addition to that, they had certain reimbursable working funds for special projects which they were operating. In 1947 they endeavored to include the entire amount of their national-defense appropriations in the regular appropriation bill, but I call attention to the fact that the amount allowed by the committee—both the full committee and the subcommittee—was approximately $3,750,000, which is almost three times as much as they had in any regular appropriation in any prior year. No one can convince me that under those circumstances, with efficient management, the Bureau of Labor Statistics cannot do the job which it is necessary to do. I believe that it can. The subcommittee very carefully went over the various projects and believed, after checking the figures of the Bureau itself, that it will have ample funds to carry on the basic work which it should perform, but I am frank to admit to the Members of the Senate that the Bureau will have to curtail a great many other activities, some of which undoubtedly are desirable to different people. But we will never have any economy in the Government of the United States unless we start to curtail certain desirable activities. As I have pointed out, it is easy to talk and to give lip service to economy in the abstract, but the place in which economy should be practiced is in a specific appropriation bill. Whenever we make a cut of any kind in any appropriation bill, of course, we step on someone's toes. It is again the old story of whose ox is being gored. But I believe that with the funds which we have allowed this Bureau will be able to carry on its very necessary and desirable work, which all the members of the committee want it to perform.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may not have reached this item, but I notice that the committee has reported a decrease of $14,345,000 below the amount provided in the House bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am coming to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That affects the unemployment offices of the States to which the Federal Government has transferred a large number of the unemployment problems. I may have to be absent from the floor before the Senator reaches that section of the bill, and I want to ask this question: To what extent will the State governments, out of their own treasuries, be able to supplement this item, and how far will they be able to meet the obligations of the State employment offices to which the Federal Government has assigned the main problems in connection with the work?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since the able Senator from Kentucky will be absent from the floor I shall move over to that particular place in the bill. In the first place, the appropriation recommended amounts only to approximately a 20-percent reduction in the grant-in-aid funds. The various States came, through their representatives, to the Congress of the United States and stated that if the Federal Government would return the employment service to them they could perform the work on a more economical basis. This will give them an opportunity to do so. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have a chart, which I may put into the RECORD at a later time, which shows the increases in personnel in the various State offices which increases took place between the time the agencies were formerly operated by the States and the time when they were given back to the States last year. To cite some percentages, in one case there has been an increase of 37.9 percent when there has actually been a decrease in the load of 6 percent. In another instance there has been an increase in personnel of 100 percent when there has been an increase in the load of only 15.6 percent. So it goes in almost every instant. There has been a substantial increase in personnel far exceeding, in most cases, the increase in the load.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall the reports made by State governments, it was stated that it was necessary that this service be returned to them. I recall that they claimed that they could do the work more economically. It was never quite specific whether their desire to control all these unemployment agencies was motivated by a desire for economy or by a desire to retain or acquire control of the appointing power of the officers to fill the offices which were to be established. It may be a 50–50 proposition.

But having that control now, it having been returned to the States by the Congress of the United States returning these unemployment agencies to them, I wondered to what extent they can carry out their promise that the work will be done more economically, whether out of their own treasuries they are going to provide additional funds made necessary by reason of the cut in the Federal allotment, and, if there are no additional funds, to what extent the unemployed themselves will suffer because of the reduction in the appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Kentucky that no one, of course, can look into a crystal ball and see what conditions will be a year or 2 years from this time. To show how this operation has increased over what had been originally intended, I want to read from section 5 (a) of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, as follows:

> For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) the sum of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, (2) $4,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, (3) and thereafter such sums annually as the Congress may deem necessary.

This year there will be a sum in excess of $50,000,000 to run those offices. I be-

lieve, based on the information we have, that the States can operate those offices, if they do it on an efficient basis, for the sum of money allowed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, if I may complete my statement, the States should be contributing a part of the cost, because, as a matter of general public policy, I believe it is a serious mistake for one agency of government, namely, the Federal Government, to raise the funds and deliver them to another agency to spend unless such agency expends some of its own money in connection with the operation. If it has some of its own money in the operation it will take more of an interest in economizing wherever it can constructively economize, rather than if it is spending some other agency's funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not disagree with that observation. I hope, inasmuch as this unemployment problem has been returned to the States, they will accept in good faith the responsibility which goes with the transfer of the activity. If they not only are willing to pay their share of the money involved, but also are willing to pay it in such a way as to guarantee the greatest possible service to the men and women for whom it was intended—the unemployed—I would have no complaint. I would not even complain at this reduction, and I am not doing so now. I am merely trying to find out, if I can, whether the reduction, if necessary to be made, will be made up by the States, who were so anxious to get the Congress to confer upon them the authority to handle the expenditure of the money and the selection of the persons who would administer the service.

I certainly went as far as the Senator from California went, and probably a little farther than he would go, in my advocacy of the position that I do not believe the Federal Government should turn over money to State authorities without retaining some bridle rein over the expenditure of such funds, so that the Federal Government may have some voice in determining how the money is spent. In other words, I do not believe in turning over Federal funds to an agency which is utterly not responsible to the Federal Government in regard to how the money is spent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say that the House report made clear that after June 30, 1949, the States will have to look elsewhere or will have to make some other arrangements. It is the opinion of the Senate committee that certainly some definite arrangements should be made in that connection, and the States should now be giving thought to the point that the Federal Government will not continue to pay the entire cost of this operation.

Of course, a matter of policy is involved. I do not know whether this year or next year the Congress of the United States might determine that in the future the cost should be met on a matching basis, dollar for dollar, or on some other basis. That will have to be worked out. But we have clearly put the States on notice that the Federal Government will not continue to provide the total appropriations and thus carry the entire load.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have always maintained that widespread unemployment creates a national problem, and that the National Government cannot excuse itself entirely from the responsibility of having to deal with it and solve it. But inasmuch as the States were so anxious to regain control of that service, and inasmuch as representatives of the States took the trouble to come to Washington, where they appeared before congressional committees for the purpose of having the States regain control of it, I am expressing the hope that they will not merely be satisfied with having the power to appoint the administrators of the service to jobs within their States but also will be willing to accept their responsibility in paying for the service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from California that I was one of the active Senators, perhaps one of the very active Senators, in urging the return of the employment services to the States. A number of reasons were offered on the floor of the Senate why that should be done. It is not necessary for us to go into that matter now.

But for a time the representatives of the States who then were here in Washington and appeared before congressional committees asking that the employment services be returned to the States were operating from my office. I think that was perhaps before the Senator from California, who has yielded to me, became a Member of this body.

All the time the main criticism was in regard to the extravagance of Federal administration, and all the State representatives urged that if the employment services were returned to the States, they could be operated by the States very much more economically than when the Federal Government was operating them. I think some of the State representatives thought the States could operate those services for as little as one-half of what the Federal Government was spending in that connection.

Mr. President, I think the action of the committee is well taken. The States gave the Senate every reason to believe that they would carry out their obligation of operating the services more economically if the services were returned to them, and I think they were in earnest in making that statement; they convinced me that they were. So I wish to see them carry it out.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, so much for the point which had been raised by the Senator from Kentucky.

I have already gone into the matter of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In regard to the United States Employment Service——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The matter about which I should like to ask the Senator was discussed in some detail on Friday. It has to do with the elimination of funds for educational activities from the Department of Labor.

On page 2 of the report it is stated that—

> The labor education activities of the Division—

Meaning the Division of Labor Standards—

> were transferred to the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the House committee. The Senate committee, on the contrary, recommends that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

On page 3, I find the following in the report:

> The labor education activities formerly in the Division of Labor Standards were transferred by the House Committee to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Senate committee recommends that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Kentucky has raised that point. It had been raised by the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on last Friday, and I endeavored then to answer it. I shall repeat now, in general, the statement I made at that time.

I agree wholeheartedly with the able Senator from Utah as to the importance of labor education in our schools and universities. My own University of California has gone into that field, and we think it is doing a good job now, and will do a better job as the years go by.

I think a great many other institutions of learning are recognizing that in this important field of labor relations our educational institutions should be giving consideration to the subject and should be arranging courses in order to help fill a gap which heretofore has existed.

The only point that we on the committee had in mind was that we felt it was a very bad practice from the point of view of Government policy to begin to set up an agency which might become a second Office of Education. In other words, as I understand the situation, there is nothing in the committee's report which will prevent the Bureau of Labor Standards from issuing factual information dealing with various phases of the labor program, and that factual information will be available to institutions of learning or to any others who may have an interest in having such information. But the members of the committee felt that the time to nip in the bud what appeared to us to be another Office of Education was now. They received their first appropriation of approximately $37,500 a year ago; and this year they had requested approximately $65,000. We were a little fearful that it would

grow like Topsy, and that soon we would have operating in the Department of Labor what in effect would be another Office of Education; and if that same situation were to be carried over into other departments of government, we would have more or less of a governmental monstrosity, in that there would be the regular Office of Education, and perhaps at a future date we might even constitute it as a Department of Education, and yet there would be competing agencies in various other departments.

As we visualize the situation, the way to operate this function and service is to have the factual information of the Bureau of Labor Standards—the appropriation for which the Senate committee voted to restore to the amount allowed by the Budget, although the appropriation had been cut off by the House—supplied to the Commissioner's Office, where it would be available to various institutions and schools which would have need for information of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. Let me inquire whether any funds of the Department of Labor are available for these educational activities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say no, except as printed material will be available to be distributed to various schools and universities throughout the country that have courses of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. Would that information be available, for instance, to officers and members of labor unions or persons engaged in industry who ask for it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I think very definitely it would be.

Mr. COOPER. Then the sentence on page 3 of the report, "The Senate committee recommended that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor," would not preclude the furnishing of statistical information generally?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very definitely not, as I interpret it. We simply do not wish to have created in the Department of Labor a subbureau of education which would be in competition with the Office of Education.

Mr. COOPER. I have received statements, particularly from the American Federation of Labor in Kentucky, in which it has been pointed out that the educational activities of the Department of Labor have been of great assistance in informing labor unions in the handling of grievances, in the method and technique of bringing grievances to the attention of employers, and thus in the prevention of disputes. They state that it has resulted in the prevention of labor disputes and strikes. They believe that the elimination of educational activities will in the long run keep from them information which will assist them in promoting satisfactory labor relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe it will prevent the dissemination to those who could make use of it of factual information, assembled in the various bureaus of the Department of Labor. Our very definite impression was that there was being created, as I have said before, what in effect was a bureau of education within the Department of Labor.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the United States Employment Service, which is the administrative end of the Employment Service in Washington, we provided an increase of $1,709,600. The committee recommends an increase in the amount for carrying into effect provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 of $363,200, to provide a total amount of $2,120,000 for that purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has just referred to the fund made available for the United States Employment Service, and particularly the Veterans' Placement Service. I should like to call his attention to a statement contained in the minority views, which charges that the majority, in this bill, has hampered, impeded, and stultified the Labor Department program, including the reemployment rights of veterans.

I should like to stress at this point that during the hearings it was disclosed that of the 2,400,000 unemployed persons currently in this country, almost 1,000,000 were reported to be veterans. On that basis our committee assumed that it would be good economy to increase the funds made available for the Veterans' Placement Service, so that the veterans who want employment could receive recruitment assistance from the Veterans' Placement Service.

I think the interpretation made by the minority of the conclusions reached by the subcommittee in providing ample funds for the functioning of this particular service is entirely erroneous. The United States Employment Service has an appropriation in this bill of $2,246,400 and the Veterans' Employment Service $2,120,000, making a total of $4,366,400.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his statement, which is accurate.

Mr. President, in the wage and hour division, we made a recommendation for an increase of $99,200.

So the total increases we have made in the Department's appropriation amount to $4,344,300.

In the Federal Security Agency we recommended, for the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, an increase of $80,400; for the Employees' Compensation Fund, an increase of $250,000; for the Food and Drug Administration, an increase of $115,300, and for the Certification Service, $100,000. That service deals with the new drug streptomycin, and the entire amount of $100,000 will ultimately be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

In the Office of Education we provided for an increase, for the development of vocational education, of $3,550,000, and for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Commissioner, $431,000, of which $125,615 would take care of salaries and expenses of the personnel they have, and $305,385 would take care of certain additional programs, including what we felt was a very important program, one of the determining factors in the decision of the committee, namely, the program outlined by the Commissioner of Education as "Democracy vs. Communism."

In the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, for general administrative expenses, we provided an extra $100,000.

For hospital and construction activities, under the bill which was passed a year ago, there was an authorization of $75,000,000 a year, which would be cumulative each year. No funds were appropriated for last year, so this year the authorization amounts to $150,000,000. Under the law, if no work were done this year, next year the authorization would amount to $225,000,000.

The House, instead of appropriating a specific amount, authorized the amount of the contract authorizations. As we read the language in the House bill, it would have meant that contract authorizations could have been made up to the total of $150,000,000. We felt that this language was rather loose; that, based on the testimony before the committee, which showed that as up to the date the testimony was given there had not been a single State which had presented approved plans to the Public Health Service to come under the hospital act, contract authorizations in an amount not exceeding $40,000,000 would cover all that could be expended.

The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] called my attention to the fact that he had been in contact with the Public Health Service, and that while he did not disagree with the conclusion of the committee, that $40,000,000 would be all that was required to be authorized this year, nevertheless it would be desirable if the $75,000,000 basis could be used, so that if some States were not going to take advantage of the program, those which were willing and interested in taking advantage of it could go ahead with their programs. So we made certain changes in the language, which I wish to read at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand the committee recommended certain language which provided that a minimum of $434,000 should be available for vocational education.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will let me finish what I desire to say about the hospital fund, then I shall come back to the subject about which he is inquiring. That is a different subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The language we recommended be inserted in lieu of the House language reads as follows:

> There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such act, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000, the total sum authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by part C of the act. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the aggre-

gate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $40,000,000.

We believe that that takes care of the point raised by the able Senator from Alabama, and at the same time sets a ceiling of $40,000,000 beyond which the Department cannot go for this year.

Under mental-health activities the committee recommended an increase of $500,000, feeling that this was a field of activity in which the additional expenditure was well warranted.

Under the National Institute of Health we recommended an increase of $500,000, and at the same time, of the total amount allotted to the National Institute of Health, namely, $9,626,000, we recommended that $1,000,000 be earmarked to provide, through grants-in-aid, for a clinical and laboratory research program in tuberculosis therapy, revolving around the use of streptomycin. The committe was very favorably impressed with the progress that has been made through the use of the new drug, streptomycin, in making cures of tuberculosis.

Under the Social Security Administration for the Bureau of Employment Security we recommended an increase of $95,000, and for maternal and child welfare, $100,000.

For the Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, we recommended an increase of $190,400; making the total recommended increases for the Federal Security Agency $6,043,100.

In the case of the National Labor Relations Board the committee was very greatly impressed by the fact that there had been a considerable backlog of cases. We felt that in this field of industrial relations, involving bona fide conflicts between labor and management, certainly the Government had an obligation to expedite the decisions just as much as possible. We felt that an increase for salaries in the National Labor Relations Board, of $686,900, was justified; for miscellaneous expenses, $94,500; for penalty mail costs, $6,300; for printing and binding, $153,300; representing a total recommended increase for the National Labor Relations Board of $941,000. For the National Mediation Board, we recommended an increase of $28,700.

In reference to the decreases, as I pointed out earlier in the discussion with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the committee recommended that the grants to the States for public employment offices be decreased by 20 percent, or a total of $14,345,600, and that the House appropriation for the Public Health Service, National Cancer Institute, be decreased by $5,328,200, for the following reasons: The committee fully recognize the importance of this field of cancer research. There was a total amount available last year of approximately $7,000,000. The amount allowed by the Senate increases that to $12,000,000, and, based on the information we had from those who are greatly interested in the field of cancer research, outside the Public Health Service, it seemed to us that the extra $5,000,000 is all that could be intelligently spent this next year. Large funds are being raised on the outside; there is pending before the Congress certain permanent legislation; and the committee felt very definitely that the increase up to $12,000,000 was all that should be allowed for the next year; and so a decrease in the House allocation, of $5,328,200, was provided.

For the consolidated operations of the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration, we proposed a decrease of $72,000.

The Senator from Wisconsin raised the question a few minutes ago relative to the language which the committee recommend be stricken from the bill in the item for the Office of Education, which reads as follows:

of which not less than $434,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized.

This is the first time that language in that form has appeared in an appropriation bill. In the bill for the prior year the language read that "not more than" whatever the amount was—should be allocated to the Division of Vocational Education. But, based on the facts before the committee, we believe that the Office of Education has been vitally interested in the field of vocational education; that the Vocational Education Division has, in fact, received certainly all that it was entitled to receive, and perhaps more; because the fund of the Division of Vocational Education for some years past has amounted to approximately 51 percent of the total funds available to the Commissioner of Education's office. If from the appropriation for this purpose an amount was taken out by the Commissioner of Education for the general overhead expenses of the office, for which no specific appropriations had been made, actually the Vocational Education Division would have had less funds available for its specific work. The facts and figures presented by the Commissioner of Education show that he is not unmindful of the importance of the work, and I will say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that should the committee, during the next year, find that in any way the Vocational Education Division was being discriminated against, we would be the first to recommend a change in the language in future bills; but we did not feel that such restrictive language belongs in the bill at this time.

For the benefit of the Senate, I have endeavored to outline briefly some of the problems with which the committee was faced, and some of the practical problems in economy which we will all have to face on each of the appropriation bills as they come along. But I want to reiterate that, after long hearings, which extended over a considerable number of weeks, the committee is convinced that the funds it has allowed are ample to permit the agencies to function properly, if the agencies themselves recognize that they, too, have an obligation to the American people to practice a degree of economy.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the Senator from California kindly yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator, acting as chairman of the subcommittee, and very ably acting, believe that any lesser sum than that which the subcommittee and the full committee allowed would permit the various bureaus to function properly?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Nevada that personally I am convinced that the agencies need the funds which have been recommended for them. If the Senator has reference to possible future conferences with the House, I can with a perfectly clear conscience go in and battle for the recommendations of the committee, if they are approved by the Senate. I would not do so on the basis that this was merely a trading operation and that the appropriations recommended by the committee could be substantially lowered.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, the Senator would then take the position that any lesser sum would in all probability cripple the agency for which the appropriation was made?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not want to make the categorical statement that the committee has recommended a Utopian bill, and that there may not be a few dollars here, or a few dollars there, which, if we had had more time, perhaps could not have been shaved off the budget figures, because I think that if the committee had been organized as it will be next year, so that its investigators could have had more time, we perhaps could have found a little more fat. But I will say that, based on the information which we now have, I believe the committee figures are entirely supported.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the Senator's definition, some time, of "a few dollars."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I was greatly concerned by the figures which the House appropriated for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I was concerned about them because the statistics furnished by that Bureau are basic, are recognized for their fairness the country over, and are used in a thousand ways by a thousand groups. But I was more particularly concerned because such large use is made of them by the Council of Economic Advisers; and having some responsibility for examining the reports of the Council of Economic Advisers, being a member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on the Economic Report, I wrote to the Chairman of the Council asking him what statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics he felt were absolutely essential for the carrying on of the work of his Council. I have received a letter which I have placed in the hands of the honorable Senator from California, and which I hope he still has in his possession, listing the various lines of inquiry which he felt to be essential. I thereupon sent a letter to the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics asking him for his estimates of the cost of carrying on those

functions. I shall not go into details of those estimates at this time, except to say that they totaled $3,562,292.

In addition to that, he estimated the overhead necessary to carry those detailed pieces of work through as being $804,000, making a total of $4,366,292. The $2 perhaps comes in the classification which was discussed a few moments ago on the floor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics underwent a severe attack 2 or 3 years ago in an endeavor to break down its professional reliability. It has survived that attack. The professional competence and the objectivity of its work are recognized by professional economists and statisticians the world over. It is one of the branches of the Government's work of which we can be most proud. The work it is doing is, in my judgment, absolutely essential for any action in a legislative way or an administrative way which relates to the maintenance of a high level of production and employment in this country.

This total figure, since it is arrived at by reference to the Bureau itself, may conceivably contain a little fat, more or less—nobody knows. I think probably the Senator from California, who, as chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, has become familiar with its details, may be a better estimator of the percentage of oleaginous substance in the figures than I would be, but I am, Mr. President, seriously concerned that these essential lines of statistics be not cut out or their usefulness diminished.

I am also seriously concerned with the point raised by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], that when the figure is arrived at, the banner be planted on that figure, and that the conferees say:

> Come one, come all! this rock shall fly
> From its firm base as soon as I.

Because it would be a calamity to have these services diminished in their usefulness. I trust the Senator from California can see to it in conference that they are not; and I trust that the committee has carefully considered as to whether the amount they are recommending is sufficient to enable the Bureau to carry on these essential services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Vermont that the committee is fully mindful of the importance of the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and it was for that reason that we made a very substantial increase over the amount which had been allotted the Bureau by the House of Representatives, and which, as I again say, is a little more than three times as great as it had ever had in any previous regular appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question with reference to the committee's action on page 17.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator speaking of the bill now, or of the committee report?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill, where the vocational educational appropriation was raised by the Senate committee from $14,200,000 to $17,750,000. I wish to ask why the proviso following that was stricken out? In the House bill the appropriation was for only $14,200,000, but the proviso followed:

> That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,759.97 for the fiscal year 1948.

I wanted to inquire of the distinguished Senator why that proviso was stricken from the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the appropriation allowed last year was $14,200,000, which was the amount recommended in the bill as it came to the Senate. We found in connection with a good many of these grants to States that if a larger sum was included in the proviso the agency went ahead on the basis that they were going to receive the larger sum; they treated it more or less like a direct authorization for an appropriation, and in a great many instances did not even consider themselves bound by what might be added in a deficiency bill. For that reason we felt that there would be less cause for misunderstanding if we made the amount which we are providing, which is 25 percent greater than they had last year, the full amount that could be allotted, so that there could be no misunderstanding.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator will recall that in the last Congress the appropriation for vocational education was in fact double. It had been about $14,000,000 prior to that total, and in the last act dealing with the matter items aggregating about $29,500,000 were allowed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think my able friend from Georgia means the authorization.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I am speaking of the authorization. Of course it was contemplated there would be an extension of vocational education in the States. I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill regarding the amount of $17,750,000. Did the committee have advice that that would be sufficient to take care of the needs of the States, or match the appropriations made by the States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the able Senator that we examined the situation in respect to the amount the agency had last year. We took into consideration the fact that the authorizations were, of course, greatly in excess of the amounts they had last year. We felt that due to the merit of this particular agency and the work it is doing, the committee would be justified in recommending to the Senate an increase of 25 percent more than was available to that agency in the previous fiscal year. In the case of most agencies we have made reductions under what was available to them in previous years, but in this case we felt that a 25 percent increase was certainly desirable. But in this economy period it was felt that that was the most we would be justified in recommending at this time.

I may say that throughout our report we have made crystal clear that in our opinion the grants to States for vocational education and vocational rehabilitation are subject to Congressional appropriation, and that the authorization is in no sense a mandatory appropriation. I have a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States which sustains our point of view. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of April 23, 1947, as follows:

"In regard to the payment to States on the part of the Federal Government for the Vocational Rehabilitation and Vocational Education programs, the following questions have arisen:

"1. Is the Federal Government obligated by law to pay one-half of the cost of services rendered on the part of States, or are the States required to match funds made available to them by the Federal Government?

"2. Is there anything in the law that would indicate that appropriations for these programs should be treated any differently than those of other Federal agencies?

"3. Is there anything in the law that would exempt appropriations for these programs from the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act?

"It is requested that an official interpretation be given in writing. This information is urgently needed."

The present vocational rehabilitation program is authorized by provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation amendments of 1943 (57 Stat. 374), which substantially changed and rewrote earlier legislation on the subject. Insofar as here material, the said act provides that funds which may be made available for the purpose thereof shall be used to make payments to States which have submitted to, and obtained approval by, the Federal Security Administrator of plans for vocational rehabilitation program (sec. 1). Such plans are required to meet certain conditions; and the Administrator is directed to approve those which qualify (sec. 2). Section 3 (a) of the act is, in pertinent part, as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) From the sums made available pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation, for each quarter or other shorter payment period prescribed by the Administrator, the sum of amounts he determines to be—

"(1) The necessary cost (exclusive of administrative expenses) to such State under the plan of providing vocational rehabilitation during the period for which such payment is to be made to disabled individuals, certified to the State by the Administrator as war disabled civilians;

"(2) One-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation

training and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or occupational limitations, in the case of other disabled individuals; and

"(3) One-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation services specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), to disabled individuals (not including war-disabled civilians) found to require financial assistance with respect thereto, after full consideration of the eligibility of such individual for any similar benefit by way of pension, compensation, or insurance, such rehabilitation services being—

* * * * *

"(4) Expenditures in such period necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan, including necessary administrative costs in connection with providing the foregoing services to, and guidance and placement of, disabled individuals."

Section 3 (c) provides, in substance, that, on the basis of information and data furnished by the States, the Administrator is to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount to be paid to each State for the particular period involved.

Section 9 provides, in part, as follows:

"There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Federal Security Agency such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The vocational education program is authorized by several statutes set forth in Twentieth United States Code 11, et seq. That part requiring the matching of contributions, to which you apparently refer, is authorized by provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 775), which amended and rewrote the act of June 8, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories" (George-Deen Act, 49 Stat. 1488). Insofar as here material, the Vocational Education Act of 1946 authorizes the making of certain annual appropriations in definite amounts therein stipulated which amounts are to be apportioned among the several States and Territories in the manner specified for the purpose of assisting them in the further development of vocational education (sec. 3). Payments to the States are directed to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon certification by the United States Commissioner of Education as to "the moneys to which the State or Territory is entitled under the provisions of this act" (sec. 5). Section 4 provides that "The several States and Territories, in order to receive the benefits of this act, shall be required to match by State and local funds, or both, 100 percent of the appropriations made under authority of section 3."

As to the first question contained in your letter, while section 3 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943, quoted above, provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is to make periodic payments to the various States of the amounts determined by the Federal Security Administrator to be payable to them—as provided in said section—on account of necessary costs or necessary expenditures made by the States under approved plans for providing vocational rehabilitation, it is to be noted that such payments are to be made only from moneys available for such purpose. Hence, it is my opinion that, under the terms of the said law, there is no legal obligation on the Federal Government to make payments to the States unless and until the Congress makes money available for said purpose. In other words, I do not feel that the said law, by itself, imposes any legal obligation on the Federal Government to make the payments provided for in section 3.

Also, I am of the opinion that the sums which the Federal Security Administrator certifies from time to time for payment to the States should be considered in the light of the total amount which the Congress has appropriated to carry out the purposes of the act for the fiscal year involved. In such connection it is to be noted that section 9 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943, quoted above, authorizes that there be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Federal Security Agency such amounts as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. Obviously, such provision contemplates that the total amount necessary to fulfill the obligations of the Federal Government under the act shall be determined in advance of each fiscal year, and that when said amount is appropriated, it shall constitute the total cost to the Federal Government for said fiscal year.

Likewise, it is my opinion that, under the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, there is no legal obligation on the Federal Government to make any payments to States, as provided in section 3 thereof, until the Congress actually appropriates the sums therein authorized to be appropriated.

As to the matter of the States being required to match funds made available to them by the Federal Government, it will be noted that section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, referred to above, provides expressly that the several States and Territories, in order to receive the benefits of said act, shall be required to match 100 percent of the amounts made available thereunder by the Federal Government. Moreover, while I find no provision in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943 requiring expressly that the States are to match funds authorized to be paid to them under section 3 thereof, it would seem clear that there is an implied obligation on the States to match funds in those instances where the Federal Government is to pay only one-half of the costs to the States. (See sec. 3 (a), (2) and (3), quoted above.)

With respect to the second question presented in your letter, I perceive nothing in the referred-to laws which indicates that the appropriations for either of the programs here involved should be treated any differently than the appropriations for other agencies of the Government—although there may be a strong moral obligation on the Federal Government, before the commencement of each fiscal year, to meet by adequate appropriations the policy commitments with respect to the continuing programs authorized.

As to the third question presented by your letter, it is assumed that you have in mind section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, (31 U. S. C. 665), which provides, in part, that "No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law." There is perceived nothing in the laws pertaining to the vocational rehabilitation and vocational-education programs which would relieve the agencies charged with the duty of administering such programs from complying with the said provisions of the Revised Statutes.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator regarding the amendment on page 18 of the bill. I refer to the language stricken out beginning in line 12 "of which not less than $434,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

Will the Senator please explain why the committee thought it was necessary to strike that provision from the bill as it came from the House?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to explain that. That is the same question as the one asked by the able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] earlier. Perhaps the Senator was not present.

Mr. GEORGE. I was not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Based on the information we have, we believe that the Office of Commissioner of Education is fully alive to the importance of the vocational education program. The appropriations for salaries in 1945 were as follows: For vocational education, $355,794, or 51½ percent of the total amount allowed to the Commissioner of Education; for the other activities of the Commissioner of Education, such as service to libraries, general appropriations, and so forth, the Commissioner had 48½ percent available to him. Had the same percentage been applied to the general overhead of the office, of which the vocational education program receives the benefit, approximately 51 percent of the total amount would have been chargeable to the vocational education funds. As a matter of fact, however, the Commissioner's office charged them for common operations, such as making out pay rolls, library service, and other activities of which the vocational education program received the benefit, not 51 percent of the total, which rightfully might have been charged, but only 34.7 percent for such common operations. Based on the facts presented, we felt that in an office of this kind, where there are certain common activies, such as pay-roll activities and otherwise, this limitation should not be applied in the bill. I will say to the able Senator from Georgia that if it should be brought out during the next year that the Office of Commissioner of Education is in any degree discriminating against vocational education work, I should be happy, in the next year, to join with the Senator in writing such restrictions into the bill. But we did not feel, under the circumstances, and based upon the actual facts, that such language should be in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator for his statement. However, there is a feeling among those in the States who are doing this work—and it is very general; it is not confined to any particular section of the country—that the Office of Education is disposed to charge too much, and not too little, to the vocational fund.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator that I have figures for a number of years showing the facts; and the facts do not substantiate the suspicions of those in the States. I have received a telegram and a letter from my own State of California in connection with this subject, and I shall give it further attention. However, I believe that, based upon all the facts, the committee action was amply justified.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator for his explanatory statement. I especially appreciate his assurance that if there is found to be any discrimination against vocational education within the course of the year, he will join in an effort to correct the situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure the able Senator in charge of the bill has given very careful consideration to the effect of the reduced appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. Is the Senator convinced that with this reduction from the estimate presented by the President the National Labor Relations Board will be able efficiently to carry out its activities?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Montana that we feel that the amount of the cut made by the House was too great, and that a substantial increase was warranted. Based upon those beliefs, and after hearing the testimony, the committee made a recommendation for an increase of almost $1,000,000 in the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. The over-all increase was $941,000. We believe that with that amount of money the agency will be able materially to cut down the backlog of cases.

Some question was raised by those who said that there is legislation pending in the Senate, and perhaps the House amount should be allowed to stand; but throughout the committee took the position that the only sound thing we could do as an appropriations committee was to take the law as we found it. At the present time the law provides for the National Labor Relations Board in its present form. Rather than wait for some speculative action which might or might not ultimately result, we felt that we should deal with the situation as it exists today. We feel that the $941,000 will enable the Board to make material progress. I do not say that it will permit it within a year's time completely to clear up the backlog of cases. I rather doubt that even the amount in the President's budget would have permitted it to do so.

Mr. MURRAY. There seems to be considerable anxiety with reference to whether or not, with this amount, the Labor Relations Board would be able to keep up with the increasing volume of cases which are coming to it. I noticed an editorial in the Washington Post of last Wednesday discussing this question. I should like to read a paragraph from it.

> On March 1, 1946, the National Labor Relations Board had a backlog of 3,875 unprocessed cases. On March 1 of this year, the backlog amounted to 5,225 cases—an increase of more than one-third. This is to say that the Wagner Act is being only partially administered. * * * That it is now, because of a shortage of personnel, unable adequately to discharge its congressional mandate is painfully apparent. If the cut in its appropriation ordained by the House is sustained in the Senate—almost 50 percent less than the President's budget estimate and 10 percent under the present appropriation—it will be forced to reduce its staff by about 50 persons, and, as an inevitable result, will fall still further behind in its work.

I know that the Senate committee has increased the amount over the sum fixed by the House; but notwithstanding that increase, I understand that in view of the constantly increasing volume of the work of the National Labor Relations Board, the sum which is now fixed in the appropriation bill will be inadequate to enable it to keep up with its activities.

I suggest that consideration be given to this matter at this time, because it is vitally important that the National Labor Relations Board should be able to process the increased load of cases it is receiving. Its failure to do so will result in considerable trouble and injury for the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Montana that it was for that reason that we made this very material increase in the amount allowed by the House. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in previous years, for instance, in 1939, the National Labor Relations Board received $2,121,000; in 1940, $2,267,000; in 1941, $2,042,000. In 1946 it had $2,653,000, and in 1947 it has $2,601,000. The committee recommends $4,974,700.

Mr. MURRAY. At the same time I should like to call attention to the fact that the National Labor Relations Board estimates that there will be a greatly increased load during the coming months and that with the reduced amount it will not be possible for them to keep up their work.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to explain my position in order that the Senator from California may understand it. I am yielding to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] because I want him to propound such questions as he may desire to propound to the Senator from California, thus preserving some uniformity in the procedure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California a question, referring to the item at the top of page 17 of the bill. The Senator has already answered a question or two propounded by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Would not the effect of that amendment, although it raises the figure of $14,200,000 to $17,750,000, be to limit the over-all amount to be expended on this program during the coming year?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. One of the things of which we were fearful was that the agency would take the larger figure and, in spite of the fact that the Congress had appropriated a different amount, make that allocation, and then come back for a deficiency appropriation. That has been done on a number of occasions under grant programs. Agencies have taken the authorization figure as being a more or less mandatory appropriation basis. They have spent their funds and obligated them more or less willy-nilly and then have come back to the Congress and said, "We have to meet these commitments. Now it is up to you to pass a deficiency bill."

We wanted to make it perfectly clear that every agency of the Government is limited by the appropriation bills passed by the Congress of the United States, and that so far as we are concerned they are not to expend more or to obligate themselves for more funds than are provided by the Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that reason. But, as a matter of fact, these programs have been held up during the war. I know that they have been held up in my State, particularly. I have here a letter dated May 2 from J. Marion Edwards, State director of vocational education, from which I should like to read one paragraph. It is as follows:

> Here in Arkansas, where we are in dire need of increased funds to aid a large number of programs that have been on the waiting list since before the war, we are extremely disappointed that such a low figure has been recommended. We could easily use Arkansas' allotment of the full amount of something more than $29,000,000 which it is possible to appropriate through the George-Barden Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no doubt that they could find use for the entire $29,000,000; but on that basis, following through the argument of the able Senator from Arkansas, instead of the figure of $19,000,000 there should be a figure of $29,000,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it ought to be $29,000,000. It is a matching program. I know of no more beneficial program. I think there is very little disagreement as to the usefulness of this program for the future. It is a preventive program rather than a curative one. We are trying to prevent old-age pensions and the payment of social security insofar as it is possible to make the people self-sufficient.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Arkansas that I do not disagree with him as to the value of the program. In my own State it is a very valuable program. But I also call to the Senator's attention the fact that we are increasing the amount by 25 percent, and if all of these items should be increased by 25 percent, in 4 years it would result in double the cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator will agree that not many of them are as valuable as is this one. I do not think we can generalize about all of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the able Senator had sat on the Appropriations Committee—I have been on three subcommittees—he would know that every bureau chief, every department head, every sub-bureau chief who comes before the committee makes the same argument—that his service is the most valuable service being performed for the people of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that. But the Senator is placed on the com-

mittee for the very purpose of using some discretion in these matters and not merely accepting a bureau chief's word. It is the duty of the Senator to use discretion in connection with these matters. I certainly do not think that the Senator would accept the principle that because they ask for an increase the committee has to grant it. There must be some distinction as between the merits of the requests. This is not altogether Federal money; it is money which is matched on a 50–50 basis.

I should like to read one further line from the letter to which I have referred. It is as follows:

For many years Arkansas has been doing much more than matching Federal funds.

In other words, they have not merely been using up to the amount that would match, but they have spent a great deal more than that, showing their own interest in the program and their evaluation of it. It is not quite like some of the programs which use nothing but Federal money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator that the minimum requirements under the act amount to $6,750,000. Then it is provided that the several States and Territories, in order to receive the benefits of the act, shall be required to match by State and local funds, or both, 100 percent of the appropriation made by authority of section 3.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That means dollar for dollar?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. As a matter of fact, there is nothing to prevent the States from putting more funds into this very worthy project.

I would call the able Senator's attention to the fact that almost all the State treasuries are in better shape than is the Federal Treasury at this time, and I would also call his attention to the fact that the debt of the Federal Government, which was approximately $16 000,000,000 in 1930, was $42,000,000,000 in 1940, and $259,000,000,000 in 1947. I think we have an obligation, if we are going to preserve the solvency of the Federal Government, to go over all these programs carefully. I think the figure in this instance is a very generous one. In the fiscal state of the Federal Treasury there is no reason at all why the States cannot carry a little more of the load.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for that statement. We are well aware of the national debt, but I hope the Senator has not lost sight of the fact that this kind of a program is the very kind which will make this country productive and put it in a position to build itself up in the future. It is very shortsighted economy to destroy our educational activities. That is the one thing which offers real hope for the future. That is my only point.

I cannot argue about reducing governmental expenditures as a general proposition; on that score I agree with the Senator from California. I am not questioning all the items as recommended by the committee. I am questioning only this particular item, which is one of the most important in the bill. All of us are familiar with the drastic cut which has been made in the item by the House of Representatives, but now we find that the Senate committee has, in effect, reduced the amount of the appropriation which the House of Representatives was willing to allocate for this purpose.

The letter to which I have referred states that the agency of the Arkansas State government dealing with vocational education has already set out its program on the basis, as it believes, that it will receive at least the $19,842,000. I think it would be going far enough to reduce the appropriation to that extent. However, in view of what has actually been done, we find that the Senate committee has voted to out-economize the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say that we have to make a comparison with what was done last year. We did increase the amount by $3,350,000 over what the House of Representatives has allowed. In other words, as I have said, that does not mean there has been a decrease, as compared with the funds allowed last year for vocational education; but that is an increase by 25 percent over what was allowed for that purpose last year. In view of that fact and upon consideration of the other facts which confront us and the fiscal affairs of the Federal Government, the committee felt that was as far as it could go in regard to this particular item for this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senate. I simply disagree as to the value of this particular program, as I have said.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, first let me state my position, because it might be construed as an indication that I am attempting to delay the consideration of this bill. I wish to clarify the situation so that all Members of the Senate, particularly the Senator from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, will understand it. I wish to yield to Senators who desire to propound questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, so as to clarify the entire situation regarding the bill. Thereafter, I shall present my views and shall do so very briefly.

For that purpose I now yield to the Senator from Oregon, to permit him to ask his questions of the Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have only a few questions to ask the Senator from California, because I think that, generally speaking, his subcommittee has covered the matter very well indeed. I think the Senator from California is to be commended for the conscientious work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee. I think he has had one of the most difficult of all the appropriation bills to handle. It seems to me that it is almost too much to expect that in regard to an appropriation bill so important as this one, all Members of the Senate can be of one mind in respect to the final recommendations of the committee.

On the whole, Mr. President, I think the report of the committee is an exceptionally good one. However, I share the views which have been expressed by some Members of the Senate that an insufficient amount of money has been approved by the committee for the National Labor Relations Board. I do not think it is sufficient. I think we should have in the RECORD at this time at least certain statistical material for future reference, because, in my judgment, if the amount recommended by the committee for the National Labor Relations Board is all the money that is allowed to the National Labor Relations Board, we shall be continuing the present trend of delay in the disposition of cases by the National Labor Relations Board. Delay is costly not only to employers and labor alike but it whips up a great deal of misunderstanding between employers and labor, and very frequently invites work stoppages because men grow restless under delay. Quick decisions in handling labor disputes are essential to labor peace.

So, Mr. President, I wish to present certain figures which I think should at least be in the RECORD. They are in line with the comments made in an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, which I desire to offer for the RECORD, to be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY OR CHAOS?

On March 1, 1946, the National Labor Relations Board had a backlog of 3,875 unprocessed cases. On March 1 of this year, the backlog amounted to 5,225 cases—an increase of more than one-third. This is to say that the Wagner Act is being only partially administered. A great hue and cry would arise, no doubt, if the NLRB were to declare frankly that it could not keep up with its case load and would therefore limit its administration of the act, say, to the States east of the Mississippi or north of the Mason and Dixon's line. That it is now, because of a shortage of personnel, unable adequately to discharge its congressional mandate is painfully apparent. If the cut in its appropriation ordained by the House is sustained in the Senate—almost 50 percent less than the President's budget estimate and 10 percent under the present appropriation—it will be forced to reduce its staff by about 50 persons and, as an inevitable result, will fall still further behind in its work.

This is an expensive form of economy. The board, like a court of law, has a statutory obligation to process cases brought before it for action; and it has small control over the number of cases filed with it. It is an instrument for the orderly adjudication of disputes or violations of the law which would otherwise dislocate the national economy. As Chairman Herzog of the NLRB told the Senate subcommittee in charge of Labor-Federal Security appropriations, "Delays in the processing of cases impair the effectiveness of the (Wagner) act by prolonging employer-employee tension and uncertainties. Further, delays often lead to strikes which prompt application of the judicial procedures of the board would prevent • • •

Not only may impatience at the board's slowness in handling 'organizational issues' lead to self-help in the form of strikes, but delays in handling complaint cases often build up employer liability for back pay. In cases where elections are delayed, all parties—labor and management alike—are subjected to tensions which promote unrest."

The goal of economy which the Republican Members of Congress have set themselves is, of course, an important one. It cannot be attained without a substantial paring of the President's budget which must necessarily entail the sacrifice of some desirable governmental services and activities. But the monetary saving must be weighed in terms of the sacrifice. In this instance it seems to us a form of saving that may prove dangerously costly. We can scarcely afford to carry unadministered or inadequately administered laws on our statute books. It can scarcely be considered economical to promote industrial chaos.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think these salient facts should be in the RECORD in regard to the 1948 budget of the National Labor Relations Board. They come under the following points:

First, the 1947 appropriation was $4,453,500, including $384,000 recommended by the House Appropriations Committee for Pay Act costs. The 1948 estimate of the President was $7,984,000. The House approved $4,033,700. The Senate commitee is recommending $4,974,700.

The House bill cuts the appropriation 10 percent below the 1947 appropriation, on the assumption that the Pay Act costs bill for 1947 passes. The House bill cuts 49 percent below the President's 1948 estimate. The Senate committee's recommendation cuts the appropriation 38 percent below the President's 1948 estimate.

The second point I wish to make deals with the staff of the National Labor Relations Board, and in that connection I wish to set forth comparative figures. On July 1, 1946, it had a staff of 990 members. Let me point out that during the war years there was considerable let-down in the activities of the National Labor Relations Board because during that period some other agencies of Government took over some of its activities and functions in handling of labor cases, the most notable being the War Labor Board itself. So the war years were not a very accurate measuring stick to use in adjudging the needs of the National Labor Relations Board now that we are returning to the industrial relations which characterize a peace-time economy. But even on July 1, 1946, the Board had 990 members on its staff; the 1947 average was 810; the President's estimate for 1948 was 1,550; the 1948 average provided for in the House bill would be 683. In the bill as recommended by the Senate committee it is figured on the basis of 870, as I understand.

The third point I wish to make is that this reduction in staff coincides with a 50 percent increase in incoming cases—11,800 of them—from July 1946 through March 1947, as compared to the same 9 months' period of the preceding fiscal year. In other words, we are dealing with an agency in which we have vested the greatest responsibility for trying to maintain industrial peace in the United States, through the terms and provisions of the Wagner Act; and after vesting that responsibility in it, at a time when it has such a tremendous increase in the number of cases brought before it—a 50 percent increase—we are allowing it insufficient money with which to function. From that, I can spell out nothing other than the word "delay"—delay in the handling of its cases, Mr. President. There is bound to be more and more delay.

In connection with the increase in its cases, it is very interesting to note that they are predominantly increases in unfair employer practices. I think that is a fact we should understand. It is not pleasant to realize that situation; nevertheless it is a reality that at this very time in the United States unfair employer practices against organized labor, as shown by the records of the National Labor Relations Board, are on the increase. Perhaps that will spell industrial harmony if those employers engaging in such practices succeed in making unions weak enough so that they cannot negotiate contracts which protect the fair rights of workers. If the unions lose their effectiveness, there will be a kind of industrial harmony in the United States for a while. But there will be an accumulation of resentment and bitterness which will finally result in a type of industrial explosion that will boomerang against the employers who are engaging in these tactics of union busting.

I think the safest investment in industrial insurance we could make would be through the appropriation of a larger sum for the National Labor Relations Board, so that these cases could be handled much more quickly than I see any chance of handling them with the amount of money which has been allowed in the committee's report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the Senator is explaining what he thinks to be the causes of delay in the deciding of cases. That applies to the past, does it not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. How does the Senator account for the fact, when the present administration has had entire charge of all appropriations in the past, that the employer has been favored in the way the Senator is explaining?

Mr. MORSE. I think the answer to the Senator's question is perfectly obvious. In the past the National Labor Relations Board has never had enough money to maintain personnel adequate to enable it to dispose of the cases quickly enough. I am not interested in who had the responsibility for that condition in the past. I am interested in the Senate measuring up at this time to its full responsibility to see to it that in the future the Board may have sufficient money to prevent that unreasonable delay in disposing of its cases. I say to the Senator from Michigan that sufficient money is not allowed in the appropriation carried by the pending bill. He cannot escape the responsibility of the Republican majority in this session of Congress by making a political criticism of what the Democrats may have done in the past.

Mr. FERGUSON. The point I am getting at is that if the administration itself which had charge of the appropriations never asked for sufficient appropriations to do the work, have we any way of telling that if we appropriate the money now the same administration will use it for the purpose for which it should go, that is, to see that the cases are actually decided?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether the Senator's criticism is well taken because I do not have before me the history of the NLRB appropriation fights in the past sessions of the Congress, but I should be very much surprised if an investigation into the history of those appropriation bills did not show that the Board asked for more money than it was allowed. I am sure that if the Board had been allowed more money it would have been able to do a better job. We cannot justify a failure on our part in not granting enough money to the NLRB on any rationalization that past Congresses have not appropriated enough money to make it possible for the Board to decide cases without unnecessary delays. The Senator cannot deny successfully the fact that the Board is unable to decide its cases now in time to avoid many strikes caused by the dissatisfaction of labor over union weakening delays. The only way the Board can speed up its decisions is to be allowed more money for more staff.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yielded to the Senator from Oregon, and I see a chance that it would rather mess things up to follow the course suggested. I am yielding to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada yields solely to the Senator from Oregon, who will proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Maine understands my position. I would like to yield to him.

The probable caseload for the entire fiscal year 1947 will be 16,000 cases, compared with around 10,000 before and during the war.

The fourth point I desire to make is that we should take note of the number of pending or backlog cases. On March 1, 1946, there were 3,875 of them; on July 1, 1946, there were 4,600; on January 1, 1947, there were 5,065; on April 1, 1947, there were 5,407. This shows a present 33-percent increase in backlog as against April of last year.

The fifth point I wish to make is the time consumed in handling litigated cases from filing to decision. Of course, the difficult ones are the ones which require Board decision because they cannot be settled between the parties, and

they are seldom if ever withdrawn in the field.

Let me state what the record shows. I asked for this information because my experience in the field of labor relations convinces me that delay in reaching decisions in cases is the most important procedural obstacle to overcome if we really wish to prevent labor disputes through the NLRB. During its operations the War Labor Board fell so far behind in acting on the cases before it that sometimes there were strikes against the Board, even in wartime. So we devised a procedure which I felt, at least, would be very helpful in clearing our backlog by delegating to our regional boards final authority to determine facts rather than have them determined in Washington. But that was during a time of war emergency, and it cannot very well be done with cases such as those I am discussing, which require determination very frequently of fundamental legal rights under the Wagner Act.

What does the timetable show as to these cases? It shows that it takes about 7 months, on the average, to handle an election case.

In unfair labor-practice cases it takes 20 months from time of complaint through to decision. That is a very long time for the handling of a labor case. These are not civil law cases, which, after all, can rest on the docket for a while because the rights of the parties are not particularly injured by the passage of time, but in this dynamic field of labor relations it is the passage of time itself which very frequently destroys rights. It does not help much if a favorable decision can be reached in 20 months, if at the end of 20 months the union has been dissipated, anyway, and its effectiveness destroyed.

On July 1, before the Board's staff was cut over 25 percent, the figures were about 3 and 9 months, respectively, which, it seems to me, shows a very interesting relationship—not a surprising one, because it would be expected, but a very interesting relationship—between size of staff and speed in handling cases. Statistics show that before the Staff was cut the present figures of 7 and 20 months' delay, respectively, were cut to 3 and 9 months' delay, respectively.

Cases in Washington awaiting review by the Board and its legal staff at the present time number 471, of which 190 have yet to be assigned.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the understanding which has been reached between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Maine is understood by the Senator from Nevada, and if the Senator from Oregon is entirely content, in view of the fact that the Senator from Maine is called upon leave the Chamber, I gladly yield to him.

DOCUMENTARY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAVEL ABROAD

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to submit out of order a resolution and to make a brief statement, of not to exceed 20 minutes, in relation thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. This resolution authorizes a study of the documentary requirements of our Government of American citizens who wish to travel abroad for business or pleasure. Neither this resolution nor the proposed study have anything whatsoever to do with the question of immigration, or the movement of displaced persons. It is my desire, however, to determine what, if anything, can be done by either the executive or legislative branch of our Government to bring the documentary requirements for travel abroad abreast of our modern day transportation facilities.

I feel certain that every Member of this body knows, either from personal experience or as a result of repeated complaints from constituents, the problem a businessman or a tourist faces with respect to passports, visas, health certificates, police records, finger printing, and so forth, when wishing to travel abroad. These requirements are largely the outgrowth of World Wars I and II. They exist by reason of statutes, Presidential proclamations, Executive orders, and regulations. I do not know to what extent this maze of documentary requirements can be simplified. I feel strongly, however, that some means can be found, consistent with the security of our country, to greatly simplify for our citizens the right to travel abroad for business or pleasure.

Not only, Mr. President, is the travel and transportation industry as a whole an important part of our national economy, but even more important is the fact that if more persons are permitted to travel abroad, and see and understand conditions in other countries, a tremendous contribution will be made to the cause of world peace through the medium of greater understanding among the peoples of the world. Moreover, the more American citizens are permitted to travel abroad, the more dollars will be left in foreign countries, thus not only strengthening the national economy of many foreign nations, but also enabling those countries to purchase our products.

Mr. President, I again wish to emphasize that the intended study will not in any way include or touch the question of immigration. I not only will welcome the suggestions and recommendations of any Senators who are interested in this problem, but I earnestly solicit them.

I may add that the greatest single item in our imports, curiously enough, is the import of our understanding of foreign countries, through the medium of foreign travel. It is that I hope that we may see increased.

I now ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 111) was received, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of (1) the advisability and practicability of eliminating or relaxing the present requirements imposed by statute, proclamation, Executive order, or regulation upon the right of United States citizens to travel beyond the boundaries of the United States for business or pleasure; and (2) the desirability of negotiating agreements with foreign nations for the purpose of allowing our citizens to travel in such nations, and their citizens to travel in the United States, for business or pleasure, upon compliance with a minimum of regulation, consistent with security. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, not later than June 30, 1947, the results of its study, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may ask, what is the primary question involved in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is whether or not we may modify to some extent the regulations and restrictions regarding passports and visas in this country and abroad, in order to facilitate a greater amount of foreign travel, both at home and abroad.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am wondering about the reference of the resolution. To what committee should it be referred?

Mr. BREWSTER. I asked that it go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was my hope that it might go to that committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that, in view of the fact that immigration is by the new rules a matter within the province of the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems to me the resolution should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BREWSTER. I tried to make it clear in my statement that the resolution has no relation whatever to immigration requirements or quota requirements. It is not contemplated that this inquiry should have any connection with or give any consideration to that matter at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that, but I still think that immigration being included within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, the resolution should go to that committee. I merely make the suggestion; I do not insist.

Mr. BREWSTER. I request that reference of the resolution be postponed pending my further discussion with the Senator from Nevada, and that the resolution be held at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reference will be postponed, and the resolution will be held at the desk.

Subsequently the President pro tempore referred the resolution (S. Res. 111) to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us have an understanding as to who has the floor. The Senator from Nevada has the floor, and the Chair assumes that, by unanimous consent, he is being permitted to yield it to the Senator from Oregon for his remarks?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the procedure which has been followed during the afternoon. I hope it may continue, for the sole reason that I wish the remarks of those who have questions to address to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having the bill in charge, may have a right to present their questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is understood, therefore, that the floor is now held by the Senator from Nevada and that, by unanimous consent, unless objection is made, he is permitted to yield temporarily to the Senator from Oregon for a continuation of his remarks. Hearing no objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, commenting on the 471 new cases now pending before the National Labor Relations Board, 190 of which have not yet been assigned, let me say that the 471 cases involve 171,000 pages of transcript which must be read and analyzed. I merely throw out that suggestion to call attention to some of the practical problems involved in the tremendous task which confronts the staff of the National Labor Relations Board. I am to some extent familiar with the work of the Board's staff. I wish Members of the Senate would occasionally visit the Board, after hours, at 8, 9, and 10 o'clock at night, to see the large number of employees, who, out of devotion to their work and because they know how important it is to get cases settled without unnecessary delay, in order to prevent strikes and to maintain industrial harmony, are laboring many hours a day beyond what is required of them. I have been one who has on occasion made criticisms, too, of certain procedures and policies of the National Labor Relations Board, but I think when commendation is due it ought to be given. I believe the Board is entitled to the appreciation of Congress for the way it is trying to handle the cases on its docket as speedily as possible under the insufficient appropriations which have been allowed it.

The sixth point I want to make is that in many places such delays make a dead letter of the NLRB; and yet the delays can only increase, in my judgment, under the House and Senate versions of the pending appropriation bill, even assuming that Congress does not give the Board any new responsibilities.

In my opinion, we should not pass on this particular appropriation in the conjectural attitude that perhaps we will give them new responsibilities and then we can reconsider this request for funds. If we do give them new responsibilities, then of course we must give them a very large increase in their budget in keeping with the additional work that we assign to them. But I say that, assuming no changes are made in the so-called Wagner Act and that the Board continues with its present functions, an increase in funds over what the committee has recommended should be granted. If the Board does not have enough funds workers will adopt a technique in many cases of organizational strikes rather than wait for certification by the Board. This will happen if it is going to take on the average 20 months to obtain certification. I commented on that at some length in a speech the other day, and I shall not repeat it now.

The seventh point I want to make is the importance of giving primary emphasis to increasing the items of salaries for the Board and of the Board's staff. The Board's most vital need in the present emergency, in order to reduce the backlog of cases is to be able more effectively to take care of the salary problem. Since the salaries item, even as increased by the Senate Appropriations Committee, is still reduced, by a greater proportion than any other item, below the original program embodied in the President's budget request, it seems to me that further consideration should be given to the item by the Senate.

Next, I would say that the exact percentages by which the Senate committee's recommendations have reduced the President's budget ought to appear in the RECORD, and I shall place them in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, they may be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. On salaries, the reduction is 39.1 percent; miscellaneous expenses, 34.9 percent; penalty mail, 0.0; on printing and binding the reduction is 28.5 percent.

I also ask permission to publish in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, a table comparing the President's budget with the House bill and the Senate committee recommendations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Labor Relations Board—Table comparing President's budget with House bill and Senate committee recommendations

Appropriation title	President's budget	Recommended by House		Recommended by Senate	
		Amount	Percent decrease	Amount	Percent decrease
Salaries	$6,157,000	$3,063,100	50.3	$3,750,000	39.1
Miscellaneous expenses	1,383,000	805,500	41.8	900,000	34.9
Penalty mail costs	24,700	18,400	25.5	24,700	....
Printing and binding	419,300	146,700	65.0	300,000	28.5
Total	7,984,000	4,033,700	49.5	4,974,700	37.7

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether anything can be done about it at this point; but, because of my confidence in the members of the committee, I am perfectly willing, on the basis of the data I have just inserted in the RECORD, to say to the committee that I think they ought to reexamine their recommendations on the basis of the data I have presented and see if they can themselves recommend some increase in the budget for the National Labor Relations Board. At least I hope the conference committee will explore this matter very carefully because I think it is vital to preventing many labor disputes in this country during the coming year.

I feel very deeply about this matter, Mr. President. If we take the budget as now recommended, then we might just as well get ready not only for greater delays in the procedures of the Board, but we might just as well get ready for some labor difficulties growing out of a lack of funds appropriated by the Congress.

I was glad to hear the Senator from California say, or to read in the report, that the committee felt probably some procedural changes could be brought about on the part of the National Labor Relations Board, which might speed up the work somewhat. I hope that is true. I hope the committee went into the practical difficulties confronting the Board in sufficient detail so that they could make helpful recommendations to the Board. I am inclined to believe that for months past, under the new Chairman, the Board has been doing its very best to find some short cuts in procedure that will diminish the delay. However, I shall be very much surprised, Mr. President, if any of the recommendations of the committee, made to the Board, will result in fact in any speeding up of the work of the Board. It is so easy for Senators to sit here and make what appear to be plausible suggestions, from our curbstone position, as to how departments can do their work more speedily and more efficiently. However, I have observed that by and large the suggestions thus made are seldom very practical or of much benefit to the departments concerned. I was a member of the War Labor Board when some of the distinguished Members of the Senate, from time to time, made suggestions as to how they thought we could do our work more speedily. Without any reflection on them, Mr. President, I want to say that if they had only sat with us for 48 hours they themselves would have found out how absurd most of their suggestions were, because they were making suggestions respecting matters about which they had very little practical experience. I want to point out that I do not think the Senate is particularly in the best position to tell the National Labor Relations Board how to handle its procedural problems. But if Senators have some good suggestions to make, I am sure they will be given earnest consideration by the National Labor Relations Board.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I want to express my dubiousness about any great

speed-up resulting from any suggestions addressed to the Board as to how it could do its work more efficiently, because the members of the Board are a conscientious and I think a highly efficient tribunal of men. They know the problems of the Board much better than we do. If we grant them the money they need they will do a good job.

I have a question or two I want to ask the Senator from California in regard to certain other matters in the committee report.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment before he leaves that subject?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to say that if the labor bill is passed in substantially the form in which it is before the Senate, the work of the National Labor Relations Board will be greatly increased, and I certainly shall urge upon the Appropriations Committee a very substantial increase in the appropriations for the Board in order that it may do the additional work which the bill would impose upon it.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator that I have already expressed similar views as to the need for a review of the NLRB budget if we grant it new responsibilities. I think, of course, increased appropriations in such case would be absolutely imperative. But even assuming that the labor bill does not pass and the Board has to function under the same terms of reference as are contained in the present act, I think the amount we are allowing it is not adequate for it to do the work which I think needs to be done in handling the increase of cases coming through the channels of the Board.

I now want to ask the Senator from California for a comment on the statement appearing on page 2, the last sentence, and running over to the top of page 3, as follows:

> The committee recommends a change in the limitation for temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators, to provide for not to exceed $25,000 for arbitrators and not to exceed $50,000 for mediators; and also recommends the addition of a proviso that not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration in any one case.

In raising my question, Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from California that I want to know why $50,000 is provided for mediators. That is, how does it happen that mediators are assigned in addition to those on the regular staff of the Conciliation Service? There exists a Conciliation and Mediation Service. It has its own mediators. The bill provides for $50,000 apparently for special mediators. What is the necessity for them?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The House language, which is stricken by the Senate committee, reads as follows:

> Including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary appointment of arbitrators and mediators on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws.

That was the language that came over to us from the House. We modified that language so it now reads:

> Including the temporary employment of arbitrators (not to exceed $25,000) and mediators (not to exceed $50,000) on labor relations without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, * * * *Provided*, That not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration of any one case.

We felt that the payments on arbitration cases were running a great deal higher than in the judgment of the committee they should run.

Mr. MORSE. Let me restate my question. What I am questioning is the $50,000 for mediators. I do not know for what purpose $50,000 for mediators is in the bill, because the Conciliation and Mediation Service has a staff of regular full-time mediators. I can see why it is desired to provide money for arbitrators; but here, in addition to the money provided for the Mediation Service to perform the services of normal mediating, there is an additional sum of $50,000 for mediators. I should like the Senator to tell me what kind of a case it is that requires the appointment of a special mediator over and above the mediators of the Conciliation Service itself?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that what we want to do is to fix a top-side limit beyond which funds may not be expended for either arbitration or mediation. Does the Senator object particularly to the mediation feature of it, or the arbitration feature?

Mr. MORSE. My objection involves a query as to whether the $50,000 is needed at all. I do not know why we are spending money for so-called special mediators. We have a conciliation budget, do we not, that provides for a staff of full-time mediators?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It provides a certain sum of money for the personnel of the Conciliation and Mediation Service. The conciliators provided for in that budget, scattered all over the country, are the regular mediators of the Conciliation and Mediation Service. Once in a while I understand they do a little arbitrating, although it is not a common practice. I think it is somewhat unfortunate that they ever do any arbitrating, because, in my opinion, their arbitration work ought to be kept absolutely separate from mediation. However, that is another matter. But, in addition to the money appropriated for the regular Mediation Service there is apparently appropriated also $50,000 that can be used for special mediators. Are they relief mediators? Are they mediators which the Service needs to add to its staff to help them out when there is an extra heavy load of run-of-the-mill cases, or are they mediators for special cases?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that would be a top-side limitation when, if it is required and necessary that additional mediators be brought into the picture, not more than $50,000 would be available. In other words, we want to put some top-side limitation on them. I refer the Senator to page 317 of the hearings:

> Senator BALL. I notice the House has allowed $50,000 for a temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators.
>
> Mr. WARREN. I am very glad you mentioned that. As a result of the unanimous recommendation of industry and labor people, we have approved a list of 26 special mediators who may be used on particular cases but who will not be used normally on regular cases.

Mr. MORSE. I will leave it up to the committee, but I think the committee has these two items in reverse. I believe the smaller figure should be for mediation, because there is already in existence a service which has a great number of mediators, and the larger figure should be made available to call in arbitrators to render the final decisions in important cases submitted to arbitration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator, for whose opinion I have the highest respect because of his long years of service in the field of labor relations, that I will go further into that subject in the conference committee relative to the proposal the Senator makes, and it is perhaps possible that some change in the figures ought to be made. I am glad to have the Senator's advice, and most certainly in the conference I shall discuss the figures to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. MORSE. My only desire is to leave the organization with a budget set-up which will enable it to do the most effective work. My suspicion is we are going to need more money for the arbitrators and less money for the mediators, because the agency has a regular mediation body any way. We should try to foster and encourage the procedure of voluntary arbitration, and see that funds are provided for that purpose.

I have one other question which I should like to ask the Senator, in regard to the language on page 13 of the report. I refer to the last language in italics near the bottom of the page. The entire paragraph reads as follows:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement, or a renewal thereof, between an employer and a labor organization which represents a majority of his employees in their appropriate bargaining unit, which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by an employee or employees of such plant.

Will the Senator explain the language?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the so-called Frey amendment, which has been in the appropriation bills for a number of years. We struck out the language in the bill as it came over from the House, and as it had been carried for a great many years. The amendment which we have recommended was proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in the committee, and was agreed to by Mr. Frey. It makes it clear that the provision applies only in cases in which the employer and the employee have gone through the process of determining whom the majority in the plant desire to represent them. The purpose is to get away from the so-called "sweetheart" contract, which might be signed before the employees were actually organized. This at least would give the protection of having the legal process followed out.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the explanation.

I have one further question. It deals with the item on page 2 of the report, the

Division of Labor Standards. As I understand the Senator's comments, the committee has reestablished the Division of Labor Standards. Some days ago I spoke at length in the Senate on the need of just such action as the committee has taken. I understand that the committee has given the Division a sufficient amount of money to carry forward on approximately the same basis as the program which it has carried forward heretofore. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is substantially correct. The House struck out the Division entirely. We restored it and allowed it $400,000.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator and the committee for that action. Let me repeat that on the whole I think this is an excellent report. I wish I could find myself in complete agreement with it. I particularly wish to point out that I think the committee has made a serious mistake with regard to funds for the National Labor Relations Board. I respectfully recommend to the committee that it give the data which I have introduced into the RECORD today very careful attention when it goes into conference on the bill to the end of increasing the amount allowed the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Oregon.

For a number of years it has been my privilege to sponsor the Frey amendment. A few moments ago the Senator from Oregon questioned the Senator from California as to the Frey amendment. I am anxious to know whether the Senator from Oregon is entirely content with the language now incorporated in the bill. Before he makes reply, let me say that, being interested in the Frey amendment, I am entirely in accord with the language now in the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am satisfied that it carries out the objective of the Frey amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that in view of the fact that the bill entails appropriations of nearly $2,000,000,000, it might be worth while for the Senate to have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Hawkes
Baldwin	Cordon	Hayden
Ball	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Downey	Hill
Brewster	Dworshak	Hoey
Bricker	Eastland	Holland
Brooks	Ecton	Ives
Bushfield	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Flanders	Kem
Cain	Fulbright	Kilgore
Capehart	George	Knowland
Capper	Green	Langer
Chavez	Gurney	Lodge
Connally	Hatch	Lucas
McCarran	O'Conor	Taylor
McCarthy	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	Overton	Thye
McGrath	Pepper	Tobey
McKellar	Reed	Tydings
McMahon	Revercomb	Umstead
Magnuson	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Malone	Robertson, Wyo	Watkins
Maybank	Russell	Wherry
Millikin	Saltonstall	Wiley
Moore	Smith	Williams
Morse	Sparkman	Wilson
Murray	Stewart	Young
Myers	Taft	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have to go along as fairly as I can during the day. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin to address a question to the Senator from California? I think it would be entirely proper if that be the object of the Senator; and if so, I have no objection.

Mr WILEY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was absent from the Senate I understand that an exchange took place between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in relation to the division of money for vocational education. I have received several letters, one from Mr. H. O. Eiken, chairman of the Wisconsin Educational Directors' Association, and one from Mr. Charles L. Greiber, State director of vocational and adult education, of the State of Wisconsin. Since the exchange to which I have referred took place on the floor I have had occasion to talk with the Senator from Georgia, who advised me that he had the assurance, as did also the distinguished Senator from California, that the interest of vocational education would not be jeopardized in any way.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, April 30, 1947.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been advised that H. R. 2700 as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations covering Federal Security Agency Budget, United States Office of Education, and amended by the Senate committee, eliminated on page 18, lines 12 and 13, language which states: "Of which not less than $434,400 shall be available for the division for vocational education as authorized."

To us it is felt of paramount importance that these lines quoted above be reinserted in the bill. This language protects a minimum appropriation in the Office of Education for administering the vocational division. The original Smith-Hughes Act, as well as the George-Deen Act, both provided for a minimum appropriation for the administration of these Federal aids. Without this protective language, the Commissioner of Education could spend as little as he saw fit and cripple the effectiveness of the national program. It is our earnest opinion that vocational education is too important for the national welfare to leave in the hands of one man a power of life and death over its administration. It is further our opinion that a Commissioner of Education, under the present language, could, if he saw fit, wipe out the entire division of vocational education.

Some time ago I wrote you with reference to this bill. At that time it was in the House. Similar letters were sent to all Members of the House. At that time, on behalf of our vocational school cities in Wisconsin, I urged that the full appropriation as provided in the George-Barden bill be made available. This has not been done and, as we have administered it to date, will result in a loss in anticipated Federal aids of some $7,000 in cities like Appleton, La Crosse, and Green Bay and smaller and larger amounts to other cities depending upon the scope of their programs. This, we feel, will be a damaging blow to the vocational schools in Wisconsin, particularly at this time when our student load has been doubled through our efforts in meeting the needs of veterans under the GI bill. In this connection it may be argued that tuition provided in the GI bill covers the cost of providing the training.

Under the formula of the Veterans' Administration this is not true—neither from the standpoint of operating and instructional cost or in administraton and clerical work. The latter, including counseling, guidance, and record keeping, is practically in its entirety borne by the local schools.

If it is not too late, I shall again like to plead on behalf of the vocational schools of Wisconsin that the appropriation be increased at least to the extent that States like Wisconsin, where local expenditures will range from five to ten times in the amount received in Federal aid, may be reimbursed as intended under the George-Barden bill.

Rest assured, Senator, that the vocational school cities of Wisconsin will appreciate anything you can do to reinsert the language quoted and previously referred to above. Anything you can do to increase the appropriation to the extent provided for in the George-Barden bill will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely and respectfully submitted.

H. O. EIKEN,
Chairman, Wisconsin Vocational Directors' Association.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, May 1, 1947.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just been advised that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has reported bill H. R. 2700 which includes appropriations for the United States Office of Education.

For many years the Division of Vocational Education in the United States Office of Education has been protected in the matter of appropriations for administration purposes. Language has been written in the appropriation bill to the United States Office of Education that a minimum amount of the appropriation allotted to the Office of Education for purposes of administration be made available for the Division of Vocational Education.

I have been advised that the Senate committee has stricken out the protective language in this matter which was written into H. R. 2700 by the House. I hope that this protective language may be restored by the Senate. In order that it be restored it would be necessary to reinsert in H. R. 2700 on

page 18, lines 12 and 13, the following statement: "of which not less than $434,000 shall be available for the division of vocational education as authorized."

Both the Smith-Hughes and George-Deen Acts authorizing Federal aids for vocational education have carried appropriations for the administration of these acts by the Vocation Division of the Office of Education in amounts even larger than the above-suggested minimum of $434,400.

I am addressing a similar letter on this matter to Senator McCARTHY and I hope that either you or he may see fit to introduce an amendment to H. R. 2700 when it is acted upon by the Senate so that the interests and objectives of vocational education from the standpoint of adequate administration by the Vocational Division of the United States Office of Education will be adequately protected.

I have also been advised that the Senate committee has recommended an appropriation of $17,750,000 under the provisions of the George-Barden Act, which was passed by Congress in 1946. The George-Barden Act, of course, authorized a total appropriation of $29,200,000, and the people working in vocational education in Wisconsin were in hopes that an appropriation larger than the $17,750,000 recommendation by the Senate committee would be made available this year so that we would be able to fully meet requests for training which are being made by returned veterans and others.

We appreciate the difficulties attending to increasing this appropriation recommendation by the Senate at this time, but I do hope that it will be possible to insert in the appropriation bill the protective language relative to a minimum appropriation being made available for the administration of vocational education in the United States Office of Education.

The Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education and the local directors of vocational education are meeting in Milwaukee this week end, and I am sure that these groups will take definite action in conformity with the communication which I am herewith addressing to you.

Anything that you can do in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

C. L. GREIBER,
State Director,
Vocational and Adult Education.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from California what the provision is in relation to the sum of $434,400 which these persons and others have asked be made available in the division.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Wisconsin that the committee has a vital interest in the problem of vocational education. The committee went into the matter very thoroughly and was convinced that the Office of the Commissioner of Vocational Education had in no way, directly or indirectly, been discriminating against the interests of vocational education. As a matter of fact, the figures show that for a number of years, taking as an example the year 1945, for administrative purposes, vocational education received approximately 51½ percent of the funds of the Commissioner's office. As a matter of fact, while he would have been amply justified in charging the vocational education funds with general administrative items, as as pay rolls, of which they get the benefit, and library, and certain other facilities which are available to all functions of the Commissioner's office—while he would have been amply justified in charging them 51½ percent as their division of the over-all administrative costs, as a matter of fact he had charged them only 34.7 percent of the cost. The Commissioner pointed out that, as a matter of fact, he was in no sense discriminating against them.

I told the able Senater from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that I would very closely watch the situation in the coming year, and if there should be any indication that the vocational education end of the office was being discriminated against I would be one of the first to come back here and join with him in inserting restrictive language, but that since the facts did not warrant it, based on the information we had, I felt that it was not good administrative policy to recommend that restriction in the bill.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from California for his statement and the Senator from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the experience I have had in the conduct of the affairs covered by the bill now before the Senate, and in view of my realization of the perplexities which now present themselves to the Senator from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, I think at this time I shall decline to yield, with due apologies, save and except for matters which relate to the pending measure. I hope Senators will concur in that view.

Mr. President, the bill now before us involves the appropriation by the Congress of moneys belonging to the taxpayers of the United States in the amount of $1 684 586,780. However, more than that is involved. If that were all that were involved, then perchance we could deal expeditiously with the appropriation of the moneys of the taxpayers of the United States. But, Mr. President, the Congress, elected to represent the taxpayers of the United States, has enacted 1 basic act and 16 major related acts which now are involved in connection with the pending bill. In other words, we shall have to deal with matters which were carefully and legislatively considered at a time when the Congress was dealing with subjects which then were uppermost in the minds of the Members of Congress; and they were worked out, indeed, item by item at that time. They are 17 in number. Either we shall say that now we will cut off those entire measures because we will not appropriate for their continuation, or we shall say that at the time when we were dealing materially with those subjects, when we thought them out and when we imposed on the related bureaus certain duties to be performed, at that time we intended to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the carrying out of those duties. Mr. President, we are now dealing with two great schools of thought: Shall we so curtail as to destroy, or shall we so implement as to provide sufficient means and sustenance to carry on?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. May I be pardoned if I do not yield at this time? I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, for several years in the past it has been the obligation of the senior Senator from Nevada to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which considered the particular bill we are now discussing, and to manage the bill on its course through the Senate. I wish now to express my commendation for the efficiency, for the splendid study, for the wonderful capability, which have been made manifest in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations by the Senator from California, who took my place as chairman of the subcommittee, and also before the full committee. His fine work, his excellent grasp of the whole subject, commend themselves to the Senate, and I wish to be the first to congratulate him for the manner in which he has performed his duty, despite the handicap which seemed to me to be placed upon him when he was put in charge of this bill, in view of the fact that he had never even been a member of the Committee on Appropriations until this year when he became chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this perplexing bill. I make this statement from the bottom of my heart, because I watched the Senator during his conduct of the hearings before the subcommittee, and I watched him as he handled the bill in the full committee.

Mr. President, we are confronted with perplexing situations. They are no more perplexing to the Senator from California than they were to the Senator from Nevada when he handled the subjects covered by the bill, except in this: That I think they are more perplexing now to the Senator from California because the Senator from Nevada conducted the hearings in the consideration of the bill at a time when our Nation was at war, and when everything lent itself to increased appropriations. I am wondering whether we are today less at war than we were during the days when I had charge of the bill.

I have thought long and lingeringly upon the bill in its present shape. I do not think that a nation at war is any more tried, from the standpoint of its internal economy, than a nation which is just working out of war into the great realm of peace, if peace be at all possible. With that in mind, I have tried to urge on my colleagues in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of the bill, and my colleagues on the full committee, the idea that now is the time when increased appropriations in this particular line should be fostered and encouraged, not with the idea of expending public money—that, indeed, would be the last thought we would have—but rather with the idea of carrying our Nation and our people forward into a period when there may be peace at home.

So, Mr. President, not with the idea of criticizing, because that is the farthest from my mind, because I know the perplexities involved, but rather with the idea of aiding those who have the affairs of our country in hand now, I shall make some suggestions.

I doubt that a bill of the kind now pending, with all its ramifications, with all its future impacts, should receive as little attention as is now being given to

the pending bill on the floor of the Senate. We spent weeks in the consideration of what is known as the portal-to-portal pay bill. Today we are dealing not alone with $1,600,000,000, because that is a mere item; we are dealing with the red blood of the people; we are dealing with the life of a nation; we are dealing with what America will be in the days which are just ahead.

Mr. President, I say that very seriously, because if there is anything which means the continuation of the life of democracy as we understand it and believe in it, it is labor. If we eliminated labor from America, then indeed I would say we were eliminating the life of our country, and we would be destroying our own Government.

Why should we consider with great seriousness—as we did—the expenditure of $400,000,000, to be sent, I think rather willy-nilly, to foreign countries, with no particular care given to economy, and then refuse to provide appropriations which would mean the upbuilding of our own internal life? I am wondering why we should do that, Mr. President. Indeed, sometimes I wonder why, at a time when we are appropriating the taxpayers' money for the welfare of our Nation at home, even if many Senators do not find it convenient to be present we refuse to spend a little more money for the welfare of the people.

Mr. President, every time we strike a blow at labor, every time we strike down something that promotes the welfare of labor, we are augmenting the enemies of our Nation. What we do will be used tomorrow, if we pass this bill today, by those who represent the Communist Party in America, as an argument that the Congress of the United States, representing democracy, refused to provide appropriations which would facilitate the great foundations upon which labor rests.

I stated a moment ago that one basic act and 16 major acts are involved in the pending appropriation bill. I repeat that statement. Every one of the 17 were acts of Congress. They were brought into being by the votes of individual Senators. They were a mandate to the Secretary of the Interior and the bureaus set up in the Secretary's office, and to the bureaus set up in the Department, that they should carry on according to the will of Congress.

Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear, I ask unanimous consent that the majority report on the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 146) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	$1,684,586,780
Amount of decrease by Senate committee (net)	8,388,700
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	1,676,198,080
Amount of appropriations, 1947	$1,310,821,873
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1948	1,779,614,039
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1948	103,415,959
Exceeds the appropriations for 1947	365,376,207

The committee recommends a total for the bill of $1,676,198,080, which is $8,388,700 less than the amount of the bill as it passed the House. It should be remembered that the bill in amount is made up mostly of grants-in-aid and benefit payments, which total well over a billion and a half dollars or about 92 percent of the total appropriation. The largest of these is for the railroad retirement account, amounting to $685,072,000, and the next largest is for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, amounting to $625,000,000, followed by much smaller items for unemployment compensation, employment offices, and lesser items for Children's Bureau, public health, education, and vocational rehabilitation. When these amounts are deducted, the effect of the reduction below the House amount is more in proportion. The total recommended, while only 0.49 percent less than the House bill, is 5.8 percent under the budget estimates, and is 27.8 percent above the appropriations for 1947.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The total recommended for the Department of Labor of $79,362,900 is $10,001,300 under the amount allowed by the House. A reduction of $14,345,600 is recommended in the grants to States for employment offices, and an increase of $4,344,300 is recommended in the operating funds for the Department, to provide for a total of $22,480,500 for operating funds.

The total amount recommended by the Senate committee is below the budget estimates by $23,817,391, or 22.9 percent; and is below the appropriations for 1947 (the Pay Act supplementals having been provided for out of available funds) by $31,550,391, or 28.3 percent.

The addition of a provision is recommended by the committee for transfer between appropriations of not to exceed 2 percent of the operating funds, limited to 5 percent for reducing any item, in order to allow the Secretary to effectuate necessary reorganizations.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

The committee recommends the restoration to the bill of the provision for salaries and expenses of the Division of Labor Standards, the provision having been eliminated by the House committee. The subcommittee was favorably impressed with the need for the service and unanimously voted to restore the division.

The child-labor enforcement activities under the Fair Labor Standards Act were transferred by the House committee to the Wage and Hour Division, and the Senate committee recommends concurrence with this action.

The labor education activities of the division were transferred to the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the House committee. The Senate committee, on the contrary, recommends that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

COMMISSIONERS OF CONCILIATION

The committee recommends an increase of $120,000, to provide a total of $2,200,000 for the necessary expenses of this service. This total amount is below the budget estimate of $2,678,400. The committee believes that a reduction below the estimated funds is warranted, but does not agree with the language in the House report attempting to specifically eliminate compensation for the positions there listed. The committee recommends that the funds provided be allocated by the Department, and that no restrictions be included which would tie the hands of the Secretary in making such allocations.

The committee recommends a change in the limitation for temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators, to provide for not to exceed $25,000 for arbitrators and not to exceed $50,000 for mediators; and also recommends the addition of a proviso that not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration in any one case.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

The committee recommends an increase of $1,376,000 which would provide a total of $3,750,000 for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Department. The committee reviewed the various programs of work by the Bureau, but believed it unwise to specify the scope of their work and preferred to leave the allocations to the discretion of the Department within the limits of the appropriated funds. The amount recommended is a substantial reduction from the budget estimate of $6,700,700.

The committee found a tendency of the Bureau to include funds formerly provided for national-defense purposes. For example, in fiscal year 1946, regular appropriations were $1,492,420, national-defense funds were $2,780,576, and reimbursable and working funds were $973,863, for a total of $5,626,571. Then in fiscal year 1947, with no national-defense funds available, the regular appropriation plus Pay Act supplementals would amount to $5,569,793; in addition to which reimbursable and working funds of $888,198 were available. The Department stated to the committee that the working funds have now largely disappeared, but the 1948 budget estimate was at the increased figure of $6,700,700.

Before the national-defense funds were available to the Bureau, the regular appropriation for fiscal year 1941 was $1,107,580, and in addition reimbursable and working funds were available of $2,005,997, for a total of $3,392,855. So that the amount recommended by the committee for 1948 is an increase over the total funds available to the Bureau in 1941.

An increase in the limitation for the cost-of-living study and report is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $845,000.

The labor education activities formerly in the Division of Labor Standards were transferred by the House committee to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Senate committee recommends that no provision be made for labor education as a part of the activities of the Department of Labor.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The committee recommends an increase in the funds for salaries and expenses, to provide a total of $4,366,400. Of this total, the amount provided for carrying into effect provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 would be $2,120,000.

The committee recommends a reduction in the amount of $14,345,600 from the budget estimate of $71,728,000 for grants to States for public employment offices. These offices were taken over by the Federal Government in January 1942, and were returned to the States as of November 16, 1946. The budget estimates for the grants to States was increased 5 percent over the amount of grants provided for 1947 as extended to a full fiscal year. The committee believes that the increase in personnel in the State offices has been in many cases entirely out of line with the increase in the work of those offices, including the insured employment under the unemployment compensation insurance activities. While agreeing with the House committee that no State matching of funds shall

be required prior to July 1, 1949, the Senate committee believes that the amount recommended is all that should be required of the Federal Government for this purpose in 1948.

The committee believes the recommended amount of $57,382,400 is ample providing proper economies are instituted for the operation of the offices within the several States. In this connection, the committee cautions the States to be prepared to assume their full obligations for operation of the State employment offices not later than July 1, 1949.

As to the field offices of the United States Employment Service, the committee recommends that a review be made of the large number of field offices, looking to a reduction in cost and extent; and further recommends that the establishment of field offices within the limitation of the appropriations provided shall be at the discretion of the Department.

An increase of $150,000 is recommended in the printing and binding appropriation for the Department to be earmarked for bringing up to date the Dictionary of Occupational Titles by the Service, for which an estimate was requested of $183,500.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The total recommended for the Federal Security Agency of $899,688,080, is $642,900 over the amount allowed by the House. A decrease amounting to $5,328,200 is recommended by the committee from the large increase granted by the House in the funds for National Cancer Institute and an increase is recommended in the grants to States for further development of vocational education amounting to $3,550,000, as well as an increase in mental health activities of $500,000 and an increase in operating expenses for the National Institute of Health of $500,000. Over $800,000,000 of the total amount is for grants-in-aid and benefit payments, of which the largest is for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, amounting to $625,000,000, and the next largest is unemployment compensation amounting to $57,586,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Further development of vocational education

The committee recommends an increase of $3,550,000 in the amount for grants to States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (Public Law 586), and believes the total of $17,750,000 thus provided is the maximum amount that should be provided during 1948. The committee in this connection cautions the agency to make the allotments from the total amount so stated, and that they should not expect any additional amount by way of a deficiency appropriation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Provision is made in the bill for $18,000,000 for payments to States of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for such services in the District of Columbia. The committee agrees with the amount allowed by the House and believes that this should be the total amount available in fiscal year 1948 for such purpose, and accordingly cautions the agency to make the allotments from the total amount above stated. The committee believes the allotments are subject to the Antideficiency Act and cautions the agency not to expect any deficiency appropriation. As in the case of other allocations of funds each agency will be expected to function within the funds appropriated by the Congress.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Hospital and construction activities

The committee recommends a change in the language inserted by the House as to contract authorization, so as to limit such authorization to not more than $40,000,000 in 1948.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act, approved August 13, 1946, authorized appropriations for one-third the construction cost of approved projects amounting to $75,000,000 in 1947 and for each of 4 years thereafter. The result of such authorization is that during 1948 there would be available for contract authorization under the bill as approved by the House a total of $150,000,000. Therefore, the committee recommends the limitation of such contract authorization to not more than $40,000,000, in the belief that the amount recommended will fully meet the requirements for 1948, but provides for allotments on the basis of $75,000,000 for fiscal year 1948.

MENTAL-HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 for mental-health activities to provide a total of $4,500,000. In the estimate requested of $5,108,000 were included the operation of mental-hygiene hospitals at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky., as well as grants of $500,000 for research and $2,000,000 for training. The committee is impressed with the need for the training of addditional psychiatrists and other professional personnel in this field. As compared with the appropriations for 1947, however, the committee believes the amount recommended of $4,500,000 will be adequate for 1948, since it is almost three times the $1,632,000 appropriated for 1947. In addition, it is to be noted that the House committee has specifically earmarked $3,000,000 for improving mental-health programs at the community level under the appropriation "Assistance to States, general."

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH

The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 for operating expenses of the National Institute of Health, to provide a total of $9,626,000. Of this total amount, the committee recommends earmarking of $1,000,000 to provide through grants-in-aid for a clinical and laboratory research program in tuberculosis therapy revolving about the use of streptomycin. This latter program was requested in Senate Document No. 44 as a supplemental estimate.

National Cancer Institute

The committee recommends a reduction of $5,328,200 from the large increase granted by the House in the amount provided for salaries and expenses for the National Cancer Institute. The appropriations available last year were $1,714,408; the budget estimate requested, $7,169,000; and the House committee transferred $4,159,291 from other budget items, in addition to a large increase over the budget estimate, resulting in a total amount of $17,328,200.

Statements made before the committee revealed that other funds and services are being provided from private sources, and the committee believes a more comprehensive plan should be worked out before adding any large sums to this important work. The committee is convinced that the $12,000,000 recommended is adequate provision for 1948.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Consolidated operations

The committee recommends a reduction of $72,000 in the amount provided for salaries to continue the so-called consolidated operations. The amount thus provided is $2,000,000 for such operation in 1948. The reorganization transferring the former Social Security Board under the President's plan (plan II of 1946) was intended to effect economies and eliminate duplication of activities. The committee believes such economies have not resulted as yet from such reorganization, and the committee strongly recommended the hastening of liquidation of the remaining superstructure.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The committee recommends increases totaling $941,000 for the salaries and expenses of the National Labor Relations Board, to provide a total of $4,974,700 for 1948. The amount provided will assist in reducing the backlog of cases before the Board. In this connection the committee believes that much improvement can be made in the Washington office in their methods of disposing of cases, and recommends that methods be devised looking to a speeding-up of such dispositions.

The committee also recommends a change in the language of the limitation on the use of funds in complaint cases, to define more clearly the management-labor relationship so covered.

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

Increases and limitations

Department of Labor:

Office of the Secretary $47,400

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries, to be allocated by the Department.

Office of the Solicitor 105,300

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Department.

Traveling expenses 151,800

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Apprentice Training Service, and the veterans' program of the United States Employment Service in proportion to the increases recommended for salaries and expenses of those offices.

Printing and binding 150,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for the use of United States Employment Service in bringing up to date the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

Division of Labor Standards 400,000

The committee recommends the restoration of the item eliminated by the House, but in an amount less than the budget estimate of $625,857, by inserting the following in the bill:

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase and distribution of reports, and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, $400,000.

"The appropriation under this title for traveling expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division of Labor Standards when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings related to the work of the Division of Labor Standards when incurred on

Department of Labor—Con.

the written authority of the Secretary of Labor."

In recommending the restoration of the item in the bill, the committee agrees with the action of the House in transferring to the Wage and Hour Division the child-labor enforcement activities under the Fair Labor Standards Act and providing $35,819 for that purpose.

Further, in recommending the restoration of the item in the bill, the committee recommends no provision be made for labor education, for which an estimate of $63,000 was requested. (The House committee had transferred this item to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

Commissioners of Conciliation $120,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for necessary expenses, to be allocated by the Department.

The total amount recommended of $2,200,000 is below the budget estimate of $2,678,400. While agreeing with the House on a reduction from the budget estimate, the committee does not agree with the action of the House committee in specifically eliminating compensation for positions listed.

The committee recommends that the following be stricken from the bill: "including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws" and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof: "including the temporary employment of arbitrators (not to exceed $25,000) and mediators (not to exceed $50,000) on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws."

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation in the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia of $66,500 to provide a total of $200,000.

The committee recommends that the following provision be added to the bill: ": *Provided*, That not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration in any one case."

Apprentice Training Service.. 184,400

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses.

Bureau of Labor Statistics... 1,376,600

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Department.

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia of $547,300 in order to provide a total of $2,750,000 as the amount required in proportion to the amount recommended for salaries and expenses.

The committee recommends an increase in the limitation for a cost-of-living study and report of $150,000, to provide a total of $345,000 for the limitation.

The committee recommends that no provision be made for labor education, for which an estimate of $63,000 was transferred by the House committee from the Division of Labor Standards (the Senate committee having recommended the restoration of the Division eliminated by the House committee).

United States Employment Service $1,709,600

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Department.

The committee recommends an increase in the amount for carrying into effect provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 of $363,200, to provide a total amount of $2,120,000 for that purpose.

Wage and Hour Division.... 99,200

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries to be allocated by the Department.

Of the total amount thus provided of $3,847,600, provision is made for $35,819 transferred by the House committee from the Division of Labor Standards for child-labor enforcement activities. The balance of $146,147 so transferred, or $110,328, is to be returned to Division of Labor Standards for the youth research and development activities under the recommendation of the committee for the restoration of that Divison eliminated by the House committee.

Transfer between appropriations:

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

"In order that the Secretary may effectuate necessary reorganizations within the Department and field, he may transfer to the appropriations under this title from funds appropriated, other than grants to States for public employment offices, such sums as necessary, but not to exceed 2 percent of the total funds appropriated: *Provided*, That such transfer or transfers shall not be used for the purpose of creating new functions within the Department, or for the continuation of any function which the Congress in its final report recommends be discontinued: *Provided further*, That no appropriation item shall be reduced more than 5 percent by such transfer."

Total increase, Labor Department 4,344,300

Federal Security Agency:

Bureau of Employees' Compensation:

Salaries and expenses.... $80,400

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Agency.

Employees' compensation fund 250,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for compensation benefit payments.

The committee recommends that the limitation on the rates for temporary services be decreased from $75 per diem to $35 per diem. In this connection, the committee also recommends a similar reduction from $75 per diem to $35 per diem on the rates for temporary services for each of the other units of the Federal Security Agency on which the bill carries a similar provision.

Food and Drug Administration:

Salaries and expenses..... 115,300

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Agency.

Certifications services..... 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of streptomycin as required by Public Law 16, approved March 10, 1947, amending the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act.

Office of Education:

Further development of vocational education... 3,550,000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide for a total amount of $17,750,000 for grants to States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (Public Law 586), and is the maximum amount the committee feels should be provided during fiscal year 1948. In this connection, the committee cautions the Agency to make the allotments from the total amount above stated, and not to expect any additional amount by way of a deficiency appropriation.

The committee recommends that the following provision be stricken from the bill: ": *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,759.97 for the fiscal year 1948, as authorized."

Salaries and expenses.... 431,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses as follows:

1. (a) For increased salary rates provided by Public Law 390..... 35,000

(b) For automatic salary increases 24,731

(c) For increased salary rates by reason of reclassifications..... 7,483

(d) To provide full-time employment in 1948 in positions which were not occupied for a full

Federal Security Agency—Con.

year in 1947 (14 percent of this amount is required for the increase in salary rates provided for in Public Law 390)..... $58,401

Total..... 125,615

2. For salaries and expenses for a small number of professional positions and supporting clerical personnel to strengthen the staff of the Office..... 305,385

Total increase recommended..... 431,000

The increases under the item (2) above are to be allotted by the Agency. The committee notes with satisfaction the inclusion of the democracy versus communism program.

The committee recommends that the following be stricken from the bill: "of which not less than $434,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:

General administrative expenses..... 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for general administrative expenses, to be allotted by the Agency.

Public Health Service:

Hospital and construction activities:

The committee recommends that the following be stricken from the bill:

"There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such act, the total sum authorized by part C of the act to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government."

And that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

"There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such Act, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000, the total sum authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by part C of the Act. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the aggregate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $40,000,000."

Mental Health activities.. 500,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses and grants to States, to be allocated by the Agency.

National Institute of Health..... $500,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for operating expenses in the total amount of $9,626,000. Of this total amount, $1,000,000 is earmarked to provide through grants-in-aid for a clinical and laboratory research program in tuberculosis therapy revolving about the use of streptomycin, as requested in S. Doc. 44.

Social Security Administration:

Bureau of Employment Security..... 95,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses as follows:

1. To provide for 10 positions needed for administration of the program for reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen.. 39,000
2. To provide for continuing administrative promotions effective in 1947..... 11,402
3. To assist the States in reducing administrative costs and in adopting methods designed to promote more effective administration of the unemployment compensation program... 44,598

Total increase recommended..... 95,000

Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance:

The committee recommends an increase of $290,300 to provide a total amount of $35,200,000 to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for salaries and expenses, in addition to $700,000 appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury.

The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill to provide for the use of travel funds for attendance at meetings: "including, when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator, attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance."

The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill to provide for needed housing of wage-record operations at Baltimore, as requested by the Bureau: "*: Provided further*, That of the amount authorized to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, not more than $175,000 may be expended, without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278 (a)), for alterations, improvements, and repairs to two buildings in Baltimore, Md., housing the wage-record operations of the Bureau, which amount, except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses of the Bureau, may be transferred to the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, for such purposes."

Children's Bureau:

Salaries and expenses..... $31,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Agency.

Maternal and child welfare..... 100,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, as follows:

1. Study of operation of health programs..... 40,090
2. Study of operation of child - welfare - services program..... 35,609
3. Maternal and child-welfare statistics..... 10,979
4. Within-grade promotions..... 7,551

94,229

5. Restoration of present services curtailed by House cut..... 5,771

Total increase recommended..... 100,000

Office of the Administrator:

Salaries..... 20,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries, to be allocated by the Agency.

Division of Personnel Management..... 14,700

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries, to be allocated by the Agency.

Office of the General Counsel..... 24,400

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries, to be allocated by the Agency.

Printing and binding..... 111,300

The increase recommended by the committee is for printing and binding, to be allocated by the Agency.

Penalty mail costs..... 20,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for penalty mail costs, to be allocated by the Agency.

Total, office of the Administrator..... 190,400

Total increase, Federal Security Agency..... 6,042,[illegible]

National Labor Relations Board:

Salaries..... 686,[illegible]

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries, to be allocated by the Board. In recommending this increase, the committee is providing a total of $3,750,000 as an amount calculated to assist in reducing

National Labor Relations Board—Continued

the backlog of cases. The committee believes that much improvement can be made in the disposition of cases in the Washington office, and that more attention should be devoted to a speeding-up of the work in Washington.

Miscellaneous expenses..... $94,500

The increase recommended by the committee is for miscellaneous expenses, to be allocated by the Board.

Penalty mail costs..... 6,300

The increase recommended by the committee is for penalty mail costs, to provide $24,709, the amount of the estimate.

Printing and binding..... 153,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for printing and binding required by the Board.

Complaint cases limitation:

The committee recommends that the limitation on the use of funds in complaint cases be amended to read as follows:

"No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement, or a renewal thereof, between an employer and a labor organization which represents a majority of his employees in their appropriate bargaining unit, which has been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed by an employee or employees of such plant."

Total increase, National Labor Relations Board..... 941,000

National Mediation Board:

Salaries and expenses..... $22,700

The increase recommended by the committee is for salaries and expenses, to provide $338,700, the amount of the estimate.

The committee recommend an increase of $25,726 in the limitation for personal services in the District of Columbia, to provide $261,726, the amount of the estimate.

National Railroad Adjustment Board:

Printing and binding..... 6,000

The increase recommended by the committee is for printing and binding required by the Board.

Total increase, National Mediation Board..... 28,700

Total of all increases recommended..... 11,357,100

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Department of Labor:

United States Employment Service:

Grants to States for public employment offices..... 14,345,600

The committee recommend a reduction in the amount provided for grants to the several States of $14,345,600, thereby reducing the total amount from $71,728,000, the estimate, to $57,382,400.

Wage and Hour Division:

The committee recommend a decrease in the limitation for departmental salaries of $73,300, to provide a total amount of $672,800.

The committee recommend that the following be stricken from the bill:

The Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from the foregoing appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division to any other bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such bureau or office to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division.

Department of Labor—Con.

Federal Security Agency.

Public Health Service:

National Cancer Institute.. $5,328,200

The committee recommend a reduction from the increased amount provided by the House for salaries and expenses for consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid, including pay of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. The committee feels that the total thereby provided of $12,000,000 is adequate provision for such purpose.

Social Security Administration:

Consolidated operations, salaries..... 72,000

The committee recommend a reduction in the amount for salaries to continue this operation. In thus providing a total of $2,000,000, the committee is not satisfied with the showing of economies which should have resulted from the reorganization, and strongly recommend the hastening of liquidation of the superstructure still remaining from the former Social Security Board operation.

Total decreases..... 19,745,800

Total increase..... 11,357,100
Total decrease..... 19,745,800
Net decrease..... 8,388,700
Amount of bill as reported to Senate..... 1,676,198,080

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1947, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Object	Appropriations, 1947 [1]	Pending Pay Act supplementals, 1947 (H. Doc. 117)	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with—			
							1947 appropriations	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill 1948
SECRETARY'S OFFICE										
Salaries	$968,686	$115,000	[2] 1,083,686	[3] $1,190,000	$819,500	$866,500	−$101,786	−$216,786	−$323,100	+$47,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor	949,775	126,000	1,075,775	[3] 1,251,000	755,300	860,600	−89,175	−215,175	−390,400	+105,300
Contingent expenses	681,316		681,316	[3] 585,600	468,400	468,400	−212,916	−212,916	−117,200	
Traveling expenses	3,017,757		3,017,757	[3] 3,229,500	2,112,400	2,264,200	−753,557	−753,557	−965,300	+151,800
Printing and binding	518,388		518,388	[3] 748,000	414,700	564,700	+46,312	+46,312	−183,300	+150,000
Penalty-mail costs	551,925		551,925	[3] 133,000	119,700	119,700	−432,225	−432,225	−13,300	
Division of Labor Standards: Salaries and expenses	504,900	41,000	545,900	[4] 718,700	[5]	400,000	−104,900	−145,900	−318,700	+400,000
Commissioners of Conciliation	2,301,976	282,000	2,583,976	[4] 2,678,400	2,080,000	2,200,000	−101,976	−383,976	−478,400	+120,000
Retraining and Reemployment Administration, salaries	338,000	25,000	363,000				−338,000	−363,000		
Total, Secretary's office	9,832,723	589,000	10,421,723	10,534,200	6,770,000	7,744,500	−2,088,223	−2,677,223	−2,789,700	+974,500
Apprentice Training Service	1,797,606	218,000	2,015,606	[7] 2,544,200	2,015,600	2,200,000	+402,394	+184,394	−344,200	+184,400

[1] Amounts in this column have been adjusted wherever necessary to place them on a basis comparable, as to activities involved, with the 1948 budget estimates as submitted as indicated by various footnotes carried in this tabulation to figures in the budget estimates column.

[2] Includes $92,456 transferred from other appropriations and excludes $23,770 transferred to other appropriations. Committee approves.

[3] Exclude amounts transferred to Federal Security Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, as follows: Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor, $3,225; contingent expenses, $30,000; traveling expenses, $136,250; printing and binding, $135,208; and penalty-mail costs, $8,075.

[4] Excludes $2,000 transferred to Federal Security Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 and includes $329,400 transferred from other appropriations.

[5] Includes $7,070 transferred from another appropriation and excludes $5,094 transferred to another appropriation. Committee approves.

[6] As explained in the text of House report, $217,097 of the amount of the budget estimate for this item has been transferred by the House committee to the items "Salaries" and "Miscellaneous expenses," Wage and Hour Division, and "Salaries and expenses," Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[7] Exclude amounts transferred to other appropriations, as follows: Apprentice training service, $2,394, and Bureau of Labor Statistics, salaries and expenses, $52,328. Committee approves.

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1947, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—continued

Object	Appropriations, 1947 [1]	Pending Pay Act supplementals, 1947 (H. Doc. 117)	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with—			
							1947 appropriations	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill 1948
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS										
Salaries and expenses	$4,880,465	$637,000	$5,517,465	[7] $6,700,700	$2,373,400	$3,750,000	−$1,130,465	−$1,767,465	−$2,950,700	+$1,376,600
Study of labor conditions in Hawaii	15,000		15,000				−15,000	−15,000		
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	4,895,465	637,000	5,532,465	6,700,700	2,373,400	3,750,000	−1,145,465	−1,782,465	−2,950,700	+1,376,600
National Wage Stabilization Board	[8] 4,191,900		[8] 4,191,900				−4,191,900	−4,191,900		
U. S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE										
General administration	6,304,600	217,000	6,611,600	6,563,500	2,656,800	4,366,400	−2,028,200	−2,245,200	−2,197,100	+1,709,600
Employment office facilities and services	36,693,875		36,693,875				−36,693,875	−36,693,875		
Grants to States for public employment offices	42,823,125		42,823,125	71,728,000	71,728,000	57,382,400	+14,559,275	+14,559,275	−14,345,600	−14,345,600
Total U. S. Employment Service	85,911,600	217,000	86,128,600	78,291,500	74,384,800	61,748,800	−24,162,800	−24,379,800	−16,542,700	−12,636,000
WOMEN'S BUREAU										
Salaries and expenses	234,000	29,000	263,000	303,600	263,000	263,000	+29,000		−40,600	
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION										
Salaries	4,187,810	577,000	4,764,810	[9] 4,803,100	3,748,400	3,847,600	−340,210	−917,210	−955,500	+99,200
Miscellaneous expenses	362,187		362,187	401,400	309,000	309,000	−53,187	−53,187	−92,400	
Total, Wage and Hour Division	4,549,997	577,000	5,126,997	5,204,500	4,057,400	4,156,600	−393,397	−970,397	−1,047,900	+99,200
Total regular annual appropriations, Department of Labor	[10] 111,413,291	[10a] 2,267,000	113,680,291	103,578,700	89,864,200	79,862,900	−31,550,391	−33,817,391	−23,715,800	−10,001,300
Deduct transfers		2,267,000	2,267,000					2,267,000		
Total regular annual appropriations, Department of Labor, less transfers	111,413,291		111,413,291	103,578,700	89,864,200	79,862,900	−31,550,391	−31,550,391	−23,715,800	−10,001,300

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

American Printing House for the Blind	[11] $115,000		[11] $115,000	[11] $115,000	$115,000	$115,000				
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION										
Salaries and expenses	1,405,080	$153,000	1,558,080	[12] 1,476,000	1,276,000	1,356,400	−$48,680	−$201,680	−$119,600	+$80,400
Employees' compensation fund	[13] 14,100,000		[13] 14,100,000	10,750,000	10,000,000	10,250,000	−3,850,000	−3,850,000	−500,000	+250,000
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation	[13] 15,505,080	153,000	[13] 15,658,080	12,226,000	11,276,000	11,606,400	−3,898,680	−4,051,680	−619,600	+330,400
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF										
Salaries and expenses	221,800	26,000	247,800	259,500	259,500	259,500	+37,700	+11,700		
Plans and specifications	7,500		7,500				−7,500	−7,500		
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf	229,300	26,000	255,300	259,500	259,500	259,500	+30,200	+4,200		
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION										
Salaries and expenses	3,458,500	426,200	3,884,700	[14] 4,129,000	3,884,700	4,000,000	+541,500	+115,300	−129,000	+115,300
Salaries, sea-food inspectors	40,000		40,000	40,000			−40,000	−40,000	−40,000	
Certification services	292,000	37,000	329,000	431,000	331,000	431,000	+139,000			+100,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration	3,790,500	463,200	4,253,700	4,600,000	4,215,700	4,431,000	+640,500	+177,300	−169,000	+215,300
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL										
Salaries and expenses	921,000	119,400	1,040,400	1,783,000	2,192,000	2,192,000	+1,271,000	+1,151,600	+409,000	
HOWARD UNIVERSITY										
Salaries and expenses	1,200,530	181,600	1,382,130	[15] 1,864,400	1,864,400	1,864,400	+663,870	+482,270		
Plans and specifications				221,170	220,000	220,000	+220,000	+220,000	−1,170	
Construction of buildings	1,377,920		1,377,920	[16] 2,022,080	[15] 2,022,080	2,022,080	+644,160	+644,160		
Total, Howard University	2,578,450	181,600	2,760,050	[15] 4,107,650	[15] 4,106,480	4,106,480	+1,528,030	+1,346,430	−1,170	

[1] Amounts in this column have been adjusted wherever necessary to place them on a basis comparable, as to activities involved, with the 1948 budget estimates as submitted as indicated by various footnotes carried in this tabulation to figures in the budget estimates column.

[8] $1,191,900 rescission in Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[9] Excludes $15,890 transferred to another appropriation. Committee approves.

[10] Represents appropriations of $140,481,443 to Department of Labor for fiscal year 1947, less $29,068,152 transferred to the Federal Security Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 (Children's Bureau transfer).

[10a] The appropriations in this column are to be made up by transfers from various other appropriations of the Department of Labor.

[11] In addition, $10,000 permanent appropriation under the act of June 25, 1906, is available without annual action by the Congress.

[12] Excludes $10,420 transferred to another appropriation pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, and $84,300 transferred to other appropriations. Committee approves.

[13] Includes $3,000,000 supplemental amount contained in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, to provide for benefit payments authorized by Public Law 650, 79th Cong., and for additional disability and death benefits accruing under the regular compensation law.

[14] Represents a consolidation of the items "Enforcement operations" and "General administration." Committee approves.

[15] Represents a consolidation of the items "Salaries" and "Expenses." Committee approves.

[16] In addition, the Budget proposes and the committee approves a contract authorization of "not to exceed $2,087,675."

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1947, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—continued

Object	Appropriations, 1947 [1]	Pending Pay Act supplementals, 1947 (H. Doc. 117)	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with—			
							1947 appropriations	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill 1948
OFFICE OF EDUCATION										
Further development of vocational education	[17] $14,200,000	----------	[17] $14,200,000	[17] $29,301,739	[17] $14,200,000	$17,750,000	+$3,550,000	+$3,550,000	−$11,551,739	+$3,550,000
Promotion of vocational education in Hawaii	30,000	----------	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Promotion of vocational education in Puerto Rico	105,000	----------	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	[19] 2,480,000	----------	[19] 2,480,000	[19] 2,480,000	[19] 2,480,000	2,480,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Salaries and expenses	1,136,475	$116,500	1,252,975	[19] 1,726,700	1,252,900	1,683,900	+547,425	+430,925	−42,800	+431,000
Food conservation	1,337,000	----------	1,337,000	----------	----------	----------	−1,337,000	−1,337,000	----------	----------
Total, Office of Education [20]	19,288,475	116,500	19,404,975	33,643,439	18,067,900	22,048,900	+2,760,425	+2,643,925	−11,594,539	+3,981,000
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION										
Payments to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Act	11,747,800	12,000	11,759,800	19,710,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	+6,252,200	+6,240,200	−1,710,000	----------
General administrative expenses, vocational rehabilitation	584,825	38,500	623,325	[21] 729,000	500,000	600,000	+15,175	−23,325	−129,000	+100,000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	12,332,625	50,500	12,383,125	20,439,000	18,500,000	18,600,000	+6,267,375	+6,216,875	−1,839,000	+100,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE										
Venereal diseases	16,601,296	281,800	16,883,096	[22] 16,883,000	[23] 17,399,500	17,399,500	+798,204	+516,404	+516,500	----------
Tuberculosis	7,979,701	114,600	8,094,301	[22] 8,430,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	+20,299	−94,301	−430,000	----------
Assistance to States, general	15,458,503	----------	15,458,503	[22] 20,971,000	[24] 15,682,300	15,682,300	+223,797	+223,797	−5,288,700	----------
Communicable diseases	7,325,677	525,000	7,850,677	[22] 7,555,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	+174,323	−350,677	−55,000	----------
Hospital and construction activities	2,340,900	----------	2,340,900	[25] 50,565,000	[26] 865,000	[26] 865,000	−1,475,900	−1,475,900	−50,100,000	----------
Hospitals and medical care	18,581,666	2,032,000	20,613,666	[27] 20,250,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+1,418,334	−613,666	−250,000	----------
Mental health activities	1,632,000	----------	1,632,000	[28] 5,108,000	4,000,000	4,500,000	+2,868,000	+2,868,000	−608,000	+500,000
Foreign quarantine service	1,985,900	247,900	2,233,800	2,491,700	2,450,000	2,450,000	+464,100	+216,200	−41,700	----------
Employee health service programs	141,234	----------	141,234	[29] 901,000	300,000	300,000	+158,766	+158,766	−601,000	----------
National Institute of Health, operating expenses	5,915,097	287,600	6,202,697	[30] 10,126,000	9,126,000	9,626,000	+3,710,903	+3,423,303	−500,000	+500,000
National Cancer Institute	1,615,508	98,900	1,714,408	[31] 7,169,000	[32] 17,328,200	12,000,000	+10,384,492	+10,285,592	+4,831,000	−5,328,200
Construction of research facilities	----------	----------	----------	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	+2,650,000	+2,650,000	----------	----------
Commissioned officers, etc	5,720,558	----------	5,720,558	[33] 6,174,000	[34] 5,750,300	5,750,300	+29,742	+29,742	−423,700	----------
Training for nurses	16,300,000	----------	16,300,000	4,834,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	−11,800,000	−11,800,000	−334,000	----------
Salaries and expenses	2,792,576	310,900	3,103,476	[35] 3,916,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	+807,424	+496,524	−316,000	----------
Development of health facilities	[36] 233,968	----------	233,968	----------	----------	----------	−233,968	−233,968	----------	----------
Office of International Health Relations	290,700	9,230	299,930	300,000	275,000	275,000	−15,700	−24,930	−25,000	----------
Total, Public Health Service	104,915,284	3,907,930	108,823,214	168,723,700	119,426,300	115,098,100	+10,182,816	+6,274,886	−53,625,600	−4,328,200
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL										
Salaries and expenses	3,251,358	----------	3,251,358	[37] 1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000	−1,701,358	−1,701,358	----------	----------
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION										
Grants to States (titles I, IV, and X), old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind	[38] 619,000,000	----------	[38] 619,000,000	625,000,000	625,000,000	625,000,000	+6,000,000	+6,000,000	----------	----------
Salaries, Bureau of Public Assistance	965,000	134,000	1,099,000	1,270,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	+185,000	+51,000	−120,000	----------
Grants to States, unemployment compensation administration (title III)	49,045,000	----------	49,045,000	57,586,000	57,586,000	57,586,000	+8,541,000	+8,541,000	----------	----------
Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen	----------	----------	----------	994,000	900,000	900,000	+900,000	+900,000	−94,000	----------
Salaries, Bureau of Employment Security	900,000	95,000	995,000	1,154,000	900,000	995,000	+95,000	----------	−159,000	+95,000

[1] Amounts in this column have been adjusted wherever necessary to place them on a basis comparable, as to activities involved, with the 1948 budget estimates as submitted as indicated by various footnotes carried in this tabulation to figures in the budget estimates column.

[17] In addition, $7,000,000 permanent appropriation under the act of Feb. 23, 1917, is available without annual action by the Congress.

[19] In addition, $2,550,000 permanent appropriation under the act of Mar. 4, 1907, is available without annual action by the Congress.

[19] Excludes $20,525 transferred to another appropriation pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[20] In addition $9,550,000, permanent appropriations available. See footnotes 17 and 18.

[21] Includes $20,525 transferred from another appropriation pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[22] Excludes amounts transferred to the item "Pay, etc., commissioned officers, Public Health Service," as follows: Venereal diseases, $26,704; tuberculosis, $14,291; assistance to States, general, $106,497; communicable diseases, $46,323. House committee approves.

[23] The bill recommends that $516,500 of this amount be available immediately upon approval of the act.

[24] Excludes $3,882,656 of the budget estimate for this item which the committee has transferred to the appropriation "National Cancer Institute."

[25] Includes $25,075 transferred from another appropriation and excludes $34,175 transferred to another appropriation. Committee approves.

[26] For administrative expenses. In lieu of an appropriation for allotment to States for construction purposes, the committee has included language in the bill to provide for allotments to States, in pursuance of Public Law 725, 79th Cong., of the $150,000,000 authorization specified therein for fiscal years 1947 and 1948, and to further provide that approved applications for construction funds shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Government.

[26a] For administrative expenses. The Senate committee recommends that the House provision referred to in footnote 26 be deleted. The Senate committee further recommends that in lieu of an appropriation for allotment to States for construction purposes language be included in the bill to provide for allotment to States for the fiscal year 1948 not exceeding $75,000,000, with provision that the aggregate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $40,000,000.

[27] Excludes $1,773,234 transferred to other appropriations. Committee approves.

[28] Includes $1,632,000 transferred from another appropriation. Committee approves.

[29] Includes $141,234 transferred from another appropriation. Committee approves.

[30] Excludes $51,851 transferred to another appropriation. Committee approves.

[31] Excludes $156,492 transferred to another appropriation. Committee approves.

[32] Includes $4,159,291 transferred by the committee from budget estimates for other appropriations in order to centralize in this item all funds included in the bill for work on cancer.

[33] Includes $402,158 transferred from other appropriations. Committee approves.

[34] Excludes $249,635 of the budget estimate for this item which the committee has transferred to the appropriation "National Cancer Institute."

[35] Includes $861,151 transferred from Department of Commerce pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 (vital statistics activities).

[36] Excludes $25,075 transferred to and estimated for under another appropriation in the 1948 budget estimates. Committee approves.

[37] Excludes $478,000 transferred to War and Navy Departments pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 (care of mental patients).

[38] For comparability with the basis for the budget estimate and the amount recommended in the accompanying bill, this figure includes a supplemental estimate of $135,000,000 (H. Doc. 101) now pending consideration by the committee, representing estimated additional requirements arising out of provision in Public Law 719, 79th Cong., for increased Federal matching of assistance payments.

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1947, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—continued

Object	Appropriations, 1947 [1]	Pending Pay Act supplementals, 1947 (H. Doc. 117)	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with—			
							1947 appropriations	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill 1948
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—con.										
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (title II)	[39]	[39]	[39]	[40] $762,000	[41] $700,000	[41a] $700,000	+$700,000	+$700,000	−$62,000	
Children's Bureau:										
Salaries and expenses (general)	$395,159	$35,800	$430,959	[42] 510,460	400,000	431,000	+35,841	+41	−79,460	+$31,000
Salaries and expenses (maternal and child welfare)	860,025		860,025	[43] 1,016,500	700,000	800,000	−60,025	−60,025	−216,500	+100,000
Grants to States:										
Emergency maternity and infant care (national defense)	16,664,000		16,664,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−13,664,000	−13,664,000		
Maternal and child-health services	12,705,000		12,705,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	−1,705,000	−1,705,000		
Crippled children	8,467,500		8,467,500	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	−967,500	−967,500		
Child welfare	4,127,500		4,127,500	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	−627,500	−627,500		
Total, Children's Bureau	43,219,184	35,800	43,254,984	26,526,960	26,100,000	26,231,000	−16,988,184	−17,023,984	−295,960	+131,000
Salaries, consolidated operations	3,369,722	466,700	3,836,422	[44] 3,794,000	[45] 2,072,000	2,000,000	−1,369,722	−1,836,422	−1,794,000	−72,000
Miscellaneous expenses	3,002,000		3,002,000	3,756,500	[46] 430,400	430,400	−2,571,600	−2,571,600	−3,326,100	
Total, Social Security Administration	719,500,906	731,500	720,232,406	720,843,400	714,838,400	714,992,400	−4,508,506	−5,240,006	−5,851,000	+154,000
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR										
Salaries, Office of Administrator	291,079	23,500	314,579	[47] 375,000	320,000	340,000	+48,921	+25,421	−35,000	+20,000
Community war services	30,000		30,000				−30,000	−30,000		
Salaries, Division of Personnel Management	129,640	17,600	147,240	[48] 170,000	132,500	147,200	+17,560		−22,800	+14,700
Salaries, Division of Service Operations	288,117	39,000	327,117	[49] 343,500	294,400	294,400	+6,283	−32,717	−49,100	
Salaries, Office of General Counsel	657,275	85,500	742,775	[50] 525,650	[51] 325,600	350,000	−307,275	−392,775	−175,650	+24,400
Miscellaneous expenses	70,000		70,000	70,000	65,000	65,000	−5,000	−5,000	−5,000	
Travel expenses, Federal Security Agency	2,822,510		2,822,510	[52] 3,227,500	[53] 1,571,700	1,571,700	−1,250,810	−1,250,810	−1,655,800	
Printing and binding, Federal Security Agency	1,153,208		1,153,208	[54] 1,676,000	[55] 558,700	670,000	−483,208	−483,208	−1,006,000	+111,300
Penalty mail costs, Federal Security Agency	485,075		485,075	[56] 692,000	480,000	500,000	+14,925	+14,925	−192,000	+20,000
Civilian war benefits	[57] 158,000		[57] 158,000				−158,000	−158,000		
Civilian war assistance	[58] 4,750,000		[58] 4,750,000	1,000,000	750,000	750,000	−4,000,000	−4,000,000	−250,000	
Total, Office of the Administrator	10,834,904	165,600	11,000,504	8,079,650	4,497,900	4,688,300	−6,146,604	−6,312,204	−3,391,350	+190,400
Total, Federal Security Agency, regular annual appropriations	[59] 893,262,882	[60] [61] 5,915,230	899,178,112	976,370,339	899,045,180	899,688,080	+6,425,198	+509,968	−76,682,259	+642,900
Deduct transfers		−5,915,230	−5,915,230					+5,915,230		
Total, Federal Security Agency less transfers	893,262,882		893,262,882	[62] 976,370,339	899,045,180	899,688,080	+6,425,198	+6,425,198	−76,682,259	+642,900

[1] Amounts in this column have been adjusted wherever necessary to place them on a basis comparable, as to activities involved, with the 1948 budget estimates as submitted as indicated by various footnotes carried in this tabulation to figures in the budget estimates column.

[39] Authorization to spend $22,987,000, from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. H. Doc. 101 contains a recommended budget increase of $3,285,000 to provide for pay increases pursuant to Public Law 390, 79th Cong.

[40] In addition, the budget proposes a total expenditure of $30,219,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

[41] In addition, the House bill recommends a total expenditure of $34,909,700 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund (the $4,690,700 increase above the budget estimate is more than offset by reductions in other items in the bill, as explained in the text of the House report).

[41a] In addition, the Senate Committee recommends that not more than $35,200,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

[42] Includes $395,159 transferred from Department of Labor pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[43] Includes $477,535 transferred from Department of Labor pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946; excludes $42,510 transferred to other appropriations, which the committee approves.

[44] Includes $6,560 transferred from Department of Labor pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946; excludes $85,000 transferred to another appropriation, which the committee approves.

[45] Excludes $722,000 which the committee has reduced from $982,625 in the budget and transferred to the trust-fund limitation under the item "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance."

[46] Excludes $3,026,100 which the committee has reduced from $3,288,900 in the budget and transferred to the trust-fund limitation under the item "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance."

[47] Includes a total of $95,420 transferred from Social Security Administration and Bureau of Employees Compensation pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[48] Includes $3,640 transferred from Department of Labor pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[49] Includes $8,500 transferred from Social Security Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[50] Includes a total of $41,510 transferred from Social Security Administration and Public Health Service. Committee approves.

[51] Excludes, as proposed in the budget, $291,000 which has been eliminated from the direct appropriation and transferred to the trust-fund limitation under the item "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance."

[52] Includes a total of $267,410 transferred from Bureau of Employees Compensation, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[53] Excludes a total of $528,300 which the committee has reduced from a total of $693,300, in the Budget and transferred as follows: To National Cancer Institute, $15,000; to trust fund limitation under the item "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance," $513,300.

[54] Includes a total of $203,208 transferred from Bureau of Employees Compensation, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[55] Excludes a total of $441,300 which the committee has reduced from a total of $736,335 in the Budget and transferred as follows: To National Cancer Institute, $12,000; to trust fund limitation under the item "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," $429,300.

[56] Includes a total of $85,075 transferred from Bureau of Employees' Compensation, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946.

[57] Includes $18,000 pending rescission in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[58] Includes $1,000,000 pending rescission in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

[59] Consists of $725,658,527 appropriated direct to Federal Security Agency, $29,068,152 transferred from the Department of Labor, and $1,014,411 transferred from the Department of Commerce pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, less a total of $478,000 transferred to the War and Navy Departments pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; plus $3,000,000 for the Bureau of Employees' Compensation in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, and a supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 101) of $135,000,000 for the Social Security Administration (grants to States) now pending consideration before the committee.

[60] Consists of $413,300 in H. Doc. 101 and $5,501,930 in H. Doc. 117.

[61] The appropriations in this column are to be made up by transfers from various other appropriations of the Federal Security Agency.

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1947, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1948—Continued

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Object	Appropriations, 1947 [1]	Pending Pay Act supplementals, 1947 (H. Doc. 117)	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), committee bill compared with—			
							1947 appropriations	Total anticipated, 1947	Budget estimates, 1948	House bill 1948
Salaries	$2,991,000	$412,400	$3,403,400	$6,157,000	$3,663,100	$3,750,000	+$759,000	+$346,600	−$2,407,000	+$686,900
Miscellaneous expenses	895,000		895,000	1,383,000	895,700	900,000	+5,000	+5,000	−483,000	+94,300
Penalty mail costs	20,500		20,500	24,700	18,400	24,700	+4,200	+4,200		+6,300
Printing and binding	163,000		163,000	419,300	146,700	300,000	+137,000	+137,000	−119,300	+153,300
Total, National Labor Relations Board	4,069,500	412,400	4,481,900	7,984,000	4,033,700	4,974,700	+905,200	+492,800	−3,009,300	+941,000

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses	$316,000		$316,000	$338,700	$316,000	$338,700	+$22,700	+$22,700		+$22,700
Penalty-mail costs	700		700	700	700	700				
Arbitration and emergency boards	110,000		110,000	119,000	119,000	119,000	+9,000	+9,000		
Printing and binding	3,000		3,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	+6,000	+6,000		
National Railroad Adjustment Board	299,000		299,000	370,600	367,000	367,000	+68,000	+68,000	−3,600	
Printing and binding	17,500		17,500	50,000	39,000	45,000	+27,500	+27,500	−5,000	+6,000
Total, National Mediation Board	746,200		746,200	888,000	850,700	879,400	+133,200	+133,200	−8,600	+28,700

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries	$2,475,000		$2,475,000	[2] $4,560,000	$4,560,000	$4,560,000	+$2,085,000	+$2,085,000		
Miscellaneous expenses	531,000		531,000	[2] 1,046,000	1,046,000	1,046,000	+515,000	+515,000		
Printing and binding	30,000		30,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	+23,000	+23,000		
Penalty mail costs	61,000		61,000	62,000	62,000	62,000	+1,000	+1,000		
Railroad retirement account	298,233,000		298,233,000	[2] 685,072,000	685,072,000	685,072,000	+386,839,000	+386,839,000		
Total, Railroad Retirement Board	301,330,000		301,330,000	[2] 690,793,000	690,793,000	690,793,000	+389,463,000	+389,463,000		
Grand total, all titles	1,310,821,873	$8,594,630	1,319,416,503	1,779,614,039	1,684,586,780	1,676,198,080	+365,376,207	+356,781,577	−$103,415,959	−$8,388,700
Deduct transfers		8,182,230	8,182,230					8,182,230		
Grand total, all titles less transfers	1,310,821,873		1,311,234,273	1,779,614,039	1,684,586,780	1,676,198,080	+365,376,207	+364,963,807	−103,415,959	−8,388,700

[1] Amounts in this column have been adjusted wherever necessary to place them on a basis comparable, as to activities involved, with the 1948 budget estimates as submitted as indicated by various footnotes carried in this tabulation to figures in the budget estimates column.
[2] As amended by revisions contained in H. Doc. 161.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the minority views (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 146) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The minority, after consideration with the full committee of the appropriation bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor and for Federal Security Agency and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, report that their views do not conform to the views expressed by the majority with reference to the following subjects:

Reasons for the conclusion of the minority with respect to particular items are stated hereafter.

In general, the minority feel impelled to report that the undiscriminating ruthlessness of some of the cuts recommended by the majority is indefensible except on the premise that it is desirable to put the Labor Department in a position where it cannot do the job which the Congress, by substantive law, has imposed upon it; to render many of the functions of the Labor Department and other labor functions of our Government incapable of performance; and, in short, to hamper, impede, and stultify the program of the administration in the fields of protection of the rights of labor, and the reemployment rights of veterans, preservation of labor peace, consolidation and preservation of social gains, and the furnishing of information and rendition of service alike to labor, business, and industry.

The minority favor economy in Government, but cannot approve the hamstringing and dismemberment of useful and necessary Government agencies, whether under the guise of economy or otherwise.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Certainly with the statutory obligations encumbent upon the Secretary, his and the President's recommendation as to the amount of funds necessary to adequately discharge this responsibility cannot be ignored. Among the statutory duties evolving upon the Secretary, he is required to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States; to improve their working conditions; and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The various divisions of the Labor Department are necessary to the Secretary in discharging these responsibilities. Certainly, his office requires sufficient personnel to assist him in the coordination and proper supervision of the various bureaus and divisions who are directly responsible to him. To slash the funds requested for his office without evidence—and there is none that the amount requested is more than is needed to properly discharge his obligation—is false economy. It must also be remembered that there is an additional responsibility upon the Secretary at this time, arising from his duty to furnish the State Department and the President with the assistance necessary in correlating our foreign affairs in the field of labor activities. The minority are of the opinion that the committee recommendation of $866,900 is inadequate, and recommend instead the sum of $1,190,000.

The item for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor for the Department of Labor provides funds for enforcement of the statutes that the Congress has enacted for the benefit of the workers of this country. This, it might be said, is similar to the police that we station in our States and throughout our country to enforce the laws. Certainly the load of work required of this office will not be reduced because of other reductions in the various bureaus of this Department. It should be pointed out that, as compared to 1942, the 1948 budget requests only 272 positions against 302 legal positions in the former year. It was established by the hearings that since 1943 the trial work of this Bureau has increased 496 percent, whereas the number of attorneys employed has decreased 32 percent. If the Congress sincerely wants compliance with the laws, which it is the duty of the Department of Labor to enforce, it certainly must provide funds for an adequate staff to enforce such laws. The minority recommend that the budget request of $1,251,000 be made available for this office.

COMMISSIONERS OF CONCILIATION

The Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor is now the sole agency of Government, except the National Mediation Board, for the handling of labor disputes. It will not help the national economy at this time to weaken the Federal agency charged with the duty of conciliating labor disputes and promoting industrial peace. When we consider the thousands of strikes that are averted through the use of this service, the appropriation recommended by the President is small in comparison with the savings that accrue therefrom. The minority does not believe that the committee recommendation of $2,200,000 is sufficient to insure an effective conciliation service and therefore recommend the budget request.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

The minority recommend $625,857 for the salaries and expenses of the Division of Labor Standards. This Division is the arm of the Department of Labor set up to strengthen State labor departments in their efforts to improve working conditions. It furnishes advisory services in all types of labor-law administration and develops standard prac-

tices which can be applied in all States. This is the only Federal agency working with the States to reduce industrial accidents outside of the mines. Industrial accidents cost industry and labor $3,500,000,000 in 1946. If by this appropriation we can continue to reduce accident rates, as the record will show has resulted from the efforts of this Division, the sum recommended will be only a small amount compared to the savings that will result therefrom. Sound economy requires that we follow the old adage of "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

The majority have cut the item for salaries of the Wage and Hour Division to $3,847,600. The minority recommend restoration of the budget figure of $4,838,919. This is the Division charged with the inspection and enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. During 1946, 50 percent of the business establishments covered by the act and inspected were found to be in violation of one or more major provisions of the act; 45,000 inspections per year out of 556,000 establishments constitute an irreducible minimum required to insure a safe margin of compliance with the act. The amount requested by the budget is necessary to continue the inspections at this rate.

It must be remembered that effective enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act is of equal importance to labor and to the many honest employers who voluntarily comply with the act. Such employers deserve the protection that this Division, in its enforcement operations, can give if the Congress provides sufficient funds. The testimony presented to the committee by the officials responsible for this enforcement amply supports a request for the funds requested by the President for this item.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

The majority recommendation, for $3,373,400 for necessary expenses and salaries, represents a reduction which can only be justified on the theory that the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is largely unnecessary. The minority do not agree with any such view.

Only in the past few years have we as a nation begun to recognize the full value of the work performed by this Bureau. Industry and labor are dependent upon many of the services rendered by this Bureau for continued industrial peace. Many labor contracts are negotiated on the basis of the facts gathered and published by this Bureau. Certainly, with the increased industrial activity, the increased number of workers, the increased number of unions, the rapid change in our day-to-day economic life, we cannot expect to operate this Bureau efficiently on anywhere near the funds that were available for its operation in 1939. A large proportion of the over-all increase in funds, from before the war to the present time, is accounted for by expansion in the scope of four programs: First, in prices and the cost of living; second, wages; third, employment statistics; and, fourth, housing and construction statistics. It is the opinion of the minority that the program justified by this Bureau requires that the Congress appropriate the funds requested by the President, in the amount of $6,700,700. By so much as the Congress appropriates less, it will be reducing or eliminating highly useful and urgently necessary work, basic to any management-labor negotiations; and, to the same extent, will thereby be contributing to labor unrest.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

The committee reduced the amount of this item to $2,200,000. In the opinion of the minority it should be at the very least $2,544,200.

This appropriation provides the funds to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of apprentice training. Industry and labor alike are in agreement in their praise for the work that has been instituted by this Bureau. Industry's demands for the technical skills that are developed by the apprenticeship-training program are not standing still, nor are they returning to the level of 1939, the base on which the majority wish to establish the necessity for these appropriations. The demands upon this service, in aiding veterans and industry, require that we furnish the funds necessary for a complete program; otherwise it would appear much of the value of the work to date will be lost. Without the increased staff requested and justified by this Bureau, the demands upon it cannot be met.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

The item for salaries of the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Security Agency has been cut, in the majority recommendation, from $525,000 to $350,000.

The record discloses that the work load of this office has been growing heavier year by year. During the last year there were 4,000 more items of mail to be handled in this Legal Division than in the preceding year. The legal work for the Children's Bureau, as well as new work necessary due to the 1946 amendments to the Social Security Act, has been added to the work load of this office. There has been a substantial increase in the food and drug work. The Hospital Construction Act of 1946, too, contributed to making the work performed by the Public Health Service double what it was a year ago. The office performs all of the legal services for the many constituent bureaus of the entire Federal Security Agency. Its work load is not increased or decreased by the operating expenses allowed to the Agency. Therefore, it does not make sense to cut the funds necessary to the efficient operation of the vital service. It is the opinion of the minority that the funds requested by the President for this Bureau have been sufficiently justified, and that the sum allowed should be $525,000 instead of $350,000.

PAT MCCARRAN.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.
CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have asked that the report and the minority views be printed in the RECORD because I think the public should read what we are dealing with, and should understand it. I do it because I fervently believe, and I am honest in my belief, that the committee has curtailed to too great an extent the items of appropriation covered by the bill.

I stated at the outset that one basic act and 16 major acts are involved in the appropriations contained in the bill. I think it is my duty to follow that up with an explanatory statement setting out the acts in very brief form. It has come to my attention this afternoon that it might be thought that I would try to delay action on the pending bill. I do not know why I should do so. I want to say frankly and emphatically that that is not my intention; that I am most sympathetic with the Senator who is in charge of the bill. I wanted sympathy when I was in charge of it, and I hope there will be the same willingness to explain the bill, of which the Senator is in charge, and of which in a previous Congress I was in charge, as there was in times past. I shall be as brief as possible in every statement I make.

The Department of Labor and the Office of the Secretary of Labor, of permanent rank, were established by the act of March 4, 1913, Thirty-seventh Statute, page 736. These were some of the things demanded of the department when it should be set up:

To foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

That being true, Congress has from time to time made appropriations. It was entirely reasonable that as time went on the duties imposed by Congress on the Department should be augmented; and so I dwelt upon a war period in which those duties were augmented. I shall dwell for a moment only upon that period of transition between war and peace; which peace has not yet been accomplished. I say without fear of successful contradiction that there was never a period in the life of the Nation when we, as Members of Congress, should be so attentive to the welfare of the working class. Why do I say that? Mr. President, I say it because the bill, the consideration of which was interrupted to allow consideration of the pending bill, deals with the working class. Throughout the present session of Congress, from the time we first assembled until the present hour, there has been in the minds of the Members of Congress the question of labor legislation. Congress may enact any amount of labor legislation it wishes, but unless it is supplemented and augmented and supported by appropriations, its labors will have been in vain.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A few moments ago, in colloquy between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Ohio said that in the event the pending labor bill is passed, it will be necessary to augment the appropriations by a good many dollars. Does the Senator have any idea as to what additional amount would be necessary in a deficiency appropriation bill to administer adequately the pending labor bill, assuming that it is passed and that the President signs it?

Mr. McCARRAN. In reply I wish to say that my categorical answer would be "No." I have no idea, excepting that I do know that if anything similar to that which is pending in the way of a labor bill should be enacted, it would entail a very large appropriation.

Mr. LUCAS. In addition to that which is in contemplation at the present time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, in addition to that which is now contemplated.

Mr. LUCAS. My reason for asking the question was the statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio. It interested me, and I wondered whether or not the Senator from Nevada, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, had any figures on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. It interested me very much, too, when the remark was made, and it will continue to interest me, because I wondered what additional appropriation we would be called upon to

make by way of a deficiency appropriation for the labor bill which was set aside to permit consideration of the appropriation bill.

Let me dwell on this language. It is worth while, very much worth while, to dwell upon it. What is the Labor Department called upon to do by the basic act?

To foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

It is my position—and I shall advocate it—that the body which was set up by the Congress to make a study of how certain functions should be carried forward, having time to make that study, devoted its time to the study, and thereafter reported to Congress the very minimum under which the functions demanded by this body should be carried forward. I refer to the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau established what it believed after study to be an essential item for carrying out the work that Congress said should be performed. That was followed by another activity on the part of the administration. Following the study made by the Budget Bureau, the President himself, taking the report of the Budget Bureau, curtailed the amount materially, and then sent the curtailed budget to the Congress.

There are many items in this bill with which I have seen fit to go along because I do not want an appropriation bill which would be out of line. But I cannot go along with the phases of the bill which have to do with labor. One reason why I cannot go along with those phases of the bill is that all industry today is looking to labor. Everyone knows that if the Nation is to carry on successfully in the years that are to come it is labor that must carry it along. Industry cannot look forward to a prosperous future unless it looks into the very face of the facility that will carry it forward, and that is labor. No great movement of national progress has ever gone forward in all the history of the world in any nation, save and except as it was moved forward by the red blood of labor. When labor stops, when labor refuses to continue, when labor is nonexistent, then civilization and national welfare are at least momentarily caused to pause. Let it be hoped with all the fervor of our hearts that the acts of Congress—the acts, if you please, of those who are now in control of Congress—will not be stultified by a refusal to make appropriations for the proper functioning of industry and labor.

Mr. President, I wish to read a very brief excerpt from a statement dealing with the office of Secretary of Labor, and relating to the other 16 major acts involved in the bill:

As head of an executive department, the Secretary has power, under Revised Statutes 161 (5 U. S. C., sec. 22) to "prescribe regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the government of his Department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it."

The act of April 17, 1946, Public Law 346, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, established in the Department an Under Secretary to—

"(1) in case of the death, resignation, or removal from office of the Secretary, perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed, and (2) in case of the absence or sickness of the Secretary, perform the duties of the Secretary until such absence or sickness shall terminate—

That has to do with the Under Secretary. I continue to read—

and to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary or required by law, and three Assistant Secretaries, of equal rank, to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary or required by law. Pursuant to Revised Statutes 161 and the act of April 17, 1946, the Secretary has delegated to an Assistant Secretary his functions in connection with the predetermination of prevailing wages under the following statutes—

And here come a few of the 16 statutes to which I have referred—

Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (49 Stat. 1011; 40 U. S. C., sec. 276a);

National Housing Act, as amended, sec. 212a (48 Stat. 1246; 53 Stat. 807; 12 U. S. C., sec. 1715c);

Tennessee Valley Authority Act, sec. 3 (48 Stat. 59; 16 U. S. C., sec. 831b);

Federal Airport Act, sec. 15 (b) (60 Stat. 170; 49 U. S. C., secs. 401, 451);

Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, sec. 225 (a) (60 Stat. 1040, 42 U. S. C., sec. 291).

The organic act of the Department also provides that there shall be in such Department a chief clerk, and so forth.

I shall not go into that. Then follows the mandatory duties of the Secretary:

The Secretary has the following mandatory duties:

General direction of activities of Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Labor is certainly vitally interested in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I doubt very much if any Senator has escaped the flood of communications that have come in on the question of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It seemed to me that we should have gone further in promoting the Bureau of Labor Statistics by way of furnishing it with sufficient appropriations, the reason being that today every labor contract—and I say this advisedly—every labor contract that is entered into by labor and employers is based on information provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; in other words, vital statistics relative to cost of living in America are basic to every contract. I may draw the Senate's attention, with due propriety, Mr. President, to the fact that in every recent strike the fact has been set forth that the cost of living is far above the workers' ability to earn. In other words, the workers cannot carry on with the cost of living as it is; they cannot carry on unless their wage is increased. So in order to establish the cost of living it is entirely important that the Bureau of Labor Statistics be able to function effectively, so it can furnish not only to labor but to the employer as well facts pertaining to the cost of living in America today.

Mr. President, shall we say to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is involved in this bill, that we will not furnish it with the money necessary to make a monthly report? Today the Bureau says it cannot make full reports because of lack of funds. The Bureau is furnishing a statistical report based on only a few communities in America. Would it not be better to have a Nation-wide report made, so that we would have a comprehensive standard of wages which could be referred to in connection with making of contracts. The minority views seek to set forth these things, and to have a sufficient amount appropriated for the essential needs of the Bureau.

Mr. President, I have stated that I did not intend to hold the Senate much longer, and I mean exactly that, because it might be charged that I am trying to hold up the bill, which is the farthest thing from my mind. As the bill is read item by item I shall offer amendments, and I hope I may have a record vote on each item.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first committee amendment, which has been stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send forward an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$866,900" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,190,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in furtherance of this amendment, let me say that this appropriation item is for the salaries in the office of the Secretary of the Department of Labor. Certainly with the statutory obligations incumbent upon the Secretary, his and the President's recommendation as to the amount of funds necessary to adequately discharge this responsibility cannot be overlooked. Among the statutory duties devolving upon the Secretary, he is required to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The various divisions of the Labor Department are necessary to the Secretary in discharging these responsibilities. Certainly, his office requires sufficient personnel to assist him in the coordination and proper supervision of the various bureaus and divisions who are directly responsible to him. To slash the funds available to his office without evidence—and there is none—that the amount requested is more than is needed to properly discharge his obligation, is false economy. It must also be remembered that there is an additional responsibility upon the Secretary at this time, arising from his duty to furnish the State Department and the President with the assistance necessary in correlating our foreign affairs in the labor field.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks for the yeas

and nays and suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	Overton
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	Myers	Young
Hayden	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Nevada has demanded the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to protest and object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. What his amendment does, in effect, is to increase the amount recommended by the committee by $323,100, bringing it up to the total amount of $1,190,000, which is precisely the amount asked by the Secretary of Labor in the budget. If we should do this we would have to approve a budget for all Government departments on the basis of expenditures for this year of $37,500,000,000. If the Senate is not interested in maintaining that high level of Government spending, I think this is the first test vote whereby we can put into practice some of the economy which we have been discussing.

I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] be rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is tremendously interested in what has just been stated by the Senator from California, which causes him briefly to discuss the appropriation bill which has been reported for the Labor and Federal Security Departments of the Government.

According to the report which is on file, and which was submitted by the majority, we find that the amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1948, in line with the President's budget, is $1,779,614,039, and the amount of the bill as reported by the committee is $1,676,193,080. The amount of the bill as passed by the House is $1,684,586,780. The bill as reported by the Senate is under the estimates as reported by the President in his budget, for the fiscal year 1948, in the amount of $103,415,959.

In line with what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said this afternoon on the floor, in the event the labor bill is passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President of the United States, I understand that quite an additional amount would be necessary for the proper administration of that act. So I think it is a safe assumption to say that the $103,415,959 which we are saving in this bill would probably be needed in the administration of the labor act and would be included in some future deficiency appropriation.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the statement made by the majority, which is as follows:

> The total recommended, while only 0.49 percent less than the House bill, is 5.8 percent under the budget estimates.

It is 5.8 percent under the budget estimates.

Mr. President, we debated on the floor of the Senate for days the question whether we would agree with the House of Representatives on a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget or whether we would vote for a cut of $4,500,000,000. The Senate finally approved a cut of $4,500,000,000. On the basis of $6,000,000,000 we must cut the President's estimate 16 percent from the top to the bottom; and on the basis of $4,500,000,000 we must cut the President's estimate 12½ percent. Everyone knows that we will not default in paying our interest on the national debt, which is approximately $5,000,000,000. Everyone knows that we will not reduce any of the international commitments, amounting to $3,500,000,000, as included in the President's estimate, and the chances are that before we finish that appropriation will be nearer $4,000,000,000. My reason for that is well known to all.

We have already passed a Greek-Turkish loan of $400,000,000, and a $350,000,000 relief bill has been reported out by the Committee on Foreign Relations and is now on the calendar of the Senate of the United States, neither of which are included in the President's estimate.

We shall not renege on the request of the Veterans' Bureau. The President's estimate in that regard is $7,200,000,000. We will be hard pressed to retain this budget estimate in full if we carry out our obligations to the war veterans.

With respect to tax refunds, the President's estimate is $2,500,000,000. There is nothing that the Senate or the House of Representatives, notwithstanding some strange bookkeeping methods, can do about this budgetary item.

So we have a total of practically $18,000,000,000 in the national budget that we cannot touch. I submit there is little or no flexibility in this total sum.

There is approximately $19,000,000,000 left, and out of that amount we have to cut $6,000,000,000, under the House resolution, which makes $13,000,000,000 for the total amount of the appropriations necessary for national defense and many other items which are included in the President's budget.

The point I want to make is primarily this. If I am correct in my figures, Congress will not cut very much from this $18,000,000,000 which is essential if we are to maintain our national honor and integrity, our international commitments, take care of the veterans, and do what we said we would when we passed the GI bill of rights and other measures for hospital work and rehabilitation. To meet the objection in the proposed six-billion-dollar slash in appropriations we will have to cut close to 35 percent of the remaining $19,000,000,000 estimated in the President's budget.

So, what does this lead us to? Well, Mr. President, we have before us the first regular appropriation bill which the Senate of the United States has considered for the fiscal year 1948. This is our first real opportunity to make reduced appropriations. After careful and long consideration the best the Appropriations Committee can do is to make a reduction of 5.8 percent. Mr. President, I am anxiously waiting to see what happens to the other appropriation bills as they come along. Those who support the making of a $6,000,000,000 cut in Government appropriations, or even those who favor a $4,500,000,000 cut in Government appropriations, on the basis of the President's budget, will find they were badly misinformed, if the present appropriation bill is a fair sample of what will happen in the future insofar as the reduction of governmental expenditures is concerned.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I desire to make it clear that I wish to see all possible reductions in appropriations made. I am in favor of economy in Government. But I merely am demonstrating, as a result of a study and recommendations made by the Senate Appropriations Committee, what we may expect in the future. I respectfully suggest that when various other appropriation bills are considered and when we compare the total amounts they provide in reduction with either a $6,000,000,000 or even a $4,500,000,000 proposed reduction in governmental appropriations there will be a disparity that Senators may have some difficulty in explaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able Senator from Illinois, because I think he has eloquently stated why it is necessary to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, because the amendment of the Senator from Nevada would increase the appropriation, over the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee, by approximately $323,100. I wish to say to the able Senator from Illinois that we shall never effect a substantial reduction in governmental expenditures, whether it be $6,000,000,000, as proposed by the House of Representatives, or $4,500,000,000, according to the proposal made by the Senate, unless we begin by saving the hundreds of thousands of dollars and the millions of dollars and the tens of millions of dollars, because it is only going to be the cumulative effect of saving the smaller amounts that will make it possible to make the total savings which should be made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the situation, the purpose of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada is to restore the amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The difference between the budget estimate and the appropriation recommended by the committee is $323,100, as I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What evidence did the committee have before it which would warrant making such a reduction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana that on the basis of the testimony before the committee, the committee thought a slight increase was necessary in the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, and the committee itself recommended an increase in the amount of $47,400.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was an increase over the amount allowed by the House, was it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Let me say that in addition to the testimony, the committee considered many other factors. In the case of some of the bureaus or agencies which we felt had not had such great mushrooming growth, we believed that a cut of 20 percent below what they had last year would be too great.

But at this point I wish to state to my able colleague that in 1939 there were 135 employees in the office of the Secretary, and in 1940 there were 222. In 1941 there were 188; but by 1947 the number of employees in that office had jumped to 324. For 1948, on the basis of the estimates, upon which the figure submitted by the Senator from Nevada is based, an appropriation sufficient for 348 employees in the office of the Secretary alone has been requested.

The members of the committee felt that, on that basis, a 20 percent reduction below the amount they had last year would be a reasonable cut, and that if we were to have any kind of economy in Government at all, certainly the Office of the Secretary could absorb that much reduction in its appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee call before it any employee of the Department of Labor, to have him show whether the number of employees should be reduced, or did the committee simply make an across-the-board reduction of a certain percentage?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana that of course we had before us representatives of the Department. The Secretary gave very able testimony before the committee, and other representatives of the Department also testified at the appropriate times during the hearings.

But finally the committee determined, on the basis of all the information it had, including the figures as to the expansion over the years, that a 20-percent cut would be proper for that department or division.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the appropriation is actually reduced by an across-the-board cut of 20 percent, regardless of whether the employees now engaged there are too many?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The reduction was fixed at a flat 20 percent, on the basis of the belief of the committee that in view of the growth I have indicated, that office could absorb the cut without in any way impairing the performance of the work necessary to be done by it.

Mr. ELLENDER. How did the committee reach that conclusion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It reached that conclusion on the general basis that the Government cannot continue to support, in peacetime, a budget of thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars, without bankrupting the Federal Government, and that consequently some economies must be made; and this was one of the places where we felt the evidence indicated that a cut which was not too great could be made and the department could still function.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee attempt to ascertain what the office would have to do in order to meet this $323,100 cut? In other words, where will the office have to decrease the number of its employees, or in what divisions will that have to be done? Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the able Senator from Louisiana that I assume that in his activities he has had considerable experience with budgets, as the Senator from California has had in his business and in the State legislature 14 years or so ago. I believe that if a reduction in operating funds is being made—whether it be 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent—it is best to do it by saying to the department concerned, "Here are the funds you will have to live on. You are working with the problem from day to day, so it is up to you to make the necessary cuts at the proper places."

I will say to the Senator that as chairman of the subcommittee—and I think this statement applies equally to the other subcommittees—it seems to me that we shall be in much better shape to meet constructively the problem of reducing the huge cost of the United States Government if the department heads will come before us and will cooperate in showing where the cuts can be made. But almost without exception, every person who appeared before the committee took the same position as that which the Senator from Nevada has taken, namely, that a budget request is a so-called Maginot line behind which they want to fight a last-ditch battle. On the basis of that kind of cooperation, I do not think we can cut the fat out of these agencies that it is necessary to cut from them if the American people are going to get any reduction at all in their taxes and if we are to preserve the solvency of the Federal Government.

So we did the next best thing. We examined all the facts we had; and it is our judgment that the office of the Secretary can function efficiently with a 20-percent cut below what it had last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice in the next item, on line 9, that the House appropriated $755,300, and the Senate committee increased the amount. Was the same formula used in respect to that appropriation as was applied to the one we have been discussing?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Substantially the same formula was used.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the same formula has been used throughout?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator is not to understand that. Let us take, as an example, the appropriation for the Women's Bureau. When we examined the facts, we found that the Women's Bureau had had only 79 employees in 1939, 89 in 1940, 67 in 1941, 63 in 1946, 73 in 1947, and asked for approximately only 80 for the next year. Therefore we felt that since that agency had not mushroomed out, as a matter of fairness and equity they were entitled to have the same amount they had last year, and we applied no cut to that agency from what they had last year, but allowed the same amount as had been allowed by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in allowing the same amount for the Women's Bureau for the coming fiscal year it received last year, did the committee consider the increase in the rate of pay allowed employees of that agency?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; that was taken care of in the supplemental pay bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the amount necessary to make that increase in pay was allowed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. Some agencies we felt could take the cut, other agencies we felt could not take the cut.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not true that all the departments which appeared before our subcommittee asked for exactly the same amounts allowed them by the Budget Bureau, and that not one came forward with a showing of where they could make any savings? Furthermore, is it not true that after months had passed, not one of them could show any way of saving money?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unfortunately, that is the fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say, in reply to the colloquy which has just taken place between the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana, that the 20-percent cut was an arbitrary cut initiated by the Senator from California as chairman of the subcommittee. There is nothing in the record that sustains that cut in any respect. He might just as well have put it at 30 percent, or 50 percent, or 5 percent, or 10 percent; it would have been all the same. It was proposed by the Senator from California, it was adopted by a vote in the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the cut amounts to almost 30 percent in the item now being discussed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think perhaps it does, but it was suggested as a 20 percent cut.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount of the Budget Bureau's estimate is $1,190,000, and the amount of the cut is $323,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield, I did not apply the formula, in that case——

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yielded to the Senator from Louisiana. If the Senator from California wishes to propound a question to the Senator from Louisiana, I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to answer the point raised by the Senator from Louisiana. I did not say we applied the formula to the Budget estimate. I said we applied it to the amount the agency had last year. The amendment of the able Senator from Nevada is not restoring the figure to what it was last year, but to the Budget request.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understood the Presiding Officer to rule that there were not a sufficient second to my request for a yea-and-nay vote. The Senator from California has since addressed the Senate, and has said he hoped there would be a record vote on this matter. I hope we may have a yea-and-nay vote, and I now ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which I have proposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator again asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to restore the budget figure as a substitute for the committee figure in the item on page 2, line 4. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out "$866,900" and to insert "$1,190,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present, would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—23

Connally	Langer	Myers
Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Hayden	McCarran	Russell
Hill	McFarland	Sparkman
Hoey	McGrath	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Umstead
Kilgore	Murray	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Flanders	Overton
Baldwin	Fulbright	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Bricker	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Holland	Smith
Byrd	Ives	Stewart
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Cooper	McCarthy	Tydings
Cordon	McClellan	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ellender	O'Conor	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Barkley	Green	Martin
Brewster	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McMahon	Wagner
Chavez	Magnuson	White

So Mr. McCARRAN's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$755,300" and insert "$860,600."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$860,600" and insert $1,251,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this item covers the salary and expenses of the office of the Solicitor for the Department of Labor, and covers the enforcement of the statutes enacted by the Congress for the benefit of the workers of the Nation. The function of this office is similar to that of the police who are stationed in the States throughout the country to enforce the laws. Certainly the load of work required of this office will not be reduced because of other reductions in the various bureaus of the Department. I should like to point out that, as compared with 1942, the 1948 budget requests only 272 positions, against 302 legal positions in the former years. It was established at the hearings that since 1943 the trial work of the Bureau has increased 496 percent, whereas the number of attorneys employed has decreased 32 percent. If the Congress sincerely wants compliance with the laws, which it is the duty of the Department of Labor to enforce, it certainly must provide funds for an adequate staff to enforce such laws.

I submit the matter to the Senate. Let me say in this regard that I realize the Senator in charge of the bill does not want the measure to be delayed. I take it that the vote just recorded, on the first amendment, is very much the expression of the Senate with respect to various items in the bill; so, rather than hold up the bill, I shall, as the items come along offer amendments, and I shall not again ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, and to point out to the Senate that the committee itself, after hearing testimony, allowed an increase for the office of Solicitor, of $105,300, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada would increase that amount by another $390,400. For that reason, I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada be rejected.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to add to what has been said by the Senator from Nevada, that I believe the Senator from California has been eminently fair in his handling of this matter. When I appeared before the committee, the Senator was very just and very fair, and he gave me all the time that I needed in which to present my reasons for increasing the amounts of appropriations contained in the House bill. I am very grateful and very appreciative of the treatment which he accorded me.

I should like to ask the Senator from California, since my State of Pennsylvania is vitally interested in this function, as well as in many other functions covered by the pending appropriation bill, but particularly in the function now under discussion, because of the public building which goes on in Pennsylvania, did the committee make any effort to determine whether or not the work-load of the Solicitor's Office was expected to decrease during the coming fiscal year, or did the committee in its deliberations and in its research and in its investigations come to the determination that the work of the Solicitor's Office would continue at about the same rate for the next fiscal year as it had been during the past year?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no question of doubt that the Solicitor has a very substantial work load. For that reason, the committee recommended an increase of $105,300 over what the House had allowed the Solicitor. We believe, however, that with proper organization of his office, and by joining in the general spirit and necessity of showing economy in government, the Solicitor will be able to perform the functions of his office with the amount which we have provided in this bill.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I am sure that everyone appreciates that the Senator's committee increased the amount over the House bill; but where, specifically, does the committee believe that the Solicitor's office can retrench, when, as I understand, his work load probably will increase in the next fiscal year? It is not merely the general question of fulfilling a promise. I am interested in ascertaining how the committee was able to determine and in what instances it was able to recommend that the appropriation for the Solicitor's office should be reduced.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Pennsylvania what I have said previously to the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The committee did not get the type of cooperation from the executive branch of the Government that I feel a committee representing the Senate is entitled to have from the executive branch. For some 14 years, the Government has been more or less under the domination of the executive branch, and the various agencies of the Federal Government have been accustomed to coming to the Congress and getting more or less what they requested.

Since it was trying to reach the objective of securing some economy in the appropriation bill, the committee had no alternative but to apply a 20-percent cut in this instance, because in 90 percent of the cases we could not get the agencies to offer any assistance to the committee, other than to say that they wanted to go back to the Budget Director's figures. So I say quite frankly to the Senator from Pennsylvania that we applied the formula of a 20-percent reduction to the office of the Solicitor because we believe that that office, like the others, if properly organized and if it will give the full day's work to the Government for the amount of money being spent by the people of the United States, will be able to function in a satisfactory manner under the appropriation the bill provides.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I have no desire at the moment to get into a discussion of the past 14 years. I would never run away from it, and would be quite ready and willing to debate that situation on the Senate floor. But frankly I will say to the Senator that I was seeking information. I am endeavoring to determine whether this agency of the Government, a most important agency in the Labor Department, can properly function and if the committee endeavored to determine whether or not the funds it is allocating to it are sufficient for it properly to function, or if the committee, simply in an effort to fulfill and keep a promise, arbitrarily cut 20 percent from the budget estimate. It seems to me the committee has arbitrarily in this instance cut 20 percent from the budget estimate with the hope that the agency can function with some economies. Whether or not the Secretary of Labor or the Solicitor cooperated with the Senator's committee, I have no way of knowing, but merely because they stood by the budget estimate, merely because they said, "We need these moneys to perform proper and normal functions of government, functions which have been committed to us by the Congress in basic legislation," is no reason for them to be criticized. They may be wrong, but I think they, too, may be sincere in their request for funds in an amount that they believe to be sufficient properly to perform their constitutional duties. I see no reason to criticize them. I only wanted to get around to the point of whether the committee made any effort to determine where these cuts could be placed, and the chairman of the subcommittee has well said:

> We are not sure that they can properly function with this reduced appropriation, but we arbitrarily said, "Let us make a cut of 20 percent in order that we can save money, in order that we can pare down and prune these tremendous Government expenditures."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Pennsylvania that that is a problem that any Appropriations Committee of the Senate is going to be faced with so long as it does not get the type of cooperation the congressional branch of the Government is entitled to have. Now that our Appropriations Committees are set up as they are, perhaps next year, with the investigation made by the professional staff, which can make the necessary detailed types of study, we will not be wholly dependent upon the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator indicate in what instance and where the Secretary of Labor failed to cooperate with the committee or indicated an unwillingness to cooperate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have previously pointed out the fact that, among all the witnesses who came before us, not a person appeared before the committee from either the Labor Department or the Federal Security Agency in the public hearings on the appropriation bill affecting them, and offered one iota of help to the committee in its public hearings respecting how economies could be effected by the committee, and how we could make a reduction below the Budget Bureau's estimate, even though they know full well that the committee was approaching this matter with an open mind and was ready and willing, if necessary, to increase amounts which had been appropriated by the House of Representatives. In not a single instance did anyone come before the committee and say, "We recognize that the American taxpayers are carrying a load of $37,500,000,000, that we have a debt of $259,000,000,000, and in recognition of this fact we are coming before your committee, which we know is trying to effect economies, and we tell you that in this place you can make a cut without it being harmful to the Agency, but in this other place, if such a cut is made, we feel that it will seriously cripple us."

It is that type of cooperation which I believe a legislative committee is entitled to have, and I was sorely disappointed that the agencies of government which appeared before us did not frankly come forward and say such a thing at the beginning. I will say that the committee has good reason to believe that word was passed out from very, very high administrative agencies of the Government that no person connected with one of these bureaus should admit that there could be expenditures below the amount recommended by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I think that is a supposition. I do not think there is any real basis in fact for that statement. I think it is a supposition on the part of some individuals. But the Senator must realize that these agencies did take a tremendous cut, if one can call it a cut, from their original recommendations, which were pared down by the Budget. I would say when they came before the committee that they had previously asked for more money. The Budget Bureau heads had cut them down, and simply because they stood fast when they came before the Appropriations Committee and said, "We need these moneys properly to operate," I do not believe that that is a reason why they should be condemned and criticized for failing to cooperate with a congressional committee. I think they are all endeavoring to do a fine job. I think they came before the committee and honestly said, "We need this much money." But the committee said, "You do not need that much. We will not tell you where you can save. We will not recommend any place where you can save. We simply will cut out 20 percent. We will not tell you what normal functions, we will not tell you what important functions, we will not tell you what vital functions of the Government you must continue and what other functions you can partly discontinue or partly continue." I think the committee might just as well be criticized as are the heads of the agencies.

I do not criticize the Senator from California. I think he has done a fine job. But he himself is a bit critical of the results of the hearings. He is a bit critical of the House. By the recommendations his committee brings in he himself admits that the House went too far in making cuts. Why cannot some of us have an honest difference of opinion and believe that the Senator's committee went too far?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not complain respecting the statements made by the able Senator from Pennsylvania. I merely pointed out that, as Grover Cleveland once said, we have a condition and not a theory confronting us. If in each and every one of the items of the Labor-

Federal Security bill we were to adopt the recommendations made by the Budget Bureau, and that principle were established in connection with each of the appropriation bills as they come before us, we would soon be right back to a $37,500,000,000 peacetime expenditure. I think such an expenditure would break the back of the people of the United States and the Government of the United States, and I think that here is the place and now is the time when those of us who give other than lip service to economy can start practicing economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am somewhat confused after listening to the colloquy that has taken place. As I understood from the Senator awhile ago, the 20-percent cut was taken from the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1947. On page 16 of the report of the committee, in column 1, under "Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor," appears the figure $947,775, which represents, as I understand, the amount of appropriations spent last year for that office. Am I correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. Column 3 contains the figure we should look at. That is $949,775, plus the pending pay act, supplemental, for that year of $126,000, making a total of $1,075,775. That is the actual amount of money that they had available to them last year. Applying a 20-percent cut to that figure, unless my percentage is wrong, amounts to $215,155 from $1,075,775, bringing it to $860,620. The recommendation of the committee was $860,600.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the total appropriation appears in the third column.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it is proposed to reduce the appropriation by 20 percent of the amount in the third column.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That formula was not followed throughout. It was followed only when we felt that it was amply justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I merely wished to clarify the situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the answer to the query of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] was made by the Senator from California in his statement, and that it constituted an answer to the entire program which is written into the bill. Fourteen years! Fourteen years! Fourteen years! I have heard it repeated so often. Blindly we refuse to go along with anything that is reasonable because there has been a period of 14 years of governmental administration under a Democratic rule. The Senator and those who are voting with him are not voting for a 20-percent cut as such, because from the answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania it appeared that not a single word was presented before the committee which justified this cut. Not a word came to the committee from anyone justifying it. In due deference to the able Senator from California, let me say that I do not think he himself believed in the 20-percent cut. I think it came down to him from a higher power, a higher authority, and it was stated to him that it would be advisable to go along with the 20-percent cut.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The Senator need not worry. He will not have to wait very long.

Mr. President, I take that position and make that statement because of my knowledge of the fairness and justness apparent in the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee. He seemed at all times to be willing to go along with whatever was necessary to make a bureau workable; but at times there seemed to come to him a voice from someone higher. I do not know who it was.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the able Senator from Nevada categorically that no one, directly or indirectly, came to the chairman of the subcommittee and suggested a 20-percent cut or any other cut, during the entire period of time occupied by the hearings before the committee or since. If the Senator from California did not believe that there was ample justification for a 20-percent cut in this expanding agency of Government he would not recommend it on the floor of the Senate today. I again say categorically that at no time, at no place, did anyone come to the Senator from California and even suggest what he should do in the subcommittee or in the full committee of the Committee on Appropriations. Furthermore, no one is ever going to come to the Senator from California and tell him any such thing.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is very enlightening, very illuminating, and indeed very conciliatory. Nevertheless, the 20-percent cut came from the Senator from California without a single scintilla of evidence produced before his committee justifying it. I want the Senator from California to deny that statement if he will.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California is not seeking to escape any responsibility so far as he is concerned, for the report which is brought to the Senate. I accept my full share of the responsibility for the report which we have submitted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I appreciate what the Senator has said. He is taking the responsibility. That is a part of his prerogative of office. I say that he did it very sincerely. I repeat what I said, that there was not a scintilla of evidence before the committee to support a 20-percent cut, a 10-percent cut, a 30-percent cut, or any other percentage of cut. I want the Senator, if he can deny my statement, to point out a word in the record showing that there should be a 20-percent cut.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I am sure that the Senator from Nevada will agree with me when I say that at least in the years during which I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have never yet seen any bureau or department head recommend any reduction. In my experience they always ask for the full budget estimate, and it is up to the committee to decide whether the request is justified or not. In this case the committee decided that the budget estimate was not justified, and that the agency could stand a 20-percent cut from what it had the previous year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell me on what testimony the 20-percent cut was based?

Mr. BALL. On the poor justification made by the Department for the increases which it was asking.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that all?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. There was no evidence to sustain it.

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that that is the only evidence I have ever seen before the Senate Committee on Appropriations for cutting an item. I have yet to see any bureau chief voluntarily justify a reduction. They simply do not do it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has not the Appropriations Committee the right to call for any information it desires? Have we not in times past called for information?

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes. We have cross-examined witnesses. It is on the basis of what we bring out in cross-examining witnesses that we establish our final estimate of what is needed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am only emphasizing the fact that the reply to the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania wa embraced in the answer which was given to him by the able Senator from California, and that is that something has been going on for a period of 14 years. It is not desired to leave anything to represent that fine administration of 14 years. It is desired to tear it down and forget it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Was any evidence disclosed to the committee which would lead the Senator from Nevada to the conclusion that the Solicitor's office cannot properly, adequately, and expeditiously perform the duties which have been imposed upon it by the Congress if this reduction goes through?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very much impressed with the idea that if we are to enforce the laws which the Congress of the United States enacts after due deliberation, we must have an augmented staff in the Solicitor's department. That is the law department. That is the department which enforces the laws which we enact. I so expressed myself before the subcommittee, and I offered the amendment before the subcommittee. I have now offered it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator noticed a disposition on the part of some to hesitate to make a frontal attack upon the structure which has been builded, but never to hesitate to make a flank attack through the appropriations committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I venture the assertion that we could not repeal one of the

17 acts of Congress which are involved. I do not doubt for a minute that any one of them would be sustained by this body; and yet we want to defeat the whole program by denying a proper appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to the committee amendment on page 2, line 9. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after "Department", it is proposed to strike out "$2,112,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,264,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 6, after the word "Department", to strike out "$414,700" and insert "$564,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Penalty mail costs, Department of Labor," on page 3, after line 11, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase and distribution of reports and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, $400,000.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to that committee amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 3, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$400,000", and insert in lieu thereof, "$625,857."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, this item covers the salaries and expenses of the Division of Labor Standards. This Division is the arm of the Department of Labor set up to strengthen State labor departments in their efforts to improve working conditions. It furnishes advisory services in all types of labor law administration and develops standard practices which can be applied in all States. This is the only Federal agency working with the States to reduce industrial accidents outside of the mines. Industrial accidents cost industry and labor $3,500,000,000 in 1946. If by this appropriation we can continue to reduce accident rate, as the record will show has resulted from the efforts of this Division, the sum asked for at this time will be only a small amount compared to the savings that will result therefrom. Sound economy requires that we follow the old adage of "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment by the committee on page 3, after line 11, through line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

The appropriation under this title for traveling expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division of Labor Standards when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings related to the work of the Division of Labor Standards when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, I know, has had a great deal of experience in the matter of arbitration. I should like to ask him whether he thinks that the maximum amount of $300 to be paid for arbitration would permit of a reasonable handling of the problem, or is the amount too small.

Mr. MORSE. I will say, in the first place, that I think, as a matter of policy, the cost should be carried by the parties unless it is a case in which one party or the other simply cannot afford to pay the expenses of arbitration. In my opinion, it is a great mistake to get into the habit of having the Government pay for the arbitration costs of private disputes between employers and employees. However, if there must be an arbitration and if the Government has to pay, I do not see how it can possibly be done within a limitation of $300, because what is needed in arbitration is to have men who are able and qualified, and I do not see how they can be obtained in an important case at a cost of $300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before proceeding further, the Chair will point out to the Senate that we are now on the amendment beginning in line 21, on page 3, and ending in line 5, on page 4.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield, because I should like to dispose of this point—it is a minor one, but it has to do with the proper functioning of this measure.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The subcommittee discussed this specific language with Mr. Warren, the Director of the Conciliation Service, and it also had before it the costs which the Service has paid in arbitration cases, which in no case exceeded, I believe, $200. Mr. Warren thought a $300 limit was ample and that $25,000 for the year would cover any amount that would be necessary to pay. They are trying to cut down the number of instances in which the Department pays the cost of arbitration. They do it occasionally when they are so requested by both parties and where the parties cannot afford, for some reason, to pay the costs for it is a little easier to get an arbitration agreement.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that it is a practice which should be discontinued. The subcommittee certainly told Mr. Warren that in its view the practice was not only not justified but should be discontinued. There are instances of relatively small unions which cannot afford an arbitration. We have records of such arbitration cases before us, and in no instance did the cost go over $300. In fact, most of them were below $200.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning in line 21, on page 3, and ending in line 5, on page 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after "(5 U. S. C. 611)", to strike out "including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws" and to insert "including the temporary employment of arbitrators (not to exceed $25,000) and mediators (not to exceed $50,000) on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws"; in line 16, after the words "not to exceed", to strike out "$133,500" and insert "$200,000"; and in line 17, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$2,080,000" and insert "$2,200,000: *Provided*, That not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration in any one case."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer to the committee amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 17, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,678,400."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, in support of the amendment which I have offered to the committee amendment, I wish to say that this item covers the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, which now is the sole agency of government, except for the National Mediation Board, handling labor disputes. The national economy will not be helped any at this time if the Congress weakens the Federal agency charged with conciliating labor disputes and promoting industrial peace. Probably all of us are familiar with the work this Service has done in the present telephone strike.

When we consider the thousands of strikes which are averted through the use of this Service, it is obvious that the appropriation recommended by the

President is small, indeed, in comparison with the savings which accrue from this Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call attention to the Government's responsibility for promoting the peaceful adjustment of disputes between labor and management. We are all agreed that our country cannot be strong and prosperous unless all our citizens are working together in peace and harmony. Certainly, the Government of the United States has a profound responsibility for doing everything in its power to promote the peaceful settlement of these labor-management disputes. During the war years, we supported and maintained the National War Labor Board, an $8,000,000 agency, through which the Government dictated the terms of settlement for any labor-management dispute which the parties themselves could not resolve. Today, we have wisely returned to the policy of free collective bargaining under which the parties must voluntarily adjust their own differences without Government dictation. This is the only policy which we can follow if we expect to preserve our free-enterprise system, the system which has made this Nation the greatest in the family of nations.

Today the Government is exercising this responsibility for the peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes entirely through the United States Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor. It is this agency whose conciliators in the field are assisting unions and employers in reaching just, sound, and workable agreements. In November 1945 the President's Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations agreed unanimously that the policy of free collective bargaining was the best policy for the United States. At the same time, that conference, composed of most of the top-ranking leaders of labor and industry, agreed also unanimously that the Conciliation Service should be reorganized and strengthened so that it could provide the most skillful mediation services to help both labor and management make their own compromises and write their own agreements. These conciliators have no power to dictate any settlement. They are, in effect, doctors of industrial peace. Their equipment is a specialized body of knowledge and their own individual power of persuasion. They have operated with marked success during the past year. In that time they have assisted in the peaceful settlement of almost 13,000 industrial disputes. In this effort they have saved the Nation, its wage earners, its industrial producers, and its investors millions of dollars which would have gone down the drain had only a few of these 13,000 erupted into strikes and picket lines.

During this past year and a half since the President's Labor-Management Conference adjourned, the Secretary of Labor and the Director of Conciliation have been putting into effect the unanimous recommendations of that conference.

The Conciliation Service has been reorganized. The authority and responsibility for the actual work of conciliation have been decentralized out of Washington. The responsibility for the assignment and supervision of the work of conciliators has been placed in the hands of the seven regional directors. The Washington office has been reorganized to exercise a general over-all supervision and to function as a central planning and coordinating staff for the organization.

With the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, the salary scale of the entire Service has been increased one grade.

The Arbitration Division has been reorganized and strengthened through the creation of a national panel of arbitrators, who have been cleared for competence and impartiality by regional and national labor-management advisory committees.

The Technical Division, which has provided so much assistance in our own textile mills has been enlarged and strengthened.

A panel of special conciliators has been created of outstanding men of national reputations in labor-management affairs who have patriotically agreed to be available on call for the mediation of disputes.

A program branch has been created to direct the constant training of conciliators and to supply them with essential information on the developments in this dynamic field, and to assist in the development of mediation techniques.

Every one of these alterations in the structure of the Service follows the recommendations laid down by the President's Labor-Management Conference. Every one of these improvements has been made with the approval of the labor-management advisory committee, which was appointed by the Secretary of Labor in January 1946. This committee is made up of men nominated for that work by the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Today, under the false guise of economy, a majority of the House of Representatives is mistakenly seeking to disrupt this entire Service—to eliminate every improvement which has been made in the Conciliation Service during the last year and a half. I should like to call the attention of this body to an editorial in the Columbia (S. C.) Record, which appeared in its issue of April 2, 1947. The Columbia Record states:

> The Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor is the one important national agency available for the settlement of labor disputes.
>
> Within limitations it functions fairly well and can take credit for the settlement of more than one labor-management controversy which might have done the American economy great harm had it been allowed to wear itself out. This is what it was created to do.
>
> Yet under the guise of economy and actually to force the removal from office of Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service, whom some Members of the House consider too much a radical, the House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill eliminating the job of Director of the Conciliation Service along with 100 of his aides.
>
> The move, which Representative HALLECK described as an indication the Republicans are intent upon "making some economies in Government," will, if it should become law, result in the saving of some $600,000, but it might be a saving that would prove more costly than any amount that appropriations may be reduced if it results in a series of prolonged strikes, as well it may.
>
> What Congress is undertaking to do is, of course, a violation of the fundamental American idea of the separation of the executive and legislative branches of Government and the enactment of the bill creates a dangerous precedent. If Congress can eliminate the head of the Conciliation Service why cannot it also eliminate the Secretary of Labor by abolishing the appropriation for the whole Labor Department or the Chief of Staff of the Army by abolishing the appropriation for the Army?
>
> Even though the House and Senate are Republican and the President a Democrat the Congress should recognize the executive department and leave it to the President's loyalty order to eliminate any person of doubtful loyalty on the Government pay roll. There isn't any need to throw out the baby with the bath water in order to get Mr. Warren.

I do not know what Mr. Warren has done to earn the displeasure of the majority of the House Appropriations Committee. I do know that his ability and his loyalty have been attested to by men of unquestionable stature, including a Republican member in this great body. I do know, also, that neither employers nor union representatives with whom he is in daily contact have brought a single complaint against him as to his ability or his loyalty to our form of government.

As the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] warned this body the other day, we are all opposed to jurisdictional disputes, and we should not get involved in a jurisdictional dispute with the Secretary of Labor.

I call the attention of this body to one specific recommendation of the President's Labor-Management Conference "that Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the Service." At the time that recommendation was made, the only appropriation for the Conciliation Service was $2,500,000. That appropriation was raised for the current fiscal year not quite $100,000. Now the House of Representatives has voted to cut its activities by 25 percent, so as to secure a saving of $600,000 on a $37,000,000,000 budget. Mr. President, that saving amounts to an economy of approximately one-half cent—6 mills—on a $370 purchase. I doubt whether any man in his right mind, who is about to buy a team of horses for $375, would quibble over a one-half cent if that one-half cent covered the services of a doctor who would help keep his team sound and workable.

The Conciliation Service has been extremely useful on many occasions for the cotton textile industry. The advice and assistance of its conciliators have been instrumental in keeping the mills going on many occasions when they were threatened with strikes. Certainly this is the important thing. It is certainly the important thing to our cotton growers. It is the important thing to me. If we are to sell our cotton, the cotton mills must be kept going. The Conciliation Service is one of the essential agencies

of the Government which has helped the cotton farmer and the textile manufacturer. I have always been an advocate of economy. I intend to vote for every real economy measure that is brought before this body, but I refuse to be taken in by a false slogan of economy when it is used merely as a device to cover what is in fact a personal grudge of a Member of this Congress against the Director of that Service. I intend to vote to strengthen, rather than to weaken, the United States Conciliation Service. I intend to do my part to make sure that the recommendations of the President's Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations are carried out.

Mr. President, finally I should like to call attention to the statement in the report that it is anticipated that this year we have spent or will spend $2,583,976 for the service now under consideration. The bill now before us provides for only $2,200,000 for that purpose. I hope the committee has taken a correct position in this matter. I hope the Government will not need more money for this purpose during the coming year.

But in view of information which is available, I would not be suprised to find that considerably more money will be needed in the next year, as compared with the amount which has been spent or will be spent during the present fiscal year. That being so, I think we should go slowly in making cuts in the item for the Conciliation Service, because what that Service does may mean the savings of millions of dollars, and probably billions of dollars, to the United States and its people.

Mr. President, I do not know how the committee arrived at the figure $2,200,000. I imagine that figure represents more guesswork. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, who now is leading the fight for adoption of the committee amendments, how the subcommittee arrived at that figure and just how it anticipated the number of conflicts between capital and labor which will occur during the coming year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from South Carolina that I do not think anyone can look into a crystal ball and tell how many cases either the Conciliation Service or the National Labor Relations Board will have during the next fiscal year.

Based on the information before the committee, the members of the committee felt that the Conciliation Service was entitled to an increased appropriation, and we recommended an increase of $120,000 over what had been allowed by the House of Representatives. Moreover, in our report we made it clear that we did not agree with the House of Representatives, which in the report of its committee sought to tie the hands of the Secretary of Labor and tell him whom he could employ and whom he could not employ in the Conciliation Service. If the Senator from South Carolina will read the House committee report, he will see that it lists the whole group of the top-flight officials of the Conciliation Service and attempts to tell the Secretary of Labor that not one penny may be spent for the salaries of any of them. The members of the subcommittee in our report make it clear that we do not agree with that point of view. The committee was of the opinion that with that restrictive language taken out, so far as the Senate was concerned, and with a $120,000 increase, the Conciliation Service would be able to do a good job during the coming year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from California for that enlightening information.

As I have pointed out, during the war years the Government maintained a National War Labor Board, at a cost of approximately $8,000,000 annually. That helped greatly in the particular field we are now considering. But today we do not have that Board in existence any more.

Therefore, at the present time all such functions must be performed in the field of conciliation. So I do not believe the amount recommended by the committee will be sufficient to effect the necessary number of conciliations between labor and management in the United States.

For that reason, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the cut proposed by the committee involves looking into a crystal ball and making a prophecy that there will be fewer disputes to be settled in the future than there have been in the past. Is it not crystal-ball gazing or wishful hoping, or is it a blunt statement that "We are going to cut"?

I compliment the committee for striking from the bill the bill of attainder passed by the House of Representatives against certain individuals; but I still think this service deals with human relationships between industry and labor, and that if the newspapers and the people of the country generally are correct in their assumption, we may find the Government inadequately staffed in regard to this service.

So I ask the Senator from California whether the amount recommended by the committee was arrived at on the basis of crystal ball gazing procedure in regard to the proposed cutting down of the item.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I do not think it is, any more than any action which the Senate takes on any appropriation bill is based on looking into a crystal ball. It is all a matter of judgment.

But I say to the Senator that in the case of a number of agencies it has been found, both in our subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and, I think, in a number of other subcommittees on which I have served, that there is a tendency to have the employees who should be in the field, doing the job, brought into Washington, thus building up in Washington a considerable staff, rather than having them out in the field, where we feel that the work should be done. I think I can say that even a number of the minority members of the committee felt very strongly that there was a tendency on the part of a number of governmental bureaus and agencies to do just that.

We believe that if those agencies will assign the bulk of their employees to work in the field, and if those employees will do the job which they should do, the amount recommended by the committee will be ample to enable this service to take care of the job which it is charged to perform.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask a further question. Was a study made of the number of employees in the field and the number of employees out of the field, and was a study made to determine how the method recommended by the Senator could be applied so as to do the greatest good in the field? I admit that it is in the field that the contacts with the public occur; but, of course, planning and coordination and statistical work must be done in the Washington office. So I wonder whether the committee had the benefit of actual figures based upon the number of disputes which have been settled, because in the past 12 months a great many more disputes have been settled by the Conciliation Service than ever reached a strike status.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator that the committee did not have all the time it would have liked to have, so as to be able to go into the field and personally see for itself the work which each conciliator was doing and the number of cases he was handling and the number which probably should be handled, and so forth, in connection with a detailed examination which the Senator from West Virginia or I might like to make in other circumstances. But considering the limitations in regard to time, and in view of the material which we had before us, coming both from the public hearings and from factual information, the members of the committee, acting according to our best judgment in regard to all the factual information, think that the amount provided for in the committee amendment will enable that service to do the job it should do.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that I agree that in connection with the reorganization of the Senate and the replanning of the Senate, we have not yet had sufficient time to build up staffs adequate to make the necessary studies.

But I should like to inquire what the committee believes will happen in the event that the work of the sort which is covered by this item actually exceeds the amount of such work which the committee amendment would care for? In other words, if we follow the committee's recommendation, it will be impossible to carry on prompt conciliation in additional cases; and let me say that prompt conciliation is the most valuable kind of conciliation. As in the case of a festering sore, a dispute which is dragged out becomes worse day by day, whereas prompt attention would settle it.

What will be done in 1947 if an insufficient amount of money is appropriated at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, no one will know what the situation will be until we have a chance to operate under the provision. I agree with the Senator. One reason why I supported an increase of almost a million dollars for the Na-

tional Labor Relations Board was that I thought a backlog was not a good thing, that it causes irritations, and that it tends to encourage more labor strife than if we can get reasonably prompt decisions. Of course, that is the objective for which we should all seek, namely, reasonably prompt decisions.

Mr. President, if the amount of money recommended is not sufficient for the Conciliation Service, if the Conciliation Service cannot reorganize itself and do the work that we contemplated, it will mean a backlog of cases, and it will mean the same thing in the case of the National Labor Relations Board. But we are very hopeful that the sum allowed will be sufficient to enable them to do their work.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator realizes that in conciliation a backlog of cases becomes a backlog of strikes in very short order, unless concilation is very promptly handled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from South Carolina that such an amendment would be out of order, being in the third degree.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am asking the Senator from Nevada to change his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to substitute his amendment for that of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to arrange that with the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I accept the change suggested by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The figure should be "$2,583,976", which is the total amount anticipated to be spent in 1947.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have voted for each of the cuts recommended by the committee up to this time, because I thought they were wise. I realize they have been attempting to establish a sound fiscal situation. I seriously disagree with the judgment of the committee in the particular cut we are now considering. It seems to me that in these troublesome times of labor and industrial disputes throughout the Nation, the appropriation for the peacemaking branch of our Government, which has been created heretofore by the Congress, and which has been rendering good service, which has done much to make peace and preserve peace when there has been difficulty, should not be cut. Therefore I hope the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which I understand has been accepted by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], will prevail.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as modified, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has accepted the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Carolina and therefore the question is on agreeing to the McCarran amendment, as modified.

Mr. HOLLAND. The situation is now that the amendment as accepted by the Senator from Nevada merely asks for a reappropriation for the Conciliation Service, the peace-making branch of the Department of Labor, of the exact amount appropriated for their use for the present fiscal year, 1947. I hope the amendment will prevail. I think it would be a good investment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, so that there will be no misunderstanding, while the Senator from Nevada has accepted the amendment, the chairman of the subcommittee has not accepted it. It would mean an increase of $383,976 in the budget item over what the committee allowed, which was an increase over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. For that reason I ask that the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada be rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee, and of the subcommittee, clearly shows that they thought this was a useful service, that the agency has been rendering good service, and obtaining good results for the people of the Nation. That being the case, I respectfully submit that such a service, being the only peace-making service we have, should not be reduced, when to the contrary it appears that we are having greater labor troublesome times, instead of less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as modified at the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to clarify the question may it be understood that I modify my own amendment to comply with the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is understood.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment as modified was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does that amendment appear on page 4, line 17?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask the Senator from California how the figure $300 was reached as the amount to be used in arbitration cases.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The testimony before the committee showed that as a matter of fact in individual cases the cost does not reach quite $300. I think Mr. Warren testified that probably $200, or in the neighborhood of $200 or $250, would cover the matter, in his opinion, but that $300 would certainly be an acceptable figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking the question was that in the unfinished business of the Senate, that is, the labor bill, on page 45, there appears a limitation of $500 as fixed by the committee, and that amount was fixed after a hearing. I wonder if the Senator from California would object to raising the limit from $300 to $500, so that it will correspond with the labor bill which is now the unfinished business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have objection, on the ground that we have to consider the law as it now exists. We do not know whether the labor bill to which the Senator refers will be passed or not, or whether, if it shall be passed, it will be vetoed by the President, and, if it shall be vetoed, whether the Congress will pass it over the veto. We merely acted on the testimony we had before us, and my recollection of the testimony we had from Mr. Warren himself was that $300 would be a satisfactory figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the average amount. I know there has been quite a bit of testimony presented to us to the effect that some of the costs exceeded $1,500. What Mr. Warren gave the Senator was probably the average cost.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Warren indicated to the committee that this figure would be satisfactory, and on that basis the committee felt that the $300 limitation was amply justified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it would be helpful if the RECORD would show at this point what the Senator from California said earlier this afternoon, that in conference he will ask for a review of the appropriation for arbitration and mediation. He will look into the question of whether or not the $25,000 for arbitration and $50,000 for mediation provided for in this report should be reversed. I think that maybe they should be. If not reversed maybe they should be combined so that there would be discretion vested in the Department to determine whether it should spend more for arbitration and less for special mediators, or vice versa. I think it is a mistake to try to draw a line of distinction between the sums appropriated for arbitration and mediation. Certainly the aim should be in the direction of encouraging arbitration. I do not know all the reasons for asking for more money for special mediators than for arbitrators. My guess is that it would be much better to give the Department a lump sum for arbitration and mediation and then let the Department spend it in light of its needs as events develop.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I express my thanks for the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 4, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Apprentice Training Service," on page 5, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$2,015,600" and insert "$2,200,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,544,200."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this item covers the expense necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of apprentice training. I am wondering whether or not every Member of the Senate realizes what is meant by apprentice training. I hope that we appreciate its full value, in view of the task that is in hand in connection with the boys who have returned from the service and who are taking advantage of this apprentice training service. In view of the attitude of the Senate, I shall not expand on the subject, because it is quite evident that, regardless of what I may say with reference to the boys returning from the service, I shall be outvoted. I shall, however, continue with this program as long as I have the breath in my body.

Industry and labor alike are in agreement in their praise for the work which has been instituted by this Bureau. I emphasize that statement. Letter after letter and telegram after telegram have come to my office. I know that I represent only the smallest part of the industrial life of the Nation. Industry wants this program to be carried on. If the Senate does not want it carried on, then of course it will not be carried on. It is not a question of labor. Those who are opposed to labor may vote down my amendment, and that will be all right; but some day or another it will be voted on again, because I have seen it voted up and down several times during "the past 14 years," about which I have heard so much. Those in the Senate who do not want to favor labor in this regard may vote it down; but labor will come back. Labor always has come back. It will come back just so long as industry prevails. When industry does not prevail, then may God help America.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment. The demands upon this Service in aiding veterans and industry require that the funds necessary for a complete program be furnished; otherwise it would appear that much of the value of the work to date will be lost. Without the increased staff requested, which is justified by the bureau, the demands upon it cannot be met.

I supplement that statement by saying that this is one of the most outstanding functions covered by the entire bill. I say further that if there is any Member of the Senate who believes in economy more than I do, I have not yet found him. I have been in favor of economy in the Appropriations Committee, as will be attested by every member of that committee, regardless of the side of the aisle upon which he may sit. The Senator from Minnesota, who asks that I yield to him, will testify, in view of the fact that he has worked with me on this subject for a long time, to the truth of my statement. I have always been in favor of economy.

There is an economy that is destructive, and there is an economy that is constructive. Do Senators belong on the side of economy that is constructive, or on the side of economy that is destructive? I think there should be a record vote on this amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I would ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I agree with him as to the value of this form of training; I helped him in the subcommittee last year, and during the past few years, to develop this apprentice training program; but is it not a fact that the House allowed to this Service the same amount allotted them for the current fiscal year, and that the Senate committee is actually recommending an increase of $185,000 over what the Service has this year?

Of course, we could go ahead and expand the service and do the entire apprentice-training job in 2 or 3 years by trying to work out all these agreements. The pending measure provides a program of study, of developing the apprentice-training agreements over a period of 5 or 10 years, covering most of the metropolitan communities of the United States. What the service wants to do is to expand it and do the job more quickly. The subcommittee decided that some expansion was justified, but not a 25-percent expansion, which the Bureau of the Budget recommended, and which the Senator is proposing.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire first to answer the Senator from Minnesota by saying he is partially right and partially wrong in his estimation—and I have great respect for the judgment of the Senator from Minnesota, because of having worked with him intimately during the past few years. I do not believe, however, that the Senator from Minnesota and those opposing my amendment are considerate of the fact that there is now presented a program that entails taking into consideration the boys who have returned from the war. I do not believe Senators realize that we are under obligation to compensate those who have returned from the war. Not every man who returned from the war was a college graduate. Have Senators ever thought of that? Many of those who were inducted into the war were not even freshmen. They are now returning, and they realize the fact that they cannot compete with the boys who have continued in school during the war.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment. The boys will not even go into training, because of that fact. They will not go into the colleges, they will not go into the schools, they will not go into the universities. Can we not pick up those in that stratum of life and say, "We will aid you to receive an apprentice training so you may be able to perform work which is worth while"? Is there not something Congress can do for the ex-servicemen other than to render lip service to them? In the name of God let us do something practical for them.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to refresh the memory of the Senator by recalling to his mind that the minimum educational limitation respecting the selective service was the fourth grade. It was not even the limitation to a freshman in high school, not even to an eighth grader. Many of those inducted had received no more education than the fourth grade. I will ask the Senator if he has not been in receipt of the same type of complaints I have been, which is that one of the things holding up the building program is a teriffic lack of journeyman mechanics, such as carpenters, bricklayers, sheet metal workers, and workers of similar types; that the whole country is now suffering from a dearth of workers of those types at the present time. Has the Senator had the same experience I have had in that respect?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have had the same experience. Of course there are more people in the State the Senator represents in part than there are in my State.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate somewhere along the line to consider this question from a practical standpoint, and forget the 14 years we have heard so much about. Somewhere along the line will not Senators come now to this year, 1947, and take hold of the problem and do something worth while to aid in building up the lives of the boys who went into the armed services, many of them with an education not even up to the point of junior high school. I appeal to the Senate to do something worth while for them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has pointed out, last year the regular appropriation for the apprenticeship training service amounted to $1,797,608, with a supplemental appropriation due to the increased-pay bill which had been passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $218,000, or a total of $2,015,608. That is the amount appropriated for the apprenticeship training service last year. That is the amount which was allowed by the House of Representatives. For some of the reasons pointed out by the Senator, and because there appeared to be in some degree an abandonment of some of the objections which some labor organizations had entertained against this apprenticeship program, the committee was impressed with the fact that there should be an increase over the amount allotted last year, and therefore the committee recommended, and it is in the bill and in the committee report, that the amount should be $2,200,000, which is an increase over the amount allowed last year. The committee believes, with all the facts before it, that this is a substantial amount, and should be supported by the Senate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to address a question to the Senator from California. The Senator from Nevada called attention to this particular item in connection with the training of veterans of World War II. While the appropriation for the item is available for the training of veterans, is it not a fact that the veterans of World War II have a special appropriation for them, a Veterans' Administration appropriation

for vocational training, separate and apart from this item?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. Supplemental, so to speak.

Mr. CORDON. So that, while this is an additional avenue for training, they have their primary avenue for training in the GI bill of rights?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada in the committee amendment on page 5, line 4, to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,544,200." [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment on page 5, line 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$2,373,400" and insert "$3,750,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 5, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$2,373,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,300,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. This item covers the necessary expenses and salaries of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I have heretofore discussed labor statistics somewhat at length. Only in the past few years have we as a nation begun to recognize the full value of the work performed by this Bureau. Industry and labor are dependent upon many of the services rendered by the Bureau for continued industrial peace. Many labor contracts are negotiated on the basis of the facts gathered and published by the Bureau. Certainly, with increased industrial activity and increased number of workers and increased number of unions, and the rapid change in our day to day economic life, we cannot expect to operate the Bureau efficiently with appropriations anywhere near those which were available for its operation in 1939. A large proportion of the overall increase in the funds from before the war to the present time is accounted for by expansion in the scope of the four programs: First, in prices and in the cost of living; second, wages; third, employment statistics; and, fourth, housing and construction statistics.

Mr. President, it is the opinion of the minority of the Appropriations Committee that the program, which was justified by the Bureau, requires that the Congress appropriate the funds justified by the President, under the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I simply wish to point out, as I did earlier in the discussion today, that the committee fully appreciates the important work done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics both to industry and to labor. I wish again to point out that our committee for that reason recommended an increase of $1,376,600 to the Bureau of Labor Statistics over the amount allotted by the House of Representatives. The amount the Bureau will now have, under the bill which we have reported to the Senate, is $3,750,000, which is more than three times any regular appropriation made for the Bureau for any year from 1939 to 1945. The difficulty in this agency has been that they have endeavored to tie into their regular peacetime appropriation all the work they did and all the appropriations they received during the wartime. I merely wish to point out that in 1939 there were in the Bureau of Labor Statistics 700 employees. In 1940 there were 603 employees. By 1947 the number had increased to 1,713, and in connection with the budget request they were proposing to increase the number to 2,032 employees. This agency was given very careful consideration by the subcommittee because there was not a member of the subcommittee or the full committee who did not appreciate the type of work and the importance of the work done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We carefully analyzed the figures which they presented to us, and we are satisfied that with the $3,750,000 which we propose they shall have, they will be able to do the work which is so essential to labor and management in connection with labor-management contracts.

I should be less than frank with the Senate if I did not say that it is necessary for them to cut out a great many of the things they had been used to doing in wartime, things that are undoubtedly of value to some, but so far as the basic work is concerned, the work with which labor and management are primarily concerned, there will be ample funds to do that job.

I again point out to the Senate that in my opinion there is not a single case presented to the Senate in connection with this appropriation bill or any other appropriation bill in which the agency concerned cannot say, If you give us any kind of a cut at all we must abolish a number of services which we are now rendering to the public. That is one of the penalties which we shall have to face if we are willing to try to cut down the cost of government. If we are not willing to face the facts and do that job, we might as well give rubber-stamp endorsement to the budget requests presented by the President. But so far as I am concerned, I do not believe that the Congress should surrender its power over the public purse to the Budget Bureau or to the President of the United States. I think we have the primary responsibility of fixing the size of the Federal budget, or determining what should be spent for the operation of the Federal Government, determining what should be applied to the public debt, and determining what the taxes of the American people should be. Since that is our primary responsibility, we must take some of the bad with the good and, of course, accept the objections which are raised by all the bureaus when we try to reduce expenditures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator please advise the Senate what are the services which the Bureau of Labor Statistics will have to eliminate in order to get along with an appropriation of $3,750,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I can answer the Senator's question by approaching it from another direction. At this time I should like to read that portion of our report, because I think it will partially answer the Senator's question:

> The committee recommends an increase of $1,376,000 which would provide a total of $3,750,000 for salaries and expenses, to be allocated by the Department. The committee reviewed the various programs of work by the bureau, but believed it unwise to specify the scope of their work and preferred to leave the allocations to the discretion of the department within the limits of the appropriated funds. The amount recommended is a substantial reduction from the budget estimate of $6,700,700.
>
> The committee found a tendency of the bureau to include funds formerly provided for national defense purposes. For example, in fiscal year 1946, regular appropriations were $1,492,420, national defense funds were $2,780,576, and reimbursable and working funds were $973,863, for a total of $5,626,571. Then in fiscal year 1947, with no national defense funds available, the regular appropriation plus pay-act supplementals would amount to $5,569,793; in addition to which reimbursable and working funds of $888,198 were available. The department stated to the committee that the working funds have now largely disappeared, but the 1948 budget estimate was at the increased figure of $6,700,700.
>
> Before the national defense funds were available to the bureau, the regular appropriation for fiscal year 1941 was $1,107,580, and in addition reimbursable and working funds were available of $2,005,997, for a total of $3,392,855. So that the amount recommended by the committee for 1948 is an increase over the total funds available to the bureau in 1941.
>
> An increase in the limitation for the cost-of-living study and report is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $845,000.

So I will say to the Senator from Vermont that in the opinion of the committee the Bureau of Labor Statistics will be able to make the cost-of-living studies. It will be able to make other essential studies; and, within the discretion of the Bureau itself, it will have to determine which of the various other activities which it is carrying on should be eliminated.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. This afternoon I spoke briefly on the work being done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and stated that I had inquired from the Board of Economic Advisers as to what services they needed, and had received the estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as to what would be required to carry on that work.

I see nothing in the list of things required which is not necessary. It strikes me, in going over it, that the Appropriations Committee—which I am glad to say has recognized the importance of the work of the Bureau—was nevertheless cutting it a little fine. The Senator from

Nevada has suggested a figure which almost exactly equals the amount which the Bureau says is required to carry on the statistical work demanded by the Board of Economic Advisers. If the Senator from Nevada would pare down the figure a little, on the assumption that perhaps the Bureau of Labor Statistics is asking for a little more than it can get along with, and would make the figure $4,000,000, I would add one vote for his proposal.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am glad to modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as modified, to the committee amendment on page 5, line 11.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for many years I have had personal experience with the objective manner in which the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is carried on. I know also that business institutions throughout the country have been accustomed to rely upon the reports of this Bureau. I think the work is very essential and should not be curtailed.

I am very sorry that the committee made the severe cut which it made. While I recognize that the action of the ranking minority member on the committee is necessary, I rise merely to express the hope that the amount suggested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] can be agreed upon. It would be a great loss to business if this amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the past 2 or 3 months the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has done a great deal of research into the operations of the executive departments. As a result, I have come to the conclusion that many departments could get along with substantial reductions in their appropriations for administrative purposes. However, I do not believe that we can approach this subject by simply slashing off 20, 25, or 15 percent, or whatever happens to come into the minds of members of the committee.

I believe that when we cut appropriations of this nature the Senate should have in mind the items in which such cuts are to be made, what activities or services are to be cut or what are to be abandoned. I do not believe that we can simply say that we will cut this item 20 percent and that item 20 percent, and the other item 30 or 40 or 10 percent. I think we can make substantial savings, possibly as much as 20 percent of the administrative costs of government, but the Congress should specify where those savings shall be. Otherwise we are likely to run into something such as occurred in connection with the Customs Bureau, where cuts were made where they would hurt the most, and hurt Congress most. If these cuts are to be made, if we are to have more economy and greater efficiency in government, the executive departments and the Congress must cooperate. It is necessary, in order to effect savings in the administrative branch of the Government, for Congress to enact certain pieces of legislation which will make such savings possible.

I believe we have here an instance where we should say what services we want the Bureau of Labor Statistics to discontinue before requiring them to make the selection. For that reason I hope the Senate will adopt, and I believe it would be advisable for it to adopt, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as modified by my colleague from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and I hope we will vote $4,000,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics which performs such a vitally important work and which is just as vital in the reconversion period as it was during the war.

I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Donnell	Lodge	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tobey
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Morse	
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall not hold the Senate more than a moment or two in furtherance of my views on the amendment. I have adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont. My thoughts on the matter may be thus expressed: This is a time, in view of legislation proposed and of laws which have been enacted by the Congress, when we should see to it that all laws are carried out. If they are not to be executed then it is time to repeal them. It is not a time to destroy the theories or the ideas of Congress basically. If we are to repeal laws, let us repeal them; if they are not worth while, let us strike them from the statute books. If they are worth while, let us sustain them.

That being true, let it be recalled that every contract made between an employer and an employee today is made on the basis of the cost of living. The cost of living is the thing which is uppermost as a basis for contracts which are being negotiated. To my mind, this is an outstanding item in the bill, I realize that there is always behind us the period of 14 years about which we hear so much and which is so much despised; but I wonder if there is a Senator here who will rise now and say he would repeal any one of the great, progressive measures which have been enacted during the 14 years we have heard so much about. I am wondering if there is a single Senator who would repeal the bill of which this item in the appropriation bill is in sustenance. If so, let him rise now while I am standing here.

I see none rise on either side of the aisle.

Oh, it would be very convenient, Mr. President, if we could smother and hide the item of the cost of living so that it would not become public, because the cost of living is the big thing which stands behind every labor contract which is being entered into. I realize that there are those in this Chamber who do not want the figures as to the cost of living to be made public. So, with that in mind, I am attempting to further something which at least will bring to the attention of the critical public the reasons for the labor-industry strikes which are occurring.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In regard to the cost-of-living item, let me say that the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics certainly is vital to the task of obtaining the objective data concerning it. In that connection, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD today's Gallup poll in answer to the question, "What is the most important problem that you and your family face today?"

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—LIVING COST, HOUSING CONTINUE IN LEAD OF NATION'S PROBLEMS

(By George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 2.—When President Truman recently voiced grave concern about the present level of prices he was voicing the concern of his constituents.

It is a problem which has headed the list of people's chief worries for a considerable period of time.

It topped the list back in January 1946, and again in February of this year.

Second on the list of present worries which people say face them or their families is the problem of housing.

This has also been found second on lists of worries in 1946 and early 1947. It is a problem particularly fretting to veterans of World War II.

Personal problems—including anything from mother-in-law trouble to how to get a girl to say "Yes" to a marriage proposal—are third on the list.

In February shortages of household goods and other equipment held fourth place.

Today that has given way to a problem which was all too familiar back in the thirties but which disappeared with the war—how to find and hold a job.

Veterans are also finding this one a particularly bothersome problem, the poll finds.

In making its periodical checks on problems facing voters and their families, the insitute asks:

"What is the most important problem that you and your family face today?"

The list:

1. High cost of living, high prices.
2. Housing; getting a proper place to live.
3. Personal family problems, health, etc.
4. Jobs; getting and holding a job.

5. Shortages: Household equipment, food, automobiles, etc.

Other problems concern worries about money, concern about security in the future. Farmers are worrying about crops, prices, etc.

A wonderful 6 out of every 100 said that neither they nor their families have any problems facing them today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the poll lists the other things which those who were polled think are of great importance to them. I have inserted the poll in the RECORD because I believe it helps to emphasize the point that, as I said in a speech which I made some weeks ago on this problem, the country needs an agency, adequately supported, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which will give us the facts, because about facts one cannot argue. In the present instance the agency under discussion gives the facts concerning the whole problem of the trend in the cost of living.

As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has said, it is of vital importance, not only to American industry but also to labor and all consumers.

Mr. President, I certainly hope the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has expressed my views, and the Senator from Vermont has stated his interest in the matter from the industrial viewpoint.

Mr. President, in every vote I have cast in all my life I have sustained labor, and in every vote I have ever cast I have also sustained industry. In the vote which I am about to cast on this matter, I shall be voting to sustain American life in the future.

Today I see an attempt being made to drive a wedge into out national life. I do not want that wedge to be successfully driven into our economy. I want labor and industry to have a fair and an equal break or chance in our industrial life. If they do not have it, then, indeed, that destructive influence which is coming to us from abroad, which is coming to us today from Russia—I shall not mince words as to its source—will have a vantage ground tomorrow. In God's name, Mr. President, let us not sustain that vantage ground. Let us bring before the American people the figures showing the cost of living today. Let the Bureau of Labor Statistics make known to the American people the growth and increase in the cost of living.

Mr. President, the cost of living enters into the laborer's house or hovel or castle, as the case may be, and it enters into the employer's castle or house or hovel, as the case may be. Both of them are equally interested. So let that information be available to all in the United States. It cannot be available unless this agency brings it forward.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada. As I understand the committee report, the committee has simply deducted from the $6,700,000 figure the estimated amount which was carried over from the national defense items which were previously in the budget; and, as I understand, the committee in its action has not stricken out anything except the national-defense items. That is my understanding on the basis of reading the report.

So I wonder how the Senator from Nevada comes to his conclusion. I wish to know why we should leave the national-defense items in the bill now under consideration.

I agree with everything the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon have said about the value of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and I am a great defender of it. But how would the work of that Bureau be furthered by carrying over the national-defense items?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey does not properly construe the facts. The facts are related in the report of the committee; the committee has provided for a complete curtailment of the activities of the Bureau. I am sure the Senator from California will sustain my statement in regard to that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], as modified, to the committee amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should simply like to call attention to the fact that the $4,000,000 item now proposed is $2,700,700 less than the amount of the President's budget figure.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask for an expression of the Senator from California on this matter, inasmuch as he is chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my position is the one I have heretofore stated, namely, that the committee, after listening to all the evidence and obtaining the facts, made a recommendation that the amount allowed for this purpose by the House of Representatives be increased by $1,376,600, which brings the total amount up to $3,750,000, which is approximately three times greater than any regular appropriation which that agency had from 1938 to 1945. Under those circumstances, and after careful examination of the facts, the committee strongly believes that there will be ample funds for carrying on the necessary work.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is it not true that the cost-of-living studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, about which we have heard a great deal, cost, this year, approximately $845,000, which the committee has earmarked for that purpose in the bill now before the Senate; and is it not a further fact that the wage-level studies cost a little more than $1,000,000 and that in addition to those two essential studies which the Bureau makes, approximately $2,000,000 is provided in the item recommended by the committee for the other studies, such as construction statistics, and so forth, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics makes, and that all the other amounts which the Bureau of Labor statistics wish to have appropriated would be used for items required during the war, which the Bureau would like to continue?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me say that I have had the most friendly relations possible with the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor and the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics in the Department of Agriculture. I have been their consistent defender in all the years I have served in this body. Because the work of both of them is good; they are highly regarded. The statistics prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are generally accepted by the industrial and financial world. That Bureau never had an appropriation of as much as $1,000,000 up until a few years ago. During the war its activities mushroomed and greatly expanded.

I happen to know that the Bureau of Labor Statistics was very badly worried about the action taken by the House of Representatives on this matter. I made some inquiry as to the situation, both before the committee made its report and afterward. I think I am entitled to say to the Senate that the Bureau of Labor Statistics can carry on and I understand is willing to carry on with the amount provided by the subcommittee. Of course, the Bureau would be happier with more money, but there is no question but that the Bureau of Labor Statistics can carry on its essential work with the amount of money provided for it in this bill by the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the Senator from Kansas state to the Senate what authority he had for the statement.

Mr. REED. I happen to have occupied a seat in this body for some years, and I make the statement on my own authority.

Mr. McCARRAN. Who in the Bureau of Labor Statistics made the statement to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. I am stating my own opinion and my own judgment, based upon a long familiarity with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. McCARRAN. That part is all right, if it is the Senator's opinion, but he did not so state it. The Senator from Kansas did not so state it.

Mr. REED. I did so state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator stated it as being the opinion of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before of my general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I transfer that pair on this vote to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay." If the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Holland	Morse
Barkley	Ives	Murray
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kilgore	Pepper
Flanders	Langer	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Taylor
Hatch	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McMahon	Tobey
Hill	Maybank	Watkins

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Dworshak	Lodge
Ball	Eastland	McClellan
Bricker	Ecton	McKellar
Butler	Ferguson	Malone
Byrd	Gurney	Millikin
Cain	Hawkes	Moore
Capper	Hickenlooper	Overton
Cooper	Hoey	Reed
Cordon	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Saltonstall	Umstead	Wilson
Smith	Wherry	Young
Taft	Wiley	
Thye	Williams	

NOT VOTING—25

Brewster	Jenner	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Buck	McCarthy	Tydings
Bushfield	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Capehart	Martin	Wagner
Chavez	Myers	White
Connally	O'Conor	
George	O'Daniel	

So Mr. MCCARRAN's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$695,000" and insert "$845,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Employment Service," on page 6, line 3, after "(Public Law 600)", to strike out "$2,656,800" and insert "$4,366,400."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the amendment on page 6, line 3, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$4,366,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,563,500."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment I have just offered is so related to the next amendment, that the two should be considered together. I am so offering my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee on page 6, line 4.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$1,756,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,120,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has offered an amendment to each of the last two amendments stated, and the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$4,366,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,563,500", and on page 6, line 4, strike out "$2,120,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,650,600."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, this item covers the general administration of the United States Employment Service, and includes the work of carrying into effect the provision of title 4, except section 602, of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This work is generally referred to as Veterans' Employment Service. May I enlist the attention of the Senate on this particular subject—Veterans' Employment Service? Although not specifically covered in the minority views, it is the opinion of the minority that this service is vital to our present economic situation, which changes rapidly. The statutory responsibility of this office requires it to promote, establish, and maintain a public employment system. It provides the business management, the personnel, and the technical services for the Veterans' Employment Service. It must also maintain budget administration and fiscal management of the vast grants-to-the-States program covered by the Wagner-Peyser Act. It must be remembered that the employment situation today, although at a high peak, changes rapidly from day to day, so that if we are to maintain our employment at this high level, the necessary facilities must be kept available to provide employees with knowledge of points of employment; and this, I submit, does not limit itself to the borders of any one State, but covers the entire Nation. That is the reason for the maintenance of a Federal level of employment service. It does not appear that this agency can operate efficiently with half of the employees with which it now operates. The number provided by the committee is less than the agency had in 1936 and 1939, the base periods which the majority likes to use for comparative purposes. I believe it is essential that the Budget estimate for this service be provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it. The "noes" have it. The amendment to the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those in favor of the amendment to the amendment will indicate by rising.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Had not the Chair announced the result of the vote prior to the request for a division?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. However, if any Senator wishes a reconsideration of the vote, the question will be put on a division.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to reconsider the vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was rising in response to the Chair's putting the question on the division. I did not rise to make a motion. I might say that the Chair rather promptly and immediately announced the amendment to have been rejected before the Senator from Nevada could get on his feet to ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the amendment of the committee is reconsidered. The Chair hears no objection, and the question recurs on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the situation, Mr. President, the vote by which the McCarran amendment was rejected, by a voice vote, has been reconsidered by unanimous consent. The Senator from Nevada has now asked for a division on his amendment—not on the committee amendment, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Those who favor the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment should vote "aye" and those opposed should vote "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator from California is correct.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment, on which a division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Grants to States for public employment offices," on page 6, line 19, after the word "purpose", to strike out "$71,728,000" and insert "$57,382,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 9, line 21, strike out "$3,748,400" and insert "$3,847,600."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 9, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$3,847,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,838,919."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this item is for salaries of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. This is the Division charged with the inspection and enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. During 1946, 50 percent of the business establishments covered by the act and inspected were found to be in violation of one or more major provisions of the act. Forty-five thousand inspections per year out of 556,000 establishments constitute an irreducible minimum required to insure a safe margin of compliance with the act. The amount requested by the budget is necessary to continue the inspections at this rate. It must be remembered that effective enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act is of equal importance to labor and the honest employer who voluntarily complies with the act. He, the honest employer, deserves the protection that this Division in its enforcement operations can give him if we provide sufficient funds. The testimony presented to the committee by the officials responsible for this enforcement amply supports a request for the funds requested by the President for this item. Let me say parenthetically that this is one of the most important items in connection with the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. I think the Senate, before it votes my amendment down, should give it fair consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in the eight short years that it has been in effect, the wages-and-hours law has established itself as a basic necessity in our economic structure. From all sections of the Nation we have heard of acceptance of this law which sets the modest minimum wage of 40 cents an hour and provides for overtime pay after 40 hours a week. Obviously, the lowest-paid men and women among the 20,000,000 workers covered by the wages-and-hours law are the greatest benefactors.

But without openly voting against the protective measures which this law provides for these low-paid workers, without openly denying these workers the further protection of the law, the House would remove that protection from them. By reducing funds for the enforcement of the wages-and-hours law, the House would encourage employers who so desired to ignore the existence of the law.

At present, operating on the same scale which the Division requested for the next fiscal year, inspectors of the Division are able to visit only about 45,000 employers each year. Yes; only about 45,000 of the approximately 550,000 employers covered by the law can be reached each year, even though the Division seeks to make its inspections only where most necessary. At that rate—45,000 a year—it would take the Division 12 years to visit each employer just once. Of course, it is not necessary to visit each employer every year. But a staff which is so small that it can serve only one-twelfth of the employers who are expected to comply with this law affecting 20,000,000 of the Nation's workers, a staff so small that it can give no better service than that, admittedly is operating on the border line of effectiveness.

Both employers and workers have a right to closer contact with the enforcement agencies of the laws affecting them. Employers have a right to be more currently advised of violations, unintentional yet potentially costly violations, which they sincerely desire to avoid. Workers, especially the unorganized workers—and there are nine or ten million of them covered by the wages-and-hours law—have a right to the meager protection the law was designed to give them. This is especially true when we realize that, despite the efforts both inside and outside of industry, there still are some employers who like to cut corners, who like to chisel, even if that chiseling is at the expense of their workers and their competitors.

But, Mr. President, even with such conditions existing at the moment, the House action reducing the appropriation for enforcement of the wages-and-hours law by 25 percent means that the situation will be aggravated to the point where the wages-and-hours law will become virtually meaningless. A 25-percent reduction would mean that, instead of 45,000 inspections a year, the Division will be able to make only about 33,000 inspections a year. A 25-percent reduction would mean that it would take the Division 16 years, instead of 12 years, to visit each employer only once. If 45,000 inspections a year, the present rate, is too low for really effective enforcement of this law desired by both employer and employee, then 33,000 inspections certainly would be much too low.

I maintain that unless we desire to write the wages-and-hours law off the records, unless we desire to kill this safeguard to employer and employee alike, we should restore the appropriation for its enforcement to the figure requested ir the budget. If the wages-and-hours law is worth keeping—and not a voice has been raised asking its repeal—if this law is worth keeping, I repeat, then it must be kept operative by providing sufficient funds for its enforcement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the committee recommended an increase of $99,200 over the amount allowed by the House for this very important agency which the committee itself recognizes has an important job to do, and we want it to do that job. Of course, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, the agency was never intended to make an inspection of every industrial plant every year, no more than a collector of internal revenue can check on every individual income-tax return. The value of enforcement, of course, lies in the spot checks in connection with which employers know that they may be visited by the agents of the Bureau at some unanticipated time, just as the value of the Department of Internal Revenue lies in the fact that it spot checks income-tax returns, and no one knows when his income tax is going to be checked. So that from that point of view, on an enforcement basis, we felt the amount allowed to the Bureau was ample to take care of the needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment on page 9, line 21. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the amendment to the committee amendment is rejected.

The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 21.

Mr. McCARRAN. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps I am in error, but my knowledge of parliamentary procedure is that the Presiding Officer should always state whether the "ayes" or the "noes" appeared to have it, and if no question is raised, then of course the Presiding Officer decides. The able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who now occupies the chair, has not carried out that procedure. There are some of us who might want a division on questions as we go along. I am not assuming to guide the able Senator who occupies the chair, but coming as he does from a great State, and having had considerable parliamentary experience, he recognizes the fact which I bring to his attention that it is always the province of the Presiding Officer to state that one side or the other to a question appears to have prevailed. Am I right or wrong in my assumption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York apologizes to the Senator from Nevada, and hereafter he will say whether the "ayes" or the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad the Senator has made that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, however, will point out to the Senator from Nevada that it has been the custom in the past, in such matters, so far as the Chair himself has been concerned, to state that one side or the other "appears to have it" in a matter of doubt, but I do not think there is any doubt about the votes which have been had so far.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would it not be well——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, however, will acquiesce in the suggestion made by the Senator from Nevada, and the Chair apologizes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator who is now presiding. It is very lovely of him to act as he has now acted. But I now ask for a division on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been requested. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected will be reconsidered. The Chair hears no objections, and the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment on page 9, line 21.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the committee amendment on page 9, line 21. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 22, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$746,100" and insert "$672,800."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. McCARRAN. The "ayes" appear to have it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question about it. The Chair insists that the amendment is adopted.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 12, to strike out:

The Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from the foregoing appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division to any other bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such bureau or office to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 2, to insert:

In order that the Secretary may effectuate necessary reorganizations within the Department and field, he may transfer to the appropriations under this title from funds appropriated, other than grants to States for public employment offices, such sums as necessary, but not to exceed 2 percent of the total funds appropriated: *Provided*, That such transfer or transfers shall not be used for the purpose of creating new functions within the Department, or for the continuation of any function which the Congress in its final report recommends be discontinued: *Provided further*, That no appropriation item shall be reduced more than 5 percent by such transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 12, line 4, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35"; and in line 6, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "$4,276,000" and insert "$1,356,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 9, after the word "cases", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$10,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration," on page 14, line 5, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35"; and in the same line, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$3,884,700" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35"; and in line 17, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$331,000" and insert "$431,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 17, line 2, after "(Public Law 586)", to strike out "$14,200,000" and insert "$17,750,000."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 17, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$19,842,759.97" and insert in lieu thereof "$29,301,740.22."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas withhold his amendment until the amendment in line 2, on page 17, is disposed of?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$14,200,000" and insert "$17,750,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, if the Senator from Arkansas will agree to it, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will again state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$19,842,759.97" and insert in lieu thereof "$29,301,740.22."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is some confusion about this particular amendment and the effect of it in connection with that on line 2. It appears in the report as if there had been an increase of $3,550,000 as opposed to the House figure of $14,200,000. But the significant part is that the $19,842,759.97 has been stricken out, which actually represents a reduction in the amount which might be developed under this program during the coming year.

I was not exactly clear as to the proper way to reach this point. I have offered an amendment to increase the amount in line 4 from $19,842,759.97 to $29,301,740.22, which was the amount authorized under the George-Barden Act. That is not an appropriation, and it is not presented in that sense, but it does constitute a ceiling on the amount which may be developed under the matching program in the vocational education activities in the various States. It is a 100-percent matching program. I know that several of the States, including my own, had already planned upon the figure of $19,842,759.97 in line 4. In my amendment the figure is made $29,301,740.22 because I think the program justifies the adoption, in this sense, of a ceiling on the total amount authorized under the George-Barden Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. The fact of the matter is that during the fiscal year 1947 there was available for this very important and desirable work in vocational education the amount of $14,200,000. Your committee is recommending that there be available for this work during the coming fiscal year $17,750,000, an increase of approximately 20 percent over the amount available last year.

I merely wish to point out to the Senate that if the language is changed, in my opinion this is very likely to be the result: The figure will be set at $29,000,000 plus. Such funds as we appropriate will be allocated, and then the States and the Agency will come back to Congress and say, "Since you held out the hope to the States that they would get the $29,000,000, we now call upon you for a deficiency appropriation to cover the difference between what you have appropriated and what you have generally authorized."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The way to prevent any confusion, or prevent a situation of that kind arising, which would bring about a deficiency bill during the next year, is clearly to set forth that the sum total to be allocated will be the amount of $17,500,000, which as I say, is an increase of 20 percent over the amount available last year.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator if I correctly understood him to say that if the language in the proviso beginning at the end of line 2 is stricken, as the committee recommends, the allocations will be on the basis of approximately $29,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I said that without certain House language which the Senate committee has stricken, which provides for $19,842,000 plus, there will

be no confusion in the mind of anyone that the maximum amount we are appropriating for the next year is $17,750,000. Otherwise there will be two figures, the amount of the appropriation of $17,750,000 and the figure of $19,842,759.97.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, he is proposing to make the figure $29,000,000-plus.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On what basis will the allocations be made if this clause is eliminated from the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion they will be made on the basis of $17,750,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Am I correct in understanding that the figure of $19,842,759.97 used by the House was inserted so that the amount appropriated by the House, $14,200,200, while that was the limit of the amount available, could be apportioned among States which elected to match the funds on the basis of the higher figure, so as to take up the full amount of $14,200,000 in case other States did not elect to match the funds?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct so far as he goes, with this additional fact: At the time the question was before the House committee, it was pointed out in the House committee report that the committee was receiving information from the several States, which was not then available. Since then the committee has indicated that in its opinion, if the entire amount of $29,000,000-plus were made available by the Congress, it could be spent by the States to good purpose. So to that extent the House, had it had all the information which it did not have at the time the committee met, might have substituted the figure of $29,000,000-plus for the figure $19,000,000-plus.

But we still get back to the point that your committee felt that a 20-percent increase in the appropriation was a substantial increase. We did not want any confusion whereby States which made early application would use up the $17,500,000 and States which applied later would come in and say, "Other States have obtained their share. We now want ours, and we call upon you for a deficiency appropriation." For that reason we felt that it would be better for everyone to understand that the total amount for that purpose will be only $17,750,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas were made, increasing the basis for apportionment to the States to $29,000,000-plus, that would absolutely guarantee that the appropriation of $17,750,000 would be exceeded by a great amount.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator. It would encourage requests for deficiency appropriations which would greatly exceed the $17,750,000 which we feel should be allotted.

Mr. CORDON. In that event, either there would have to be a very heavy deficiency appropriation next year, or a very great inequity as between States which were prudent or fortunate enough to make the first applications, and those which might delay making application.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Generally speaking, the Senate committee has raised the appropriation agreed upon in the House; but I think the effect of the amendment of the committee is to lower the appropriation by the difference between $17,750,000 and $19,842,759.97. The committee has actually lowered the amount that could be developed this year under this program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the able Senator from Arkansas that I have never indicated on the floor that I thought we should underwrite the House figures on the top side or the lower side. As a matter of fact we have substantially lowered the figures of the House of Representatives in connection with grants to States for the employment service. We have lowered the recommendation of the House in connection with the cancer fund, feeling that the proposed increase was far more than could be properly expended at this time. To that extent we have lowered the sights of the House of Representatives. The bill which we have about halfway through the Senate represents appropriations $8,000,000 less than those in the bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I was trying to do was to make the situation clear. In the digest or recapitulation on page 19 of the report it appears that there is an increase of $3,550,000 over the House figures, but because of the peculiar condition of this proviso it is not clear, when one reads it, just what has been done. The Senate committee has actually not increased the appropriation, in my opinion, but has lowered it, and has decreased the budget estimate $11,551,739, one of the largest decreases under the budget in all these programs. Percentagewise it is a decrease of more than 30 percent in the budget estimate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that we want the facts to be clear. I have tried to outline them. The fact is that we have allowed an increase of more than three and one-half million dollars over what was spent last year for this purpose. It is not up to the authorization figure, if we may use that as distinguished from the appropriation figure of $19,842,759.97 which the House had authorized, or the $29,000,000-plus which the House might have authorized had all the reports from the States been available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Our topside figure for both appropriation and authorization is $17,750,000, and is meant to be $17,750,000, with all the facts I have outlined before us.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that when the House fixed the figure and then placed a higher limitation, it was based upon the knowledge then available, that probably a sufficient number of States would not make application for participation to take up the full $14,200,000, and that a higher limitation would permit fewer States to use up the $14,200,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my colleague from Oregon that I do not know whether that is exactly correct. What was in the mind of the committee—and I want the facts to be fully understood by the Senate—was that the House decided, at the time it allotted the $14,200,000, that it did not at that time have all the information from the several States. If the Senator will read the report, he will see the House left the question more or less wide open, pointed out that certain additional information was coming in, and at least strongly left the impression in my mind from reading the report that the House would have been glad to appropriate more and to authorize more if it had had before it all the factual information. So I think that in fairness the whole effect should be known on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; and I think it should also be pointed out that the program was very greatly curtailed during the war, for very obvious reasons, and they are just now beginning to develop it again. In my own State there is a tremendous demand for this particular program, and the State is proposing to spend considerably more than the matching part of the Federal fund.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My observation is that a great many of the States are in better shape from a budget point of view and from a debt point of view than is the Federal Government. I think a 25-percent increase is a substantial one. I am, myself, very much interested in the vocational educational program. California is one of the early States which took advantage of the program. From that point of view, my State will probably have as great a cut percentagewise as will any other State in the Union. But I still feel that we perhaps have to make haste slowly, and if we can increase the amount 25 percent this year and perhaps the same amount next year the program will be doing very well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, one reason why we did not use any of the money during the past year was that the law was amended late in the session last year, too late for States to get in their reports. This year it will be found that the departments of education probably have not determined their needs for next year, and for that reason the reports will be coming in the next few weeks. Some States will not have any funds from the Federal Government. We shall probably run into a big deficiency in this particular item next spring if we cut them entirely out from now until that time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas is agreed to, will it not deceive many of the States? In other words, States have to make matching appropriations. They will make them on the basis of the larger amount, and will find when they want to spend the money for this desirable purpose that Federal funds will not be available to match.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct, and I believe in fairness to the States as well as the Federal Government it would be much better for all concerned to make clear here and now that the $17,750,000 will be the maximum available for the purpose. If they are able to match and want to exceed their matching they will be free to do so, but they should not look to the Federal Government for more than $17,750,000 so far as the fiscal year 1948 is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it true that the George-Deen Act at present assures to the States more cash, amounting to $29,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think it says any such thing. As I recall, it says that the total amount which may be authorized by the Congress would figure up to $29,000,000; but I think that the Congress of the United States has in its hands the determination of the amount of money which shall be granted to the States. We have a ruling and opinion from the Comptroller General which says that the Congress of the United States has control over the amount and that the agencies are subject to the antideficiency provisions in the Antideficiency Act.

This is the language which I read earlier in the day. Perhaps the able Senator from South Carolina was not present at the time. Section 4 of the George-Deen Act reads as follows:

The several States and Territories, in order to receive the benefits of this act, shall be required to match by State and local funds or both 100 percent of the appropriations made under authority of section 3.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. It authorizes the Congress to match up to $29,000,000, provided it makes the appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from South Carolina that, as he well knows, we have authorized from year to year for many years public works, including river and harbor works; and though I do not have the figures before me now, we have authorized the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. The fact that we have passed an authorization bill is no mandate upon the Congress immediately to meet all the authorizations passed by the Congress, because if that were so the country would probably be bankrupt today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from California. But last year the authorization was increased, was it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the Senator that the authorization was increased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the committee amendment on page 17, line 4.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Chair, if this amendment be agreed to, is the proviso automatically reinstated in the bill, or does it have to be voted on. The committee amendment strikes out the language, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas sent to the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, in the committee amendment, on page 17, line 4, to strike out "$19,842,759.90" and insert in lieu thereof "$29,301,740.22."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment on page 17, in line 4. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the next committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 2, after "$17,750,000", it is proposed to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,759.97 for the fiscal year 1948, as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 11, after "(Public Law 658)", to strike out "$1,252,900" and insert "$1,683,900"; and in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not less than $434,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 19, line 20, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35"; and in line 24, after the word "films", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 20, line 13, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 24, after the word "appropriation" and the period, to strike out:

There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such act, the total sum authorized by part C of the act to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such act, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000, the total sum authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by part C of the act. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the aggregate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $40,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "patients", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after the word "buildings," to strike out "$9,126,000" and insert "$9,626,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$17,328,200" and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate is aware that the effect of the amendment now proposed is to reduce by $5,328,200 the House appropriation in the field of cancer research conducted by the National Cancer Institute. A summary of the matter is presented in the Senate committee report, on page 6, as follows:

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The committee recommends a reduction of $5,328,200 from the large increase granted by the House in the amount provided for salaries and expenses for the National Cancer Institute. The appropriations available last year were $1,714,408; the budget estimate requested $7,169,000, and the House committee transferred $4,159,291 from other budget items, in addition to a large increase over the budget estimate, resulting in a total amount of $17,328,200.

Statements made before the committee revealed that other funds and services are being provided from private sources, and the committee believes a more comprehensive plan should be worked out before adding any large sums to this important work. The committee is convinced that the $12,000,000 recommended is adequate provision for 1948.

Mr. President, on page 27 of the bill the concluding proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That such parts of the amount appropriated under this head as the Surgeon General shall determine from time to time to be available for research and training grants shall remain available until expended.

Mr. President, I am not contesting the finding of the committee that the amount made available by it is all that can properly be spent in the year 1948, and none of us wish to have money expended in the field of cancer research if it cannot be wisely and well spent. But since the committee has specifically provided that the money for research not expended shall remain available until spent, I regret that the committee has not provided for the allowance of the additional $5,328,200 to remain available until spent, so that the public-health authorities who are working in this field may know that they have a backlog of that amount of money, which will remain available until expended, when it could be wisely and properly expended.

There has been an immense increase in public interest and in public contributions for cancer research. We know that the American Cancer Institute has been carrying on a great campaign during the last several years. In the 15 months prior to the end of the last year, the American public contributed approximately $5,000,000 for such research, and some for other aspects of the problem.

Of course, at this late hour, in view of the disposition of the Senate which has been exhibited, I do not suppose it

would do any good to make a motion to restore the $5,328,200.

Let me say that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] also is interested in this field.

I have pending a bill which would make available or would appropriate $100,000,000 to be used in the event the President might find that course desirable, and the bill also provides that the money not expended at any one time should remain available until it could be properly expended.

Of course, no one is suggesting that $100,000,000 be used at one particular time; but all the persons engaged in research in this field tell us that in order to achieve any effective results, it is necessary to be able to plan a long-range program, and that in cases in which the program is dependent upon annual appropriations from the Congress, so that it is not possible to know what amounts of money will be available for the next year, it obviously is impossible to develop programs except for a year at a time. The result is that we do not get the best results and are not able to follow a sustained program.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has proposed similar legislation, and at this time I invite his comment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is aware of the fact that I have introduced a bill to provide for a cancer commission to dispense money for research, and that bill contains the provision which the Senator from Florida wishes to have adopted by the Senate.

It may be desirable to incorporate that bill in the National Science Foundation bill, which we hope to have considered in the Senate very shortly. I am most hopeful that before the Senate adjourns we may set up an over-all program which will be satisfactory.

In the meantime as the Senator from Florida knows, the general testimony—even that from the National Cancer Institute authorities and others—is that we would make a mistake to appropriate $5,000,000 more, in addition to the $12,000,000, for the National Cancer Institute and to facilitate that work of the Public Health Service. Those authorities feel that there should be a much broader control of the money. The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, would give the National Cancer Institute approximately $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, I think, more than it has ever had before, and probably more than it could use during the coming year.

If we wish to adopt a long-range program covering more than 1 year, then we should pass the bill to which I have referred, and in that bill provision should be made that the money should remain available until spent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In furtherance of the remarks of the Senator from Florida, let me say that the money could not be expended and will not be expended directly by the Federal Government. As the matter was presented to the Appropriations Committee, the money will be, if I may use a homely term, rather farmed out to private institutions.

The whole question of the control of cancer or the cure of cancer is now one of investigation and study as to how the objective may be accomplished. Up to date, no one has been able to tell us the answer.

Mr. President, I do not believe we could expend too much money for investigations in the field of the control or cure of cancer. Today, cancer is the greatest enemy of mankind, not even excepting war. It is a destructive influence, which attacks youth and age and middle life, as well. We are calling upon every facility in civilization to bend its efforts to find an answer to this terrific human problem. Can this Nation, which leads civilization today, invest too much money to accomplish results which will answer the question of what is the cure for cancer? I do not believe so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. I wish to say, in that regard, if I may have the attention of the Senator from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, that there seem to be a number presenting themselves to the appropriations committees, private groups, who have said to the Congress of the United States, through their correspondence and testimony, that there should not be appropriated the amount of money provided by the House because the Federal Government, through its agencies, cannot expend it. Private groups are setting themselves up to say how much money the Federal Government shall appropriate for this all important venture on the part of humanity.

Mr. President, I again draw the attention of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, in charge of the bill, to the fact that I hope private groups will not be so jealous of their position as to say that we shall not appropriate something to destroy the greatest agency for human affliction in all the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the committee recommended a reduction of the $5,328,200 in the large increase granted by the House, in the amount provided for salaries and expenses for the National Cancer Institute. The appropriation available last year was $1,714,408. The budget estimate was $7,169,000, and the House committee transferred $4,159,291 from other budget items.

Relative to the point the able Senator raised, I think there are a great many public institutions, such as the Public Health Service, which is doing a very fine work, and which is interested in the field of cancer research, and many private hospitals which are quite properly interested in the field of cancer research and treatment. I think the association which has been set up by public-spirited citizens is interested just as much as any of us can be on the floor in finding a solution to this problem.

This fact is basically true that the existence of unlimited atomic energy was known, and it was merely a matter of putting the known facts together and developing the atomic bomb. The evidence indicates quite clearly that the basic answers are well known in the field of cancer.

The National Cancer Society is raising quite a substantial sum of money, and I am sure they have a vital interest in this question. I do not believe they should be criticized, however, both as taxpayers and as citizens interested in this subject, for saying to the Congress, "An increase such as you have granted, from a million and a half, roughly, plus certain allocations of the States, up to twelve million, is as much as we think can intelligently be spent this year. If you will have your appropriations increased reasonably each year it will be possible to set up an organization and establish research, and efficiently and effectively spend the money."

Merely dumping huge sums of money into the Public Health Service is not, in my opinion, the correct or the constructive way to meet this very great problem which faces mankind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will not the Senator agree that this money is to be farmed out, as I use the term, to various institutions, hospitals and research centers for their use?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, and personally I see no objection to it. That is precisely what we did in the case of atomic energy development. We went into the various universities, into the various research laboratories, and found the best brains in the country to help on the problem.

Mr. McCARRAN. With that I agree. The Senator refers to the fact that we are collecting private funds from various sources through a private agency. If it be necessary to collect private funds why is it not necessary for the Federal Government to appropriate $17,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think the answer to the problem is merely shoveling money into any of these activities. I think we should put money into activities in this very important field as rapidly as it can be intelligently spent. We have allowed a substantial increase over what the agency has had before for this purpose. I think that as the Public Health Service gears itself to spend intelligently the money, we can take a look at the situation next year, and if necessary increase the appropriation again. Merely putting huge sums at their disposal before they have worked out any plans, or anything of the sort, for meeting the problem, I do not think is a constructive solution.

So far as the private agencies are concerned, for a number of years I was very active in my home county of Alameda, Calif., and was chairman of the Alameda Tuberculosis Association. That association, through its national organization, has been doing very fine work in the field of tuberculosis control, and will continue to do so. The Federal Government is

doing work in that field, and the various localities are active in the same field. But I certainly would not feel that there was anything objectionable if in the field of tuberculosis control the American Tuberculosis Association should come forward and say "In our judgment this is as much money as can be intelligently spent in this particular year."

Mr. McCARRAN. Except for the fact that, to my mind, it represents selfishness on the part of private organizations and I use the word "selfishness" advisedly—which seek to curtail and hold the study of this all-important subject within their own grasp.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not agree with my able colleague in that statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment. I do not believe that is either human or American. I think that if the American Government wants to appropriate money for this research, it should be permitted to do so without the intervention of the private institutions, saying we should not do so, and that they want to make the appropriation. I do not think that is fair or right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not agree on that point with my very able colleague from Nevada, as I pointed out, because I think these private individuals are unselfishly giving of their time. There are people in the scientific world and the medical world and the business world who are contributing of their time and money, and soliciting funds from private individuals, to carry on this very important work. I do not think they are taking the position that no work should be done by the Federal Government in this regard at all. They are quite agreeable that this increase which the Senate committee has granted, and which is a substantial increase over the amount they had last year, should be handled by the Public Health Service. I have a very high respect for Dr. Parran and for the Public Health Service. Some might charge just the opposite to what my distinguished friend from Nevada charges, that is, that the Public Health Service was trying to monopolize this movement in its own hands, and was discouraging private institutions and private enterprise getting into this field. I certainly would not agree with the Senator, because I think the Public Health Service has a proper place in this movement, but not an exclusive place. Apparently the Senator from Nevada believes that the Public Health Service should be the exclusive agency handling the funds in cancer research.

Mr. McCARRAN. No. The Senator from California seems to be defending the private institution. I am not defending either one of them. Cancer is a human affliction, the greatest scorge known to mankind. Neither private nor public institutions should get any credit for anything save and except they put forth their entire energy to eradicate this dread disease.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the point I want to emphasize is that nobody is suggesting, as I said a while ago, that all this money should be expended in 1 year, but I am pointing out that the committee has already provided that "such parts of the amount appropriated under this head as the Surgeon General shall determine from time to time to be available for research and training grants shall remain available until expended."

One out of every eight living Americans, according to statistics of the past, will die of cancer, and if those statistics prevail, several of us sitting in this Chamber this afternoon will die in the agony of a cancer death. I am reluctant, Mr. President, to see the United States Senate cut an appropriation made by the House of Representatives for research in cancer, and to indicate that we are not so zealous in our efforts to find the cause and cure of that dread disease as is our sister body of the Congress.

Mr. President, the able Senator from California has said, what would happen when the Public Health Service has had time to plan; but how can they plan when they do not know how much money they have with which to plan for the future? All they will have available will be what the Congress appropriates; they cannot go beyond that point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to finish this statement, then I will yield. What I am saying is that if we vote down this committee amendment, if we adhere to the appropriation made by the House on this subject, the Public Health Service will be able to plan further into the future than they would otherwise be able to do.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has covered what I was going to suggest. I thought he said they could not plan. I was going to say, "certainly they could plan, but the plans would have to be within the limits of the appropriation."

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly. Mr. President, here is a bill appropriating billions of dollars. We have added to various appropriation items which the House has sent to the Senate, and yet we cut off $5,328,000 of the money made available by the House of Representatives for research in the field of cancer. That is a dangerous action on the part of the Senate, and I am very grateful for the fine attitude that has been taken by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from California. He is thoroughly appreciative of the problem.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has a bill now pending in the Senate to make $5,000,000 available the first year, $10,000,000 the second year, $15,000,000 the third, $20,000,000, the fourth, and perhaps an additional sum thereafter. The legislation setting up the machinery of expenditure is under consideration. But surely we have a Public Health Service, we have a National Cancer Institute. Surely it would not hurt to follow the House in this matter and let those agencies have this additional $5,000,000, to remain available until it can be wisely expended; but with which they could plan a research program that might result in the saving of the lives of Senators sitting this afternoon in this Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the general attitude of the House committee and of the House of Representatives toward cuts in appropriations, does not the Senator think the fact that this one was not cut by them is fairly good evidence that it ought not to be cut?

Mr. PEPPER. I should think so. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will see fit—I wish he might see fit—to accept our suggestion and allow the House provision to stand, not insist on the committee amendment, so that the additional $5,000,000 would be available. If the Senator does not feel he can do that, I hope the Senate will not agree to the committee amendment, and will allow the $5,000,000 appropriated by the House to remain available until spent on cancer research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 27, line 11.

Mr. AIKEN (and other Senators) asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly that the vote now is on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A vote to sustain the committee is a "yea" vote; a vote to override the committee is a "nay" vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, to make it more specific, a "yea" vote is for $12,000,000; a "nay" vote is for $17,328,200.

The PRESIDINC OFFICER. It may be construed either way. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. Making the same announcement as before, I transfer my general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and will vote. I vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent. If present and voting he would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. [MARTIN]. If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "nay," if present, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—34

Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bricker	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Watkins
Dworshak	McKellar	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Moore	
Hawkes	Reed	

NAYS—24

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Barkley	Langer	Russell
Butler	McCarran	Sparkman
Cooper	McFarland	Stewart
Ellender	McMahon	Taylor
Hatch	Morse	Umstead
Hoey	O'Mahoney	Williams
Holland	Pepper	Wilson

NOT VOTING—37

Baldwin	George	Myers
Brewster	Green	O'Conor
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hill	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Kilgore	Tobey
Chavez	Lucas	Tydings
Connally	McGrath	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	
Fulbright	Murray	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] had expressed the keenest interest and desire to be present when the vote should be taken on the amendment relative to the subject of cancer. The Senator from South Carolina was called unexpectedly from the Chamber. I simply wanted to record the fact that he is deeply interested in the subject. I understand that his pair in favor of the larger appropriation has been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 33, line 14, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$995,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 17, to insert "including, when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator, attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance"; in line 22, after the word "than", to strike out "$34,909,700" and insert "$35,200,000"; and on page 34, line 8, after the word "purposes", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That of the amount authorized to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, not more than $175,000 may be expended, without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278 (a)) for alterations, improvements, and repairs to two buildings in Baltimore, Md., housing the wage record operations of the Bureau, which amount, except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses of the Bureau, may be transferred to the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, for such purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 35, line 2, after the word "distribution", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$431,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 7, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the words "appropriated for", to strike out "$2,072,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator", on page 40, line 8, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$75" and insert "$35"; and in line 10, after "(Public Law 659)", to strike out "$320,000" and insert "$340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 20, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$132,500" and insert "$147,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 1, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$325,600" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 13, after the word "reprints", to strike out "$558,700" and insert "$670,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 18, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "$480,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board", on page 45, line 2, after the word "law", to strike out "$3,063,100" and insert "$3,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$805,500" and insert "$900,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California if the same percentage of committee allowance to budget request applies to other appropriations as applies to the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; because we felt that some increases were well warranted. I call the Senator's attention to page 24 of the Senate committee's report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator kindly tell the Senate how much increase or decrease has been made in respect to the entire appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board in contrast to what the appropriations were during the last fiscal year?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will give the figures to the Senator. The National Labor Relations Board had as their regular appropriation for 1947, $4,069,509, and

due to the pay raise increases they had an additional $412,400, making the total amount available to them for 1947, $4,481,900. The amount recommended by the House was $4,033,700, which was a decrease below their over-all figure for last year. The Senate committee, however, recommended that the sum be $4,974,700, which is more than they had last year by some $500,000 roughly, and, including salaries and the other items, is almost $1,000,000 more than allowed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator state how much more this amount is than the budget recommendations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The budget estimate was $7,984,000, so all these figures are below the budget estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount is a little under 50 percent of the budget estimate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is approximately correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I might say that it is almost useless for any of us to make any attempt to increase the appropriations above the amounts placed in the bill. I think the item the Senate is now considering should be given serious consideration. For the past 90 days we have heard much testimony on the labor bill now before the Senate, and a hue and cry was raised that the reason why many of the difficulties arising in management-labor relations existing in the country came about was because of lack of funds. I believe the Senate should by all means increase the amount which is to be made available by the pending bill. As I have stated, it is idle, apparently, for us to attempt to increase appropriations over the amounts which have been provided in the bill, but I simply thought I should bring this subject to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think when we were having the discussion a few moments ago the Senator stated that the total appropriation was a little less than 50 percent of the budget request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it figures out something around 60 percent of the budget request, and it is more than the Board received last year by the difference between $4,974,000 and $4,483,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I understand that. I will say to the Senator. But during the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare it was brought out by many witnesses that one of the main reasons why the Wagner Act was not properly administered was lack of appropriations. I believe that if a sufficient amount of money were appropriated so the act could be properly administered, there would not be so much difficulty in management-labor relations as there has been in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 13, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$18,400" and insert "$24,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 15, after "National Labor Relations Board", to strike out "$146,700" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "between", to strike out the words "management and labor" and to insert "an employer and a labor organization which represents a majority of his employees in their appropriate bargaining unit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Mediation Board," on page 47, line 2, after "(Public Law 600)", to strike out "$316,000" and insert "$338,700"; and in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$236,000" and insert "$261,726."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 48, line 8, after the word "Board", to strike out "$39,000" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2700 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY KRUG AND SENATOR WHERRY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. J. A. Krug, appeared this morning before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Interior Department appropriation bill, to discuss the over-all effect of certain reductions below the budget which have been made in the bill as it passed the House.

The entire West and a great part of the rest of the country are very much interested in this statement. It is a matter of current legislative interest. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR J. A. KRUG BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MAY 1947

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the Interior Department's problems in economy. I am keenly aware that Congress, too, is faced with the necessity of bringing Federal expenditures in line with sound peacetime requirements, and I wish to assure you of my full cooperation in facing our obligations realistically. I do not want for the Department of the Interior 1 cent more than is required for the efficient operation of economically, justifiable functions.

As a matter of fact, the appropriation requests for Interior for the fiscal year 1948 already had gone through an unusually thorough pruning process before they ever reached the Congress. The estimates of the various bureaus and offices were reduced by about half within the department as the result of a double screening, first as to activities and then as to amounts. The Bureau of the Budget and the President, when they received these reduced estimates, further cut them back about 38 percent, to a final figure of $295,420,420. I felt and still feel that this estimate represented a rock-bottom figure of the amount needed for the department to do its necessary business.

The bill approved by the House provides, however, for appropriations totaling only $161,413,513, or a reduction in the budget estimates of $134,006,907. I believe the conclusion inescapable that the unusually severe reduction in these already reduced appropriations will, if they are allowed to stand, prove themselves much more costly to the American people and the well-being of our country than the amount which would be saved. Indeed, in many cases there will result an immediate loss of revenues to the Treasury which exceeds the expenditures saved.

As I read the report of the House subcommittee, these drastic reductions were imposed by virtue of four erroneous assumptions made by the committee. These are:

1. That the Department's operations should be adjusted to the dollar level of the prewar year of 1938;

2. That construction operations should be held to an absolute minimum and that such operations can be conducted during 1948 with minimum appropriations due to the carry-over balances from 1947 resulting from the Presidential freeze order upon Federal construction;

3. That many services rendered by the Department were of primary benefit to special groups which should finance such services directly or by repayment to the Federal Government; and

4. That only those functions were eliminated which are not authorized by law.

I will comment briefly upon these assumptions and later will illustrate the very real harm which has been done to the various programs of the Department by what I consider to be false economy.

The House has not cut the Department back to its 1938 level of activity but in reality far below that level. In 1938 the Department had about $133,000,000 in regular appropriations and about $98,000,000 in public-works funds, used for the regular work of the Department. When these dollar figures are adjusted to the 1947 level of wages and prices, the 1938 program would require $312,000,000, or $17,000,000 more than the President's estimate before the House cut it by 45 percent. So, in result, we are asked by the House to carry on our 1948 work, plus all the increased responsibilities which have come to us in the past decade, for an amount which will go only about 52 percent as far as the funds available in 1938.

The basic difficulty with the position taken by the House subcommittee with respect to our construction activities during the 1948 fiscal year is that it has assumed that all unexpended balances on July 1 will be available in that fiscal year. In fact, of course, it is only unobligated balances that are available. The committee notes that it has allowed about $79,000,000 for construction work (increased to about $85,000,000 on the

floor), adds about $125,000,000 of unexpended balances and gets a respectable total of $204,000,000 available for 1948. But the unobligated balances available for use on July 1 will in truth be only about half the figure used by the House subcommittee, some $63,000,000, and these will be earmarked for specific projects not according to need but only according to past delays in construction work. You will see, therefore, that over $60,000,000 of new construction money must be added if the Department is to have a 1948 construction program equivalent to that described by the House subcommittee.

The third assumption of the House subcommittee was that the Federal Government should not continue activities such as research and the collection of statistics which are of value to private industry, or even in some cases to State and local governments, until arrangements are made for financing those activities by the beneficiaries. This principle would remake the Federal Government if generally applied, but may nevertheless be sound in some cases. It is in any event necessary to work out some new legislation to cover federally conducted activities for which the beneficiaries would be required to reimburse the Government. In view of the fact that the Department of the Interior has an impressive record of about $85,000,000 of revenues returned to the Federal Treasury each year through its activities, it seems rather arbitrary to apply this principle to the Interior Department alone. This is particularly the case in view of the necessity of continuity if statistics are to give their full value and if highly qualified technical staffs are not to be disbanded.

With respect to the fourth assumption, namely, that only functions not authorized by law were eliminated, it appears to conflict with the fact that Congress has specifically directed the Secretary of the Interior to market the power generated by plants constructed by the Corps of Engineers. Yet the committee, in its report, recommended, and the House adopted its recommendation, that no money be used to pay for the Division of Power, the only agency of the Secretary qualified to carry out the mandate of Congress.

Another example that does not seem to square with the committee's fourth assumption applies to the Division of Geography. Every year since 1890 Congress has appropriated funds for this activity. In view of that long precedent of congressional approval, it appears to be particularly specious to advance the argument that the Division of Geography was never specifically authorized by law.

Each of the Bureaus and Offices of the Department will later appear before you to present their needs in detail. I wish at this time to give you a more general picture of what will result from the reductions made in the House.

It is hard to select those items which are especially damaging to our work. Any list would include the enforced slow-down of all of our work due to the drastic curtailment of the legal staff, to the deep cuts in the already overwhelmed staffs of the Bureau of Land Management and the Indian Office, and to the general reduction of administrative expenses everywhere. It would include the abolition of the invaluable ground water work, carried on for half a century by the Geological Survey, and the truly dangerous halving of our mineral investigation work. It would include, of course, the curtailment or cessation of work on our great multiple-purpose water projects, the insistence that the Pacific Northwest get along without the power it needs so badly, and the slow-down of all construction work to the point that its cost to the people will be greatly increased. The opponents of public power will be glad to note the abolition of the Power Division, the antagonism toward Government transmission lines and the novel marketing impediment found in denial of substations.

In result I must tell you that the Department will not be able to discharge the responsibilities placed upon it by Congress unless the House appropriation figures are very substantially increased. Here, in more detail, are my reasons.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The House has eliminated three important activities carried on within the Office of the Secretary, has crippled departmental administration generally, and has halved the recommended soil and moisture program by excluding it from the range lands where this work is most vital. In doing all this it has saved $2,862,500, a sum which is inconsiderable when compared to the damage done.

The total investment in power facilities for which the Department of the Interior has the pay-out responsibility is approximately $500,000,000. Construction underway by the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department will increase this amount considerably within the next few years. The capacity of those plants from which the Department markets the power was 2,790,400 kilowatts as of December 30, 1946. This is the largest aggregation of hydroelectric power in the world. During that year over 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy were generated, bringing in a revenue to the Federal Treasury of approximately $32,000,000. I cannot review personally all such matters as rate determinations, cost allocations, pay-out studies, construction and operating programs and practices, or sales contracts, for which I am responsible. It is necessary that I have expert assistance in the fields of administration, electrical, hydraulic and civil engineering, finance and accounting, power construction and operation, power utilization and marketing. To assist me in supervising and coordinating the power activities there is in the Secretary's office a small staff in the Division of Power consisting of 11 professional and administrative employees and 11 clerical assistants.

The budget request for the Division of Power is $131,917 for the next fiscal year. This item was completely eliminated in the bill as it passed the House. In addition to that I had requested $32,500 to be expended in connection with the marketing of power from six War Department dams in the Southeast where there is no established power agency of the Department. Negotiations for sale of over 600,000 kilowatts of power from the projects in this area, involving an investment approximating $245,000,000 and a potential annual income of over $7,000,000 must be carried on during the fiscal year 1948 to avoid waste of water over the spillways at a cost of over $19,000 each day. This item was also eliminated in the bill as it passed the House. I am asking for the restoration of these items in order that the interests of the Federal Government may be properly protected and that the Government may be reimbursed for the expenditures for that portion of the costs allocated to power, without which these projects are not feasible. Never in the history of the Department has the need for expert advice in connection with its power activities been as urgent and necessary as it is today.

The major work of the Oil and Gas Division was also eliminated, apparently as a case of mistaken identity. The primary function of this Division is by no means to be of service to the oil and gas industry, as the House subcommittee stated, but on the contrary to obtain from that industry information essential to the welfare and security of the Nation. It was set up by the President as the focal point at which all Federal activities in this field could be coordinated, and at which the talents and information available to the industry could be brought together to provide essential information to the military services and other agencies of the Government. The Division is now advising and assisting in the procurement of supplies for the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, as well as such civilian agencies as the Treasury and postal service. There are already critical scarcities in crude oil and petroleum products, others, perhaps more grave, are certain to occur. All of this work has been eliminated, at a cost to the Nation which can hardly fail to exceed the $245,000 saved.

The House eliminated the $90,000 request for the Division of Geography, on the ground that the activity is not authorized by basic legislation. It has, however, been carried on under Executive order for about 60 years, and basic legislation is awaiting consideration of the Congress. I believe it rather late in the day summarily to halt the important and basic geographic necessity of standardizing nomenclature.

One of the most distressing reductions is that which cuts the Office of the Solicitor from $307,000 requested in the estimate to $200,000. This small saving will require the elimination of more than one-third of the attorneys who work directly for the Department and who review Bureau actions and appeals from Bureau decisions. The legal advice which is necessary to conduct the diverse and complicated affairs of the Department will be lacking, our legislative reports to the Congress will be inadequate, and delayed and most of the several hundred citizens who each year appeal to the Secretary from Bureau decisions will be denied careful review and painstaking opinions to which they have been accustomed. I cannot too strongly urge that I, who am not a lawyer, have restored the legal staff without which no Department head can safely function.

My own office has been reduced from $1,665,000 to a round but inadequate $1,000,000. The demands of the various committees of Congress, of the Civil Service Commission, and of the Budget Bureau for information serve in themselves to place a steadily increasing burden upon my central personnel and fiscal staffs. The housekeeping and the purchasing functions of the Department will suffer, at costs to the public funds and properties well in excess of the savings, if the staff reductions required by the House action must be carried through.

The House committee, without any explanation, ignored the request in the President's budget estimate for the establishment of a small staff to service the Department's Coordination Committee and to provide for an Office of Mineral Resources. Each of these is necessary, in one form or another, if the Department is to be soundly managed. They not only denied this request but, in section 8 of the bill, wrote in an affirmative prohibition against any organizational or management improvements in the Department. Section 8 forbids the use, transfer, or allocation of any appropriation for the expenses of any regional, field, or other office or committee for which prior approval has not been given by the Congress. I do not know how far this language goes or was intended to go: it could be read to forbid the opening of a new field office of any of the bureaus, the establishment of an advisory committee for which traveling expenses might be provided, the financing in any way of the Department's Coordination Committee or the Pacific Northwest Coordination Committee of the Department. The latter activities I have found to be especially important and useful in bringing together the many agencies of the Department in order to make a unified approach toward a single problem. Whatever the meaning of this section, it is bound to be a serious impediment to good management and I urge that the section be eliminated.

The reduction of $1,500,000 in the amount for soil and moisture conservation is something like canceling half of an insurance policy. This money is spent on lands under

the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management to help prevent the vast erosion which has taken place over the years. These reseeding and conservation activities protect not only the land, our basic national asset, but also, by reducing siltation, our great investment in western dams. I do not think that in the long run we save the taxpayers a dollar by cutting down on work of this type; in fact, so-called savings made here may eventually prove themselves to have been exceptionally costly.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the administration of more than 750,000,000 acres of Federal public land in the United States and Alaska. The reduction of 27 percent in the estimates for the operation of this Bureau will result in a suspension of many of the safeguards placed by the Taylor Grazing Act upon the use of the Federal range, require almost inconceivable delays in the service of the Bureau to the public, will result in a large loss of revenue to the Treasury, and will in effect nullify many of the congressional mandates for conservation of natural resources on the public domain.

I have already had many understandable complaints about the slowness in the handling of leases and land patents and in the other work of the Bureau. Their work is too far behind; it would take the present staff about a year to catch up if not another paper were filed or request made of them. The reduction of 21 percent in the funds requested for employment of personnel in Washington will inevitably add to the difficulties and delays already experienced by the public. The delay in handling mineral leases alone will, moreover, cost the Treasury in revenues many times the few hundred thousand dollars saved.

In addition the cuts will require the closing of most of the district grazing headquarters and we will have to limit the number of such offices to no more than one for each State. We have already moved too far away from the policies of range management expressed by the Congress in the Taylor Grazing Act; these reductions will carry us even further away from an effective administration of the Federal range.

The budget estimate included, as has been customary in the past, an item for fire protection on public lands in the Territory of Alaska. In a thinly populated Territory such as Alaska, once a fire starts there is nothing that can be done to stop it. The time to prevent fires from destroying resources of enormous value is before they start. The House, to save $170,000, has eliminated this item altogether. I consider this action the very reverse of prudent economy.

INDIAN SERVICE

Especially damaging to the work of the Department were the reductions made by the House in the appropriations for the Office of Indian Affairs. The amount approved by the House, $33,122,133, is $10,302,646 less than the amount available to the Indian Service this year.

I am aware that it is difficult to make administrative items sound dramatic, but the cut of $2,331,000 in administrative items for the Indian Service will have near-catastrophic results in the operation of the agency. It will be necessary, if these reductions stand, to discharge 122 persons in the central office, 64 from the district offices, and 572 from the reservations. No amount of reorganization and elimination of functions that we have been able to envision will allow the Indian Service to function in any effective or orderly fashion after such surgery.

Almost $3,000,000 was eliminated in Indian education. This means that at least 5,000 of the 24,000 Indians now receiving education must be turned away from school.

The Alaska Native Service suffered a cut of $470,000. This will require the closing of a 60-bed hospital at Juneau, the discharge of 10 field nurses, the termination of all private hospital contracts, and the closing of 23 day schools.

The restoration of these items for the Indian Service seems to me to be of the greatest urgency. We are dealing with the education of children and the health and lives of the sick, and I do not believe the concept of government economy can properly be interpreted to justify such treatment of its wards by the Government.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The severe cut of approximately 50 percent in the appropriations for commercial fisheries and of 29 percent in the appropriation for the Fishery Market News Service will be felt not only by the fishing industry but by the public which has benefited by the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service in improved quality of fishery products and from more efficient utilization of the Nation's fishery resources. As a result of this cut, two of the five technological research laboratories and four of the eight market news offices operated by the Service will have to be closed. The cut will also mean the virtual elimination except in the very limited areas of statistical surveys of the fisheries which have been made by the Federal Government since 1880. These data on the production and value of fishery products have been our only guide to the extent and condition of the fishery resources. They have been used not only by the Service but by the States as a basis for fishery conservation. They have been widely used by many branches of industry. They are the basis of certain regulations of the Tariff Commission. A break in the continuity of this statistical information can never be repaired.

The cut from $1,000,000 for the present fiscal year to $750,000 for the fiscal year 1948 in appropriations for predatory animal and rodent control will make it impossible for the Federal Government to fulfill its obligations in this field. Western livestock raisers have been struggling for years to reduce the tremendous losses to their herds of sheep and other domestic livestock that are inflicted by coyotes, wolves, and other predators. These animals range over tremendous areas of the public domain; it has never been possible for private industry to control them effectively. The Fish and Wildlife Service has been cooperating with the various State livestock associations in this work. The reduction of 25 percent compared to the present appropriation and 40 percent from the amount requested in the budget will be a blow to the entire livestock industry.

Although Congress last year passed Public Law 732 requiring Fish and Wildlife Service to study the effect on fish and game of impoundments such as the dams built by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the House version of the Interior appropriation bill makes it impossible to comply with the mandate of this law. Although the budget recommended $350,000 for river-basin studies, the House provided only $100,000, thus making no provision for the expanded program of river-basin development. At the same time it denied all funds requested for transfer from the Reclamation Service to other agencies for cooperative work in the Missouri River Basin. Most of the impoundments proposed or under construction will have serious effects on the fish and game reserves. The Fish and Wildlife Service under this bill will be virtually powerless to carry out its responsibility to protect these resources.

The reduction of the item for investigations of food fishes from the requested $902,000 to $725,000 will necessitate the laying-up of the fishery research vessel *Albatross III*, the reconditioning of which was authorized by Congress. This is the only seagoing research vessel owned by the United States, although all other maritime nations of the world operate many such vessels. The cut in this fund will also result in the closing of several marine fishery research laboratories, and the abandonment of a number of established research projects on the effective management of our fishery resources.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

At a time when the facilities of the National Park System are being strained more than ever before by a constantly increasing number of visitors, the House appropriated $10,304,655 for this Service, despite budget estimates of $14,666,600.

Coincident with the great increase in the use of the national parks has been the rise of vandalism, which has reached such proportions as to threaten many of the features for which the parks were set aside.

The amount granted by the House for all roads and trails requirements is about one-half of the amount requested. This appropriation not only allows no improvements in this category but is $750,000 below the amount which is estimated as necessary for adequate maintenance of the roads and trails which we already have. It should be remembered in this connection that during the war years these roads and trails suffered great neglect from which they have by no means recovered.

With the Park Service, as with other bureaus, in spite of the fact that the personnel in headquarters and in regional offices is badly overtaxed, not only were the requested increases not allowed, funds were cut, some $156,000, from the amount available in the present fiscal year.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The funds requested for the Geological Survey were cut almost in half by the House action. This will require abandonment of some essential services which have been rendered by the Survey for as long as half a century, and the cessation of a large volume of work, some of it already in part completed, which is of vital importance, not only to industry but to the security of the country.

The House cut the land-classification and mineral-leasing activities of the Geological Survey has been performing for many years respectively. These are functions which the Survey by approximately 49 and 31 percent, by specific mandate of Congress. Obviously, it cannot do the job assigned without tools. I might add that royalties from these activities on the public domain and Indian lands have increased from about $9,500,000 in 1938 to more than $14,000,000 estimated for 1947. Of this latter amount, approximately $11,000,000 apply to public lands. As you know, 52.5 per cent of the public-land revenues go to the reclamation fund, 37.5 percent to the State school funds, and 10 percent is retained in the Federal Treasury. It is estimated that these revenues will be reduced by at least 10 percent, or nearly $1,100,000, through this "saving" of something like $200,000 in appropriations.

Underground-water surveys have been in progress for more than 50 years, but it was the opinion of the subcommittee of the House that such surveys should be done by States, counties, and localities. Consequently all funds for this purpose were disallowed. It should be pointed out that one of the chief beneficiaries of this work is the Federal Government itself. Such surveys are essential to the planning of irrigation and water-control projects, just as they are essential for industries and municipalities. Making such surveys on any other than a Federal basis is by no means always practical since underground pools and streams are no more respecters of political boundaries than are surface lakes, pools, and streams. The use of underground water has at least doubled since 1939 and there is no indication that this growth will stop. It is more necessary than ever to have as complete a picture

as possible of underground-water supplies due to the fact that overuse in one section may seriously affect use at another point many miles away. It should also be pointed out that the value of the surface investigations, which were continued, are dependent for much of their value on a knowledge of underground-water supplies. Abandonment of one type of investigation consequently reduces the value of the other.

I am deeply disturbed as well, by the reduction in the amounts for geological and geophysical surveys. We entered the last war with only 5 minerals so scarce as to be regarded as strategic; we emerged from that conflict with the list expanded to 50. Over and over again I have urged an inventory of our mineral resources. I regard this as vital, not only from the standpoint of our normal peacetime industry, but from the standpoint of our national security. The cuts made by the House will cause the abandonment of some 30 projects in this field. This means that we shall not only fail to gather information which in time may be vital, but a loss of an investment of about $750,000 already made in these projects, which will be of little value unless the projects are completed. These reductions may delay for years any progress toward the discovery of new reserves of badly needed minerals.

An especially large cut was made by the House in the amount requested for topographic mapping of the strategic areas of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. It was at the request of the War Department, in the interest of national security, that this mapping program was speeded up. The War Department was and is anxious that this mapping program be completed in 20 years. Under the leisurely program provided for by the House, we shall be lucky to have this work performed by the year 2020.

BUREAU OF MINES

The Bureau of Mines requested $16,834,000 to operate during the 1948 fiscal year. The House has approved a total of $10,533,875 for the Bureau.

A decrease in the appropriation for testing fuel from $507,000 to $302,000 will cost the Government an estimated $3,000,000 because of decreased services in coal samplings, inspection, analyses, boiler-water service and testing, and a material reduction of fuel efficiency service to Federal agencies.

A pilot plant investment of about $100,000, operating on subbituminous coal and lignite at Grand Forks, N. Dak., will have to be shut down. Exploration and development of coking coal deposits essential to western steel industry will be eliminated under the reduction from $280,000 to $57,000 made under coal investigations. Examination of coal beds in the State of Maryland also may have to be halted before completion.

The $579,000 recommended for oil and gas investigations is 36 percent below the 1948 budget estimate. This reduction will cause a decrease of 40 percent or more in the Bureau's technical studies of primary and secondary recovery of oil, petroleum chemistry and refining, and petroleum thermodynamics. In view of the current petroleum reserves picture, it seems that any curtailment of Government research in this field will threaten national security, increase the waste of resources, decrease tax payments to Federal, State, and local governments, and place thousands of independent operators at a disadvantage in competition.

I have previously referred to the necessity for an inventory of our minerals. With this should go a development of metallurgical and pilot-plant research work. Both are essential to the future security of this country. The House has cut the mining and metallurgical work of the Bureau drastically. This will result in abandonment of many worth-while projects and a consequent lag in mineral technology progress. Under "Investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits, except fuels," the committee allowed only $800,000 as compared to $1,600,000 in the budget estimate. Fifty metals and minerals are known to be strategic now, and yet we are told to carry on with inadequate funds. Another appropriation, "Metallurgical research and pilot plants," has been reduced from $1,600,000 to $600,000. This cut of about 62 percent will stop all pilot-plant activities on iron and steel, nickel, cobalt, aluminum, and magnesium. It will cut chromium and titanium research at a time when the titanium pilot plant of the Bureau is a source of supply for the armed forces in their development work on an important metal regarded as the best-known metal for airplanes and guided missiles. A third appropriation, dealing with mine and metallurgical research, "Expenses, mining experiment stations," has been reduced from $1,600,000 to $1,000,000. This will seriously curtail operations at a number of the experiment stations, such as Seattle, Tucson, Tuscaloosa, Norris, Reno, and Minneapolis. The fourth appropriation in this series, "Mineral mining investigations," has been reduced by $269,000. If this cut stands the Bureau's fundamental research on such problems as raw material sources of radioactive minerals will have to be curtailed seriously.

One of the most alarming decreases ordered by the House is in the appropriation, "Economics of mineral industries," which has been reduced from the budget request of $1,233,000 to $555,000. This action specifically denies funds for the collection of statistics on bituminous coal, information which the Government has been compiling for its own use and publishing for the benefit of thousands of coal consumers, the general public, and producers for a great many years. Current reliable statistics on coal are essential to manufacturers, railroads, businessmen, household consumers, the Government, and the public generally because of the importance of coal in our national life. I hope that the Congress will restore the funds necessary to carry out the work of this long-established service.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The House cuts for reclamation will have far-reaching effects on the development of the Western States. First, they will slow down and in some cases stop projects now under way, and, second, will stop entirely the investigational program that permits the orderly construction of future projects necessary to develop fully the natural resources of the West. The President's budget was predicated on the most efficient rate of construction and field investigation consistent with the national economy. The House budget would destroy the efficiency of the Bureau's program.

The most striking thing about the House action is the emphasis it places on the continued freezing of the huge investment of the United States in these irrigation and power projects and the importance it attaches to postponement to later years of the flow of benefits and revenues which are now scheduled to accrue within the next few years.

The United States Government now has more than half a billion dollars invested in partly completed projects, from which only a small part of the scheduled revenues and benefits are now being received. The House action would greatly delay and reduce realization of the anticipated measure of these benefits. The accumulation of interest on a frozen investment is as inexorable as death and taxes. Over 1,300,000 acres of irrigated farm land and 350,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power must be postponed for later years. Crop income lost from unirrigated farms may total as much as $78,000,000 and revenue lost from uncompleted generators and unfinished transmission lines will be at least $13,000,000. This total loss due to this year's action will be greater in subsequent years unless the funds now eliminated are superimposed on top of regularly required funds in the future.

Previous Congresses have strongly emphasized the desirability of irrigating the Columbia Basin project land as promptly as possible to provide opportunities for veterans. Funds were made available to initiate such a program, but the amount allowed by the House will not even permit progress payments on contracts now outstanding. The project will virtually close down during the next fiscal year. The cost of shutting down a project of that magnitude and opening it up again, with the great loss of time and disruption of personnel, is very heavy. But the possibility of having any of these lands available for settlement by veterans is growing more remote with each month's delay. Restoration of the full budget amount is the minimum necessary to keep the Columbia Basin project on its schedule.

The same general situation is true of the Davis Dam project which is on the Colorado River and will perform service in regulating the river under the requirements of the recent treaty with Mexico. The Bureau has set up a construction schedule designed to meet the completion date of 5 years required by the treaty. Such a schedule is impossible under the House allowance and the treaty requirements will have to be ignored with obvious results in our relations with Mexico.

The Central Valley program in California was forced behind schedule by the war. The greatly increased permanent population of that State demands that its benefits be realized as quickly as possible. Governor Earl Warren was so concerned about the limitation placed on us by the Budget Bureau that he made a special trip to appear before the House Committee. He did not support the Budget estimate, but, rather, sought twice that amount or a total of $10,000,000. The House committee allowed about one-sixth of what the Governor felt would be a justifiable expenditure. I share the Governor's views that the project should be completed with the greatest possible dispatch, and certainly within 4 years as he requested. Other projects of the Bureau are confronted with a similarly distressing situation.

Related to the construction program is some new language that the House added to the appropriation bill for the Bureau, also appearing for the Bonneville Power Administration, which would require these agencies to carry on all their work by contract. The Bureau of Reclamation has an outstanding record of accomplishing its work through recognized contractors, and much of its success in building such monumental structures as Boulder Dam is due to the genius of the private contractors of America. In an engineering program as complicated as that being carried on by the Bureau there will obviously be some work of a character that contractors find unattractive because of the risks involved. There also are occasions when bids may be received for an important structure out of all proportion to the estimates of the engineers who made the plans for it. In cases like these, if the Bureau is to meet its commitments, it may have to do it by force-account or not at all. It certainly is not in the interest of the United States to force the Bureau to accept the high bids that may be expected from contractors under provisions such as this, or be faced with the alternative of not doing the work at all. It would establish a closed shop on Government projects, inconsistent with the policies and objectives of the Congress.

The House has methodically eliminated from the Bureau's bill practically all funds

for investigation of new projects. The budget estimate of $5,000,000 for general investigations was stripped to $125,000. The funds for the Colorado River investigations were reduced from $500,000 to $250,000, and no money was allowed for investigations in the Missouri Basin except for an itemized list of six specific projects which have no particular reference to over-all basin development.

The issue here is whether the Bureau is to continue with the development of the Western States or is to finish the projects now authorized and then quietly go out of business. The Bureau has today a well-developed organization of competent engineers and other professional men engaged in investigations and assembly of plans and specifications to support the authorization of new projects and basin developments. The true effect of this crippling of the Department may not be appreciated during the coming year because the presently authorized projects are at the peak of their construction. In 5 years' time, assuming no further investigations and concentration on completion of construction on existing authorized projects, the Western States would be without a Federal reclamation program. Future Congresses would be without resources on which to draw for western development or to provide for western participation in any emergency program that might be developed.

The power program of the Bureau of Reclamation has always been conducted in a glass bowl. Each year the Congress has critically examined this program. The interest of the Senate has been strongly reflected in past decisions and authorizations for these public-power projects. The House has taken drastic action with respect to the Bureau's efforts to conduct an orderly power-development schedule designed to meet the greatly intensified demand for electric energy in the Western States. By reducing the funds available for payment on construction of generators and turbines, the generation of new energy for 1948 will be reduced from 629,000 kilowatts to 80,000 kilowatts. The House action was particularly severe in this regard in the Central Valley project, where the budget estimate for power items was reduced from $6,400,000 to $1,075,000. Other power items affected included the Davis Dam, on the Colorado River; the Colorado-Big Thompson project, in Colorado; the Fort Peck project, in Montana; and various sections of transmission lines in the Missouri Basin. Of particular interest is the action of the House in denying funds for substations on the Fort Peck project, requiring that purchasers of power provide them at their own expense. This is not a practical arrangement where power is sold to a number of wholesalers at one substation and it would nullify the express policy of Congress that public agencies have first priority on public power.

The House crippled the Bureau by other actions such as reducing its funds for administrative expenses, ordering substantial reductions in the Denver office, and requiring the financing of construction appropriations from the Reclamation fund. The Bureau's administrative organization has always been held t reasonable limits and has been thoroughly explored by interested agencies. I am particularly concerned about the efforts on the part of the House to dismember the organization in Denver which supervises the many-sided construction programs. I hope the Senate will find reason for removing the House limitation on the Denver office.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The estimates for the Bonneville Administration were cut from $26,278,000, including contractual authorization of $6,000,000 to $6,907,800, an over-all reduction of 74 percent. The appropriations recommended provide an electric-power system which is physically not workable, and serve to nullify some provisions of the Bonneville Act.

The House action might have been justified had the responsibilities of the Administration also been sharply reduced through a decline in power sales or revision of the functions of the Administration under the Bonneville Act. But the exact opposite is the case. The cut in the appropriation is made at a time when the Administration is selling all the power that can be generated. In fiscal year 1946, the revenue amounted to almost $20,000,000, and the Administration is turning down demands for additional power from public and privately owned utilities and from industries.

The construction items in the budget request, which includes contract authorizations, were reduced 80 percent or from $21,578,000 to $4,307,800. The specific reductions in the construction items includes:

1. The Grand Coulee-Snohomish transmission line was reduced from $6,000,000 to $1,000,000. This will upset existing delivery schedules, and will prevent the early delivery of Grand Coulee power into the north Seattle shortage area. The resulting loss in power revenues is not prudent management.

2. The Columbia substation additions totaling $141,000 were completely eliminated. This is a trunk line switching station necessary for the safe operation of the main circuits into Seattle as well as the relief lines to the Hanford atomic-bomb plant.

3. A contract authorization covering the McNary-LaGrande transmission line was completely eliminated.

4. The new acility construction allowance, including contract authorization, was reduced from $11,248,000 to $1,021,000. This action reduces the power capacity scheduled to meet the critically short southwestern Oregon area. It also eliminates all eastern Washington and Idaho REA and PUD connections. Items designed to provide relief to overloaded transformer banks and switching equipment were completely eliminated, as were provisions for the protective relay system. Such action compounds serious hazards now existing.

The committee recommended elimination of all save two small substation construction allowances, specifying in the report that these costs should be borne by the consumer. This is contrary to all practice in the power business and has the chief effect of making Bonneville power more difficult and more costly for the consumers to get. In eliminating substations the committee did not, moreover, differentiate between primary stations and step-down transfer stations. The effect would be to make all new lines unworkable, to make largely ineffective such allowances as were granted, and even in some cases to prevent the use of lines already built.

The action of the House in reducing the operation and maintenance allowance is fully as destructive to Bonneville as its action on the construction items. These funds were cut from $4,700,000 to $2,500,000, a reduction of 47 percent. Such a reduction will reduce operating personnel in the same ratio. If the items covering the administrative functions are entirely ignored, the reduction results in reducing the operating and maintenance forces 37½ percent below the lowest level of minimum safe operation. Such a reduction in the technical operating forces will impair service, create and compound hazards, and fail completely in protecting the large Federal investment in the power system.

No privately managed utility system could operate efficiently, or even safely, in the manner required by the House action. Neither can the Bonneville Power Administration, which is charged with the responsibility for the third largest power system in the United States.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the salient details of the effects of the reduction from the President's budget estimate by the House. They will be developed more fully by the individual bureau heads. I wish to emphasize just one over-all point, which you will see specifically applied in the programs of the various bureaus.

That point is simple: The Department of the Interior is staffed by men and not by magicians. Probably more than in any civilian department, the personnel of the Department is a nonpolitical, permanent corps of experts who are devoting their lives to the public service. I believe they are at least as talented and as hard working as the men to be found in any organization, public or private. But we cannot discharge our responsibilities, to the Congress or to the public, if we are denied the appropriations necessary to do our job. No man can work effectively if each day he is given more work then he is physically able to do. No construction work can be done economically if it is slowed to a wastefully slow rate or if it has to stop altogether.

Congress has given us important work to do in the Interior Department. We want to do it as economically as possible. Appropriations at the House level mean only that we retain our responsibilities but are denied the men and the organization necessary to discharge them. Our work must necessarily be done less satisfactorily, more slowly and more expensively if the Congress insists that we do a 1948 job, at 1948 prices, with less funds than the Department had in 1938.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I made as chairman of the subcommittee in the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill. The statement is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNETH S. WHERRY, CHAIRMAN, AT OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL MONDAY, MAY 5, 1947

The members of the Senate subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill are mindful of the magnitude of the job confronting us as we proceed with public hearings here today.

We are aware of the great part the Department of the Interior plays in the present activities, hopes, and ambitions of the 17 Western States which in whole, or in part, are within the arid and semiarid zones. About 90 percent of the Department's activities are concerned directly or indirectly with this region, constituting about half of the continental land area of the United States. Nevertheless, as the custodian of the country's natural resources in land, water, minerals, recreation, fish and wildlife, and related activities, the Interior Department has a national responsibility and is accountable to the Nation as a whole.

It may be noted here that as the Interior bill passed the House, more than 40 percent of appropriated funds are earmarked for the Bureau of Reclamation activities dealing with irrigation, power, and multiple-purpose projects.

The people of my own State of Nebraska are water conscious. Sometimes we have too much water, as in the case of the Republican River flood in 1936, when more than 100 lives were lost. More often we have too little water for our potentially rich farm lands. What we have sought and are seeking are ways and means to conserve the waters and put them to beneficial use upon these agricultural lands.

For example, the Missouri River Basin program of the Bureau of Reclamation coordinated with the program of the Corps of Engineers, is a constructive approach to the solving of this problem, to the enrichment and increased economic stability of the whole United States.

It is heartening to those of us who are seriously concerned with natural resources development, that on the Senate floor on April 30, the chairman of the Republican conference, Mr. TAFT, the chairman of our full Appropriations Committee, Mr. BRIDGES, declared their interest in Reclamation and their desire that every project have full and fair consideration. Chairman BRIDGES stated and I quote:

"If it can be shown beyond any doubt that there is a sound and vital need for spending the money, it will be spent."

As subcommittee chairman, I wish to say for the entire subcommittee membership that it shall be our purpose to examine each individual project and each item within the Interior budget on its separate merits and give to each a fair hearing.

The future of Reclamation is of equal concern in our national resources development program along with the more immediate problem of current construction. Investigative work of the Reclamation Bureau and preliminary engineering surveys, looking toward construction in the immediat future years, is essential if Congress is to have adequate information in determining subsequent appropriations. For this reason, we shall ask that the Bureau give this phase of its program full treatment along with justification for individual projects during the appearance of its witnesses before our committee.

While Reclamation appears to be the center of interest, in the Interior bill, this subcommittee is no less concerned with the other vital services for which the Department is responsible. The general administration of the Department, through the Office of the Secretary, is, of course, vital as is the administration of each of the subordinate bureaus and agencies. These agencies which will be taken up separately, as hearings proceed, will include—

Bureau of Land Management, which has absorbed the former General Land Office and the Grazing Service.

Office of Indian Affairs, an agency entrusted to represent the Government in dealing with its Indian wards.

Geological Survey, the oldest technical agency in the Department, responsible for stream gaging, ground water investigations, geologic mines, petroleum surveys, topographic mapping, and other duties.

Bureau of Mines, which has Nation-wide responsibilities in the mining industry for inspections, research, and oil and gas investigations.

National Park Service, which operates National Parks throughout the country.

Fish and Wildlife Service, which has responsibility for food-fish propagation, cooperates with States and commercial fisheries, protects migratory birds, and handles Federal aid in wildlife restoration.

Government in the Territories, through the Division of Territories, which handles activities in Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

Bonneville Power Administration, which operates in the Pacific Northwest and distributes power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams.

Southwest Power Administration, which operates in the Oklahoma-Arkansas-Texas area distributing power from Federal dams in that area.

And the Bureau of Reclamation, custodian of a billion-dollar Federal investment in irrigation and power, which is charged with developing western water resources for irrigation and incidental power.

The subcommittee expects full, frank disclosures by spokesmen for the Department, and within time limitations will attempt to give other interested witnesses an adequate opportunity to present useful information concerning items in this bill.

The proceedings of our committee will be governed under the letter of April 25 from Appropriations Committee Chairman BRIDGES to the heads of executive departments, a copy of which I now insert into the record:

APRIL 25, 1947.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, provides as follows in section 133 (a):

"Each such standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members."

Your Department is requested to file with the clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee, not later than 5 days after your bill passes the House, 25 copies of written statements of departmental witnesses, covering the item or items on which the Department is requesting to be heard. These statements should be factual and confined to the justification of any increases being requested.

Likewise, the Department's answer to the committee's letter in which the Department sets forth the items on which a hearing is requested and the justification thereof must be filed with the committee not later than 5 days after your bill passes the House.

All statements of witnesses to be filed by your department and the reply to the committee setting forth the amendments on which your Department wishes to be heard, together with the justification thereof, shall be considered confidential and shall not be made available for any purpose other than for committee use until each witness' statement is released for the record by the chairman of the subcommittee at the conclusion of his examination.

It is the purpose of the committee to receive the prepared statements in advance so that the members may familiarize themselves with the contents. Witnesses will not be expected to read their statements but should come prepared to answer questions.

Yours very truly,

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, tomorrow morning the Committee on Armed Services will hear some important witnesses. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may hold a hearing until 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

ORDER DESIGNATING BEGINNING OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the calendar is called upon the reconvening of the Senate at 11 o'clock tomorrow, as has already been ordered, the call begin with Order of Business No. 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 1236) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 206) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 5, 1947.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the absence of both Senators from Pennsylvania, and in their behalf, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MYERS and Mr. MARTIN as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], that the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 23, 1947.

Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1952.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Col. Ray Maxey Hare, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from September 1, 1946.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Col. Wharton Girard Ingram, Cavalry, with rank from December 28, 1945.

TO AIR CORPS

Col. Henry Lester Barrett, Infantry, with rank from September 1, 1946.

Maj. George Henry Dietz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 30, 1942.

Maj. Wilson Turner Douglas, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Maj. Basil Littleton Riggs, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Capt. John Clifford McCawley, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

First Lt. Roy William Ballard, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. Wesley Skilton Calverley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. John Jay Easton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Robert William Griffin, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. George Mercer Higginson, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Alden Dale Jacobson, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 4, 1944.

First Lt. John Arthur McDavid, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Richard Magee Osgood, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. John Rose Richards, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. James Wesley Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 12, 1945.

First Lt. Joseph Walter Stephens, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from September 22, 1946.

First Lt. Edward Verner, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. John Robert Wilbraham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Patrick Wynne, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, Son of the living God, who hast worn the robe of earthly flesh, we pray Thee to bless us with that assuring confidence that all murmuring may be cast aside and we shall find in Thee a guiding light. Forgive our impatience and our lack of faith and make us worthy to stand for spiritual integrity in all our works. O teach us to find in solitude the sources of power and wisdom, and in the sanctuaries of our own breasts the strength to discern Thy will and the inspiration to follow it.

We pause in the consciousness of the brevity and the uncertainty of life. Again we have learned that the staff of human life is all too frail. We pay reverent tribute to our brother who has just left us, who gave conspicuous devotion to his high office and to his country. Blessings of comfort upon all who remain in sorrow.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 2, 1947, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 1, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Wisconsin I have received the certificate of election of the Honorable GLENN R. DAVIS as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Second Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Robert K. Henry.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948

Mr. STEFAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 336), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARY reserved all points of order on the bill.

POLAND'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House 1 hour has been set aside for the observance of the Polish day of freedom. Because of the unfortunate death of our colleague, the Chair believes we cannot follow the regular order of business, but that a few moments might well be devoted to the observance of Polish day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is Poland's national holiday. It commemorates the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence. Its immediate consequences were tragic, its lasting influence great. Poland had been partitioned in 1772 when, with one-third of her territory wrested from her by her powerful neighbors—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—she was still the third largest state in Europe.

When 19 years later the Diet of Poland proceeded to pass a constitution recognizing the equality of all men, extending religious liberty to all, it was more than Catherine the Great could stand. In 1793 Poland was again dismembered, but the insurrection which Kosciusko started the next year resisted the Russian armies. At Macieyowice, Kosciusko had three horses shot from under him and was taken prisoner. Warsaw capitulated, and on October 24, 1795, Poland ceased to exist as an independent state until the day dawned in 1918 when she again resumed the place that was hers among the nations of the earth.

Poland had been done to death because she was centuries ahead of her times. The absolute rulers of Poland's despoilers, the Czarina of Russia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Austria, although they envied Poland's culture and progress, feared that Polish love of liberty and democracy might infect their own subjects. Poland was free, independent, and democratic. Poland was doomed.

No better commentary on the principles of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May can be given than in the eloquent words of Burke, the great English statesman and orator:

> We have seen anarchy and servitude at once removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people without trenching on their liberties * * * not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the King to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder—this unheard-of conjunction of wisdom and fortune—not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system of slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoils; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know

how to proceed as they have begun. Happy prince, worthy to begin with splendor or to close with glory a race of patriots and of kings and to leave a name which every wind to heaven would bear.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the observance of Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, despite the disappointments, the disillusionments, and the discouragements the Polish people have encountered during and since the Second World War, their magnificent courage is undiminished. Unflagging courage is one of the most outstanding characteristics of the Polish people. In probably every country in the world there are Polish men and women who observed May 3 as a long-cherished anniversary of their independence. As most of us know, this Polish Independence Day is the anniversary of the promulgation of the document which defined specifically the liberties and the freedom of the Polish people.

No people in all history have demonstrated a greater appreciation of freedom than the Polish people. No people in all history have sacrificed more, or will sacrifice more, for freedom than will the Polish people.

It is tragic that today the Polish people should be denied absolute freedom after they have, in so many lands, and on so many battlefields, fought for freedom not only for Poland, but for nations and peoples everywhere.

We cannot forget, we never will forget, and we ought not to forget the magnificent contribution made by Polish lovers of liberty to the American cause of freedom by Kosciusko and Pulaski.

No native of Poland anywhere in the world ever forgets the fact of the Polish Constitution, adopted by the Diet of Poland May 3, 1791, established and dedicated to the preservation of the freedom of the Polish people, and peace toward their fellowmen. The Polish Constitution is in the nature of the Magna Carta and our Declaration of Independence.

Poland's ideals of freedom are very similar to those we cherish in America. The Polish Constitution sets up the ideal of tolerance, good will, and a deep sense of the value of the individual. Under that Constitution, newcomers to the nation were at liberty to exercise their industry and their talents just as they are in our own beloved land.

History records that Polish patriots were in the forefront of America's battle for liberty, and they fought as well under the flag of France for the freedom of the common people of that nation. They helped to turn back the Asiatic legions when they tried to overthrow the whole of Europe and Christianity. The pages of history glow with the stories of gallantry and the sacrifices made by the Polish people in the cause of liberty. For that reason, it becomes all the more tragic that Poland should today, to a very great extent, be under the iron heel of tyranny, through the denial of free elections.

Today, after a short span of 20 years' existence as a republic, Poland again lies prostrate. A shattered nation, she is again suffering from the oppressions of a new tyrant. She is denied the right to have a government which represents the will of her own people.

From the desecrated ashes of Nazi conflagration, Poland rises a weakened and impoverished republic seemingly deserted by her allies, scourged by her enemies. She is a victor in war, and a victim in compromise—a strange paradox indeed. After her many sacrifices and heroic efforts she deserved better justice from the allies to whom she gave such gallant aid.

But the fires of liberty for Poland still flame in the hearts of Poland's people. They will grow greater and greater to once again help to show a confused world the path to truth and righteousness cannot be permanently obscured by the oppression of despotism. Like justice, liberty cannot be dstroyed. While patriotic Poles live, Poland cannot be destroyed. She will again know freedom as the fruit of her long and earnest devotion to the cause of liberty.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is Poland's national holiday. It commemorates the signing of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence.

This constitution, which had introduced many advanced social and political reforms, effecting an astounding spiritual regeneration of a nation not recorded in any other national history, came about without bloodshed or disorder.

The constitution of the 3d of May began the long struggle of the Polish nation for freedom. This struggle was waged, not alone on Polish soil. The part the Poles played in the struggle for freedom in both the Old World and the New, in America, Spain, France, Italy, Hungary, and Greece is well known. The proud words emblazoned on the old Polish battle standards to this day remain their watchwords: "For our freedom and for yours."

It was this constitution of 1791—that glowing ember of freedom—that changed into a torch and continued to light the spirit of every Pole, and consumed the encroachment of Poland's enemies.

It came into being 156 years ago, and became the foundation of the Polish constitution of 1919 after catastrophic World War I. This new document was accepted as the most democratic agreement in Europe.

This passion for freedom, which was born within the writing of the 3d of May constitution, seemed to regenerate the Polish people and infuse in them a new faith in a better world based on freedom and justice. This same passion brought the Polish fighters for freedom on all the battle fronts of Europe in the recent war. We find the brave airmen of Poland forming the nucleus for the British Air Force. At Mount Cassino, the British, after many unsuccessful attempts, asked the Polish legion, stationed there, to help. These freedom-loving, hard-fighting Poles succeeded in routing the enemy and planting the British and Polish flags atop of the ancient monastery. At Dunkirk we find the Poles fighting alongside their British brothers; also at Tobruk and in the invasion of Normandy.

Throughout the Polish history, one finds these people despised aggression, but fought religiously for the moral rights of humanity, the conviction that all men are equal, to whom freedom is a heritage that only death can destroy. Poland never cared to expand her boundaries at the expense of enslaving other people and has always strived to live in accord with her neighbors as the love of God taught her the principles of peace.

These freedom-loving people not only produced such great soldiers as Jan Sobieski, who in the seventeenth century saved Christian Europe from falling into the hands of the Turks, and Thaddeus Kosciusko, Casimir Pulaski, who fought for American freedom in the Revolutionary War, but scientists such as Nicolas Copernicus, the father of modern astronomy and Marie Sklodowska Curie, the Nobel prize winner in the discovery of radium and the radioactivity of the new radioactive elements. In art, Jan Matejko is the Michael Angelo of Poland. To the music world, Poland contributed Frederick Chopin and Ignace Jan Paderewski. Helena Modjeska did much for the American legitimate stage in its early beginnings. Adam Mickiewicz, Julius Slowacki, Henry Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, and Wladyslaw Reymont are some of the men who contributed to the field of poetry and fiction. Some whose works have been translated in almost every tongue of the world.

Poland may lay in ruin and tears today, but her energetic and freedom-loving people have great hopes and aspirations for a better world and a free Poland in the near future. People of such great endurance cannot be kept down, as their national anthem repeats, "Poland is not lost as long as there is life."

Mr. CLASON. Mr Speaker, I am glad to speak this afternoon on this program dedicated to Poland and her people. All Americans are deeply interested in Poland's future and that of its army veterans. I wish to present here today my own views which I have at different times expressed to my constituents in Massachusetts. Probably no other country in history has had so many tragedies in the course of its existence. At the close of the first world war, a new Poland rose from her ashes to develop into an independent democracy. In 20 years it grew in population, in industry, in shipping, and in international importace. But it is the misfortune of the Polish people that the geographic location of their country places them in the midst of turmoil and strife whenever unrest breaks out in Europe. Our American people awaited with bated breath

word from Poland when the news reached us that the Germans had crossed the borders. At a time when other small countries had bowed to Hitler and Great Britain and France were seeking a solution to the impending war, Poland first offered military resistance to Germany's mighty armored forces. The fall of Warsaw will never be forgotten so long as modern history endures. During the years which followed, the people of Poland were, in fact, enslaved. The Russians engulfed them from the east while the Germans advanced from the west. Their cities were destroyed and looted, their farms were ransacked, their able-bodied men and women were dragged from the country. Yet, more than 100,000 Polish soldiers fought on in behalf of Poland outside their native land under the direction of a provisional government set up in England. In Italy, they fought beside American soldiers in some of the bloodiest battles of the war.

I believe that every American who gave any thought to the future fully expected that when the war was won Poland would not only be restored to its freedom and independence but reparations would be given to her people in order that the cities might be rebuilt and their industrial and farming life restored to normal. All of us have read of the partitions of Poland at the hands of the Austrians, the Russians, and the Germans in the past. I doubt if anyone ever believed that either Great Britain or the United States, through any of their authorized representatives, would ever speak up in behalf of a further partition of Poland following the successful outcome of World War II. Certainly no one would expect such a result after the enunciation of the principles in the Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and, with reservations, by Prime Minister Churchill.

Conditions in Europe are difficult both for those who won and for those who lost. Those of us who have been in Europe since the war have seen the devastation in England, France, Belgium, Germany, and Italy. Knowledge of conditions in Poland and Russia is best obtained from those who have been fortunate enough to secure permission to leave those countries and to come to the United States. From them and from messages received by relatives in the United States from people in Poland, we know that Poland is suffering more than any other of our allies. Perhaps Secretary of State Marshall, upon his recent return to the United States, will be able to give us definite information about Russia and Poland and will finally state what our position will be on the issues involving Poland.

Today as it is Americans do not know what is going on behind the "iron curtain" interposed by Russia between the rest of the world and not only her own people but also those of several smaller nations along her borders and under her domination. If our State Department has this information, it should be told. It seems to me that Poland has received most unfortunate treatment from those who owe her much. Poland has ties with the United States extending back into the colonial days before our independence was proclaimed. Poles of high and low degree fought for our freedom. It is because of this background of common understanding and close friendship, cemented by millions of Polish immigrants to the United States in recent years, that few Americans understand why our representatives made agreements which hurt the people of Poland.

MANY QUESTIONS ARE ASKED

What agreements did President Roosevelt make at Yalta with Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill? Why were they in part, in important parts, kept secret and even denied by our Government officials long after the death of President Roosevelt? Out of the darkness created by our own Presidents and their representatives on our side of the "iron curtain" certain vague outlines are taking shape. Yet we can never be certain that other secret agreements do not exist to which our Government is a party. Russia, through these inequitable agreements, has gained advantages in Poland against which the leaders of the present administration of the United States cannot act or argue without denouncing their own acts of the past. Will they change their present policy? Fortunately, the people of the United States are not legally bound to respect these unfair secret agreements, for they are not treaties—they are not pacts known and ratified by their elected representatives in Congress. They certainly do not represent the will of the great majority of the people of the United States. What has resulted? When World War II broke out, Poland had grown to a free and independent nation of 35,000,000 persons, living in a territory far smaller than the State of Texas. By these agreements Russia has taken from Poland 77,000 of its prewar 150,000 square miles, or more than half of its land. More than 12,000,000 Poles lived there. German lands cannot compensate for this territorial loss. But, worst of all, Poland is no longer a free and independent nation.

This was shown when the party now in control of Poland received 87 percent of the vote cast in the January election. The election was not the free election promised at Potsdam. Twenty-three persons were killed on election day because, as we are told, they opposed the Communist-supported government party. The Washington Post reported that the United States Government saw the Polish election as more than a violation of international pledges. It regarded the conduct of the campaign as clear evidence that Russia is tightening her control of the entire national life of Poland and her other eastern European neighbors. Probably the secret agreements have not worked out as our leaders intended, but they never should have been made.

Within 2 months of the controlled election in Poland, President Truman, on the basis of a great emergency, demanded that Congress give him authority to spend $400,000,000 to send aid and military missions to Greece and Turkey. Our Secretary of State Marshall, before he left for the Moscow Conference, knew of the President's intended speech to Congress. Since the conference at Moscow made little progress and our Secretary of State has returned from Russia, we may soon know more about the relations between the subjugation of Poland and the threat to the existence of the Greek and Turkish Governments. On what road are we traveling? How far do we intend to go with our money, our supplies, and our military resources? We did not stand firmly for Poland when it needed our help, as the European war drew to a close. Have our leaders decided that we must establish a line beyond which we will not yield today? If so, Poland may have played an important part in the ultimate decisions of World War II, just as Poland will always be hailed as the home of the courageous people who first refused to sacrifice principle for the unjust demands of Hitler at the price of national honor. At that time small countries were submitting to the will of an overpowering neighbor.

What is the situation which now faces us? If the United States intends to make good on the principles of the unsigned Atlantic Charter announced by our Government, we cannot afford to let any more small nations disappear. We will have a long, hard row to hoe, I fear, before the United Nations will be strong enough to assure to the people of Poland a truly free election and real independence. Meanwhile we must retain our friendly relations with the people of Poland. Under present conditions this will largely be the task of Americans of Polish descent. Ultimately right prevails. In this case Poland has earned, by blood and sacrifice, the help of the United States.

Some day Poland will be free again.

Another lesser and yet grave problem confronts us. Today there are in England 100,000 Polish veterans of this war, most of whom fought with our own soldiers in Italy. They have been fighting for freedom for Poland. They have maintained and believed in the same underlying principles of government as Americans cherish. In my opinion they have proved by their courage and their sacrifices that they have earned a preferential status for coming to the United States for permanent homes. They are not displaced persons, as that term is now used. The British appreciate their qualities and are offering them jobs and permanent homes in Britain. But many of these Polish veterans wish to come to the United States. I believe that our naturalization laws should be amended to give them this opportunity without the long wait for quota numbers now required. In this manner at this time tangible proof of our friendship for the people of Poland can be shown. May this friendship, already centuries old and cemented by successive wars in which our people have fought in a common cause, endure through the ages. Certainly the coming of these Polish veterans to our shores would symbolize this feeling of friendship which our two peoples possess for each other. I am very glad to have had the opportunity to participate in this program for the celebration of the Constitution Day of Poland.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world, wherever there are Poles, the 3d day of May is one of memorable significance. It is the birthday of hope born 156 years ago—the day when the Polish Constitution came into being. What a monumental day for democracy. How profound the glorification of the will of the people.

It would seem proper to state that our own Constitution is a close relative of the Polish Constitution, since both were conceived not too many years apart and resemble one another to a remarkable degree. Where one—our own—saw freedom blossom and grow, the other witnessed frustration and encroachment for more than a century and a half. Yet these noble principles, once instituted, have never ceased to be part and parcel of Poland's struggle for independence.

Four partitions by her neighbors and years of subjugation have not stilled the cry for freedom, nor lessened the willingness to fight for it. Though a procession of tyrants with resolute and methodical plan sought to snuff out the spirit of a courageous people, resistance was never eliminated and a desire to live as a free nation never weakened. There was Catherine the Great, of Russia, and Austria's Maria Terese. There was the Prussian, Frederick the Great, and Kaiser Wilhelm, and more recently the late unlamented Hitler. Yet freedom's flame burns bright and brighter yet for every Pole each Constitution Day, the 3d of May.

In 1939, when the land of short-lived independence was ignominiously trampled, the world knew there had been no compromise. There never could have been. That great document of freedom, from the year 1791, with all that it promised for a better future, had remained in the hearts and in the minds of a people resisting the onslaught of a barbaric horde. Their epic struggle will live forever as a contribution to the cause of freedom lovers the world over. Though felled, brought to her knees, Poland's sons rallied and joined hands with other nations in a common purpose. They fought in the futile defense of France. They took positions in the skies and as the Polish Air Force with the RAF helped ward off the desperate murderers at the throat of England. They were a Polish unit in north Africa, serving with distinction. They were hunters at sea tracking down the Nazi submarine packs. They were present wherever freedom was at stake. The price was high.

And when at long last the strong hand of the righteous prevailed there should have been justifiable jubilation—a glorious and triumphant return to the homeland, to loved ones, to the task of rebuilding and taking a rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Yet today there is room for pessimism. There is an unbelievable departure from the promises made by the victorious leaders. Time alone will tell. Poland still hopes, still waits, and looks to the day when those noble tenets of their May constitution will at last be given the opportunity to be exercised under a truly free and independent government.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, all patriotic and loyal Americans rejoice in commemorating the 3d of May as Poland's national holiday. It is proper that we recall on this day the fact that one of the world's great documents of freedom was signed on May 3, 1791. The constitution of Poland, assuring the basic rights of man, self-government and religious freedom, takes its place alongside the Declaration of Independence and the Magna Carta.

In commemorating this anniversary day, our hearts are saddened by the fact that the aftermath of the greatest war in all history has again placed liberty-loving Poland under the indirect domination of an outside power.

The love of freedom and religious liberty is very deeply set in the hearts of all Polish people. The records of other freedom-loving nations, including our own, is replete with the names of fighting, patriotic heroes of Poland or Americans of Polish descent. We need not recall all of them, but I must mention the brave Pulaski, whose memory every American reveres; also Kosciusko, the Polish patriot, who, when denied liberty in his own land, came to America to assist the people of the Thirteen Colonies in obtaining the independence they sought in order to build the great America of today.

It should also be remembered that Poland adopted its constitution only 4 years after our great document of liberty became the basic law of the land.

In reviewing over a century and a half of Polish history we find a brave people constantly fighting the battle for liberty regardless of incessant attacks and conspiracies on the part of powerful neighbor nations.

In listening to our great Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, over the radio the other night, giving a report on the Moscow Conference, one could optimistically hope that the world powers, headed by our Nation, will eventually succeed in reestablishing self government and religious freedom for Poland and the other small nations on the European continent. Back through the centuries, Christianity and civilization have been jeopardized many times by dictators and conquerors, but human rights and justice in the end have always prevailed.

The best interests of future permanent world peace calls for the success of the United Nations program. If the United Nations Organization becomes endangered by the unreasonable exercise of the veto power to such an extent that it cannot function for all practical purposes, then the present veto system should be abolished. The peace of the world depends upon the nations of the world functioning and negotiating together for a peaceful settlement of international problems. Civilization cannot survive another devastating international conflict.

Our Congress and the governments of all democracies must, without delay, proceed to make the United Nations practical and effective.

That is why it is so fitting that we on this anniversary day of the Polish Constitution recall the heroism that one small nation has exemplified for over a century and a half to gain and keep freedom. This spirit is as intense in the minds and hearts of all Poles as it was on May 3, 1791. This spirit will continue to be uppermost, not only in the land of Poland, but in the minds and hearts of all liberty-loving Americans who demand justice and will fight for the rights of their fellow man.

The next few years will be important milestones in the pathway of future peace. As compared with the centuries past and the distant future, these next few years are small indeed; but nations that believe in liberty and peace should consecrate the next few years to asserting and insisting for self government and religious freedom to all nations, whether great or small.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of May 1791, the Congress of the Republic of Poland adopted a new constitution which was the most liberal, the most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its breadth, its magnanimity and its wisdom which assured rights and freedom in Poland.

Among the many similar provisions which this constitution stipulated, we read this one:

> Every person, upon coming to this Republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contract for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This is but one citation to illustrate the liberal and human manner in which Poland of that day welcomed all persecuted peoples of the world and those who sough to escape oppression within their own country. Poland seemed to beckon kindly to these peoples with the words: "Come to me. Taste and see that my bread is delicious and sufficient to feed the hungry of the world who wish to eat of it. Find employment within my boundaries and when you decide to leave me, I shall put no obstacles upon your path because all my people are free to come and go. I profess the profoundest belief that every person has a God-given right to freedom—an inherent right which no one or nothing can challenge without perpetrating a most serious crime."

Thus spoke Poland 156 years ago.

The neighboring countries of Poland shuddered to hear this uniquely lofty proclamation. They harbored none of such utopian ideologies and they did not desire to see them thrive elsewhere. These countries condoned slavery within its own boundaries and were intent upon fostering similar situations elsewhere. To help propagate their ideas and to stifle the birth of new freedom in Poland, as had been so bodly epitomized

in the voice of its constitution of May 3, these evil neighbors jointly attacked Poland and brutally assassinated that ultrademocratic Republic.

They did not, however, succeed in assassinating the Polish people. From that day on, for over a century, each successively rising Polish generation lived in political slavery. The spirit of freedom of Poland's glorious constitution suffered a dim-out but never a thorough extinction. During those long years of patient suffering, of bleak despair, and of brutal political oppression, this spirit was a beacon light which lifted the hearts of Poland's children, which nurtured within them a love of freedom and of democracy into a hopeful and bright tomorrow.

And when Poland gloriously arose in the full attainment of its political independence resulting from World War I, it reiterated these lofty ideals of freedoms granted by its constitution of 1791.

With the noble ideals of freedom as its battle cry, the Polish Nation went forth to meet its age-old foe in that unequal match of power with the Germans in September of 1939. Poland bared its breast to defend its sacred ideals from desecration on the part of an enemy who exemplified the direct antithesis of these ideals—Hitler's Germany. In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an "inspiration to all nations" because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that "inspiration to all nations," was most ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian opprobious slavery.

Today Poland's sons, scattered throughout the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by Soviet secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

In today's Poland—that Poland which emerged from Tehran and Yalta's Conferences—freedom is nonexisting. American press and our own officers in diplomatic service therein testify to the fact. As long as this status quo will be permitted to persist, as long as the United States will not justly repair the harm done Poland and the other countries similarly mistreated in Tehran's and Yalta's secret dealings—until then there will be no peace in the true sense of the word.

Lasting peace, God's peace, must, of necessity, rest upon a solid foundation of justice. Heretofore we are trying to build peace upon the crumbling foundation of the gravest kind of injustice.

Strictest justice demands that the United States and England redeem Poland from that onerous yoke of Soviet domination which they thrust upon Poland at a time when it was politically impotent to resist it.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland there will be no true peace.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, May 3, the Polish people celebrated their National Constitution Day. It marks an epoch of advancement for the common people, not only of Poland, but for freedom-loving people all over the world. I salute the brave, heroic, freedom-loving Polish people on the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of their National Constitution.

The world knows that Poland was the first to fight and the first nation to stand up and say "No" to the demands made by the Nazis upon them, when other and more powerful countries trembled at the roaring threat of Hitler and his powerful war machine. Up to the time of Poland's defiance, every nation upon whom the Nazis made demands, meekly submitted. If Poland had not taken the stand she did, we might have had Hitler and his terrorists as the rulers of all Europe and in collaboration with his stooges in Japan, thus have become the undisputed tyrant of the world. We look back upon those dark and dreadful days of the war, when the fate of the world hung in the balance and we still remember how the Nazis conquered country after country; the fall of Belgium and the eventful defeat of the British at Dunkirk, when it looked like all resistance in Europe would collapse and we anxiously waited and watched from day to day the events which were developing, wondering whether our allies could survive.

In all of these trying days the soldiers of Poland, who retreated from one battle front to another, stood side by side with our allies.

The world will never forget the valiant and brave defense of Warsaw in September of 1939, the heroic stand of the Polish Army against a highly trained and fully equipped mechanized army, until there was no food or water in the city and the people were hungry, thirsty, and exhausted, but the soldiers did not surrender; and when their country was again invaded by the Russian armies from the east the Polish soldiers joined forces with our other allies to carry on the battle against the tyrant who threatened to destroy democracy and enslave the people of Europe.

The heroic Polish people from the beginning of the war fought the invader not only in their own country but on every battle front in the war until the enemy surrendered. Poland was one of the fighting allies, bearing her share of the war's burdens and her sacrifices were very great in the loss of human life in the battlefields, and the murderous concentration camps where the Nazis exterminated those who were learned and educated; the professional men and the scientists.

Poland fought with the Allies with the same objective as expressed in the celebrated charter, the "four freedoms," but today Poland is not free. She is governed by a regime forced upon her people by Russia. The Polish people do not want a communistic government. They want to be free. They believe in free enterprise and they want freedom of religion. They are a Christian people. They have defended Christianity for many centuries and will do so until the last vestige of atheistic communism is driven out of their country.

Poland has fought for her existence for over a hundred and fifty years and although at times she was completely conquered and under the heel of tyrants, the spirit of Poland never died, and that spirit will live on, until Poland is completely free and her land which rightfully belongs to her is restored. Poland has a right to demand the restoration of her eastern boundaries as they were in 1939 and her western boundaries permanently fixed on the present Oder-Niesse line as definite and final. This has been Polish territory and because it was taken from Poland by force, it does not give the conqueror good title thereto. These boundaries will make a strong Poland, and be the best assurance for peace in Europe, for the Polish people want a democratic form of government.

I am satisfied that the Polish people want to live on friendly terms with Russia, but they, like ourselves, do not want any interference by any outside powers in their internal affairs. So long as any government is forced upon them they will not be satisfied. Today Russia is the one Nation that could restore peace in Europe and bring about harmony and good will, by restoring to Poland and the other small countries their full freedom and independence and unless these countries are restored and given their freedom, there will be smoldering in Europe, that everlasting fervor of unrest of all those who are subjugated but desire to be free and independent, which every nation and all people are entitled to. If Russia will be fair and just with her neighbors, our world troubles can be easily solved for I am sure they all want peace and to live on friendly terms with Russia. I have hopes that Russia will see this light of fairness and honesty and change her attitude of conquest and aggrandizement; and cooperate with the other great powers in bringing about an agreement with all the Nations for a peace based upon justice, the only kind of peace that will bring harmony and good will among the nations, and reestablish the spirit of friendly relations, banish suspicion and distrust so that the people throughout the world can feel free of the danger of war, and resume their work for their own welfare and existence and contribute their share for the common good of all.

The restoration of full freedom and independence to Poland and the other small nations of Europe will make democracy safe and strong. With a strong, free, democratic Poland, the world will never have to fear a militaristic Germany.

Mr. BROPHY. It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland was converted into a hereditary limited monarchy, with ministerial responsibility, and duennial parliaments. All the complicated and obstructive practices of the old system were done away with. Class distinctions were abolished and the personal privileges of the gentry were thrown open to the townsmen. The peasants were placed under the protection of the law, and their serfdom was made less harsh and severe in preparation of the abolishment of serfdom entirely. Absolute religious toleration was established, and provision was made for further reforms from time to time.

Thus is recorded the establishment of Polish Constitution Day—the day which marked a new birth of freedom and tolerance for a people who have amply demonstrated through thought, word, and deed that they are self-sufficient, ambitious in a righteous way, and worthy of every consideration and help that can be given to them in order that the Polish Nation may once more assume its rightful place in world affairs.

For centuries the Polish people were denied liberty. Through almost superhuman effort they overcame all obstacles and established themselves as leaders in the fields of art, culture, and science. Their myriad contributions speak for themselves. We honor them for giving the world the scientific contributions of Madam Curie; the art of Paderewski and Sienkiewicz; and the statesmanship of Malachowski, Kollontay, and Potocki. We Americans are especially grateful for the contributions of Kosciusko and Pulaski in our own fight for freedom on the battlefields. We recognize and acknowledge with equal emphasis the outstanding gifts to civilization made by each generation of Poles to their beloved homeland. In gratitude we memorialize the gallant struggle of the Polish people against the ruthless aggressors in the Second World War. No people fought more valiantly nor suffered more humility.

Many thousands of Poland's sons and daughters served the country of their adoption during the late war. Polish names rank high on the scrolls of honor of every community in our land. Thousands of them won honor and distinction on the field of battle. Untold numbers contributed their financial resources during the war-bond drives, and gave freely and without reservation of their labors for long hours to produce the tools of war and the means to eventual and a more lasting peace.

Poland must remain a nation governed by Polish people and not under an alien government. It must be guaranteed political and territorial integrity. We must do all in our power to conquer the enemy—starvation—which threatens Poland. It is our sacred obligation to assist in every way possible that Poland again becomes a strong, prosperous, and independent nation. The basic pledge given during World War II to the fighting Polish Nation was that common victory will bring full restitution of Poland's independence and its territorial integrity. Almost one-half of Poland's national territory was incorporated into the Soviet Union; the Polish people were forced to accept a territorial settlement after having been deprived of any opportunity of expressing their views in this matter.

The United States shares in the responsibility for Poland's misery. The decision of an American President, taken alone, determined the fate of Poland. There was never a chance given to the American or Polish people to express their feelings as to the justice or the iniquity of the course pursued. That course was taken for expediency, and a courageous and gallant ally was sacrificed. Notwithstanding such unbearable set-backs I have every confidence that the Polish people will restore their nation with credit and in glory. We must not be indifferent to the fate of the Polish people; we must be alert to every possibility for the righting of their wrongs until Poland is free, and can follow her peaceful pursuits under a government genuine of the choice of her people. I share with our fellow citizens of Polish descent the sadness they feel today.

I know that notwithstanding all the trials and tribulations that the people of the Polish Nation have had thrust upon them they will once again assume their rightful place as a free and independent state, and with the help of all freedom-loving people I have faith that this advent will be hastened and realized in the not too distant future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we have the honor to celebrate the one hundred fifty-sixth anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. Strangely enough, the nation which fought for the liberty and the ideals which we now enjoy and which furnished a light to the world in that respect now suffers under a bondage of slavery probably as bad, if not worse, than in its previous long history of struggle.

During the past centuries the people of Poland have responded many times in aid of the efforts of other nations to achieve the goal which Poland has sought. Concrete illustrations of that fact are narrated in the history of America wherein Gen. Casimir Pulaski laid down his life on our soil in the cause of liberty, and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko also gave mightily to aid us in the success of our struggle for our independence. Even in the recent war, the citizens of Poland, after their own country had been viciously attacked and outraged and their population decimated by millions, fled to other nations and continued to fight in the cause of liberty and justice. Most of these people now hesitate to return to their own land for fear of the reprisals which await them on the part of the dictatorial totalitarian government which now holds sway over the lives of the people of that unfortunate nation.

I am honored to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, the largest in the Nation, which has a population of over 1,000,000 people, of whom approximately 20 percent are of Polish extraction. They are a fine, honest, hard-working, freedom-loving people, for whom I have learned to care a great deal. To them, and to the people of Poland, and to all others of Polish descent throughout the world, I extend my greetings, along with my hope that the day may soon be near when the light of freedom, for which the people of that nation has so valiantly fought and died, will again shine over the fair land of Poland.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a district in which there are many patriotic Americans of Polish ancestry, I desire on this day which means so much in the history of that great country, to raise my voice in protest against the betrayal of Poland.

On January 9, 1947, Arthur Bliss Lane, then United States Ambassador to Poland, delivered a note to the Polish Foreign Office in Warsaw.

That note said in part:

> It is a source of regret to my Government that its previous efforts to call the attention of the Polish Provisional Government to its failure to perform its obligations under the agreements cited have not resulted in any change in the course which that Government has pursued in connection with preelection political activities. According to information reaching my Government from various authoritative sources, these repressive activities on the part of the Provisional Government have now increased in intensity to the point where, if they do not cease immediately, there is little likelihood that elections can be held in accordance with the terms of the Potsdam Agreement, which call for free and unfettered elections "on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates."
>
> It is the view of my Government that this matter involves the sanctity of international agreements, a principle upon which depends the establishment and maintenance of peace and the reign of justice under law. The obligations with respect to the Polish elections which my Government assumed at Yalta and reiterated at Potsdam, together with the Soviet and British Governments, and frequently reiterated, provide for the conduct of free and unfettered elections of the type and in the manner described above. The fact that the subject matter of these agreements relates to elections in Poland is incidental. The essential fact is that they constitute an international agreement under which all four nations concerned have assumed obligations. I need hardly say that my Government is interested only in seeing that the Polish people have the opportunity to participate in a free and unfettered election and that my Government does not regard the results of such an election as being a proper concern of anyone other than the Polish people themselves.
>
> My Government would be failing in its duty if it did not again point out that the continuation of the present policy of suppression, coercion, and intimidation as applied to political opposition in Poland constitutes a violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

I have quoted fully from the restrained diplomatic language of Ambassador Lane's note to the Polish Foreign Office because it points up the futility of the attitude of the western democracies in their half-hearted defense of the Polish people who, in their devotion to the cause of individual liberty, have contributed so much to our civilization.

On four different occasions in approximately 6 months, our Government protested the policy of the so-called Polish Government of National Unity in permitting Russian representatives to have their way in preventing a fair election. These Polish authorities winked at the disenfranchisement, the beatings, and even the killings among the anti-Communist group, which represents by far the greater number of Polish citizens. On August 19 and November 22, 1946, American protests went to Warsaw. We protested on January 5, 1947, and again on January 9. Ten days after our final protest a general election was held in Poland. The puppets of the Kremlin were returned to power.

It is a toss-up whether Poland has suffered the more from her strong enemies

or from her faint friends. The people of the United States have a deep and sincere appreciation of the Polish people. The sentiments expressed in this countr on Polish Constitution Day are true sentiments. Americans value the contributions of Polish statesmen, scientists, men of letters, and musicians to those national cultural values which make this country great, even as they admire the more direct services of heroes such as Kosciusko and Pulaski to the ragged continentals of George Washington, and the hundreds of thousands of American veterans of the last war of Polish ancestry. But there is a great gap between American popular respect for Poland and what our Government has done and is doing for the Polish people.

Let us look at the background of our Government's relations with Poland over the last 12 years. The present group which governs Poland has its feet in Warsaw but its head in Moscow. It is only about a year and a half old so far as we are concerned. Our Government turned its back on its wartime ally on July 5, 1945, and accepted this Soviet instrumentality in its stead. In these 18 months or so we have not concluded any satisfactory agreement with the puppet Polish government.

What about the legitimate Polish Government which existed from the constitution of 1935 until we severed relations with it? Poland, under its constitutional government, was the first nation to resist Hitler. At that time the swastika and the hammer and sickle floated in totalitarian comradeship over a dismembered nation of heroes. Even then, that government and that people refused to be defeated. In the midst of the hopeless fight in defense of their homeland, these patriots organized a powerful and efficient underground movement which made life perilous for the invaders for nearly 6 years. The leaders of this movement never ceased to recognize the authority of the constitutional Polish president in their long period of Nazi domination. The Polish Government left their country and went to France where Polish soldiers formed the rear guard of the retreat from the Maginot Line.

Members of this legitimate Polish Government pleaded with the French Prime Minister Reynaud to keep up the fight; but, Reynaud denied their pleas and surrendered to the Nazis. However, the rightful Polish Government escaped to England and carried on the war from that base. The United States Government and the true Government of Poland were joint signatories in all the major international agreements concluded during the late war. To name just a few of these agreements: the Declaration of the United Nations, Washington, January 1, 1942; the final act of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference, Hot Springs, Va., June 3, 1943; agreement on United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Washington, November 9, 1943; and the Final Act of the Bretton Woods United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, July 22, 1944.

We did business with this legitimate Government of Poland while the Polish resistance forces were fighting our common battle on European soil; while Polish soldiers died on the slopes of Cassino; while Polish airmen waged unrelenting conflict against the Luftwaffe; while Polish sailors helped our landings in Sicily. But we cannot do business with this Frankenstein monster which exists today, whose Lublin committee Communists never carried a gun, never ran into danger in their safe quarters far behind Soviet lines.

When I say "Frankenstein monster," I say it advisedly, for, in the most accurate sense, our Government was the Frankenstein who was responsible for its creation.

This Provisional Government of Polish Unity emerged by reason of some things our Government did and some things we did not do at the Conferences of Casablanca, Montreal, Moscow, Tehran, and Yalta. We did appease Stalin. We did not uphold that traditional backbone of American foreign policy—the recognition of the territorial rights and politic sovereignty of small nations.

No. We set up no false governments. We merely permitted the Soviet Union to set them up. We did not plan the partition of Poland with Hitler. We did not take 181,000 Polish prisoners of war and impress most of them into slave-labor ranks. We only turned away when Stalin did it, conveniently forgetting our traditions of over a century and a half of national existence as enemies of aggressor nations.

What we did to weaken and what we did not do as a government to support and keep alive the principles for which nearly 400,000 American boys were to give their lives was a reflection on the leadership which permitted the situation to come about. International politics is, was, and always will be a series of hard bargains. The country which has the bargaining power will eventually get what it wants. But it is also an axiom of international politics that if that bargaining power is not used at the time when a nation is in need, it will be of no use when that need has passed. We could have bargained with Soviet Russia—our stakes, the national existence of Poland—before the Red victory at Stalingrad. After that, the bargaining power was weighted on the other side.

Even though the extreme urgency of the Soviet need had passed after Stalingrad, the emergency was still sufficiently critical for our Government to have said in effect: "No concessions. No lend-lease." The tide had turned, but the war was yet far from won after the Nazi Sixth Army surrendered. Nor would we have had to recoil from this step because of our fear of its being unethical. Had we used our advantage we would have merely been practicing the same day-to-day hard bargaining methods of realistic diplomacy for results which would have been beneficial to the whole world. We were playing ball in a league where every advantage was considered ethical.

We would not have needed to justify our actions in using lend-lease as a lever to pry a guarantee of Polish freedom out of Stalin. That means would have been fair. It constituted an honest bargaining power—and ours was a just goal.

What would happen if the United States Government should reconsider its recognition of the present Polish governmental monstrosity, the outgrowth of the shameful Lublin committee, is a matter of conjecture. Thus far, we have not seriously challenged its existence. Our reaction to the Russian absorption pattern has been to send querulous notes protesting that the ballot-box farce was not a "free and unfettered election" and peevishly bringing home Ambassador Lane.

There seem to be those in this country who do not find the courage to face unpleasant reality in considering the Polish-U. S. S. R. problem. The most glaring fault of this attitude, created and cultivated by Communist propaganda on these shores, is the hope that, if left alone, these two countries will work out a solution. To those who indulge this false and dangerous kind of wishful thinking I have this advice: Read the book Defeat in Victory, by Jan Ciechanowski, for more than 6 years Ambassador from the legitimate constitutional Government of Poland to the United States. Defeat in Victory gives a play-by-play account of the actual diplomatic struggle in which Poland tried to get together with the Soviets on a basis of decency and common humanity. In every instance all attempts were blocked. Poland's negotiations with the U. S. S. R. constituted a one-way effort: Poland to give everything, to get nothing; the U. S. S. R. giving nothing, taking everything.

The rigid Soviet policy of give-nothing, take-all was and is the core of the Polish-Soviet problem. The Russians will not veer from this policy. It is one of their unalterable decisions.

The Soviet one-way diplomatic street starts at Moscow and dead-ends at Moscow. No consideration of the rights or sensibilities of other peoples has any place in the Soviet scheme of things. Such an obstruction to Soviet schemes of conquest is promptly crushed into submission.

This Soviet attitude of mind controls the military as well as the diplomatic field. Perhaps, the outstanding example of this way of doing things is the manner in which the Soviets acted in Operation Tempest. Early in August 1944, the Polish underground opened an offensive of its own. At that time, the Nazi-Soviet front was within a few miles of Warsaw. The Polish-Russian understanding was that the Red army and Polish underground army were to work together. In fact, Stalin himself had given the "go" sign on this cooperative enterprise. However, under orders, the Red army gave no aid to their allies. British and American airmen flew supplies to the beleaguered Polish forces, but this aid was not enough. General Bor held out for a month and a half against heavy odds and 100,000 Polish citizens were killed before he had to surrender. Meanwhile, the Red army ap-

peared to forget the whole affair and went on toward their conquest of the Balkan countries. In any case, the military-political Soviet machine got what it wanted; the Nazis were eventually defeated and 100,000 Poles, who loved liberty, had been, as the Russians put it, "liquidated."

Knowing the position of Stalin, the true Polish authorities were not astonished when they were told that the Soviet leader had demanded some of the most important Polish industrial cities, the major Polish oil fields, 40 percent of all Polish territory, and 13,000,000 Polish citizens as his price for what he chose to call his "noble defense of Polish liberty." They were, however, horrified to learn that the United States Government had acquiesced to these demands as far back as the Tehran Conference, and had confirmed its stand at Yalta. They were shocked beyond words that the United States Government had given its stamp of approval to the traitor-stooges of the Union of Polish Patriots—Lublin committee.

As former Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski expresses that feeling of shock and horror in his book, Defeat in Victory:

> The empty chair of Poland at the San Francisco Conference—
>
> The United Nations Conference for International Organization—
>
> weighed heavily on the Assembly. There was something uncanny in the fact that, at the end of a victorious World War, by a unilateral decision approved by democratic America, Poland, an Allied nation, with a splendid record for loyalty and active contribution in the war, was prevented from taking her part in a gathering of nations allegedly held to apply the terms of justice and democracy to a future system of world security.

The death of President Roosevelt did not materially alter the Polish-Soviet problem. Had he lived, it would have been impossible for him to revoke, even had he desired to do so, the concessions and commitments he had made. The only change his death caused was a series of loud Soviet claims of "secret agreements" which he was to have made with Stalin, agreements unknown to even the President's most intimate advisers.

According to our Constitution, any agreement so far-reaching in its implications as the future existence of a friendly nation cannot legally be an accomplished fact without having the approval of the United States Senate.

The refusal of the United States Senate to become a party to selling Poland down the river should have a profound effect on the ultimate outcome of this tragic situation. By refusing to do business with Russian stooges in Warsaw and by emphasizing that refusal with a resounding majority against any treaty confirming the infamous bargains of Teheran and Yalta, the Senate can, it is hoped, stalemate the final Soviet effort to absorb Poland. Should that refusal be in the nature of a stern rebuke to the aggressor tactics of the Soviet Union which could, in no way, be interpreted as appeasement, the Soviets might yet feel that it was expedient to let free Poland live. Anything the other body may do will not erase the shameful role the United States officials of those days played in the "Allied unity at any price" campaign. Nevertheless it is still possible to avert the complete betrayal of our loyal friend and gallant ally.

Should the other body take appropriate action to make national honor and integrity once more the salient principle in our dealings with other nations, then every American of Polish ancestry—yes, and every other American, regardless of his ancestry—could point with satisfaction to the victory over the forces of tyranny. They could say, in the words of Poland's great hero, Jan Sobieski, writing from the battlefield of Kahlenberg, near Vienna, after successfully halting the Turkish invasion of Europe, "I came, I saw, God conquered."

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 3, marked the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of one of the greatest documents ever designed by civilized man. On May 3, 1791, the Polish Constitution became the first written democratic constitution to be put into effect by a European nation. Every one of the 3,000,000 Americans born in Poland, or whose parents were born there, may well be proud of his great heritage. All America salutes them and the brave people living in Poland today. All America gives humble thanks to the millions who lost their lives in the last struggle for freedom. All America must determine that never again shall Poland be called upon to give her life blood to save mankind from his own folly.

The significance of the great Polish constitution is magnified when it is compared with the Constitution of the United States of America, which had come into being less than 3 years earlier. The founders of this Nation faced a less complex task. The Nation was young. Everything about it was new. There were no ancient customs or traditions to break down. Most of the people who had settled here came because they were dissatisfied with society as it was organized in the older states of Europe. The domination of the aristocracy had not yet become strong and powerful as it had through centuries of ruthless exploitation of the people of the older nations. The very nature of pioneer life brought men closer together, made them more dependent upon one another; hence more willing to work together and recognize their common rights and equality before God and man.

The problems which faced the freedom-loving people of Poland were, by comparison, almost insurmountable. The Polish nation has existed, in one form or another, for a thousand years. Poland had been the mightiest nation of Eastern Europe, and great wealth and power had been amassed by a relatively small group. An old culture with its natural resistance to change proved a mixed blessing in the Polish struggle for freedom. Before a democratic constitution could be enacted the nobility was obliged to give up the very means by which it kept itself in power. But the indomitable will of the people of Poland could not be broken, and almost miraculously, by peaceful means, the Polish people gave to the world their articles of faith in free men.

These mutual struggles to establish freedom and maintain democratic government have brought Poland and the United States closer together. So, too, have the people who made their way to the United States to ally themselves with men and women from other parts of the world in their struggle to build our own Republic. Two hundred and one years ago, Thaddeus Kosciusko was born. He left his native Poland, came to the United States, and inspired the young, untrained military men of the colonies. He gave unstintingly of his energies, time, and thought to the cause of Polish freedom. His stature is further shown by his proposal, which we are still trying to implement—a working international organization to guarantee peace and freedom to all mankind.

Poland has won her high place in the hearts of Americans by other, in addition to political, accomplishments. Her culture has reached the highest levels. She has produced such men as Copernicus, Chopin, Conrad, Paderewski, and Rubinstein, to name but a few. Her great poet, Mickiewicz, once wrote of Poland as suffering for the salvation of the world, being crucified repeatedly to redeem the sins of all nations that they might be worthy of freedom. Poland gave to the world one of the truly great women of all time, who lived a spartan life for years, that others might not die—the beloved Madame Curie. Poland was the first European government to establish what the United States has yet to achieve, a Federal Department of Education.

The most recent experience which has strengthened the bonds between our two nations has been the common struggle against the demoniacal forces of Nazi Germany. In 1939, when Poland refused to submit to the invaders, she was once more crucified. We in this country can never know the horror, the suffering, or the true strength of the people of that courageous nation. It is impossible even to imagine how we would sustain the loss of one-fifth of our population, as Poland has done. The hideous cruelty of the enemy could not be satisfied by the killing of millions. The appalling tortures inflicted upon Polish men, women, and children, within and without Poland itself, are such as to shame the race of man for centuries to come.

Today Poland is striving mightily to keep body and soul together that she may gain strength to build a new nation out of the ruins left by war. Today, more than ever, she needs our aid, physically and spiritually. God grant that the United States will repay the debt of gratitude we owe the indomitable people of Poland.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today, but in view of the circumstances I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HINSHAW, for 5 days, on account of official business.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES L. GERLACH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and profound sorrow that I announce the death of our colleague the able Representative from the Eighth District of the State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable CHARLES L. GERLACH, who passed away early this morning.

For the past 9 years it was my pleasure to know CHARLIE GERLACH very well. He was a self-made man. He was a hard worker and devoted his time to representing his constituents according to their wishes. He had faith in those whom he represented. They had faith in him. He was always conscious of his responsibilities as a Member of Congress. Every available week end he would drive to his home in Allentown, Pa., to thoroughly acquaint himself with what his constituents wanted in the way of national legislation. CHARLIE GERLACH was an able member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

He was my loyal friend, always faithful to his trust and to his associates. His reward is found in the satisfaction that he performed his duties well.

Through the death of our colleague and friend, a good and upright man has passed into the great beyond. We are going to miss him very much.

To Mrs. Gerlach, a grand character, we extend our sincere sympathy in the loss of a devoted husband.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d day of January 1939, 104 new Members of Congress rose and took the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. Among that number was CHARLES L. GERLACH. Of the number of men who rose that day in that new group, exactly one-half, or 52, are no longer Members of this body, and of that number of 104, 18 have passed to the great beyond. Of our own Pennsylvania delegation of 34 Members who rose that day, 23 are no longer Members, and 9 have answered the last summons.

I briefly recite these facts at the moment to impress upon us all not only the brevity of our sojourn here in the Congress of the United States but also the shortness of our lives.

CHARLES L. GERLACH was a typical Pennsylvania Dutchman. He was born in Bethlehem, Pa. Into that community back in the year 1745 there came the Moravians, seeking religious freedom. He was a member of that church and a consistent and loyal Christian. Out of that church went the missionaries to the Indians, who traveled through western Pennsylvania.

CHARLES L. GERLACH later moved from Bethlehem to Allentown, named in honor of William Allen in 1762, the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania. In the town of Bethlehem in which he was born and reared there stands an old German church where the Liberty Bell was hidden during the time that the British occupied Philadelphia. So the boy was steeped in stories of patriotism, and probably no more loyal, genuine, and true American has ever appeared in these Halls than was CHARLES L. GERLACH.

Before coming to Congress he had been a successful man in private business. Starting as a poor boy he built a business that brought him substantial returns, and he looked upon his service here in Congress as one to his fellowman. As our secretary and colleague, Mr. TIBBOTT, has said, he felt a duty to report quickly to his people. I never knew a man who felt he must give first-hand information to his constituents as did Mr. GERLACH. He was faithful to every trust.

Our Pennsylvania Republican delegation holds numerous meetings, an average of one every 2 weeks. He was always present and he offered his advice and his counsel. It was always good, and in turn he had an open mind and the recipient of all that which came from the collective will and judgment of our delegation. He cooperated fully.

Our State has lost a strong and substantial man. His community has lost a leader, and here in the halls of Congress we have lost a man whose first duty, as he saw it, was to his country and his fellowman. He was a Christian gentleman, and I know that as he looks down through the gates of heaven this morning, CHARLIE L. GERLACH looks down in the hope that we who survive will carry on as he himself tried to do to build a better America.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, in common with all the members of my committee I am deeply sorrowful over the sad news of the death of our colleague, Mr. GERLACH. He came to me when this last sickness took him and I advised him very strongly to go at once to his home where he would receive proper care. He has now gone to that eternal home in which we all hope some day to find a place.

I admired and trusted Mr. GERLACH because he represented in his person and exemplified in his conduct a fundamental faith in the divine realities. He belonged to the Moravians, who have made a unique contribution to the spiritual resources of this great Nation of ours. Simple, genuine, kindly, he played his part as a good American and a true Christian gentleman.

Our committee in common with the Members of the House are deeply affected by this sudden loss, and we extend to his beloved wife and to his friends and constituents our sincere sympathy at this time.

A good man is a great asset to any nation. At this time we are more in need of men of Mr. GERLACH'S quality and character and outlook and foundation and faith than we have ever been. His passing is a great loss, but we must accept it as one of the inevitables of our common life.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. This morning as I was driving down to the Capitol I noticed the flag was at half-mast a feeling of sadness came over me. That signal always means the loss of a colleague and a friend. When I reached my office and learned that the significance of the flag at half-mast applied to my old and dear friend, CHARLIE GERLACH, my sadness increased immeasurably. A deep feeling of personal loss came over me.

As several of my colleagues have pointed out, Charlie was one of a group of us who came down here together to represent the great State of Pennsylvania. We took the oath of office on January 3, 1939. During the past 8 years, going on 9, each of us has had an opportunity to know each other better and better and to appreciate the sterling qualities which repose in each of us respectively to a greater or lesser degree. As other members joined our delegation it did not take them long to love and admire our departed friend, as all of us had done.

Charlie was an outstanding character. He was patriotic, he was loyal, he was loyal to his friends, he was loyal to his convictions, and above all, he was loyal to the ideals of America. This Nation and this House have suffered a real loss, as have the relatives and friends at home, in his town, and in his congressional district.

All of us have many strictly personal contacts with our associates here on Capitol Hill. There was one way in which I knew Charlie better and more intimately than most of the Members. Many times we have driven back from Washington to Harrisburg together. The route to Allentown lies through Rockville, Frederick, Gettysburg, and on to Harrisburg, and then down through the Lebanon Valley to Allentown. Many times Charlie has invited me to ride back with him. During those 3-hour rides we had great opportunity to discuss our respective outlooks on life, the problems, domestic and foreign, down here, and everything that was occurring. It was a great privilege to know what a really sincere, able man he was. His advice and his analyses were a great help. These were pleasant interludes, but they were instructive and valuable as well.

I have no doubt whatever that the work which Charlie did driving back to Allentown, having office hours and interviewing his constituents all day had a great deal to do with his final breakdown. No one could stand up under the strain which he undertook.

Mr. Speaker, to give you one little instance: He invited me to drive back with him. I asked him, "When and where shall I meet you?" He said, "At 4:30 a. m. Monday morning at the Penn Harris Hotel, in Harrisburg." I said, "If you expect to meet me at the Penn Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, at 4:30 a. m., you must be leaving Allentown at 2:30." He said, "Yes; but I have business to take care of for my constituents in Allentown and I have business to take care of for them at Washington the first thing Monday morning. So I must keep to this schedule." I met him at 4:30. On the way

down he confided that such trips were regular events rather than unusual. The same attention to duty marked his work in Washington, in committee and on the floor, in delegation meetings, and elsewhere. Others have stressed that.

That gives a picture of Charlie's character. I think that illustration proves his devotion, integrity, perseverance, and loyalty. It also shows how he served his people in the district and his Nation. It will not be easy to replace CHARLIE GERLACH. He was able, simple, loyal, and sincere. He was a man.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, within the shadows of one of the oldest churches in America was born just a little over 50 years ago a man who learned what America was, what it meant and what it stood for. Through the stories that came down from the beginning of that community, this man understood how this great Nation was hewn from the virgin forest and was typical of the fine type of people who resided and reside in that little Moravian community. He was working conscientiously, he was sincere and passionately devoted to the principles upon which this great Republic was founded.

I have known for a long while that he was not going to be able to continue to perform all of the services that he endeavored to carry out to the best of his ability which in his judgment were best for the people he had the honor of representing. No man could tax himself as did CHARLIE GERLACH and continue for any great period of time.

During the hard, trying years through which we have just passed he was literally on the road continuously. Time meant nothing to him. His health was of secondary importance. He always had in mind the desire to do that which in his judgment was best for the preservation of those ideals and ideas that he learned as a boy and understood as well as anyone.

Our community has lost a fine man. The people have lost a devoted servant. America has lost a real American.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of Congressman GERLACH at the very moment when we all were encouraged by reports of his confidence and early convalescence, bespeaks a loss which defies the successful use of words to measure. It is the loss to the Republic of an effective statesman. It is the loss to Congress and the State of Pennsylvania of an able and skillful legislator. It is the loss to his associates of a great and precious friend.

My heart is heavy, for I have lost a cherished friend who has been one of my closest legislative associates. A most sincere comrade, a stalwart and sterling public servant has been called to his fathers.

In his totally unassuming way, Congressman GERLACH exerted major influence, and always constructive influence in the legislative history of his time; a period which will leave an indelible and vivid mark upon the story and statutes of his beloved country.

Behind a vigorous personality, there was an unfailing kindliness and courtesy, which breathed strength, astuteness, and an iron will. Common sense was ever his prime counselor, as the Constitution and the laws were his unfailing lamps. His party's faith was reflected when it enthusiastically named him for five successive terms in Congress. His integrity, his vision, his talents, and his honor were worthy of any man.

Through a perilous and perplexing decade, CHARLIE GERLACH helped to guide the Republican Party as one of its most vigorous and competent leaders.

He was true to the finest instincts of a deeply conscientious public servant, and the best traditions of the constitutional Republic which he loved so much and served so long and so well.

He was never touched by the pomp of power. He was never lured from the realties of human fellowship. His popularity among his constituents was matched only by their granite confidence in him. One of his greatest loves was to be at his home, surrounded by his friends; and, this he did at every moment when his duties permitted him to leave the Capitol where he so well and ably represented their interests.

Little did any among us remotely sense that we were looking upon our living friend for the last time when he, but a short time past, still strode vigorously from the House, never to return. But he has never for an instant left our hearts nor was deserted by our anxieties. "What's the news from Charlie?" was the constant, intimate, daily question upon all our lips, eloquently testifying to the bond that bound him to his fellow men. Life affords few greater triumphs.

We follow him in stricken grief, but with gladness that we could have known such an honest and frank friend; one whose loyalty never swerved under the most trying circumstances.

Our country has lost a faithful and effective leader. Pennsylvania has lost an outstanding citizen and public servant. I humbly add that I lost a cherished colleague and comrade. Farewell, my friend.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in this world there are people whom one might call prima facie people. One becomes conscious of their goodness the moment you are near them, and that appraisal never changes in life.

To me CHARLIE GERLACH was one of those prima facie people. In the visits that I made to his district I saw there a tender affection and an esteem on the part of young and old that touched me deeply, and I thought there is truly one of God's noblemen. He was that sort of person who was always at his station in life.

He was that type of person who is in his place in church on Sunday. He was that sort of person who is at his station in the lodge hall whether anyone else is there or not. He was that sort of person who has his place and his station, and is at his station in a public body at all times. They are the kind who do not seek vain glory. There is no ostentation about them. They are the self-effacing people, they are the jewels of the world, whom the scripture denominates the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, who are the real forces for human progress.

If I were to describe CHARLIE GERLACH in a sentence, I think I would borrow the Biblical description of that old man Simeon. You may recall that the Lord promised Simeon that he should not die until he had looked on the Christ Child. When the first ceremony came in the temple, here was this old man with a long beard, Simeon, to have consummated that devout wish and the promise of the Lord. If all of Scripture had been devoted to a description of Simeon, it could have done no better than the one sentence that we have of the man. The Scripture says, "He was a good man."

CHARLIE GERLACH was a good man. There is no richer adjective in the whole English language than that word "good." CHARLIE GERLACH was good in his heart because there was a richness of fellowship there. He was good in his mind because he was so steadfast and so forthright. He was good in his hope because it was touched by the rich color of optimism for the future of his country. He was good in his vision because he saw a greater glory and a nobler destiny for this our common country.

In truth, we have lost a friend. Let us not mourn that he is gone. Let us rejoice that he was here, that he lived. We do not remember the death days of people. We remember the birthday of Abraham Lincoln and the birthday of George Washington and the birthday of the Man of Galilee, because that is when human service began. So rejoice this day that he has been elected to a larger constituency, and let there be rejoicing in our hearts that he lived, that he moved among us, that he had his being here and made such a fruitful contribution to the cause of this our common Republic.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my colleague and very dear friend, CHARLES L. GERLACH. It is a great loss to our Pennsylvania delegation and to our State, and to those of us who have been close to him and known him well and had shared his friendship. His death carried with it a sense of deep and personal loss.

CHARLES GERLACH was a man who loved his country and his native State, and served them well. He was devoted to the interest of the people he represented and was sincerely and profoundly patriotic.

By his work, he contributed much to the spiritual, civic and social building of his community, State and Nation. His work, in the House of Representatives, since he was first elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress was constructive and useful, and his ability and resourcefulness, respected and admired.

His faith in the principles of liberty and a free Government, was not the outcome of any vigorous enthusiasm, but the deep-rooted growth of long years.

His ambition was to preserve the principles and ideals of our great Nation and to hand on to posterity and the generation of tomorrow a greater America than was handed to him. In all things it can be said, he was an American.

He will be greatly missed, and it is with a feeling of deep sadness that we record his passing.

Mr. TIBLOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, while it was not my privilege to know CHARLIE GERLACH nearly as well or nearly so long as some of his colleagues from Pennsylvania, it was my great pleasure to know him perhaps better than the majority of other Members of the House, particularly on our side of the aisle. I say to those who did not enjoy the privilege of so knowing him that they missed much, the silver cloud in the lining being that their bereavement cannot be as great as that of those who did so know him, because to know CHARLIE GERLACH in that way was to love him. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with him for some 6 years and to have gone with him on an official inspection trip for that committee. As many of you know, we really learn to know each other on such trips.

I am very confident the other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and other Members of the House join me in saying to you Pennsylvania gentlemen that we thoroughly share your grief over the loss of this fine, good man, excellent citizen, and able Member of this House. I would join you, too, both personally and for them, if I may further speak for those I have mentioned, in expressing to Charlie's bereaved ones our great regret and our deep heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the storm of life another sturdy oak has fallen. I was one of those who stood here in that great class referred to, I believe, in 1939 when Congressman GERLACH came to this House. We took our oaths together. From that time on I knew him quite intimately. One had to get close to him to recognize his true worth. He lived in the same hotel I live in and it was unusual to meet him on a Friday evening checking out as late as 10 o'clock. I would say, "Charlie, are you going out?" He would say, "No; I am going home. There are many people who want to see me tomorrow." I told him many times that the burden he was taking upon himself was too great. I do not live far from my district and I do that, too, sometimes. Just this last week end, after spending all day in my office, at 11:30 p. m., when I thought I was going to bed, the telephone rang and a school teacher who lived 4 miles away called and wanted to come to see me in my home. I saw him and spent half an hour with him. That is what Charlie was up against every week end. He would drive 200 miles late at night. He would be on the go all day Sunday and then would be back here early Monday morning. He certainly rendered devoted service to his constituents and to his country. He was a kindly man. He was an honest gentleman. His word was always his bond. We always knew where Charlie stood on legislative matters. His feet were on the ground. He believed in America. He loved freedom. He wanted the country to be strong and sound and its people to be free. He hated regimentation and controls. He worked hard. I will always remember when we held our monthly delegation meetings there was one thing he always wanted us to enjoy with him, and we did, and that was home-fried potatoes. He was a simple liver. He worked hard. He deserved all he got. He served his people well. His community has suffered a tremendous loss. I have lost a friend. Those are the kinds of friendships we cherish through a lifetime. The community may have difficulty in putting a man back here who will just fit into his shoes. I know his people. I represent a similar people. Those solid, stanch Pennsylvania Dutch demand certain things, and he was one of the men who delivered those things, believing that whatever he did he was doing for the best interest not only of his constituency to whom he was answerable but to this great country of ours, he wanted to see the people happy and he wanted to see our country a mighty power in the world. He labored to that end.

The Nation has lost a strong man. A mighty oak has fallen.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are going down the Valley one by one, with our faces toward the setting sun.

This morning when the 7 o'clock news came over the radio that our colleague, CHARLES L. GERLACH, had gone to his reward, I said to my wife, "Another one of our substantial Members of Congress has gone on to heaven." While we realize that he has left our midst, he will be with us in his thoughts. He will be with us as time goes on, because we knew him as a colleague who had a mind of his own, who wanted to do the thing that he thought was best, first for his country and then for his constituents whom he represented. He did not always agree with me and I did not always agree with him, but one thing is sure, we always tried to do that which we believed in our own minds and hearts was the best thing. I honor him so greatly for that. He thought for himself, and he acted for his constituents' best interest as he saw it.

I, too, drove back to Harrisburg with him. He talked about the people he was going to see next day and how many visitations he would have. I said the same thing that some of my other colleagues did of CHARLIE GERLACH. I said, "Charlie, you just can't stand this terrible pace that you are setting for yourself. Some day you will wear out by doing it." Charlie thought he should give to his constituents every ounce of energy that he had, in trying to fulfill the duties that were incumbent upon him as a Member of Congress. He served them and he served them well.

Some day, too, I hope that when my day comes that I will meet CHARLIE GERLACH around the Great White Throne and we will then discuss the questions we have had here in the House of Representatives.

I realize we have lost a friend, a real true friend, in losing CHARLIE GERLACH from this body. It is going to be up to someone else to serve the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Whomsoever the people elect there, we will welcome to the Halls of Congress. He will have to serve well and faithfully if he can take CHARLES GERLACH's place in the hearts and minds of his constituents.

As was said here a few moments ago, it will require a good man to fill the shoes CHARLIE GERLACH has left empty. We have lost a real friend, his constituents have lost a faithful servant as a Member of Congress, and this Nation has lost a great legislator.

Our world will have been much better off for his having lived among us even if his life has been terminated by the hand of death.

We will all be better off for having known CHARLES GERLACH.

"Farewell, my brother, farewell."

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we newer Members of the Pennsylvania delegation liked CHARLES GERLACH and got to know him as a real friend. I think we new ones liked his sparkling good humor and his chuckling laugh, and liked him also because he was always pleasant, cordial, willing to give advice and be helpful.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and one of CHARLIE'S juniors on the committee, I liked him because he was interested in the whole world as well as his own district. We have too few men like CHARLIE GERLACH. We newer members of the committee could look up to him. I want to emphasize that we in Pennsylvania and the Nation at large, as well as in his own district, have lost a good friend.

I think it is a fine gesture in this House today to stop, to pause, when one of our number passes away, and say he was a good friend and fine fellow.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this morning as one of the new Members of Congress, one of the men who did not know Mr. GERLACH extraordinarily well. During the years while he was in Congress we newer Members were on other duties. At the same time, as we came down here it was necessary that we quickly get the measure of the men who were in Congress, and I believe we newer Members quickly got the measure of Mr. GERLACH. We have received the idea that he was a person who well represented his district, that he was a person who faithfully carried out not only the known wishes of his constituents but actually

the unspoken desires of those whom he represented. He represented them not only in those things that they did indicate to him were necessary but also in the greater ideas back of the actual words that they spoke, ideas that were for the preservation of the country and for the continuance of the type of life which he exemplified. I think that he was, if I may put it in a few words, an exemplification of the carrying out of the philosophy of our founding fathers: equal opportunity for all, special privilege for none.

May I add one more word following the line the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] brought out. Walter Pater, long ago, told the story about Michelangelo who when painting the Apostles on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel painted them in plain raiment. The Pope coming in downstairs below the scaffold, called up to him something to the effect: "You have not painted these Apostles very well, because there is no gold about them."

Michelangelo called down to the Pope: "These are simple people; they have no gold on their garments." It seems to me that well exemplifies the sterling worth of CHARLIE GERLACH. He, too, was a simple man who carried no gold on his garments. But he did carry the affairs of his people in his heart; and he carried more than that, he carried the real desire to be of service to his friends. Both Pennsylvania and the Nation have lost a splendid public servant, a simple man, an apostle of the people.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the death of my close personal friend, Representative CHARLES L. GERLACH, of Pennsylvania, is a source of profound sorrow, and I tender sincere expressions of deepest sympathy to his beloved wife in her bereavement.

CHARLIE, as he was affectionately called by all of us, was a genial and noble soul, whose ability to make and hold friends was one of his admirable traits of character. We became members of the 76 Club as we both were elected to our first term in Congress in 1938. Our close association in the years that followed are replete with fond memories and I am proud of the fact that I had the pleasure of cultivating the friendship of such a lovable personality.

While it was common knowledge that his health was impaired, many of us were heartened by recent reports that his condition had improved. Thus, the announcement of his death was a distinct shock, especially to the Members of the delegation from Pennsylvania, among whom he was universally loved and respected. He was held in similar esteem by those on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of which he was a valued member.

The people of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania have lost a tireless Representative in the passing of CHARLIE GERLACH. Despite ill health, his primary consideration was the service he felt should be rendered to the people he represented. That he gave a good account of his stewardship is evidenced by the fact that he was reelected to the Seventy-seventh Congress, and to succeeding Congresses, solely on his record of loyalty and service. We shall miss the kindly greeting of our departed colleague and friend; yet, in his death we are reminded that time is fleeting and that the angel of death may soon point his finger at anyone of us; so uncertain is life in this vale of tears.

The active and useful life of CHARLIE GERLACH is an incentive to all of us to strive to emulate the many virtues he possessed, which earned him the title of one of God's noblemen and enshrined him in our hearts forever.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are all sad at heart this morning because of the passing of our friend and colleague, the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, CHARLES L. GERLACH.

Mr. GERLACH served his district, his Nation, and his State well; a man of unquestioned integrity and fidelity to his country made his service in the Congress especially valuable in these days of conflicting emotions and difficult problems. He was a businessman and always advocated the application to government of the same common-sense business principles used in his own vocation. He was courageous, fearless, and was always interested in the little men in business. He was proud of his district and his constituency, and in his going the Members of Congress have lost a personal friend and the Nation has lost a conscientious, worth-while Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that we cannot say the nice things and scatter the flowers before the funeral. How happy and how proud CHARLES GERLACH would be if he could have been among us at this hour and heard the splendid eulogies on the part of those who knew him best and liked him most.

I join in the expressions of those preceding me. There is little that can be added. His wife and family especially have our deepest sympathy.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as one of the new Members of this House and of the Pennsylvania delegation, it was not my privilege to have the opportunity to come to know CHARLES GERLACH well. His allotted span here, since my own arrival, was too brief to permit that. I regret it, for from my short acquaintance with him, I know that I should have found, in greater measure, the qualities I was beginning to discover.

All who knew him found him a man of great kindness and friendliness, simple, and generous, profoundly conscious of his obligation and responsibilities as a Member of this body, not only to his own constituents, but to all the people of this country of ours, and untiring in his efforts to discharge those duties to the very best of his capacity. In these exacting and trying times such men are sorely needed. His passing leaves a void that will not easily be filled.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 206), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent funds of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that he will name the members of the committee later and their names will be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER appointed the following Members of the Pennsylvania delegation to attend the funeral of Representative GERLACH: Messrs. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, IVOR D. FENTON, HARVE TIBBOTT, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

647. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

648. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 28, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Racine Harbor, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 28, 1942; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEFAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3311. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 3311. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3312. A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3313. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3315. A bill to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3316. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3317. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3318. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 3319. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3320. A bill to permit the Administrator of the National Housing Agency to sell war housing project Tonomy Hill (RI-37013) to the city of Newport or to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3321. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 3322. A bill to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3323. A bill to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3324. A bill to provide for the leasing of the lands and real estate of members of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma who do not have certificates of competency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3325. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3326. A bill to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3327. A bill to prevent the imposition of restrictions against alienation of certain classes of personal property acquired from the restricted funds of members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in August of each year as National Purple Heart Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to permit the use of at least six live decoys in the central migratory States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact laws to continue the hot-lunch program for school children; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that H. R. 1759 or any other suitable legislation be now enacted permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all the States of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing certain pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the Mississippi flood control in Aitkin County; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to speed action in appropriating funds for the improvement of Red Lake River and tributaries in Clearwater, Red Lake, and Pennington Counties, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for forest conservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider favorably both the advisability and equity of refunding 50 percent of the income taxes paid directly to the Federal Government by Alaskan taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that negotiations be entered into with the Canadian Government for the exchange, sale, lease, or transfer of so much of the territory lying in British Columbia and the Yukon Territory as may be necessary in order that the whole road from Haines, Alaska, to connect with the Alaska Highway at a place called Dezadeash to Yukon Territory, Canada, for its entire length might be brought under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for repeal of existing laws whereby whites are restricted from owning reindeer in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ANGELL introduced a bill (H. R. 3328) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

433. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 250 veterans of World War II, residents of the Twenty-fifth District of Pennsylvania, urging cash payment of terminal-leave bonds, increased subsistence payments, and to lift the on-the-job wage ceilings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

434. By Mr. KEATING: Petition of residents of Rochester, N. Y., urging passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

435. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Federal income-tax law so as to exempt the retirement allowances of all persons who are or may be retired under the various retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

436. Also, petition of Roe L. Morris, of Jackson, Mich., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the conduct of an impartial investigation of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. behavior in the 11-month-old strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

437. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

438. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of William H. Emerine, of Alvada, Ohio, and 251 other residents of that community, petitioning Congress to remove sugar from all rationing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forgive us, O God, that in this land so richly blessed by Thee, we, Thy people, have been wasteful. We have wasted the treasures of the earth, stolen the virtues of the soil, in failing to restore after we had received. But we have been wasteful of ourselves. We have wasted our strength in enterprises not inspired of Thee. We have wasted our talents in unworthy causes, wasted our love in loving the unlovely. We have wasted our money for that which satisfieth not. We have wasted our time in activities that profited nothing. Forgive us all wherein we have been prodigal, and, like the younger son, help us to come to ourselves,

that we may come to Thee, to be forgiven and restored.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1947.

To the Senate.

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BRICKER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 5, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to sit and hold hearings the remainder of the forenoon, this afternoon until 2 o'clock, and thereafter during the sessions of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 182 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

QUOTA PROVISIONS OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relating to quota provisions contained in the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Director of the Washington office of the Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission for the period ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate and House of Representatives not to ratify any treaty or agreement with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey on February 12, 1940, passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate not to ratify a treaty with the Dominion of Canada for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey on January 21, 1941, and on February 11, 1946, passed concurrent resolutions reaffirming its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States may be called upon to approve or authorize the construction of the seaway: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring):

"1. That this legislature reaffirm its position in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the State of New Jersey; and

"2. *Be it further resolved*, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of New Jersey, be memorialized and requested to not ratify any treaty or agreement for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway or to approve or authorize the construction thereof; and

"3. *Be it further resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of New Jersey."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary laws to continue the hot-lunch program for school children

"Whereas the hot-lunch program inaugurated by the United States Government has been a very successful program and of great benefit to the school children of this State; and

"Whereas it assures a nutritious diet to the children of poor parents, many of whom would suffer from malnutrition if such hot-lunch program is not continued in cooperation with the school districts of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to enact the necessary laws, and to make the necessary appropriations to continue the hot-lunch program for school children.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of this senate be, and he is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of March 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 29th day of April 1947."

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2868 transferring the horses, property, and program of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas H. R. 2868 now pending in the Congress of the United States has for its purpose the transfer of the horses, property, and program of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas the program of the Remount Section of the United States Army has been to raise thoroughbred horses, and to distribute stallions throughout the country in such manner and on such basis as to improve the quality of horses generally; and

"Whereas it would be in the public interest for such programs to be continued through the United States Department of Agriculture rather than for the horses and the property of the Remount Section to be sold and the program discontinued: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact H. R. No. 2868 now pending in the Congress having for its purpose the transfer of the horses and property of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture, and the continuance of the program which has resulted in improving the quality of horses throughout the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 1st day of May 1947."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has for many years last past enacted legislation for the advancement of women and to increase their rights in every particular to be at least equal to the rights of men; and

"Whereas in furtherance of its desire that there shall be no discrimination against women because of their sex, the legislature believes that the women of Hawaii should be permitted to serve on juries; and

"Whereas the legislature is hampered in this regard by reason of the antiquated provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested to so

amend section 83 of the Hawaii Organic Act as to remove the present limitation on juries to men; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate of the United States of America, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

"*To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Delegate from Alaska.*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas an adequate supply of electric power is essential to the civilian economy of Alaska; and

"Whereas location within the Territory of large military developments has created rapid expansion of the need for electric power in communities adjacent to such developments; and

"Whereas as a consequence of this rapid growth, the communities of Alaska are unable, because of the numerous other demands upon them, to make the large capital investments necessary to produce adequate supplies of electric power; and

"Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration has embarked on a highly commendable program to make an adequate supply of electric power available to areas in Alaska where such power is needed; and

"Whereas basic statutory authority of the Rural Electrification Administration limits the activities of that agency to participation with municipalities of not more than 1,500 population; and

"Whereas the shortage of power is particularly acute in Alaska in communities of larger than 1,500 population, which communities are thus denied the benefits of participating in Rural Electrification Administration developments.

"Now therefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States broaden the statutory authority of the Rural Electrification Administration to enable it to participate with municipalities in Alaska irrespective of their size.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 25

"*To the President of the United States, the State Department, the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate From Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas it has been reported that Russia plans expeditions into the Bering Sea for catching crabs and fishing for salmon; and

"Whereas Alaska's fisheries must be protected against encroachment by any foreign power into the Alaska zone; and

"Whereas, the President of the United States has declared that the jurisdiction of this country extends over the entire Continental Shelf and is no longer restricted to the 12-mile limit.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that Russia be warned not to extend such fishing expeditions into waters under the jurisdiction of the United States so that the matter may be clearly understood for avoidance of future trouble, and that the proper safeguards be maintained to insure observance of the rights of the United States in the premises.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the President of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; Secretary of State; Secretary of Commerce; Secretary of War; Secretary of the Interior; and Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in regular session, most respectfully submits for your consideration a resolution received from the city council of Anchorage, Alaska, dated February 8, 1947, which reads as follows:

"'Whereas the city of Anchorage is now designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as a terminal point in aerial transportation between the United States and Alaska; and

"'Whereas the city of Anchorage has also been designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as an intermediate point in international and aerial transportation between the United States and the Orient; and

"'Whereas the city of Anchorage, in order to extend its facilities to accommodate rapidly increasing passenger and freight transportation by air needs additional financial aid; and

"'Whereas the city of Anchorage now owns and maintains the municipal airport known as Merrill Field; and

"'Whereas said municipal airport is inadequate in size and facilities to accommodate modern air transport equipment; and

"'Whereas said airport cannot be economically enlarged to accommodate such newer types of equipment; and

"'Whereas the use of said municipal airport for large aeromotive equipment has been made impracticable because of the construction of Elmendorf Field at Fort Richardson, Alaska, within such proximity to said Merrill Field as to create a conflict in traffic patterns which has proven extremely hazardous to the operation of both said airports; and

"'Whereas the Federal Government, under provisions of the Federal Aid Airport Act of 1946, has made Federal appropriations available for the development of modern air transport facilities in local communities, subject to the limitation that the Federal Government shall not contribute more than 75 percent of the total cost of such construction; and

"'Whereas in conjunction with the operation at Merrill Field, the city of Anchorage is presently compelled to provide a much larger airport and more adequate facilities at another location adjacent to such city; and

"'Whereas the city estimates that the cost of such new airport will approximate seven and one-half million dollars; and

"'Whereas the city is unable to raise 25 percent thereof by taxes, or public improvement bonds; and

"'Whereas the city is authorized by congressional act passed June 28, 1946, to issue bonds for certain municipal purposes, including the construction of municipal airports; and

"'Whereas the city council, under the authority of said act, will expend $250,000 for such purposes, provided it is authorized so to do by city electors; and

"'Whereas urgent need exists for immediate action to develop such new and expanded airport facilities for civil and national defense purposes; and

"'Whereas the city of Anchorage does not have sufficient funds, either authorized or prospectively available, to enable it to qualify under the present financing provisions of the Federal Aid Airport Act of 1946; and

"'Whereas the city deems urgently necessary the assistance of the Territorial government and the Federal Government in the financing of such airport project: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved*, That the city council, for and on behalf of the city of Anchorage, request that the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt special legislation in favor of the Territory of Alaska authorizing expenditures of Federal funds for airport purposes in excess of the sums now available for expansion of the airport facilities in said Territory; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the council, for and on behalf of the city of Anchorage, solicit the aid of the honorable Governor and all members of the Territorial legislature toward procuring assistance from all Federal agencies established in the Territory of Alaska in development of such project; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the city council, at the next special or general election to be held in said city, place before the voters of said city a proposition calling for the expenditure of $250,000 to be used in the construction of a new municipal airport, and for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the city of Anchorage to finance the city's share of the construction costs thereof; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the city council immediately take such further action as it may deem necessary and advisable to institute an airport-development program for said city.

"'Passed and approved this 8th day of February 1947.'"

"Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Joint Memorial 34

"*To the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Whereas the Territorial government within all reasonable means is attempting to assimilate into its school system the great increase of children, now in need of schooling, without reference to race, creed, or color; and

"Whereas the legislature feels it is the responsibility of the Federal Government for the education of Indians or children descended from the aboriginal groups, which responsibility is primary or at least equal to that of the Territory and yet there are now over 2,000 children, or 26 percent, of the total Territorial enrollment in the Territorial schools who are eligible to enter the schools of the Alaska Native Service; and

"Whereas it is reported that there are 1,000 children who are now without school facilities in the regions of the lower Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers, the Arctic slope, and other remote areas; and

"Whereas the trend of children eligible to enter schools maintained by the Alaska Native Service to enter the Territorial system of schools is accelerating due to the inevitable advance of modern civilization; and

"Whereas there is also a large increase of children, by reason of the considerable increase of population due to the extensive activities by the Federal Government within the Territory of Alaska, and such increase of children is an added responsibility on the Territorial school system, all of which fully justifies this Territory in requesting that considerable financial help be given it, that the Territory shall be able to cope with the problem of maintaining present standards of education to say nothing about needed new schools; and

"Whereas the costs of providing education have increased over the years and the Office of Indian Affairs is paying tuition to the States of California, Oregon, and Washington for children of Indian descent having one-fourth or more Indian blood, who have real property with limited title not subject to tax; and

"Whereas the transfer of native children to Territorial schools is increasing year by year until ultimately the Territory will have the majority of the native children in Territorial schools. This year several communities in Alaska whose schools are now operated by the Alaska Native Service have asked that their schools be taken over by the Territory. The Territorial school board has rejected these applications until some agreement can be reached with the Federal Government concerning tuition for the native children; and

"Whereas the Territorial board of education has made the following offer to the Alaska Native Service:

"(a) To accept into the public schools native children as individuals or schools as rapidly as the Alaska Native Service desires to transfer them upon payment of $100 per year per child or equivalent daily rate.

"(b) The average per pupil cost for Alaska is about $200 per child exclusive of capital outlays. This means that Alaska is offering to assume one-half the cost of native children, which is in essence offering to match Federal funds dollar for dollar, and the Alaska Native Service placed in its budget this year an item of $200,000 for payment of tuition to the Territory of Alaska, but the item was immediately stricken by the United States Budget Bureau. The Territory cannot afford to extend its school services and facilities to accommodate an ever-increasing number of children without some financial aid. If the plan for tuition offered by the Territory were adopted by the Federal Government, it would cost the Federal Government a maximum of $100 per year per child, or about $200,000 for the native children at present enrolled in the Territorial schools. The ultimate cost to the Government would not exceed $850,000 per year since there are about 8,500 native children in the Territory of Alaska. The present cost to the Federal Government for schools in Alaska conducted by the Alaska Native Service is about two times $850,000 per year; and

"Whereas the State of Washington has entered into a contract with the Department of Interior, Alaska Native Service, for the payment by the Federal Government for tuition for eligible Indian children, a sum not to exceed 60 cents per day for each day of school attended:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist prays that the Secretary of the Interior and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska favorably report to the Budget Bureau and to the Congress of the United States, the matter of extending to Alaska the present tuition system being used in continental United States, for the payment of tuition to Territorial schools for Indian and native children and that the Department of the Interior enter into a contract with the Territory of Alaska allowing to the Territory the sum of $100 per year tuition for each eligible Indian child attending Territorial schools, thereby assisting the Territory of Alaska in fostering its policy of eliminating segregation and discrimination based on race.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A petition of the members of the Moultrie Townsend Club, No. 1, Moultrie, Ga., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAW

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Twelfth District Republican Women's Club of St. Louis, Mo., at a meeting held in that city, in which the club goes on record as asking for the passage of a uniform marriage and divorce law, as provided for in Senate bill 198, which I have introduced. The resolution reads as follows:

At the regular quarterly meeting of the Twelfth District Republican Women's Club, Mrs. Jane Smith, president, a round-table discussion was held at length regarding bill S. 198, formerly known as bill S. 728. An article taken from the magazine, Today's Woman, was read and experiences were reviewed, after which the following resolution was presented and adopted, to wit:

Whereas inasmuch as untold injustice is inflicted on innocent persons under the existing marriage and divorce laws, a uniform Federal marriage and divorce law is essential; and

Whereas there being ample protection under the uniform Federal marriage and divorce law presented by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, known as bill S. 198: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Twelfth Congressional District Republican Women's Club, Mrs. Jane Smith, president, go on record as endorsing and supporting said bill S. 198, sounded off by the Senator of Kansas, the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, and urge prompt action in the matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 470. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 155); and

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Birkes; without amendment (Rept. No. 156).

PEACETIME BALANCING OF BUDGET—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT (S. REPT NO. 154)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, earlier in the session, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which has for its objective the automatic balancing of the budget in peacetimes. Under a special consideration, this amendment was sent to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee on Appropriations have considered it and have made slight alterations in it. From the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to report the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I submit a report setting forth the general philosophy of the amendment and its application. Under the understanding, at the time it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, it now should go properly to the Committee on the Judiciary, which, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, has direct charge of proposed amendments to the Constitution. I should like to point out briefly the simple philosophy of this proposed amendment, which I shall read:

On the first day of each regular session, the President shall transmit to the Congress his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of one full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year, including due obligations of prior years, in excess of such estimated receipts, as transmitted or as modified or revised by the President, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House, a quorum being present, taken by yeas and nays on a concurrent resolution stating its intention so to do. In the event the Congress shall, without the passage of such concurrent resolution by such three-fifths vote of each House, a quorum being present, taken by the yeas and nays, appropriate money in excess of the estimated receipts for said fiscal year, then the President is authorized and directed to reduce all appropriations made by the Congress, except for the payment of claims against the United States the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by such tribunal as may be established by the Congress for the investigation of claims against the Government, appropriations for servicing the public debt, appropriations for trust expenditures, and due obligations of prior years, by such uniform percentage deductions as will bring total appropriations within the estimated or subsequently modified or revised receipts.

If today that amendment were a part of the Constitution we would be sure to have a balanced budget. If the Congress appropriated more money than the Treasury took in, the President would have to make uniform percentage reductions in all appropriations, in order to make the Government live within its means, unless the Congress adopted a concurrent resolution by appropriate vote, stating that for some particular emergency it was not desired to live within the budget. The report sets this out in full.

I now ask the able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if at his very first convenience he will be so kind as to interest his committee in the measure, because I believe there is strong sentiment on both sides of the aisle, as well as in the other House, for substantially the philosophy set forth in the amendment. It will insure in peacetime hereafter that the Government will live within its means unless Congress specifically declares its intention to appropriate during some emergency period greater amounts than the receipts of the Government would warrant.

Mr. WILEY. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said, and immediately upon receipt of the measure a subcommittee will be appointed and we shall do all we can to facilitate action on the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that having been a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considering the particular amendment to the Constitution in question, I agree

with the statement made by the able Senator from Maryland, and I feel that the matter should receive very careful and speedy action so that the constitutional amendment can be submitted to the States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very strongly in favor of a provision of this sort, since the State of Colorado has adopted a similar provision. The Senator in his explanation stated that the President would be enabled to reduce other appropriations. Does the Senator mean, reduce appropriations which have been passed by the Congress and signed by the President, or only appropriations which have been passed by the Congress and not signed by the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. He would be enabled under this measure to reduce by uniform percentages all appropriations except those which are exempted, such as the appropriations for servicing the national debt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So as to bring the amounts of all the appropriations within the receipts of the Government, for the current fiscal year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. President, because of the situation existing, there being a very important measure before the Senate, I shall not take time to read the report, but I hope all Senators will read it. I request unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and, under the order of the Senate of February 10, 1947, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (No. 154) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 61

The intent of the proposed constitutional amendment (S. J. Res. 61), is to make automatic and mandatory (with certain safeguards for periods of real national emergency) the annual balancing of the Federal budget in peacetime years.

The language of the proposed amendment is as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. On the first day of each regular session, the President shall transmit to the Congress his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of one full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year, including due obligations of prior years, in excess of such estimated receipts, as transmitted or as modified or revised by the President, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House, a quorum being present, taken by yeas and nays on a concurrent resolution stating its intention so to do. In the event the Congress shall, without the passage of such concurrent resolution by such three-fifths vote of each House, a quorum being present, taken by the yeas and nays, appropriate money in excess of the estimated receipts for said fiscal year, then the President is authorized and directed to reduce all appropriations made by the Congress, except for the payment of claims against the United States the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by such tribunal as may be established by the Congress for the investigation of claims against the Government, appropriations for servicing the public debt, appropriations for trust expenditures, and due obligations of prior years, by such uniform percentage deductions as will bring total appropriations within the estimated or subsequently modified or revised receipts."

In no other way except by an amendment to the Constitution can Congress be compelled to balance its budget in peacetime. If automatic and compulsory budget balancing in peacetime is sought through any other medium it cannot be definitely guaranteed. If, for example, attempt to compel an annual balancing of the budget is sought to be obtained through the medium of a statute, any succeeding statute can at once repeal, amend, or set aside the original.

Confronted with this fact, the problem then is to find the method to accomplish annual peacetime budget balancing through the medium of a constitutional amendment, and at the same time to provide within such amendment methods whereby annual peacetime budget balancing shall not be mandatory—as in the case of a real national emergency—whenever Congress deems it wise for a time to make appropriations in excess of the National Government's income.

This we believe the proposed amendment does in an orderly and a practical way.

Under the amendment, congressional appropriations in excess of national governmental income are valid, provided such appropriations are supported by a vote of three-fifths of each House, a quorum being present, taken by the yeas and nays.

If, without such a three-fifths vote as above indicated, the Congress appropriates in excess of revenues, then the President is authorized and directed to reduce all appropriations (except those listed hereafter) so as to bring appropriations and receipts into balance.

The President is forbidden, however, in making such a reduction in appropriations from reducing appropriations for the following purposes:

1. Appropriations for servicing the public debt;

2. Appropriations to pay claims against the United States, the justice of which have been judicially determined by such tribunal as may be established by the Congress for such purposes; and

3. Trust expenditures.

All other appropriations than those just hereinbefore enumerated must be reduced by the President "by such uniform percentage * * * as will bring total appropriations within the estimated or subsequently modified or revised receipts." Thus, the constitutional amendment proposed always provide for those appropriations which are essential to the financial solvency and financial integrity of the Government.

Reductions, if necessary to balance the budget, can and must be made only by proportionate percentages in all other appropriations.

In time of war, or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of one full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the amendment is inoperative, insofar as to compel during such periods an annual balanced budget.

We submit that in this present serious juncture of world affairs, with our own National Government debt now reaching to $260,000,000,000, the balancing of the budget in peacetime ought be made mandatory. The present national debt places an average obligation of approximately $1,800 against each man, woman, and child in the country, or an average debt of about $8,000 against each family in the Nation.

Interest on the national debt alone consumes now $5,000,000,000 a year. This interest charge alone is more than the total receipts of our annual Government for any year preceding 1937, and represents about the same amount of annual receipts received yearly by our Government from 1937 to 1940, inclusive.

If this amendment is adopted, budget balancing will never again be left to chance in peacetimes. Budget balancing will be automatic and mandatory. It will take care of itself. The amendment forbids the Congress to continue on a live-easy, appropriate-what-you-have-not-got policy in peacetime. It prevents one Congress from appropriating beyond receipts and passing the buck for the payment of such appropriations on to succeeding Congresses. It will force a consideration of all appropriations upon their relative merits, since the amount of money to be divided for all purposes is automatically fixed.

If the President or the Congress wanted to appropriate more than the estimated receipts, then both would have the responsibility of raising additional moneys and have them available for such extra appropriations.

However, the amendment does provide a good safety valve for dealing with highly critical emergencies. In such highly critical emergencies, Congress could borrow and spend instead of raising new revenue, but only if three-fifths of the Members of each House of Congress, on formal roll call, deemed it wise to adopt such a policy for 1 year at a time.

If Congress can be required to live on a pay-as-you-go basis in peacetime, the small owners of savings-bank accounts and life-insurance policies can breathe easily. Every person in America will pay less taxes. Industry and business, large and small, will have unquestioned confidence in the financial integrity of the Government. Such confidence means for business a green light to go ahead, and for the people the best prospects for jobs and good pay. An automatically balanced budget in peacetime is imperative in this postwar period.

To repeat, there is no way that Congress can be forced to adopt a pay-as-you-go basis for governmental finances except by constitutional amendment.

A mere act of Congress requiring the Government to live within its means will not accomplish this result. In any appropriation bill Congress can circumvent the purpose of such a congressional law simply by using the words: "Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Congress hereby appropriates blank dollars."

Nor will a new congressionally created budget law or bureau keep Congress on a pay-as-you-go basis. We have a budget law now, but Congress has been living beyond its means ever since 1930. A congressional budget law, too, can be evaded whenever Congress wants to do so by the use of the magic words, "Nothwithstanding the provisions of any law," at the beginning of an appropriation bill. The constitutional amendment outlined above is the only certain way to keep Congress on a pay-as-you-go basis in peacetime. Congress could not pass a valid law making an appropriation, no matter what words it used, if the appropriation violated a constitutional amendment.

The alternatives to pay as you go after the war are not pleasant to contemplate. Among them certainly are continued higher taxes; a constant threat to the value of our currency, and to the savings of the people in

savings accounts and life insurance; the repeated postponement of any effort to put our house in order; and, finally and only too probably, economic and political disaster and ruin. If there are any valid arguments against setting up now an adequate protection against such catastrophes, we do not know what they are.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1237. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1238. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in the United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas, and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 1239, to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

COORDINATION OF EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency.

I call attention to a letter which I have received from the President of the National Council of Chief State School Officers of Oregon. He is really the superintendent of public instruction of Oregon. I wish to have the letter published in the RECORD, because it is on the basis of this letter that I am introducing the bill. I also request that the bill be printed in the RECORD, because it is a bill which seeks to coordinate the educational functions of the Government in a single agency. It is a bill which I hope may go to hearings during the present session of Congress, because it involves subject matter which in my judgment needs very careful investigation by the Senate, to the end that we should at least pass some legislation which in the long run will help improve the Nation's educational standards and systems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the letter presented by the Senator from Oregon will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1239) to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Education Agency Act of 1947."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) that educational functions are widely scattered through many agencies in the Federal Government with resultant confusion and duplication of effort, and that because of this diffused organization State education authorities and other officials find it necessary to work with and through numerous Federal agencies and officials with respect to education program authorized under a number of unrelated Federal statutes; and

(b) that it is the policy of the United States through consultative services and by grants-in-aid to assist the States to make available improved educational opportunities to all citizens.

NATIONAL EDUCATION AGENCY

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the United States Office of Education, which shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education, who shall be appointed by the National Board of Education as hereinafter set forth, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) The Commissioner shall be a citizen of the United States and an outstanding professional educator, who shall, during his term of office, devote his full time to the duties of the position.

PURPOSES AND DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the purpose of the United States Office of Education to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by aiding and fostering progress throughout the Nation in the field of education and by coordinating in the United States Office of Education the activities of the Federal Government relating to education by schools and colleges, libraries, and other organized educational instrumentalities.

(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the United States Office of Education shall—

1. aid, stimulate, and encourage the development throughout the Nation of improved services and facilities in the entire field of education;

2. advise and cooperate with other agencies and departments of the Federal Government, with State governments and agencies, and with nongovernmental agencies functioning in the field of education;

3. collect and analyze statistics and make studies, investigations, and reports on conditions, problems, needs, and progress in the field of education in the United States and in other countries and disseminate and make available information in this field;

4. make reports and recommendations with respect to the most efficient policies and methods for the promotion and improvement of educational and related services;

5. carry out such specific duties as may be entrusted to it by this and subsequent enactments of Congress including the administration of funds appropriated as grants-in-aid to States for educational services and facilities.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to grant to the United States Office of Education any powers, functions, or duties other than those transferred pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 hereof; nor to transfer to the United States Office of Education any powers, functions, or duties exercised by the Army, the Navy, or the Veterans' Administration.

AGENCIES TRANSFERRED TO UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SEC. 5. (a) Upon the effective date of this act, as provided in section 8 hereof, the following educational agencies as respects their educational powers, functions, and duties are hereby transferred to the United States Office of Education:

(1) The United States Office of Education in the Federal Security Agency.

(2) The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Federal Security Agency.

(3) The Division of Aviation Education in the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

(4) The Education Section in the United States Savings Bonds Division, Treasury Department.

(5) The Labor Education Service in the Department of Labor.

(6) The Division of School Lunch Programs in the Food Distribution Programs Branch, Department of Agriculture.

(b) Upon the transfers provided for in subsection (a) of this section all laws relating to any agency or function transferred shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties which may be assigned to such transferred personnel. All orders, rules, and regulations issued by any agencies or in connection with the functions, so transferred, and in effect at the time of transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as though such transfer has not occurred until modified, superseded, or repealed.

(c) All personnel and property (including office equipment and records of the agencies transferred under subsection (a) hereof) shall be transferred to the United States Office of Education.

(d) So much of the unexpended balances of the appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or to be made available for use of the agencies and of officers and employees of the agencies transferred and of agencies and officers and employees of the agencies some or all of whose functions are transferred under this section, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the United States Office of Education, but only for the use of such agency or function herein transferred to the United States Office of Education for whose use such appropriation, allocation, or other fund was originally provided. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations or other funds prior to the transfer.

(e) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby authorized and directed to make a study of the activities of the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government with a view to determining whether any activities of such departments and agencies relating to education, but not transferred to the United States Office of Education in this act, should, in the interests of economy and simplicity of administration, be transferred to the United States Office of Education; and to complete such study and report the results thereof to the Congress by December 31, 1947.

ORGANIZATION OF UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SEC. 6. (a) By action of the National Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Education, the United States Office of Education shall be organized into such constituent units and divisions as may be found necessary to carry on its work efficiently.

(b) The heads of the constituent units of the United States Office of Education and all other personnel shall be appointed by the Commissioner and shall receive compensation in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that when deemed necessary by the Commissioner expert consultants may be employed on a part-time basis without regard to such laws.

(c) There may be appointed by the Commissioner one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the heads of the units and divisions and their staffs in the formulation of policies and the administration of programs and with respect to matters involving technical questions of policy and procedure. Persons appointed to serve on such committees shall serve without remuneration except for a per diem subsistence allowance of not to exceed $15 for actual time devoted to attending meetings called by the Commissioner and shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION CREATED

SEC. 7. (a) A National Board of Education is hereby created and established to consist of 11 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall be adult citizens of the United States selected solely because of their character, ability, and special interest in education. Each member shall be appointed for a term of 11 years. In order to provide for overlapping terms the initial appointment of the members of the Board shall be as follows: One for 11 years; one of 10 years; one for 9 years; one for 8 years; and so on; thereafter the terms of office of each new member appointed shall be for 11 years: *Provided*, That any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed: *Provided further*, That upon the expiration of the term of any member he shall continue to serve only until his successor has been duly appointed. Not more than six of the members appointed shall be from the same political party. A majority shall constitute a quorum. No vacancy in the Board shall impair the right of the remaining Board members to exercise the functions of the Board. The Board is authorized and directed to elect from its own members a chairman and a vice chairman, the latter to act in case of the absence or disability of the chairman. The Board shall meet upon the call of the chairman and not less frequently than twice each year or more frequently than four times each year. The members of the Board shall serve without remuneration except for a per diem subsistence allowance of not to exceed $25 for actual and necessary traveling expenses while so serving away from the Board members' places of residence: *And provided further*, That per diem allowance shall not be granted in excess of 40 days per annum.

(b) The National Board of Education shall exercise general control and supervision of the policies and program of the United States Office of Education and in so doing shall act through the Commissioner of Education as its executive officer. The National Board of Education is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint as its executive officer the Commissioner of Education, which officer shall serve for a definite term of years to be determined by the Board unless sooner removed by the Board for cause given.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect July 1, 1947.

SEC. 9. If any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., April 14, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The National Council of Chief State School Officers has for a long time been of the opinion that the United States Office of Education should be set up as an independent agency of the Government under a Federal board of education rather than a part of some other agency or department.

There is a very strong sentiment among educators throughout the country that this should be done. I shall not burden you with the many arguments and reasons why we seek such a reorganization. You are already familiar with most of them. What we seek is an opportunity to lay our case before the appropriate committee of Congress.

At its annual meeting in St. Louis last December the National Council of Chief State School Officers voted unanimously to sponsor legislation to achieve the purpose outlined above. At that same meeting I was elected president of the council: hence, as State superintendent of public instruction of Oregon I have the honor of representing the chief State school officers of all the States in requesting you to introduce the bill which we desire actively to support. Please be assured that these responsible school authorities from all over the United States will greatly appreciate your action if you will introduce this bill which our organization has prepared.

Enclosed is a preliminary draft of the proposed measure. Anything that you can conscientiously do to expedite this matter will be considered as a personal favor.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Cordially and sincerely yours,

REX PUTNAM,
President, National Council of Chief State School Officers.

DECLINE OF COTTON PRICES—REPORT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on March 28, 1947, the President pro tempore referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], dated March 26, 1947, with proposed legislation relating to the decline of cotton prices. In view of the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered kindred legislation, I talked with several members of that committee and they agreed with me that it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the matter and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON HARBOR DEVELOPMENT IN VICINITY OF MEMPHIS, TENN. (S. DOC. NO. 51)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 12, 1946 from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the provisions of the project for the improvement of the Mississippi River, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, with a view to determining whether any changes are now advisable in the adopted project in order to provide a safe and adequate harbor development in the vicinity of Memphis, Tenn. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committe on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on October 17, 1945. I ask unanimous consent that the letter together with the accompanying papers and an illustration be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document. The request was made of the committee by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator EDWARD MARTIN at the banquet of the national executive committee of the American Legion, at Indianapolis, May 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A New Grain Era," describing a new process for milling grain perfected by the Midwest Research Institute, published in the Kansas City Star of April 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY SMITH L. MULTER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Smith L. Multer, past president-general of the Sons of the American Revolution, at the Jefferson National Memorial, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM JAMES L. SMITH RELATIVE TO HIS DISMISSAL BY TVA

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 22, 1947, from James L. Smith, of Knoxville, Tenn., relative to his dismissal by the TVA, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT BY CHARLES M. LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in tribute to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, delivered by Hon. Charles M. La Follette, in Berlin, Germany, April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JAMES E. SHEPARD, NEGRO EDUCATOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Dr. James E. Shepard, Negro educator of North Carolina, from the Durham Morning Herald of May 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the consent is granted.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection is now in order, beginning with Calendar No. 106.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
George	Morse	Young
Green	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection is now in order, beginning with Calendar No. 106. The clerk will state the first bill.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY CENSUS BUREAU

The bill (S. 614) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census) was announced as first in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to withdraw my request. I was in error as to the bill that was called.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, what is the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 614) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. I notice that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who reported the bill on behalf of the Committee on Civil Service, is not present. It would appear that it is substantive legislation creating another bureau or division of the Federal Government. Under the circumstances, I request that the bill be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee, but I should like to reply to the Senator from Oregon because it is a matter of some importance. The Christian Science Church has its headquarters in Boston, Mass. The bill, as I understand it, in connection with the taking of a census would make it possible not to include as a part of the census the number of members of any church. As I understand, no new office or bureau would be created by the bill. It is of particular importance to the Christian Science Church, which does not permit the number of its members to be disclosed in any public document. That is the purpose of the bill and of the amendment it proposes to the act of March 6, 1902. The bill was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am not a member of the committee, but I have received considerable correspondence on the subject, and I have stated the purpose of the bill as I understand it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to withdraw my objection to the bill, after having heard the explanation made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina seek recognition?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If objection is withdrawn, very well. Otherwise, I had proposed to explain the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was also on my feet to ask an explanation before the Senator from Oregon was recognized. I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. He has stated he is not a member of the committee. Is the Senator from Massachusetts certain that the bill will do only what he said it would do?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] introduced the bill, and I should prefer to have him answer the question.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator from New Mexico that the bill merely excuses religious organizations which have written into their codes a prohibition against disclosing their membership from being compelled to disclose their membership, as is required by the present census law. All the bill does is to amend the act so as to give to religious organizations the privilege of not disclosing their membership for the census. The Christian Science Church has a provision in its code which prohibits it from disclosing its membership. The measure would simply permit them to adhere to their code.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, speaking for the Committee on Civil Service, which considered this particular bill, I should like to say that we were unanimous in reporting the bill, because all it does is to provide that the census of members of a religious organization shall not be taken in cases where a code or rules of the church prohibit the disclosing of such information. The committee could not see any harm in granting the request made by the church in question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the ascertainment of what is a religious organization within the meaning of the bill very clear? I mean, how is the line drawn between, we will say an established church, such as the Christian Science Church, and an organization which is seeking to become an established religion, such as organizations which grew up during the war or organizations with which the Government had considerable trouble. One was Jehovah's Witnesses. Take that organization, for example. How is the line drawn under the terms of the bill between a regular, well-established religious organization and one which is merely "on the growth"? Perhaps the Communist Party will say, "Well, we are a religious organization."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have that question raised, but I do not think we have reached that bridge yet, so there is no need to cross it. I hope we shall not reach it. Of course, it is left to the Bureau to decide just how far the bill would go in that respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which bureau?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the Bureau of the Census which makes the report.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think a reading of the bill makes its purpose so plain, and the text is only four lines, that it seems to me, if it were to be read into the RECORD, no one would have any question about it. The bill is simply a proviso, and the proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That where the doctrine, teaching, or discipline of any religious denomination or church prohibits the disclosure of information relative to membership, such information shall not be required.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 614), to amend the act entitled "An act

to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (U. S. C., title 13, sec. 111), is amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof the words: "*Provided*, That where the doctrine, teaching, or discipline of any religious denomination or church prohibits the disclosure of information relative to membership, such information shall not be required."

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES AND PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN PRISON INMATES

The bill (S. 534) to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the discretion of the Attorney General and under rules and regulations promulgated by him—

(a) the additional deductions from sentences of prisoners employed in industries or camps authorized by section 8 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744h), may be extended to prisoners performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services in institutional operations; and

(b) the prison industries fund established by section 4 of the act of June 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744–1), may be employed in paying compensation to such prisoners.

SALE OF PUBLIC LAND IN ALASKA TO VICTORY BIBLE CAMP GROUND, INC.

The bill (H. R. 173) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF LANDS OF THE L'ANSE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS, MICHIGAN

The bill (S. 522) to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell for the sum of $2,015 and convey to the village of L'Anse, Mich., certain tribal land and allotted Indian lands described as the southeast quarter of section 32, township 51 north, range 32 west, the north half northwest quarter of section 1, the south half northeast quarter of section 2, township 50 north, range 33 west, Michigan meridian, Michigan, containing 177.20 acres, more or less. The sale of the tribal land shall be made only with the consent of the tribal council. The proceeds of the sale of the tribal lands, $640, shall be delivered to the bonded disbursing officer of the Great Lakes Indian Agency, Ashland, Wis., to be credited to the tribal funds of the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community. The proceeds of the sale of the allotted lands, $1,375, are to be placed to the credit of the various heirs in their respective individual Indian accounts by the disbursing officer of the Great Lakes Indian Agency. Such funds, received from the sale of these lands, may be reinvested in other lands, in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER FOR BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 490) providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park, in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, can the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] tell me whether this is the bill which has been pending before the Committee on Public Lands for some time, and to which at one time some objection was raised in the State of Texas?

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry I cannot answer the question of the Senator from New Mexico. The bill is very simple. It originated in the House.

Mr. HATCH. I observe it is a House bill. I have in mind the objection which was made previously, but I am quite certain the purpose of the bill must be correct since the bill was passed by the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 490) providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park, in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER FOR SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 729) to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST CHARGES ON NORTH PLATTE PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 804) authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte project, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 193) to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 2, line 13, after the figures "1902", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act from lands within the naval petroleum reserves shall be deposited in the Treasury as 'miscellaneous receipts,' as provided by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813), as amended June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252, 34 U. S. C., sec. 524)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MEMORIAL MUSEUM, FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1584) authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the words "shall be", to strike out "supervised, managed, and controlled by" and insert "operated by the said tribes under supervision, management, and control of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SILVER CREEK RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT—EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

The bill (S. 583) to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of lands acquired for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to exchange any such lands for other lands of approximately equal value when in his opinion such action is in the interest of the United States, the title to any lands acquired hereunder to be satisfactory to the Attorney General. Upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States, any lands acquired pursuant to this authorization shall become a part of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, and shall be subject to the laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 2. Upon the conveyance of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project to the State of Oregon, or political subdivision thereof, pursuant to the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326), the Secretary of the Interior may authorize the grantee to exchange or otherwise dispose of any lands so conveyed in order to acquire other lands of approximately equal value for the purpose of consolidating the holdings of the grantee, the title to lands so acquired to be satisfactory to the Attorney General. For the aforesaid purpose the Secretary is authorized to execute a release, as to the particular lands involved, of any condition providing for a reversion of title to the United States, that may be contained in the conveyance by the United States to said grantee. No such release shall be executed, however, unless the grantee shall agree, in form satisfactory to the Secretary, that the lands to be acquired by it shall be subject to the conditions contained in the original conveyance from the United States, except that, in lieu of a provision for reversion, the grantee shall agree to convey said lands to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary in accordance with the procedure provided in said act of June 6, 1942, that the grantee has not complied with such conditions during a period of more than 3 years. Lands so conveyed to the United States shall be subject to administration or disposition in like manner as recreational demonstration

project lands that revert to the United States under the terms of the aforesaid act.

ACCESS ROADS TO STANDING TIMBER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 800) to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Is any appropriation involved?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the bill makes no appropriation. It provides for a transfer of funds made available under the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. When the act was passed originally $15,000,000 was made available for construction of arterial access roads into public timber lands so as to make the timber available to operators and increase the lumber supply for the housing program. That money has been used in various parts of the United States. This bill would make available an additional $10,000,000 for the same purposes. The funds would be made available solely to build arterial roads into national forest properties and make the timber on those properties accesible for the purpose of sale to private operators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the $10,000,000 to be obtained from funds heretofore made available for housing, or is there to be a new appropriation?

Mr. CORDON. It is to be made available from funds already appropriated for the emergency housing project.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not involve any new appropriation?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It does, however, amount to an additional authorization of $10,000,000. Subsidies under the Housing Act have been completely abandoned, so the money is not to be spent for that purpose. The Senator will remember that we appropriated $400,000,000 for subsidies for building materials. Of that sum, $15,000,000 was for access roads. The whole program has now been abandoned, so that no more money is being spent under it, notwithstanding the authorization, so this bill would in effect authorize $10,000,000 more than would be used if we did not authorize it.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, if the money were not used for building access roads or for any other purpose, it would not be used. But there is no appropriation for the purpose. The funds are to be used to construct roads into publicly-owned timber, and the costs of such construction will ultimately be returned to the Government by virtue of increased costs to the purchasers of the timber.

The most important thing to be considered is that these roads will make accessible overripe merchantable timber now in the national forests, which, if it is not cut while it can be cut, will go to waste, by virtue of old age, disease, pests, and so forth. It is an investment, to that extent, in Federal property.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question at this point. The Senator from Oregon made the statement that the money would be refunded by virtue of additional costs to purchasers of the timber. Is there provision for such a thing in connection with the public lands?

Mr. CORDON. There is not; but the fact is that in the pricing practice up to date—not as a legal requirement—additional charges are being made for the timber which is sold.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, in the sale of the timber, accessibility is taken into consideration to a certain extent, so that the Government would get a sufficiently greater yield to recover part of the cost.

Mr. CORDON. That is true; in addition to which it would be able to sell timber which would otherwise be ruined by old age, pests, and so forth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I invite the Senator's attention to a fact which he ought to bear in mind. There is pending on the calendar a House bill dealing with housing, which repeals the entire act to which the Senator has referred. Unless he is very careful, in spite of this authorization, the program will be entirely wiped out by the passage of the housing bill.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate that suggestion. If that bill passes, I will see if we cannot have the money properly obligated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator agrees also, does he not, that it is very desirable to have this bill passed in order to permit the carrying out of our sustained-yield program throughout the United States? It will save a great deal of timber which should not be cut by private concerns immediately if Government timber can be made available to them on an exchange basis, or a sustained-yield arrangement with the Government, so that private operators can have access to Government timber which is overripe and needs to be cut.

Mr. CORDON. My colleague is entirely correct in that respect. The sustained-yield program now being developed by public and private owners of timber is one of the most important programs going forward in the conservation of natural resources in the United States. At a later time I hope to discuss it comprehensively.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand that it is proposed to build roads to timber which is now owned by the Government or timber which has been sold by the Government?

Mr. CORDON. Timber which is now owned by the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The proposal is to sell that timber?

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it not be better to handle this matter by means of an original bill providing for the construction of such roads, the bill to go through the regular channels, rather than to appropriate funds from an agency which, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has pointed out, we possibly expect to eliminate in the near future?

Mr. CORDON. The program has been established and has been going forward along these lines. It is important to those of us who live in the West, where Government timber exists, and from which Government timber is taken in great amounts, that so long as this program is established and funds which otherwise were deemed necessary for a vast subsidy program are no longer to be used for the purpose such funds shall be made available. What is sought to be done now is to make immediately available necessary timber to increase the lumber output for the very program for which the Emergency Housing Act was enacted, namely, to build homes. It seems to me proper to continue the use of such funds, limited solely to access to Government-owned timber. The problem could have been handled in another way, but it would necessarily require a great deal more time than would be required to handle it under a program which is already in operation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 800) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 11 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Not more than $25,000,000 of the funds made available under this section shall be used to the extent that other funds are unavailable for the construction and maintenance of access roads to standing timber on lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of an agency of Government."

SEGREGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 666), providing for payment of $300 to each enrolled member of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., from joint funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill, as amended, corresponds exactly to House bill 1098, which passed the House of Representatives on April 9, 1947. Therefore I think it is in order to ask that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 1098, and that the House bill be substituted for Senate bill 666. In other words, we accept the House bill, which is identical.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Public Lands is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 1098. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 666 is indefinitely postponed.

PATENT IN FEE TO HENRY BIG DAY AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, was considered, order to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILMA E. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 326) for the relief of Wilma E. Baker, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. IDA ELMA FRANKLIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 620) for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,500", and insert "$1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States Government vehicle, driven by an employee of the Department of Agriculture, on North Stone Avenue, Tucson, Ariz., on November 3, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN B. BARTON

The bill (S. 423) for the relief of John B. Barton, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of John B. Barton, of South Chicago, Ill., whose disability compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of March 4, 1927, as amended, was terminated as of August 16, 1931, by a compensation order filed January 16, 1932, the Federal Security Administrator, in the administration of such act, is authorized and directed to review such case in the manner prescribed in section 22, as amended, of such act, and in accordance with such section to issue a new compensation order which may terminate, continue, reinstate, increase, or decrease such compensation, notwithstanding the provisions of section 22 which limit the time for seeking review of an order.

ALVA R. MOORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 361) for the relief of Alva R. Moore, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alva R. Moore, of Section, Ala., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on March 11, 1943, at the Huntsville Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., as a result of handling in the course of his employment certain salvaged materials which were contaminated with mustard gas, after having been advised by a commissioned officer in charge of the salvage yard at the arsenal that the materials were not so contaminated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD H. ISENHART

The bill (S. 664) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart, of Kemmerer, Wyo., the sum of $662.82, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for the sums of $475.20, representing the 6 months' death gratuity, and $187.62, representing arrears of pay, which would be payable to them in the case of their foster son, Harold Emmett Isenhart (service number 553-17-98), late a seaman first class, United States Naval Reserve, except for the fact that they were not his natural parents: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF FORMER AND PRESENT NAVY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 665) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States Naval Training Station, Farragut, Idaho, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate to not to exceed $2,017, as may be certified by the Secretary of the Navy to be required to reimburse them for losses they sustained as a result of certain sums of money having been stolen or obtained by false pretenses from them, without fault or negligence on their part, while they were on duty as members of Company 956-43 at the naval training station, Farragut, Idaho, in the months of November and December 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REMOVAL OF STONE PIERS IN WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue, between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR AND UNDER SECRETARY OF NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1369) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is presiding at a hearing of that committee and has asked me if I would respond.

The bill simply permits the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy to be permanent officers in the peacetime Army and Navy, respectively, as in wartime.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy are to be permanent civil officers?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A permanent part of the Army and Navy Establishment, legalized by law. I understand that today they are simply acting under war powers. Their offices will cease when the War Powers Act expires.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the offices will be abolished?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They will be abolished unless the Senate takes action.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1369) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

The bill (H. R. 1368) to include civilian officers and employees of the

United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN DECORATIONS

The bill (H. R. 1381) to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled, "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think we should have an explanation of the bill by some member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I understand, at the present time the date of the appointment of an officer is uncertain because of the place at which he may be. In other words, seniority lists are determed by the time when an appointment reaches an officer and is accepted. He may be in Alaska or in Japan. This bill provides for making certain the time of appointment when the Senate confirms, or, when the Senate is not in session, the President appoints. It permits seniority to be based on a certain time regardless of where the officer may be stationed. It is an endeavor to be fair to an officer who is stationed in Japan, so that he will not lose his seniority because he happens to be there instead of in Washington.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the bill in no way increases the number of officers, does it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It does not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As the law stands now, the effective date is the date of acceptance of the commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the bill amends that provision and makes the effective date the date of offering the commission here rather than the date of acceptance by the officer?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It is for the benefit of the officer who is far away.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIEF OF NAVAL CHAPLAINS

The bill (H. R. 1365) to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORRECTION OF TECHNICAL ERRORS IN PUBLIC LAW 729

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1367) to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the construction of two experimental submarines, the money for which has already been appropriated, but, under the first supplemental surplus rescission act of 1946, such remaining appropriations cannot be used to initiate the construction of new vessels during the fiscal year, except for certain vessels then being built. This bill is to make available $30,000,000 of the funds already appropriated to construct two experimental submarines which, based on knowledge gained in the last war, the Navy considers to be essential. They desire to have construction authorized so that work can be begun.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know what disposition has been made of German submarines after the war? Does the Navy still have them?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not claim to be an authority for the statement, but I believe that the Russians have some of the latest German submarines. I am not certain whether we have one down in the Gulf of Mexico, but the Navy wishes to take advantage of what it has learned about submarine construction and would like to have work on the experimental submarines started at once.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I can answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas. The United States Navy has one or more of the latest type German submarines under study and comparison with our latest type submarines.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read in the newspapers that a number of submarines which had been captured had been destroyed, which seemed to me to be a very short-sighted thing to do. I understand the Germans had made great progress in the last war in the development of submarines, and I have a feeling that they would be very useful to us.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think any of the late types were destroyed. The living accommodations in the German submarines were rather atrocious. They were superior fighting boats as compared with ours. The purpose of the experimental work and study is to see if we can get the same efficiency and at the same time be able to permit the men to live in a reasonable amount of comfort, which they would not have in the German type of submarine. I recently saw two of the late types.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Japan the Army destroyed machines which had been used to carry on research work on nuclear fission. I think that was a great mistake. We are also destroying machines in Germany.

Mr. KILGORE. I am glad the Senator raised the point, because the Navy is doing work on the late types of submarine. They are actually operating them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think we should have an explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the joint resolution speaks for itself. It simply provides that the law "is hereby amended by striking out the phrase 'including citizens of the Philippine Islands who are members of the naval service at the time independence of the Philippine Islands becomes effective' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'including citizens of the Philippine Islands who were in the naval service on July 4, 1946, or who, having been discharged from the naval service on or prior to that date, reenlisted therein subsequent thereto but before the expiration of 3 months following discharge.'"

The bill makes perfectly clear that the act would apply to those Filipinos who were in the Naval Reserve at the time of independence, or having been discharged from the Naval Reserve on or prior to that date, reenlisted subsequent thereto, but before the expiration of 3 months following discharge.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES TO SERVICEMEN

The bill (H. R. 1363) to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think we should have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill simply permits a serviceman who has received certain allowances because he has been married to retain the allowances after his marriage has been adjudged void. In other words, in view of

the difficulty of forcing men in such circumstances to repay such allowances to the Government, the bill would permit them to keep them after the marriage is declared void.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARBLEHEAD MILITARY RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 450) providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, in line 5, after the word "directed", to insert "upon payment to the United States of the sum of $5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASE OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN NAVAL CORPS OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

The bill (H. R. 1359) to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill merely allows the percentage of officers in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy to be increased from 2 percent of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list to 3 percent. The bill does not, as I understand it, increase the number of commissioned officers; but because of technicalities and in view of the size of the engineering force which is required, the bill would permit the Navy to have 3 percent of its commissioned officers members of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy, instead of 2 percent, as the law now provides.

Mr. WHERRY. Would there be more officers in the Navy under those circumstances?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the bill would simply transfer a greater number of officers in the Engineering Branch of the service.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I received the very definite impression that the Corps of Engineers would be increased; and from the report it seems very apparent that it should be increased. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. It is interesting to note that the percentage of such officers is to be increased from 2 to 3 percent, but the number of engineers has increased 50 percent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CENSUS OF MANUFACTURERS, MINERAL INDUSTRIES, DISTRIBUTIVE TRADES, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 554) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, in line 7, after "distributive", to strike out "trades and" and insert "trades."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "establishments", to insert "and transportation (exclusive of railroads and other means of transportation for which, in the judgment of the Director, adequate statistics are available from other sources)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 11, after the words "of the", to strike out "Act", and insert "Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 13, after the word "act", to strike out "Sections" and insert "Section 3, as amended by section 404 of Reorganization Plan Numbered II (53 Stat. 1436), and sections."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 18, after the words "by the", to strike out "Bureaus" and insert "Bureau."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, after the words "case of", to insert "any"; and after the word "new", to strike out "surveys," and insert "survey."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the word "a", to strike out "return," and insert "return."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, now that the amendments have been adopted, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill is presented at the request of the Department of Commerce. The Under Secretary of the Department appeared before the Civil Service Committee and stated that because of the war no statistics of any kind had been gathered relative to censuses of manufactures or of mineral industries or of transportation. Moreover, Mr. McDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, wrote a letter to the committee stating that he, too, wanted this measure passed and that he was most anxious to have it passed.

Only one census will be taken every 5 years. The one taken in 1948 will take care of the businesses for 1947 and thereafter every 5 years a census will be taken.

Mr. Ramspeck, a former Member of the House of Representatives, appeared for the transportation-by-air industry. The decision as to whether a census will be taken relative to the air-transportation industry is left entirely to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is any other department of the Government duplicating that work?

Mr. LANGER. Only the Department of Commerce and the Department of——

Mr. LUCAS. What will it cost the Government?

Mr. LANGER. It will cost $4,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Let me say that I believe it is the duty of the members of the Appropriations Committee, who are charged with the responsibility in the first instance of reducing the total amount of appropriations of the Government in this and other years, to call the attention of the Senate to additional costs which will be saddled on the Government because of the enactment of certain measures, so that the Members of the Senate may vote advisedly. In the present instance $4,000,000 more will have to be appropriated as a result of the passage of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Director of the Bureau of the Census, hereinafter referred to as the Director of the Bureau, respectively, is authorized and directed to take, compile, and publish the censuses of manufacturers, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of railroads and other means of transportation for which, in the judgment of the Director, adequate statistics are available from other sources), in the year 1948 and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof. The censuses herein provided for shall include the United States and its Territories, and such possessions as may be determined by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) That the Director is further authorized to make such surveys as are deemed necessary to furnish annual and other interim current data on the subjects covered by the censuses provided for in this and other acts.

SEC. 2. That the following sections of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to the censuses and surveys authorized by this act; section 3, as amended by section 404 of Reorganization Plan No. II (53 Stat. 1436), and sections 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15, except that the Director may also authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for travel expenses for attendance at training courses held by the Bureau: *Provided*, That in connection with any survey conducted by the

Director pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), with respect to the answering of questions and furnishing of information, shall apply only to such inquiries as are within the scope of the schedules and of the type and character heretofore used in connection with the taking of complete censuses under the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), or in connection with any censuses hereafter taken pursuant to section 1 (a) of this act and the act of June 18, 1929: *Provided further*, (a) That sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to surveys conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act only after publication of a determination with reasons therefor certified by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce that the information called for is needed to aid or permit the efficient performance of essential governmental functions or services; or has significant application to the needs of the public, business, or industry; and is not publicly available from nongovernmental or governmental sources; (b) that in the case of any new survey said sections 9 and 10 shall apply only after public notice, given by the Director at least 30 days in advance of requesting a return that such survey is under consideration; (c) that the provisions of said sections 9 and 10 shall not apply to any survey more frequent than annual conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act; and (d) that the provisions for imprisonment provided by said sections 9 and 10 shall not apply in connection with any survey conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act.

SEC. 3. That inquiries, and the number, form, and subdivisions thereof for the censuses and surveys provided for in this act, shall be determined by the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. To the extent that the provisions of this act conflict with the provisions of any other act, pertaining to the Bureau of the Census, the provisions of this act shall control: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to revoke or impair the authority of any other Federal agency with respect to the collection or release of information.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 640) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2123) to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 2, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

And insert:

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The bill (H. R. 2758) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that this bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has already been made, and the bill has been passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say that the Senator who made the request of me said he had no objection to this particular bill, but he believed it to be of sufficient importance to be debated. For that reason, I have requested that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has already been passed over at the request of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I serve notice that in a day or two, as soon as I can get the floor for the purpose, I shall move that the bill be considered.

AREA OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL GROUNDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 930) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, in line 13, after the word "Capitol," to insert "police."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 (b) of the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Regulations authorized to be promulgated under this section shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board and such regulations may be amended from time to time by the Capitol Police Board whenever it shall deem it necessary: *Provided*, That until such regulations are promulgated and become effective, the traffic regulations of the District of Columbia shall be applicable to the United States Capitol Grounds."

SEC. 2. Section 14 (c) of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) All regulations promulgated under the authority of this section shall, when adopted by the Capitol Police Board, be printed in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and shall not become effective until the expiration of 10 days after the date of such publication, except that whenever the Capitol Police Board deems it advisable to make effective immediately any regulation relating to parking, diverting of vehicular traffic, or the closing of streets to such traffic, the regulation shall be effective immediately upon placing at the point where it is to be in force conspicuous signs containing a notice of the regulation. Any expenses incurred under this subsection shall be payable from the appropriation 'Uniforms and Equipment, Capitol Police'."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 408) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION OF OPERATION OF GAMBLING SHIPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 560) to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 3, after line 14, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(c) Whoever, being (1) the owner of an American vessel, or (2) the owner of any vessel under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, or (3) the owner of any vessel and being an American citizen, shall use, or knowingly permit the use of, such vessel in violation of any provision of this section shall, in addition to any other penalties provided by this act, forfeit such vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, and furniture, to the United States.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "gambling ship" means a vessel used principally for the operation of one or more gambling establishments.

(b) The term "gambling establishment" means any common gaming or gambling establishment operated for the purpose of gaming or gambling, including accepting, recording, or registering bets, or carrying on a policy game or any other lottery, or playing any game of chance, for money or other thing of value.

(c) The term "vessel" includes every kind of water and air craft or other contrivance used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, or on water and in the air, as well as any ship, boat, barge, or other water craft or any structure capable of floating on the water.

(d) The term "American vessel" means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any

vessel which is neither documented or numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if such vessel is owned by, chartered to, or otherwise controlled by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

(e) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the continental United States and the Territories and possessions of the United States, other than the Canal Zone.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any citizen or resident of the United States, or any other person who is on an American vessel or is otherwise under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, directly or indirectly—

(1) to set up, operate, or own or hold any interest in any gambling ship or any gambling establishment on any gambling ship; or

(2) in pursuance of the operation of any gambling establishment on any gambling ship, to conduct or deal any gambling game, or to conduct or operate any gambling device, or to induce, entice, solicit, or permit any person to bet or play at any such establishment,

If such gambling ship is on the high seas, or is an American vessel or otherwise under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, and is not within the jurisdiction of any State.

(b) Whoever violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned for not more than 2 years or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

(c) Whoever, being (1) the owner of an American vessel, or (2) the owner of any vessel under or within the jurisdiction of the United States, or (3) the owner of any vessel and being an American citizen, shall use, or knowingly permit the use of, such vessel in violation of any provision of this section shall, in addition to any other penalties provided by this act, forfeit such vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, and furniture, to the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful to operate or use, or to permit the operation or use of, any vessel for the carriage or transportation, or for any part of the carriage or transportation, either directly or indirectly, of any passengers, for hire or otherwise, between any point or place within the United States and any gambling ship which is not within the jurisdiction of any State. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any carriage or transportation to or from any vessel in case of any emergency involving the safety or protection of life or property.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to prescribe such reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section and to prevent violations of such provisions. For the operation or use of any vessel in violation of the provisions of this section or of any rule or regulation issued hereunder, the owner or charterer of such vessel shall be subject to a civil penalty of $200 for each passenger carried or transported in violation of such provisions, and the master or other person in charge of such vessel shall be subject to a civil penalty of $300. Such penalty shall constitute a lien on such vessel, and proceedings to enforce such lien may be brought summarily by way of libel in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to mitigate or remit any of the penalties provided by this section on such terms as he may deem proper.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof, or to preclude action, otherwise valid, by any State or Territory with respect to the navigable waters within the boundaries of such State or Territory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMON-TRUST FUNDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 629) concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was on page 1, line 7, after the word "time," strike out "by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States or the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System," and to insert "by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the provisions of Section 11 (k) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 248 (k)), pertaining to the collective investment of trust funds by national banks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 3, page 2, line 21, after the words "law of", to strike out "those States which enact it," and to insert "the District of Columbia with the law of those States which enact the Uniform Common Trust Fund Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Delaware, explain the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to establish common trust funds to become the basis of investments in the District of Columbia. A common trust fund is a fund used for common investment and reinvestment of moneys paid into a bank in its capacity as administrator, executor, trustee, or guardian, and the bill would permit the investment of much greater amounts in trust funds than is otherwise possible. There are 26 States which have similar laws.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

SECTION 1. Establishment of common-trust funds: Any bank or trust company qualified to act as fiduciary in the District of Columbia may, subject to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated from time to time by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the provisions of section 11 (k) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 248 (k)), pertaining to the collective investment of trust funds by national banks, establish common-trust funds for the purpose of furnishing investments to itself as fiduciary, or to itself and others, as cofiduciaries; and may, as such fiduciary or cofiduciary, invest funds which it lawfully holds for investment in interests in such common-trust funds, if such investment is not prohibited by the instrument, judgment, decree, or order creating such fiduciary relationship, and if, in the case of cofiduciaries, the bank or trust company procures the consent of its cofiduciaries to such investment.

SEC. 2. Court accountings: Unless ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction the bank or trust company operating such common-trust funds is not required to render a court accounting with regard to such funds; but it may, by application to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, secure approval of such accounting on such conditions as the court may establish.

SEC. 3. Uniformity of interpretation: This act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of the District of Columbia with the law of those States which enact the Uniform Common Trust Fund Act.

SEC. 4. Short title: This act may be cited as the "Uniform Common Trust Fund Act."

SEC. 5. Severability: If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

SEC. 6. Repeal: All acts or parts of acts which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. Time of taking effect: This act shall take effect July 1, 1947, and shall apply to fiduciary relationships then in existence or thereafter established.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

JURISDICTION OF JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CAPITAL CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 492) to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation from the able Senator from Missouri of the effect of the bill, which provides for waiver of jurisdiction in capital cases?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as the law of the District of Columbia now provides, a defendant under age, charged with a capital crime, is under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. The maximum penalty which may be imposed in the juvenile court is commitment to a detention home, where the defendant, upon reaching the age of 21, is automatically paroled. The purpose of the bill is to permit the judge of the juvenile court to transfer such a case, in her discretion, to the District court for trial.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public

Law 388 Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMPLETION OF VETERANS' TEMPORARY RE-USE HOUSING PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 854) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "$460,000,000" and insert "$445,500,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill would increase the authorization for the temporary re-use program under title V of the Lanham Act. The bill is similar to a companion bill which was introduced in the House and approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House; in fact, it is the same, with one exception.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the bill passed the House?

Mr. BUCK. I think not.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it on the House Calendar?

Mr. BUCK. Yes. As originally introduced, the bill carried an authorization of $50,000,000, but the amount was cut in the House, and the bill as reported by the committee in the Senate would authorize the expenditure of $35,500,000.

The bill provides for the completion of 8,300 units of a Lanham housing project, which have been switched to the universities, cities, and public authorities. It sets no limit; it does not increase the amount of money to be appropriated.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the amount involved?

Mr. BUCK. The amount originally authorized was $50,000,000, but the committee reduced it to $35,500,000.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am somewhat confused about the cost.

Mr. BUCK. The additional cost is to be $35,500,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand, this $35,500,000 is not included in the President's budget.

Mr. BUCK. I do not know about that.

Mr. LUCAS. This seems to me very important, I might say to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. This measure was recommended in a message sent to the Congress by the President.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that; but I should like to ascertain—and someone should be able to answer—whether or not the $35,500,000 is included in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1948. That would make a vast difference, perhaps, in a decision as to whether the bill is to be considered and passed.

Mr. BUCK. The President endorsed it; he approved it for $50,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. The President may have endorsed it, but it does seem to me we should have the information I have requested.

Mr. BUCK. I cannot answer that definitely.

Mr. LUCAS. Therefore, Mr. President, I am constrained to object to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In a message to Congress on February 18, the President requested that the authorization for this program be increased by $50,000,000, and the Government agencies concerned appeared before the committees of both Houses of Congress. I should certainly assume that they would not appear without getting clearance from the Budget Bureau.

Housing projects have been started, they are in all stages of completion, and the amount of money recommended is the amount that is necessary to complete all those which are as much as 10 percent complete. Those under 10 percent completed will be discontinued.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The explanation just made throws a little different light on the subject, so far as I am concerned. As I understand from the explanation of the Senator from Alabama, the bill requests the appropriation of money to complete projects which have been started under the Lanham Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Lanham Act has expired, and has not been renewed, and there are a number of projects uncompleted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If a project has a 10-percent start, under the bill the money appropriated will go to complete the project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. There are projects of that type in the State of Illinois, and I assume similar projects are scattered throughout the country. Now that I understand it, I am definitely for the bill, because if there is anything that leaves a bad taste in the mouth of a community it is for a project to be started through the use of Federal funds without total completion. A noncompleted project stands out like a ghost in the night, giving the community and the Federal Government a bad reputation for efficiency and economy. I certainly think the appropriation of the money provided is necessary. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not a recommendation for this proposed appropriation was contained in the budget estimate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot answer definitely, but I call to the Senator's attention the fact that the President in a message to Congress definitely requested $50,000,000 additional. As I stated a few minutes ago, representatives of the Housing Agency appeared and testified before the committees, and asked for these additional funds. Knowing the manner in which they operate, I certainly do not assume they would have been here making the request had it not had clearance. I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the floor. I believe he is a joint author of the bill, and perhaps he can answer the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask whether this appropriation comes within the budget estimate which the President submitted to Congress, or is above the estimate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, of course this is not an appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it an authorization?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is an authorization; so that it is not within the budget.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as it is an authorization, if the appropriation is made, it will be above the budget estimate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; it would be.

Mr. WHERRY. So an appropriation would be authorized for which there will have to be an appropriation of money above the President's budget?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no question about that. But, Mr. President, if I may make this additional statement, the reason the Committee on Banking and Currency voted to report the bill, and the reason the House of Representatives reported it was, that unless the authorization is made, the Government will suffer a much greater loss by reason of the abandonment, half-finished, of facilities in various parts of the country. I speak with knowledge only of my own State. Upon the campus of the University of Wyoming there was begun under the Lanham Act the construction of quarters for students at the university, but before those quarters were completed the housing agency in charge, finding that the costs were going up, stopped the construction, because the housing agency was unable and unwilling to incur a deficit. These structures are standing now half-finished. The question before us is, Shall we leave them unfinished and thereby decline to give to the students, most of whom are veterans upon the campus of the State university, the housing they urgently need, and incur the danger of loss of the expenditure already made, or shall we authorize the expenditure of the additional funds?

I say to the Senator that both in the House and in the Senate, the judgment of the committee was that the bill should be so amended that no new projects could be initiated; so that as it comes from the committee, and as it is now on the floor, it represents only authority to complete structures which are already in process; some of them more than 50 percent already completed. In another community in my State, the town of Kemmerer, and also in Park County, the home of my colleague, there

are buildings which were initiated for the purpose of providing housing for workers. They are very much needed. Already on the ground are materials to go into those units, but the units are not finished. There are refrigerators, for example; there are, as I understand, ranges and other types of equipment. They are on the ground. If an appropriation to complete those structures is not authorized, the result will be a loss of the money already expended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask me another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the housing confined to educational institutions only?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator give me some idea of the location of other housing than that connected with educational institutions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I mentioned the housing in Park County, Wyo., where a good many dwellings, as I understand, were initiated in order to provide housing facilities for workers in the oil fields, producing a very necessary commodity.

Mr. WHERRY. The facilities are not connected with Government projects primarily?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the housing at Kemmerer probably was connected with the reclamation project, and I think there is something of that kind in the Senator's State.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not had opportunity to read the report carefully, but I should like to ask the Senator a question. It seems that of the amount to be authorized, at least $8,500,000 is money for which the Federal Government is already liable. In section 2, the bill provides for reimbursement of local bodies and educational institutions for expending their own funds in completing units which otherwise would have been extended due to lack of funds, in the amount of $6,500,000. That is to go as a reimbursement of local bodies and educational institutions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. HATCH. Another is for reimbursable utility work performed by local bodies and educational institutions, $2,000,000, making a total of $8,500,000 which the Federal Government is obligated to reimburse to the local bodies and educational institutions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. With objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 4, to strike out after the word "housing" the words "(including dwelling units not under construction)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 9, after the word "as", to strike out "amended" and insert the following: "*Provided*, That such additional funds shall not be available for completing suspended units with respect to which, prior to April 1, 1947, no expenditures were made by the Administrator or the only expenditures made by the Administrator were for dismantling or dismantling and transportation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 24, after the word "amended", to insert the following: "and (3) making payment to such educational institutions, States or political subdivisions thereof, local public agencies and nonprofit organizations of amounts equal to actual expenditures made by them prior to April 1, 1947, for costs of site acquisition and preparation, or installation of streets and utility mains, with respect to suspended units referred to in the proviso in clause (a) above."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 854) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1572 (a)), is amended by striking out "$410,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$445,500,000."

SEC. 2. That the additional funds herein authorized shall be available to carry out the purposes of sections 501, 502, and 503 of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, but shall be available only for necessary expenses in (a) completing the provision of temporary housing for which a contract in writing with any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization had been made prior to the enactment hereof pursuant to title V of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended: *Provided*, That such additional funds shall not be available for completing suspended units with respect to which, prior to April 1, 1947, no expenditures were made by the Administrator or the only expenditures made by the Administrator were for dismantling or dismantling and transportation, and (b) reimbursing any such educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization (1) for funds expended by it in completing any such temporary housing (exclusive of the costs of site acquisition and preparation, or the installation of streets and utility mains), or (2) for the cost of utility and other work in connection with any such temporary housing performed by it for the Administrator on a reimbursable basis pursuant to section 502 (d) of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and (3) making payment to such educational institutions, States or political subdivisions thereof, local public agencies and nonprofit organizations of amounts equal to actual expenditures made by them prior to April 1, 1947, for costs of site acquisition and preparation, or installation of streets and utility mains, with respect to suspended units referred to in the proviso in clause (a) above.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES FOR OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES IN THE SENATE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 125) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the bill would provide for the reporting staff of the Senate certain privileges which Members of the House reporting staff already have. The bill is approved by the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the bill. In all, 13 persons are presently affected. The bill would accord to the proposed beneficiaries the same rights and privileges under the retirement system as are enjoyed by other employees and servants of the Government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following:

"For the purposes of this act, the Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government, and service heretofore or hereafter rendered as an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate or as a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be service as an officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them until he gives notice in writing to the said Official Reporters of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who is in service on the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after such date. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who enters the service subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of such entrance into the service. No provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, obviously this measure will have to go over on the call of the calendar. I give notice that when the unfinished business is concluded I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

SALE OF WEATHER BUREAU PROPERTY AT EAST LANSING, MICH.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present con-

sideration of Senate bill 640, Calendar No. 141. I have talked with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who made an objection to the consideration of the bill on the call of the calendar. I have explained the bill to him, and I should like to explain it for the RECORD at this time.

At the State college at East Lansing there is a Weather Bureau station. The college has grown, and it needs this particular location, which the State of Michigan deeded to the Federal Government for the Weather Bureau. The site is needed for building purposes in connection with the college building program. It is the purpose to transfer the land back to the State of Michigan, and the State of Michigan will furnish another location at the State college for the Weather Bureau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 640) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he deems to be to the best interest of the United States, to the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science the Weather Bureau station located on the campus of the said college, to convey such propperty to the said college by quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided*, That the sale of the Weather Bureau property to the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science shall not be consummated, and the Weather Bureau shall not be required to vacate said property, unless and until the said Bureau shall have obtained and occupied other quarters in the State of Michigan, either by construction of a new building or by rental of, or other means of obtaining, such quarters.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF FISCAL OFFICERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 273, Calendar No. 98.

By way of explanation, let me say that this is a bill requested by the War Department. The bill was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and it has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 273) to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, effective 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, the monthly or quarterly accounts of any disbursing, accountable, or certifying officer of the Government shall be settled by the General Accounting Office within a period of not to exceed 3 years from the date of the receipt of the account by the General Accounting Office. A copy of the certificate of settlement in each case shall be sent to the officer involved and such settlement shall be final and conclusive on the General Accounting Office after the expiration of 3 years from the date of receipt of the account to the extent that no further charges or debts shall be raised in such account thereafter except as to moneys which have been or may be lost to the United States due to fraud or criminality on the part of said officer: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit recovery from any payee of public moneys illegally or erroneously paid to such payee or to preclude the recovery from the disbursing, accountable, or certifying officer or his surety of any balance found due the Government under a settlement made within the period of 3 years as herein provided: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deprive any such officer of his right at any time to clear his accounts of questioned items in accordance with the provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That the period of limitation above prescribed shall be regarded as suspended for the duration of any future war in which the United States may be engaged.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to give us an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that when a disbursing officer, an accounting officer, or certifying officer of the Government renders his accounts, if the accounts are not disallowed within 3 years, he is then relieved of responsibility.

The original language suggested by the War Department was not acceptable to the General Accounting Office. We have adopted the language suggested by the General Accounting Office, with two minor changes which are of no moment, and the language of the bill is now acceptable both to the General Accounting Office and to the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes."

THE VISIT TO AMERICA BY PRESIDENT ALEMAN OF MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Capital of the Nation made durable history last week. The President of the Republic of Mexico graciously returned the visit recently made to Mexico by President Truman of this country. President Truman's thoughtfulness in cementing better understanding between the peoples of the two countries was entirely in keeping with the noblest of American ideals and with the fine understanding nature of the person of the President of the United States. Those who know him well, as a man, as a citizen, as the President of this great country, and as one who represents the best that is American, fully understand and were not surprised at his expression of trust and confidence in the people of Mexico. By his humanity he endeared himself to the masses of the Mexican people. His placing of the wreath of flowers at the monument erected for the Ninos Heroes de Chapultepec was noble and appealed to the best emotions that are better understood by people who have hearts and are emotional like the Mexicans. That deed alone did more to cement real friendship than would 100 years of political discussions.

The last few days President Aleman visited the seat of government of the United States. He was shown the official consideration of which he is worthy and to which he was entitled, but I venture to say that, notwithstanding official consideration, the one thing that he will carry back to Mexico is the spontaneous feeling of understanding and good will of the 600,000 people who saw him when he arrived and the good will of millions of others who knew about his visit through the medium of the press and the radio.

Good will has been brought about, not only by the representatives of governments being friendly and considerate of each other, but more so when the millions of the populations of the countries know and respect each other. I have seen great progress made in matters of human and governmental relations as between this country and Latin America. Officials of this country who have to do with matters affecting citizens of Mexico have and exercise attitudes that make for friendship.

To my mind the one man who of late years contributed more to our real friendly relationship with Mexico and its people is that fine nobleman from North Carolina, the Honorable Josephus Daniels. His fine qualities, his great heart and his broad-mindedness brought about real friendship with Mexico. His successor as American Ambassador to Mexico during the trying days of the late war, George Messersmith, carried on the idea that Daniels had in mind of cementing the friendship of the people of the two countries, and I may say that the worthy successor of those two gentlemen, Ambassador Walter Thurston, now our representative in Mexico City, has done great and noble work without any extra officiousness but as a representative of a dignified country that wants to get along with and understand the Mexican people. I can say as much for the Mexican representatives to this country. The former Mexican Ambassador, Hon. Francisco Castillo Najera, and his successor, Ambassador Don Antonio Espinoza de Los Monteros, certainly have been wonderful and

worthy representatives of their nation. They understand the United States of America and its people, its ideals, its traditions, its hopes, and have done their utmost to cement good will. To speak further about American officialdom which has had to deal with matters concerning Mexico, I find that the hard-boiled, insolent, bad-mannered official of the customs service of this country is a thing of the past and of a different age. Now that service does its duty, as it should, and enforces the law as it should be enforced, with courtesy, consideration, and humanity. The thoughtful representatives of the Immigration Service of this Nation are of the best. That Service does its duty and likewise enforces the law as it should be enforced, with courtesy and humanity.

The impression I want to leave with the Senate is that carrying out a good-neighbor policy is not confined to government officials alone, to the presidents of the countries, or the state departments of nations, but is, or must be, part of the life and existence and the rule of conduct of the peoples of the nations of this hemisphere. I am most happy over conditions in the United States and Mexico. Mexico is the key to all our efforts in Latin America. It is our closest neighbor. Four of our States border that nation. How we get along with Mexico is how we get along with Latin America. I am positive that the other nations of Latin America are forever watching our attitude toward Mexico because how we get along with our next-door neighbor is the test by which other neighbors, farther away, might expect this country to get along with them.

Mr. President, let us hope and pray that the friendship and understanding now existing between this country and Mexico shall permeate every corner of the Western Hemisphere, and that the peoples of the different nations of the Western Hemisphere may understand that our intentions are of the best, that we respect their sovereignty, ideals and culture; and that we do want and shall work for peace and good will, not only on this continent, but throughout the world.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico upon the excellent statement he has made, and I wish to associate myself with his views. The able Senator from New Mexico is probably closer to the Mexican people than any other Member of the United States Senate. What he has done here today in paying tribute to the people of Mexico and the people of his own country has, as a result of the exchange of visits between the Presidents of the respective nations, in my opinion, further cemented the bond of unity which now exists and which should continue to exist between Mexico and the United States. Certainly the Senator by his timely remarks has also added strength to the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Development of the bonds of unity, Mr. President, should not be confined to the actual governments. In order to have real unity we must have unity of peoples, and that is the impression I wanted to leave.

THE FARM PRICE SITUATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have been greatly concerned and alarmed at all the adverse publicity agriculture has been receiving in the past months. Nearly every magazine, and many columnists and radio commentators are constantly making public statements regarding agriculture, which, for the most part, I know to be most unfair and not based on facts.

Through this publicity, the consumer is led to believe that our government is using the United States Treasury, in a big way, to raise farm prices, at a time when a drive is being made to reduce industrial prices. I regret that almost everyone making public statements on the farm price situation does not take the time to make a fair and unbiased study of the actual circumstances.

Many powerful interests at this time are doing their level best to eliminate all appropriations for soil conservation. If they are successful, it will destroy the whole soil-conservation program and organization throughout the United States. In the past, both Republicans and Democrats have, with great pride, claimed credit for the origination of this program. The soil-conservation program has made possible in the United States the greatest food production in all the history of the world, while, at the same time, conserving the soil fertility of this Nation. May I add that if soil fertility is not preserved, this Nation in future years will face tremendously increased food prices and perhaps disastrous defeat in any possible future war.

In 1946, this Nation produced its greatest wheat and corn crop, along with record-breaking quantities of other food crops. Through this great production, it has been possible for the United States to export more foodstuffs in a single year than all other nations of the world combined have exported throughout all history. We have exported tremendous amounts of meats, farm products, and grains of all kinds. Since last July our exports of grain have totaled more than 1,000,000 tons a month, or a record for the year of more than 14,000,000 tons. In grains the figure will reach more than 500,000,000 bushels.

There are some extremists who, in their ardent support of the free enterprise system, would at this time eliminate all export controls. If that were done at this time, our exports would increase and food prices would rise sharply, since it is estimated that the world food demand exceeds by 3,000,000,000 tons the world food supply. Naturally, without export controls the drain on our production would increase, resulting in far greater food cost in the United States. The plain, unadulterated fact regarding the rise in the cost of foods in this Nation is that it is almost entirely due to our tremendous shipments abroad. While I believe that helping feed the rest of the world is highly important, particularly if we are to stave off communism, I think it should be understood, here in the United States, what effect great exports have in America, where all foodstuffs are sold on the open market, and where the farmer has nothing to say about the price he receives. So long as we export down to a level where a home scarcity is created, we can expect nothing but the resulting high prices.

The Department of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, are in no way responsible for most farm prices, as only in a few isolated cases are farm food prices supported. Three exceptions are milk, wool, and potatoes. In another speech later, I intend to go more fully into the necessity of support prices. Briefly, may I say that at the present time without wool support prices, we would practically eliminate the sheep industry so vital to many Western States. This industry has been rapidly liquidating in the last 5 years. In fact, we now have the lowest sheep population in 68 years at a time when we are importing 80 percent of all the wool used in the United States. For the good of this Nation and particularly to safeguard its future security, I cannot see how it would be advisable to liquidate agriculture in any of its phases.

Mr. President, there are many columnists and radio commentators who suggest that we should adopt the corporation method of farming at this time. Perhaps in some phases of agriculture cheaper prices might result; but if that were the case great numbers of our farmers would have to leave their farms, which would result in making this Nation possibly an entirely industrial Nation; something which, in time of war, would, I think, make the United States very insecure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator spoke of wool. I should like to point out that the support price of wool has absolutely nothing to do with the price which the consumers are paying for clothing today, for the simple reason that practically 100 percent of the wool which is now being used in the Nation is foreign wool bought on the world market.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator for the speech which he is making. I am particularly interested in the last comment he made concerning the trend toward large corporate farms. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with me that basic to the prosperity of the American farmer is the maintenance of the small family-type farm?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. I will add that farmers have always been the bulwark of democracy in the United States, not only at elections, but at all times. I may also say, in connection with that statement, that most of the college graduates in the Midwest do not return to

the farms. They seek employment in industry. If we were further to liquidate the agricultural industry, we would only increase the burden of unemployment in cities in future years.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with me that unless we can maintain a large number of family-owned farms the end result will be a dislocation of a great many of our people who will then be in competition with workers in other types of industry, thus endangering, of course, full employment in this country?

Mr. YOUNG. I certainly agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator.

Last year, the support of potatoes and wool prices cost many millions of dollars, but in its over-all operations, including the price-support program, the Commodity Credit Corporation has an actual profit of $227,000,000.

These supports were strictly in accordance with the Steagall amendment which guaranteed the farmers some protection in their reconversion from war- to peacetime production. This is comparable to the Government's guaranties to business in its reconversion, which has already resulted in payments of more than $6,000,000,000 to industry. Some of the publicity in recent weeks regarding farm prices has tried to leave the impression that wheat could be produced for 60 cents a bushel. This statement indicates a total lack of any knowledge of production costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In making that statement the Senator has reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, establishing a support price under corn on which they loan the value of the corn. In my section this year it is $1.09 a bushel. The farmer borrows the money, the Commodity Credit Corporation loans it, and that, in reality, is the money used for the support program. When the Commodity Credit Corporation buys it, if it does buy it, in that particular case the farmer probably owns it and sells it if the price advances. It only becomes a subsidy if the price goes below $1.09. If it goes above $1.09 the Commodity Credit Corporation makes money. During the past 5 years when corn has been purchased at support prices usually the price has gone off. Probably corn is not the best example. But in cases in which the Government actually owned the corn, that was the result. So, it becomes a subsidy and will become a subsidy in future only when the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation finally sells the agricultural product goes below the support price at which it was bought. Only then does it become a subsidy. I think that is not generally understood. I merely wanted to suggest that point to the Senator, since he mentioned it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. In fact, in the production of wheat, it costs the average farmer more than 60 cents a bushel for gasoline and repairs. That statement is in answer to a recent editorial in which it was suggested that wheat could be produced for 60 cents a bushel. Perhaps on free Government land or on Indian land, where the producer paid practically nothing for it, he might in some years produce wheat for 60 cents a bushel. But to the average farmer of the United States the cost of his gasoline amounts to that much. If repairs were added to that the cost would be far over that amount, giving him nothing for labor dollars.

I wonder how many realize what portion of the cost of a loaf of bread the farmer gets for his wheat. According to Government figures, 19 percent of the cost of the loaf of bread is represented by wheat. In other words, when bread is selling at 12 cents a loaf the farmer actually only gets 2½ cents. I wonder how many realize that the grocer in Washington gets 2 cents for his handling charge on a loaf of bread and that even the delivery boy gets 2 cents a loaf, which is nearly as much as the farmer gets for his entire operations.

Today the farm price of eggs for the farmer in most of the Middle West is 34 cents or 35 cents a dozen. According to a check this morning of six large food stores in Washington, the price ranges from 52 cents to 69 cents a dozen. In five of these six stores the price is 61 cents or above.

The press of this Nation and the radio commentators who are giving so much adverse publicity to farm prices might do well to investigate the tremendous spread between the price the farmer is actually receiving and that which the consumer pays. It is this tremendous spread between the price that the farmer receives and the price the consumer pays which ought to be of great concern to the general public. In my opinion, if this drive on agriculture is successful to the extent of wrecking the soil-conservation program and other worth-while farm programs, then in future years this Nation will really pay a high price for its food requirements. Farmers ought to be commended rather than condemned for their tremendous success in producing the greatest crops in history. While farm prices in many instances are far above parity—and incidentally parity does not include labor costs—they still are not making as much money this last year as many think they are. The lumber, machinery, automobiles, clothing, labor and, in fact, practically everything they have to purchase is more than double and sometimes triple the price that they had to pay only 5 years ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from North Dakota has spoken of clothing prices. I should like to give him an illustration of what has happened. I have read and heard over the radio that the price of raw cotton is responsible for the present high clothing prices. When the OPA was in existence, cotton was figured in the OPA ceilings at 36½ cents a pound. At that time the American textile industry was making more money than it had ever made before in its history.

Then the OPA went out of existence, and thereafter the mills raised textile ceiling prices roughly 10 percent across the board. The price of cotton went down $50 a bale. As a result, the American textile industry has made more money than any other major American industry has made in the history of the United States. Yet I hear commentators make statements and I read the voluminous writings of columnists to the effect that the present high clothing prices are due to the price of raw cotton, and that the Government support program is responsible for that price level, when nothing in the world could be further from the truth.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am happy to have that comment from the Senator from Mississippi, because I know he is vitally interested in cotton, which means so much to the South, and he knows a great deal about the production of cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to add to what the Senator from Mississippi has said that it is my belief that at the present time a well-organized campaign to prejudice American consumers against American farmers is being indulged in simply for the purpose of diverting attention from the real profiteers in the food and clothing markets, the speculators and commodity gamblers, and also to prevent farmers and working people from knowing the truth about each other. The Senator from North Dakota will recall that a year ago one of the largest cotton manufacturers in the United States appeared before our committee and, almost with tears in his eyes, said he was practically going broke and that he could not make a dollar. But, lo and behold, at the end of the year, when the financial returns of his company were made, they showed that that company had made an unbelievable profit, the largest it had ever made in its history.

The Senator will also remember that about a year ago certain meat packers came before our committee and said they were losing money and that they did not know what their stockholders were coming to. But when the first of the year came, they, too, reported the largest profits in the history of their companies. That was for the year 1946.

The Senator will also recall that at one time, when witnesses appeared before the Committee on Agriculture, pleading for an increase in the price of cotton, it developed that over 90 percent of all the cotton grown in the country had left the farmer's hands and was in the hands of the dealers and the mills at that time. Those witnesses before our committee were not interested in raising the price of cotton while it was in the hands of the farmers.

In addition, only this spring, when the price of wheat went to $2.50 a bushel—and I think it is higher than that now——

Mr. YOUNG. No; it is lower than that now.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, this spring, when the price of wheat was so high, and when the consumer was led to believe that the farmer was profiteering again, it developed that the farmer had left on his hands only enough wheat for seed and other farm use. Over 85 percent of the wheat had been sold by the farmers.

Also, at the time when the price of hogs went to $30 a hundred, it developed that the great proportion of hogs had left the hands of the farmers, with the result that the farmers were left with only enough for their own use.

So the process goes on, year after year, with that little group of men, who are more responsible for the high prices to the consumer than any other group is, depressing prices at the time when the farmer has the wheat or beef or hogs on his hands to sell; but when over 80 percent of that production has left the hands of the farmer, that same little group of men puts on a campaign to raise prices; and they did succeed in raising them, and then they put on a campaign to make the American people believe that the farmer is getting the profits for himself.

At this time the commodities the farmer is producing currently for the market are yielding him less than they did a year ago.

The Senator has spoken of milk. The fact is that today milk is costing the producer about 20 percent more to produce than it did a year ago, and the farmer is receiving 10 percent less for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say that I was amazed to read in this morning's newspaper a statement by the president of the National Association of Manufacturers to the effect that one of the principal causes for high prices in the United States is the Federal support program of farm prices. Mr. President, nothing in the world could be further from the truth. Although I admit that I was a party to abolishing the OPA, yet I think the facts will show that the cause of the present high prices in industrial goods is the discontinuance of the OPA. The manufacturers had a great deal to do with abolishing the OPA, but now they indict American agriculture with the statement that the farmers are responsible for the high prices. However, in the case of practically every commodity, the amount of money the farmer receives is very minor, as compared with the cost of the commodity at the retail level.

A few months ago I was on the island of Cuba, and while I was there I visited a pineapple farm. I asked the farmer what he got for his pineapples. He told me they were shipped to the United States, and that he was paid 35 cents a dozen for them. But when I returned to this country I was charged 40 cents apiece for pineapples, which came from the same section of Cuba which I had visited, where the farmers received only 35 cents a dozen for their production.

A similar situation exists, according to my observation, in regard to practically all agricultural commodities. It appears to me that a conspiracy is being engaged in by the great industrialists in this country to try to lead the American people to believe that farm prices and the Government-support program are responsible for the present high prices in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am fully in accord with the statement the Senator has made. The industrialists are trying to put agriculture in a bad light; they are trying to throw out a smoke screen behind which they can hide; they are also trying to destroy the soil-conservation program and all other programs which are needed by the farmers of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First let me say that I am delighted with the statement the Senator from Mississippi has just made. I wish to ask him if he agrees with me that what has happened in the past few months is that American industry has taken advantage of a short supply and has raised prices to heights beyond which they should have been raised in order to return to industry a fair and decent American profit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think that statement is absolutely true. They simply followed human nature when they did that. They charged all that the traffic would bear.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask one more question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Mississippi agrees with me that, having reaped that harvest at profiteering prices, they are now beginning to become a little afraid about a tendency on the part of millions of American consumers to engage in a buyers' strike, so now they are beginning to look at their card in the hole, so to speak, to see whether they had not better lower prices a little, and shift responsibility for the present unconscionable high cost of living upon the American farmers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, that is absolutely true.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senators from Mississippi, Vermont, and North Dakota that once we obtain the correct economic data in regard to the situation we inevitably find that the type of statement which we read in the newspapers this morning, to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, simply cannot be substantiated by the facts.

I think the Senator from North Dakota is performing a real service to the farmers by stating in his speech a rebuttal which should be made to those in the United States who wish to try to save their face, in view of the type of profiteering they have engaged in during the past few months, by attempting to put the blame on the American farmers. But if the facts are known, it will be impossible for the blame to be placed on the farmers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What has been said reminds me how strange it is that we never learn lessons except through distress and bitter experience. For instance, if the present campaign to remove the support from farm prices, to drive them down, to attempt to make the farmers of America responsible for present high prices should succeed, as eventually, when times become normal, it will succeed, and farm prices go down and down, as they have done before, I ask the Senator from North Dakota, if that effort should be successful, how long will other prices remain where they are, and will it not eventually, as it always has before, result in depression and hard times?

Mr. YOUNG. If farm prices are driven down I believe a depression would follow in short order. In fact, I believe history has proven over and over again that there has never been an extended period of general prosperity in this country while agriculture has been in poverty.

One of the most vicious of all commentators is Mr. Taylor, sponsored by General Motors. I listened to his remarks last night. First he attacked labor, then he attacked the farmers.

I shall now make a statement about labor I had not intended to make. I am not an expert on labor legislation. I have tried to study the proposed labor legislation. I have tried to be fair with labor. But if men like Taylor, representing industry, are as unfair to labor as they are to the farmers, then I think the labor bill amendments have gone far enough, and my position from now on will be to oppose all amendments. If the bill is presented to us without any further amendments I shall vote for it, even over a Presidential veto; but if it is made one bit tougher, my position will be against it all the way through.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The answer to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a few minutes ago is that the leaders of American industrial organizations have simply gone mad with their own avarice. The Senator from Oregon will recall that when we took up the original labor bill we found in it one provision which would have removed the exemption which was granted to farmers under the Clayton Act, giving them the right to organize in order to better themselves. Does the Senator from Oregon recall that?

Mr. MORSE. I recall it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been satisfied all the time that as quickly as that mad leadership of industry in America had settled with labor, had crushed labor, they would turn their attention to American agriculture next, but I did not expect to find their opposition all in one bill, until the original labor bill as written came along, which would effectively have crippled farm organizations, as well as labor organizations.

Mr. YOUNG. I am sure the Senator from Vermont agrees with me that our

present agricultural program is not a perfect one. We in the farm business admit it needs some correction. The Steagall amendment will expire next year, and in the meantime we hope to write an agricultural bill acceptable to industry and labor, and acceptable to agriculture, and which will not result in any great cost to the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I rise because the Senator from North Dakota made a statement about the labor bill which expresses the same sentiments I have been trying to voice, in which endeavor others have been helping me.

The labor bill which is before the Senate was reported with certain changes, which were made by a majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We are discussing amendments which are out of harmony with the changes which the committee accepted. These amendments are offered, it is said, in an attempt to make the bill tougher and more in keeping with the bill passed by the House of Representatives.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota this question, as a result of the statement he made about the bill: Would it not be wise for the Senate now to stop considering these amendments, and vote on the bill as it was reported? It is true that one amendment has been adopted and is in the bill, and to that extent it is a bill which is unacceptable to one group who joined in reporting the bill. But the bill could go to conference, and the discussions now under way could be stopped, and probably in conference an acceptable bill could be drafted.

Mr. President, it seems to me that while we are confused in the beginning of the consideration of this very drastic labor bill, we become more confused as we proceed, and it would be a sensible move if we could follow the idea which the Senator from North Dakota has expressed, namely, vote on the bill as reported, get it back of us, send it to conference, and see what can be done with it there.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that some corrective labor legislation is necessary. I think business generally over the United States understands our position. They should know that there is not a two-thirds vote possible in the Senate to override a Presidential veto of a tough labor bill. If they know that—and they should know it—then they are only playing politics; and if they want a measure of some kind passed, they had better get behind a bill along the lines we have advocated, or forget all about it, and wait until the next session.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreement to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish now to address myself for a few moments to the pending bill, and to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Last Wednesday, in my humble opinion, the Senate took the first step toward killing any workable labor legislation for this session of Congress by rejecting the motion made by the able Senator from Oregon, and by that very action gave an indication that it did not wish to be curative, but to urge what has been openly called antilabor legislation.

I supported that motion because I thought it was a sound proposal. Adoption of the motion would have permitted the Senate to vote on four separate pieces of labor legislation. Each Member of the Senate would have been able to decide for himself the issues at stake, and accept those provisions he approved and reject those he disapproved.

Each measure would have been decided on its own merits. However, the Senate turned the motion down and we are now in the position of having to vote for or against an omnibus labor bill which contains some good provisions and some bad ones.

We are in the position of the customer who ordered a pound of butter and a pound of limburger cheese, and the grocer, in order to save money, wrapped the two in the same piece of paper, and sent them out.

I firmly maintain that adoption of the Morse motion would have placed the Senate in a better position to pass corrective labor legislation.

In a few moments I shall expand that point, but first, Mr. President, let me point out that I believe the Senate is taking another step toward killing labor legislation for this session by attempting to add drastic amendments to the Senate labor bill as reported out of committee.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose any Senator's right to try to amend any measure that comes to the floor of this great body. At the same time I firmly believe that Senators who support drastic amendments to a measure as important as the labor bill now before us—amendments which, in the opinion of many competent officials, go far beyond correcting any inequities in our labor laws—are inviting a Presidential veto.

I do not know what the President's views are regarding the labor bill as reported out of committee. I do know that he is vitally interested in securing the adoption of corrective labor legislation. He made that clear in his state of the Nation address to the Congress. He is anxious to correct the labor laws insofar as it is possible to do so to the end that we may remove the blemishes from the labor-management picture.

That is the statesmanlike approach to this vital problem.

In my opinion, passage of a labor bill that strays far from this corrective path will place the President in the position of being forced to reject the bill. When anything strays from the corrective path, it goes into the "anti" path, the punitive path, the path that stirs up trouble rather than preventing it.

Every Member of this body is well acquainted with the President's keen sense of fair play and devotion to the best interests of the entire Nation.

As much as he wants corrective labor legislation, I believe that his conscience will lead him to veto a drastic measure that goes far beyond the stage of correction.

Mr. President, the Senate is split into three basic groups on the question of labor legislation.

One group, of which I am a member, approves some sections of the labor bill as reported by the committee. We want corrective labor legislation, legislation that will benefit the entire Nation, legislation that will correct inequities, but, at the same time, will not place labor in an unfair bargaining position. We approve some major sections of the bill as reported by the committee, but we cannot approve the bill in its entirety.

The second group, which I may say, Mr. President, is composed of Senators on both sides of the aisle, approves the labor bill as reported by the committee. Some members of this group may oppose some features of the bill, but they honestly believe that it is the best bill that could be passed at this time, and they are willing to go along with it as it is written.

The third group, Mr. President, is composed of Senators who are in favor of making the bill more severe, more drastic. This group apparently has the upper hand in the Chamber at this time. In other words, it has the votes to write into this bill many of the drastic, restrictive measures which were left out of the

bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I believe the committee acted wisely in omitting these provisions from the bill it sent to the floor.

One of these provisions, in the form of an amendment, has been adopted by a sizable vote; and the Senate is now preparing to act on a second amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

The first amendment—the one that has been adopted—in my opinion would open the door for the activities of vicious opponents of organized labor, those who want to wreck the entire idea of collective bargaining, those who built up the strength of organized labor by their very efforts to crucify it in the past, by the oppression of labor. Under that amendment, company stooges could easily foment labor troubles. Senators know from reports of the subcommittee headed by the former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, that there are company stooges on the pay roll for specific purposes. They can foment trouble, and then accuse the union of coercing the employee. Abuses by company stooges would be laid at the door of organized labor, and then they could operate under the amendment which was adopted last week.

The Labor Board would be forced to spend a great deal of time considering these cases, and as a result it would be hampered in its major task of trying to bring about a better spirit of cooperation between labor and management, which is the essential thing needed for continued prosperity in the country.

In view of the fact that this amendment has been adopted, I shall not go into the subject any further. I merely wanted to point out the viciousness of the situation it may bring about.

However, I wish to outline my position on the pending amendment which is described by its sponsors as a measure to give local unions authority to handle collective bargaining with their employer on a local level.

I believe the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare acted wisely in omitting all provisions prohibiting industry-wide bargaining from its bill. For despite all the misleading propaganda about it—and, I may say Mr. President that there has been a great deal of it—industry-wide bargaining, when properly conducted on both sides has been one of the greatest uplifting factors in this modern industrial age.

It has been a stabilizing factor despite what the false prophets have been saying about it in a steady stream of newspaper advertisements. Industry-wide bargaining has helped industry as well as labor. Industry-wide bargaining has prohibited a few large coal corporations, for instance, from driving their competitors out of business, and thus the entire coal industry has benefited. Unfortunately, the bitter opponents of industry-wide bargaining in the coal industry have been noisier than the great number of coal operators and others who have benefited tremendously from this product of both industry and labor.

Let me emphasize that industry itself largely brought about industry-wide bargaining, not the unions.

Industry took the first step by organizing into national corporations and far-flung trade associations.

Labor followed suit out of the necessity of keeping pace with the self-organization of the employing industry, or the industry itself.

In the coal industry, as in other industries, there are some corporations which have bitterly opposed this trend because it has prevented them from dictating to industry as well as to labor.

These coal corporations, it will be recalled, fought the Coal Stabilization Act because that act, in large measure, prevented cut-throat operations. They are still fighting it, although 95 percent of the coal operators favor the Coal Stabilization Act.

A few industries benefit from such operations, but, industry as a whole, and certainly, the individual States involved, suffered tremendously because of these undemocratic practices.

The coal industry is by no means the only industry which has benefited from industry-wide bargaining.

Far from it.

In fact, it would be hard to find an industry that has not prospered because of industry-wide bargaining.

Despite these facts, the so-called Hartley bill wipes out industry-wide collective bargaining by a complex set of provisions.

Apparently these provisions were aimed at certain labor leaders. One of the worst forms of legislation is that, though designed to cover a national subject, which proceeds on personal grounds, because of a dislike for certain personalities.

To my way of thinking, it would be tragic indeed to follow a course that would lead to great strife and bickering in a vain effort to curb the so-called power of a few individuals no matter how unpopular they may have become.

A few industrialists in this Nation are far more dictatorial and far more powerful than the so-called top labor leaders, but, of course, the industrialists receive scant publicity in comparison to the daily harpoons thrown at labor leaders.

I wish to make it clear that I am not here to defend labor leaders.

Their leadership must, and does, speak for itself. But I do wish to emphasize that the great trouble today is that labor's accomplishments seldom find their way even into the small print in the newspapers, while labor's so-called abuses are blazoned across the front pages in large type headlines. It is a rather peculiar thing. If a man fights with his wife that makes headlines. The fact that a man has for years taken care of an invalid wife and cherished her and cared for her does not make headlines. The many individuals who do good do not make the headlines, but someone who does something bad makes headlines which affect everybody.

Let me review briefly the consequences to employers of an impairment, by Federal law, of the natural unfettered development of industry-wide bargaining.

There is the danger that the weakest member of an industry will be singled out and be forced to set the standard for the others.

There is the certainty of time-consuming piecemeal negotiations, thus endlessly delaying the achievement of industrial peace.

There is the danger that small employers lacking skill in bargaining and lacking research facilities will have to forego these technical advantages.

There is the likelihood that employers in low-wage areas will undercut industry-wide standards, and remove the protection which industry-wide agreements now afford employers.

Area wage differentials would play havoc with all efforts at stabilization and would recreate all manner of harmful competition between company and company and between area and area.

It is rather interesting to me that no one ever complains because the Manhattan Shirt Co. compels its dealers to charge the same price for the same type shirt all over the United States. The same is true of the Arrow Shirt Co., of shoe companies, of typewriter companies and most all other companies. They do not take into consideration transportation charges, but compel the man who lives next door to the factory to pay as much as the man to whom they ship their product 3 000 miles away must pay. Yet they insist on other differentials when they are buying from the raw material producer or paying the wages of the worker.

Let us also analyze the oft-repeated charge that unions exercise an undue monopoly of labor. American labor is not a commodity to be bargained for in the market place. We got away from that when we did away with the slave block, at least we did away with it constitutionally and legally.

American labor is the man who works in the mine, the automobile factories, the rubber factories, the steel mills, the tailoring plant, the shoe manufacturing plant. American labor is the man who operates the streetcars and the trains. American labor constitutes a great percentage of American citizens. When I am talking about labor I am talking about the entire labor pool of the United States, not segregated into union or nonunion or anything else.

American labor is the worker who keeps our production machinery going.

When we place him in the category of being just another object, or another commodity, we deny the very essence of collective bargaining which must remain the cornerstone of our labor policy, if we are to retain our free enterprise system, about which we prate so much, and if we are to obtain the freedom of government, about which we boast so much to the world at large.

The charge also is made that industry-wide bargaining leads to strikes which threaten the public welfare. That is another fallacy foisted on the public by labor's bitter enemies.

It is not the scope of the bargaining unit which leads to strikes, but, rather the entire complex economic problems which are the product of many things, including the difficult transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, as was so well demonstrated in the remarks made by the speaker who just preceded me.

Under company-by-company bargaining, unions would try to drive the stand-

ards up the highest in the industry, while employers would try to effectuate the lowest. This divergence would bring about a wave of strikes throughout the industry affected.

Under such bargaining conditions, some well-organized unions could write their own terms, just as some powerful companies could destroy weak unions.

The fundamental problems which give rise to abuses, to dislocations, to industry-wide strikes will not be solved by writing a few words into the lawbooks.

These problems require a thorough study such as suggested by the President and proposed in Senate Joint Resolution No. 22.

Let us examine the pending amendment.

It would prohibit the Labor Board from establishing units or certifying unions for employees of more than a single employer, unless all employers are in the same metropolitan district or county.

It would also make it an unfair labor practice for unions to attempt to compel their officials, or other unions, to seek or oppose the inclusion of any particular provision in a bargaining agreement.

Let us consider the first point. For instance, in my home State of West Virginia, in the coal industry, we would be limited to a contract being made within a county. Ever since there have been unions in those coal fields the contracts have been made by operators' associations at the very least. The county in which I live has three associations operating in it; yet they also operate in many other counties. The membership is spotty, and there would be all sorts of interlocking negotiations going on. We would have one county trying to fix the rates for various associations, and there would be associations bucking one another.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that only 1 percent of all the coal operations in the United States are certified at all or have ever gone to the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. KILGORE. I know that. That is not the point in issue.

One of the sponsors of the pending amendment stated on the floor of the Senate that it leaves the issue of industry-wide bargaining to voluntary agreements. That statement, in my opinion, is misleading. I know it is misleading to employers in my own State.

In the first place, existing law fully protects the individual right of unions and employers to espouse or reject industry-wide bargaining. Industry-wide bargaining is not now compelled by law. It must be engaged in by mutual action of the labor group and the industry group.

Under existing law the Labor Board approves a multiple-employer unit only when a union requests it and the employers involved have organized themselves into an association for bargaining purposes.

Unless both preconditions exist, the unit is always restricted to the employees of a single employer. That is under existing law. But the freedom is left for them to get together.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I do not want to yield any more until I complete my statement, and then I shall answer any questions that may be asked.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. As I stated, the existing law fully protects the individual right of unions and employers to espouse or reject industry-wide bargaining. In other words, it has been stated on the floor of the Senate that the pending amendment is intended to create exactly that which is now in existing law.

Unless both preconditions exist, the unit is always restricted to the employees of a single employer.

No legislation is needed to achieve the desired result of voluntary agreement. Actually, the pace is always set by the employers. Unless they have associated themselves for bargaining no multiple-employer unit can result.

This amendment absolutely prohibits the establishment of broader than city-wide or county-wide units. This would open the door for all kinds of raiding.

As a measure of self-protection during the time following the depression, the bituminous-coal operators organized themselves into the Southern Appalachian Producers' Association, and as such bargained and dealt with their workers on an association scale covering all the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line and east of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, except the northern part of my own State of West Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I prefer not to yield at this time.

As I have stated, no legislation is needed to achieve the desired result of voluntary agreement.

If a rival union enters, both contracting parties—management as well as labor—will be powerless to defend their existing relations. One raider may pick off the employees or one member of the association; another may snatch those of a second member. The employer association finds itself faced with a multitude of employee representatives, all holding Labor Board certificates.

In other words, there may be a bargaining unit in every plant. The contracting union is forced to defensive organizing instead of being free to administer its contract.

The Labor Board has no alternative, in the impact of this amendment on existing law, but to grant each new petition of the raiding unions for separate employer units and to authorize the fragmentation of the contract unit, despite the objections of the contract union and all the employers in the association. They must be broken down into county units. .

Does this protect industry-wide bargaining under voluntary agreement, or does it invite industrial strife?

I believe, Mr. President, that the conclusion is clear.

The other provision of the amendment prohibits unions, but not employers, from attempting to compel their own associates to present an unbroken front in bargaining. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

If this provision is adopted, and international unions are prohibited from exercising their authority over their own locals, we should in all fairness require the enactment of a parallel prohibition against corporations exercising control in bargaining over plants scattered all over the country.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment would protect the wage chiseler who wishes to compete unfairly with other firms in the same industry by cutting wages.

One further point, Mr. President; the NAM says that wages should be set to fit local conditions. This is the same group which is in favor of establishing the same price for shirts and various other things all over the United States.

That is a fancy way of saying that we should split the Nation into various hostile economic camps. It is a fancy way of saying that we should open the door to unscrupulous employers who would like to set up shops in areas where wage rates are low. Mr. President, we should be working toward the goal of industrial peace—not against it.

It is indeed tragic, Mr. President, that an organization as wealthy and powerful as the NAM should be working day and night to promote industrial strife instead of industrial peace. The NAM has adopted a vicious practice of "divide and conquer." I remember a chapter in Mein Kampf on the same subject, and I presume possibly others may have read it.

I hate to think what the political and economic consequences will be if the NAM is successful in its battle to turn the clock back to the days when a few powerful industrialists played with the lives of workmen as if they were so many pawns on a chess table.

I sincerely hope that the United States Senate will not follow the example of the House of Representatives and jam through antilabor legislation on the pretext that it has some kind of a mandate from the people to do so.

My mind goes back to the discussion which occurred immediately before I started speaking. The agricultural group in the Senate is suddenly realizing what a wonderful trimming it took. Let me say to them that the wailing wall will be established anywhere they want it. The beautiful policy of divide and conquer has crept into our economy too far. The agriculturalist is being taught to hate workers. I have just returned from the Middle West. I talked with college professors and officials, who told me about the vicious propaganda being spread against working people. It is being spread even among farm children. The boiler plate in the weekly newspapers and the editorials in the daily press are all along the same line—that labor is responsible for all our troubles. At the same time the workers are being taught that the farmers are responsible for the high cost of living. All we see played up is the market price at some market—for example, $3.15 for wheat.

Find me the farmer who received $3.15. That was the gambler's profit.

Agriculture is being set up against labor. By whom? By the divide and conquer policy of the National Association of Manufacturers and by lobbyists in the Congress of the United States. I defy them to disprove it. I watched the lobby operate on price controls, and I am now seeing it operate on labor controls. In a short time we shall have the same unrest with labor that we now have with farmers in the Middle West. The next drive will be on the retailer.

Mr. President, when we follow the teachings of Hitler, to divide and conquer, we are following a man whom we outlawed, whom we spent billions of dollars and great quantities of American blood to put out of operation. Yet we allow a group to use the same principles on which he sought to conquer the world, to conquer the small businessmen. Farmers are small business people. The worker is a small businessman. His capital consists of his brain, his hands, and his skill.

Mr. President, I seriously doubt if very many people fully realize what Congress is endeavoring to do with this so-called mandate. We had a mandate to abolish price controls. We thought that mandate came from the farmers. Now we are beginning to realize that it did not. It was not a good mandate. We were misled.

Several Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the Hartley bill have said publicly and privately that they hope the Senate will adopt a less severe measure.

In fact, according to newspaper reports, one Member of Congress who voted for the Hartley bill said afterward that he thought it was a bad bill.

This Representative was confronted with the situation of taking all or nothing, and apparently he decided to vote for the measure although he thought it was a bad bill.

Apparently we in the Senate are to be confronted with the same situation. We were told in the debate last week, in the discussion on the Morse motion, that we must take this bill as an entirety because the House treated it as an entirety. Should we, as Members of the Senate, make a mistake simply because the other body has made a mistake? Should we do something merely because the House has done it?

I deeply regret that we should be in such a position, because I believe that it will mean that this session of Congress will draw to a close without any new labor legislation on the law books.

Some Senators seem to think that it is wise to send a tough bill to the White House and leave the responsibility for its approval up to the President. The idea is that if he disapproves it, there may be some political repercussions in 1948. I may add that there may be political repercussions in the other direction. It is regrettable that some Senators believe political motives are more important than the passage of corrective labor legislation.

As I have previously pointed out, I do not know the President's views on the pending measure; but, in view of the fact that he has endeavored to do at all times what he believes to be in the best interests of the Nation as a whole, I am confident that he will veto a drastic measure. That is my most sincere belief, if the bill is drastic.

As the able Senator from Massachusetts pointed out Friday, statesmanship calls for the correction of evils—not the creation of new ones of greater magnitude.

Industrial peace can never be obtained by building a wall between labor and management or by placing labor in an unfair bargaining position.

The Nation favors corrective legislation, but it certainly would not approve of the creation of new strife to replace any present malpractices.

Certainly, the Nation would not approve the actions of firefighters who extinguish a brush fire by burning down a forest.

During the war, labor doubled its annual income, while big business tripled its annual income. Yet we are told over and over again that organized labor is too powerful.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I should appreciate it if the Senator will permit me to finish.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I am in favor of correcting, insofar as it is humanly possible to do so, any abuses of labor's powers, but I believe that it would be most unwise to eliminate these abuses by creating new and far greater problems.

No one can dispute the fact that organized labor has contributed greatly to the economic well-being of the Nation. Organized labor has raised the standard of living in this Nation, and it has not been an easy struggle. Workmen have been forced to strike to achieve anything resembling a wage sufficiently large to meet the high cost of living.

In many respects the present fight resembles the bitter period that followed the First World War.

A few industrialists set out to destroy the unions, and they all but accomplished that undemocratic goal.

Today we are faced with many problems in a fast-developing industrial age. Many of the problems are highly complicated and tailor-made answers are not always available.

In many respects industry has abused its economic power and without question labor in some respects has abused its power.

I believe we should honestly tell the people what will be the effect of the measures which it is proposed to pass in the Senate of the United States. I believe we should be concentrating on correcting the abuses and not in stripping organized labor down to a position where it will have a much more difficult time preserving anything commensurate with an adequate balance between wages and the cost of living.

Mr. President, I reiterate that I believe the Congress will make a grave mistake if it continues to follow the policy of passing punitive antilabor legislation or no labor legislation at all.

I believe it is time for us to pause and to review what has been done thus far.

I believe it is time for each Member to decide for himself whether or not it is important to perfect our labor laws, thus eliminating recognized abuses, or whether we should blindly rush down the trail of antilabor legislation that will lead to industrial strife. It will lead some of them to the wailing wall, just as in agriculture some are going to the wailing wall because of their activities on the question of price control. Of course, Mr. President, it is blamed on labor now. At first it was blamed on the Government. Who will be next?

Mr. President, I reiterate that I believe Congress will make a grave mistake if it continues this antilabor policy.

The Senate well knows that there are many Members on both sides of the aisle who believe that the President will approve corrective legislation, but that he will veto legislation that goes far beyond its intended purpose; and I doubt seriously if the Senate would override a Presidential veto in this respect.

The pending bill is a cure-all measures: All the medicine is put into one glass and the whole dose is swallowed. Some of it may be poisonous and may mix badly with other things. It is like taking a medicine which should be taken by mouth and mixing it with a shot of serum which should be taken through muscular injection, together with horse liniment which should be rubbed on a sore muscle, but is mixed in with the other medicines in the glass to be drunk.

Mr. President, I believe that we should proceed with caution and sanity.

I do not want the public to be misled into believing that the Senate is acting on a measure that will cure the problems of industry and labor.

I believe that the public wants the Senate to act in a statesmanlike manner irrespective of what the political implications may be.

As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out statesmanship calls for the correction of an evil, not the creation of new and greater problems.

Therefore, Mr. President, I propose that action on the pending business, Senate bill 1126, be postponed for a period of 10 days and, in the meantime, the Senate take up the next measure on the calendar.

I ask for this postponement in order that both the advocates and the opponents of Senate bill 1126 and the various proposed amendments be given a more complete opportunity to explain their positions to the public.

I repeat that I do not believe that the majority of the people understand the full implications of this measure and, in particular, the proposed amendments.

In view of the seriousness of the pending legislation and its economic effect on the Nation, I believe that such a postponement would be beneficial in clarifying the issues at stake.

The postponement would not hold up the Senate's legislative program. In fact it might well speed it up, because at the end of the period of postponement, I am confident that many Members will have fully clarified for themselves this measure and the proposed amendments. They would be ready to act with little delay.

The postponement, I suggest, would afford each Member an opportunity to study the records of the lengthy hearings conducted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and each Member would be in a better position to decide the issues involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that action on the pending business be passed over for a period of 10 days and that the Senate resume its consideration on May 15.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President may I ask what is the parliamentary proposal?

Mr. KILGORE. I proposed to lay the pending measure on the table for 10 days and take it up on the 15th of May.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KILGORE. I have already suggested the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
But'er	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Knowland	Taft
Connally	Langer	Taylor
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarran	Tydings
Dworshak	McClellan	Umstead
Eastland	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] moves that the pending business be laid on the table and passed over for a period of 10 days, and that the Senate resume action on it on May 15. If this is a motion to lay on the table, it is not debatable, but inasmuch as it appears to be the purpose of the Senator from West Virginia to postpone consideration to a day certain, the Chair will assume that it is a motion to postpone to a day certain, and therefore is debatable.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if I may clarify my motion, what the President pro tempore has stated was my intention, to postpone consideration of the pending bill to a day certain. I thought I made it very clear that that was the intention, and that it was not a motion to lay on the table, because I think the proposed legislation should be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes that interpretation, and considers the motion debatable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion made by the Senator from West Virginia, and on my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, on which question the yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If the Senator from Virginia were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and will vote. I vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent. If present and voting he would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is detained on official business, is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania, if present, would vote "nay."

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is unavoidably detained. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained at an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments with a delegation from the State of South Carolina.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

On this question I announce the following pairs: The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who, if present, would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who would vote "yea"; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who would vote "yea"; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who, if present, would vote "nay," with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who, if present, would vote "nay," has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—59

Aiken	Fulbright	Overton
Baldwin	George	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Holland	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Smith
But'er	Kem	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Thye
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Cooper	Lucas	Umstead
Cordon	McClellan	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Martin	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ellender	Moore	Wilson
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Flanders	O'Conor	

NAYS—17

Barkley	Hill	McMahon
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Green	Kilgore	Taylor
Hatch	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	McGrath	Sparkman
Bushfield	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Maybank	Tobey
Downey	Murray	Wagner
Hawkes	Myers	White
Jenner	O'Daniel	
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate is the amendment appearing on page 51 of the report, the second amendment proposed in the supplemental views. There has been this afternoon on the floor a discussion of Nation-wide bargaining. The amendment has no direct effect on Nation-wide bargaining. It has an indirect effect, perhaps, on the general subject, but a good many people seem to have confused it with the provision of the Hartley bill which completely abolishes industry-wide bargaining. There is no such provision in the pending bill.

There has also been some confusion with respect to another amendment on the desk, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which also attacks directly Nation-wide bargaining. As a matter of fact, the pending amendment does not change the situation so far as Nation-wide bargaining is concerned. Nation-wide bargaining is permissible under the present law. It is permissible, but it cannot be forced on anybody unless all the employers get together and voluntarily decide that they want a Nation-wide bargaining unit.

Under the proposed amendment, Nation-wide bargaining may continue. The Board may not certify one union to bargain for an entire industry; it may not certify the international, but it may certify the unions belonging to particular companies, and those unions can delegate the power to deal with the employers on a national basis through the employers' association. I see nothing which in any way would prevent a continuation of any Nation-wide bargaining agreement which now exists.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At that point, may I ask, is it necessary for the unions, when they designate the national organization, to obtain consent of the employer in order that the national organization may represent them in a Nation-wide bargaining effort?

Mr. TAFT. No. In the case of a company with five or six plants the union to be certified is the local union, or the branch of the international which contains all the employees of the company. The Board may certify that particular union. That is the largest union they may certify. That particular union may designate their own president. They may designate the international union to bargain for them. They may designate the president of the international union—Mr. John L. Lewis, for instance, in the coal industry—to bargain for them. They may jointly and voluntarily, therefore, bargain collectively as a national unit. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that if anyone of the unions dealing with a particular company is dissatisfied with Nation-wide bargaining, it may leave the Nation-wide conference and sign up with its employer; exactly as any employer may leave the Nation-wide conference and sign up with his particular employees, as many of them have done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator explain how, under the amendment, the following situation would be dealt with, to wit: suppose the employers agreed to bargain as a whole on a Nation-wide basis, and the labor unions agreed to bargain, not on a Nation-wide basis; or, suppose the labor unions agreed to bargain on a Nation-wide basis, and the employers did not want to bargain on a Nation-wide basis; the point being that one side to the controversy would want a Nation-wide approach, the other would want a regional or local approach. In that situation, what would be the solution, under the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. In order to conduct Nation-wide bargaining it would be necessary for both the employers and the unions to want to bargain collectively nationally. That, I may say, is the situation today, except in a few cases in which the Board has certified a multi-employer unit. There are not very many of those, but in a few cases the Board certified such a unit. In that case the employers can break it up voluntarily, but the unions cannot break it up voluntarily. The effect of the amendment is that the unions may break it up voluntarily, just as now the employers may break it up voluntarily.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it a fair interpretation of the amendment to say that there can be, first, no Nation-wide collective bargaining without both labor and management agreeing to that process, and that there is no way by which that process can be brought about by either side to the controversy unless there is mutuality of agreement on a Nation-wide basis?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct; whereas, under the present law, the employers can break it up, but the employees of a particular union or district cannot do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, as I understand the amendment, it virtually puts labor into the same position which the employer is now in, to wit, that the employer can prevent Nation-wide bargaining, but labor has no machinery defined in the law by which any local or regional union, as now constituted, can prevent it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states substantially the effect of the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. TAFT. I yield further to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To clarify the point which has just been raised—and I am very glad indeed the Senator from Maryland raised it—suppose the local organization designates its national head to bargain for it in a labor dispute with the employer, the national head of the union organization can bargain only with a particular plant and not upon a Nation-wide scope unless the employers together agree to that. Is that correct? Do I make myself clear?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. The collective bargaining under the Wagner Act is basically between an employer and his employees. That may be upon a plant basis or it may be on an over-all company basis. The original Wagner Act said nothing about any unit larger than an employer unit, but the Board has held that if the employers voluntarily associate themselves together, then the Board may certify one bargaining agent for the men to deal with an employers' association. However, any employer can break it up today, and he can break it up after the adoption of this amendment. That situation is not changed. In the committee bill we specifically recognize the rule of the Board that if there is a voluntary association of employers they may certify one man to act for all the employees of all those employers. Under the amendment we provide that they cannot certify such an individual as a bargaining agent, but all the unions that are certified may join together so one man or one international union can deal with the employers' association.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And that selection of the bargaining agent for the union is solely in the hands of and in the determination of the unions themselves.

Mr. TAFT. It is solely in the hands and determination of each union as to what they wish to do. In other words, what we do here is to say, "If you have a group of men who are all employees of a particular company they may decide whether they want to bargain nationally or whether they want to bargain with the particular employer." That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. TAFT. Before I answer any other questions I should like to state why we came to this conclusion. I have tried in no way to put anything in the bill for which there was not testimony showing a clear abuse. Senators will remember that last year the United Steel Workers demanded a 25-cent-an-hour increase, and various other changes. The United Steel Workers was the certified union. Heretofore the International United Steel Workers' Union has been the certified bargaining agent for some 1,100 plants in the United States. Those plants are not only steel-manufacturing plants but they manufacture many other articles. Some make toys; one makes cans for packing beans; others fabricate all sorts of products of which steel is a component part. What Mr. Murray did last year was to tell those plants that they could not settle with their employees under any circumstances unless the employees received 25 cent an hour or until he settled with Big Steel. U. S. Steel was unwilling to pay 25-cents-an-hour increase, and the result was that Mr. Murray called a strike in more than 500 plants, in fact, I think in all 1,100 plants, but a number of them belonged to the same company. He called a strike on 500 different companies. The employees in all of them were compelled to strike. Finally he settled with U. S. Steel at 18½ cents. In many cases those men had already settled with their employers. These plants are scattered among many small towns in the eastern section of the United States. I suppose such plants are located in half of the Ohio county seats, and in all the surrounding States. In many cases the employees had sat down with their employers. They knew what they wanted, and could reach an agreement at something short of 25-cents-an-hour increase, but with other conditions. Nevertheless they were compelled to strike.

They told their employers, "We have no power to settle in any case for less than 25 cents so long as Mr. Murray does not settle with United States Steel." It seems to me that if we can change that condition we can reduce the number of

strikes, and that is one of the improvements I have been particularly anxious to bring about.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if it was not possible for the unions in the smaller plants engaged in manufacturing a diversity of products to withdraw from the international steel union if they were dissatisfied with the manner in which it was operated?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. And did it not happen that several of them did?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. As a matter of fact, in Ohio there were some five or six plants where the men themselves went back to work. They simply paid no attention to the international union and went back to work. But the international union was the certified bargaining agent, and the employer could sign no collective-bargaining agreement of any kind whatsoever. Furthermore, those men lost all the funds they had accumulated in their local unions.

Let me read to the Senate what the charter of the international provides. It provides that the charter of a local may be revoked or suspended in the event that any local fails to comply with any provision of the constitution of the international union

It further provides that when a local is suspended "the members thereof and the local union shall not be deemed to be in good standing during the period of suspension."

That means that if the union has a maintenance-of-membership or a union-shop contract with the employer the international can then demand the discharge of all those employees, that is, if there is a contract in force. There was not at this particular time.

The constitution further provides:

> In the event that a local union's charter is revoked, or the local union disbands, the charter and all books, moneys, and property shall be delivered and turned over to the international union.

Within 10 days that is what happened to those who left the union. They lost all their union funds. They had to form a brand-new union outside the CIO. It took them a year to receive a certificate as bargaining agent of that particular plant, because the international union had been the certified bargaining agent up to that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I listened to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] discuss the amendment a few moments ago. From what he said, I gained the impression that only the local union could bargain with the employer, while on the other hand that local union had the right or the power to go to the national organization to seek advice or counsel, or if they wanted to say "We will do nothing until the international organization agrees to this," that was within their power, but that under no circumstances could they delegate to the national organization the power to act as the bargaining agent. They had to do it themselves. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think that would be a mistake. They could delegate their power, but they could revoke it at any moment they became dissatisfied with the international union's bargaining, or if the international union made what they thought were unreasonable demands, or required them to strike when they did not want to strike, they could revoke that authority, and then themselves sign the contract, because under the National Labor Relations Board's ruling they are the final bargaining agent.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that explanation. I take it the Senator from Minnesota agrees.

Mr. BALL. Yes; I agree. The Senator from Ohio stated the effect of the amendment. If I said anything that could be interpreted the way the Senator from Illinois interpreted it, I misspoke myself, because I understand very well that all the amendment does is to vest the bargaining rights in the local union, and that then the local union can do whatever it wants to with them. It can delegate those rights to the international. It can name an international representative to deal with the employer. It is up to them. But it is within their power under the amendment. It is not within their power under the present law.

Mr LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator if this is the only amendment in the labor bill which in any way gives some autonomy to a local union, or are there other provisions which seek to do that very thing?

Mr. TAFT. I think this is the only amendment which affects the authority of local unions, so far as I can remember. Yesterday or one day last week we were considering a provision that it shall be an unfair labor practice for a union to compel an employer to designate a particular representative. In other words, the union cannot say to an employer, "We will deal with you only if you designate your employers' association as the bargaining agent." The union cannot coerce an employer to join an employers' association. That provision is in the committee bill. That has a rather indirect effect on Nation-wide bargaining, but it has no effect on the autonomy of the local union.

Mr. LUCAS. I am thinking about a union which has only a few districts in the United States which enjoy complete autonomy. The union I am thinking about has few free elections. Labor leaders at the top appoint officers of the unions in the various districts, and they control the affairs of the local union with little or no interference from the respective members.

As I see this amendment, it would have absolutely no effect whatever upon individuals who belong to that kind of a union, because they have no rights now. They have rights under their constitution, but the constitution is ignored to the point where there is no autonomy whatsoever in the district.

Mr. TAFT. That is true; but under this amendment they could go to the National Labor Relations Board and say, "We want to be certified as the agent for this particular plant."

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with that. They could do many things now under their own constitution, but they dare not do the very thing I am talking about. As I see it, this amendment would have no effect whatsoever upon the particular organization I have in mind, because the same high, arbitrary power, through dictatorial methods, will continue to govern the members of the union in the various districts throughout the United States. I do not see that this amendment would have the slightest effect in giving a local union an opportunity to do any faithful collective bargaining with the employer, because the same individuals who have heretofore refrained from doing the things that were necessary to protect their rights will continue to live in the same atmosphere under which they have lived in the past, notwithstanding this amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the Senator. I cannot see why they should be afraid to go to the Board and have themselves certified as the bargaining agent. Under the present law, if the Board is certifying an industry-wide unit, the Board will refuse such certification. However, under the terms of this amendment the Board would have to grant such authority.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reply I wish to make is this: At the present time the members of the union have rights under their constitution and under the rules laid down by the National Labor Relations Board. They have the right to free elections in the various districts; but what I am saying is that they do not have free elections, and they do not make any complaints, because they dare not.

Mr. TAFT. What would happen to them if they did?

Mr. LUCAS. That is the question.

Mr. TAFT. We do not take away the right of persuasion.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not complaining particularly about the amendment. The only thing I am saying is that in my opinion it will have no effect on the type of organization which I am discussing. I am thinking about the individual who uses arbitrary power to control members of a particular union. This amendment will not affect them one iota, in the final analysis.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think I know the union to which the Senator refers. The tremendous hold of the national leaders in that union grows, for one thing, out of the union shop and the complete control of membership from the top down. If anyone has the temerity to organize a movement for local autonomy, he is immediately kicked out of the union and expelled from office. He can no longer work under his present contract. Under other provisions of the bill members of a union who might lead a movement for local autonomy could not be deprived of their jobs. It would be an unfair labor practice for the employer to discharge

them if they were expelled from the union for any other reason than nonpayment of dues. I think this amendment would strengthen the hands of members of the union who wanted local autonomy, and return democratic procedures to the union.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I had in mind a moment ago when I made inquiry of the Senator from Ohio as to whether or not there were any other provisions in the bill which would add to the antonomy of individuals in the local union.

Mr. TAFT. The various provisions against coercion may make it more possible for members of unions to rise above the fear threat to which the Senator refers, and which I had not taken into account.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would appreciate it if the Senator would outline how, in his judgment, the mechanics of collective bargaining would work under circumstances like the following:

Let us suppose that a local or regional group of workers are designated as the bargaining agent. Let us suppose that subsequently they wish to transfer to the national association their right to bargain collectively. The query comes to mind, Is the national association always represented as the bargaining agent, or does the national organization, after the local union delegates its power to the national organization, have to be designated over again as the bargaining agent?

Mr. TAFT. No. If the local union says "You are our agent to negotiate this contract," that authority continues indefinitely, until the local union says "We are not satisfied with what you are doing, and we are therefore going to revoke your power." If the contract is signed, of course it is binding on the local union until the end of the contract.

Mr. TYDINGS. My point is, whenever a local or regional group of employees is designated as the bargaining agency, may it delegate that power to other organizations without reference to the National Labor Relations Board or anyone else?

Mr. TAFT. They may appoint Mr. X as their agent, or they may appoint the international union their agent for signing the contract.

Mr. TYDINGS. So it is not necessary to go back to the Government for a redesignation.

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Under the terms of the amendment the National Labor Relations Board could not certify the international union as a bargaining agent. That would be entirely a relationship between the local union and the international union.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. The Government would have nothing to do with it. If a request were made to the National Labor Relations Board for certification, it could certify only the local union.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

I should like to refer to one or two cases to show how this plan worked in the steel business. Take the case of the United Welding Co., in Middletown, Ohio. They were ready to sign a contract. They met with the men, and the union representative said:

> In plain words, there is no company that has offered us a quarter—

That is, an increase of 25 cents—

> and we do not expect this company to offer us a quarter at this time. We don't think that this company is large enough to set the policy for the whole United States and we don't expect them to; and on the other hand we couldn't agree to anything less than a quarter at this time until the policy is set for the country.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Again I will have to answer that I don't know. I haven't been informed of it. I have been informed indirectly that our International Wage Policy Committee has authorized our international officers to take any method they see fit.

In this case, even after the settlement had been made with Big Steel, many of the fabricating companies were held up by strikes for many months because in most cases they could not afford to pay the increased cost of steel plus 18½ cents more for their labor, and yet Mr. Murray insisted that the strike should continue unless they paid exactly the same increase as did Big Steel. It did not make any difference whether they had treated their employees particularly favorably, whether they had welfare funds, incentive plans, or anything else. Unless they paid the increase of 18½ cents Mr. Murray insisted on the strike continuing.

Finally the fabricating companies went to the President and asked him, "Did you mean, when you approved the 18½-cent increase, that it was to apply to these companies?" The President issued a public denial of the statement, stating that his recommendation applied only to the basic steel industry, and expressing the hope that thousands of other strikers would return to work. As soon as that statement was published, Mr. Murray sent a telegram to all his district directors castigating the President for daring to issue a statement "without knowledge or presence of union," and concluding with the following instructions:

> It remains the policy of our union that workers in fabricating plants are entitled to the 18½-cent increase—

And that they cannot settle the strike unless they get the 18½-cent increase, regardless of their local conditions, regardless of what their particular arrangement might have been with the company with which they were dealing—

> and with the same solidarity and firmness as has characterized our strike up to the present time, these workers will receive the 18½-cent increase to which they are justly entitled.

I may say that the same rule was applied to the United Automobile Workers. We had Mr. Reuther before us, and he testified to the same effect. His testimony appears on page 1289 of the record, as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. You have made a general demand of 23½-cent increase, have you?
>
> Mr. REUTHER. That is correct.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Have you issued orders to all of the local unions dealing with other smaller companies? I mean I was told that they either must get 23½ cents or they must have a wage-reopening clause that can be reopened when your larger contracts are settled.
>
> Mr. REUTHER. We have issued instructions that when the contract is open the local union committee is to submit a wage demand on the basis of the 23½ cents. If they get what we call a down payment now, they take that down payment but have an open end agreement so if at a later date there is a general adjustment higher than what they get, they can then get consideration for an additional adjustment.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. So, wherever this union exists—

Meaning the United Automobile Workers—

> there is now a demand for 23½ cents, one way or another?
>
> Mr. REUTHER. That is right.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What I am trying to get at is that you are operating this not only out of one center for all the automobile industry, but for a great many other industries wherever your union exists. That is correct, is it not?
>
> Mr. REUTHER. That is correct. The demand that we have made is being served upon industries in the agricultural implement industry also.

So also in the United Automobile Workers' provision, where they also retain the right to approve or disapprove every contract the workers have, and where only one man, the head of the union, dictates the terms upon which every union dealing with every company, whether in that same industry or in other industries, can settle with their own employers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] does not stop the evil that flows from industry-wide bargaining if the unions desire it, does it?

Mr. TAFT. No. We do not do that in any way. The international is free to tell the locals just what it is telling them now—"You should get 23½ cents"—but it will have no right to compel them to strike in order to get it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the amendment simply prohibits coercion by the nationals or internationals against its affiliates?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it prohibits coercion of local unions that wish to settle with their employers. That is the purpose of the amendment. I cannot see any legitimate objection to it. After all, it enforces the whole theory of the Wagner Act, which was enacted for the purpose of preventing one employer from having the advantage of dealing with thousands of separate employees, and giving to the employees the right to act as one against an employer, so that when they sat across the table there would be equality of bargaining power.

But unless we adopt this amendment, we have reached a condition where every little employer scattered through the entire West or the entire State of Ohio will be at the mercy of a union controlling hundreds of thousands of employees, and the leader of the union may sit in one place and say to the employers, "You cannot settle with your own employees. We have the right to order them to do whatever we want to order them to do, and we have the right to say whether they strike or do not strike."

Mr. ELLENDER. I still insist that employers cannot be forced to accept, particularly in view of the provisions in the pending bill, such as the one denying the right to strike to compel an employer to join or remain a member of a bargaining association. This would mean that if certain mining operators withdrew from a coal association and Lewis struck to make them bargain on an industry-wide basis, the union would be guilty of an unfair labor practice, viz, coercing employers in the choice of a bargaining representative.

Does not the Senator think that since the bill we are now considering provides for realistic collective bargaining by all concerned, that is, management as well as by the unions, it will also have the effect of dissipating a great many of the evils that prevailed in the last few years because of industry-wide bargaining? In other words, the bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a union or an employer to refuse to bargain collectively. Is that true?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that because of such a provision in the bill which we are now considering, it will in a measure ameliorate the difficulties which have occurred in the past and which have resulted from industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. TAFT. I think it will ameliorate them; yes. I agree with the Senator.

I do not think, however, that it goes to the basic point. I do not think anything else in the bill will nullify the provisions which give the international, either through certification or through its own constitution, the right to control the welfare of and the final contracts made by hundreds of locals throughout the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such a provision means that if unions tried to do what the Steelworkers Union did last year when every rolling mill and steel fabricator was confronted with the same demand on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, unions could be cited for an unfair labor practice, unless it was willing to negotiate in good faith with each employer. This is true, as I pointed out a while ago, as to all industries in which employees have not voluntarily formed a bargaining association.

Does not the Senator also feel that the added leeway we are giving to independent unions will assist in that situation?

Mr. TAFT. I think that will be rather an indirect assistance.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I view it, a union will be able to say to the international, "We can get recognition now before the Labor Board; we can go on our own, and we do not need your services any more." They will be able to use their own judgment rather than be bludgeoned, as could now happen.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that makes much difference, because today an A. F. of L. union can say, "We will join the CIO," or a CIO union can say, "We will join the A. F. of L."

Mr. ELLENDER. But they are almost compelled, as the law and regulations stand today, to join either the CIO or the A. F. of L., because if a charge were made against them of being company-assisted or company-dominated, it would remain against them for time immemorial, and they could never be cleared of that charge.

Mr. TAFT. If it were a union which were a constituent part of the A. F. of L., but if it chose to leave the A. F. of L., it could do so without having in the bill any provision permitting it to form an independent union and be recognized by the Board, because it was never company-dominated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but the Senator knows that we have had before us, many cases in which the charge was made that a certain union which was not affiliated with either the CIO or the A. F. of L. was at one time company-dominated and it could not be washed of that sin. Is not that so?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. We are saying now that an independent union can now be recognized, even though it had once been company-dominated.

Mr. ELLENDER In other words, we are saying to the Board, "You cannot listen to any charges that are over 6 months old." Such charges must be banished." So this bill will make it possible for all unions to be braver, as it were, and to bargain as they choose to do. They will not have to bow and scrape to the big bosses.

Mr. TAFT. I admit the point, but I do not think that provision will in any way change the situation now existing in the steel and automobile industries. It seems to me that situation will remain just as it is.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I want to make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio. I think the Senator indicated that a provision such as this would be a protection to the small manufacturer in a given industry or to a small shop owner, and so forth. I think I know what he means by that implication but I am wondering whether at the same time that it would operate in that way perhaps it would also act as a protection to those in the same industry. I mean to say that in some instances the bill will act as a handicap to those who are in the same industry by presumably eliminating the possibility of their getting together and working out a wage scale or a wage schedule which is more or less uniform. I can see very plainly how by the application of this provision a way might be opened for the chiseler and the employer who wanted to have a level of production, so far as employment was concerned, lower than that which would be considered a suitable standard level. I am wondering whether such a provision would open up the situation in such a way that the employer who wants to do a decent job and pay a decent wage would be without the protection he otherwise would have.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President I do not understand the Senator's point. The employer who wants to do a decent job can do it, under the amendment; and if he benefits his employees, they will know it; and when they sit down with him, thereafter, they will make allowance for what he has already done. They will not force on him exactly the same terms that the international will force on an employer who has neglected his employees from the beginning.

If we do not include this provision, but if we permit the continuation of the situation which now exists in respect to the steel workers union and the automobile workers union, that will mean that there will be no advantage to any employer to have good labor relations or to benefit his employees by setting up funds or by doing other things to assist them, because regardless of whether he benefits them or does not benefit them, that union will have to take its orders from an international union whose president knows nothing about the local conditions and knows nothing about the local employer. That situation will entirely deprive any employer of any incentive to work out good labor relations of his own, because even though he is as friendly as possible with his own employees, he will be as badly off as the employer who is at war with his employees every moment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am not quarreling with anything the Senator from Ohio has to say about the situation in the steel industry, but I do not think that is typical of the conditions which may exist in other large areas of so-called industry-wide bargaining in other types of industries.

What I have in mind is the possibility, which this amendment presents, of destroying in a given industry a certain amount of uniformity which exists in the whole wage schedule or the whole wage standard or structure, thereby creating such conditions in certain areas or sections that the level of the living standard might be vastly reduced, thereby eventually forcing other employers in the city or urban area to reduce the wages they pay, in order to be in line, which presumably would mean wages which would be commensurate with those paid by their competitors.

Mr. TAFT. No; this amendment provides, in effect, that it is up to the union to persuade the men what their interest is, and the union cannot order them around.

In the same steel case to which I have referred, in three plants, under the Smith-Connally Act, the workers voted to go back to work; but the union said,

"You still must strike"; and the employees had to strike, even though they themselves wished to go back to work.

No, Mr. President; I do not think there will be any demoralizing effect on the wage structure because of the fact that the unions cannot be compelled to do what some big boss in New York or Chicago or Washington wants them to do. I do not think the amendment will break down the wage structure in any industry. If the unions are satisfied with conditions in their own industry, those conditions probably will be continued in effect. For instance, let us consider the unions in the stove industry. The stove industry has the longest history of industry-wide bargaining. It went on for 15 years, long before there was any certification or any law on the subject. Why was that so? Because the unions in that industry felt it was to their interest to operate in that way.

So those unions will continue to bargain collectively because they feel it is to their interest to do so. As a matter of fact, if the employers wanted to break down that schedule, they could withdraw, of course, and could thus break down the schedule.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. A situation similar to that in the stove industry, about which the Senator from Ohio has spoken, exists in certain segments of the garment industry. I happen to have made a study, some years ago—not too many years ago—of a report that insofar as New York City was concerned, the same overall major parent labor organization which then controlled in New York had been engaged in the process of obtaining locals in the districts on the outside, including areas of Connecticut and areas of New Jersey and several other sections of the country. I found that as a result of that situation, the effect was most beneficial both in the city of New York and in the areas outside. The wage scale has been raised in those outside areas, not to the level that existed in the city of New York, to be sure, but to a level commensurate with the condition existing in that locality. At the same time the wage scale in the city of New York has not had to be lowered.

What I am fearful of is that because of the incentive, which inevitably exists in this proposal, to pull away from the parent organization, there will be, at the same time, an incentive for the chiseler and the employer who wants to take advantage of cheap labor, if we wish to call it that, to entice one local union after another to pull away from the parent organization, until the whole set-up, which may have been very satisfactory at one moment, may become completely disorganized and the whole union itself disrupted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the employees with whom the international union could get along the easiest would be the employees of the chiseling employer. They would be the very ones who presumably would have some incentive to join the international union and to have the general assistance and protection of an international union.

It seems to me that the only case in which the amendment will work is a case in which an international union tries to make unreasonable demands—so unreasonable as to appear to the workers themselves to be unjustified or so unreasonable as to force the workers to strike, even though they wished to keep on working, and not to strike.

It seems to me that the Senator from New York is arguing, in effect, for industry-wide bargaining as a general method of settling labor troubles. It seems to me that process would inevitably lead to a complete monopoly condition in the United States, whereby a few men at the top would absolutely fix the wage standards of all the workers of the United States and would bring about the very type of Nation-wide strike which has most injured and annoyed and outraged the American people. In other words, the difference between the attitude of the Senator from New York and my attitude is this: I am willing to have industry-wide bargaining if the men really want it, but certainly I do not think it is a good thing as a general rule for the economy of the United States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I simply wish to point out that I do not intend to leave the impression from what I have said that I am arguing in favor of industry-wide bargaining to the extent that it will be monopolistic and injurious to the public of the United States. That is not my idea at all.

I have understood from what the Senator from Ohio has had to say earlier that there is nothing in the proposal which will stop that very kind of monopoly. That is the impression I have gathered from his remarks, namely, that there will still be industry-wide bargaining of that type, under the amendment now proposed.

Mr. TAFT. But, Mr. President, under the amendment it will not be possible for an international union to set up industry-wide bargaining by main force, or to set up what amounts to industry-wide bargaining by dictating to 100 or 500 different companies the one wage scale which they must pay.

Mr. IVES. But by the same token, the amendment would not prevent that, either.

Mr. TAFT. I think we can prevent it.

Mr. IVES. The Senator may think it possible to prevent it, but it will not be prevented by the legislation now proposed.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why it will not be prevented by it. In the first place, we say in this proposal that the international union cannot have the tool of being named as the bargaining agent; and, second, we say it cannot have the tool of writing into its constitution a provision which will deprive American citizens of the right to join together and act as they wish to act for themselves, instead of taking orders from someone else.

Mr. IVES. Let us get the situation clearly in mind. The Senator from Ohio is speaking of the rights of the individual member of a local union, as opposed to the rights under industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. No; I am speaking of the joint rights of a union; not the rights of the individual.

Mr. IVES. I understand. But from what the Senator from Ohio has said, it seems to me that nothing that is contemplated in connection with the proposals now before us will in any way, shape, or manner force a local union to depart from the parent organization.

Mr. TAFT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. IVES. The pending proposal would permit the local union to do that.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Very well. Then, to that extent, the proposal will not stop in any way, shape, or manner industry-wide bargaining of the type which the Senator from Ohio has been deploring.

Mr. TAFT. That is right.

Let me say that I am not deploring it. I am saying that it can be brought, or may eventually be brought, if pressed to a conclusion, to constitute a serious threat to the people of the United States. As the Senator from New York knows, in our bill we have provided that that subject shall be studied by the committee, and I think it should be studied.

The question is, Does the monopoly control of wages, which is brought about by industry-wide bargaining, present a real threat? That is the question I have in mind, and the solution has not been determined as yet. I am not prepared to say that it presents a threat at the present time. What I said to the Senator was that I thought there was danger of its reaching such a point that it would constitute a threat.

Mr. IVES. I think the Senator and I are very much in agreement in our observations in regard to this matter. The only difference is that the Senator thinks the amendment proffered will accomplish the desired result, and I do not think so.

Mr. TAFT. I think it will accomplish the one purpose, that is all, of preventing an international union from dictating to every member of its union, to all the locals in its union, exactly what they must do in dealing with their particular employer. I think such dictation denies the whole theory of collective bargaining. There cannot be any collective bargaining if the employees of a particular employer are forbidden to sit down with their employer and reach an agreement.

Mr. IVES. No one will argue about that in theory, but let us get down to the practical side of the matter. Can the Senator imagine for one instant a local in a strong international set-up, even though the local might find itself in such a position that its condition would be slightly impaired by an agreement which might be reached—can the Senator imagine a local that would tear itself away for the purpose of a local collective bargaining agreement, when it belongs to a sound, good, international union?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; there were 10 or 12 unions which did that in Ohio, at great loss to themselves in money, and in the time and difficulty of getting themselves finally recognized as a different union.

Mr. IVES. That may be true in that particular instance. What was the international?

Mr. TAFT. The United Steelworkers.

Mr. IVES. I have already indicated that I do not consider that a typical example of the problem with which we are now dealing. We must recognize that we have such a problem; I do not think anyone will deny it; but, according to my judgment, we have not in the pending amendment found the solution by which to meet that problem. For instance, in the coal industry the amendment would do little or no good at all, and certainly the coal industry is a great deal more fundamental and more basic in this country than is steel.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the effect in the coal industry would be that if the employees of a certain mine wished to organize into a union separate from the United Mine Workers, if they had an election and voted against joining the United Mine Workers, they would be recognized. Today they would not be recognized. Under the present law they are absolutely at the mercy of the United Mine Workers, whether they want to be or not. For instance, in Illinois the United Mine Workers do not care what particular mines vote; they put them into one district organization.

Mr. IVES. But the chances are that that would not happen more than once in a hundred times.

Mr. TAFT. It has happened.

Mr. IVES. It has happened, and a union has actually broken away, but the ones which would take advantage of this are the very ones which would break away in any event.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with the Senator. We have evidence of the particular things which have happened. We have the evidence of something which made it possible to bring about an absolute, national wage pattern last year, which I think was distinctly inflationary, and in many cases distinctly unjust. We do have a particular case. The steel industry is typical of present organizations. The United Auto Workers are typical of present organizations. These are the things with which we are dealing, and in dealing with them we are not in any way interfering with industries which desire to continue collective bargaining because they want to do it, and not because they have been forced to do it.

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The strange thing is that the Senator and I see this problem in exactly the same way, but we are very far apart, in this instance, in finding the answer. What I am afraid of is that in what is being attempted here we are encouraging the local set-up, the local organization, to break away. What is proposed would destroy responsibility, which is basic in labor organizations. The Senator may say, "Yes, the responsibility of the local will be broken." Presumably they might all be taken out of international or national organizations, or parent organizations, and the responsibility be placed on the local level also to that extent. But where would organized labor itself, where would trade-unionism in this country wind up on that kind of a basis, and where would our economy wind up, with industry organized as it is today?

Mr. TAFT. When men organize, I do not see why they should not organize with this condition imposed, just as well as with anything else. As a matter of fact, when the United Steelworkers organized their plants, they persuaded the workers they should join the union. That is all the workers knew about it. They did not know what the conditions of organizations were, they did not know what the constitution of the union provided. Whether this provision is in the law or not, it seems to me just as easy to organize a new plant. I cannot see any reason at all—even though a few unions break away, where they are entitled to break away—why it is going to do any harm to unionism.

It seems to me that its result will be to make union leaders more reasonable. That is what we are trying to do. So long as they have the power they have had, they are bound to make unreasonable demands, and they have made them. One of the purposes of the bill, as I see it, the Senator's bill as well as mine, is to cut that power down somewhat.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. To this extent we cut it down, but we do not destroy it. We merely restore it to a point where the national union will have to be reasonable in their demands, and not force a strike at the drop of a hat merely because they can do it, when they think that by doing it on a national scale they can force the employers to agree to something which the workers could not get by reasonable and direct collective bargaining.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Fully agreeing with a portion of what the Senator has said about the situation which sometimes results from the unreasonable demands on the part of certain labor leaders, I wish to say that it has been my observation that not only do unreasonable demands come from that source, but also extremely reasonable demands. Without those labor leaders, and without that type of leadership in labor—I think the Senator will readily agree that, by and large, the big, sound, honest-to-goodness labor leaders far exceed in number those who are not—organized labor, and labor as a whole in this country, never could have made the progress it has made It is that very thing about which I am disturbed in connection with the pending amendment. It tends to tear down that kind of a condition.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the power of labor unions has never been affected until recently by the particular method the amendment seeks to destroy. Their power was built up by persuasion, by direct organization, by the assistance of the Wagner Act guaranteeing real collective bargaining. It was only to be expected that the effort of national leaders to dictate would develop in the case of an entire industry, and as to the locals in the industry, and we are trying to stop it now before it goes further. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. IVES. I realize what the purpose is. As I said at the very start of my questioning, I am in full accord with grappling with this problem, which must be solved. The condition which the Senator has cited must be corrected. But the things I have indicated in the questioning I have posed and the statements I have made occasion me to doubt extremely that what is proposed is the right answer. I feel that in the proposal we have before us there is a definite possibility for much more harm than good. I do not think we have the answer. We know what the problem is, that is one thing, but I do not think we have the answer as yet, and I see no point in attempting something the effect of which we know nothing about at the present time, and can only guess.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New York several times has indicated that he thought the situation in the International Steelworkers Union and the auto workers union was in a way unique in labor organizations. I should like to call his attention to a survey of the constitutions of international unions. It does not by any means cover all of them. It is found in volume 4 of the House hearings, exhibit No. 7, page 2632, in which are listed some twenty-odd internationals, virtually every one of which has provisions in its international constitution which make it impossible for any local union to negotiate and agree on any contract with its employer without the approval of the international. In some cases they cannot even negotiate without getting prior approval.

It seems to me that kind of a trend is increasing steadily in this field.

I know that the teamsters union, for instance, will not permit any local to negotiate a contract that is not in accord with the international's policy. I know that in my home city there is a receiver over the teamsters union, who has been there for years. They have not had an election in the local in Minneapolis for a long time. In Des Moines, the teamsters international has had a receiver for 7 years.

To me, it is not democratic trade-unionism; it is not voluntary association and collective bargaining, through representatives of their own choosing, when the local union is completely controlled by someone appointed by the international.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator wish to answer the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. IVES. I do.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose.

Mr. IVES. I simply want to point out that I am acquainted with quite a number of the contracts to which reference has been made, and with quite a number of the regulations and bylaws of the parent organization. I agree with the Senator in his statement of the problem, but the point I am trying to stress

in this discussion is that what is proposed is not the answer. It may be necessary to go into the conditions existing in the parent organization and straighten them out, if it can be done on that level. I do not know whether it can be done. But certainly by incorporating in our system a condition which will encourage the disintegration of the parent organization itself, no contribution is made toward a sound answer to the problem.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for one comment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Labor organizations and unions enjoy a great many privileges and immunities under the law, on the theory that they are voluntary associations. How can they be voluntary associations when it is necessary to have a few international leaders dictating to all the locals, sometimes dictating terms of membership, saying who can belong and who cannot, appointing receivers of local unions, when they disagree with decisions of the men at the working level? To me that is the complete opposite of a voluntary association, and I think it is about time the unions got back to a little voluntariness.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I will not disagree for one moment, Mr. President, with what has been said by the Senator from Minnesota. That is not the proposition as I see it at all. Nobody will quarrel with that. But as I pointed out in the exchange of comments with the Senator from Ohio, a great deal of good has come over a period of time from that very same process; more good than harm. What I am stressing is that the reply, the answer, the solution, or the suggested solution which is now before the Senate is not such at all.

Mr. PEPPER rose.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on page 51 of the report there is summarized, I think, very clearly the effect of the amendment, as follows:

> These amendments require the Board to certify as bargaining agents unions containing only the employees of a single employer, or of different employers in the same metropolitan district or county, thus preventing the certification of a national or international union.

I wish to put two or three cases to the able Senator. First, I have seen in the press the statement that a certain citizen of this country is chairman of the board of one large railroad and has the controlling stock in another large railroad. I assume that that individual, having control of two railroads, can fix one policy for both railroads. Under this amendment would it not be true——

Mr. TAFT. However——

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator kindly let me finish?

Mr. TAFT. However, the stockholders of one railroad may depart from that at any time they wish.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am assuming, Mr. President, that the financial reports are correct, and that this gentleman controls the policy of two major railroads. What I am disposed to ask the able Senator is, Would it be fair under his amendment for one management to control two railroads, and to lay down the policies of each and of both at the same time, whereas the unions cannot organize their effort, they cannot bargain collectively with the two railroads under a single management? So there is singleness of management control and power, but a double and divided authority on the part of the workers. I want to ask the Senator if he thinks that is conducive in the first place to a fair wage level for the workers, and if it is a fair policy for the Congress to adopt.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly the same thing may be done by unions. Mr. Reuther may be elected president of the General Motors employees, he may be elected president of the Chrysler employees, he may be elected president of the Ford employees. The same man may be president of all three unions, if the unions wish to have that particular set-up.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. And he would have exactly the same control over two unions as some man theoretically might have by controlling the stock of two companies. I do not see that there is anything parallel in the two cases.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me ask the Senator whether he thinks the analogy is correct. In the case he put, if Mr. Reuther represents two labor unions, there is nothing in the law that Congress has passed—and we are not called upon to pass such a statute—that would forbid the two managements getting together to meet the two labor organizations, welded into one.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. But here, the Senator from Ohio is barring the two labor unions from acting together against the same management.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. We have not barred two labor unions acting together at all. That is the effect of the Hartley bill, but that is not the effect of the pending Senate bill. Those two unions may both be controlled by one man, just as a railroad might be controlled by one entity. As a matter of fact, a man cannot be a director of two railroads at the same time, without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not saying the gentleman is a director; I am saying that because of his stock holdings he controls the two railroads. I wanted to ask the Senator, under the amendment that he is now asking the Senate to adopt, whether two labor unions could choose the same bargaining agent, as they could under the present law? In the case the Senator put, the two railroads could choose the same bargaining agent, or the two automobile companies could choose the same bargaining agent to negotiate against Mr. Reuther, if he, in fact, be one person representing two unions.

Mr. TAFT. The two unions can get together and designate an international union as their bargaining agent. They can take the authority away from other unions, and they can make it their agent for the purpose of bargaining and signing the contract if they want to do so. It is not the officially certified agent of the National Labor Relations Board, so they may revoke that authority and sign a contract themselves, if they wish, exactly as a railroad may designate a man to bargain for them and then may terminate his agency and sign any other contract they themselves want to sign.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator then is permitting them to do indirectly what he says he is not permitting them to do directly?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no.

Mr. PEPPER. I see nothing to be gained from giving them a sort of morganatic-wife status, instead of being a bargaining representative properly certified by the National Labor Relations Board, which is at present possible under the law.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator has missed the point. I tried to explain that the purpose is to prevent one union from coercing another union from doing something the other union does not want to do. That is the only purpose; and neither a worker nor a company can force some other company to do that, so far as I know. I cannot think of circumstances under which it could successfully be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator meant to say exactly what he said, that the purpose of the amendment is to forbid one union from forcing another union to do what it does not want to do. That is not what this is aimed to accomplish, if I correctly understand it.

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly its aim.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me ask the Senator if he really means that? I thought he had been telling us that he wants to prevent the management of a national union from bringing one of the locals of the same union into line with the national policy.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I just said.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator said it in language that was so broad it might apply to one union dissociated from another union in an international organization.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, we make it an unfair labor practice for any union, whether it be a national union or whether it be an entirely different national affiliation, to coerce a union representing the employees of a particular employer to do something they do not want to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield further to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. May we examine what is likely to be, and what it seems to me will inevitably be, the effect of that policy? Let us take, in the present case, for example, the United Mine Workers. I am not schooled in the knowledge of

mining, but I assume that in the mining of coal costs are relatively the same in a great many areas, and, at least if there were a weak union that represented the workers in a given mine and the management of that single mine were able to beat down or to persuade the workers or the union representing the workers in that mine to a low wage scale, that that mine owner or management would have a competitive advantage perhaps in the same neighborhood or the same general area over another competitor who was either disposed to pay his workers a fair wage or who happened to have a strong union representing the workers in his mine. Is not that the effect of the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. No. The very ones who receive the lowest wage would be the easiest ones to organize. So the harder the employer is on his workers the easier it is for the union to organize them. As I stated to the Senator from New York, I do not think the amendment would have any effect in depressing wages below the standard wages.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the present law and the policy of the National Labor Relations Board, the union workers in a given mine may certify the national union as its bargaining agent. Is it not conducive to more of a uniform wage throughout the country to have that policy than the policy the Senator from Ohio now proposes, which is to make it possible for each group of employees to make their own separate contracts without paying any attention to the admonitions or the persuasions of the national union which is trying to keep a uniform wage scale in effect generally throughout the country?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. President, let us consider another case, a case in which the United Auto Workers insisted upon their local union following the national union's particular rules, regardless of what the local union wanted to do, and how such a method would completely kill the whole theory of collective bargaining. This is the case of the Fafnir Bearing Co., a small company in New Britain, Conn., which had had about a 9 weeks' strike. I read from the statement of Mr. Cooper, executive vice president of the company, as follows:

> We had offered 15 cents, and the discussion centered around that and the union's 18½-cent demand.
>
> The international representative was called in. The international union was the bargaining agent.
>
> Mr. Cooper quoted him as follows:
>
> There will be no contract signed with this management for less than the 18½-cent figure. Neither the local nor any staff member has the authority for settling for less than that.
>
> My proposal is 18½ cents across the board. I don't think I am breaching a confidence when I say we are going to deal shortly with the bearings industry. * * *
>
> On this question of wages, I can only emphasize that 18½ cents is the minimum for which we can settle. I don't want to appear arbitrary. I am merely outlining our position taken by the highest authority in the union. That is the policy.

And later the same representative of the international said, as quoted by Mr. Cooper:

> I don't want to be boring. I told you quite frankly that the position of the international union, whether you want to recognize that as binding on you, is the fact that we have established the 18½-cent pattern nationally. The local representative of the union cannot sign for less than that figure.

The international representative further said:

> You are dealing with the international union that has a certain policy on a given subject, just like on the question of incentives, enunciated at a recent conference. They said there could be no extension of pay on that basis; that this plant was a day-rate plant, and if you wanted to put incentives in, we would not agree. It is an impossibility for the local committee to agree to any form of payment in the plant that does not conform with the existing formula.

Here is an international union attempting to say in this case to a local union in its plant, and to the employer, "We insist that you can have no incentive system whatever in this business. Maybe you can have no piece rate." They absolutely insist upon a national pattern. They refuse to permit the employees, even though they think they could obtain more money under the incentive system, to be parties to it. The employees are forbidden to strike or work out their own problem with the particular employer, and try out a plan which may be perhaps worked out between them. That is the kind of arbitrary action by an international union which, it seems to me, we must stop if we are going to give any body or substance or meaning to the theory of the Wagner Act that we are trying to create bona fide collective bargaining between an employer and his employees.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason for that policy on the part of the international labor organization has been to try to present a pattern so as to preserve something like a decent living wage for the workers where there was similarity of situation. But nearly all the unions, if not all of them—I know it is true of most of them—have recognized regional differences. For instance, the workers in the South have not been paid the same high wage that the workers have been paid in the North. I regret that. As a matter of fact, I am sick and tired of hearing it said that the southern worker is not worth as much as the northern worker. I do not want southern industry to grow up at the expense of sweatshop wages or with that inducement. But, Mr. President, the unions do recognize that the cost of living is perhaps perceptibly lower, and today they recognize regional differences.

The Senator from Ohio is not satisfied with that. He wants to give the workers in each mine, the workers for each employer, for each management, regardless of the effect of that policy upon industry generally, the right to deal separately with their employers. The inevitable effect of that policy will be to make nothing but a hodgepodge out of the national wage scale, and the lowest will always pull down the level of the highest. It will means the demoralization of the wage levels of this country. It will give the employer who is willing to gain an advantage over his competitor at the expense of his workers an added access to the markets of the country and an unfair competitive advantage, and it will destroy the strength of the national labor unions, which has been the leverage which has pulled up the wage scale and the standard of living of the workers of the country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we do not deprive the national unions of the power to do what they have heretofore done if they wish to do it by the means they have always used. They can do it by persuasion. If their reasoning is correct, Americans can be persuaded. They can be persuaded to stand up and insist on their honest rights if they know what their rights are. The international unions have spread their power, and justifiably so, by educating the men to what they should have, and encouraging them to get it, and backing them up with funds and assistance. But this is a new feature which has developed in labor in this country in which the international union threatens and coerces the members of the local union to do exactly what some boss at the head of the international union tells them they must do, and if they do not do it they are fined, their charter is taken away from them, their funds are seized by the international union, a receiver is installed, and the whole thing operated by the international union. Those are the methods we are trying to stop. Certainly, it seems to me the international unions have made great headway under the collective-bargaining provisions of the Wagner Act. They have made headway by the power of persuasion, by the power of education, by the willingness of the men who want to cooperate with them, and that is the proper way for them to do. It is the only sound way for them to make progress. I think that depriving them of these arbitrary weapons will in the end only result in strengthening the unions and will not break down in any way the fair wage scales the unions want to obtain. If they no longer have arbitrary power, perhaps they will take proper account of the men in different industries and in different sections of the country.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I understand from what the Senator from Ohio has said, that the real purpose then of this part of the amendment is to discipline the parent organization to such an extent that its hold over the subordinate is largely eliminated. That is about what it mounts up to in the final analysis, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. It aims at improper methods of control, such as control by threats, control by coercion. The exercise of

such power does not represent the history of the unions. Unions have controlled by persuasion. They have persuaded men that their interest was to join the union and stay with the union, and unless they did so they would not succeed. The unions did not create the series of abuses we now have to deal with which have brought this bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. I simply want to become clear in my own mind as to exactly what the Senator from Ohio is driving at, to make sure I am correct. The purpose is the elimination of the authority of the parent organization over the subordinate organization. As soon as we get that point fairly well cleared up between us we will know better where we stand. Personally I do not think that doing that is going to produce the result we are seeking. It may produce one thing we are after, but it will create a number of other conditions which we certainly do not want.

I think the debate this afternoon, as I have followed it, has taken another pattern. If I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio, it is his idea that this amendment does not outlaw, and is not intended in any way to outlaw or limit, industry-wide bargaining. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask another question. If that be the situation, what is the reason for the provision in the amendment restricting the bargaining unit to a single metropolitan district or county?

Mr. TAFT. That seems to me to be perfectly obvious. What is it that gives control to the international union? Two things. One is its constitution, to which I have referred. The other is that it has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the bargaining agent for the little company in Middletown, Ohio, for example, which happens to have a local union. The local union can be disregarded. The international union can sign any contract it wishes to sign, regardless of what the local people want. That is one method of control.

The other method is through coercion, through threats to throw unfon members out of the union, fine them, or do something else to them under the constitution.

Mr. IVES. Nevertheless, the Senator points out in the course of this discussion obvious ways to get around that very condition.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think so.

Mr. IVES. It is perfectly obvious, as the result of this discussion, that there is nothing in the amendment to stop industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. I am not trying to stop industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. IVES. I understand.

Mr. TAFT. I am trying to stop the arbitrary power of the international union to make local unions stop bargaining collectively with their employers. I am trying to get back to the original plan of the Wagner Act, in which members of the union were supposed to sit down with the employer and reach an agreement with him. The Wagner Act never recognized a unit larger than the employer. It did not prohibit Nation-wide bargaining, any more than does this amendment. It is perfectly legal if the unions want it. They have a perfect right to engage in it. Presumably, in many industries where they have done so, they will continue to engage in it.

Mr. IVES. When the Wagner Act was before Congress for consideration I do not think the question of industry-wide bargaining had been before the country to any great extent. We know that the whole question of contracts goes back 60 years. Contracts and agreements were made on that basis in the late 1830's. But the thing which has evolved as a result of the Wagner Act, through the process of collective bargaining itself and the machinery created by the Wagner Act for that purpose, is the over-all broadening of the approach in collective bargaining. This has come about as a very natural result of conditions which existed, and which in the first instance brought about industry-wide bargaining in certain great industries such as the glass industry, the pottery industry, and a number of others. So it is a natural consequence of the growth of our economy.

The problem with which we are confronted in dealing with that condition, as I see it, is the effect on the economy where monopoly is concerned. If the purpose behind the amendment is to reach monopoly, that is one thing. Apparently that is not the purpose, because this amendment would not stop it. It is possible to get around the amendment, because it applies only to collective bargaining itself.

On the other hand, if the purpose is to discipline parent organizations and destroy their influence and control over local organizations, that is another thing. I fear that that would completely destroy the entire plan.

Mr. TAFT. I have stated the purpose over and over again. I do not suppose that I could make it more clear. The amendment does not affect Nation-wide bargaining or industry-wide bargaining. The purpose is stated clearly on page 51 of the report. The purpose is to give local unions the right, first, to bargain with their employers if they wish to do so; and, in the second place, to give them the right to decide for themselves what they want to contract for, without being dictated to by anyone else. I do not think I could state the purpose more clearly than I have stated it.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to point out one thing, and that is that it was not so many years ago, as I recall, that we were trying our best, in large areas in this country, to encourage industry-wide bargaining of the type we are discussing here because it was believed that it would produce a standardization of wages and working conditions which might be desirable, and thereby produce an understanding and a feeling of appreciation on the part of employers and employees of their respective obligations, difficulties, and responsibilities, and of everything else that goes to make up labor relations. Not very long ago we were encouraging this very thing. That is another thing that this type of approach may go a long way toward destroying.

Mr. TAFT. We have encouraged many things. We have encouraged them to such an extent that a bill is now necessary to discourage them. That does not particularly apply to industry-wide bargaining, but certainly it is no argument against the amendment.

As I have said over and over again, the amendment does not prohibit industry-wide bargaining. It merely provides that it may be undertaken only if the men and the unions concerned wish to undertake it. It cannot be forced on them by a national labor leader if the particular union does not wish to enter into it.

In that respect this amendment is in line with the general theory of our bill, equalizing the situation as between employer and employee. The employees of a particular company may bargain collectively on a national basis, a regional basis, or any other basis if they so desire. They do not have to do so if they do not so desire—just as a particular coal mine company may bargain collectively on a national basis if its owners desire it; but if they do not wish to do so, they are not compelled to bargain on such a basis. All this amendment does is to try to restore equality, to try to restore the original theory of the Wagner Act, which contemplated that the employees of one employer should deal with the employer, and that collective bargaining should take place between them unless both of them decided to enter into a Nation-wide agreement. That is the condition which will be restored by this amendment and that is the condition which I think was contemplated in the Wagner Act. I think it is the only kind of condition which applies Nation-wide bargaining in the way it ought to be applied, on a voluntary basis, and not on a compulsory basis.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Ohio to say that the Wagner Act does not prohibit local bargaining?

Mr. TAFT. The Wagner Act contemplated collective bargaining. The Board decided whether the bargaining should be on a department, plant, employer, or craft-unit basis. That was up to the Board to decide. The largest unit the Board could fix, so far as the language of the act was concerned, was the employer unit. Subsequently, the Board held that if a number of employers had voluntarily associated themselves together an employer unit could be said to be a multi-employer unit. That definition has been accepted although I do not think it was the original idea of the authors of the Wagner Act.

Mr. MALONE. But, as the Senator interprets the Wagner Act, it was up to the National Labor Relations Board to decide the type of bargaining, and, if the Board so desired, it could allow such local bargaining under the act.

Mr. TAFT. The usual pattern for certification by the Board today is that of the employees of a particular company. There are not very many multi-employer

units. The number of such units outside the metropolitan districts is limited. However, under the terms of the amendment, such units could no longer be certified as bargaining agents. However, those certified to the various companies might join together voluntarily and bargain with the employers, acting voluntarily.

Mr. MALONE. But that could be done under the Wagner Act if the proper attitude were taken by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean Nation-wide bargaining or industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. MALONE. I mean local bargaining with the industry.

Mr. TAFT. We are trying to get back to local bargaining. Today in many cases craft units are certified, and the bargaining takes place between a small group of employees and their employer. In other cases the employees of one plant are certified, and they deal with the employer. In other cases, as in the glass industry, the employees of 7 or more plants of one employer are certified as one bargaining agent, and the bargaining is between the company and all its employees, or representatives of all its employees. It is up to the Board to decide, up to that point, whether it will be the bargaining agent.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In setting up a new board, which we hope will be as contemplated by this bill, and taking the rights of both sides into consideration, could a new and, we will say, an unbiased board, taking the attitude laid down in this bill, allow such bargaining without this amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, certainly, indeed, the Board can do that now. It has not very much to say about it. The only way we limit the Board is to say that it cannot certify an international unit as the bargaining agent for a group of employees who are dealing with a particular company.

Mr. President, I do not want to continue this discussion indefinitely. I think I have said all that I care to say. I believe that this measure places the whole question of collective bargaining on an equal basis and puts the employer and the labor unions on an even footing; and that is necessary, if we are to permit men in this country to decide their own lives, to have something to say about their own lives, and not be dictated to by others.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to remark, with reference to the proposed amendment, that, like many other things in this bill, the amendment in itself can destroy the labor movement, because, if a national labor organization has no power to impose sanctions of any kind upon a subsidiary union how can it hold together? When a local branch of the union joins the national union it expects to receive certain benefits, such as the extra prestige and power which go with belonging to the mother union. The national union can hire lawyers, which the little union cannot afford to do, and have headquarters to carry on educational activities and one thing and another. So that the local union expects to share in such benefits. If the parent organization has no power to discipline the local organization at all, to revoke its charter, or even take its funds if it disobeys the rules and regulations laid down by the parent organization which it knew about when it joined the parent union—if the parent union has no power to do those things, it would disintegrate completely. It is very similar to the case of the red-and-white chain stores, for example. Those who organized the chain insist that the buying be done en bloc, the individual stores receiving the benefit of it. But the parent organization insists that they must have certain counters in the stores and that they must sell at certain prices. They are restricted in many ways. The stores must be kept clean and painted a certain way. If that is not done the proprietors are kicked out. I imagine, although I cannot say for sure, that they demand sometimes a deposit as penalty in case they are kicked out, so they will know they have some security under the chain organization and that an individual store proprietor cannot decide all of a sudden that he is going to pull out without any penalty being attached. That strikes me as being similar, in effect, to the pending proposal in its relation to labor unions. The owner of the plant can go to the union and say, "Listen. The demand is falling off for this product. If you boys will chisel on these fellows a little bit, I will chisel on my profits a little bit, and we will keep going and will close up these other fellows."

It is the object of the national union to treat everyone the same and make it impossible for workers or management to chisel on anyone and lower the standard of living, which also lowers the other fellow's standard of living, which can very well lead us into a depression on down the spiral. If we take one step in that direction and everyone chisels on everyone else, it could very well take us down to the depths.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In labor relations of the past few years has it not been one of the causes of complaint that the local unions could not be disciplined by the national unions? They say, "The local union does it, but we have no control over them whatever. They are allowed to do that." I know there has been quite a little complaint about the fact that a local union might take a certain position entirely contrary to the position taken by the national union.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct. We would have no stability at all if this amendment were passed because the local union could strike and could do anything it pleased. The parent organization would have no power to discipline them. There would be no cohesion at all. We would have economic chaos in this country with an economy which became so tightly handicapped.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

SENATORS SHOULD KNOW CONTENTS OF THIS LABOR BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there was a time in the history of legislative bodies when every measure presented for consideration had to be read three times. It was a very good rule because it then made certain that at least those members who were independent would know the contents of the bill which was proposed to be voted upon. That was the rule in the old British Parliament for many years.

But the time came when Government control over Parliament became so strong that it was deemed a waste of time to have the clerk read the bills which were to be acted upon. Because the King and his Prime Minister knew precisely what they were going to do, and because they had complete control over the legislative body, no one paid much attention to the reading of the bills the first, second, or third time, and it was a practice which fell into complete disuse.

When Thomas Jefferson became Vice President of the United States and then, for the first time, presided over this body as President of the Senate, he expressed the view, as I recall, that while three readings of a bill were formerly necessary, at least it would be possible to read them twice by title alone. However the rule of the Senate until approximately 1914 required three separate readings of bills.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator imply that it was a result of a failure to observe that rule that we now do not get as good laws as we got when that rule was in operation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I am not making any such implication. I shall make the application to this bill. I venture to make the statement, Mr. President, that many of us who have already made up our minds about this bill do not know the contents of the measure.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the point. I was going to suggest that some famous statesman in England pointed out a short time ago that anyone could drive a coach-and-four through any law passed by the British Parliament, as the result of failure to understand what was being legislated upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I believe a coach-and-four can be driven through this bill. I undertake to say to the Senate that unless the Members of this body read this bill they will be doing their part in placing upon the statute books of the United States a measure which will promote the concentration of government, which is a condition against which most of those Members of Congress who are urging the adoption of this bill were eloquently declaiming against during the last campaign.

EXPANDS THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, it has been said that one of the characteristics of the juvenile mind is the capacity to believe in two absolutely contrary propositions at the same time. I suggest to the Members of the Senate, particularly to my friends upon the other side of the aisle who are insisting upon driving this measure through the Senate, that this bill creates and expands and enlarges the "big government" against which they have been orating so extensively. We have heard many criticisms of the New Deal. We have heard many political orations about the terrible folly of the New Dealers who were expanding the powers of Government. I would be the last person to deny that the powers of Government were expanded during the New Deal. There is no question at all about that, Mr. President. But what I am pointing out this afternoon is that we are going even farther than the New Deal ever attempted to go, and we are now about to pass a measure in the fond hope that it will have the result of curing the admitted evils of our labor-management relations, whereas a frank, honest, unprejudiced review of the bill before us will make it clear that it will not do anything of the kind. The inconsistencies which are revealed here day after day, Mr. President, are enough to astonish the prudent mind.

MAKING A RECORD OF INCONSISTENCIES

Yesterday the Senate passed an appropriation bill in which the Senate considered the fund which was to be allocated to the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of having it administer national labor relations. What happened? The majority of this body, in conformity with the action taken by the House of Representatives, being intent upon cutting expenditures, without regard to what those expenditures are to be devoted to, undertook to cut down the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board; and yet we now have before us a bill which enlarges the National Labor Relations Board and places new responsibilities upon it.

Mr. President, do Senators wonder why I say that a characteristic of the juvenile mind is to advocate passionately two contrary propositions at the same time? And, Mr. President, this is not the first occasion during the present session when that has happened. Of course, it is not the first occasion during recent years when that has happened. A year ago, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress passed the Congressional Reorganization Act. The Congress did that because the country was convinced that by a modification of procedure in the Congress it should be possible to streamline and make more efficient the legislative action of the House of Representatives and the Senate. I suggest to Senators and I suggest to those who are in the galleries, looking down here, that if they look around the Chamber this afternoon and observe the empty seats, they should realize that these empty seats do not represent neglectful Senators—not at all. They are vacant because Members of the Senate, in violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act, are attending committee sessions instead of attending the sessions of the Senate. It is true that the law provides that committees may not sit during the sessions of the Senate except by leave of the Senate. So, Mr. President, every day, when the Senate session is about to begin, or every evening when the Senate session is about to conclude, some Senator rises in his place and says, "Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on So and So may sit today during the session of the Senate"—or "may sit tomorrow during the session of the Senate." So, Mr. President, while we are supposed to be considering a measure which deals with one of the most fundamental issues of our time, Members of the Senate disappear from the Chamber and go into committee sessions where they are attempting to deal with other problems equally difficult and equally important to the people of the United States.

What is the explanation of that situation, Mr. President? I can speak from knowledge, because I first gazed upon the Senate in session as long ago as March 1917. Because of one of the soto voce remarks of one of my colleagues here, I wish the RECORD to show that at that time I was a young man; I did not then have the gray beard that I now wear. [Laughter.] But, Mr. President, Senators were in attendance on the Senate sessions in those days. Senators then paid attention to the debates in the Senate, and Senators read the bills. They knew what sort of laws they were placing upon the statute books and what they were going to call upon the people of the United States to endure.

THE TREND TOWARD CENTRALISM

The change has come about, Mr. President, because of the progress of centralism. There has been a steady drift toward central power which has deprived the people in their local communities, in their several States, even in regions, of the power, first, to make their living without the consent or the direction of some economic power in a central city; and, second, of the power, likewise, to govern themselves.

The result of it has been that a great lot of demands have turned here to Washington, for the Washington Government to do things which a few years ago were being done in the local communities. But now, Mr. President, it makes little difference what the proposition is, the people turn to Washington for action by the Central Government, and because they do, every committee of the Senate and every committee of the House is confronted with scores and scores of bills which affect the economic life and the political life of the people of the United States all through the land, and we no longer have the decentralized economic life or the decentralized political life to which we have been as a people dedicated.

Mr. President, I have said that the bill before us increases the responsibility of the central government, and it is a perfectly simple matter to demonstrate. The bill before us, in my judgment, is a congeries of inconsistencies. Title II is entitled "Mediation and Emergencies." I shall not read section 1, but I shall substitute for the clerk and read section 2 of title II, a provision which has not yet been read to the Senate of the United States. I do this though many of the Senators who should be listening and who should read this section are absent at committee meetings, attending to business which is quite as important. I wish that I, for example, could at this moment be in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which is dealing with the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior. Witnesses are before that committee in the Appropriations Committee room at this moment, discussing the action of the House of Representatives when it eliminated completely the appropriation for the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior, a division which is attempting to coordinate the petroleum activities of the Federal Government, and improve conditions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. O, Mr. President, why should I take Senators away from their work? I made the remark I just uttered only because I wanted those who are in the galleries to know that the Senate is not neglectful. The Senate is just overworked, because we have permitted a condition to arise in this country in which every community and every State turns to Washington, and there is not time enough in the day or time enough in the year to do our job. But since the distinguished Senator from Oregon is on his feet, I will say to him that the leadership of the party to which he gives his allegiance, we are told in the public press, is now devoting its attention so rapidly to drive bills through the Senate, that the Senate and the House can adjourn on the 31st of July, and leave the work of the people of the United States undone.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to discuss the bill, I should like to have as many of my colleagues present as possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator for the purpose he has suggested.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Knowland
Baldwin	Ecton	Langer
Ball	Ellender	Lodge
Barkley	Ferguson	Lucas
Brewster	Flanders	McCarran
Bricker	Fulbright	McCarthy
Brooks	George	McClellan
Buck	Green	McFarland
Bushfield	Gurney	McKellar
Butler	Hatch	McMahon
Byrd	Hayden	Malone
Cain	Hickenlooper	Martin
Capper	Hill	Maybank
Chavez	Hoey	Millikin
Connally	Holland	Moore
Cooper	Ives	Morse
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Downey	Kem	O'Conor
Dworshak	Kilgore	O'Daniel

O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Vandenberg
Overton	Stewart	Watkins
Pepper	Taft	Wherry
Reed	Taylor	Wiley
Revercomb	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Robertson, Wyo.	Thye	Wilson
Russell	Tobey	Young
Saltonstall	Tydings	
Smith	Umstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I made a mistake in yielding to the Senator from Oregon to call for a quorum, because I now have fewer Senators to address than when the quorum call was made. But again I say the Senators have retired to their committee tasks.

I was about to discuss the conflicts and the inconsistencies of the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. These inconsistencies are not only internal inconsistencies within the measure itself, but they are inconsistencies between the professions of the Republican majority during the last campaign and what they are now proposing to do.

Title II of the bill, believe it or not, Mr. President, sets up a new independent Government agency in Washington, to add to that great host of agencies which are here, eating out the substance of the taxpayers of the United States, to whom the Finance Committee of the Senate, acting under the direction of the majority of the Senate, is about to propose a little cut of the melon by way of the distribution of reduced taxes, out of the windfall created by inflation, which is increasing the receipts of the United States. But here we have a bill to create a new agency. Let me read section 202 (a):

> There is hereby created an independent agency to be known as the Federal Mediation Service (herein referred to as the "Service"). The Service shall be under the direction of a Federal Mediation Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director").

Mr. President, if Senators who have responded to the quorum call would prefer to retire to their committees and attend to important work, I would certainly appreciate it, rather than having them talk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator want us to understand that he is opposed to any mediation service?

BILL CREATES A NEW GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all; not at all. There is a Mediation Service in the Department of Labor now. But I am pointing out that a committee of Congress, majority control of which is in the Republican Party, by this bill is taking that service from the Department of Labor and creating a new agency. I propose to show in a moment how it is going to give it powers that will reach out into every corner of the land. No; of course, I do not say that; but I am merely pointing out, I will say to the Senator, that the bill emphasizes the evil from which we are suffering, which is too much government.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Surely.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator by implication wish to emphasize again the fact that we are adding to government by this process?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. IVES. Yet, at the same time, the Senator thinks we should have a Mediation Service, and he points out that we already have a Mediation Service?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me until I have finished my remarks——

Mr. IVES. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He will see that what I am trying to point out to the Senate is that we are now dealing with a fundamental problem, in the wrong way. Instead of seeking to decentralize the economic and political life of the country, we are concentrating it. I am not one to say, Mr. President, that there are not abuses in the labor field; I acknowledge them. I am not one to say that the Federal Government should not attempt to conciliate in disputes and should not attempt to settle strikes when they take place; of course not. I recognize these abuses, and I recognize the necessity of action by the Federal Government at Washington when we do not take the proper course, which is to decentralize, and if we do not decentralize, Mr. President, the effect is going to be the break-down of Government.

I shall undertake to show here that it will be physically impossible for the new Labor Relations Board and the new Mediation Service to do the things which are expected of them, and that we shall be doing a futile thing, just as last year when Congress passed the Reorganization Act it did a futile thing. Many public-spirited citizens, many editors of monthly magazines and weekly magazines and of newspapers were convinced that the streamlining of Congress would increase the efficiency of Congress. They said, "It will reduce the number of committees." I said, "The committees will subdivide and we will have more subcommittees in the last analysis than we had standing committees in the first place." That is precisely what has happened.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am a member, is holding a meeting this afternoon. I should be at that meeting. A subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is holding a meeting this afternoon. I should have been present. The subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill is holding a meeting this afternoon. I should have been present. But I could not be there and wait here on the floor of the Senate for an opportunity to make these observations which I desire to make upon this most important measure.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I think the situation the Senator has just pointed out cannot be charged to a fault in the Reorganization Act. Rather it is to be charged to the failure to observe the terms of the Reorganization Act by which it was intended or designed not to have committee meetings during the session of the Senate. I have observed, as the Senator from Wyoming has just pointed out, that that provision of the act is being absolutely disregarded by the chairmen of various committees, probably because they have to do so, getting up in the Senate day after day and requesting unanimous consent that their committees or subcommittees may meet during the session of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not because they have to do it, I will say to the Senator. It is because the plan of the majority is to hurry this session through and bring it to an end on the 31st of July, no matter what happens to the public business.

Mr. HATCH. Or the Reorganization Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Or the Reorganization Act. But, Mr. President, I have no intention of discussing the Reorganization Act. I want to discuss the important factors and aspects of the bill before us which adds to the power of the Central Government in a manner which I hope to be able to show will make its provisions perfectly impossible to carry out effectively.

I am returning to section 202 (a):

> The Service shall be under the direction of a Federal Mediation Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum—

Here, Mr. President, is a new Federal official at an increased salary. This is not the salary which is now paid to the head of the Federal Mediation Service in the Department of Labor. This is an increased salary proposed by a majority which is devoted to economy in Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this another bureau which is being set up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is another bureau being set up in Washington.

Mr. LUCAS. Bureaucrats, I assume, will come into the bureau?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. I continue to read from section 202 (a):

> The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum, together with necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, subject to the provisions of law applicable thereto, while away from the principle office of the service on official business. The Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

Mr. President, there is not a line in the bill to prescribe the qualifications of the Director—not a single word. He shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; he shall receive $12,000 and his necessary

expenses; but he shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Then—

The Director is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary—

And so forth. There is another clause, Mr. President, however, which says that the Director may—and I am now quoting—"without regard to the provision of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such conciliators and mediators as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Service. The Director is authorized to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as he deems necessary."

I have read the whole of this title to find out whether the economy-minded majority has placed any limitations upon the amount of money which may be expended by this new Federal official. I find no authorization here. I find only the explicit language:

The Director is authorized to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as he deems necessary.

Now, does language mean what it says? Or is there some recondite meaning of this sentence which has not yet been disclosed to us by the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me why the proponents of the bill are bypassing the Civil Service Commission in section 202?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suppose the thought is that the Director of the Federal Mediation Service should be permitted to select his own appointees. It may be that they have some thought of efficiency, or it may be that they are merely surrendering to the present drift toward central power. We have forgotten the old American theory of letting the people govern themselves, and we are turning rapidly to the foreign idea that we shall name some official and give him the power to say what should or should not be done. And if an official is to have that power why, of course, he should be able to select his conciliators and mediators without regard to the civil-service law. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that this is a provision as wide open as a barn door to political preferment.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is not the charge which the Senator is now making against the majority which is responsible for the bill, the very charge they have been making against the now minority, which was the majority for the last 10 or 12 years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. What I am pointing out is that this is a bill which makes big government bigger. I say that as one who for almost 14 years has been protesting against big government. I want to see the government of the people of the United States restored to the people in their local communities, but I know that that cannot be done until, first, we undertake to see that the centralism of big business shall not be permitted to control the economic lives of the masses of the people. That is the vice of the whole situation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to comment on the observations which the Senator has made thus far, and point out a few matters in the bill which I think have perhaps been misunderstood.

In the first place, I point out that in one sense of the word no new function of government is being established. What is actually occurring is a substitution in connection with an agency of Government, namely, the Conciliation Service, which is already in existence. So far as the Director himself is concerned, it was indicated by the Senator's remarks that there is perhaps no limit to the expenditures which might be made under the authority of the Director. However, I have always understood that the Director or head of any governmental agency is always bound by the limit of his appropriation, and to that extent he very definitely would be limited.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. He would be limited by an appropriation when one was made.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out one further matter, and then I shall desist. I think the Senator perhaps has the idea that the Director is the sole and final authority with respect to what he is to do. To a certain extent that is correct. However, if the Senator will turn to section 205 (a) on page 47, he will find there a provision for the creation of a national labor-management panel, to be composed of 12 members to be appointed by the President, 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management, and 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor. The position of this panel is very important in the establishment of the new mediation machinery. It will have a far-reaching effect, not only because of its position as an advisory group, but because of its actual influence on the Director and on the policy to be adopted by the new agency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I was about to come to that provision in reading the bill. There again we have some more Federal officials created by this measure, under the leadership of a party which has denounced the great number of Federal officials. One of the curious things about the bill is that it represents one of two conflicting ideas of the majority. The majority demands the reduction of appropriations and the discharge of Federal officials; and the next minute it comes to us with a bill which creates new Federal bureaus and requires the appointment of new Federal officials.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. IVES. Perhaps the Senator did not understand me. I tried to point out that the creation of this service is in itself a substitution. It is nothing new so far as function is concerned. I should like to point out in that connection that up to the present time, notwithstanding the excellent work which has been done in the field of mediation by the various agencies of the Federal Government and of the State governments, that field has only been touched so far as the exploration of the entire field is concerned. The great lack at the present moment in the field of mediation is measures by which we may prevent industrial strife as well as cure it after it has begun. That, of course, is contemplated under the new title.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not the Senator from New York acknowledge that there is no specific limitation in the bill upon the amount which may be authorized to be expended for this purpose?

Mr. IVES. I point out very definitely to the Senator from Wyoming that there is always a specific limitation in connection with any agency created by statute, and that is the limitation of the appropriation itself, which must be authorized before any agency of Government can begin to operate. I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming appreciates that fact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator misunderstands the method by which we act in the Congress of the United States. I recognize the ability, sincerity, and good faith of the Senator; but the procedure in the Congress of the United States is not to appropriate directly. It is to pass a bill authorizing a certain type or amount of appropriations in the first instance, and then later the Appropriations Committee decides whether or not that authorization shall be fulfilled, and to what extent. My point is that the usual procedure is to make provision in language something like this: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of ——— to carry out the purposes of this act." If the Senator will refer to the rules of the Senate, he will find that the Appropriations Committee is also limited.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is mistaken in thinking that statutes creating boards or offices usually contain limitations on expenditures in connection with the administration of the duties of the agency. As a rule, limitations on authorizations relate to public works, or distribution of money to States or otherwise. I believe that statutes which prescribe limitations on expenditures of the departments—for example, of the State Department, or any bureau of the State Department, or any other department—are very few and far between.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator from Ohio, I refer to rule XVI of the Rules of the Senate, as amended by the Reorganization Act:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session—

And so forth. The usual practice, as I have said, has been, first, to pass an authorization act, and then to make the appropriation. But that is a minor matter. What I am pointing out to the Senate is that the new bureaucratic agency which is being established as a substitute for service already being performed in the Department of Labor is broader, more complete, and more expensive than the service which is now available, and is an evidence of the broadening central power of the Government of the United States. Either we want to extend the power of the Government or we want to decentralize.

I read from subsection (c) of section 202:

The principal office of the Service shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Director may establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise.

Observe that sentence. The Director is given the authority—not his panel, not the President, not any other executive officer, but the Director. He has the authority to establish regional offices wherever he may desire to establish them, anywhere in the United States. Naturally that will involve expenditures; and every time the Director of the Service acts to establish a new regional office he lays upon the Appropriations Committee the moral obligation to appropriate whatever sums may be necessary to meet the obligations which the Director incurs.

Why are we talking about economy? Why are we talking about cutting down the expenditures of the Federal Government? Why are we talking about reducing the taxes to the taxpayers of the United States, if, in the same breath, we are trying to expand the personnel and the bureaus of the Federal Government?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out to the Senator that on his desk he may find an amendment which I am proposing which will be made, if it is adopted, a part of subdivision (3) of subsection (d) of section 8, on page 17, line 22, of the bill, and which will require that the agencies of the States or the Territories are to be notified in connection with any of these matters which come up involving new contracts.

The matter which the Senator is now calling to the attention of the Senate has been quite forcefully brought to the attention of some of us by some of the State governments, and an amendment of this type is found necessary and, I trust, will meet with the approval of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I congratulate the Senator on offering such an amendment, to let the officials of States who are to be affected know what is to be done by this new Federal bill. What I am suggesting is that if the Senator will read the bill he will find that there are innumerable other amendments which ought to be added. That is the reason I was one of those who voted to send this bill back to the committee. The measure is full of such provisions as, for example, with respect to the delegation of power. How often have we heard the delegation of executive power denounced, and properly so, Mr. President?

Here is a provision in this bill:

The Director may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any regional director or other officer or employee of the Service.

What are we to say now about the delegation of executive power?

INCREASES DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

One of the vices under which the people of the United States have suffered is that we have been willing to set up executive officers, give them power, and then let them delegate that power to whomsoever they may choose. The Senate of the United States will have to confirm the nominee, but it will not confirm any of the persons to whom he may delegate his power. Is that the proper way to legislate? I suggest that question, Mr. President, to the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Here we tell the people of the United States that we are creating a new bureau, the head of which shall be able to delegate any authority or discretion that he has to any other person whom he may choose. Talk about big government! Talk about executive authority! Here it is in the *n*th degree. Yet, Mr. President, I have no doubt that all over this country many citizens who honestly believe that there ought to be labor reform are supporting this measure because they believe it is reform, because they do not know what is contained in the measure to which the Members of the Senate are expected to give life by their votes. This is the way, Mr. President, to expand discretionary authority over the people of the United States.

Referring to section 203 (b), I will read from that section, as follows:

The Service—

This is the new bureau—

The Service may proffer its services in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute, whenever in its judgment such dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption of commerce. The Director and the Service are directed to avoid attempting to mediate disputes which would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce if State or other conciliation services are available to the parties.

Then I turn to the next page, and in subparagraph (d) of the same section I find this sentence:

The Service is directed to make its conciliation and mediation services available in the settlement of such grievance disputes only as a last resort and in exceptional cases.

So, Mr. President, here we create this great Bureau. We give to it this unlimited power. We allow the Director to say how much shall be spent, what obligations shall be assumed, and then we carefully hedge him about and say that while he must offer this conciliation he must be careful and he must in certain cases act only as a last resort.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator has described the unlimited power of the Director of the Mediation Service proposed in title II of the bill. Actually he has no power except to act as a mediator and try to bring all parties to a dispute together. He cannot compel either party to any dispute to do anything.

His unlimited power to spend funds, of course, as the Senator knows, being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, is strictly limited by what the Congress gives him to spend. This is the only title in the bill, particularly the Mediation Service, which is purely voluntary. It does not give anyone any power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator how he interprets the provision which I read a few moments ago, found in section 202 (c), which gives the Director the authority to establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise? Not where they are rising, but where they are likely to arise. He has that authority. What has the Senator to say about that power?

Mr. BALL. I would say to the Senator from Wyoming that every Federal service of which I know, regardless of whether such power is explicitly granted it in the statute relating to it, has established regional offices. Under the bill which we had before us yesterday, the United States Employment Service never had any explicit authority of law to establish regional offices, but it found that in order to perform its functions satisfactorily it needed to have regional offices.

I think a mediation office would not wish to send all its employees or members out from Washington every time there was a dispute. Naturally, it would establish regional offices in the areas in which disputes would be likely to arise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yet, Mr. President, one of the things we quarrel about year after year in the Appropriations Committee is the exercise by Government officials of that authority to set up regional offices, whereby the people of the United States in the various States have found among them scores of Federal employees working on cases just to keep themselves employed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I never heard the Senator from Wyoming argue against it in the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I argued against it in the committee long before the Senator from Minnesota was a member of the committee. I assure him of that.

Mr. BALL. I simply remind the Senator from Wyoming that in the bill which the Senate passed yesterday, the House knocked out the provision for regional offices for a number of agencies in the Social Security Administration and a number of agencies in the Department of Labor. We restored to the bureau or agency heads the discretion to use regional offices wherever they felt that was the most efficient way to do the job they had to do. As I recall, the Senator from Wyoming went along with that decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not fight it—no—because it was perfectly obvious that there was no chance to resist what the majority of the committee had made up their minds to do. I did sign the minority views, which were brought in on the floor of the Senate. But, as I recall, every amendment which was offered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was voted down.

Mr. BALL. But those amendments had nothing to do with regional offices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that. I am simply saying that our experience was such that there was no sense in wasting the time of the Senate by opposing those provisions.

Mr. BALL. Let me say that my mind was never made up in advance in regard to regional offices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that I am wasting my time in arguing about the measure now before the Senate.

The point I make—and it cannot be denied—is that the majority in control of the Committee on Labor have brought into the Senate a bill which expands "big government." In a little while, when I get around to it, I shall undertake to show that the present situation is such that it is impossible to resist that movement. In fact, let me show it now. Let me read from the report which the majority filed. I think the Senator from Minnesota joined in the report. On page 2 of the report I read the following paragraph:

> The need for congressional action has become particularly acute as a result of increased industrial strife. In 1945 this occasioned the loss of approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor through strikes. This total was trebled in 1946 when there were 116,000,000 man-days lost and the number of strikes reached the unprecedented figure of 4,985.

Mr. President, 4,985 strikes in a single year, when divided by 365 days in the year, means 13 strikes a day. Does anyone pretend to believe that it will be possible to set up in Washington a central bureau which will be capable of dealing with a problem of that magnitude? O Mr. President, before the Senator from Minnesota entered the Chamber just now, I said that I do not deny that there are abuses in organized labor which should be corrected. I do not object to labor legislation which will actually bring about reform, but I am saying to the Senate that the way to do that is to proceed through an understanding of the fact that in this day and age we are no longer dealing with individuals, but we are dealing with organizations; and until we in the Congress undertake to pass a law which will establish standards of action and standards of responsibility and standards of power on the part of labor organizations and industrial and economic organizations, we shall continue to multiply Government bureaus in Washington; and the more we multiply them, the more difficult it will be for them to carry on their labors.

Mr. President, the situation in these various bureaus is exactly the same as it is in the committees of the Senate, where we find it difficult to get enough members of the committee to assemble at a particular time in order to deal with the subject under consideration by the committee. That is a matter of common knowledge to every Member of the Senate.

CENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT BREAKING DOWN

I say to you that central government in Washington is breaking down both in the legislative branch and in the executive branch; and we are doing nothing for the people by multiplying Federal bureaus.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The concentration of government in Washington is not a New Deal procedure, but it is something which had been going on for many years before President Roosevelt came into power. I wish to call attention to the fact that even by President Hoover's time, the Government had accumulated 10 departments and 87 independent agencies, which regulated the packers, enforced the Food and Drug Act, pried into trading in grain futures, investigated mines, ran the Federal land banks, enforced prohibition, influenced the banking system of the Federal Reserve, attacked monopolies through the Federal Trade Commission, bought farm surpluses, meddled with the power industry, loaned money to banks and insurance companies, and made researches into almost everything under the sun from salmon to soil conditions. In other industrialized countries—notably England—the government has, for years, been moving further and further into the industrial field. That is the result of the concentration of business.

The Government cannot help setting up bureaus in Washington to regulate those huge industries. For instance, no one can successfully contend that the steel industry in the United States is a purely private concern.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is a private collective enterprise. I am glad the Senator from Montana has made that interruption.

But the Senator from Minnesota asked me a question, and I was undertaking to show how it is perfectly impossible for these bureaus to function. I was undertaking to show how the Government is breaking down because the problems of 135,000,000 or 140,000,000 people are so multitudinous that they cannot possibly be handled by a system of Government bureaus.

The authors of the bill now before us have recognized one of the vices inherent in the situation, by the proviso which they have written into section 4 (a), in dealing with the National Labor Relations Board. Let me read that proviso:

> *Provided*, That the Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings and preparing drafts of opinions except that any legal assistants assigned separately to any Board member may for such Board member review such transcripts and prepare such drafts.

The reason for that language was that the delegation of power in the National Labor Relations Board had been regarded by some as being abused. It was felt that attorneys were writing decisions. So the provision here is that the members of the Board may not appoint attorneys to do that, but, through a curious use of words, the second part of the sentence says "except that any legal assistants assigned separately to any Board member may for such Board member review such transcripts and prepare such drafts."

When is a lawyer not a legal assistant, or when is a legal assistant not a lawyer? Is it to be understood that legal assistants who are not lawyers, under this provision are to be authorized to draft the opinions of the members of the Board for them?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The whole purpose of the language the Senator has been reading is to abolish the Central Review Section which the NLRB now uses, where there is a chief of the review section, with lawyers under him, to review all trial examiners' reports, and I think write tentative opinions. It is to establish the judicial functions of the NLRB on the same basis on which court functions are organized, namely, to have each member have his own law clerks, and such law assistants as he needs, but to write his own opinions instead of having them written in a central review bureau. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming would not want the Supreme Court to function by a central review section of lawyers writing the opinions, instead of the individual justices and their law clerks doing the work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what I am saying, and what the Senator from Minnesota has said, merely serves to emphasize the point that the magnitude of this task, as an example of the growing centralization to which we have become a victim, is such that we have delegation piled upon delegation. I am glad the committee has abolished the central review board; but, nevertheless, the point remains that the task is so great that it is beyond the powers of the persons who are appointed.

The committee proposes to expand the National Labor Relations Board from three to seven because of the growing complexity of the work, no doubt, and instead of having a central review section, now we are to have four additional members of the National Labor Relations Board. But that allows the situation to remain exactly as I have described it, namely, that we are setting up a new Washington bureau, with power to pass over labor disputes which extend into every county in the United States upon occasion.

Mr. President, I just referred to the National Labor Relations Board out of order. I wish to refer now briefly to a portion of section 204, so that the Senate may realize how ineffectual and obscure and vague some portions of the bill are. Section 204 (a) provides:

> SEC. 204. (a) In order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, employers and employees and their representatives, in any industry affecting commerce, shall—

(1) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including provision for adequate notice of any proposed change in the terms of such agreements and provision for the final adjustment of questions regarding the application or interpretation of such agreements.

PROVIDES NO TRUE REFORM

There, Mr. President, we have a mandatory legislative order. Every lawyer knows what the statute means when the statute says such an official "shall" do thus and so, or such-and-such a person "shall" do thus and so. So here we declare in a law of the Congress that "employers and employees and their representatives shall exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements," and so forth.

Mr. President, how is that to be enforced? That is ineffective legislative draftsmanship.

The same situation occurs in connection with the next paragraph. The same individuals, employers, employees, and their representatives "shall, whenever a dispute arises over the terms or application of a collective-bargaining agreement and a conference is requested by a party or prospective party thereto, arrange promptly for such a conference to be held and endeavor in such conference to settle such dispute expeditiously."

That is just a hortatory statement, an expression of hope. They "shall" do thus and so.

Mr. President, if those two paragraphs collectively were effective, no other power at all would be needed. If Congress should solemnly assemble and pass a statute saying "the people of the United States shall from now on behave," it would be no more absurd than this. Yet the people of the country are being asked to believe that a great reform is coming out of the Congress of the United States when the proposed act shall have been passed.

Section 205 (a) provides:

SEC. 205. (a) There is hereby created a National Labor-Management Panel which shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President, 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management and 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor. Each member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 4 at the end of the first year, 4 at the end of the second year, and 4 at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. Members of the panel, when serving on business of the panel, shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

(b) It shall be the duty of the panel, at the request of the Director, to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which mediation and voluntary arbitration shall be administered particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

Mr. President, I wish to point out, with respect to this provision, that it reveals what I regard to be one of the most difficult aspects of the whole problem of labor and management relations. This bill, Mr. President, is drawn in the light of the activities of big business and big labor. It utterly overlooks and neglects the conditions which exist in thousands of cities and communities throughout the United States where little business and little labor are employed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator recognizes that the net purpose and object of the bill is to break down big labor, while at the same time permitting big business to grow bigger. It proceeds on the assumption that labor has become a monopoly in this country, and that it has become too powerful, and that therefore labor must be broken.

The fact of the matter is that labor has grown big in this country because it was absolutely necessary for it to be big in order to cope with big business. It could not otherwise protect itself. Able witnesses appeared before the committee, among others, a candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, Mr. Stassen, who testified that it was because labor was broken down following the First World War that it was unable to cope with big business in the country, unable to protect itself from lowered wages and bad working conditions, and that that contributed more than anything else to the coming on of the depression. And now, if we proceed on the same theory again to break down labor, to make it weak at this time, the same consequences will follow.

BIG BUSINESS BEGETS BIG LABOR AND BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Montana for that statement. It is absolutely accurate, and I have in my hand some testimony to support his contention, which comes from a very respectable Republican source. The Senator from Montant has pointed out, as I have stated over and over again, that big government and big labor are the twin sons of big business. If it had not been for the concentration of economic power in the hands of big business we never would have had to multiply the powers of government in Washington, nor would the big labor organizations ever have come into existence.

On this point, Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover spoke in New York City on February 12, 1946, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club. I want to read one or two paragraphs from that statement. I shall read only two.

The industrial revolution—

This is former President Herbert Hoover talking. It is not a radical New Dealer like my friend from Montana. It is a former Republican President of the United States.

The industrial revolution, despite its fabulous gains in living standards, threatened us with a host of new dangers to free men. The imagination of free men had stretched new invention across a continent; we had big business. Some big business undertook extracurricular activities in special privilege and vicious interference in the politics of free government. That was a new tyranny over free men. That battle for free men from outmoded laissez faire was first fought out in the antitrust acts and the public regulation of utilities and corporations. Today we see a gigantic growth of labor unions paralleling big business. And out of the extracurricular activities of some CIO unions under radical leaders we have another form of special privilege and vicious interference in the politics of free government.

There, Mr. President, is the testimony of Herbert Hoover that big labor was the product of big business. The distinguished ex-President was making a Lincoln Day speech to the National Republican Club, and it is only natural that he glossed over the abuses of big business. I have no doubt that the auditors assembled at that banquet knew, some of them at least, from intimate experience what those abuses were; but if anybody were to draw the inference from what former President Hoover said that the abuses of big business had been corrected by the Antitrust Act of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1917, that person, Mr. President, would be very much mistaken; because those abuses still exist. For more than 20 years the Federal Trade Commission has been trying to plug the gap in the Clayton Act, by which monopolistic mergers are created through the purchase of the assets of competing corporations. That gap has never been closed. A bill is now pending in the House and in the Senate, before the respective Judiciary Committees of both Houses, to do that.

If it were done, Mr. President, it would have a far more beneficial effect upon the settlement of labor-management disputes than this bill, because it would go to the root of the difficulty. It would go down to the grass roots, where big business grows, and where it brings into existence the type of conditions which require the organization of great labor unions like the CIO.

Again, Mr. President, I say I do not deny that there have been abuses; there have been. But I say to the Senate that the economic record of this country is so plain that nobody can misunderstand it, unless he desires to misunderstand it. The abuses of big business, long after they had been practiced year after year, brought about the creation of the big labor union, like the CIO. How long did men work for Big Steel and for Little Steel? Not 8 hours a day, not 9 hours a day, not 10, but 12 hours a day. How long did they labor? What were their wages? What consideration did they have? They could not deal with their employer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had the great misfortune to miss part of the remarks of the able Senator. I know of no one in the Senate better qualified than he to speak on this aspect of the matter. I am sure that the Senator has probably adverted in his remarks to the recommendation by the President in his message to the Congress that we attack the problem of

monopoly at the same time he recommended that there be certain legislation affecting labor. Has the Senator found, and has he in his address referred to the fact that there has been any effort, as far as the Senator or I have heard, to carry out those recommendations of the President about antimonopoly legislation, on the part of those who are so ably sponsoring the pending legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The direct answer to the Senator is that I have not yet gotten around to that part of the discussion. As I started out here, I was interrupted on numerous occasions by other Senators who were inquiring about the effect of certain provisions of the pending bill, to which I had alluded, and I have been delayed in the presentation of some of the observations that I would desire to make. But, as the Senator observes, the hour is now getting late, and Senators who were working in their committee rooms have now probably gone to their offices to handle their mail, and there seems to be no disposition now to listen to an extended discussion of the subject.

Mr. President, I started to read the bill. I think perhaps that the reading of some of the provisions to which I wanted to refer may be postponed until a later date, so I shall not go in complete detail into some of the other provisions. I want to point out, however, that the bill not only sets up this new Federal bureau, the Mediation Service, and expands the National Labor Relations Board, but it places a new responsibility upon the Attorney General with respect to emergencies, and this because of a very acute situation which can easily arise in some of these great national enterprises. I am referring now to section 206:

Whenever in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States—

Here we have another venture into discretionary authority. Whenever in the opinion of a single person—

a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including the respective positions of the parties but shall not contain any recommendations.

That is a curious provision, is it not? The Attorney General is given the power to appoint a board whenever in his opinion the circumstances are such, described here, as to make it desirable, and this Board shall make its inquiry and make its report, but it shall not make any recommendation.

The Attorney General shall file a copy of such report with the Federal Mediation Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

So here we have a bill which creates a new Mediation Service, and then reposes in the Attorney General discretionary authority to appoint a board.

Now observe:

A board of inquiry shall be composed—

This is section 207 (a)—

of a chairman, and such other members as the Attorney General shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States, and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

Then we turn over two pages, and we find after appeal to the court:

SEC. 209. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 208 enjoining acts or practices which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health or safety, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation Service, created by this act. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Mediation Service.

Then we go to section 209 (b):

(b) Upon the issuance of such order, the Attorney General shall reconvene the board of inquiry which has previously reported with respect to the dispute. At the end of a 60-day period (unless the dispute has been settled by that time)—

Sixty days is a long period—

the board of inquiry shall report to the Attorney General the current position of the parties to the dispute and the efforts which have been made for settlement. The Attorney General shall make such report available to the public. The National Labor Relations Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by their employer and shall certify the results thereof to the Attorney General within 5 days thereafter.

Mr. President, experience under existing law proves that the National Labor Relations Board is delayed weeks and sometimes months in certifying the results of such an election. Here we have a provision for an election intended to hasten labor disputes, but it comes into existence only after the board originally appointed by the Attorney General shall have made its report, without recommendations, and then upon the order of the Attorney General shall have been reconvened to make another report. But observe section 210:

Upon the certification of the results of such ballot or upon a settlement being reached, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged.

I call attention to the fact that it says nothing in the world about the nature of the vote. Suppose that in this election the voters shall reject the settlement proposed; what then happens? By the language of the bill it makes no difference if the voters reject the settlement; the injunction shall be discharged exactly the same as though they had accepted it. So here we have language so inexpertly drawn that after all this long rigmarole the members of the union affected need only to vote to reject the settlement and the injunction is discharged.

This, Mr. President, is again evidence of the fact that the legislation is being presented to us without the due consideration which legislation of this momentous character should have.

I could spend many hours reading the bill. I do not intend to do so. It has taken me longer than I had intended to present what I wish to say.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am much interested in the Senator's comments. I regret I was called out of the Chamber on another matter and did not hear the Senator's entire discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have already made excuse for the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I notice the Senator has been discussing the national emergency legislation. As a matter of fact this subject was discussed very fully and completely by the committee in all its aspects, and the committee is fully aware that the action taken up to the point the Senator has brought it is as he has stated, except for one thing. After that happens and the vote is taken and the injunction discharged, then the matter is reported to the President of the United States, and the President reports to Congress with such recommendation as he sees fit to make. The purpose being that we do not intend to keep anyone under injunction indefinitely. I just mention that to explain that point. It was not overlooked and it was not thoughtless legislation. I will say to the Senator that if he can produce any better system for dealing with a national emergency it is just exactly what we need, and I will be delighted to support any bill he can produce which convinces me it is better than the bill presented here.

THE PRESIDENT SUGGESTED A BETTER WAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my opinion the President of the United States in his message to the Congress at the beginning of the present session did propose a much better way to handle this legislation. The difficulty with this measure is that there are thousands of persons in the United States, particularly among labor unions, who believe that the proposed legislation is designed to break the labor-union movement and not to reform it. Whether or not that is so makes no difference. I am ready to testify here or anywhere that in my judgment the able Senator from New Jersey is not motivated by any such purpose.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize the deep sincerity and the ability of the Senator from New Jersey; but I say to him and to all my other colleagues that a much better way would be to create the labor-management conference which the President of the United States asked for, and let that conference work out the problem, instead of bringing in a measure which applies not only to big business and big labor but to little business

and little labor. It creates new bureaus and new employees of the Federal Government, scattering them throughout the land and making them attempt to do an impossible thing.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I should like to make a comment. In stating that I would be glad to have him offer some alternative, I was referring to the national emergency-paralysis cases. Last year when such an occasion arose the President of the United States suggested that the railroad strikers be inducted into the Army and made to work. I definitely opposed that suggestion, and I think the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would definitely oppose it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did indeed.

Mr. SMITH. I am asking the Senator what emergency legislation he would propose in the event of a national paralysis. That is the only question on which I am seeking advice. As to the rest of the proposed legislation, it involves a question of judgment, as to whether we should pass it now or wait for more and more endless investigations by commissions before determining what should be done. If we are not careful, we shall be in a condition of national paralysis very soon. Presently we shall come to the end of the Smith-Connally Act, and we shall have to decide what to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was not present when I started to discuss the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I regret very much that I was not able to hear all of the Senator's speech.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not undertaking to condemn an attempt to deal with an emergency situation, but I am saying that a reading of the provisions of the bill shows that this particular type of legislation is so involved and contains so many vague provisions that it will not be effective—with its creation of boards to meet and make no recommendations, its reconvening of boards, its 60-day delay, its issuance of injunctions, its elections under the National Labor Relations Board, and then the dismissal of the injunction.

I grant that the Senator from New Jersey has been motivated by a sincere desire to enact constructive legislation, and I attribute the same motive to all the other members of the committee. I am endeavoring to point out, as I stated at the beginning, that we are attacking this problem from the wrong end. Instead of establishing responsibilities for the organization, we are trying to enact punitive legislation.

Mr. SMITH. If I may interrupt, I cannot agree with the Senator. I do not see anything punitive in the bill. The attempt is to be corrective and not punitive. However, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. If one listens to propaganda, it is punitive, but I do not agree with that view.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I could read sections of the bill which are so regarded by respectable authority. My point is that until we find it in our hearts and minds to recognize that a national organization, whether it be a labor organization or an organization of capital, should not have any authority to act in interstate and foreign commerce, except upon the basis of a charter and under specifications laid down by Congress, we shall be only waddling around and making a futile attempt to settle a profoundly difficult and disturbing problem.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

ENACTMENT OF THIS BILL AN INVITATION TO DISASTER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me make this point clear. I say to the Senator that in my opinion the enactment of this bill would be an invitation to disaster. The whole world is looking to the United States. Most of the people of the world are looking to the United States for leadership and succor. Some portions of the world are looking to the United States in the belief that there is to be a crisis here, that there is to be a class war, and that when the crisis comes and the class war takes place, a new ideology will take over. I have some respectable authority for that statement.

No doubt the Senator has read the message from Moscow which was delivered to the press last Sunday by Mr. Harold Stassen, who is an active candidate for nomination by the Republican Party for the Presidency. Mr. Stassen tells all about his interview with Mr. Stalin. I read his transcript. This is what Mr. Stalin said:

Do you expect a crisis?

We see what is in his mind. When Mr. Stassen sits down with him in the Kremlin, Joe Stalin says to him, "Do you expect a crisis?"

The Presidential candidate answered:

I do not. I believe we can regulate our capitalism and stabilize our production and employment at a high level without any serious crisis. But it is the main problem to avoid a depression in our economic system. With wise policies in Government and through learning the lesson of 1929 and the 1930's we should have a successful, regulated, but not a monopolistic, capitalism, with which we can avoid an economic crisis.

That is the opinion of Mr. Harold Stassen. We must avoid a monopolistic capitalism, but we are doing nothing to avoid it. Millions of workers who are employed by monopolistic capitalism believe that we do not intend to do anything about it, and they believe that this bill is intended to cripple their efforts to protect their position.

After Mr. Stassen had thus delivered himself in response to Mr. Stalin's inquiry, Stalin continued:

The Government must be vested with wide powers to accomplish that.

That is, regulation of capitalism, of which Mr. Stassen was speaking.

The Government must be strong and adopt broad methods.

I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he and his associates on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are carrying out the recommendation of Mr. Stalin, and are seeking to have the Senate pass a bill which would give the Government great power. But that is not all——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me finish with Stalin and Stassen.

STALIN. Magazine analysts and the American press carry open reports to the effect that an economic crisis will break out.

STASSEN. Yes. There have been those reports in the papers.

See how this naive candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket is feeding Mr. Stalin in his inquiries about conditions in the United States.

Yes; there have been those reports in the papers. Also, reports that there would be 8,000,000 unemployed the year after the war.

That was a report made by another gentleman who campaigns from Moscow. I refer to my good friend, Mr. Wallace.

I read further:

But they were wrong. The problem is one of leveling off at high production and stabilizing without having an economic crisis.

STALIN. The regulation of production?

STASSEN. The regulation of capitalism. There are those who say there will be a depression but I am optimistic and say we can avoid a depression. I find a broader understanding by the people of regulation of capitalism than before.

STALIN. But what about businessmen? Will they be prepared to be regulated and restrained?

STASSEN. No; some will have objections.

STALIN. Yes; they do.

Does the Senator from New Jersey understand now why I say that the communistic dictators are looking to the United States to see whether we are going to have a depression, an economic crisis, a class war? They are convinced we will.

MANY CONSIDER IT AN ATTEMPT TO STRIKE DOWN LABOR

The Senator from New Jersey heard the message which was delivered over the radio to the people of the country by Secretary of State Marshall when he returned from Moscow, when he was trying to set out the delay and harassment by the communistic dictators who believe that by delay and postponement there will be an economic crisis in the United States to come to their aid. But here we are, instead of trying to build strongly, to weld together all of our people—labor, management, and capital—making them work as one for the preservation of the American system, bringing in a bill which many of the citizens of the United States, as patriotic as anyone in this Chamber, believe is intended to strike down labor. Is that not a justifiable belief? The Senator from New Jersey knows as well as I know that there are many men in business who believe that labor should be reduced once again to a commodity, and that wages should be reduced, because, forsooth, wages constitute the largest element of cost in the production of goods. Yet the facts before us, undenied, coming from the centers of business, show that organized capital in the United States is earning greater profits now than ever before—greater profits in 1946 than in 1945. Reports for the first quarter of 1947 indicated that the rate of profit

would be even greater. I say, Mr. President, that unless we preserve economic peace in the United States, unless we avoid a class war, unless we preserve the unity of all our people, production in the United States will fall off; and when production falls, then, Mr. President, look to the debt.

I think the Senator from New Jersey desires to ask me a question.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to very much, if I may. I have been trying to for some time. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said, and I do not quarrel with him regarding what he said about Russia looking to see us crack up. But I do not understand that that is relevant, since I do not agree that the bill has any such purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not say it has that purpose, but I think in all probability it will have that effect.

Mr. SMITH. That is just the opinion of the distinguished Senator, whose opinions I always value most highly. I look upon him as one of my best friends, and I like to discuss matters with him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I reciprocate the feeling expressed by the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I do not agree with the Senator as to the way he interprets the bill. I do want to check up one thing the Senator says, which interests me greatly. Did I understand him to say he thought labor should have a charter from the Government, and that Government should lay down the conditions under which labor unions shall operate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. SMITH. I am very much interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have had a bill containing such provisions before the Senate of the United States for almost 10 years, but because there was coupled with it a charter system for big business as well, the bill has never gotten to first base.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that my labor friends with whom I try to check on these matters object to that more than to any other single thing. They say that is an effort to destroy the freedom of the labor movement. I am saying that because the Senator mentioned it. That is the objection I get to that suggestion. I am interested in what the Senator said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That may be the opinion which has been expressed to the Senator; but I speak only for myself.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that. I think the Senator's suggestion is very interesting.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We must settle these matters upon principle. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the States, with foreign nations, and with the Indian tribes. Then it follows as the night follows the day that the organization which engages in such commerce has no right to come into existence except by permission of the Congress of the United States. No corporation can create itself. Men are the builders of government, and governments are the creators of corporations. But we have fallen into times in which we attribute to corporations and organizations the rights which only the individual human being, the creature of God, possesses. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution is a protection to the individual, but the powers, the duties, and the responsibilities of an organization, whether it be an organization of capital or an organization of labor, should be laid down by the Congress of the United States which alone has power to regulate the commerce in which it is engaged.

Mr. SMITH. Then the Senator would have labor organizations organized under a charter of Congress, with all the details, all their rules and everything else, controlled by the Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe that a labor union engaged in nationwide business has any more right to write its own blank check than has a corporation. But I say to the Senator that we have surrendered to the latter, and because we are blinded to that thing we do not realize what a tremendous variation there has been from the American way of life.

Mr. President, the president of the National Association of Manufacturers read a paper recently commenting upon the bill which I have introduced to prevent monopolistic mergers, and he said:

> These changers of the American system ought to be driven out of the temple.

As though this bill to prevent monopoly was changing the American system.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will not the Senator admit that the trend in events has been enough to justify the belief that corporate monopoly has become the American system?

COLLECTIVIST INDUSTRIAL EMPIRES IN OUR ECONOMY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what they assume. But their attitude becomes so naive. Last night I was enjoying myself for 15 or 20 minutes at home by listening to the Telephone Hour. In the middle of the beautiful music—Lily Pons was singing—after she had finished one of her arias, the "commercial" came on. I was so impressed with it that I called up the radio station and asked them to transmit it to me. Here it is; here is the "commercial plug" which was put on the air last night by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.:

> The sixty-second annual meeting of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was held recently in New York City. At the time of the meeting the number of stockholders had risen to more than 700,000. If all of those people could be brought together in one place, you'd have a representative cross-section of everyday average Americans.

Mr. President, I wish that I could read this with all the eloquence and pathos that the radio announcer put into it, but that is beyond my capacity.

> In that great crowd of stockholders you'd see school teachers and nurses, bakers and grocers, farmers, housewives, bankers, salesmen, and many others; more than half of them would be women. You'd see citizens from every State in the Union—from Maine and Oregon, Illinois and Texas, Maryland and North Dakota. Five States have more than 50,000 stockholders each. Twenty-six States have more than 5,000, and no State has fewer than 500.
>
> More than 650,000 of these stockholders have less than 100 shares each and no one of them holds as much as one-half of 1 percent of the total stock. The average holding is 30 shares, and half of them have held their stock for 10 years or more.
>
> All this adds up to a simple truth. Here is a distinctly representative American institution. The money it needs for equipment to give telephone service comes from the savings of the many rather than the wealth of the few.
>
> Your Bell Telephone Cos.—
>
> Observe the plural—
>
> belong to people in all walks of life in cities, towns, and villages throughout America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator pause for a station announcement? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in 1942, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was the third largest corporation in the United States. Its gross revenue amounted to $1,469,263,216. It had 327,107 employees. If we add its employees to the 700,000 stockholders of that corporation, we have an industrial population of 1,000,000, and even then we are not taking into account the families of the employees or the families of the stockholders. I have no criticism to make of the men who make up the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I know that many of the managers have come from the very lowliest positions in the organization, up to the top. But I wish to point out, Mr. President, that it is an example of Big Business. It is an example of the concentration of economic power which has developed in this country. It is an illustration of what organizations do. It is an illustration of a collectivist industrialized empire.

The author of the "commercial plug" doubtless is convinced that that corporation is typical of America, but I point out that those 700,000 stockholders do not have anything to do with the management of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. That company is an illustration of a recent development—I say recent, but it has been developing during the last 25 or 30 years—of corporations in which ownership and management are separated. That is not what we have been led to believe is typical of the American system. The American system is the system in which ownership and management are in the same hands. When they are separated, all sorts of opportunities are created for taking excess profits from the people.

I do not wish to talk about the telephone company now, in the midst of the telephone strike, because, as I have said, I have a great deal of admiration for many of the men who make it up. But the testimony from the telephone company illustrates what I mean when I say that in the development of our economic life we have come to a position in which concentrated management controls great segments of our economy, and that concentrated management is placing its stamp upon our economic life and upon our political life.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I saw in the newspapers, a little while ago, a statement to the effect that a gentleman who owned 1½ percent of the stock of a great railroad controlled that railroad; that is to say, he had the authority to elect the directors

and to determine the policies of that great railroad.

No doubt the Senator from Wyoming is intimating that although there are 700,000 stockholders of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in all probability very few and a very small percentage of that total number of stockholders actually run the company, and the great mass of them never do anything but send in proxies which are solicited by the group which runs the company, and the great mass of the stockholders actually have no more to do with the management of that company, I dare say, than they have to do with the management of some of the labor unions which are under attack in the proposed legislation now before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Florida for that comment. He has directed attention to one of the significant aspects of our modern corporate system.

Yesterday, Mr. President, I think it was, Mr. Robert Young testified before the Banking and Currency Committee about the evils of the Baltimore & Ohio financing practices. With respect to that matter I know nothing but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a few weeks ago Mr. Robert Young was quoted in Time Magazine as saying that when he purchased 300,000 shares of the stock of the New York Central Railroad Co., he had acquired the control of that railroad.

Mr. President, we hear much about communistic infiltration. Here is an example of infiltration in the field of business. The control of the New York Central Railroad is held by such a small group that the leader of another railroad, by the purchase of 300,000 shares of stock out of a total of some 20,000,000 shares or more is able to assert that he has secured control.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield, I think the total holdings of Mr. Young, as reported in some of the dispatches, were not in excess of one and a half percent of the total outstanding stock.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the point. So one and a half percent of the ownership controls these big business enterprises, and we are acting as though they were normal flesh and blood people. They are not. That is the source of all our difficulty.

A curious thing happened, Mr. President. As I opened the Washington Post this morning I found an article by J. A. Livingston, who writes very wisely under the heading "Minding your business." The stock ownership of the A. T. & T. had appealed to him, and he made a very interesting comment. Having heard the statement I read, perhaps, that no one person has as much as one-half of one percent of the total stock outstanding, he said:

> However, A. T. & T. is not strictly a poor man's corporation. There are 20,000,000 shares of A. T. & T. common; they are quoted at $166 a share. One-half of 1 percent of A. T. & T. stock would be worth about $17,000,000.

So we realize the tremendous magnitude of this institution.

Mr. President, the rest of this article is of such great interest that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINDING YOUR BUSINESS

(By J. A. Livingston)

WIDOWS, ORPHANS AND WORKERS

The New York Stock Exchange has just published an eye-catching ad. On a table are hats—a broad-brimmed one of the man from Texas, the denim cap the railroad fireman wears, the crushed fedora you might associate with a newspaperman, the derby of the stockbroker, the white skullcap of the house painter, the homburg of the business man, and the hat of a naval officer.

The title of the ad is "Stockholders' Meeting," and it says: "They come from everywhere * * * from every income group, from every community. They are women as well as men, employees as well as executives, farmers as well as businessmen. They are typical stockholders, the owners of business.

"This distribution of business ownership through the whole mass of the people is an American development. A healthy and democratic development. We believe that much of the great strength of American industry derives from the depth and breadth of its ownership * * *." And so the advertisement runs on—a moving declaration of faith.

And yet, nobody—not even the New York Stock Exchange—knows just how deep down or broad across is stock ownership in the United States. All we know is that barbers and ribbon clerks are in the market along with bank presidents and industrialists. What proportion of whom is a statistical mystery.

Best and most-cited example of widespread ownership is the American Telephone & Telegraph Corp. At the end of the year, 695,660 persons, corporations, colleges, institutions had a piece of it. A. T. & T. observes that "no stockholder held as much as one-half of 1 percent of the total stock outstanding." However, A. T. & T. is not strictly a poor man's corporation. There are 20,000,000 shares of A. T. & T. common; they're quoted at $166 a share. One-half of 1 percent of A. T. & T. stock would be worth about $17,000,000. A widow or orphan with such a nest-egg would be highly prized in the marriage or any other market.

Though many persons are shareholders, most are not. This is borne out by the study of liquid assets made last year by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Federal Reserve Board. It showed that 24 percent of United States families had no bank deposits or savings bonds at all; 29 percent had less than $500 of savings. Thus, 53 percent of the Nation's families had less than $500 saved. It's a safe guess that few of these were stockholders.

Guesses on the number of United States shareholders have ranged from around 6,000,000 (probably too low) to 15,000,000, which may be a bit high. SEC officials have made a tentative estimate of eight to ten million. At the topmost total, 15,000,000, only one out of every six adults could be classed as a stock owner.

What's more, the person who owns one or two shares of a stock does not identify himself with the corporation. He's strictly an absentee owner. He is gladdened by his dividends, but probably bored by the company's reports. Often he'll not show sufficient interest to send in his proxy for the annual meeting—as the rise in proxy-gathering costs of corporations attests.

The average stockholder's main interest is his job, or law practice, or grocery store, or garage. Perhaps his union. Lower prices at the meat market probably mean more to him or his wife than the possibility of an increased dividend by General Motors or R. H. Macy & Co. The United States is still not a nation of coupon clippers or dividend collectors.

Unquestionably the Stock Exchange "ad" will ring true to big stockholders—persons who get $250 or more in dividends a year. They are more inclined to associate themselves with corporations, with private property. But it's questionable whether the "ad" will ring the bell with workers. When they are informed that business ownership has been distributed through the whole mass of the people they're apt to wonder first why they've been left and second who are the masses, if not they.

Probably, more Americans have a property stake in industry than British, French, or Italians. And ultimately, as more and more corporations split their stocks, the distribution of ownership may increase. Yet it still seems premature to suggest that we have mass ownership of industry. Certainly we don't have mass identity with the large corporations. Indeed, we are more likely to develop a sense of ownership through profit-sharing plans than through stock ownership. For just on reason: Most persons don't save. And it takes saving—putting money aside—to own stocks. It only takes an act of the boss to say, "Here, you get a piece of the profits. This is your plant, too."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the leadership has indicated a desire to recess.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou who fillest space and time and transcends all things, we praise Thee for the one perfect flower of manhood. Grant that His judgment and devotion may be translated into our service, and through Him our national life may be made brotherly, thus enabling us to transform the individual, while duty becomes a contagion and our citizens are emancipated from misapprehension and enabled to see the best glimmering through the worst.

Dear Lord, we beseech Thee to overrule whatever has been imperfect and unwise in us, and send us forth as heralds of good will, whose duties are to maintain the high standards of Christian government. Always may character and conscience have their way in the defense of the Republic and in the perpetuity of righteous institutions. Do Thou cleanse our hearts, that they may be innocent from the great transgression; and hasten the day of brotherhood in all the earth.

In the blessed name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2700. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. National Archives.
8. National Archives (General Schedule No. 1, Revision A).
9. Federal Works Agency.
10. Federal Communications Commission.
11. Office of Selective Service Records.
12. Selective Service System.
13. United States District Court (Northern District of California).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 112):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] were appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

RELIEVE THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is committed to the reduction of taxes. The American people have carried the heaviest tax burden in the history of America in the past 7 years. Time has definitely long passed when Federal expenditure and taxes should be reduced.

How can the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, keep its pledge to the American people to reduce taxes if we vote $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey? I was under the impression that we are going to vote some money for the American taxpayer. Instead we are asked to vote the American taxpayers' money for Greece and Turkey, and Mr. Truman has told us that he intends to follow this same policy all around the world, and that this gift of $400,000,000 is nothing but a first installment even for Greece and Turkey. When, Mr. Speaker, do we get around to cutting taxes? When do we get around to keeping the pledges made by the Republican Party? Are we prepared to increase the taxes of the American citizen to carry out the Truman doctrine? I, for one, am opposed to it.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we are called upon to wrestle with the Greek-Turkish problem. Some time ago we learned that Great Britain could not meet her commitments in Greece. We also learned that she had slightly more than 10,000 troops to fight the guerillas in Greece, but that she had about 100,000 troops in Palestine fighting the Jewish people. Is Palestine more important to Great Britain than Greece, and, if so, why? Are Greece and Turkey more important to us than is Palestine? If so, why? We do not know about that, but we do know that someone is on the receiving end of a very short bill of goods, and that someone is Uncle Sam, familiarly known as Santa Claus. I believe that we should be very generous with the starving and needy people of the countries that have been devastated by war, but we should cease to expend the lives of our people and our money in a vain effort to perpetuate foreign empires and the property of oil barons and other financial geniuses of this Nation and other nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all seem to be concerned about the Greek-Turkish matter, and I think it is entirely proper that we are. I offer as my brief contribution to the RECORD this morning a part of an article which came out of Athens by the correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune. It is contained in an editorial which reads as follows:

A REMARKABLE DISPATCH

The Herald Tribune has also been a consistent backer of the Truman policy, but on its editorial page last week it carried a remarkable dispatch from its Athens correspondent, Seymour Freidlin, who wrote:

"It is high time that policy makers in Washington realize that the 'Greek situation' cannot even be placed on the path to solution simply by a meaningless anti-Communist policy. * * * Every [reactionary] step undertaken by the Government is explained away as having Washington sanction. * * * Proposals to suppress the opposition as traitorous are sanctified as following the example of the United States.

"The United States is in the process of granting aid to Greece. This country and its people, proud and loyal to the Allied cause, deserve every dime. Greece must be rehabilitated, her people fed, and her economy soundly grounded, but a shower of cash will be as ineffective as Britain's aid unless some concrete steps are taken to insure tranquillity, to mitigate hatred, and lay the foundation for political security. * * * Careful political readjustment will not be accomplished with long-term credit alone."

All in all, the article was a remarkable denunciation of the viciously reactionary regime in power in Greece, and it was all the more remarkable for turning up as it did, on the editorial page of a paper which is supposed to be supporting the President's program.

TURKISH LOAN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this proposal for a military alliance with the corrupt dictatorship of Turkey is the most disgraceful proposition which this House has ever been asked to rubber stamp. Have any of you gentlemen who are sup-

porting this business tried to find out anything about the Government of Turkey? If you have you know that there is a wall which keeps information from coming out of that country which makes the iron curtain look like tissue paper. What were the results of the election which was staged in Turkey in 1946? Nobody in Washington will tell you. The Turkish Embassy will not tell you. The State Department will not tell you. Even Hitler rigged up election figures and gave them out to the world but the insolent dictatorship in Turkey does not even bother to do that. No, Mr. Speaker, Turkey will take the United States for millions of dollars but they are very careful not to let the people of the United States get any information about any of the details of the workings of the corrupt and oppressive dictatorship that runs Turkey. Only last Friday the New York Times had another story about how Turkey censored foreign newsmen for trying to smuggle out a little of the truth. The Turkish dictatorship has already buried the few newspapers within that country that had the courage to hint at the truth, and that dictatorship has been ruthless in seeing that no information gets to the people of the rest of the world. Mr. Speaker, I say with all the force which I can command: Not one cent of American money for the military dictatorship in Turkey.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, where will this proposal to pour money into every trouble spot of Europe end? Was it a deliberate policy to begin with the corrupt and oppressive governments of Greece and Turkey on the theory that if the Congress of the United States would rubber stamp the proposal to send money there that we would send it anywhere? If we send money under the guise of "relief" to bolster the ruthless and tyrannical governments of Turkey and Greece, what possible excuse will we have to refuse sending it anywhere else? Every corrupt government in the world that has fastened itself on the backs of the people will raise the cry of the threat of communism to get money from the United States to keep itself in power. This policy is one which can lead only to bankruptcy for the United States. I say: Send no money at all to the rich and crafty government of Turkey. I say: Send relief to the hungry people of Greece, but do not send them guns and tanks and try to tell the American people that this is "relief." It may be a relief to the present government of Greece that wants to shoot down all the opponents to its misrule, but it is no relief for the Greek people. No, Mr. Speaker this proposal is nothing more than a proposal for the United States to embark upon a policy of supporting in power every government in the world which does not have the support of its people. It is the most shameless kind of hypocrisy to try to sell this program to the people of America under the guise of relief to the hungry.

GREEK-TURKO LOAN

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, one sure way to destroy America is to saddle an impossible burden on the backs of the American people.

The continuous hand-outs everywhere automatically resulting from the Greek-Turko venture would cost billions annually.

This deal would encourage blackmail hand-outs enabling Stalin to sit on his front porch and watch the United States bleed to death.

The Greek-Turko loan plays right into Stalin's hands.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Library of Congress of the Committee on House Administration may sit today during general debate for a meeting which has already been called for this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable WILLIS W. BRADLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Conant of Harvard University. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost is estimated at $213. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL POLL ON GREEK-TURKISH SITUATION

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to you a little résumé of conversations I have had with people whom I have interviewed about the President's proposal in regard to Greece and Turkey.

I think it is fair to say that the majority of them fell into a certain pattern advocating three things.

First, a willingness to supply within reason food and clothing for the relief of the distressed people in other parts of the world.

Secondly, opposition—and great opposition—to military occupation and military maneuvers in those countries.

Third, a strong feeling that we should start to combat communism in this country first.

Mr. Speaker, if it be said that these people do not have all the information that they should have, is that their fault when their own government will neither give it to them or give it to us to pass on to them?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRADLEY of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the true measure of assistance to a working world at peace is not the amount of expenditures to sustain life but the amount of assistance for economic reconstruction. The best contrast between the performances of democracy and the promises of communism, is what the United States has done since the end of the war to help war-devastated countries to rebuild their economies.

Based on a study prepared under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Willard L. Thorp, from the office of Under Secretary Will Clayton, entitled "American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries Since Mid-1945," a summary of which appears in the Appendix, I estimate the United States expenditures since VJ-day at about $6,000,000,000 in long-term credits and grants, exclusive of the British loan of $3,750,000,000 being used partly for food and partly for reconstruction. This sum is an investment in peace, in trade, and in health. Our expenditures since VJ-day include loans and technical assistance, vast war installations transferred, agricultural and industrial "hard goods" of permanent benefit to the recipient countries distributed through UNRRA, and special bilateral financial arrangements. Though no nation on earth has ever done as much to help other peoples to help themselves in peacetime, it represents but a little over 6

percent of 1 year's production of our economy. It is not our lifeblood, as many would have us believe—nor do the peoples we help want it to be. On the contrary, a healthy and prosperous world holds not only the promise of peace, but the promise of greater well-being for us in common with other nations. Such a world can make possible for the United States an aggregate annual production of $250,000,000,000, opening up new vistas of economic security and culture to all our people. Our Nation whose productive machine could almost double its output for war from about ninety billion, the peacetime top, to one hundred and seventy billion, can reach new heights of production in One World. As a result of American credits and grants, technical services, transfers, settlements, allocations, and surplus-property sales, many countries on every continent have a greater share of roads, hospitals, airfields, libraries, machinery, sanitation, cargo ships, and other tools of a civilized economy.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of a report.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter to the deputy managers by Gen. Omar Bradley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GRECO-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

The was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the United States stands on the precipice of bankruptcy and collectivism. Today the Congress is deliberating whether or not to push it off the cliff into the bottomless pit. Let us not be deceived in believing the move we are being asked to make is anticommunistic for it is the contrary. If executed, the forces of communism within our Nation will in any event be strengthened. The further drain upon our resources and the additional deterioration of our finances and economy that will inevitably supervene, war or no war, will blight what little hope remains for saving our country from the curse of totalitarianism. May God help us in this hour of great decision.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today during the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects and include an address in each.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Carroll County Independent entitled "The Only Way To Be Prepared."

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, and that in the permanent RECORD it may appear in the proceedings of yesterday with regard to the anniversary celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including NAM recommendations to the international financial policy of the United States.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saluda Sentinel on Colonel Bonham and Colonel Travis, of the Alamo, both of whom were born and raised in the district it is my honor to represent in this Congress.

And may I add also, Mr. Speaker, that in these times of seniority in the armed forces and elsewhere, it is an inspiration to the youth of this country to know that Colonel Travis wrote the most heroic letter in American history at the age of 27.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with regard to the efforts of the Alabama Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to raise funds for the erection of a suitable State headquarters in the State capital of Alabama.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include in the event it has not already been inserted the address made by President Aleman, of the United Mexican States, on April 30 at the Pan American Union; and in the other an article appearing on May 1 written by Marquis Childs, entitled "Growth of the Industrial Monopoly."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests, one in reference to the extension of an article dealing with reciprocal-trade agreements. I have had an estimate by the Printing Office and find it exceeds the limit and will cost $372.75. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made, and that I may include the remarks of Dr. John Lee Coulter against the reciprocal-trade agreement.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to sit during sessions of the House this week while general debate is in progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JARMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to include as a part of his

remarks an editorial from the Washington Post.)

WALLACE, STASSEN, AND THE RED PARADE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we desired to befuddle the public mind of Europe as to what Democrats and Republicans in this country think, I know of nothing that we could do that would contribute more to that end than sending Henry Wallace to London and Harold Stassen to Moscow, unless we could have brought them to New York on May Day and let them witness that Communist parade under the Red banner of Moscow.

In that parade they carried placards denouncing me personally, which I consider a compliment. They hate me because of my fight against the Communist menace in this country.

They carried placards denouncing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the one committee of Congress that is doing more to stop their infamous activities in this country than any other committee in either House.

They also denounced both the Congress and Harry Truman, the President of the United States.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has moving pictures of that Red parade which we are going to show the Congress at an early date. I wish every American could see it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the current Liberty magazine entitled "Navy Versus Air Force on How to Fight the Next War."

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American Red Cross.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill for the RECORD.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the charter of the American Red Cross and except for technical amendments the principal one is to change the governing body from 18 to 50. At the present time the board is selected six by the President, six by the original incorporators, and six by the chapters. This bill provides for a board of 50 to be selected; 8 by the President, 30 by the chapters, and 12 by the governing board itself.

Mr. Speaker, this is the result of an unanimous report of an advisory committee appointed by Chairman Basil O'Conor to make the representation of the Red Cross more democratic. The reason for speed is that the national meeting of the Red Cross is to take place early in June and they are most anxious to have the meeting take place under the provisions of the new charter. It is important, therefore, that they get out word for the selection of delegates in this more democratic way.

I might say that this bill has nothing to do with and does not in any way affect the Red Cross emblem. A subcommittee of three of the Committee on Foreign Affairs consisting of Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. KEE, and myself as chairman, has gone into the matter very thoroughly and unanimously reported to the Foreign Affairs Committee. The full committee reported it out unanimously. It was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee and passed the Senate unanimously. Due to the stress of work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs we have been unable to get to it until recently, and we therefore hope it can now be speedily passed in order to take care of the annual meeting in June. There are two technical amendments which have no opposition and I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this does not affect any other organization except the Red Cross, does it?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman says that the matter does not involve the Red Cross emblem, does he mean to say it does not affect in any way those private concerns which might be using the Red Cross emblem in their businesses?

Mr. VORYS. It does not affect in any way the present legal status of the emblem problem. It does not affect the private concerns that are using it, the Red Cross, or anyone else. It has nothing to do with that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended by inserting the following paragraph immediately following the second paragraph of the said act:

"Whereas the said treaty has been revised and extended by a treaty or convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and the sick of armies in the field, signed at Geneva, July 27, 1929, and adhered to by the United States of America, effective August 8, 1932; and."

SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Whereas a permanent organization is an agency needed in every nation to carry out the purposes of said treaties, and especially to secure supplies and to execute the humane objects contemplated by said treaties, with the power to adopt and use the distinctive flag and arm badge specified by said treaties, on which shall be the sign of the Red Cross, for the purpose of cooperating with the 'Comité International de Secours aux Militaires Blessés' (International Committee of Relief for the Wounded in War); and."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the name of this corporation shall be 'The American National Red Cross', and by that name it shall have perpetual succession, with the power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity, State or Federal, within the jurisdiction of the United States; to have and to hold such real and personal estate as shall be deemed advisable and to dispose of the same, to accept gifts, devises, and bequests of real and personal estate for the purposes of this corporation hereinafter set forth; to adopt a seal and the same to alter and destroy at pleasure; and to have the right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes hereinafter designated, as an emblem and badge, a Greek red cross on a white ground, as the same has been described in the treaties of Geneva, August 22, 1864 and July 27, 1929, and adopted by the several nations acceding thereto; to ordain and establish bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, and generally to do all such acts and things as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and promote the purposes of said organization; and the corporation hereby created is designated as the organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under said treaties and under any other treaty or convention similar in purpose to which the United States of America may hereafter adhere. In accordance with the said treaties, the delivery of the brassard allowed for individuals neutralized in time of war shall be left to military authority."

SEC. 4. Paragraphs "First" and "Second" of section 3 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"First. To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the conference of Geneva of October 1863, and also of the treaties of the Red Cross, or the treaties of Geneva, of August 22, 1864, and July 27, 1929, to which the United States of America has given its adhesion, and also of any other treaty or convention similar in purpose to which the United States of America may hereafter give its adhesion.

"Second. And for said purposes to perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to any of said treaties or conventions."

SEC. 5. The act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4a to read as follows:

"SEC. 4a. That membership in the American National Red Cross shall be open to all the people of the United States, its Territories, and dependencies, upon payment of the sums specified from time to time in the bylaws.

"The chapters of the American National Red Cross shall be the local units of the corporation within the States and Territories of the United States. The regulations with respect to the granting of charters to the chapters and the revocation of the same, the territorial jurisdiction of the chapters, the relationship of the chapters to the corporation and compliance by the chapters with the policies and rules of the corporation, shall be as determined from time to time by the Board of Governors. Such regulations shall require that each chapter shall, in the election of the governing body of the chapter and in the selection of delegates to the national convention of the corporation,

adhere to democratic principles of election as specified in the bylaws."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the governing body of the corporation in which all powers of government, direction, and management of the corporation shall be lodged, shall consist of a Board of Governors numbering 50 persons, to be appointed or elected in the manner following, namely:

"(a) Eight Governors shall be appointed by the President of the United States. Of the Governors so appointed, one shall be designated by the President of the United States to act as the principal officer of the corporation with such title and such functions as may from time to time be prescribed in the bylaws; and the remainder shall be officials of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, whose positions and interests are such as to qualify them to contribute toward the accomplishment of Red Cross programs and objectives. Of these at least one and not more than three shall be selected from the armed forces.

"(b) Thirty Governors shall be elected by the chapters. The Governors so elected shall be elected at the national convention under procedures for nomination and election which shall be such as to insure equitable representation of all the chapters, having regard to geographical considerations, to the size of the chapters and to the size of the populations served by the chapters.

"(c) Twelve Governors shall be elected by the Board of Governors as members-at-large. The Governors so elected shall be individuals who are representative of the national interests which it is the function of the Red Cross to serve, and with which it is desirable that the corporation shall have close association.

"The term of office of all Governors shall be 3 years, except that the term of office of any Governor appointed by the President of the United States (other than the principal officer of the corporation) shall expire if and when such Governor shall retire, prior to the date on which his term as Governor would otherwise expire, from the official position held at the time of his appointment as Governor.

"Of the first Board of Governors to be selected hereunder, those Governors to be elected pursuant to subsection (b) of this section 5 shall be elected at the first national convention following the enactment of this act, those Governors to be elected pursuant to subsection (c) shall be elected as soon as practicable following such first national convention, and those Governors to be appointed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be appointed so as to take office at the same time. The Governors so elected pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) shall be divided by lot into three classes, the terms of which shall expire at the end of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, so that thereafter one-third of the members of the Board of Governors elected pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) will be chosen at the time of each national convention, and shall take office at such time or as soon as practicable thereafter.

"The President of the United States shall fill as soon as may be any vacancy that may occur by death, resignation, or otherwise in the office of the principal officer of the corporation or in the membership of the Board of Governors appointed by him. Any vacancy that may occur in the Governors elected by the chapters pursuant to subsection (b) or in the Governors-at-large elected by the Board of Governors pursuant to subsection (c), shall be temporarily filled by appointment made by the Board of Governors, such appointees to serve until the next national convention.

"The Board of Governors shall have power (i) to appoint from its own members an executive committee of not less than 11 persons, who, when the Board of Governors is not in session, shall have and exercise all the powers of the Board of Governors, and (ii) to appoint and remove, or provide for the appointment and removal of, all officers and employees of the corporation, except the principal officer designated by the President of the United States.

"The annual meeting of the corporation shall be the national convention of delegates of the chapters, which shall be held annually on such date and at such place as may be specified by the Board of Governors. In all matters requiring a vote at the national convention, each chapter shall be entitled to not less than one vote. The number of votes which each chapter shall be entitled to cast shall be determined according to allocation by the Board of Governors, which shall be established on an equitable basis giving consideration both to the size of the membership of the chapters and to the size of the populations in the territories served by the chapters. Such allocations shall be reviewed at least every 5 years.

"Voting by proxy shall not be allowed at any meeting of the Board of Governors, or at the national convention, or at any meeting of the chapters: *Provided, however*, That in the event of any national emergency which in the opinion of the Board of Governors makes attendance at the national convention impossible, the Board of Governors may permit the election of Governors by proxy at the national convention."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That the endowment fund of the American National Red Cross shall be kept and invested under the management and control of a board of nine trustees, who shall be elected from time to time by the Board of Governors under such regulations regarding terms and tenure of office, accountability, and expense as the Board of Governors shall prescribe."

SEC. 8. The corporation now existing as The American National Red Cross under the act of January 5, 1905, as amended, shall continue as a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia. The first national convention after the enactment of this amendatory act shall be convened and held under rules and regulations prescribed by the governing body of the corporation as presently constituted. After such first national convention, the Board of Governors of the corporation from time to time shall constitute the associates and successors of the incorporators named in the said act of January 5, 1905, and neither the said incorporators nor any associates or successors theretofore designated by them or by their successors shall have any powers or duties.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 13, strike out all after the word "treaties" down to and including the word "adhere" in line 15.

Page 9, line 4, after "1905", insert "as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LT. COL. ORVILLE E. McKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

JAMES HAROLD NESBITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 334) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor, of Big Sandy, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at the intersection of Church and Gilmore Streets, Big Sandy, Tex., on July 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGINALD MITCHELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 385) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAUDE R. HALL AND FLORENCE V. HALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 407) for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,024.65 to Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall, in full satisfaction of their claims for damage to their property at 1233 Sunset Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif., caused by United States Navy airplane, bureau No. 06307, on October 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$4,024.65" and insert $1,491.15."

Page 1, strike out all of line 7, and insert, "settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to personal property."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELWOOD L. KEELER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elwood L. Keeler, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum represents reimbursement for the loss sustained by the said Elwood L. Keeler on account of the payment of a fine of a like amount which was covered into the Treasury of the United States prior to the time the President of the United States granted to the said Elwood L. Keeler a full and unconditional pardon with respect to the offense for which he was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California and sentenced on December 1, 1941, to imprisonment for 2 years and to pay such fine of $5,000. Such pardon was granted on the ground that the evidence did not support the conviction of the said Elwood L. Keeler: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "$5,000" insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. TAYLOR, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 821) for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,735.14 to Charles W. Taylor, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and other losses sustained as a result of being struck by a trailer attached to a United States Navy vehicle at the intersection of El Camino Real and Willow Avenue, Burlingame, Calif., on October 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out $11,735.14" and insert "$5,735.14."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSELL F. TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Russell F. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Russell F. Taylor, Greensboro, Ga., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident when his automobile was struck by an Army vehicle in Atlanta, Ga., on August 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED PITTELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1015) for the relief of Fred Pittelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Fred Pittelli, of Oakland, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of being struck by a traveling crane of the United States Navy at pier 5, at the foot of Seventh Street, Oakland, Calif., on March 3, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

Line 6, after "California," insert "for exclusive use."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. C. SPRADLING AND R. T. MORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1067) for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. C. Spradling, of Durham, N. C., the sum of $308.01, and to R. T. Morris, of Durham, N. C., the sum of $118.44. The payment of the sum of $308.01 shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of damages sustained by the automobile of the said S. C. Spradling when a United States Army truck collided with his automobile on August 27, 1944, on Buchanan Road, Durham, N. C. The payment of $118.44 shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of damages sustained by the automobile of the said R. T. Morris when a United States Army truck collided with his automobile on August 27, 1944, on Buchanan Road, Durham, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN F. HOPPERTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased, late of Cleveland,

Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said John F. Hopperton, a minor, who was shot with a Smith and Wesson .38-caliber revolver by George H. Sagel (554727), seaman second class, United States Coast Guard Reserve, aboard the steamer *O. S. McFarland*, a freighter operated by the Columbia Transportation Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, on April 27, 1943, while the steamer was moored at the dock in Port Washington, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be filed in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL GOODMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Paul Goodman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Goodman, of New York City, the sum of $722.37, for reimbursement for funds expended in replacing funds of military personnel delivered to him as a class A agent officer, and lost in the course of duty through no fault of negligence on his part: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "$722.37", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 10, strike out "of" and insert "or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGH C. GILLIAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hugh C. Gilliam, of Highland Park, N. J., the sum of $2,825. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of personal injuries received by the said Hugh C. Gilliam in a collision between the automobile he was driving and a United States Army truck which occurred on October 12, 1944, near Stelton, N. J., at the intersection of Route 27 and Plainfield Avenue: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,825" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHEASTERN SAND & GRAVEL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2257) for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the Southern Bitumen Co. heretofore contracted with the United States to build an outfall sewer in the city of Anniston, Ala., the contract being designated as Federal Works Agency project No. Ala. 1-160 (F); and

Whereas Roberts Blount became the guarantor on said contract; and

Whereas the Southern Bitumen Co. defaulted on its contract and Roberts Blount arranged for the completion of said contract by the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., and the same was so completed in 1943; and

Whereas the Federal Works Agency withheld from the contract price the sum of $13,685 on account of liquidated damages for delay in completion and on account of an alleged defect in workmanship resulting in excess seepage of water into the sewer main, which said defect has since proved in actual use for nearly 3 years to be of no material consequence; and

Whereas the sum of $3,053.88 has been paid to the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co. as assignee of the Southern Bitumen Co. in part payment of the sum of $13,685 due under said contract: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., or its assignee, the sum of $10,631.12 in full satisfaction of all claims of the Southern Bitumen Co., the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., and Roberts Blount arising out of the construction of the afore-mentioned sewer at Anniston, Ala., under project No. Ala. 1-160 (F).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 619) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORMAN ABBOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 770) for the relief of Norman Abbott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Norman Abbott, Baltimore, Md., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Norman Abbott against the United States for damages resulting from personal injuries sustained when he was struck on March 26, 1944, while standing at the intersection of Patapsco Avenue and Ninth Street, Baltimore, Md., by a United States Coast Guard automobile: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$3,500."

Line 8, strike out "damages resulting from personal injuries" and insert "personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT HINTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Robert Hinton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Hinton, Santa Barbara, Calif., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Hinton against the United States on account of personal injuries, sustained on September 23, 1944, when the automobile which he was driving was struck at the intersection of Valerio Street and Chapala Street, Santa Barbara, Calif., by a United States Marine Corps truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$2,000."

Line 9, after "injuries", insert "medical expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES F. BARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2631) for the relief of Charles F. Barrett.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, may continue in such office and be reappointed as a Foreign Service officer, in the class of career minister, and such reappointment may be effective as of November 25, 1946: *Provided*, That the total compensation to be paid him as a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister and as Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council shall be that provided by law for a Foreign Service officer in the class of career minister or that provided by law for Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council, whichever is the higher.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COMDR. PAUL A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 874) to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the existing provisions of law or any rules or regulations issued thereunder, the President is authorized to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith, an officer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, and his appointment to, acceptance, and service as such alternate and representative shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the United States or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion or retirement, or other benefits incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That during the time he holds the office of alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor and representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization he shall have the rank of rear admiral (lower half) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and shall receive such compensation and allowances as the Secretary of State shall prescribe payable from appropriations made by law for the Department of State: *Provided further*, That so long as he remains alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization he shall retain his permanent rank and grade or such rank and grade to which he may be promoted by reason of his position on the lineal list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, Lieutenant Commander Smith shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition other than would be operative with respect to him if he was in no way connected with the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Abernethy	Fellows	Lane
Barden	Fletcher	Latham
Bell	Fuller	Lesinski
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	McConnell
Bland	Gifford	McDowell
Boykin	Gillie	McGarvey
Buckley	Gregory	McGregor
Bulwinkle	Halleck	Madden
Chelf	Hand	Maloney
Clark	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.
Clements	Harness, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Cole, Kans.	Harris	Mitchell
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Morrison
Cooley	Hébert	Nixon
D'Alesandro	Hess	Nodar
Dawson, Ill.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Dingell	Howell	O'Toole
Doughton	Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer
Ellsworth	Kearns	Philbin
Elsaesser	Kefauver	Poage
Elston	Kelley	Powell
Fallon	Kunkel	Rabin
Reed, Ill.	Sikes	Trimble
Richards	Smathers	Van Zandt
Rivers	Smith, Maine	Vinson
Rooney	Somers	West
Scoblick	Taylor	Wood
Scott, Hardie	Thomas, N. J.	
Short	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 205 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 9 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 2616 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938 and to move to strike out all after the enactment clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 2616.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2616, a bill to authorize the expenditure of some $400,000,000 for relief, rehabilitation, and certain military purposes in Greece and Turkey. The rule provides for 9 hours of general debate, following which the bill will be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I might interpolate to say I will support this rule because I believe in majority rule, and the Committee on Rules did report this rule.

Never in my experience have I encountered a legislative measure concerning which so many people know so little. We have been told that this is a bill to feed the hungry and to clothe the destitute in Greece and Turkey; and to provide for the rehabilitation of those countries. We are also told that this is a bill for military purposes—to stop the spread of communism and the march of the aggressor.

There is no doubt of the need for food and clothing, medicine and housing, reconstruction and rehabilitation in war-torn, tragic Greece. But no such situation exists in Turkey, where food and clothing are abundant, and the people have grown fat on the profits of war. There is no suffering, no destitution, no wreckage of war in Turkey—for Turkey was neutral in World War II. So, while there may be need for additional funds to help Greece—funds greater than those already being furnished under our general European relief program—surely the only purpose behind the Turkish loan is a military one.

No one in this House knows how much the new foreign policy we are embarking upon will cost, or when that cost will end. No one knows how many other countries will demand aid of us to stop the spread of communism; or to drive back the aggressor. No one knows whether the enactment of H. R. 2616 will result in war or in peace. No one knows whether this is the best way or the worst way to accomplish our desired purpose of bringing peace, liberty, and freedom to the peoples of the world. Little or no real information has been given us by those who favor this bill.

So in the belief this is one of the most far reaching and important measures ever to come before the Congress—for it establishes a new American foreign policy from which we cannot easily turn aside—I opposed the granting of the rule until we could first hear from Secretary of State Marshall and ask for answers to many of the questions which are now giving us such grave concern.

I do not know where this legislative step—if we take it—will lead. I do not believe anyone knows. I do not know how long we will have to continue furnishing aid to Greece and Turkey to stop the spread of communism in those lands, or if we start, what the full cost will be. I do not know what other peoples or countries will be appealing to us for money, munitions, and men with which to combat the spread of communism. I do not know whether this is the road to peace or to war.

However, there are some things I do know. I know that 30 years ago we entered a great war—the World War we called it then—to save democracy by destroying kaiserism, and that we expended billions of dollars and many thousands of lives in that cause. We helped to win that war, but with the victory came disillusionment, and less democracy and freedom than prevailed before the struggle began.

I do know that of the tortured and decaying remains of a war-torn Europe there arose an even greater autocracy than that which prevailed under the kaisers and the czars. Fascism, nazism, and communism spread their cancerous growths across the continent and into the far reaches of Asia. As the strength of these political ideologies grew, human liberty lessened and disappeared. The sound of military boots was heard everywhere. Force, violence, and a total disregard for the rights or dignity of man became the order of the day. Then suddenly the growing monsters reached out to take the land, the property, and the lives of weaker peoples. Italy seized Ethiopia and Albania. Russia wrested territory from little Finland, from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Germany marched into Czechoslovakia and Austria, and divided Poland with Russia. Later came the invasions of Norway, France, Belgium, and Holland, and of the Balkans, and Greece. Once more the cry came for America to save democracy. First we extended credit and loaned our money. Then we sent our guns and ships—and last our men.

Finally the eagles of victory perched upon our war banners. Hitlerism was destroyed. Treacherous Japan was defeated. We had fought and won two conflicts on opposite sides of the earth—two great victories at the cost of more than 300,000 dead, 700,000 wounded, and nearly five hundred billions of dollars.

Once again we had saved the world for democracy. The Four Freedoms would live, we were told. Yet even before the victories were won in what we know as World War II, the seeds of a third great world struggle were being sown—planted at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta—yes, even at Potsdam.

Now it is communism we must fight. We find it here at home, as well as in almost every other part of the globe. Now we are being told once more that we can save the world with our money, with our food, with our tools—all short of war. However, we are not being told the whole story. Are we to fight the spread of communism only in Greece and Turkey? What about France and Italy, and Egypt, Palestine, and Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, India and the East Indies, China, Korea, the Philippines, and all the rest of the world? What about communism here at home? Are we to oppose it elsewhere and permit it to thrive unopposed here in America?

Must we fight another war? I believe that answer will be given by Russia, rather than by ourselves. If another war does come it may matter little whether we win or lose, for civilization cannot stand another world conflict. The United States cannot stand the winning of another great victory. As certainly as I speak here, if another world war does not mean the end of civilization, it will, at least, mean the end of representative government, and liberty and freedom for the average individual.

After every war there is always less liberty and less freedom, and more hunger and greater suffering. If it is not to be war, how long can the 140,000,000 people here in the United States feed, finance, and police the world, or any great portion of it?

If this new proposed foreign policy is to cost the fifteen to thirty billion dollars many estimate it will; if we are to continue to furnish the food, the clothing, the machinery, and the equipment the world needs and demands; if we send hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, of our young men to police humanity's danger spots; there is a strong likelihood we shall so weaken ourselves here at home as to fall an easy prey to those Communists and radicals within our own ranks who even now are attempting to destroy our representative government, and to set up in its stead some sort of a socialized state here in America.

Two years ago the nations of a war-weary world sent representatives to San Francisco to endeavor to work out some means of preventing a third world war. Asking, in every tongue, the guidance of divine providence the delegates to the San Francisco Conference labored and brought forth a new international organization—the United Nations. Its purpose was to preserve the peace of the world and to protect the territorial and political integrity of the smaller nations.

In less than a year the first real test of that organization came, when Russia, who had insisted upon being given the veto power in the Security Council as the price for her joining the United Nations, broke an agreement to withdraw her troops from Iran, and insisted upon keeping them in that oil-rich land. The United States did not move as an individual nation to force withdrawal of the Russian troops from Iranian territory. Instead an appeal was taken by the Iranian Government to the United Nations and with the support of the delegates from this country, and from almost every other freedom-loving nation on the face of the earth, the United Nations organization was able to marshal public opinion throughout the world and, through it, to force the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran. It was a great victory for the United Nations. It augured well for the future.

Yet, here a year later, when no Russian troops are in either Greece or Turkey, we propose by this legislation to ignore and bypass the United Nations, to lay ourselves open to the false charge of imperialism and to take upon ourselves the single-handed responsibility of stopping the spread of communism in those countries.

Let me say to you, in all sincerity, by the enactment of this bill we shall drive a dagger into the very heart of the United Nations. We shall destroy it. We shall make certain of its death. How much wiser it would be if we were to appeal to the United Nations to aid Greece and Turkey in protecting their political and territorial integrity, while we serve and help the hungry and destitute of Greece. How much better it would be were we to loan our strength to the support of the United Nations in solving the Grecian-Turkish situation, rather than to risk it on a single game of pitch and toss in the Mediterranean. How much better if we would furnish most of the financial aid, the goods and the men, to the United Nations, and then, under the auspices of that organization, and with the moral support of the other liberty-loving peoples of the world, make a united stand against the spread of communism and the threats of aggression.

No, my friends, if you really believe in world peace, if you want to stop the spread of communism and the march of the aggressor, you will not by-pass the United Nations, but instead will strengthen and use it as the one vehicle by which the great goal we all seek can be gained.

Let us test the sincerity of Russia. Let her join with the rest of the peace-loving nations of the earth in making the United

Nations work in preserving the peace, and in protecting the territorial and political integrity of the weak. Or, if she chooses, let her refuse to cooperate and give her the opportunity to withdraw from the United Nations, or to be expelled if she does not wish to keep her solemn promises and pledges as made at San Francisco. If that last final step becomes necessary, then let the peace-loving countries of the earth ostracize Russia from the society of decent nations. Let diplomatic and commercial relations be severed. Let the iron curtain become effective both ways.

It is with the firm conviction that not until the United Nations and the ostracizing of Russia have failed, should we, as an individual Nation, take upon ourselves the responsibilities of either feeding, financing, and policing the whole world, or of fighting another world war.

Therefore, at the proper time I shall offer or support an amendment which would refer this whole matter to the United Nations, while, in the meantime, we can move to relieve the sufferings of our friends in Greece.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, some of the 1-minute speeches made here on the floor this morning, including the speech of my friend the gentleman from Ohio who just yielded the floor, pain me very much. It is difficult for me to realize that they represent the sound and informed judgment of their authors. Some of them are speeches that you would expect to hear in a political campaign addressed to a complacent and uninformed constituency. Make no mistake about it, they are the kind of speeches that will pierce the iron curtain drawn by Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I indulge no false illusions about what is here proposed. To me this is a solemn moment. We are here called upon to make a decision that will affect for good or evil the entire world. Following the policy of appeasement, we have come to the brink of disaster. Our situation is somewhat like that of the eagle observing the arrow that had pierced his heart that was heard to say, "With our own feathers, not by others' hands, are we now smitten." We have done much which we must now undo.

The whole world is divided into two camps—Russia on one side and the United States on the other. There is no intermediate ground upon which people can long stand.

There are those who hesitate to support this resolution because of its military aspects and for them I have great sympathy. The resolution is military in character and for that reason, and that alone, I give it my wholehearted support. While it is a defense measure, it is also a declaration to the world that for the preservation of liberty we will war, and that America shall never be fed into the greedy maw of Russia.

That we are forever abandoning our historic doctrine of no entangling alliances with other peoples, I concede, but remember that when that doctrine was promulgated we were a small and weak nation. We were protected from foreign aggressions by the Atlantic to the east of us and the Pacific to the west, but this is no longer the case. This is a new age and a new world in which we now live. We now move forward or else we perish. We are in the hands of fate and must do her bidding. Our time for world leadership has come and we must not falter.

Men whose hearts have surrendered to fear and whose hopes grovel in the dust may seek refuge in the torn-down house of isolationism, but those of lofty souls and stout hearts, taking account of realities, will go forward in the determination that liberty shall not perish from the face of the earth.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct one error made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], when he said a while ago that at San Francisco the delegates prayed to Almighty God. The only prayer we heard during that entire conference was the prayer of Harry Truman, President of the United States, in his broadcast to the conference.

MOST IMPORTANT LEGISLATION EVER PRESENTED HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are today considering, as I view it, the most important legislation that has ever been submitted to this House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] who preceded me—and I know he is sincere; I know he is honest—told us that this legislation is military in character. I was fearful of that. The people of this country on every occasion when they have had the opportunity have shown they are against war. The polls now show they still are against war. Are we today by passing this legislation going to declare war? I hope to God that we will not bring about such an eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the press reported that I voted against this rule. Yes, I did vote against it, although I did not give out that information. I believe that my vote was in the right direction. I voted to postpone consideration for a few days so that the Members and the country would have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with this great and important matter on which we were about to grant a rule.

MANY WELL-INFORMED WITNESSES NOT CALLED

We have in this country, Mr. Speaker, many outstanding and completely loyal men who are better informed, by personal knowledge and investigation, than the small number who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and on whose judgment the committee acted.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we might have the benefit of the direct views of such disinterested and personally informed individuals as Secretary of State Marshall, Former Secretary of State Hull, former Secretary of State Byrnes, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, former Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, former Ambassador Joseph Davies, former Governor Harold Stassen, Col. Elliot Roosevelt, and above all of Paul Porter, former Price Administrator and lately head of the American Economic Mission to Greece and as such the President's personal ambassador.

I am satisfied that it was not the intention of the President to recommend this legislation as a war measure.

I have the utmost confidence, and the country has the utmost confidence, in President Truman.

He is honest, sincere, and patriotic, and he has always at heart the best interests of this great country and the masses of the people.

PRESIDENT LED ASTRAY BY FALSE ADVISERS

I am fearful only that the President may have been imposed upon and led astray by officials and advisers in whom he has reposed undeserved trust who are actually dominated by Wall Street finance and certain oil interests.

Such men almost inevitably confuse their private interests with the public interest, to put it in the best light; and some deliberately work for their private interests, knowing they are in direct conflict with the public good. Their environment and their conditioning and their affiliations make the distinction difficult even when the motives are pure.

Certainly I should not undertake to reflect on the honesty and sincerity of the Honorable Dean Acheson or of the Honorable Will Clayton. Yet Mr. Acheson was, prior to his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, a partner in a prominent Wall Street law firm, and his family connections are with the conservatives inclined to think that wealth can do no wrong.

Mr. Clayton, a man of great ability, is a senior partner of the greatest firm in the cotton industry, intimately associated with uninhibited bigness of holdings, volume, and world-wide interests. He is a big man, and associated with big men, and in viewpoint is unavoidably in sympathy with Wall Street financial groups.

The close connections of John Foster Dulles, the Republican adviser to the State Department, with international finance and cartelism, with the Nazi-Fascist governments, and with the ruthless exploitation of Big Business, are so well-known and have been so widely publicized they need not be repeated. Suffice it to say that his law firm found it easy and advantageous "to do business with Hitler."

CONFIDENCE IN GENERAL MARSHALL

I have thorough and great confidence in the judgment of Secretary Marshall in guiding and safeguarding the interests of our own country, and accordingly I have been favorably impressed by his expression of belief that there is a real and potential opportunity to effect an amicable adjustment of the differences between the United States and Russia, thereby assuring peace not only to our own country but to the whole sick world.

As I may not have another opportunity to speak on this legislation, I appeal to the membership to read the full text

of General Marshall's report to the people, and of the interview between former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, who resigned that great office to enter the service of our country as a naval commander and served with distinction in the war against nazism, and Generalissimo Stalin.

Remember that Stalin told Commander Stassen: "I want to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to cooperate."

Just yesterday you saw the headlines in the Washington Star, "Stassen says arming of Greek regime will be tragic mistake."

I should have liked, Mr. Speaker, to insert the full text of that interview at this point; but because of the length I insert instead the summary of the interview published in the Christian Science Monitor, which is concise and fair:

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Harold E. Stassen, Republican Presidential aspirant, has brought home from Prime Minister Joseph Stalin words of promised cooperation on a wide range of issues, from world atomic control to exchange of students, which continue to divide the United States and Russia.

From the verbatim transcript of the 80-minute exchange which Mr. Stassen had with him at the Kremlin and which Mr. Stassen has now issued in full text, it develops that the Russian Premier offered to his visitor these views:

1. Stalin said he believed it is possible for Russia's Communist economy and America's free-enterprise economy to exist together in the same world in harmony.

COOPERATION

2. He held that cooperation between the two systems which was possible could not be realized unless both sides "wish to cooperate," and he told Mr. Stassen that he wanted "to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to cooperate."

3. He argued that if Americans will stop calling Russia "totalitarian" and if Russians stop calling America "monopolist," there will be a good chance of achieving cooperation. "We must start," he said, "from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people."

4. Stalin thought it would be difficult for Russia to dispense with censorship.

5. He "hoped" there was a "reasonable prospect" of working out agreements for world control of atomic energy, and used the words: "I think we shall succeed in establishing international inspection and control. Things are leading up to it."

6. He revealed interest and concern over the possibility of an economic crisis in the United States. Twice he asked Mr. Stassen this question and referred to the fact that "magazine analysts and the American press carry open reports to the effect than an economic crisis (in the United States) will break out."

The record of the interview shows that Mr. Stassen replied that he did not think a depression would develop. To the specific question "Do you expect a crisis?" Mr. Stassen answered:

"I do not. I believe we can regulate our capitalism and stabilize our production and employment at a high level without any serious crisis. But it is the main problem to avoid a depression in our economic system. With wise policies in Government and through learning the lessons of 1929 and the 1930's, we should have a successful, regulated, but not monopolistic, capitalism with which we can avoid an economic crisis."

Stalin himself volunteered this explanation of America's development and favorable postwar position:

"Things are not bad in the United States. America is protected by two oceans. In the north there is a weak country, Canada, and to the south a weak country, Mexico, and so you need not be afraid of them. After the War of Independence the United States did not have another war for 60 years, and that was a great help to the rapid development of the United States of America. America's population is made up of such people as fled from monarchy and tyranny and kings and landed aristocracy, and that was also a great help, and that is why America developed in leaps and bounds."

Mr. Stassen's interview took place on April 9 in Moscow, where he was visiting during the course of a 2-month trip to study economic and political conditions throughout Europe.

MOLOTOV PRESENT

Present at the interview were Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov; Messrs, Pavlov, Russian interpreter; Jay Cooke, Philadelphia Republican leader, war veteran, and associate of Mr. Stassen on his journey; and Robert Matteson, of St. Paul, Minn., war veteran and research assistant on Mr. Stassen's staff.

The transcript was prepared from Mr. Matteson's notes in English of the entire conference and reviewed with interpretation of Mr. Pavlov's transcript in Russian, copy of which was obtained upon request.

Permission to release the transcript was requested and obtained from Prime Minister Stalin at the conclusion of the conference.

ALEMAN PLEADED FOR PEACE

You have heard also the stirring appeal of President Miguel Aleman, of our friendly sister Republic of Mexico a few days ago, when he appeared before us, for world peace and justice and freedom.

You heard him say, in part:

Amity between governments is short lived, unless it be the outcome of a genuine desire of their people to cooperate. Were we to limit the efficacy of good neighborliness to the covenants to safeguard the theoretical equality of all states, the respect of territorial integrity, the principle of nonintervention, as well as the joint defense of the continent, we would still be defrauding some of the most cherished hopes of our peoples. The fact that nearly 300,000,000 people live side by side in our hemisphere involves not only juridical problems and not alone problems of military strategy. As much as in the political solutions—and perhaps much more than in the political solutions—those millions are concerned not only with assistance to ward off foreign aggression, but also with common efforts to overcome the dangers of poverty and despair in the difficult years of the peace.

The true significance of good neighborliness is cooperation. It springs from the democratic tenets that bind us together. It surpasses the scope of diplomacy. It goes beyond the exchanges of military staffs. It brings our peoples closer to one another, holding fast to their inalienable rights, those very rights your Declaration of Independence sets forth as supreme goals—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

NOT PRESENTED AS WAR MEASURE

The witnesses who appeared before the committees of the House did not state, as my colleague from Georgia has said, that this is a war measure, but, Mr. Speaker, if I could persuade myself that this is not a war measure I should gladly support it.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection to helping the needy and tragic people of the countries devastated by the horrible Nazi war against humanity.

There can be no possible doubt of my position on that, for I have explained it over and over.

I voted to provide $350,000,000 for foreign aid in Europe, and I am willing to vote for any additional millions necessary to feed the starving or to help rehabilitate the war-devastated areas, but I am unwilling to vote any millions for foreign military operations in peacetime when our direct interests are not affected.

At this point I want to make my position equally clear on another point.

I am not in favor of permitting Russia to expand in a way which would affect our legitimate interests anywhere, or which would jeopardize world peace, and I am opposed to any unjustified and aggressive Russian expansion at the expense of the freedom of any smaller nation.

TURKEY NOT IN NEED

As for Turkey, I have heard no convincing arguments that she is in any need of financial or military aid. Her economy is in good shape. Her agricultural economy is the best she has ever known.

Turkey fought against the Allies in the First World War, and in the Second World War, notwithstanding her promise to join the United Nations, she remained friendly with Hitler and flirted with both sides.

All through the war, far from suffering, Turkey fattened on bribes from England and the United States.

Official figures show that Turkey already has received more than $100,000,000 from the United States in subsidies or bribes to keep her out of the war.

Turkey's on-the-fence attitude during the war caused the United Nations great anxiety, and in addition to those huge bribes we had to keep armies ready for action if she joined Hitler.

Turkey continued negotiations with Von Papen, Hitler's emissary, all through the war.

Nobody with whom I have talked feels that Turkey deserves any aid.

As it has been stated, all that Turkey needs is help to equip her standing army of 600,000 men. Is that for the purpose of enabling the Turkish Army to kill off the remaining Christian Armenians, as has been the national custom in Turkey for generations past?

For the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, to say, as he is reported to have said, that Greece and Turkey are democracies is ridiculous.

I have no doubt that there has been some improvement over the days of the Sultans; but Turkey is still the "sick man of Europe." Her huge standing army is a constant drain on the national economy and on her manpower.

Greece is little better. The monarchy is German, imposed by British bayonets. Religious and political persecution there is reported to be about as bad as in Nazi Germany, and it is said that people are imprisoned or executed without trial merely on suspicion of criticism of the existing government.

UNITED STATES ABANDONED LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Twenty-five years ago we foredoomed the League of Nations to failure by refusing to join our great power and strength with other peace-loving nations.

Are we now going to let another great effort at world peace go by default by by-passing the United Nations?

The people of the world have pinned all their hopes on the United Nations to bring a just and lasting peace.

Shall we dash those hopes by embarking on a one-nation war of nerves to save the investments of financiers and oil cartels in the Middle East?

It is my belief that had we entered the League of Nations we might have so strengthened the League that the Second World War could have been warded off, and I am fearful that today we shall threaten the stability and effectiveness of the United Nations, organized for the same purpose: To bring peace to a troubled world and to create the conditions under which all people can live in harmony in the democratic way of life.

FORMER ISOLATIONISTS EAGER FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Is it not strange, Mr. Speaker, that many former isolationists are now so eager for war?

It is possible that had our isolationists not so opposed and delayed our preparations, the Second World War could have been avoided.

I feel they are making a mistake now as they did before, and I hope they will come to the realization that we owe it to the country, we owe it to ourselves, and we owe it to the world not to weaken the United Nations but to strengthen it.

Actually, it has been brilliantly argued by many international lawyers that under the United Nations Charter this legislation is illegal.

Whether or not it is illegal, it certainly contains grave dangers that we may weaken the cause of international government and international law by acting alone in this way.

CANNOT EXTERMINATE ALL WHO DISAGREE WITH US

I know the President is honest, sincere, and patriotic, a great Democratic President, with the welfare of the people always close to his heart, and I know that he does not intend and did not intend by recommending this measure to involve us in any global war such as this might conceivably bring about.

I fear only, as perhaps I have said before, that he is being advised by gentlemen whose views differ from those of most of us, and to whom, somehow, matters which might be to British interest seem paramount, or to whom true democracy is not very real or meaningful, and who put their own interpretation on events.

Our ruling monopolists perhaps think that we can exterminate by force of arms all who disagree with us.

They are wrong.

The strong hopes of the people for peace and freedom are stronger than all the armaments of reaction.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include several editorials and articles.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is impossible in the short period of 3 minutes to express intelligently our views on an important matter of this kind.

I shall vote for this rule, but I am opposed to the legislation which the rule makes in order.

I think it extremely unfortunate that the information has gone out from the press that there was an attempt to kill the bill outright in the Rules Committee.

The informant for the press who gave the information in respect to the proceedings of the Rules Committee in executive session last Friday, when it was considering the pending resolution having to do with the Greek-Turkish loan was quite accurate in most respects. However, in order that the press may now be fully informed, we think the informant who made the report should, as the lawyers would say, have told "the whole truth." Of course, I do not know who furnished the press with the information concerning the proceedings of committee in executive session. Ordinarily, and there was a time, when executive sessions of committees were presumably off-record for the public generally; but I am sure that most Members of Congress have long since learned that nothing is off the record so far as congressional procedures are concerned. Quite often conferences of either of the parties which deal with strictly party matters, also cloaked in utmost secrecy, are made available to the press as soon as the conferences are adjourned. There is nothing secret any more except the facts that are withheld from the American taxpayers, which they would no doubt like to have before agreeing to pay for a third world war. As far as I am personally concerned, it was perfectly agreeable with me to inform the press, not only of the results, but as to the entire discussion that was carried on in the Rules Committee in executive session; but certainly the informant should have been fair enough to tell the gentlemen of the press that the postponement of the bill at that time, on the part of some of us, was not for the purpose of permanently killing the bill, which seems to have been the impression that was given the press either intentionally or unintentionally; but that the real reason for the temporary postponement was to make available to the committee further information which they believed it was possible to get from General Marshall.

Some of us wanted to ascertain from the Secretary of State, General Marshall, the position of the State Department in respect to continuing shipments of equipment, heavy materials, and other commodities to Russia. To some of us it seems that the two policies, namely, the policy to stop communism by making a military alliance with Turkey and Greece against Russian expansion, and at the same time continue to pour American goods into Russia, are somewhat inconsistent. Some of us believe that the American people should be told the truth about this Greek-Turkish loan. Apparently the State Department assumes for itself that it can label such legislation as a relief bill, pretend that the bill is for the purpose of giving relief to hungry and naked people, and that the House and the American people will be fooled by such hypocrisy and take the bill as labeled.

All of us know relief is desperately needed by the Greek people and we just last week voted $200,000,000 for relief, a part of which is to go to the people in Greece. I supported that bill. Certainly I am willing to vote for funds necessary to assist the brave and heroic Greek people in food, clothing, and shelter, but the policy of a military alliance with Greece and Turkey is a matter which should be considered very carefully and prayerfully before the final step is taken.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; this country wants peace, the whole world wants peace, and we were hopeful that when we joined in the creation of the United Nations organization that we had created the machinery where questions of the character involved in this bill could be settled and would be settled by the United Nations and that thereafter no single one country would attempt to form a military alliance or a military compact with one country or two countries or a group of countries without first consulting the United Nations, and thereby attempt to bring about settlements through that organization.

It is said that the United Nations is impotent. That may be true; but at least it could have been consulted, and if the United Nations, with the exception of Russia, had concluded that the intention of Russia was to encircle Europe, the Balkans, including Turkey and Greece, or were attempting encirclement of any other section of the world, contrary to the rules and regulations and understanding contemplated in the United Nations organization, then would have been the time for this country to have spoken. In other words, if we are to disregard entirely the United Nations organization at any time and under any circumstances that we desire, then we should make that policy known, we should withdraw from that organization so that the whole world, and especially our own people, will know that we intend to make such deals at such times and under such circumstances as we deem advisable with reference to the other part of the world.

I do not surrender to the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else in my devotion to America and to American principles, but military agreements and compacts of this character usually mean war. I do not believe the American people want war. I think they are crying and praying for peace.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker, this country is not strong enough economically to police the world alone. If we follow this course we are now charting, we must have a military establishment strong enough to go into every section of the world on a moment's notice prepared

to wage war against those who attempt to foster some other form of government which we construe to be imperialistic. Maybe we will spend untold billions fencing Russia in so that they cannot infiltrate into Greece and Turkey. When we have spent those billions, then it may be that the next infiltration will be into France or into some other part of Europe, and we will be called on for more billions and more soldiers. After Europe it may be India; after India it may be China; and after China, perhaps Korea. These billions that we will be required to expend, when added to our present debt of more than $250,000,000,000 will bankrupt this Nation just as sure as you and I are here today. Then, with a bankrupt United States, what will happen. The men on horseback will come along here. Nothing breeds communism as much as poverty; and if we are not very careful in this world-wide attempt to fight communism, we will ourselves become insecure and communism will enthrone itself in a bankrupt America, brought about by our own stupidity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RIZLEY. May I inquire, in passing, what governments are we going to support and just what governments are we not going to support? Does anyone claim that Turkey is a democracy? Has Turkey done anything to demonstrate its love for this country or its love for democratic principles? How long has it been since they were murdering the Armenians and Christians? Just how strong do we want to make Turkey from a military standpoint? The answer is, according to our friends who are sponsoring this legislation, Yes; we admit it is fraught with danger, it is bad, but the alternative is much worse. Where are the facts that warrant such a conclusion as the alternative? What has this administration, which is sponsoring this legislation under the theory that it is being done to thwart the Red menace, done in America to stop communism? In every branch of our Government now we have Communists. Yesterday, if we are to believe the press, Communists in Army uniform were marching in May Day parades in America. Has anything been done to weed out the Army of Communists? Had we not better stop Communists at home and make America strong before we attempt this policy abroad? Before we pass this legislation we better have a breathing, praying spell, so to speak. We better get our own house in order; we better be sure that this is not an OPA or a WPA to further the ideologies of the genuine New Dealers. Only a strong America can survive, and bankruptcy and strength do not go together.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this brief time under the rule to explain my views with respect to the pending legislation.

This legislation has now been debated in the country at large for over 2 months. It was recommended by the President, and it was passed by the Senate in substantially the same form in which it now comes to us. A bill of the far-reaching importance of this one requires just such free and full discussion, and I am glad that the rule now before us provides for 9 hours of general debate.

I am going to vote for the bill. I shall do so, and I believe that many others on the floor of this House will do so, without great enthusiasm. Our lack of enthusiasm stems from the fact that no one can tell us where ultimately the policy on which we are about to embark will lead. On the other hand, we do know this—we know that the Soviet Union has adopted a course, the outlines of which are quite clear. That course has for its objective bringing within the orbit of communistic totalitarianism as many nations as can be weaned away from their present social and political concepts. Where this cannot be done by infiltration and revolution it has been done by occupation and force. It is a policy which is very similar to the policy adopted by Hitler of picking off one nation at a time, hoping thereby to avert an open clash but hoping likewise thereby eventually to become so strong that no single power nor remaining combination of powers could challenge his world-wide ambitions. A halt had to be called to that policy of Hitler's. So today a halt must be called to the aggressive ambitions of the Soviet Union. The legislation now before us attempts to do this.

I am convinced that we have but two alternatives to choose from. The first is to reject this legislation and in effect say to the Soviet Union that in spite of the recommendation of the President and the action of the Senate we do not propose to interfere with her expansionist policy. The second alternative is to accept this legislation and say to the Soviet Union that we are giving this help to allow two nations to continue their existence without Soviet domination. In choosing between these alternatives I feel that the latter course is the wiser and in the long run is much less likely to lead to open conflict.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the measure which it makes in order. No one can question the terrible import and importance of this legislation. We all, I think, realize that this policy perhaps will affect generations yet unborn, but it seems to me that we have here a proposition that should appeal to our common horse sense. In a matter of this great importance I would ordinarily hesitate to raise my feeble voice and express my views on so transcendent a proposition, but what have we here today? We have the considered recommendation of the President of the United States. It has the support of the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party and of the Republican Party. It comes to us with the endorsement of the United States Senate.

The plain, common, horse-sense question that is presented to the membership today is whether or not they are going to repudiate the foreign policy laid down by the President, by the responsible leadership of both parties and by the Secretary of State who we have designated as our representative to formulate our negotiations with foreign nations.

What has happened in this matter? For years this Nation has attempted to appease Russia. We have reached the conclusion that that cannot be done, and that is what this measure means, that this Government intends to stiffen its policy. That is the plain truth of the whole situation.

When I came on the floor this morning I happened to pick up a newspaper and this was the first thing that struck my eye. I am going to read it to you. It is dated Paris, France, yesterday:

PARIS, May 5.—Faced with the threat of a general strike, spearheaded by striking workers of the nationalized Renault automobile plants, uneasy France was wondering tonight just which direction it was headed.

Yesterday's vote of confidence for Premier Ramadier and the expulsion of five Communist Cabinet Ministers was conceded in authoritative quarters to be motivated by President Truman's program for assisting democracies endangered by Communist domination.

Someone during the course of the debate this morning asked where this would lead us, which way it would lead us. Do you not think this article from the morning's paper is significant? It shows that this policy has already begun to pay dividends throughout the world. It shows that this stiffened policy of the American people is indicating to certain foreign countries that this country will no longer yield at every point.

We had to face a similar decision in the last World War. We repudiated the League of Nations and then decided through a policy of appeasement and do-nothing that we would let the dictatorships go to the point where they could challenge the civilization of the world. Are we going to do that again?

It seems to me when I hear certain Members of this body, certain Members I say, get up here and espouse the same cause as is espoused by the followers of Henry Wallace, it seems to me that when certain Members of this body join forces with the Wallace forces, then I have seen everything that there is to be seen.

Are we going to return to the old policy of isolationism that destroyed the League of Nations and brought on the last World War?

Does history teach us nothing?

In these days are we ever going to learn that we cannot stick out heads in the sand and hope that these tides are not going to flow over us? Let us look at the realities of life. Let us realize that we cannot repudiate our Secretary of State and our President, as well as the leadership of the Democratic Party and the leadership of the Republican Party. Whatever else might be done about this matter, let us resolve ourselves in favor of following a leadership that so far has been successful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and the bill. I shall vote against both. President Truman, on the skinny pretext of stopping communism, has asked this Congress to authorize the intervention of this country in the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. He has been honest enough to admit that this calls for a basic change in our foreign policy, contrary to all precedent. Certainly it contradicts historic American policy, and if approved, will lead us into World War III—the first atomic war, if you please.

So long as we remain free and strong we shall never permit the entry of European or Asiatic nations in the Western Hemisphere. We would resist such an effort with all our resources. That is the essence of the Monroe Doctrine. As late as July 6, 1940, Secretary Hull said:

> The Government of the United States pursues a policy of nonparticipation and noninvolvement in the purely political affairs of Europe.

If this request is not political intervention in Greece and Turkey, what is it? President Truman reverses the Roosevelt-Hull policy and now asks us to approve a policy that justly might be called "intervention unlimited."

Admiral W. H. Standley, retired, and United States Ambassador to Russia in 1942–43, recently said:

> We should not assume responsibility of maintaining economic and political order in the Mediterranean area, or in any other area, without giving full consideration to its implications.
>
> Never again should we assume political commitments which we are either unable to support financially or unwilling to support with our full military power.

We are asked to support this legislation on the ground that our national security is involved because of communistic expansion. If that is true, then we share a great measure of responsibility. The cause of Russian expansion was accelerated in historic secret conferences at Teheran and Yalta, where Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill partitioned the postwar world. At those conferences—mark you well—those gentlemen turned over control of all of eastern Europe to Russia. Only Greece was exempt from those operations because of the strategic importance of that country. Churchill did not want Russia flanking Britain's life line to the Far East, and he fondly hoped that Soviet expansion would stop at the Greek borders. Stalin had other ideas. He insists that Greece is as properly within the Soviet sphere of influence as Cuba is within that of the United States. If we are honest and realistic, we will admit there is some merit to this position. So today we are in our present position by our own choice. We are reaping what we have sown.

Before embarking upon unchartered seas prudence demands that we count the costs. There is nothing in this bill which justifies taking a leap into oblivion, for that is what it is.

I am opposed to this measure for the following reasons:

First. It is purely a military venture.

Second. It will ultimately lead to economic disaster.

Third. It is properly a matter to be considered by the United Nations.

I urge that the rule be voted down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are today embarking upon a proposal such as has never been presented to the American people up to the present time. This is a military bill and should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs rather than to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is also appropriated in it $400,000,000 which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

May I ask, where are you going to get this money?

Mr. Speaker, the administration has been spending money in the last 10 years like drunken sailors so that the country at the present time is about wrecked, financially it is $259,000,000,000 in debt, and if we do not build up the United States and make it strong in every way instead of tearing it down and down, making it weak by such bills as this, we will not be of service either to ourselves or any other country in the world. Bankrupt the Nation and anything can happen to America.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will result in a hardship on the taxpayers of America. It will go to build up a military machine in Turkey and Greece and we do not know how long these countries will be under control of men in whom we have faith. This build-up of a military machine is just as liable to be turned against us as to be used for us when we want it. This will not stop communism in Greece or Turkey.

Great Britain withdrew from Greece and asked us to go in there and pull her chestnuts out of the fire and to perpetuate in Greece a monarch who does not have a drop of Greek blood in his veins. That is the kind of dynasty we are now trying to build up for the Greek people. Do you think for one minute that is going to be a country which will be loyal to Greeks? I question it very much.

We are taking as an ally the Turks. Never before have we condoned the things that the Turkish Government did and, in my judgment, they too will turn against America after we have built up a military machine that they can turn against America. O! how foolish a proposal this military bill is for us here in America.

The Rules Committee was told by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, very little what the bill was intended to do with the exception of the gentleman from South Carolina, that this is to build up a war machine for Greece and Turkey. The gentleman from South Carolina told us that we are going over there to build up a military machine in order to keep the Dardanelles from falling into the hands of Russia, that we are going to build up a military machine over there to protect certain oil interests in the Near East.

Mr. Speaker, this bill smells too much of oil to suit me and the quicker the American people realize we are going over there to protect oil interests the better it will be for the American people. Be honest about it.

A few years ago I remember in a political campaign a great radio voice said and I quote: "I promise you mothers again, again and again I will not send your sons to fight on foreign soil." Mr. Speaker, if we pass this legislation we will be sending the sons of America over there to fight on foreign soil again and that in the very near future. Do not bypass the United Nations or you kill it. Keep America strong—build up our own country, our own resources, our own flood control, our own reclamation, our own Army and Navy, our own Air Force, our own Marine Corps, our own atom-bomb.

If we become bankrupt we are no good to ourselves or anybody. Be wise and economize.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and also do not hesitate to say that I shall support the bill itself. Obviously, in the time assigned to me it is utterly impossible to discuss the bill. I can merely express my opinion in two or three sentences. I believe the passage of this measure will serve as a deterrent of war rather than encourage it. And I believe further—and this is more important, in my view—that the passage of this measure will inure to the safety of the United States.

My plea now is, however, that the House of Representatives adopt this rule so that we may go into this thing in an open debate, in which the Members interested in the matter may take part; a public debate, which may contain utterances heard around the world. I am for that kind of debate, and whether you are opposed to the legislation itself or in favor of it. I hope on this occasion, when the House of Representatives is facing the world and world opinion, that we shall go forward, debate this matter, and make the great decision.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what does the Truman doctrine cost? Where does it end? Does it destroy the United Nations? Is it an undeclared declaration of war?

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the President has proposed a policy which stabs the United Nations in the back. Mr. Truman advocates that we and we alone decide what should be done about aggression. In the Greek-Turkey bill he has asked the Congress to adopt as a policy intervention in every civil war in the world. In so doing the President

has violated our Nation's commitment to the United Nations to bring before that body any condition—economic, political, or military—which threatens the peace of the world. His policy destroys the United Nations, and in so doing the President makes inevitable a third world war. The sons and daughters of America will die on the battlefields of Asia and Europe to carry out this policy.

Financially, we cannot afford to divide the world into two armed camps. We already owe $260,000,000,000. Now Mr. Truman asks us to give away anywhere from ten to twenty billions of dollars every year. This fancy doctrine should be called the bankruptcy policy for America.

Our taxes are already too high. How can taxes be reduced if we continue to send $20,000,000,000 of goods and services abroad every year? The simple answer is that it cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are other excellent reasons for opposition to this violation of our commitment to the United Nations. In Greece, Mr. Truman would use our money to sustain a corrupt and venal monarchy. One Greek king was assassinated; three Greek kings were driven into exile. The Greek people hate monarchy; yet Mr. Truman wants to spend three hundred millions of good American money to keep him in power.

The story on Turkey is even worse. That country for a thousand years has persecuted Christians and Jews. Turkey has been a military dictatorship for the past 20 years. They have no freedom of speech—no free press—and in the last war they sold out the Allies to the Nazis. They violated their sworn agreements; yet, it is proposed that we should form what in effect is a military alliance with Turkey, despite the demonstrated unreliability of their military dictatorship.

He is asking us to cut the American standard of living in order to form a military alliance with Turkey. Every old, worn-out, moth-eaten shiek in the Middle East will be filling his pockets with our tax money.

Mr. Speaker, our money will be poured down every international rat hole from Singapore to Constantinople.

Fortunately, there is another way—an honorable way—and an effective one. We should keep our commitment with the United Nations. We should join with the other nations of the world in preventing aggression. Fortunately, we do have enough money to contribute relief and clothes to the Greek people, but Mr. Truman, under the guise of feeding the hungry, is asking us to form a military alliance with a Turkish dictatorship. This policy destroys the United Nations—it leads to war.

FAVORS ADOPTION OF RULE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], a member of the Committee on Rules, has explained, we wanted to postpone the action on the rule until we could obtain additional information. My position for years, and I still adhere to it, has been that I shall not deprive the House by my vote or action of the opportunity to pass judgment on any important legislation. I feel, however, since I voted to postpone action, that I owe it to myself and the House to say that I feel that the rule should be passed, because that has been my belief and my practice.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I point out that on March 12 when the President addressed the joint session of Congress he stated:

> We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in position to extend help of the kind that is required.

This statement of immediacy and urgency was made on March 12. It was made to justify the bypassing of the United Nations. Almost 2 months have gone by. I think the time element and events have negated the urgency of the request, in view of the fact that nothing has happened to substantiate the alleged urgency, urged as an excuse to bypass the United Nations.

May I add further that no one up to now, including the President, particularly, with the Assembly of the United Nations and the Council in session, has been able to explain the reason why the United Nations should be bypassed.

GREAT BRITAIN GAVE UNITED STATES RUSH ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully believe that Great Britain has, by her usual conniving methods, given us the rush act, feeling that if our country had time to consider this matter carefully there would be no chance to maneuver us into pulling her hot chestnuts out of the fire and permit her to unload many of her responsibilities upon us. May I ask: What has Great Britain ever done for America that we should assume her burdens and commitments?

Few have taken the trouble to examine the patent absurdity with which Britain announced 6 weeks ago her financial inability to further maintain an illegal occupation army of perhaps 12,000 officers and men in Greece, and her subsidies to the rotten Turkish autocracy, while continuing to maintain and finance an illegal occupation army of more than 100,000 officers and men in Palestine.

Through a tremendous propaganda campaign Great Britain is skillfully placing herself in a position of arbiter between the United States and Russia, when there is only imperial jealousy and economic conflicts between England and Russia.

This is an absurd situation.

As the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, with no national aspirations toward imperialistic exploitation, but desiring only peace and freedom of commerce and travel and of establishing a democratic way of life, we should be the arbiter, the world umpire.

Our only aggressive and dangerous enemies—and I want to repeat this again and again—were the Nazis and the Japanese war lords. We fought those countries and defeated them, in alliance with Russia and the other United Nations.

It is the English bankers and investment brokers who have been bleeding Greece and Turkey and much of the rest of the world with high-interest loans and absentee ownership of utilities and resources, and it is the British Empire's life line that stretches through the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas—not ours.

DANGERS EXAGGERATED

As I have stated frequently on this floor, I believe that the great hue and cry about imminent danger from communism is a blown-up fraud perpetrated by those spokesmen of reaction who oppose the slightest progress.

I sincerely believe that there is greater danger to our country, and to international peace, from stubborn reactionaries, from brutal cartels playing for monopolistic power, and from the adherents of the Nazi-Fascist ideology than from our handful of Communists whose potential power has been so fantastically exaggerated.

There is little doubt that England played a double game throughout the rise and reign of Hitler.

Without the tacit consent of England the Hitler legions would never have marched into the Saar and the Ruhr over the protests of France and Russia. The sacrifice and betrayal of Austria and Czechoslovakia could not have been accomplished without British complicity.

It is a matter of history that the British delegation deserted Russia at the crucial time that Hitler might have been checked.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Surely Hitler must have believed that Chamberlain intended to betray Poland, as he had betrayed Czechoslovakia, and to renounce the defensive treaty with Poland, or he would never have risked the Polish invasion.

True, England did meet her treaty obligations by declaring war on Germany to protect Poland; but only after Germany had amassed the most powerful army, up to that time, the world had seen, and when it was too late to aid and protect Poland from devastation and misery.

Even when England was fully in the war, she never lost sight of her own economic and political stake in Poland.

More than that of any other government in exile the Polish Government in London was a government in captivity which was directed and supported by the British with a view to recapturing her own economic domination of that brave unhappy country when peace came.

She broke her promises and pledges to that Polish Army when she could no longer use it, and there seemed no profit to be extracted from it. It is to be regretted that she has once more failed to keep her promises, and after using the Polish soldiers attempted to force them to take the most degrading employment.

One of the most ancient democratic documents in history is the Constitution of Poland.

The pride and courage and the democratic strength of the Polish people runs strong and true, and have for centuries.

There are, therefore, many strong bonds of sympathy between the brave

Polish people and the common people of Greece and Turkey.

It is perhaps not well know in this country that Turkey was the only state which refused to recognize the partition of Poland.

Similarly, the Polish people have sympathized in the struggles of the Greek people for freedom from foreign and domestic tyranny.

During the war Poland and Greece suffered equally from the brutal destruction and slaughter of the Nazis, and thousands of Greeks died in Nazi concentration camps on Polish soil.

I have tried to show not only the bonds of friendship and of common experience between the people of these countries but also to suggest some parallels.

Germany found her excuse for invading Poland with Hitler's overwhelming war machine in manufactured "border incidents."

We have heard, and always from British sources, reckless charges of "border incidents" in northern Greece, and of allegations that Greek guerrillas tagged with the term "Communist," were helped from across the border, always intended to create prejudice in America against the Greek patriots who resent British rule.

For many weeks now a United Nations investigating committee has been looking into those reports.

We have had a lot of gossip about burglars and straying delegates, all of which have been officially denied, but no authentic information that the Commission found any truth in the rumors of trouble on the border.

Many similar unfounded stories, rumors, and suspicions have been published with great headlines, but the truth of the facts denying the original stories receives scant press publicity.

The report of the investigators is being drawn up now in Geneva. I feel that the House should have that report before acting on this legislation.

THIS IS USING RELIEF FOR POLITICS

It has been stated, even before the bill is passed, that other financial assistance will be extended to France if the new Cabinet is free of Communists, and there is talk of similar aid to Italy and other countries on the same conditions. This, I submit, is using relief and rehabilitation for politics very openly, although we condemn that practice when it is even suspected of other countries.

Some Members have said frankly that they intend to vote for this bill, not for the sake of aiding Greece in establishing a sound economy and a sound government, but because it is clearly a war measure directed against Russia.

Mr. Speaker, my urgent plea to this Congress, and to my country, is to take a positive and constructive approach to the whole question of aid to the war-torn countries of Europe.

Our task is not to restore and strengthen the brutal exploitation of Greece, Turkey, Poland, Rumania, and the other countries there by the British, no less than the Germans, but to aid them in rebuilding their countries.

Soup lines and doles are not the answer; but machinery, agricultural implements, irrigation and drainage projects, fertilizer and seeds, insecticides, tools, medical care, for all the people, without regard to race, creed, or political inclinations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman in agreement with the observation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. SABATH. He read what the President stated. Those were not his views, they were the expressions of the President.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further since my name was mentioned?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman from Georgia, who has admitted that this is virtually a step that will lead toward war, explain in his time what reasons he can give for the bypassing of the United Nations?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. If I have one virtue it is frankness. I am seeking no alibi. I regard this argument that this matter should be referred to the United Nations as an alibi, because every informed Member of the House knows that under existing conditions the United Nations can do nothing because of the veto power held by Russia.

Mr. SABATH. I disagree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] because a year ago the United Nations did act in the case of Iran and forced Russia to withdraw its troops. It was capable of acting there and I believe it can act now, if the right cooperation is given.

REACTIONARIES WILL SUPPORT BILL AS WAR MEASURE

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that the coalition of Democratic reactionaries and Republicans will support this measure for its warlike sound and meaning, and not for the sake of helping to rebuild the Greek economy and to establish a sound, democratic government in Greece, and not to help the Turkish people to progress further in their slow way toward democracy.

It is a sad commentary that those wealthy and powerful forces who seem to control our industry and business and finance and to maintain their own invisible government favor this high-handed military intervention in Greece because they believe that through it they can bring about the elimination of the threat of communism and perhaps the defeat of Soviet Russia.

They appear more interested in the welfare and the economic rehabilitation of the Germans and the Japs than in the nations who fought side by side with us against the enemy, and who suffered the cruel ravages of barbarous warfare, with the wanton murder of their nationals and destruction of all their industrial and agricultural wealth.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

God alone knows how much it will cost in years to come in American dollars and American resources and American lives to stop communism as the proponents of this wild plan claim.

You cannot stop communism by war and murder and military rule.

On the other hand, war and murder and military rule create the conditions which bring anarchy and socialism and communism.

Furthermore, you cannot bribe a whole people into submission with any amount of money against their own powerful aims and hopes for freedom and self-government and decent living conditions.

That is the outstanding reason I cannot support and vote for this bill; though a war crusade might, which I doubt, destroy communism, it might also and probably would destroy civilization. Such a war would, beyond any doubt, be not only a most unfortunate thing for our country but for the world; if that sad eventuality comes about it will be the most destructive of all wars in lives and property.

Therefore, I feel we should consider long and carefully before we take this fateful step.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun of Sunday, May 6, commenting on the published interview between Commander Stassen and Generalissimo Stalin:

STALIN ON THE RED DOGMA

Harold Stassen may have risked his standing with some Republican leaders by talking with Stalin, but he has brought back one of the most illuminating interviews yet to come out of the Kremlin.

We all knew beforehand that Stalin wants peace. What is new and important is the great emphasis which Stalin, under Mr. Stassen's prompting, laid upon the compatibility of the Communist and capitalist economic systems.

Mr. Stassen was on perfectly sound ground in pointing out that some of Stalin's own past statements suggested the contrary view. The Leninist orthodoxy has often assumed an irrepressible conflict with capitalism. But Leninism, like other orthodoxies, has many facets, many tenets. Stalin was able to argue that the true religion does not exclude the possibility of peaceful coexistence with capitalism. And he could point to "the book" to prove his case.

The significant thing is that Stalin should find it desirable to make this point so emphatically. There have been many indications that western suspicion and fear of communism were based in part on an outmoded interpretation of its principles. Many of us have gazed with rapt fixation on that part of the doctrine which spoke of inevitable struggle for world rule. If Stalin now chooses to underline that part which points in the opposite direction, Communist hierarchs everywhere are reminded that the line has changed, and the world is reminded that the line does leave a basis for the composition of power conflicts.

One may say that this shift in the line is no more significant or trustworthy than others of the past; that, when circumstances change, the old idea of world domination may come forward again. But this is not important. The cardinal error would be to base our own policy on the assumption that communism has fixed and rigid purposes, when in fact it is opportunistic, flexible, and capable of infinite adaptation to practical situations.

The very fact that the Red orthodoxy is elastic enough to include theoretical compatibility of its system with ours is significant of itself. For this means that, with wit and wisdom, we have a chance to attain a

peace settlement and an organization of the world which, once established, will be proof against a revival of the world-revolution idea.

If we begin with the premise that the world must divide, then on both sides we shall do things which widen the breach and accelerate the descent toward ultimate war. But if we start from the opposite assumption, as Stalin suggests can be done in harmony with Communist dogma, and as we know can be done in harmony with our own, then there is hope that a reconstructed world will gradually build up on both sides a vested interest in peace.

In that case it will not matter that the Red orthodoxy is capable of returning to the idea of world domination. A peaceful and prosperous world will create little incentive for revolution. A peaceful and prosperous world will open to it no opportunities.

Stalin's confidence in the ultimate attainment of international control of atomic energy is encouraging. But he obviously still believes the tenet of Communist orthodoxy which holds capitalism to be naturally aggressive and imperialistic. He thinks we are in for an economic crisis, and that when that happens we may go to war for foreign markets. Mr. Stassen earnestly tried to convince him that capitalism will accept regulation to the extent necessary to avoid a major depression and restrain any expansionist tendencies. Stalin didn't sound convinced. It is up to all of us to prove Mr. Stassen right—to disprove this item of the dogma as we have disproved others.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE FOR INFLATIONARY SPIRAL IN FOOD PRICES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is responsible for the inflationary spiral in food prices. That fact should be remembered when we hear almost daily appeals by administration spokesmen for reductions in prices. It is not generally realized that purchases by the Government for relief to the needy abroad is having a noticeable impact upon our own cost of living.

These purchases for foreign relief have the double effect of reducing supplies in the United States and in adding to the money or credit in circulation. Countless items daily are being taken out of our stocks to cover Government commitments made to peoples abroad.

It will be noticed that in all of the pleas by administration officials for business firms to slash their prices, nothing is said about the way the Government is entering the markets and taking out huge quantities of food and other materials.

The Truman administration cannot escape the responsibility for higher prices of certain vital food products which account for the increase in the cost of living during the months of February, March, and April of this year.

President Truman properly has made appeals for a reduction in the cost of living. We all want that. I feel, however, that the President would be more helpful in pointing to the causes for higher prices if he would tell the people the part his administration has played in causing the inflationary spiral of grains and certain foods, instead of attempting to place the blame on farmers and the food industry.

Without criticizing the need for an export food program of grains and other food by the Government, a careful study of daily purchases of grains and other food by the Government discloses that prices were driven up by reckless and ill-timed buying for shipment abroad.

This is an example of bungling by bureaucracy—some officials hammering for reduction in the cost of living; others adding to prices by barging into the markets with huge orders for food products without proper planning of purchases so as not to blow the lid off prices. I suggest to President Truman that he cause coordination of these policies.

There is evidence that speculators have been reaping a golden harvest on Government-made bull markets. America has become the happy hunting grounds for easy money for wealthy refugees from abroad. They are flocking to this country and putting their money to work in the food and other markets—of course, with the intention of making money from rising prices. The net result is higher prices for food and other things the American people must buy.

The prices for corn, oats, feeds, meat, bread, and other food products generally follow the price of wheat. The speculative fever in commodity markets was created last fall by Government buying to fill commitments that had not been counted upon earlier in the year.

But the speculative boom in grain prices did not actually acquire its upward momentum until Monday, January 20, 1947, when the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government buying agency, stepped into the market and purchased 19,728,647 bushels of wheat in 1 day.

This single day's purchase of wheat by the Government, which involved more than $40,000,000, was the spark that touched off feverish speculation in all grains. In the weeks following January 20, wheat advanced around $1 per bushel, with corn, other grains, and meat following the upward price of wheat. With large increases taking place in the price of wheat and other grains, prices of feed, flour, bread, meats, and other foods except dairy and poultry products, were advanced to cover higher raw material costs.

I want to again stress the importance of the ill-timed planning of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its buying of wheat during the month of January, at which time it was also announced by the Department of Agriculture that the 400,000,000 bushels of grains scheduled for shipment during the crop year 1946–47 would be stepped up and completed by May 1, 1947—2 months ahead of schedule. During the month of January the Government purchased 38,593,541 bushels of wheat. Of this total, 19,728,647 bushels were purchased on January 20. This operation was the go-ahead sign for the bull market and the green light for the wild speculation which took place during January, February, and March.

While I am satisfied that policy-making officials in the Department of Agriculture did not knowingly or intentionally disclose any information as to the magnitude of the Government's grain-buying program in advance of actual purchases, it is commonly heard on the street that certain well-known speculators in Washington, Chicago, and New York acquired large speculative grain holdings in the futures market during the months of November and December and prior to January 20 of this year.

An analysis of speculative operations for the months of January, February, and March will disclose that hundreds of millions of dollars in profits were made by speculators in grains and cotton.

American citizens were not the only speculators in the futures market for cotton, grains, and other commodities. My investigation discloses that certain wealthy refugees, who are enjoying the bounty and hospitality of the United States, and who are not required to pay income taxes on speculative gains, were amongst the leading speculators in the recent bull market in grains.

The nationality of some of the foreign speculators are listed as follows: Greek, Chinese, German, Dutch, Iranian, Polish, French, British, Egyptian, Czechoslovakian, Latvian, Swiss, Argentinian, Australian, Colombian, Cuban, Japanese, Mexican, Norwegian, Russian, Swedish, Turkish, and Venezuelan.

I am satisfied that all American citizens and foreign nationals did not make a profit out of the recent speculative grain market. Some of them lost money because they took the "short side" of the market too early, but most of them made substantial profits.

Foreign nationals are not required to pay any income taxes on speculative gains made in this country. This policy is wrong, and I will ask the Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to amend our income-tax laws so that all foreigners will pay the same taxes as are assessed against American citizens.

The information which I have gathered covering Government grain-buying operations and speculation by individuals in the futures market during recent months will be presented to the Committee on Agriculture for investigation.

GOVERNMENT GRAIN BUYING AFTER JANUARY 20, 1947

While Commodity Credit did not buy any substantial amount of wheat after its $40,000,000 purchase on January 20, speculation in grains was given added impetus by statements of responsible Government officials and other prominent citizens as to the need for large additional supplies of grain and food from this country to take care of the expanding needs of hungry people in the world. Obviously, we must ship food supplies abroad to prevent starvation.

Just as obviously, these shipments and Government purchases of food should be planned in a manner which will least upset our domestic economy. In the current instance, wise planning has not been done and the Government itself has become the greatest gambler in grain and the most bullish influence in a highly speculative market.

Thus, I repeat, the Truman administration cannot escape responsibility for high food prices by placing the blame on farmers and food distributors.

I will also request the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the "squeeze" that is being put on dairy farmers and poultry producers, who are forced to pay prices for feed which are far out of line for what they receive for their products.

I will have more to say on this subject at a later date, but in conclusion, I want to add the following thought for the benefit of the administration. President Truman is properly asking for a reduction in the cost of living.

It seems to me that he could set a good example for all producers and distributors in this country, by making drastic cuts in the price of Government. Congress is engaged in this task, and it would be very timely for the President and his Cabinet to join in slashing the budget by at least $6,000,000,000.

President Truman's frequent statements that it would be false economy to reduce his budget estimated have not been helpful. He has taken the attitude that his budget is sacred writ and that Congress, the policy-making branch of the Government, must take it as it is. Department heads and officials of other Government agencies have taken the attitude of the President as a signal to oppose reduction in the swollen budget.

The country is demanding elimination of unnecessary Federal expenditures. I believe that cooperation by the President in reducing the price of government would be helpful not only to relieve the taxpayers' burden but as a weapon against inflation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a bill.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn moment in the deliberations of this body. It is the hour of destiny for you and for me. We cannot avoid the issue like this bill bypasses the United Nations. We must make a fateful decision which may determine the future of this country. No one can decide for us and each of us must face the cold and brutal facts involved in this situation.

The title of the bill would indicate this is a measure to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey. This is a misnomer, as this is not a relief bill. We passed the relief bill last week and authorized $200,000,000 for Greece and other foreign countries. Of course we want to help Greece rebuild. The Greeks are our friends. The Greeks need food, medicine, and clothing. We are called upon in this bill to furnish military assistance and equipment so that Greece can fight communism. In other words, we are using American dollars and American soldiers to settle the political and domestic quarrels of a foreign nation. Such a policy is contrary to American tradition.

It is urged that we must prevent the spread of communism abroad. I am one of those who have been calling attention to the dangers of communism in this country. Surely we have all we can do to combat Communists right here at home. The danger from communism lies within, and not without our shores. We do not have to send military supplies and soldiers to Greece and Turkey to prove we are through appeasing Russia; we can do that by exposing the activities of Communists in this country.

I would also like to inquire what will be gained by stopping communism in Greece, and permitting it to spread through Europe. I am greatly concerned over the precedent we are establishing if this bill is passed. How can we deny similar aid to Poland, Austria, Italy, and France if we carry out the spirit of this new, and, in my opinion, most dangerous doctrine?

If we pass this bill it sets this country on a new course without compass or chart, and no one can predict what our destination will be. No one knows where the policy contained in this legislation will take this Nation. Today it is Greece and Turkey. Tomorrow it will be Korea, then perhaps India. By this bill we announce to the world that the United States is embarking on a world crusade, and that we will use American money, and American soldiers, to compel every country to adopt the type of government we dictate. All admit it is a step in the dark, but they say it is a calculated risk, and one we must assume. The proponents of this measure tell us the alternative will be worse. I dispute that. I wholly repudiate the doctrine announced in this bill. I do not believe the American people want to assume any such responsibility or obligation. I think one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee very aptly described the situation when he appeared before the Rules Committee. He said that no Member of this House can vote for this bill without violating his oath of office, unless he really believes that the first line of defense of the United States of America lies in Greece and Turkey. I agree with him, and I am not ready to admit that the security of the United States will be affected by the political philosophies of Greece, or any other foreign nation. I am reminded of another bill that was in this House since I have been a Member, the lend-lease bill, which was also labeled a peace measure. This was back in February 1941. The setting was very much the same and we were told that the bill was necessary to keep this country out of war. The question came up about delivering materials and supplies and whether or not we would use American ships as convoys. The House was assured that we would not convoy, but later it was discovered that we were so engaged even at the time the bill was being debated. We were deceived, and the American people were denied the truth. All of us know the tragic consequences that followed.

Now, we are told that we are not going to send combat troops. We intend to send only 40 American officers to Greece and Turkey, who will act in an advisory capacity, and train the armies of Greece and Turkey. Can you imagine 40 officers stopping communism in Greece and Turkey? You might as well try to bail out the Atlantic Ocean with a thimble. It cannot be done. It appears that history will repeat itself. Such a course may not result in war today or tomorrow, but in the end the outcome is inevitable. The bill calls for military commitments that start us on the road to war. For me, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to take this step.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 168, noes 22.

So the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include excerpts from papers and letters.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include therein certain articles and editorials.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 4½ hours, and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], is recognized for 4½ hours.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I propose to yield myself at this point 15

minutes, but before doing so I wish to announce an arrangement we have made with reference to the time.

In consultation with my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], we have decided on each side to allot or yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] an hour and a half, making 3 hours in all; and each of his colleagues who desire to oppose this measure will kindly report to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], and he will report to me or to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and we will allot time in accordance with his wishes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] will have 3 hours and the gentleman from New York will have 3 hours. That makes 6 hours in support of the bill as against only 3 against the bill. It is not a fair distribution of the time.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman seems to object to recognizing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] represents a great political party and that the chairman of the committee also represents a great political party. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania assigns to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] a third political party, we are going to question whether it is equal to the other two.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Do I understand that in the matter of time for the opposition the gentleman from New Jersey has given control to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]? Suppose a Member on my side asks me for time in opposition, or suppose a Member on the gentleman's side should go to the chairman of the committee and ask for time in opposition? Are we not privileged to allot any time to the opposition?

Mr. EATON. Under the understanding each side was to allot an hour and a half to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BLOOM. But suppose a Member comes to the gentleman from New Jersey or to me for time in opposition. Have we got to tell him to clear it through the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. EATON. If a Member came to me for time in opposition I would turn him over to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BLOOM. Then I will do the same thing.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under the rules of the House it is my understanding that time in general debate is equally divided between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Member, irrespective of what opposition applicants for time may take on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the provisions of the rule it has been provided that the time is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The announcement which the gentleman from New Jersey has made is a private arrangement that might be said to come under the rule which has been adopted.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In other words, the anouncement that has been made is not in conformity with the rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New Jersey has merely made an announcement of what he proposes to do with some of the time under the rule.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was in the gallery when this colloquy started. I may say that I was alongside of the two gentlemen here, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], and the Speaker when the arrangement, whatever it was, was made. There was not any agreement as to yielding any 3 hours to the gentleman from Wisconsin to be yielded by himself.

Mr. EATON. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. It was that the gentleman from New Jersey would yield to Members suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin an hour and a half.

Mr. EATON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the statement made by the Chair. The time is equally divided between the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking minority member of that committee. The gentleman from New Jersey has made an announcement merely of what he proposes to do with an hour and a half of the time for which he is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. And he will yield the time himself?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New Jersey and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey did not mean what his statement implied a few minutes ago that those of us on this floor who might hold some firm convictions on this bill belong to a third party on this floor?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to have the gentleman from Minnesota explain my position on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of the immediate and practical purpose of House Resolution 2616 which is to furnish aid to Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations.

In addition to this immediate and practical purpose, the bill implements the foreign policy of our Nation as set forth by President Truman in his historic address to the Congress on March 12, 1947. In implementing this foreign policy, the bill becomes one of the most fundamental and far-reaching enactments ever proposed in the history of our Congress.

Mr. Truman did not create the national foreign policy which he enunciated on March 12. It was forced upon him and upon the Congress and the Nation by the inescapable facts of history. It is a product of those mysterious and mighty spiritual energies of mankind upon which the world has been, is now and will continue to be carried irresistibly forward to its unpredictable destiny. We can no more escape the impact of these mighty forces flowing beneath the surface of human existence than we can escape the law of gravitation.

President Truman condensed the essence of our new and far-reaching foreign policy into a few simple and pregnant sentences. He said:

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion.

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guaranties of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedom.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

The adoption by our Government and people of the principles upon which this proposed foreign policy is based involves great risks. The rejection of these principles involves greater risks. I am profoundly convinced that the safety and security of our Nation and of the world, as well as the very existence of the United Nations, depends upon the acceptance by our Government and people of the principles underlying this foreign policy and our resolute defense and enforcement of those principles.

I hold in my hand a letter I have just received from the Secretary of State, a gentleman for whom we all have the profoundest respect and in whom we have the greatest confidence. I will read this letter to you.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. EATON: I regret that I was not in Washington during the consideration by your committee of the Greek-Turkish aid bill. As the bill comes before the House of Representatives for consideration, I would like you to have an expression of my views on it.

Prior to my departure for Moscow, I participated in the formulation of the program which the President later laid before Con-

gress. The President telegraphed to me in Paris the proposed text of his message of March 12, and I informed the Department that I fully concurred. The bill which was later introduced in both Houses of the Congress, together with the amendments agreed on in the Senate, has my full approval.

My strong conviction that the immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting in Moscow.

I am in complete accord with the actions taken by Mr. Acheson on this subject in my absence. We were in constant touch with each other and all moves were fully coordinated.

Your committee is deserving of the highest praise for its thorough exploration of the question and for its able and comprehensive report. I fully endorse the committee's conclusion that the bill pending before the House would enable the United States, in this crisis, to support the United Nations by pursuing a positive policy in behalf of Greece and Turkey. I am convinced that it will be in our own interest and in the interest of world peace.

I hope that the bill will be enacted as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

The currents of life which have carried mankind forward to this most fateful hour of its entire history are not difficult to define. Man is the only member of the animal kingdom endowed by the Creator with the power of rational choice. In the exercise of this divine power, freedom of choice becomes an absolute necessity and it is the exercise of this power of choice and the struggle to be free in its exercise that constitutes the essence of human progress from the dawn of time to the present complex and baffling world civilization in which we find ourselves today.

Certain races seem to have been endowed with a genius for freedom. Other races less endowed with this genius have lagged behind in individual and social development. Today with the world in complete and continuous contact the minds of all races, including the most backward, are disturbed and inspired by an awakened sense of the value of freedom and a determination in one way or another to achieve freedom for themselves.

This inherent passion for freedom is, without doubt, the fountainhead out of which has grown all fundamental individual and social emancipation.

Within the last hundred years there has developed, principally in Europe, a devastating counter movement against the principle of freedom. Its prophet in the beginning was Karl Marx. His announced objective was in accord with the ideals and principles of freedom. His motive however was hate, which is the most reactionary and destructive force in human nature. His method for achieving economic freedom for the masses of men, he called, the class conflict, which was simply hate expressed in terms of destruction rather than construction.

Out of this Marxian glorification of hate and violence grew a three-pronged ideology, each based upon some particular form of class hatred, each destructive of every freedom for which man had fought for thousands of years, and each inspired by a mad dream of world conquest, either by force of arms or by traitorous penetration of self-governing societies, or by both.

Fascism destroyed itself when it came in contact with organized freedom. Nazism was destroyed at a frightful cost, leaving a large section of the civilized world in social, political, and economic ruin. Communism, in its essence close kin to fascism and nazism, now bestrides the shattered world like a colossus. It seems to have forgotten nothing and learned nothing from the frightful tragedies that have darkened the first half of this alleged century of progress.

No amount of wishful thinking or mockish sentimentality can disguise the grim facts of the communistic march toward world domination.

During and since the war Russia has taken over the northern strip of Finland for the purpose of dominating the arctic, and the southern tip of Finland which gives her domination over the Baltic.

She has absorbed the three independent Baltic states—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

She has taken a substantial slice of eastern Poland.

She has acquired domination, more or less complete, over the internal government and economy of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

Her armed forces are devouring the substance of Austria.

In the Orient, with or without the consent of her allies, she has acquired immeasurable influence in the communistic areas of China and neighboring regions.

She has stripped Manchuria bare of its immensely valuable productive machinery.

She has acquired control of one of the great railroad arteries of that region.

She has assumed dominance of Port Arthur and Darien.

She has taken over the most productive half of Korea and held it incommunicado behind an iron curtain against the United States.

She has been granted undisputed possession of the Kurile Islands and the Japanese half of Sakhalin.

And today the Communists, either directly or through their satellites—Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria—hover upon the borders of Greece and Turkey ready to take over and absorb these two essential gateways to the Orient.

Much of this expansion of Russian power has taken place in complete disregard of the obligations which she has assumed in the organization of the United Nations.

If Russia were permitted to take Greece and Turkey, her next steps of course would be Iran and Afghanistan, India, and China, all of which countries border upon Russian territory.

These are the deep spiritual forces and the external facts which make the foreign policy, enunciated by President Truman on March 12, absolutely inevitable if free self-governing nations and institutions are to survive here and elsewhere throughout the world. And these are the reasons why, in full knowledge of the risk involved, the United States must for our own protection and for the peace of the world go to the help of Greece and Turkey at this time.

I would recognize the validity of many of the secondary arguments advanced against this legislation by conscientious and patriotic Members of the House if the world situation, with which we are confronted, were other than that which I have described. But these secondary considerations are of absolutely no avail in solving the supreme issue which confronts today not only our Government and people, but the entire world. That issue is simply this: Is the world civilization now in process of creation to be a civilization of freedom or of slavery? Does Americanism or communism hold the key to the future of mankind?

There stands the challenge which we must meet. And we must meet it here and now.

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line;
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 33 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY].

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why I am designated to open debate upon our side of the House. Conscious as I am of my own limitations, I had expected that the ranking minority Member and my distinguished colleagues who are my seniors on the committee would precede me. Unexpected, however, as my position in the debate is, I shall do the best I can. I shall endeavor to yield to the Members to answer any question that I can with respect to this bill, but I do request that you withhold requests for me to yield until I have completed the remarks I have prepared.

Mr. Chairman, today America stands at the crossroads. This is the day, this is the hour for a momentous and far-reaching decision. The issue to be determined is this: Are we to continue our old foreign policy of just muddling through, of shifting this way and that from day to day as in the past, with no long-range plan, until some crisis of unprecedented proportions descends upon us and finds us unprepared? I criticize our former peacetime foreign policy with no partisan feeling whatever. It was no more criminal to scuttle our Navy and reduce our armed forces to skeleton proportions under the Harding administration than it was under the Roosevelt administration to beat our breasts and wail to high heaven in sympathy with the Chinese and at the same time furnish Japan with oil and scrap with which to blast their cities and riddle their helpless bodies.

To adhere to our former uncertain policy is one alternative. The other is: Are we to adopt a new, firm, permanent, and far-sighted policy that will command respect throughout the world, give assurance to our friends, and give to every potential enemy reason to stop and think before seriously contemplating an act of aggression against us? The importance of this decision may be measured by the fact that had we had such a policy in the past, in my considered opinion, World War II would not have come upon us. The bones of our sons

that now lie buried on every continent and within the soil of every country, almost around the circling globe, would be walking upright with us in the flesh today, and their blood that stained the seven seas would never have been spilled. And upon this thought I shall amplify a little later.

It has been loosely said, Mr. Chairman, that we are eternally pulling England's chestnuts from the fire. This bill that we consider today is proposed for no such purpose. The objective it seeks to attain is protection for ourselves, and others who believe as we do, that we may continue our way of living. President Truman wisely said:

> At the present moment in world history, nearly every nation must choose the alternate ways of life, between representative government and government by minority, based upon terror and oppression.

Yes; the forces of disintegration are on the march in all the countries which share our belief in the kind of world state we seek to establish. Greece and Turkey stand as bulwarks against communism in its spread from east to west, and their fall would hasten its further spread from the east around the world in the other direction. Should they succumb to communistic influence, we will see that doctrine spread like consuming fire from the Dardanelles to the China Sea, and then in the other direction throughout Europe. Soon America, aided with such feeble efforts as England may be able to command will stand alone against this despicable, evil, and degrading theory and form of government. So we are not pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire.

Incidentally it might be said, though such a consideration is relatively unimportant as respects this proposed legislation, the first fruits that would fall to Russia as her influence engulfed Greece and Turkey would be the control of 27,000,000,000 barrels of oil underground in the Middle East. When we realize that the United States has an estimated 21,000,000,000 barrels only underground, and that oil, or the lack of it, wins or loses a war, we have some food for thought on that score.

The unwarranted statement that we are always pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire came into common use because we have fought by England's side in two wars. We did not do this to help England primarily, but for the reason that, in both instances, we had no other alternative but to fight. In the first war the enemy engaged in a series of provocative acts against us that no self-respecting nation could endure; and the second time the common enemy thrust war upon us overnight. Such incidental help that England received, in both instances, was well deserved and well earned, for she has been our shield and our protection in the past. We have known throughout the years that she stood between us and any danger that might threaten from Europe; that the might of her navies underwrote the Monroe Doctrine and that our first line of defense was the far-flung battlements of the British Empire. But that sustaining protection is fading fast away. "I have not," said Mr. Churchill several years ago, "become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." But Mr. Churchill is out of power and that disintegration proceeds apace.

Rudyard Kipling never dreamed that he spoke with true prophetic ken when he penned the lines:

> Far called our navies melt away;
> On dune and headland sinks the fire;
> Lo! All the pomp of yesterday
> Is one with Nineveh and Tyre.

And so England told us recently, with apologies and in sorrow, that her internal affairs and her economic position were such that she could no longer continue her commitments to Greece and Turkey, that had enabled these countries, so far, to exist as free and independent states.

Prior to our entrance into the last war, President Roosevelt said, or was quoted as saying, that our frontier was the Rhine. And I recall what a storm of criticism descended upon him. Now, however, after the experience of World War II and with the ushering in of this atomic age, we know verily that our frontier is anywhere in the world where there exists a potential enemy, and the frontier is right at his front door.

Mr. Chairman, since England's announcement that I referred to above, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been in session for some 25 days. We have examined and have had the counsel and advice of high officials of the State, War and Navy Departments. Their significant testimony will be found in the record of the hearings. We had the benefit, too, of the advice of our respective ambassadors to Greece and Turkey; that was heard in executive session, not for the purpose of hiding anything from the members, but because from the nature of things, it would be improper for our representative, accredited to a foreign government, to frankly discuss the situation of that country and have his views passed back to its citizens to confront him on his return. Such a course would greatly embarrass him in his future relations with that government. We examined in all some 35 witnesses. We were much impressed by the testimony of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], whom, by the way, I consider to be one of the ablest men in the House. His testimony will be found in the record from pages 178 to 195. He spoke with respect to several matters and set out in detail an amendment that he is to propose. He, however, was so impressed with the gravity of the situation prevailing, that he advocated, if I understood correctly certain portions of his testimony, that this bill to strengthen the resistance to communism falls far short of the mark; that what we should do is to send our representatives—Secretary Marshall and General Eisenhower, I presume—to Moscow, have them seek out Mr. Stalin and, standing up to him brow to brow and belly to belly, tell him bluntly that he must forthwith cease and desist from his devilment, call his troops back within their proper boundaries and proceed to disarm them, and that if he refused then to advise him to issue an alarm to his people so that noncombatants might flee the cities and towns and take to the caves and the hills, as we expected immediately to fly over and blow the whole outfit to kingdom come.

Well, that is one way to handle the situation, and a rather expeditious one though, on the whole, somewhat Draconian. I doubt if the majority of you would want to go that far. But I do believe that all of you who read the record of the hearings carefully and the committee report will agree that this is must legislation.

And now to the bill itself, and I must apologize for taking up so much time with preliminaries before getting directly to the point at issue, but I thought some background might be helpful.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $400,000,000 in loans, grants, and credits, to Greece and Turkey, to enable them to survive as free and independent nations. It is assumed tentatively that some $275,000,000 of this will go to Greece and some $125,000,000 to Turkey. These funds would be used to give military aid to the two countries, especially Greece, and to give such help to both countries as may be necessary to build up their resources and their industries to a point where they would be on a going basis so that further help from us would not be necessary.

These countries are and have been subject to unusual pressures, as the committee report records, which threaten the peaceful existence of these nations and their right to maintain their freedom and national integrity. This pressure, to speak bluntly, is Russian and communistic, being applied to these countries, as it has to others in the past, steadily and with increasing force.

I know of no better way to describe the conditions in these countries than by quoting the words of the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, who has, I think, the most alert, active, and brilliant mind that it has ever been my privilege to contact. With respect to Greece, he says this:

> Greece's difficulties are not new, but they have become acute as a result of special circumstances. Long before the war Greece had a hard time making ends meet. Her poverty of natural resources is so great that she has always needed more imports than she could pay for with exports. Only by hand-to-mouth contriving has she been able to maintain a precarious balance in her international economic position. In the past, much of her export trade went to central European markets, particularly to Germany. During the thirties she was forced into closer dependence on Germany through clearing agreements and other instruments of Nazi economic warfare. Then came the Italian invasion, the German invasion, 4 years of cruel enemy occupation and the scorching of her earth by the retreating enemy. Perhaps no other country in the world has suffered greater destruction of its physical resources than Greece. Furthermore, the authority of the Greek state is threatened by thousands of armed men who defy it.

It is certain that these insurgent groups are assisted from outside Greece by supplies and training in neighboring countries, including Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, the three of them being backed up and supported by the Soviet Union.

The situation in Turkey differs substantially, and I again quote Mr. Acheson:

The Turkish Army has been mobilized since the beginning of World War II and this has put a severe strain upon the national economy. During the war, Turkey received substantial assistance from Great Britain and the United States, which helped her to carry this load.

Today the Turkish economy is no longer able to carry the full load required for its national defense and at the same time proceed with that economic development which is necessary to keep the country in sound condition. With some help from the United States, and further assistance which Turkey may be able to negotiate with United Nations financial organs, Turkey should be in a position to continue the development of her own resources and increase her productivity, while at the same time maintaining her national defenses at a level necessary to protect her freedom and independence.

Turkey is being subjected to severe external pressure, which has forced her to maintain large armed forces for defense purposes. This pressure includes repeated demands for the separation of certain portions of eastern Turkey from the rest of the country, and demands for bases which would virtually give Russia military control of the Dardanelles. The collapse and subjugation of Turkey would, in the opinion of our highest military experts, almost inevitably follow, and would involve the speedy collapse and subjugation of the entire Middle East.

This would greatly compromise the strategic position of the United States and aggravate the danger to world peace.

So, we see the necessity for this aid.

I shall now direct my attention to the questions frequently heard with respect to this legislation. First, how are we to know that these funds will go for the purposes intended and not be dissipated on unnecessary items. I quote now from the committee report:

It is understood that the American mission in Greece would be in a position to carry a large part of the responsibility for this activity. The expenditure in Greece of any funds that may be made available to the Greek Government for the program would be subject to control by the American mission there. Purchases in the United States with the funds made available would be made through the procurement agencies of the United States Government, or, if made otherwise, would be subject to careful supervision and strict control.

Members of the committee expressed the strongest concern that competent persons be sent to Greece to insure the development of controls at key points and to supervise their application.

The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece.

The military programs in Greece and Turkey will be administered through small groups of United States military and naval personnel sent to those countries for that purpose. They would screen requirements and advise in the best application and use of the materials and equipment made available to Greece and Turkey.

It was suggested by someone recently that funds advanced under this bill might be dissipated through payments on loans to foreign governments. This is covered by a amendment to the bill, requiring that as a condition precedent to the receipt of assistance, the recipient government must agree "not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, or grant or other financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of principal or interest on any loan made to such government."

In the next place, the question has been raised in many quarters as to why this whole matter should not be turned over to the United Nations. Well, primarily we are proposing this loan at the suggestion of the United Nations or a component agency thereof. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was asked by the Greek Government to send a mission to Greece to look into the prevailing situation. The mission of the organization of the United Nations made a preliminary report in September 1946. The report is dated November 9, 1946. Recommendation No. 3 made by this associate organization of the United Nations is as follows:

It is recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom to aid it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal until expanding exports, international-development loans, and expanding production enable Greece to balance its international accounts without special aid.

And that is essentially what Greece has done. It has in the past asked Great Britain for this assistance. Great Britain has now told her that she can no longer continue it. There is no point in appealing to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in this emergency because that organization has no funds with which to operate, nor has the United Nations itself, or any agency or organization thereof. The Economic and Social Council acts merely in an advisory capacity and has no particular executive powers. Greece is now asking the United States of America, which is the only source to which she can turn, as indicated by this organization's report as an emergency matter.

Furthermore the authority of the United Nations is recognized and preserved in the premises by an amendment that has been made to the bill now under consideration, which is as follows:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

* * * * *

2. If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the use of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuation of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

The United Nations was not created to supersede the ordinary relations between states. If the United Nations can help in any situation, it certainly should do so, but no nation in the United Nations is precluded from asking the assistance of any other friendly state when an economic or other internal matter arises which causes difficulty in the state.

And I quote from the testimony of Mr. Acheson again, at page 34 of the hearing:

For instance, some time ago the Export-Import Bank set aside $500,000,000 to be loaned to China when conditions in China would make such expenditure of that money useful in the reconstruction of China. It did not, so far as I know, occur to anybody that that was showing any disrespect for or disinclination to support in every way the United Nations.

This Congress has appropriated very large sums of money to assist the new Philippine Republic. That was not considered in derogation of the United Nations.

The United States Government has done a great deal to assist the new Italian Republic. First and last, almost $1,000,000,000 worth of goods have been made available to that new struggling republic.

All of these acts, I had supposed, were in support of the principles of the United Nations. Now, it is against that background, I think, that we ought to consider this request of the Greek Government and the various requests which the Turkish Government has made for economic assistance from the United States.

If there is anything in the charter which precludes us from doing what we have been doing with other countries since the charter was created without criticism from anybody, then we should stop and ponder those considerations very carefully.

But if there are not, we should not lose critical and valuable time in going forward in order to go through what would eventually be procedures which would lead right back to the requests which we are now making of the Congress.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, furthermore, were we to refer this matter to the United Nations, we would run smack into a Russian veto. Russia has already used the veto 10 times and has refused to join various United Nations subordinate organizations—the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Trade Organization, the World Bank and Monetary Fund, UNESCO, and others. And so we could certainly expect Russian resistance to this proposal were it taken up within the framework of the United Nations. That the United Nations is not yet able to handle so urgent a situation as is presented does not mean that the United Nations has failed or is going to fail. Two hundred years elapsed between the first attempt to federalize the American Colonies and the triumph of the Union in 1865. With the progress made so far, I predict that within 12 months the United Nations will be perfected and will be functioning as intended if Russia will come around and begin at least a semblance of cooperation. The passage of this bill will serve perhaps to bring Russia to her senses and to point her in the right direction. General Marshall said that the mere proposal to make this loan to Greece and Turkey had a profound

and favorable effect upon the stolid Russian attitude. It was this proposal, in my opinion, that brought Stalin around when, after blocking all efforts for solutions of problems at the recent peace conference at Moscow, he said after the adjournment of the session that having proceeded so far with the discussions already, we will probably be able to get together at the next meeting, or words to that effect.

And this brings me down to the third and last objection frequently made to the bill: It may bring us into war. The Under Secretary of State was asked this direct question by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—see page 19 of the hearings:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Secretary, you have given this a good deal of thought and consideration. In your opinion, what are the possibilities of this policy leading to war?

Secretary ACHESON. I should say that—I was going to say there was no possibility of it leading to war.

I do not see how it possibly can lead to war. It seems to me that by strengthening the forces of democracy and individual freedom and strengthening the economies of those two countries, you do a great deal to eliminate the sort of situation which would produce friction between the great powers.

Russia does not want war now, but she will want it eventually if necessary for her ends and purposes when she thinks she has set the stage properly for it. Russia may be stupid, but not stupid enough to bring on war now. When we compare the British-American sphere with the Russian sphere, we find that at the present time the former controls 67 percent of the world's crop land, 84 percent of its coal, 85 percent of its industrial production, 85 percent of its steel, 85 percent of its railroad mileage, 89 percent of its electric power, 90 percent of its petroleum, and 97 percent of its shipping.

Russia's plan is not for war at the present time.

The Russian plan is one of infiltration, of troublemaking, of encouragement of civil war in outside areas. Her plan is to lay the groundwork for local Communist groups to take over, whittling away at the areas outside the Russian sphere, getting things set so that if and when a war does come her fifth column can make trouble for the other side. (See United States News, issue of May 2, 1947.)

And Russia has an active fifth column in every country in the world—stronger than any that Hitler had that enabled him to conquer country after country with such ease—and developments indicate that Russia has in this country today a fifth column far stronger and more effective than Franco, who coined the expression, had in Madrid as his other four columns marched upon it. Russia continues her dilatory tactics upon the amazing theory that the Government of the United States is about to go to pieces. Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party, has recently been pursuing the line which likens our "bourgeois system" to a pyramid "the foundations of which are riddled with poverty and deprivation, while its summit is decorated with diamonds and gold." "Such a system must necessarily collapse," the Communist organ reasons, and "involve the United States in a colossal economic crisis." And so Russia continues to delay the peace settlement, waiting for this chaos that she foresees to descend upon us so that we will be helpless to resist her demands. The quickest and easiest way to dissipate this illusion on the part of Russia and show her how false and ridiculous it is will be to pass this bill by an overwhelming majority, the object of which is to enable Greece and Turkey to strengthen their resistance to communism and to bring to an end the Machiavellian machinations of the Kremlin with regard to these two countries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, to amplify a statement I made in the beginning of my remarks: We stand today where we stood in the early thirties when Japan first turned on helpless China with all the power of her first blitz attack. Had we followed the advice of the then Secretary of State Stimson, taken a firm attitude and said, "Thou shalt not, if an embargo on our exports to you, and financial aid and material help to China, short, of course, of intervention, can prevent you," then the course of tyranny and oppression that from that beginning spread over the world as a seething, hissing fire, would have been quenched in its incipiency.

Had we said the same thing to Italy when Mussolini sent his mechanized forces against helpless Ethiopia, even then we could have stopped it.

Had we said as much to Hitler as he poised his troops toward Poland, he would have blanched and quit, and death would never have stalked through the homes of every city, town, and village in America.

Shakespeare had his Brutus say in Julius Caesar:

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat
And we must take the current when it serves
Or lose our ventures.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with nations. God led this Nation to its present place of power, the strongest nation on the face of the earth. He did it, I think, with the divine belief and the divine expectation that we would accept and discharge the responsibilities that go with that power. We cannot escape, we must not escape our rendezvous with destiny.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my esteemed friend and fellow member on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy for me to come into the well of this House as a member of this great Committee on Foreign Affairs and to oppose the majority members of it. I have discussed this matter with my own chairman and I am sure he feels that I have a sincere conviction of my position, and I know that he would defend my right to assert that position this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my desire to stamp out communism. As a member of the American Legion in the State of Wisconsin for more than 20 years, I traveled about the State calling attention to the menace of that foreign ideology. As department commander of that organization, I spent many hours trying to bring to the attention of my people just what communism would do to this country. Mrs. Smith, as president of the American Legion Auxiliary, did the same thing on a national level. So, I am unalterably opposed to communism and want to stamp it out.

Hardly without exception Members have come into the well of this House today and called attention to the seriousness of the present situation as reflected in this legislation. Indeed it is serious. I believe a terrible mistake has been made by the Rules Committee in limiting this debate to 9 hours. Here we are considering the greatest problem that has faced this country since it was organized and we are to debate it in 9 hours, and those who oppose it have 3 hours in which to state their position.

I want to serve notice on those Members who have come to me this afternoon asking for time. I want to tell them that the time has been oversubscribed by 100 percent, that there is not going to be time for you. I have asked for 10 minutes myself and at that reduced my time by two-thirds, if you please, to give those who want to speak an opportunity to do so. And yet we are asked to come into this House and debate this matter fully! How fully? How fully? You answer that question.

I am somewhat interested in the philosophy apparently of some who come into the well of the House and say: "Well, we do not have much of a stomach for this thing but I guess we have got to go along." What kind of reasoning is that? Have we got to go along with a man who is wrong just because we like him personally? I say that Harry Truman is wrong, and history will so record it. One of the primary issues in this debate, it seems to me, is the one wherein we are asked to follow this leadership, a leadership which led us into a war but which after we have fought it with dollars beyond comprehension and with the lives and blood of our children, now asks us to approach the threshold of the next one, which will be an atomic war, mark you well.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry, I cannot yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan. My time is almost gone now.

Someone has said that we have got to save face, that in the Orient face saving means everything. I say to you we can well lose face instead of our necks. That is exactly what it is going to be. I do not propose to go along with any face-saving policy. This is no time to save face; it is time to save the Nation.

Let us proceed now to consider this "stop communism" proposition. Stop communism with $400,000,000 and 40 to 50 men from the Army or Navy? Are we serious about that kind of proposal? Obviously it is so fallacious I am amazed that the argument is even made at all. I suggest if we are going to stop communism, let us stop it right here in this country. All of you gentlemen received

yesterday or the day before a report of J. Edgar Hoover made before the Un-American Activities Committee. Read that report. He tells you the extent of communism in this country. We will under this bill send $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to stop communism there. What is the President asking for to stop communism in this country? He said, "Give me $50,000,000 and we will clean them out of all the Government departments." Fifty million dollars in this country and $400,000,000 over there. Does that make sense? Of course it does not.

I wonder if the President is sincere about stopping communism. A few weeks after he had appeared before this body former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, wrote to him and called attention to the danger of communism from within. And what was the President's amazing response? He said, "Mr. Earle, do not worry about that. Communism in this country is a bugaboo." Well, if it is a bugaboo in this country and if our national security is not involved, why should we worry about it in Turkey and Greece?

Oh, it is not communism. This is a military proposal, as so many have said on the floor of the House. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] put his finger on it. It is oil; it is the Dardanelles, and all we are doing is shoring up, if you please, a broken-down British economy which cannot afford to have the sword of Damocles hanging over the British in the eastern Mediterranean. I admire the British; I have no quarrel with them; and I do not blame them for getting all the assistance they can from us. But we ought to be prudent in this matter. We ought to consider this bill very thoroughly. Certainly we should not approach it by saying that it is a fight against communism. It is not a fight against communism, as I have indicated. It is a military proposal.

When Mr. Patterson appeared, I asked him this question: "Mr. Secretary, assuming that you got what you asked for in this bill, then you found out in 6 months or a year that it did not work to our advantage, that we did not stop communism?" What was his answer? He said, "Frankly, I do not know." He said, "I know that is not the kind of answer you want but," he says, "I cannot tell you."

Mr. Chairman, there is the crux of the whole situation. We are asked to support a proposition and we do not know where we are going or where it is leading us. There is no indicator on the highway. I challenge anybody in the course of this debate to show me in writing or in print the State Department's policy on this matter.

What is the plan? The plan is a military one. I believe we ought to tell the American people that is what it is. We ought to go before the American people and say, "We have a national interest in those oil fields in the Middle East and we will have to take military action if necessary."

Why not be forthright in this matter? But no, it is the old, old technique; little by little, inch by inch, and then finally we find ourselves in the position that we are in today and we cannot back out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman was pleading for more hours of general debate. I am sure the empty seats in this House do not lend color to that statement, since only a handful here represent 435 Members.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I might say to my distinguished colleague that he knows how these debates are handled. It is just a matter of routine, is it not? But, those who are here are ready and willing to talk.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Abernethy	Fogarty	Meade, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Mitchell
	Gifford	Morrison
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillie	Nixon
Barden	Granger	Nodar
Battle	Gregory	O'Toole
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Pace
Bonner	Halleck	Pfeifer
Boykin	Harris	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	Poage
Buckley	Heffernan	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Rabin
Burleson	Hope	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Sarbacher
Celler	Judd	Scoblick
Chapman	Kearns	Scott, Hardie
Chelf	Kee	Shafer
Clark	Keefe	Short
Clements	Kefauver	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	Kelley	Smith, Maine
Cooley	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Cotton	Kilburn	Stockman
Coudert	King	Sundstrom
Curtis	Lane	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Latham	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	Lea	Thomason
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Towe
Doughton	Lucas	Trimble
Ellsworth	Lusk	Van Zandt
Elsaesser	McDowell	Vinson
Elston	McGregor	Welch
Fellows	Madden	West
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Flannagan	Meade, Ky.	Worley

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 327 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconson. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Just before the gentleman was rudely interrupted by a quorum call, he stated there were Members on this floor who were going to vote for this bill just to go along. That reminded me immediately of my experience in Germany a year ago last summer. When I asked the German people, from Hamburg to the Rhine, in their language why they followed Hitler so blindly, their answer was "Because they had to go along," and they did to their destruction.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that very excellent contribution. That is exactly what is going to happen here.

I want to say to my Republican brethren, you pass this bill and next year, 1948, you will have the indispensable man on your hands and the swapping of horses in the middle of the stream just as sure as you are a foot high. That is where we are headed and we ought to realize it.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, remember, this is just another blank check; no program—just give us the money.

I hope that when an amendment to cut this amount is offered the committee will very seriously consider it. Also other amendments that will be presented when the bill is read.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation because I believe it is, first of all, a military venture, secondly, that it is not designed to stop communism, and, thirdly, that it is in effect a declaration of war against Russia. When, as, and if we go to war again, we will emerge from it, if we are victors, the greatest imperialist Nation in the world. That will be a burden to the American people and will ultimately lead to the extinction of the North American Republic. What a heritage to anticipate for those who follow us. Members of this House have a great and lasting responsibility. We should vote our firm convictions and not be swayed by pressure to go along with the present administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

DOES NOT BYPASS UNITED NATIONS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this bill presents momentous questions for us to decide, but there are certain questions that, in my judgment, are not involved. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion as to whether this proposal bypasses the United Nations. I want to point out that the little country of Greece months and months ago appealed to the United Nations for help in their perilous condition, caused by guerrillas coming across their northern border, and has gotten no action yet from the United Nations investigating committee, which is tied up by Soviet obstruction and delay. It looks to me as if the United Nations is bypassing Greece rather than the United States bypassing the United Nations. Senator Austin has reported our proposed action to the United Nations. The Vandenberg amendment in this bill gives the Security Council of the United Nations the right to stop our assistance by majority vote, and we waive our veto. The United Nations FAO Committee has rec-

ommended to the United Nations, in its report on Greece, that Greece apply to the United States for assistance. The United Nations has no funds and no machinery for rendering such assistance. In view of all this, I feel that the claim that this bill bypasses the United Nations is simply an attempt to bypass our responsibility on this bill.

NOT A RELIEF BILL

There has been a lot of talk that this bill is a relief bill. I want to point out that the word "relief" is not used in this bill. It is an assistance or aid bill; to authorize the President to furnish assistance up to $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey upon their request when it is in our interest. The assistance is to consist of economic and military loans, grants, supplies, and advice. This is not merely a loan bill. This is an assistance bill.

PURPOSE OF THIS BILL

The purpose is to start stopping Soviet aggression, and it is about time that we started to do this. One nation after another has been taken over by the Soviet, and by the administration policy of appeasement we have ignored or condoned and thus encouraged this expansion and aggression. The time has come when we can no longer condone or appease or look the other way, as Members today have suggested, as this aggression goes on.

Now, this is the way the bill will work. Greece and Turkey are on the spot. This bill may help them enough to relieve the pressure on them. Our help should then be sufficient to make those countries good economic risks for the World Bank for further aid, if they are considered good military risks. Now, no life insurance company would grant a policy on the life of a man who had been threatened by gangsters, even though the threats were utterly lawless and the man utterly innocent. On the other hand, if the gangsters agreed to lay off, or if the man were assured police protection, he then would become a good risk for a life-insurance policy. No world bank is going to loan Greece and Turkey money at present. If Greece and Turkey were assured police protection by the United Nations or by the United States and other member nations, acting under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of armed attack, until the United Nations was ready to aid, Greece and Turkey might then become bankable risks, and this is a first step in that direction.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman stated a moment ago that Greece had months and months ago applied for relief to the United Nations.

Mr. VORYS. Not for relief.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Or for assistance and aid. What was the position of the United States delegates to the United Nations on that request?

Mr. VORYS. The United States participates and has membership on the Commission, which is still investigating. We are investigating what everybody knows is going on across the northern Greek border.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What was the position of the United States delegates?

Mr. VORYS. The United States delegates supported it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I mean the United States delegates to the United Nations, what was their position on this particular request?

Mr. VORYS. They supported the request and are participating in the action which is now going on.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. When I was home recently a minister of the gospel accosted me and asked me some pertinent questions, and I would like to ask the gentleman one or two at this time. He asked me how strong is the present Greek Government, and in the event that this loan goes through, will the Greek people be represented in the disposition and administration of this loan?

Mr. VORYS. The answer is, It would strengthen the Greek Government. It is a very weak government. It is using police measures to attempt to preserve order, in a country that has been devastated and torn asunder by war, and that is threatened by guerrillas supported from outside. The only reason we are offering aid and assistance is that the government is weak. If we provide this assistance, we are going to bolster up that government and we are going to insure that it is a democratic government. I do not think we should dictate the type of government they should have in Greece any more than we should do so in any other country, or than we would permit any dictation here.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman enlighten the Members of the Committee as to what success the Allied Commission of the United Nations is having in investigating the Communist activities in the Balkan and central European area? Have they made any report up to this moment?

Mr. VORYS. No; they have not made a report. The report is stymied by the Polish and Soviet members of the Commission appointed by the United Nations. The interpreter joined the guerrillas. That was another action embarrassing to the Commission. We know from this about how effective United Nations action can be at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. May I add that the Commission was supposed to report on the 1st of April, and it has not done so yet on account of the opposition by the two governments the gentleman named.

Mr. VORYS. Yes; the United Nations Commission was supposed to act by the 1st of April but it is still tied up and stymied by the same forces that would tie up and stymie and delay any attempt to refer this matter again to the United Nations.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman seemed concerned about the question of free elections in Greece. May I ask his opinion of that?

Mr. VORYS. The last election was a free election according to about 600 observers, among them many Americans. When Greece gets ready to have another election, I hope she will again have a free election. One of the purposes of this aid is to maintain Greece's integrity so that she can have free elections and choose the kind of government she wants.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Is it not true that the Commission investigating the border disturbances on the northern frontiers of Greece was turned back at the border of Yugoslavia and not permitted to enter?

Mr. VORYS. Not only Yugoslavia but Bulgaria.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. What testimony did you have before the committee to that effect?

Mr. VORYS. We had the testimony of both ambassadors and we had the testimony of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton. If the gentleman will familiarize himself with the hearings, I will point out further testimony. We also have the long questionnaire prepared in the other body, answered by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson.

NOT THE MONROE DOCTRINE NOR LEND-LEASE

This is not an extension or a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Remember, we are invited to do this by both Greece and Turkey. We have furnished similar assistance in South America, in China, in the Philippines. European nations have furnished military equipment and advice in South America, on request, and we have not claimed this violated the Monroe Doctrine.

This is not like lend-lease, in that neither of these nations are now at war.

THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY

This is an extension of our open-door policy. When China was about to be divided by the great powers, we stepped in and said that we wanted, not a slice for ourselves, but an open door for all, and demanded territorial and administrative integrity for China. That policy was announced under a Republican administration, by Secretary of State John Hay. It was written into a nine-power treaty here in Washington in 1922 under a Republican administration when Charles Evans Hughes was Secretary of State.

Our Government offered at Potsdam to help guarantee to Russia an open door through the Dardanelles in peace and war. Russia, however, wants the key to the door herself. We want no special position. All we are asking is an open

door through the Middle East for Russia, Greece, Turkey, and all of us.

We are not pulling any British chestnuts out of the fire there because the British chestnuts in the Middle East are in the fire and gone whether we do anything or not. The question is, whether we help those Middle East nations maintain an open door, or whether Russia closes the door.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

THE NEW POLICY

Mr. VORYS. What makes this bill unique, a new policy for us, is that Russia seems to be offended at our friendly response to a request for help from her neighbors. Stalin knows Greece and Turkey are not going to attack Russia. He knows Russia is pledged not to attack them. The new part of the policy is that we may respond to requests for economic assistance and legitimate military advice on defense, whether Russia likes it or not.

INCREASES CHANCES FOR PEACE

Will Russia fight over this? I think not. The experts say Russia will not fight now because she is not ready. These same experts said Russia would not last 90 days against the Germans. If Russia fights, the assistance possible under this bill would not enable Greece or Turkey to stand for long unassisted against an all-out Soviet attack. That simple fact plainly shows the fundamentally unmilitary character of this particular bill. On the other hand, if any nation, anywhere, launched an aggressive, unprovoked attack on a neighbor now, I think this Congress would back a United Nations request for police action, and would join with other nations for collective defense under article 51 of the Charter, if the Security Council were paralyzed by a veto, and I think our counterblow as a part of such collective self-defense would not necessarily be made at the place where the attack was taking place but might be by air elsewhere. This bill does not commit us on that question. The passage of this bill shows, however, that we will not refuse justified and necessary unilateral action, even though expensive and unpleasant, merely because of the threat of unjustified and unnecessary unilateral action, however unpleasant and expensive, by the Soviets. This bill shows we are not pulling out of Europe, but intend to stay and help work things out.

If we fail to do anything to assist Greece and Turkey now, there is no reasonable chance of their resisting the pressures now being exerted against them. If they go down and become satellites and the satellite frontier moves forward, we may expect political disorder and economic disruption in the Near and Middle East from the same causes, and with similar results. After the domination of the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal by the Soviets, there is no effective strategic, economic, or ideological line of resistance short of the Atlantic, and we know that this ocean is now no barrier to subversive infiltration activities which are now going on in the capitals of the Western Hemisphere. Such activities are going on right here in Washington. If we do nothing now, when our right has been challenged even to help and advise these two nations, our decision will announce to the world that we are withdrawing to the Western Hemisphere, and no amount of talking, or making proposals in the Security Council will convince the aggressors or their would-be victims otherwise. I know, from personal talks with statesmen and common people in Greece, Turkey, and from the other nations in Europe and the Near East who had representatives at the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Cairo, what a lift this Greek-Turkish proposal has given them. If we do nothing now, we might as well withdraw to our own borders, double our military budget, adopt universal military training, and get ready for the bitter end of World War II in a few years.

If fighting should break out now, at least Russia will not be as ready as she will be in a few years with a continent to use as a base. After seeing the war-devastated countries, I believe in fighting our wars away from home. I think this bill is a step toward peace, by stopping Russia from achieving the fruits of war by unprovoked, unjustified, yet unresisted aggression. On the issue of whether this brings us nearer to war or not, I prefer to rely on the judgment of General Marshall rather than that of General Bender. I think the bill will bring Russia to her senses. If it does not, and war with Russia is inevitable, and she starts now, we will be better able to defend ourselves now than later.

CONDITION IN GREECE AND TURKEY

I was in Greece and Turkey a little over 3 weeks ago. I realize that I did not become an expert in the few days that I was there. I learned enough, however, from what I saw, and from my talks with Greek and Turkish officials, with our American representatives, with newspaper correspondents, and others to confirm the information given by our Ambassadors and others in the hearings and to refute certain reckless generalities that have been made in this debate.

Turkey is not a corrupt and venal dictatorship. Its government is not perfect by any means. They are struggling to become a western democracy. They have adopted our clothes, our alphabet, our Sunday, and an enlightened code of laws. They have an opposition party which attacks the party in power for its extravagance, corruption, and inefficiency. This proves, at least, the degree of free speech permitted in Turkey. One of our delegates said that these criticisms sound just like home. I never could secure a reliable figure on the number of men they had under arms. The figure in the hearings is 600,000, but I believe it is much larger. The reason for secrecy is obvious, considering the threat that hangs over them. This threat is very real. They know of the Soviet troops massed above their border. Soviet diplomatic pressure continues. Five times a day the Soviet radio beams Turkish-language broadcasts across the northern border, filled with threats and abuse. You see soldiers everywhere. The Government is secretive as to the total amount their present state of preparedness is costing, although it adds up to at least 50 percent of their budget. Again, the reason for secrecy is obvious. It is simply untrue to say that the Turks will sell out to either side in a struggle where Soviet Russia is involved. I have been assured, by Turks and by Americans in Turkey, that the Turks will fight to the last man against any Russian invasion, whether we help or not. The lend-lease equipment we have already given them is of value in their defense. The assistance planned in this bill, only a part of which is for arms and ammunition, will enable them to defend themselves more effectively and will relieve the dreadful strain of their present burden. The encouragement to them and the deterrent to their enemies which is implied in this assistance is of even greater importance.

Greece is not a royalist dictatorship. Greece has a very weak Government, with a new King, uncertain of his position, with a coalition of anti-Communist parties attempting to carry on and preserve order in a poor country that suffered more than any other in the war. I have had Greek republicans, who opposed the monarchy, tell me that they would prefer to see any new election postponed until the country can get on its feet and feel safe from outside aggression, for only then, they say, can a free choice be made between a monarchy and a republic in Greece. At present, the only choice is between the constitutional monarchy, which was voted in by a fair election last fall, and communism. The connection between the Communists in Greece and Moscow is so clear that it is taken for granted in Athens. I saw leftist papers on the streets, with pictures of Stalin and cartoons against the United States. Their contents shows that they are part of the world-wide Communist movement headed from Moscow. A day in Athens confirms what our Ambassadors and high officials have told us.

ENDING WORLD WAR II—PAST MISTAKES

I am one of those who opposed every step our Government took in 1939–41 toward war in the name of keeping out of war. I urged, not isolation but friendly neutrality, an American peace offensive, with the hope that we might stop the war before we got into it. We did not follow that course. It is useless now to debate what might have happened if we had done so. After Pearl Harbor I voted for the laws that spent three hundred and forty-one billions and brought wounds and death to a million Americans in order to win the war. Now, over 5 years after the struggle began, I am forced to this grim realization: If we fought the war for the ideals and purposes we said we were fighting for, either the war is not over or we lost it. I prefer to believe it is not over. We have no peace treaties with our main enemies. We have no feeling of security; the totalitarian threat against our way of life is still critical. Soviet expansion, by infiltration and aggression, has taken more territory and subjugated more people in the last 2 years, we are told, than either Germany or Japan conquered in the 4 years before that.

It will not do much good to debate now the New Deal policy of appeasement that is partly responsible for this. It was not a bipartisan policy. Republicans generally opposed it. We were for a policy of firmness with Russia. Now that our policy of firmness is at last being followed, we Republicans should back it up.

By this new policy we seek a happy ending of World War II without further fighting.

The administration made a lot of mistakes in launching this program. Republicans should have been consulted earlier. Paul Porter, the most thoroughly repudiated public official in America, should not have headed the mission to Greece. The United Nations should have been informed earlier. We should never have been told that March 31 was the deadline.

So what? All of this is spilled milk—very sour spilled milk—but there is no use crying over it. If this bill is voted down it will be taken the world over, not as a vote of protest against the administration's past mistakes, but as a vote against the new policy of firmness backed with action instead of words. It will look like a vote of confidence in Stalin, a vote of lack of confidence in ourselves and our way of life. This bill does not give the Governments of Greece or Turkey a vote of confidence. It is their own lack of confidence that prompts their requests.

CONFIDENCE IN DEMOCRACY

We are not going to take over those Governments. We are going to furnish a lot of advice, pressing advice, but they will run themselves. In the end, suppose after we have furnished all this help, they vote into power, by fair elections, a Communist regime controlled from Moscow. Why, then we are through. Democracy, as we know it, is through. We are told that just will not happen, that no country in the world outside Russia ever adopted communism by majority vote. Remember, the Communist system involves a single minority party taking over the government by revolutionary means. But if, with the provisions for publicity in this bill, with the urge for feedom we know is aflame in those nations, the Communists can win in a fair election, we, of course, are through.

It is our faith that people who have a chance to be free will stay free. We need a little more faith and confidence in ourselves, our system. We need to believe in it. We need a little more of the missionary zeal the Communists have. This is our chance. I have such faith in the dynamic power of democracy that I believe we will save money on our military budget eventually by a judicious and well-ordered plan of assisting in the rebuilding of the economy and the defense of the world. I believe this will bring peace nearer; at worst, it will make our defense cheaper.

I am concerned at the strain on our resources, but if we act wisely we will not go bankrupt. We need more faith in the terrific productive power of our free land. I believe that our production plant, with the marvelous possibilities of atomic energy just ahead, is going to make us and the world richer. I believe that our American way of doing things is going to sweep over the world, including Russia, not by force, but by friendliness; not by military power, but by spiritual power; not because of its might, but because it is right.

I have faith in America. We have the kind of strength, moral and material, to assist Greece and Turkey and a war-torn world, right in our stride, as we grow stronger here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is important that we emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Ohio that the appeasement policy which preceded the March 12 address by the President to the joint session of Congress was not a bipartisan policy

Mr. VORYS. Amen.

Mr. MUNDT. Either wise or wrong, it was an administration policy. I want to emphasize to my Republican colleagues that this is the first thing we have approximating a bipartisan foreign policy, jointly arrived at by Republicans and Democrats, originally given emphasis by the elections in November, but evolving from that to the point today where the Republicans and Democrats stand committed to a discontinuation of the appeasement program with Russia.

Mr. VORYS. I agree, and I hope the Republicans will not desert this new bipartisan policy of firmness through action, instead of appeasement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements just made by my distinguished colleagues that until now we have had no bipartisan foreign policy, I can but wonder what a gentleman named VANDENBERG has been doing during the past 2 years.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, spoke of the fact that the President asked for $50,000,000 to clear Communists out of the Federal Government and $400,000,000 to withstand their advance into Greece and Turkey, and said, "Where are we going?" or something to that effect. My comment on that is, first, Greece and Turkey are much nearer to the great majority of the Communists of the world than is Washington. Secondly, I hope and believe there are a great many more Communists in Russia than in Washington.

The gentleman also correctly quoted Secretary of War Patterson to the effect that we are not sure where this course will lead. How can anyone ever be sure of the final result of such a tremendous, momentous problem? I will say, however, that the burden of the testimony before the committee was to the effect that if we do not do something we will most probably be in a bad way, whereas there is great hope in this effort.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio. Then please may I not be permitted to continue with my statement? I gladly yield to my good friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. On this matter it is only costing $50,000,000 to eliminate Communists from this country. The gentleman was in the last war. Does not the gentleman believe that the place to stop communism is before it gets to the borders of our country as a possible military force?

Mr. JARMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and wish to thank him for his contribution.

Just as I said this morning, it was much preferable to fight Hitler in Hitler's territory than here.

Mr. Chairman, I quote from President Truman's message to the Congress:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.
>
> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved. * * *
>
> This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundation of international peace and hence the security of the United States. * * *
>
> This is a serious course upon which we embark. I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious. * * *
>
> If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation.
>
> Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events. * * *
>
> On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are strong, momentous words, words in which I do not believe any President of the United States, past, present, or future, be he Democrat or Republican, would indulge casually, frivolously, or without mature consideration of good reasons. If my confidence in the people of the United States is justified, or even if it is merely half justified, certainly those words pose a challenge to statesmanship to us that we cannot lightly wave aside. Certainly those words place a responsibility for statesmanship upon the shoulders of each one of us which must be answered by each individually.

I thoroughly agree with the gentleman who made the statement this morning that on this subject it is a matter between us and our God. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, that being true, none of us can devote a moment's consideration to answering that challenge to statesmanship by falling victim to any of the faults of human nature such as pride of authorship, jealousy, publicity, or politics; nor will we do so. On the other hand, each Member of this House must and will decide this question for himself with one idea, and one alone in mind, that is, a patriotic consideration of what is for the best interests of the country we all love. Yes; standing out over any petty considerations such as those to which I

have referred must be that patriotic love of country. It must stand out just as Mount Suribachi on which those magnificent marines, incredibly it seemed to me as I stood on the spot and looked down that steep, rocky grade, raised Old Glory, stands out over the little island of Iwo Jima and looks down on every acre of it, including the graves of more than 4,000 American soldiers in the cemeteries on the right and on the left. Out of that strong language there naturally grew this bill which could well be termed "a bill to aid Greece and Turkey maintain their independence, prevent domination of those countries by communism, and contribute to permanent peace."

This merely faces up to what I believe is probably the great responsibility of our age—the prevention of communistic domination of the world. We are quite willing to have Russia maintain the form of government she wishes in her own country. We not only do not wish her to try to inflict that form of government on us but we do not wish her to succeed in inflicting it on the rest of the world, leaving us standing out isolated and alone as Suribachi stands out on Iwo Jima.

A most unfortunate situation confronts Greece as was so ably explained in detail by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] and I shall not repeat but try to briefly supplement it. Before doing so, my mind reverts to the thrilling headlines we read each morning during the dark days of 1940. How greedily we read each word which told of the magnificent feat of those brave little Greek soldiers as they stood their ground against Mussolini's legions, Mussolini having decided, against the advice of his senior partner, to conquer them without assistance. Not only did they stand their ground but I think there is no doubt either in the United States, in Greece, in Italy, or in Germany that could the issue have been resolved entirely between these countries, valiant little Greece would have defeated a much larger neighbor. Consequently, it became necessary for Hitler's hordes to flow down and literally engulf the Greek Army. In the meantime, however, it had sufficiently retarded his advance to save hundreds of thousands of lives, at least thousands of which were those of Americans. Do not we, does not the world, owe this noble little country a debt of gratitude?

It is common knowledge that Greece would have long since collapsed but for the hope engendered in the breasts of her brave people by this legislation. There is not the shadow of a doubt in the mind of any informed man that should this legislation by any chance fail of passage she would collapse—certainly within 2 weeks. It is not civil war either but an attempted Communist revolution. It is simply a part of the same Balkan pattern which has been in progress since VE-day, a pattern which I think a great Englishman foresaw when he insisted on an attack, when he repeatedly insisted on an attack, on the soft under belly of Europe at a time when you will remember Marshal Stalin was insisting with even more determination on the creation of a second front by an attack from across the channel. Everyone must realize now that what Churchill mainly had in mind was the desire that Allied armies be in the Balkans when the war ended, instead of what happened. It was a mistake, but both individuals and countries frequently make them, particularly during war, and it was one of the head and not of the heart.

As to the situation in Turkey, that was well illustrated by an article that appeared in Sunday's Washington Post, referring to the capture of a Bulgarian soldier down near the corner where Greece, Turkey, and Bulgaria join. He was carried to a commissioner for questioning who happened to be of Bulgarian descent and who happened to recognize that his pronunciation was not Bulgarian. Soon the prisoner confessed that he was a Russian lieutenant of the intelligence department and that Marshal Zhukov had instructed his organization to get plans of all the roads in Turkey and how many divisions each could handle. He had a map in his pocket of all the installations in that whole area. Two days later he was exchanged for one of the Turkish spies the Bulgars had captured. The high command of Turkey was not disturbed about that because they were thoroughly convinced that the whole thing was planned, the capture, his confession, the map, and everything, just a part of the war of nerves with which Turkey has been afflicted and will continue to be afflicted indefinitely.

Turkey cannot continue to maintain the tremendous army it feels is necessary to combat this war of nerves and the threat against her, and also maintain its economy. If her people do not receive assistance, they will naturally become discouraged and the danger will soon be as great in Turkey as it is now in Greece.

It is rather amusing to me to hear this program referred to as intervention, when, as the gentleman from Tennessee well said, every single thing proposed to be done in this bill has been definitely requested by the governments themselves.

Furthermore, the report makes it quite plain that we have no desire to intervene in the local governments of the countries concerned. We want them, as long as they believe in democracy, to have whatever particular form of government they wish, just as we do not wish Russia telling us or the world what kind we or it should have.

Now, I think it is generally understood that civilization very probably cannot withstand the shock and the destruction of another war. Our main hope against another war is, of course, the United Nations organization which can, must, and I believe will, succeed. It is equally ridiculous to me to refer to bypassing the United Nations with this legislation. The United Nations as such has no funds. As was said, the Social and Economic Council merely recommends. It is an advisory council which recommends social and economic action to the countries of the United Nations. The Export-Import Bank, which has just completed its organization and has made no loan, makes long-term self-liquidating loans. The Advisory Commission for Europe is only in its early stages of organization. Hence, had Greece requested this assistance from the United Nations instead of from us, the only result would have been, even in the absence of a veto, great delay, because it would have been necessary for the United Nations to refer the request to us, since we are the only nation in the world in position to grant the relief at this particular time.

Furthermore, as has also been said, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations made a careful analysis of the situation in Greece and suggested that Greece request aid of us. However, to make the assurance doubly sure, an amendment stipulates that either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations may order the discontinuation of our efforts under this legislation at any time, and by it we waive the veto in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, another angle of that United Nations proposition is, if we are correct in the belief that this is the only hope for peace, how foolish would it be to load it down with matters which it cannot take care of; matters which are not its functions. It is performing its function right now in the mountains of northern Greece. When that trouble occurred, that threat, Greece requested the United Nations to send a commission over there, and they have done so, but as far as authorizing or contributing $400,000,000, the United Nations simply has no funds at this time for that purpose, and the easiest way we could kill it would be for this Congress to unilaterally pass legislation to try to have it take over a burden which is absolutely impossible for it to accomplish.

Certainly, my friends, if we believe in peace—and I know we all do—and if we agree that either the United Nations or something like it must succeed if civilization is to survive—and I think most of us do—certainly I beg of you let us not take the chance of crippling, if not killing, the only hope for the salvation of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, not only is it hoped that this communistic penetration will immediately stop, thereby removing the threat to the Middle and the Far East and the indirect threat to the peace of the world, but it is equally sincerely hoped that passage of this legislation will have a most salutary general effect on Stalin and Russia as well as on the peoples in the other countries of Europe who believe in democracy, and that it will encourage those people to continue or commence their fight for freedom. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I am impelled to hope that it will also have a most salutary effect on the people of our own country who are performing the tremendous disservice to our country and the world of so greatly encouraging the spread of communism. To my mind, they are more dangerous to the future of this country, on which the peace of the world depends, than paid agents and proponents of this foreign ideology. I hope,

incredible though it be to believe, that many of them are unaware of the result of their activity, and that this legislation will cause them to stop, look, and listen, just as, I repeat, it is the duty of every Member of this House in meeting the challenge to statesmanship to which I referred in the beginning to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Was the gentleman present when Mr. Inman, guest professor of international relations, Ohio Wesleyan University, testified?

Mr. JARMAN. Unfortunately I was in Alabama during 1 day of the hearings, and Mr. Inman appeared at that time.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of this statement of Mr. Inman:

> Every man who travels outside the United States today knows that people everywhere—even in Canada, the Scandinavian countries, Holland and England—talk of fear of American dominance. The other great fear is of communism. The way to throw the weight of the public opinion of the world on the side of Russia is to follow the President's plan to start arranging the affairs of other nations for them.

What is the gentleman's thought about that?

Mr. JARMAN. I answer that by saying that the President positively has no such plan.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to compliment him on the statement that this is America's job.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the President's proposal in this bill to extend our foreign policy to the point where we are committed to defend by force, if necessary, any nation in the world with our men, money, and munitions whose governments are threatened or about to be overthrown by aggressor nations, is a commitment our American people do not approve if they understood it. It is a commitment we should not make, we cannot keep, and in attempting to keep it, may destroy the economic and financial solvency of this Nation.

The President's proposal to expend $400,000,000 to send money and men into Greece and Turkey, is the most momentous step the people of this Nation have been asked to take since we became a nation following the Revolutionary War. It may far exceed in importance our entry into the two world wars. In each of these wars we had allies. Now we are branching out on our own on to the unchartered fields of the world. Let no one be deceived. This is a world program and a world commitment on the part of the United States to use the military forces and might of the Nation around the world at the expense of the United States Government and through the sacrifice of her people on the home front, and our young manhood on the battle fronts of the world in the future.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked by this legislation to wrap up a $400,000,000 diplomatic atomic bomb, so to speak, and place it, with the detonating mechanism all set for explosion, on the very doorstep of the satellite nations of Soviet Russia. If ever there was a time for the Members of this Congress to quit dreaming and idealizing, and seriously face what we are doing here today, and its effect on the people of America and the world, the moment is upon us. We should consider legislation as realists and not as theorists or idealists. We all endorse the idea of stopping communism. But as realists, can we endorse this proposal as the proper approach?

Let us strip away the wishful thinking and look at this legislation in the light of what it may mean, rather than what we hope it means. More than half of the $400,000,000 is admittedly for military aid to Greece and Turkey. We are told that the purpose of this loan is to "stop communism," which is the political ideology of Soviet Russia. All of us detest the reprehensible record of the Russian Government and all of us are opposed to its ideology of communism. If by voting for this appropriation of $400,000,000 we could stop communism even in the Middle East we would support it, but tied in with this initial step is a world commitment 1,000 times more dangerous than the millions involved.

Certainly no one can seriously believe or contend that what military aid we propose to render to Greece and Turkey will put those countries in a condition that would prevent Russia from overrunning the Middle East within a matter of a few days if she desires to move in. What we are beginning, in fact, is the establishment of a military beachhead in Greece and Turkey which commits us to pour all of the men, munitions of war, and military might into that sector of Europe and, if necessary, to defend over 3,000 miles away this military beachhead if Russia now or later decides to move into the Middle East. These are the things the American people do not know are wrapped up in this legislation. If we are challenged we shall certainly have to do this or be humiliated before the world.

If this legislation passes this House, it having already been given the senatorial green light, the die is cast, our diplomatic challenge will have been sent to the Middle East. Stalin and Soviet Russia can react in one or two ways. They can cry out against our actions through the press—try to inflame the minds of the Russian people that we are an imperialist nation and that the Russian people are in danger of being attacked.

This move gives them the benefit of the opportunity of using such propaganda which doubtless will tend to solidify the Russian people in believing that we are, in fact, their enemies, which, of course, is false.

The second way they can react is to act physically through their Balkan satellite nations, and authorize Balkan Communist forces to agitate and start a Balkan war. In other words, Russia can have Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia start the fight and set back and wait to see how things proceed. If we enact this legislation, we would have to rush our men and military forces into the third world war, which would start as a side show with the Balkan countries. When we move in backing Greece and Turkey, then Russia can, and doubtless will, back the Balkan countries. Then we are on our way with the third world war.

Certainly the Members of this House must deal and think in realities. Certainly the American people ought to know what may likely happen if this legislation is passed. They will have to furnish the billions that this program will cost, even if it does not provoke war. They will have to furnish the millions of young men to fight and die throughout the world if it hastens the third world war.

They will have to submit to regimentation and controls far greater than we experienced in World War II. In considering this legislation the Members of Congress should realize that all of these things may happen and many more. We must visualize our economy geared to all-out production for war. We must visualize the serious possibility of the reorganization of the draft boards with millions of young men filtering through these boards on their way again into the maelstrom of destruction of life and property throughout the world.

Now is the time to think about these things that may happen. Let us count the cost before we take such a fatal step.

Mr. Chairman, if this move starts World War III now or later in the Balkans; in order to support Greece and Turkey we must protect the British life line of World War II. We must protect our flanks through the Gibraltar Straits—the Straits of Sicily—and the escape route through the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. In South America there are strong communistic party organizations in most of the Republics which may need our attention.

If the World War III comes we must expend money, men, and munitions to aid the noncommunistic forces of South America to make sure we are not attacked from that quarter.

Then we must defend and supply the vast Pacific from the Aleutians to the Philippines and Korea, around Guam and back to the outposts of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Chairman, we know that our military forces are now at a rather low ebb; yes, we know the millions of men and the billions of dollars that will be required to meet this task if it comes. These are some of the realities that we are facing in considering this legislation. We had better face them now than to indulge in theoretical dreams and wishful thinking.

Mr. Chairman, by comparison the Russian dictatorial government instead of demobilizing their forces in the interest of the peacetime economy of their country have continued the biggest army in the world today. They have appropriated $12,600,000,000 for their over-all military budget. With their slave labor by the millions, with the low wages they pay their workers and the long hours they drive them to their task, you can begin to realize how much war production and how much force these dictators can muster if they so desire. They have all of the 17 strategic raw materials for war

contained in their land which is also serious to contemplate when we think that the United States is sufficient in less than half of these 17 strategic raw materials of war.

Mr. Chairman, in addition Russia is the largest gold-producing nation in the world. While the administration proposes to try to stop communism in the Balkans and in Europe, the Secretary of the Treasury representing the Government for the past number of years has been purchasing gold from Russia and from all nations at $35 a fine ounce. About the time in 1933 when President Roosevelt recognized Communist Russia the Congress passed the Gold Reserve Act raising the price of gold from $20 to $35 a fine ounce. In other words we are still paying Russia in American dollars $35 a fine ounce for gold that it costs Russia $9 a fine ounce to produce.

We are now in a position where the President said recently that we must curb the power of the Communists in America, while at the same time their activities here are being financed by the $26-a-fine-ounce profit we pay Russia for its gold which we hoard in the ground down at Fort Knox, Ky.

Russia with $9 gold can buy strategic raw materials in the world markets which gives her a greater advantage by reason of the fact that this administration which proposes to make war on her ideology of government is, in fact, helping to finance the Russian Government to extend its power throughout the world. Our Government helped to finance Japan in the same way and in other ways with our scrap iron, oil, and machinery prior to Pearl Harbor. She shot this metal back at our troops in the war.

I do not say that we should not go to war with Russia if that is the one means for the salvation of America, and the freedom of men throughout the world.

I do not say that Americans who fought World War I and World War II in the name of freedom would not fight World War III as well for the same cause.

But I say, before we take a step inviting World War III let our people from Maine to California and Washington to Florida know all the facts. Let them know that war can come from this move instead of being told that this move is the one way to prevent war.

Let the people of America know with emphasis that five-eighths of this $400,000,000 is earmarked for military aid, rather than for relief of starving women and children.

Let them realize that this is a parallel step in 1947 to the "all aid to the Allies short of war" that led to lend-lease and the full-scale war of 1941–45.

Look at this Greek-Turkish loan from still another angle.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, presented a tabulation recently showing commitments of $15,800,000,000 for foreign loans and other aid, present or set for the immediate future.

We have 50,000,000 men and women in jobs in the United States outside of Government and the armed forces. This cumulative and aggregate commitment of 15.8 billions of American tax dollars to help the rest of the world means $316 for each and every one of these 50,000,000 job holders.

Yet the national debt share of each of these job holders is already something like $6,000, on a basis of one job for every three adults of our population.

Have you who want to vote this Greek-Turkish loan told your constituents of this?

Have you analyzed for your constituents the figures which will show that the whole cost of military, air and naval preparedness to guarantee American security and American defense against the actions of aggressors for a generation is less than what we have poured out and propose to pour out in foreign largess?

If we want to fight communism, first clear out the Communist fifth column within our own borders. Clear them out of Government jobs, out of the State Department, labor unions, and out of our schools and colleges.

If we want to protect the peace of the world, let us start with hemisphere unity, help the governments of the Central and South American Republics clear out the Communists which would give Russian totalitarianism a permanent foothold in the Americas.

We need to invoke the Monroe Doctrine to apply to communism in the Western Hemisphere, if we would keep the republics of that hemisphere as the habitat of free men and women.

Mr. Chairman, after studying this proposition for weeks I have come to a firm conviction that the proposed foreign policy of the State Department is dangerous and wrong. I am so sure that there is another and a better way that should be tried first, before we take this momentous step that my conscience will not permit me to commit the American people so far as I am concerned to take this step.

The proponents of this bill, both in the Senate and the House now know that their first move should have been to take this matter to the United Nations Organization with all the force and power of the American and British forces and other peace-loving nations belonging to that organization.

They try to excuse themselves by saying that the United Nations does not have the power; they do not know this to be a fact. They have not given the United Nations a chance. The feeble Government of Iran called upon the United Nations to demand that Russia take her military forces out of that country many months ago. She promptly took them out upon the demand of the United Nations organization.

I have advocated for over a year that our Government with Britain and other peace-loving governments should amend the United Nations Charter taking away the veto power of Russia or any other nation; establish armament quotas and provide for inspection of all war materials including minerals for the production of atomic bombs from the mines through the laboratories to the industrial plants. It is not too late to make such a move in conjunction with the move I have suggested of taking the Greek-Turkish matter to the United Nations. I know of no other way where we can so effectively call the bluff of Russia and put her on notice before the world as an aggressor than to follow such a course. If we should follow such a course then the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia and most of the satellite nations of Russia, including the liberty-loving people of France, Germany, Italy, and all nations could look with hope to the United Nations for deliverance from their present bondage and in the hope of perpetual world peace. I think such a course would be a thousand times more effective against the spread of communism in Europe and the world than the dangerous proposal to establish a military beachhead in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of the bill will say that the United Nations does not have the finances. This Government can authorize through the Congress that $100,000,000, or more, be paid over to the United Nations organization to be used at once under the direction of the United Nations in Greece and Turkey to bolster up their economy. In fact, everything and more that the President's proposal contends for, can be effected as promptly and with greater force and power if directed through the United Nations organization. This bill should be amended providing for an approach to the problem along this line. I believe that the House of Representatives has the greatest opportunity to serve this Nation and to serve world peace that will ever come to this Congress. I believe that such a move can be approved in this House which will prevent the financial destruction of this country. If we cannot so amend this proposed legislation we should vote to recommit the bill to the committee for further study.

Mr. Chairman, we have just financed a war that cost us over $300,000,000,000 plus the lives of 300,000 men, with a million more wounded. It will require three hundred billion or more for compensation for the soldiers of this war before we have discharged the commitments now written into law for their relief. Our Government is committed to $15,000,000,000 more in loans and immediate relief. Our debt now stands at $260,000,000,000. Can any one believe that the United States Government, in justice to its own people can afford to embark on this expanded world policy that will call for billions upon billions more? Stalin is waiting for time and is predicting that a depression will come in America that will wreck our Government financially. Doubtless he is planning that when this time comes, his fellow travelers and Communists in this country with the power of Russia can destroy this Government. If we pass the administration's proposal he can begin to bleed us white financially by encouraging his satellite nations to start a war with Greece and Turkey which we will have to defend. He can threaten other nations and under the President's policy we would have to move in to protect them.

This proposed expansion of world policy may well be a trap which will work swiftly and directly to the benefit of the Russian Government by bringing about the destruction of our own form of government through financial bankruptcy.

It is too great a gamble to take until we try out the handling of this matter through the United Nations organization.

Mr. Chairman, the mistakes of our leadership and State Department at Teheran in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter by our own leaders in the partition of Poland, our ally, without her knowledge and consent, by secret agreements add to our difficulties in Europe today.

The mistakes and secret agreements of the State Department and our own leaders giving great concessions to Russia in Manchuria, giving equal power with us in Korea, giving her the Kurile Islands, makes Russia a threat to the Philippines and to our attempt to establish democracy in Korea and Japan. It will cost us over $1,000,000,000 by compelling us to stay in Japan and Korea for years. It was a colossal blunder which gave Russia the power to threaten us from a military standpoint in the future never dreamed of.

Mr. Chairman, the past mistakes of the State Department and our leaders at Yalta in agreements affecting further mistakes made at the Potsdam Conference which have prevented the cooperation of the four powers to bring order out of chaos in Germany, will cost billions of dollars and may defeat the whole purpose of European peace under the United Nations Charter.

Now they ask us to go on our own and make this world-wide move, which, in my judgment, will compound the mistakes of the past and may well wreck the United States Government financially.

I refuse to be a party to helping save the face of the State Department or of the bipartisan leaders of both parties who apparently have entered into a combination to drive through the Greek-Turkish loan, and expanding our foreign policy.

How can we have faith in view of the State Department's constant mistakes on foreign policy that they are right now?

Mr. Chairman, the all-important aim of this Congress is to prevent World War III. To do this we must cast aside the old war-breeding policy of having each nation arrogate to itself the right to decide what it will do to or in other nations, and instead begin to use the machinery of the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the Biblical admonition, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword"? America should not take unilateral action. Whatever action needed to be taken should be taken through the United Nations Organization. It is not too late to correct our course and start putting the pressure on Russia through the United forces of the liberty-loving people who formed the United Nations organization to meet just such emergencies as we are facing in the Greek-Turkish matter.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. I hope that when amendments are being offered that certain of those amendments will be adopted by this committee, which will make it a better bill and one more acceptable to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the bill for military aid to Greece and Turkey involves one of the most significant policy questions ever to face the American Congress. It is urgent that the American people understand the issues involved in this bill; the policy to which it commits us; the people it commits us to support; the interests which are behind this bill and the methods they are using to put it across; and the consequences for this country and the world of such a policy.

Let me quote from Walter Lippmann in his column of April 22:

> This is not a bill to establish democracy in Greece and Turkey. It is only incidentally a bill to bring relief to the victims of war. It is a bill which establishes the United States as a power in the Middle East.

This Government is now considering a policy of unlimited intervention in the affairs of Europe, intervention which repudiates our solemn pledge in the Atlantic Charter to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

Under this policy we commit ourselves to support reactionary forces throughout the world, to support the residue of the very forces against which we expended billions of dollars and 300,000 American lives in World War II.

We are told Greece is a democracy because they held an election attended by United States observers. However, the left was not allowed to campaign and had no ticket. Neither the left nor the center is represented in the present Greek Parliament. The present Greek Government includes collaborators with the Nazis and the Greek Army has been recruited from prewar royalists and quisling forces formed by the Germans. The Government is using the same police force which served the Metaxas dictatorship and the Germans.

We say we are supporting the forces of democracy in Greece against "leftist bands." But who are these leftist bands against whom we propose to throw the full economic and perhaps military might of the United States? Let me quote to you from the report of the New York Times' distinguished foreign correspondent, Raymond Daniell, in the New York Times magazine of April 20, 1947:

> A year ago leftist bands had dwindled to an insignificant size, but they have been growing steadily until they have almost doubled. This is not entirely due to the power of Communist persuasion, nor is it the result, as Government spokesmen often argue, of terrorist tactics on the part of leftists alone. The truth is that large number of villagers have been forced to seek sanctuary with these bands because Government troops and gendarmes, including members of the security police created by the Germans to fight the resistance, themselves have created such a reign of terror in the provinces that for a good many it seemed the best chance of survival was union with the bands.

If there were a truly democratic form of government in Greece, I would be one of the first to come to its support. But as I have indicated, I am opposed to using our money, our military equipment, and eventually our young American manhood, to maintain in power a reactionary government such as now exists there.

But of course the support of Greek reaction against these humble Greek villagers is merely a starting point. As Lippmann pointed out on April 8:

> Greece is only a pinpoint in the Truman global policy.
>
> A policy of this kind is bound to fail—

Lippmann continues—

> because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world. * * * If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally, we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people everywhere.

You have undoubtedly heard that in a recent poll 63 percent of the American people felt that the problem of Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the UN, while only 23 percent were opposed, 14 percent had no opinion. I am sure that you will hear it again. I mention it here now, because I think it is a good idea to take our discussion out of the realm of politics and bring it down to earth. We can do that best by quoting facts.

It is a fact that we were given to understand that the British would withdraw their troops and Communism would take over in Greece and Turkey if we did not vote this program before March 31. It is now May 6 and the British still tramp the streets of Athens and no pitched battles rage on the Turkish frontiers.

It is a fact that we were assured that this measure would strengthen democracy. Yet, the day after it was announced, the monarchist government of the King of Greece swooped down on hundreds of moderate democrats in Athens and trundled them off. As if by signal—instead of the emergence of a democratic regime—the King of Greece watched benignly while monarchist bands murdered 21 men in cold blood held under his protection, in the royal jail—and then complimented the murderers.

No sooner were our great Turkish allies assured of the strengthening of democracy in their country through our aid to their army, than they banned 11 newspapers.

Elsewhere in the world, where they exist, the collaborators, the right wing terrorists, the reactionaries, danced with glee and felt that their day had dawned again.

These are the facts as to how we have strengthened democracy throughout the world.

As I said, Greece is only a pin point in the Truman global policy, only a beginning in a world-embracing undertaking. But Greece, Turkey, and the Near East offer an important clue to the kind of interests which are pushing us into this delirium.

Look at the United States News of March 14, 1947, pages 14–15, and you will see a map of the Mediterranean area. It is captioned: "Greece: the key to the Mediterranean." And at the far right of the map there is a pointer marked in large letters: "Middle East—world's greatest oil reserve in which United States is deeply interested."

Mr. O. John Rogge, former special assistant to the Attorney General, has explained this key. Addressing the Inde-

pendent Oil Men's Association of New England on April 16, Mr. Rogge pointed out that American oil companies now owned or controlled 40 percent of the Middle East oil production and the percentage is growing steadily. That is a substantial "chestnut."

The Washington correspondent of Barron's Financial Weekly wrote on March 17 that the Truman doctrine "in effect creates an American-trained Turko-Greek army between Russia and the world's largest oil reserves."

I think we must appreciate the frankness of some business interests. They at least do not say "democracy" when they mean "oil empire." If this issue could be put to the American people on this frank and honest basis, undisguised by arguments about relief and communism, I know a workable solution could be found within the framework of the United Nations, to which the majority of the American people have indicated that the problem of Greece and Turkey should be referred. As Mr. Rogge said:

> There is no reason why the oil reservoirs of the Middle East should not be pooled for international purposes, supervised by an international commission and run by independent oil companies under a license system.

But such a sensible policy would not guarantee to Standard Oil, Gulf Oil, and other American oil interests the monopoly control they desire. So we are to run the risk of a catastrophic war in order to secure control for these monopolists.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 2 Senator O'MAHONEY warned of possible "cartel arrangements eventually controlling the supply of oil for the United States." Have we so soon forgotten the situation in which cartel control of essential items like rubber, aluminum, and tungsten left us at the beginning of World War II?

Let me give you a description of the oil properties in the Middle East, to which Greece and Turkey are considered the keys:

In Iraq, a subsidiary of Iraq Petroleum Co., controlled by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum along with dominant British and minor French and Dutch interests, has a 75-year concession, with the United States companies entitled to get nearly a fourth of the output.

Kuwait Oil Co. has a 75-year concession on the borders of Iraq in the Kingdom of Kuwait, a British protectorate at the head of the Persian Gulf. This company is owned jointly by the Gulf Oil Corp. — Mellon — and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., a British company. Its production is about 40,000 barrels daily.

The rest of Iraq not covered by other concessions is exploited by the Basrah Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Iraq Petroleum, which as noted above, is owned jointly by United States, British, Dutch, and French interests.

In Iran, Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. are involved through a purchase agreement in the 60-year concession in southern Iran given to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. This British concern has an output of over 400,000 barrels a day. It is now planning an $80,000,000 pipe line from the Iranian fields to the Mediterranean to be completed by 1949.

In Saudi Arabia, American interests have a concession covering 281,000,000 acres and control virtually all the oil reserves through the Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—which is already getting out about 200,000 barrels a day. It has contracted for a 1,200-mile pipe line to the Mediterranean coast to be completed by 1949.

Aramco is owned jointly by Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. and is now transferring about 40 percent of its stock interest to Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the biggest of the oil trusts, and to Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., another company in the Rockefeller group.

A loan to Aramco of over $100,000,000 is reportedly being made by a group of United States banks headed by the Chase National Bank—a Rockefeller bank—while another loan of $125,000,000 is being extended by a group of insurance companies.

In the Bahrein Islands, a protectorate of Great Britain off the east coast of Arabia, the Bahrein Petroleum Co. is exploring, producing and refining oil. Bahrein Petroleum is owned half by Standard Oil Co. of California and half by the Texas Co.

In Qatar on the Persian Gulf, also under British protection, the government is actually run by the Petroleum Development, Ltd., subsidiary of the Iraq Petroleum Co. which I mentioned earlier. The oil reserves here are estimated at 1,000,000,000 barrels.

In Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Cyprus, Trans-Jordan, and coastal Arab states, the Iraq Petroleum Co., controlled by United States, British, Dutch, and French interests, has oil rights to lands with estimated reserves of around 5,000,000,000 barrels.

These being the facts, it is a crime against the American people to withhold them from their full and free consideration, so that they can judge the policy on its real merits. It is they who must do the fighting and dying in war. It is upon them that the immediate economic consequences of this policy will fall.

For—let us make no mistake about it—this policy is alien to the American tradition. It is alien to the purposes for which we fought World War II. It is especially alien to the whole course of foreign policy pursued by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and so overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people during the 12 years in which they elected and reelected him to office. It is those "economic royalists" who abused and slandered our late great President throughout the whole of his term in office who look upon the "Truman doctrine" with equanimity and ill-disguised gloating. In a remark which is outstanding for its bad taste and open contempt for the American people's feelings for President Roosevelt, Barron's declared on March 17:

> Mr. Truman cannot be thanked too gratefully for his honest and straightforward presentation of the reasons for embarking on a course so alien to that of his widely worshiped predecessor.

One of the most serious objections to the so-called Truman doctrine is that by extending unilateral aid to Greece and Turkey the United States is bypassing the United Nations and other international bodies which we are pledged to support. The United Nations, the world's great hope for peace and security, will be undermined by this defection of the greatest power in the world. That the United Nations is capable of extended help to Greece was shown by the recent recommendations regarding Greek economy made by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was specifically established for loans to nations needing funds to rebuild their economy.

If action is required to restore the economy of Greece, it should be carried out through the agencies of the United Nations in accordance with the proposals of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Such funds as are required for this purpose should be granted to the UN by an appropriation of Congress. But no funds should be released until there has been established in Greece a coalition government replacing the present reactionary government. The function of this coalition government should be to hold office during a transition period in which honest attempts would be made to end the civil war by conciliation and by the promise of fundamental reforms.

With regard to Turkey, I am opposed to giving them any sort of help whatsoever.

In the first place, Turkey is not a democracy, and never was. In the second place, if she was not actually an ally of Germany, she enjoyed a benevolent neutrality during World War II. She played one side against the other, until, finally, yielding to United Nations pressure, on February 23, 1945 she declared war on Germany and Japan.

In direct violation of the Montreux Convention, she permitted Nazi warships to enter the Black Sea, from which they assisted in the siege and capture of Odessa and Sevastopol, and contributed substantially to the Nazi advance on Stalingrad. Her capital, Ankara, was a haven of refuge and a vantage point for Von Papen and many high Nazi diplomats, and a headquarters for the Gestapo.

In the third place, Turkey does not require financial aid. Her budget deficit is small and she has a gold reserve. A British retreat from commitments in Turkey would not have great economic effect. Consequently, the problem of Turkey is not quite the same as the problem of Greece. If Turkey's security is threatened, her case should be placed before the Security Council of the United Nations.

In summary, a British opinion on the present condition of Turkey may be of interest:

> Turkey today is a happy land not only in the richness of her soil, but in her freedom from that fatal fission which is the curse of so many countries in Europe today. Well provided, united, * * * Turkey is today probably the most comfortable country in

Europe in which to live. With more prosperous days in view, her outlook for the near future is far brighter than that of the greater part of the world. (The Statist (London), January 11, 1947, p. 36.)

An amendment will be offered to strike all reference to Turkey from the bill. This should be adopted by the committee.

Also, an amendment will be offered to limit any Greek aid exclusively to the granting of funds for relief purposes, on condition that the spending of the funds be properly supervised by representatives of the United States Government. This amendment also should be adopted. Otherwise, should we appropriate funds to the present regime without conditions, as Lippmann puts it:

Greece will be a rathole into which we will pour not only money—that is the least of it—but our prestige and our good name.

The world is watching to see if we meant what we said, when we talked about joining with all peace-loving nations to "afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman feel this legislation will not stop the onrush of communism in Europe and elsewhere?

Mr. KLEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I made my position clear in connection with the foreign relief bill which we debated last week. Communism feeds on peoples who are living in misery and despair, and unless you feed those peoples, unless the people can be happy and content, you will have the desire for communism, or at least something, some ideology, which offers those people some hope. If we establish truly democratic governments over there we will not have to worry about communism because the people will shun it, they will reject it and will not have anything to do with it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KLEIN. Examine this so-called Truman doctrine very carefully. I hope that some of these amendments which will be offered will be adopted, but if not, if the bill remains in its present form, it should be voted down, because it is not deserving of our support.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation as presented in H. R. 2616 is perhaps the most important piece of legislation that this Congress has considered for a long time. It sets forth a pattern of the foreign policy of the United States for the days ahead, and whenever a definite policy on such an important matter is determined it carries with it grave responsibilities. It is only after the most careful consideration and thought that I have decided to support this bill, and although I do not know much about the detail of its import, nevertheless, I am convinced that it is for the best interests of our country that it be adopted.

In the first place, the President of the United States, whose duty it is to inaugurate the international policies of our country, has requested it on the grounds that it is necessary for the security of the United States; and in the second place, Secretary of State Marshall has stated that this legislation should be enacted in order to strengthen his hands in our dealings with our former allies. The Secretary of State has been reported as saying that the President's proposal was taken most seriously and had a definite effect on Generalissimo Stalin, the dictator of Russia.

Furthermore, I am convinced that the people of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, whom I have the honor to represent, are in favor of this legislation and I know whereof I speak. Immediately after the President read his message to Congress on this subject, I recognized the importance and the far-reaching possibilities of such action on the part of our country and I felt that I should ask for the views of the people that I represent. I drafted a quarter-page advertisement for insertion in the newspapers in my district, which consisted of three paragraphs, stating as follows:

The implications in the President's message regarding Greece and Turkey are far more serious than the advancement of $400,000,000 to these countries.

This matter affects the entire future of our country and demands the attention of all the people.

Therefore, I earnestly request that the people I represent write me their views and opinions on this problem.

The response to this advertisement was immediate and generous and I received approximately 1,000 letters from individuals, each giving me his or her personal views on this momentous question. The replies were divided, about 56 percent in favor and 44 percent against the President's proposal, but it should be noted that a large number of those in favor qualified their approval by stating that the proposal should have been channeled through the United Nations and that no military aid should be extended to either Greece or Turkey.

Of course, I feel that unless we are prepared to support anything we may do, our efforts to aid would be in vain. There is no sense in going into this thing unless we are prepared to stand up in support of our convictions and not run away. Whether we like it or not we have become a great international power and we must assume our responsibilities to maintain peace in the world.

It is for these fundamental reasons that I believe it is desirable that this legislation should pass and I hope it will pass by an overwhelming vote. At the same time, however, I do not wish to let this opportunity go by without making some observations about these responsibilities of ours as a great international power, and the part that the House of Representatives must play in implementing them. For the first time perhaps in history the House of Representatives is called upon to have some part in determining a definite foreign policy for our Government, and the question naturally arises—what do we Members of the House really know about the political and economic ideologies of other nations? Do we know when we vote these huge sums of money that they will be used wisely for the benefit of those who really need aid? Are we sure that mere money and advice will bring to an end the spread and growth of communism? Do we know whether $400,000,000 is enough to accomplish our purpose, or is it too much? Have we first-hand knowledge of the economic conditions of these countries and whether the Governments that rule them are honest and capable and are able and willing to administer whatever relief we may offer? Will these countries, and any other countries we may see fit to aid, cooperate with us to the end that the people of the world will grow to respect us and that our prestige will be enhanced? Is it economically sound for us to make such a loan and can we do likewise for other countries who may seek our aid? These and many other questions arise and the answers, if there are any, are vague and tend to add to the confusion of thought which already exists.

During the debate of the relief bill, recently passed by the House and now being considered in the Senate, confused thinking was very evident. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs gave the impression that they were not able to agree among themselves about many of the important features of that legislation. This great committee is made up of hard-working, conscientious Members of the House, and my statement is not meant to reflect on them in any way. The members of this committee were reaching for the truth and for what was best for America, but unanimity of thought was absent and their unanimity of thinking is necessary for the guidance of the judgment of the other Members of the House of Representatives. This is not a good state of affairs because in the days to come the House of Representatives will be called upon to decide other matters of great international import and confused thinking must be eliminated if we are to prepare and pass constructive legislation.

As I have already pointed out, the House of Representatives up to the present has not had to consider matters of this kind, and its membership was not called upon for any great knowledge about the economies or philosophies of foreign governments. This was the responsibility of the other body where, under the Constitution, treaties with other nations are considered and passed upon and our general policy of foreign relations decided. However, those days of no responsibility on the part of the House are passed; the world is on our doorstep and is looking to our Government for courage, for leadership and for financial aid, and in accordance with our constitutional system the House of Representatives must share the responsibilities of determining our foreign policy and our country's attitude toward other countries in the world. We cannot shirk that responsibility if our Nation is to live.

This present situation calls for the education of Congressmen in the ways and byways of international relations. We Members of the House of Representa-

tives, if we are to be faithful to our trust, can no longer remain content with what information is revealed to us by the Executive Department of our Government and we must develop our own facts concerning the economic and political conditions at home and abroad. It is true that many Members of the House of Representatives, in the past year or so, have traveled overseas and visited foreign lands, but I venture a guess that for many of them it was their first trip outside of the United States. These Members, of course, have seen much in a short time and have gathered a great deal of useful information, but such trips cannot possibly make anyone an expert, or the son of an expert, on foreign relationships. The world has a great history and events are changing rapidly the course of human destiny; therefore, in the light of that history these changes must be interpreted and their meaning weighed. That is a job for men of the highest technical training; it is a job for experts.

The need for this education and study has been recognized by our able and experienced colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. It is quite natural that he should recognize the lack of appreciation on the part of the House of the difficult and complicated questions involved in the matter of administering relief. He knows considerable about it because he has been engaged in it and has studied it under the guidance of that great statesman and American, Herbert Hoover. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] introduced House Resolution 173 and I commend it to my colleagues for their study. This resolution provides for the appointment by the Speaker of the House of a select committee of 15 members, at least 10 of whom shall be selected from the majority and minority membership of the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, Banking and Currency, Armed Services, and Agriculture, and reads as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to make a continuing study of—

(1) Actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, etc., and of economic rehabilitation;

(2) Resources available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States;

(3) Existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs;

(4) The administrative skills and performance of such agencies;

(5) Continuing wartime or other controls, if any, required to maintain prices of commodities in short supply at reasonable levels, whether such controls be domestic or international;

(6) Any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

This would not be a legislative committee; it would be a study committee, designated to secure the facts about conditions of relief and aid to foreign countries, and it would be required to report to the House "not less often than once in each 6 months." This committee may, of course, report more frequently as occasion may demand and thereby keep the Members of the House supplied with factual information developed under their own auspices.

Every Member of the House would benefit tremendously from the study of such a committee and their conclusions would be more intelligently arrived at and they would have more definite knowledge of the possible results of their action. Such study would tend to promote a positive, integrated foreign policy and would stop the practice of, on the one hand, shipping supplies to a country while on the other hand during what we can to stop its expansion. Such a thoughtless and vacillating policy makes us the laughingstock of the world, because thereby we are aiding in the promotion of the very thing we are seeking to destroy. This does not reflect any glory on us who claim to be a people of great business acumen, nor does it enhance our reputation in the eyes and hearts of other nations. Bewilderment among the Members of the House today is the result of their dependency on information received from all kinds of sources, some of which is little better than mere gossip, and they do the best they can, hoping for the best. That is no way for us Members of Congress to act for the best interest of our country.

Such a study committee as proposed in House Resolution 173 should in no way conflict with the duties and prerogatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; indeed it would supplement its work. This is clearly set forth in the whereas clauses in the resolution itself, which read as follows:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions.

This clause indicates the great intricacy of this problem and the fact that this demand for aid will come from all quarters of the globe.

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States.

This clause shows the intimate part that relief extension plays in the whole economy of our country, affecting industry, agriculture, defense, and our fiscal affairs.

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress.

This clause shows that the problems involved go far beyond the scope of any one of the committees of the House of Representatives and should have the combined attention of people who are experts in the various segments of our economy which are affected.

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other.

This clause points out the fact which has been troubling many of us, that we must be on our guard that we ourselves do not become weak while we are doing our best to make others strong.

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress.

This clause merely states the truth, but one could go further and include every member in Government, if not every citizen in the United States as benefiting from such a study.

I hope that early and favorable consideration will be given to the passage of this resolution, but we must act presently on this proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey, using the best judgment at our disposal. Pray God that any aid that we may be able to render will be sufficient and efficient enough to aid these stricken people to get on their feet and establish themselves as free men and women. What the little nations of the world want is what we cherish—liberty. What they want is to take their place among the comity of nations and contribute what they can to peace in the world. It is right that we should do everything possible to aid them to achieve these objectives, but we must be sensible and prudent or we ourselves may be engulfed by the very thing we seek to destroy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, Sunday will be Mother's Day. I like the description of "mother" by Kate W. Wiggins, the author of Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch. She said that so many fine things like jewels, roses, stars, and sunrises and sunsets come in quantities in our lifetime, but there is only one mother: She is a single jewel.

You and I have been receiving letters from mothers in recent weeks, and if your letters are like mine, they are couched in such refreshing terms. Normally, the demands that one gets are, "We demand that you be for this" or against something. How refreshing it was to hear from the mothers out home and to have them say, with that kind and tender supplication, "We hope that you will do everything possible to avert another war." That is an entreaty. That is a fervent plea. That is the proposition before us today. It is a question of method, whether to go in or whether to stay out of world responsibility as the most effective way to avoid and avert another war.

I say to you out of my own prayerful meditations on this subject that I want to support this bill. I think it is the thing to do. I believe it offers a chance to cure a condition which if continued is more likely to invite conflict rather than circumvent it.

I do not believe I can tell my story any better than to tell it from this map, because this is the Middle East, the explosive area in today's world. Over here is Greece, hanging like an appendage from the body corporate of Europe. Down at the lower end is Athens, the cradle of democracy, where democracy was born 27 centuries ago. Greece is not so far from Africa. You can start from Cairo in a C–47 and in 3½ hours you are in Athens. A short distance across the blue Mediterranean—and all those distances in the Middle East are short. If you could stand on a high mountain here at Athens, the cradle of democracy, and look north to that little area that is encircled in orange, that is Albania. The

ruling head of Albania is a former chief of police who was indoctrinated with communism long ago. That is part of our trouble. Part of the terrorism of today comes from that source.

Next to Albania along the northern border of Greece is Yugoslavia, presided over by Tito. Joseph Brosip is his name. For 5 years he was a lieutenant in the armies of the Soviet Union, and you know the doctrine and the ideology that he absorbed and which he follows today. Yugoslav communism is too well known to need description. It, too, is a source of terrorism.

Standing on this high mountain at Athens, if you look a little farther to the east you will find Bulgaria, where a border dispute is in progress at the present time. The one who gives direction to the affairs of Bulgaria is Georgi Dimitrov, who is also indoctrinated with communism. Perhaps the most powerful person in Bulgaria today is Tsola Nagoychova, who is the secretary general of the Communist Party in Bulgaria, and who has recently indicated the intention that she is going to visit the United States one of these days. I hope she never does. She was the one who gave direction to the efforts of 20,000 terrorist troops in Bulgaria after the war ended. The situation was so bad that an American major general and an American diplomat could not even go beyond the confines of Sofia to have luncheon with a Bulgarian general because a Soviet sentry said no. Those are the documented facts. The State Department has not said too much about them in the interest of good feeling, so long as the world was so turbulent and so feverish. But a truly impossible situation developed there. It is a present source of terrorism.

In the northern area of Greece is Macedonia, the same place from whence this man came in a vision to the Apostle Paul to say 1,900 years ago, "Come over into Macedonia, and help us." Today, 1,900 years later, we are receiving the same kind of an appeal to help these people. And why help them? Because the wave of Red ideology wants to come down from the north, seeks to take over Greece and make it another Soviet satellite, seeks to extend the iron curtain to the Aegean and to the blue water of the Mediterranean.

Now let us look at a little proof. Standing on this high mountain in Athens, look down to Alexandria in Egypt. If you could have been there in April of 1944 you might have witnessed a mutiny upon the vessels of the Greek Government that were then attached to the British Mediterranean Fleet. That mutiny was developed by soldiers and sailors who were Communists. The man who put it down was Admiral Voulgaris, with whom I spent a day in Athens just 2 years ago—a fine, stocky, amiable gentleman who told me about his problems. That mutiny has been described as Red fascism's first bid for Greece. It occurred a year before VE-day.

In that same year, in December there came the liberation uprising in Greece that left 8,000 dead bodies upon the pavements of Athens, and 12,000 were wounded. That was fomented with Soviet money and under Soviet direction. It is a known fact that Siantos, from up at Salonika, from up in the tobacco area, Partsalides, and Zacharides, all Communist leaders, were all there when it was taking place. They are the king pins of EALS and its Red actionist wing.

I can bring a man to this Chamber who practices law in Washington who was a colonel in the Army, and I can bring a general, and I can bring a young Greek lawyer from Chicago, all of whom were there to bear witness to this story as to whether or not the Reds were active in trying to start World War III in the ancient land of Hellas where democracy was born. They saw this brutal endeavor to take over and extend Red fascism to Greece.

They found 20,000 metal Communist badges in the headquarters of KKE, the Communist Party of Greece, when it was burned. When the victims of this alleged liberation uprising were disposed of, the bodies were buried in trenches 2 feet deep and covered with lime. That was the same Soviet technique by which they buried the Poles who were butchered in the Katien Forest of Poland. They were slaughtered by the Communists. The technique is exactly the same. That is the bestial thing that wants to come down into Greece for a purpose. And when that takes hold and it can use a fine airport in Athens, it will be only 150 miles from a body of water, 45 miles long and heavily fortified, that we call the Dardanelles. The strategic straits would then be practically behind the iron curtain. The rest would be easy.

I understand that an effort is going to be made to eliminate Turkey from this bill. I hope it fails. It is only 200 miles from the Bulgarian border through Turkey to the Dardanelles, and that is another access for communism and the communistic forces. It is not so very far over to Istanbul. It is not so very far over to the Bosporus which is only 20 miles long. It is not so terribly far over to the border where Russia and Turkey join and where they insisted when I was there that a million Soviet troops had been massed. If communism fails in its push through Greece, it can try through Turkey. The two nations are a part of a common problem.

Now, the thing that we really have not heard about in all this show is the fact that of the many demands that Russia has made upon Turkey the most important is not the Dardanelles. It is the reformation of the Turkish Government. A former high Turkish official told me about this whole picture over there. That is the thing they really want to do. By reformation, they mean reformation with the MVD, the espionage, and the secret police, and deception and brutality. So, finally, they can take over Turkey, too. For years the Moscow radio has been needling members of the Turkish Congress.

I had a very interesting all-day visit with the members. We had a little round-up at night. I examined some of the translations of the Moscow radio scripts. Gentlemen, make no mistake as to what Russia is doing. She is trying to move in and take over in Turkey as well as in Greece. There is a reason for it. Once you cut off here, you have set up a sort of iron curtain between western culture and eastern culture—between western democracy and the type of thing that they have over in the other end of the world. And when they have done it, they will be ready in their own sweet time to take over the greatest natural resource in all the world, which is the stuff of peace and the stuff of war. By that I mean the proven and indicated petroleum reserves in the Middle East.

In these demands that Russia has made upon Turkey there is a demand for two provinces ceded to Turkey after World War I, here at the end of the Black Sea, called Kars and Ardahan. That is high ground. That would be a great base for bombers. When they have gotten that, they are just a little bit closer to the natural oil resources. Here is the great proven oil field of the world. Notice how close it would bring Red fascism to Mosul and Kirkuk, the great oil center of Iraq. One of the greatest oil geologists that we have in the United States is Mr. de Collyer, who went over there at the instance of Secretary Knox in 1944. He came back and made a report and said that the greatest known oil reserves in all the world was there and that the center of gravity of oil production was shifting from the Caribbean-Gulf area of this hemisphere to the Middle East

Why do you think the Soviet Union wants to move into Iran? Because down at the lower end of the Persian Gulf are the great refineries and there is the oil. Why have Russian agents been undertaking to organize the highly nationalistic Kurds in the northern part of Iraq? Because the scheme is one day to set up the Kurdish Nationalistic Republic and have them join the Soviet Union. Anybody in the Kurdish Army who can speak with authority will tell you that whole story. They are interested in Iraq because there is Mosul and Kirkuk, two great oil centers of the Middle East, next to Abadan and Khorramsahr on the Persian Gulf. As one flies across this country and notes the pipe lines from Mosul in Iraq to Tripoli on the Mediterranean coast, where vessels, including naval vessels, obtained their oil for fuel; as one observes pipe lines on top of the surface of the desert; as one observes refineries converting petroleum into liquid power for tanks and tractors and planes and motor vehicles; as one traces out the efforts of Soviet agents in northern Iran, he becomes conscious of the bid which Red fascism is making for the eastern and middle eastern world.

A pipe line runs from here out to the Mediterranean coast. There is another branch that runs down to Haifa in the northern part of Palestine. Oh, how easy it is, once communism has moved into Greece, once they have developed bases in the adjoining Mediterranean, how easy it will be to set up that curtain that will separate the Western Hemisphere from the strange kind of eastern culture that threatens to engulf the whole wide world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. Do I understand it is his view that we must stop communism in Turkey and Greece in order to protect these oil fields?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean just this, that the gentleman from Illinois tries to be something of a realist. Having talked with leaders in all parts of the world, how can you deal with policy unless you divine or assume or appraise or know for a certainty what the other fellow has got in mind, who is going to push into all corners of the earth? Communism is one aspect of this thing. That is the cloak and shield they are using at the present time by means of armed assaults and terrorism up in northern Macedonia to finally bring Greece to heel and take over and reform the government like they did in Latvia, like they did in Lithuania, like they did in Estonia, like they did in Roumania, like they did in Yugoslavia, like they did in Bulgaria, like they did in Albania, and like they are trying to do with Austria.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is the cloak that covers this bill—oil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the cloak and shield that our Soviet friends are using at the present time to mask one of their ultimate purposes. They have many purposes, including world domination, as so freely expressed by Soviet leaders. There is only one answer to it, and that is, first of all, to assert, if we are going to, our eternal hostility to this ideology, which is based upon bestiality, brutality, and destruction, and to stop it from engulfing the rest of the world. That is the whole story as I see it. It is just as plain as a mountain on the map why they are interested here. They have been working at it for a long time. By sham and deception they pursue their objective. When Colonel Popoff, of the Soviet Army, was in Greece, one of the officials insisted, "What are you doing here?" He said, "I am here looking after Russian prisoners of war." But there were no Russian prisoners of war in Greece.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I should like to commend the gentleman. The gentleman has correctly and succinctly stated the issue confronting the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I have returned within the last 3 weeks from the Middle East, and I have talked in Cairo to the representatives of the other countries mentioned. The situation which the gentleman saw with his own eyes 2 years ago still exists and he has described it accurately to the House—the threat and all the rest of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to ask the gentleman to answer two direct questions and he can answer them at once.

Has the Soviet Union offended us? If so, why do we not, like a nation, sever relations instead of taking a pusillanimous action like this, like we are now contemplating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, you know, gentlemen, that is so easy to utter, but at the end of the road there may be dead GI's. I think our first concern is, since we have so recently emerged from the dismal shadow of the greatest war the world has ever experienced, that we do not want to wittingly or unwittingly make a move that will get us into another conflict. The thing we must do is to avoid conflict and over a period of time to give the world an opportunity to heal, have its wounds heal. I think the greatest service we can render to these distorted and fanatical minds behind that strange Red ideology that would take over the whole wide world, is to simply say, "Now, there is no malice, no venom in our policy. We simply say that we left some hundreds of thousands of youngsters in all sections of the earth for an ideal that we call freedom. We assured the world of our devotion to freedom. We sacrificed for it. We went deeply into debt for it. We signed an Atlantic Charter to evidence our faith in freedom.

Now, shortly after the war is scarcely over, up bobs a little country, raising its hands in supplication, and it says, "Please, America, help us to maintain that freedom." Do not misunderstand me. I am not unmindful of the type of government over in Greece; you do not cure it overnight. I am not unmindful of the fact that Turkey is somewhat on the semitotal side. Is freedom and democracy more likely to be asserted and perfected by themselves with our aid or by having communism take over? We are dealing here with something that brooks no delay. You have got to move now, and then to hope by the interposition of our aid to be able in due time to cure a number of things that I have set forth in a statement I made here in March. Their exchange system is all out of kilter and that is why they are suffering such riotous inflation. I hope that it can be democratized, but it will never be democratized if Siantos, and Zacharides, and Partsalides finally bring ELAS from underground and get the master hand.

As soon as they take over they will replace democracy with the hammer and sickle and all that the hammer and sickle stand for. No. That is what Russia has in mind by re-forming Greece and by re-forming Turkey. And then remember that once the filthy imprint of Red fascism is placed indelibly upon those countries it will not be erased in your lifetime and in mine. Then they will move relentlessly over into the rest of the Middle East.

On a Saturday night the biggest meeting in Beyreuth, Lebanon, was a Communist meeting at one of the largest and most fashionable hotels there. They are working on it. They are all talking about it in the streets of ancient Damascus which was the center of the ministry of the Apostle Paul.

They play for keeps, Mr. Chairman, and it is necessary for you and I now to play for keeps and to be registered on the right side of this issue. Even though all the provisos that you and I would like to have in this bill are not inscribed there by the committee, I would still vote for it.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. In view of the geographical and ideological situation that the gentleman from Illinois has described, is it his idea that we can accomplish this result with $400,000,000 and 40 officers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, do not underestimate the moral force behind the power of America which is even greater than dollars.

Mr. MATHEWS. Against Russia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not worried about the strength of Russia; I am worried about this infiltration of an ideology which has already penetrated our own country and is giving us trouble right here in the Nation's Capital. There is a great moral force about the help of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I have already yielded the gentleman 10 minutes, but I yield him five additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great moral force about aid from America that is even more important than the dollars; and when this humble people so many of whose kinfolks are among the fine businessmen in every metropolitan center in the United States, feel that we are in their corner the curtain of fear will rise, there will be a new spirit in their guard service and they will be ready with a little material help to deal with those terrorists who are presently up in the rugged hills of Macedonia along the borders trying to come in and take over that nation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that when Turkey has ever played she has always played for keeps and she was always for sale to the highest bidder?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, now, let me put my friend straight on that. I have heard that kind of talk before.

I think Turkey performed a real service in World War II and I will tell you why. Here was the course of the Nazi forces coming down to the world bridge, and Turkey is the bridge from Europe to Asia, and Turkey was neutral. When the German hordes with their Panzers and their Stukas were coming through the Balkans, how easy it would have been for them to proceed down the Levantine coast and put the pincers on Cairo and El Alemain and sweep across northern Africa. If that had happened the war would not have been over for a long, long time. It may be said in part that the Turks kept them out. When the German legions arrived at the Turkish border and were intent on proceeding

through Turkey, the Turkish officials said: "See here, if you violate our neutrality, of course, the British will be free to violate our neutrality. Would you want that to happen?" Day after day they had to carry on this moral battle of holding the Germans back, and preventing a violation of Turkish neutrality and they succeeded. To show you how serious all this must have been in the minds of military strategists, one can go up and down this Mediterranean coast and see the pillboxes, the barbed-wire entanglements, the fortifications, the emergency airports, and everything else that was constructed in anticipation of the day when a great horde of motorized troops would one day be moving through Turkey and down the Levantine coast putting the squeeze on Cairo and North Africa, where Rommel and his Afrika Corps were threatening that continent.

Let us, therefore, not minimize the service that the Turks rendered to the Allied Nations by their firm stand on neutrality.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In further substantiation of what the gentleman says about the Turkish contribution to the war, which is exactly correct and which unfortunately is not broadly understood in America, let me mention this: In speaking to the President in Ankara in 1945 we were discussing this particular problem and he told us then something that has since been confirmed by the record. That is, when the Russians with their backs to the wall were holding Stalingrad, he, the President of Turkey, sent a mission to Moscow to assure them that the large armies they had massed on the Turkish border, since they did not know where Turkey was going, were unnecessary because Turkey was not going to be on the side of the Germans, it was not going to attack the Russians, and with that assurance some of the reinforcements were moved from the borders of Turkey and permitted Stalingrad to stand and to help win the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], may I say that he has raised this question of oil as the real reason for the action which it is proposed that we take here, but that is but a small part of it. Suppose the iron curtain is put up across this middle eastern area. What happens to the trade between the United States and the rest of this world? Will we do business with this vast area on Mr. Stalin's terms and no other? Is that the kind of a world we want? If so, then we might as well capitulate. But are our memories so short that we have already forgotten the effects of a policy of appeasement? When all is said and done the $64 question still remains and right now is very, very simple. If Greece and Turkey are overwhelmed by Communist penetration and the petroleum domain of the Middle East is there for seizure or domination by the forces of Red fascism, will it make them more bellicose or tractable or will it make them less so? And once they dominate and control this whole area, does it make future war more likely or less likely? To that I have but one answer and that is that conflict would be far more likely and so what we do today in stemming this scarlet tide is an answer to the mothers who are pleading for that kind of action which is most likely to prevent conflict and death for young men.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We have already capitulated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; we have not.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Are the Macedonians Greeks? That is where all the trouble is. Are those people Greeks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You know my friend gets me now into an ethnological discussion where I am not too well at home and I would therefore find some difficulty answering the question. I do know that we have always considered them as a part of that same country. That is where they are located; and besides, what has such a discussion to do with the business which is before us?

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman knows that the Macedonians are Slavs. They are not Greeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could be, but that portion is in Greece, otherwise what are they doing in there harassing the Greeks?

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman knows further that the Macedonians put up a most stubborn fight in this war, as they did in the First World War. They should be entitled to freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They should be entitled to freedom. They were promised by Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter that that they would have their freedom. They fought stubbornly on our side. The Greeks have received a lot of credit for the fighting that the Macedonians did in those mountains. The Macedonians are rugged, mountain people and they fought against the Germans there. As a matter of fact, they were never subdued by the Germans or the Italians.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, but I know what the boundaries of those countries indicate and that is they are a part of Greece at the present time.

I want to say one more thing because it is the most important of all. It sounds so academic to go back constantly and talk about this thing called freedom, but it is the greatest thing on the face of the earth. It is the blessed inheritance of this country. It is the purpose of this country. Now, then, if we let it languish anywhere finally and within reason, of course, if we let it languish there, right in the heart of this European and Asian Continent, it will not be too long before we take it for granted and then it becomes a rootless thing and dies. Then what about freedom? Has this thing called freedom already become so vague after the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of young Americans in our own country that it means nothing? Are we ready now so shortly after World War II, and notwithstanding the pledges which we made in the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration and other documents, to toss small countries to the dogs of communism?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say in respect to Turkey that when the pages of history have been written of her role in the last war it will be revealed that Turkey was ready to declare war on the side of the Axis if Stalingrad had fallen. However, here is what I deem to be even more important. The gentleman's main contention is that this legislation is complementary to a policy of preserving and aiding freedom and democracy. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, then, I ask the gentleman this: How is it that over all these years we have not had any application to Congress either from the State Department or from the President for aid to the Republicans of Spain?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There you have a different situation in this respect: This request, gentlemen, comes to us from the Government of Greece; not from a group; not from a lot of Falangists or Loyalists or anybody else. This is an official request by a sovereign country to a sovereign country, couched in the language of 1,900 years ago, "Please come over and help us."

In my judgment the help that we render now may turn the balance as to whether or not some day in the future the horizons will again be livid with the flames of war.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois this question: In view of his eloquent appraisal of the value that Turkey gave to the Allied cause during the late war, by the same token did not General Franco, by remaining neutral when the Allied forces were landing in North Africa, also contribute, as you say Turkey did, to the ultimate victory of the Allies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know. But, gentlemen, what has that to do with the issue before us here. Let us not be diverted with red herrings. Let us consider the forces that are operative in Greece, that are operative in Turkey. Let us consider the armed minorities abroad. Let us consider the psychological aggression that Herbert Hoover alluded to in San Francisco during the United Nations Conference, when he said something should be done about it. That is the kind of aggression that is being practiced over there at the present time, the objective being the taking over the rest of the area that comes to the blue water, cutting off western culture, and finally taking over one of the greatest resources that God ever put below the surface of the earth.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. What about the $146,000,000 we have sunk in Turkey since 1945? We have spent $146,000,000 in Turkey since 1945. What have we received for that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know that up to this point we have received anything. Under lend-lease we invested billions in all parts of the world. When this defense aid was authorized we knew that much of it would never be returned either in cash or in kind.

Mr. BENDER. What did Von Pappen do in Turkey during the war? Did he help the Allied cause?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. But notwithstanding the efforts of Von Pappen and his staff, Turkey did remain neutral and in that way helped to terminate the war as early as it did come to an end.

Mr. BENDER. What are the Nazis doing now in Turkey, the fugitives from Germany? What is happening to the Nazi gold in Turkey?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me conclude on this note: When the shadows and the bitterness of World War II have been dissipated somewhat, we suddenly discover that we have swapped a black dictator for a red one. Are we going to run out on the job now, or is this deep and abiding thing called freedom going to have a chance in countries that are still too weak from the conquering hordes of obstruction and destruction to help themselves? Let me again present the $64 question: Will our endeavors from now on to bring peace to a sick and bleeding world be made easier or more difficult by having Red fascism take over in Greece and Turkey and impose an extension of the iron curtain across that area of the world and ultimately dominate a natural resource of such high importance in peace and in war. To that question, gentlemen, an answer is simple and easy. Our task would become infinitely more difficult and that is the best and the simplest reason I know for approving the proposal which is before us today.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I asked a question, Are the Macedonians Greeks? We have heard much about this Greek trouble, and it is always referred to as the trouble in Greek Macedonia, but why is it that no one comes down here and tells us the truth about this situation? The Macedonians are not Greeks. The Macedonians are a Slav race of people. They are southern Slavs. Further, history will bear out the fact that these Macedonians have lived there since the time of Christ. The city of Salonika is their city, it is not a Greek city. These Macedonian people are a rugged race of people. They live in the mountains; they are a mountaineer people, a simple, hard-fighting people, good Christian people. They have withstood the onslaught of the Romans, the Greeks, and the Turks. The Turks did their best to make Mohammedans out of them. They had them under Turkish domination for many, many years. The Turks practiced every kind of brutality against these Christian people. They desecrated their churches. They burnt their farms and homes. But they remained Macedonians. Then after the First World War, after these Macedonians had joined with us in our big fight in that war, and had shed their blood and given us of their best men in that struggle, what did we do, or rather, what did England do? England handed those people in bondage to Greece, instead of giving the Macedonians freedom. Freedom is what they wanted and that is what they fought for, and that is what they were entitled to have.

In this last war great fighting was done in that northern part of Greece, up in that hill country. A lot of credit was given to the Greeks, but who did this fighting? Macedonians, Greek Macedonians, those mountaineer people. The Nazis and the Italians never did subdue them, they never did annihilate them. They have never been conquered.

Now the war is over. Again these people are asking for freedom. They want an independent Macedonia. Are they entitled to it? In my opinion they are. I think they are. Half of Macedonia now is a free state within the Yugoslav federation. They have their own president, they have their own legislature, they have their own state set-up within this federation of Yugoslavia. The other part of Macedonia is still under Greek domination.

Here is the problem. Those Macedonians that are still within Greece, under Greek authority, all want freedom. They are united 100 percent on the basis that they want freedom, but they are divided on this: Some of those Macedonians want to join with that part of Macedonia which is now in the Yugoslav federation. Some of them do not want to join but they want to have a separate Macedonian state, a free state so that they would not be under Tito. But all of these people want freedom. All of these people have been on our side in this war and in the First World War. They fought heroically for our cause. Now it is proposed that we give bayonets and guns to the Royalists of Greece to kill these Macedonians. I am not mad at these Macedonians. I am not mad at those who want to go into the Yugoslav federation or those who want an independent Macedonia and freedom from Greece. I do not want to see any of them killed. President Truman and the State Department have remained silent about this struggle for freedom. Why? Surely the sentiment of the American people is with the Macedonians.

Here is a piece from today's Washington Star: "Greeks condemned for aiding guerrillas in Athens"; a dispatch from northern Greece reports today from the military fort at Almania they have condemned 10 persons, including women, to death and sentenced 6 others to life imprisonment for aiding antigovernment guerrilla forces.

Now, that has taken place after we have announced this program of aid to Greece. They are still killing Greeks in Macedonia, and killing those Greeks who do not agree with the Royalist Government in Greece and killing Macedonians because all Macedonians want freedom.

Am I going to vote to give more bayonets and more guns to kill off more of these people? No. So far as I am concerned, this is not a question of communism. This is the age-old struggle, centuries old, of a fight for freedom—of the peoples' fight for freedom. The United States of America should be the first to say, "We stand back of you in this fight for freedom." We did say that in the Atlantic Charter, but now must these people who are struggling for freedom go to Uncle Joe Stalin to look for that freedom? Why should it not come from us—from the United States of America? That should be our program. That is what we should do.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can bring the discussion back now to the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan and let the theoretical discussion as to the ethnological background of the residents of Macedonia go until some more appropriate occasion.

I would like to take up with you some of the factors which, it seems to me, must be considered by every man and woman in this body as we make this very momentous decision. It is a decision which each of us is going to make, and there is no easy answer for anybody. It is not one of those cases where we can easily say "No," and shrug our shoulders and assume that we have answered the problem. It is not one of those questions to which we can say "Yes," and be sure of the consequences or of the results.

I assume if it were not for the very definite fact that the President of the United States called us together in joint assembly on March 12 and presented us with a specific program that the area of discussion in which we are now engaged could be considerably wider. Had it not been for that pronouncement which has been heard all around the world, we could begin with a theoretical discussion as to what to do about this big problem which is confronting us, growing out of the conditions existing in Greece and Turkey. But as a result of the fact that the announcement has been made in a joint session of Congress and the President of the United States speaking as its Chief Executive has announced it as his decision that this country is going to discontinue appeasing further aggression on the part of the Russians, and that he has recommended specific steps to stop that appeasement, the decision is now in the hands of the Congress. We must decide whether or not we wish to associate ourselves with the President's proposal to discontinue appeasement of Russia or whether we wish to associate ourselves with the kind of sorry appeasement policies which existed from the days of the Cairo Conference until March 12, when President Truman stood on the rostrum in this Chamber and announced that the policy of appeasement had failed and that we were set to follow a different course.

In my opinion, the appeasement policies followed by President Roosevelt in the conferences at Yalta and Tehran,

especially, and followed by President Truman at Potsdam and down to March 12 did much to create the sorry situation in which we now find ourselves. However, be that as it may, while Republicans were not consulted in those days of appeasement, we are all now confronted by the same challenging circumstances. Republicans are now being called upon to help cure that which we did not help create. It is my conviction we now must measure up to our new responsibilities.

I was one of those who opposed repeal of the Neutrality Act prior to World War II. I was one of those who opposed the original lend-lease legislation and joined with the minority of members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in offering an alternative plan which I thought incurred less risk of war. When our alternative proposal was defeated, I voted for lend-lease on final passage. It seemed to me then there was no other alternative. I was one of those who voted against arming our ships prior to World War II. I voted against these proposals because I felt they were steps leading to war.

As a consequence of my votes before World War II, I have been accused frequently by the administration of being an isolationist, of being a Tory, of being an obstructionist, of being a reactionary. I have been attacked by all the abusive adjectives New Dealers use to discredit diligent Republicans. However, in spite of all that, in spite of the fact that this same administration may seek some way in which to make political capital of the fact that I now support the President in a program which it seems to me is right, I have no desire to engage in the sharp practices of partisan politics in looking at a decision that is as stupendous as this one. I now support President Truman's proposal on Greece and Turkey for the same reason I opposed President Roosevelts' early proposals to commit us to the fighting before Pearl Harbor. In each case, my desire to keep America at peace is the motivating factor.

Whether the predictions of those of us before World War II, who said that these unneutral steps were leading us into war were correct or incorrect, the men who write history later will have to determine. In any event those steps did not keep us out of war. Out of that war came new problems as great as we were told by the eager interventionists of 1940 and 1941 were the problems which would be solved by World War II.

I believe that as realists, as Americans, without regard to partisanship, or political alinement, we have to survey the world as we find it today, not as we would wish it were. We cannot discuss this problem in a vacuum. We have to pick up the march of history where it is in front of us and govern our decision on the basis of the facts which exist today, regardless of how we happened to arrive at this point, or regardless of whether or not different decisions at a different time might have brought about a happier situation than that which we now confront.

It seems to me these are the facts which we now confront. Fact No. 1 is that Russian aggression is on the march in the world today. I think nobody will deny that. I think the most insistent opponent of this legislation cannot come down in the well of this House and say that Russian communism is not marching out with an aggressive force today. That is demonstrated all around the periphery of Russia. It is demonstrated by the complete elimination of the little independent Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—gone from the map entirely, sucked against their will and their wish completely into the Russian system, as I am convinced Turkey and Greece will be gone from the map entirely if at this stage of the game we pull the rug out from under the President in his first practical step in opposing the program of appeasement of Russia. We must not send out the signal to Russia that as far as the people of America are concerned, through their elected representatives, we do not propose to support the President when he stands toe to toe and says Russian aggression must stop. We now have Russian aggression. We will have to concede that. If peace is to prevail this aggression must stop or be stopped.

Fact No. 2 we will also have to concede. That is that the Red tide of Communist aggression now threatens to break out of its boundaries at a new point—in Greece and in Turkey. Certainly, nobody who has kept abreast of the developments in that area through the newspapers and the radio, even, if you have not taken the trouble to read the hearings reporting the evidence before the committee on this bill, can help but concede that Russian interests and Russian influences and Communist forces are, in large part, responsible for the guerrilla warfare taking place in Greece today. They are responsible for the unstable conditions existing in Greece today, and certainly for the dreads and fears which the people of Turkey have that the Red Army is going to come rolling in and take over the Dardanelles and the eastern provinces of Turkey.

Thus we have a set of circumstances which nobody likes but with which we must deal to avoid the things which none of us would like to have happen. But here they are, these facts. What are we going to do about them? Each one of you has to make a decision on those circumstances. It is not only those of us who are going to vote in support of this legislation who have to make the decision, but also the rest of you have a decision to make. What are you going to do about the facts which exist historically today? I think there are only three decisions any of us can make:

First. We can go along as proposed here with the President's proposal, throw up some temporary dikes at the points represented by Greece and Turkey to hold back the Red river of Communist aggression at that point, at least for a time, so we can prepare a more comprehensive program for keeping the Communist forces within their own boundaries. You can do that if you will; that is one alternative. It is represented by the legislation now before us to aid Greece and Turkey.

There is a second alternative. You can say that you do not want to see communism overflow the world, that you want to do something about it, but this is not the place and this is not the time. You can say that we should erect this dike at a later time or at some other place; and I will not quarrel with you about that decision. However, I think you owe it to your country and to your Congress to tell us where then you would put up the dike if you believe one should be erected somewhere else and at some other time. If you think Turkey and Greece are not the proper places to try to hold in this torrent of communism, you should tell us where you think we should make the stand so we can intelligently appraise the merit of your position.

There is a third alternative. You may say you do not think the dike should be built at Turkey and at Greece, that you do not think the dike should be built at any later time or any later place, that you believe the thing to do is to let communism overflow its banks, seek its own level and sweep out until it comes to our immediate shores and threatens our own particular industry at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In just a moment. I wish to develop this third point first.

You may say you think the thing to do is to wait until communism has overflowed all through Europe, until it has overflowed into Africa and Asia, and then if the Red torrent continues to come our way at our shores we will try to stop it.

There are no other ways than these three alternatives confronting us. None of them are very happy eventualities, none of them can be cited as being a completely secure policy for us; but to me the first alternative is the best to set up the dikes now in Greece and Turkey. I think this choice holds more of peace and less of war than either of the other two alternatives. If there be other alternatives, at least during the hearings which we held for many weeks in our committee none was presented by any person in authority.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman's claim is correct, that Soviet Russia is on the march, does not the gentleman feel that we were wrong in disposing of our surplus war materials at a fraction of the cost to the taxpayers of America, that we were making a mistake? Does not the gentleman feel that we are making a mistake in cutting the appropriations of the State Department, of the War Department, of the Navy Department? Does not the gentleman feel that the Republican program for economy in these items is wrong if Soviet Russia is on the march, if we are going to have another world war?

Mr. MUNDT. I will try to answer the gentleman's question if I can remember all he said. It was sort of a chain series of questions.

Certainly I would say that the program is wrong that we have followed in the disposition of war surpluses. It has been full of mistakes. I am not trying to justify the War Assets Administration. It has had nine successive administrators since it was first organized. I recognize, of course, that this is a stupendous problem, but it has been handled most stupidly.

Mr. BENDER. And much of the surplus property is going to Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. I decline to yield further but I doubt if much of the surplus property is now going to Russia. If the gentleman has any evidence to show that it is, I think he owes a duty to the House to spread it in the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. I brought that out on the floor a month ago.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. A little later if I still have time I will yield. I want to finish up with these alternatives, one of which we must select. I think the bill before us is the alternative which we should choose. There are several reasons why I favor it to the other available choices.

In the first place it buys us some time at a moment when time is important. I think it sets up these temporary dikes. I think it is going to serve as a stop-gap measure to give us a chance, now that we have abandoned appeasement, to revise our American foreign policy on an intelligible and effective basis so that the Members of Congress can set themselves up in opposition to the forces which threaten freedom.

The second point which I think this legislation covers is that it does something of a constructive nature in that it will prevent Russian aggression into Turkey and Greece from taking place in the near future. I do not think there is a remote chance that the armies of Russia are going to go into Greece and Turkey in the face of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Russians are realists. They know better than we do that they do not have the atomic bomb; they know that their navy is inferior to the American Navy; they know better than we that their army is not mechanized in terms of modern equipment in comparison with the American Army; they know they are woefully weak in the element of machine tools, so essential in the event of a modern war. If they find out that we are determined and I hope united in our opposition to further aggression on the part of the Russians this stop-gap will serve as a temporary measure while the Russians stand back and resurvey the situation, not being willing to precipitate a war by going up against us in a situation like this.

The third constructive thing I think the measure does is that it signals to the world that this is the end of the era of appeasement and remember, Mr. Chairman, when we vote on this measure we are going to send a signal to the world and that signal is going to be one thing or the other: Either we are going to signal that the Congress of the United States stands firm with the President in believing that the end of the period of appeasement should come, that this is the end of our appeasement program whereby we bend the knee and bow the head every time the Kremlin speaks. That signal will say in a most impressive manner that from now on we are going to have a program of realism, of reciprocity, of justice, of respectability. We are going to send out that kind of signal when we vote on this measure or else we are going to send out the other kind of signal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, that other signal would be we are going to send the signal out to Russia and the people of the world that the Congress does not uphold a program of firmness against Communist aggression, that we are not standing shoulder to shoulder in bringing about a cessation of the program of appeasement.

How will that signal be interpreted in Moscow? How will the men of the Kremlin feel and what will they do if we announce to them and to the world that we are not going to help the Greeks and the Turks keep down this Red invasion? I would not be greatly surprised, if we sent out that kind of signal, that within 30 days the armies of Russia would be in Athens and in Ankara in control of the situation. Then, Mr. Chairman, how would those who now dissent from this measure answer that situation? What would be their answer then? What do they then propose? Do they propose that we do nothing then or do they propose taking steps leading to war? That is why I say there is less chance of war in setting up these temporary barriers to give us time to survey the situation and develop an intelligent positive program than there is by running the risk of inviting the Red armies to walk in when we show weakness at this critical period.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman speaking is a very able member of the Un-American Activities Committee. Does he believe that we have appeased Russia in this country?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do, but we have taken steps of late to drive the Communists out of the Government, out of high positions of responsibility, and 10 days after the President addressed a joint session of Congress he issued a proclamation, which indicates that the President himself now realizes we are going to have to curtail communism at home at the same time we are fighting it ideologically abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And he asked for $50,000,000. Do you think we can do it with $50,000,000?

Mr. MUNDT. Here at home?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do. If we place $50,000,000 in the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I think we can drive the Communists out of every Government position in America; we can get them out of teachers organizations, labor unions, churches, and elsewhere. Fifty million dollars, put in the hands of the FBI, will give us a population of sturdy Americans such as we have not had in this country since the days of Teddy Roosevelt, a long time ago.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has mentioned March 12, 1947, as a historic day. Would not the gentleman say that November 5, 1946, when the complexion of the Congress changed and the people spoke, and the Republicans who had been denouncing Communist appeasement at home and abroad were swept into office, is the historic date when the administration changed its course?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is correct. I think the vote last November 5 was the original impetus. I think that was the one single thing which started this issue of events, which started the switch from a policy of one-party Russian appeasement to one of a bipartisan arrangement in which Democrats and Republicans joined and which has finally eventuated in that happy goal where the better type of Democrats, aided by the Republicans, supported the President in his tardy proposal to purge the Communists of all Government positions.

The fourth constructive thing, it seems to me, this measure achieves, is this; that it will give new hope and new confidence to freedom-loving people all over the world. Even in Poland there are a great many freedom-loving people still very unhappy under the whip lash of the Communist leaders. Even in Yugoslavia there are many freedom-loving people who are restive under the whip lash of Tito, the dictator. If we answer this call of freemen today it is going to give new hope and new confidence and new courage to freedom-loving people everywhere, including those, in some considerable number, living behind the iron curtain of the U. S. S. R. today.

Now, I want to say in all candor there are some things this bill does not do, because I think we should appraise this bill dispassionately and objectively. In the first place, I think this bill does not mean that this is an end to the menace of communism and the aggressive forces of Russia. I do not think this means an end to the efforts of communism in America to take us over from within, and I do not think it means an end on the part of the Communists in the Kremlin to push out their boundaries in all directions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. I do not think that this bill will mark the end of the Communists menace, but, as I say, it does set up a dike. It stops the immediate hazard at the point where the danger exists, and since this is the first time since 1941 that the Russians will have been stopped in an effort to take away the autonomy of a little country, it is going to cause some serious thinking in the Kremlin before they make the effort anywhere again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the gentlemen spoke a few minutes ago about the $50,000,000 asked for to purge this Government of Communists. If the Congress will pass the bill that we now have pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to make the FBI an independent agency, we can take that $50,000,000 and expose every Communist on the Federal pay roll and elsewhere throughout the country.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Now, if I may proceed and get away from a discussion of that which has transpired earlier in my remarks I would like to push forward to the conclusion of my statement.

The second thing that this bill does not do is this. I think it does not mean that we are adopting for America a permanent foreign policy called the Truman doctrine or anything else which could be interpreted as meaning that we are going to finance faltering governments all over the world simply because they claim to be operated by free men. I do not think that that is involved in this decision. We are meeting an important problem, recognizable at two specific points and answering it in a specific manner. This does not mean that we are committing ourselves—and our committee report makes that very clear—to faltering governments which may get into difficulty all over the world, and simply by coming to us and saying, "We need help; we believe in freedom," expect that we will aid them with hundreds of millions of dollars. These are two unique cases paralleled by no other country in the world, unless possibly you could present the case of Iran. In Iran we have already done the thing we now propose to do in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to compliment my distinguished friend, one of the ablest members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the able address he has made, and to say that I think he is very effective, indeed.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman very much. Had I known the gentleman was going to say that of course I would have yielded to him a long time ago!

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. It appears to me that Turkey and Spain are in the same category. We are lending money to support the Government of Turkey. I want some of the gentlemen on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to tell me why we do not at least accept an ambassador from Spain in this Nation's capital. I think Spain did as much to stop communism and remain neutral as Turkey or any of the other neutrals in that section of the world did.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot permit the gentleman to divert me onto a lengthy discussion which would take more than the remaining time I have, so I shall have to decline a discussion of that point. I want to keep this discussion limited to Greece and Turkey because, as I say, they are cases which are not typical of any other areas in the world with the sole possible exception of Iran, where we have already proceeded in this direction and with this same formula. I might add, also, that up to now certainly our policy in Iran has been highly successful.

The third thing this bill does not do is that it does not suffice in itself as a doctrine for freedom or as a policy for preserving what we consider the American ideals throughout the world. For this program to be effective, it seems to me it is imperative that it must be made part of a comprehensive and consistent overall program, which I have the courage of hope is now in the process of formation in the councils of the mighty here in the United States. I think that new policy should be an affirmative, positive, American foreign policy of action, instead of a cringing American foreign policy of reaction to what happens in various parts of the world, such as we have been following since the days of the war. American foreign policy should be geared to action in support of American ideals not just a pattern of reactions to moves by Russia or any other country.

If we accompany this program in Greece and Turkey by the evolvement of a truly bipartisan American foreign program, positive and active in nature, moving on its own force and with its own ideals, and abandon herewith and hereupon this whole program of making our policy one of reaction to what happens here and what happens there, then I believe these $400,000,000 holding up this temporary dike will indeed save the situation long enough for us to articulate and enunciate a policy which can preserve the peace and establish equality throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry; I have only 2 minutes. If the gentleman can induce my chairman to give me some more time I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. EATON. The chairman of this committee cannot manufacture time. The gentleman has had over 20 minutes already. While he is a very brilliant and able Member of the House, there are some other gentlemen here who still have something to say, and we have to give them some time.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not asking for more time, I am explaining why I am unable to yield any more of the rapidly vanishing time I still have.

You have a right to ask me and I have the impossible task of trying to tell you in a few minutes what I think should be included in this affirmative American foreign policy.

Let me point out, first of all, though, that I think accompanying this program should be a revitalization of an American information program abroad. To that effect, this afternoon, I introduced a bill which has just been given the number H. R. 3342, and which would give legislative authority for our Voice of America short-wave program and also set up a broad over-all program to tell the truth about America in the areas of the world where we are today being misinterpreted abroad by the voices coming from the Moscow headquarters of Red fascism.

The second thing I think we should do to supplement approval of this legislation and make it effective is to remove the last vestige of communism from every official place in American life, be it the Federal Government, the State governments, the local governments, or the schools of this country.

The third thing I think we must do if this program is to be made effective, if these temporary dikes are to hold back the flood of aggressive communism long enough for us to get real security, is to press for an early and an affirmative decision on the international control of atomic energy, because unless we do that there can be no peace in a world in which the atom bomb is loose in the hands of dictators.

The fourth thing I think we have to do with the time this legislation will buy is to establish a program of realistic relationships with Russia which, as I see it, can come only from a meeting between the leaders of America and the leaders of Russia. I find myself in that one category alone advocating a move also advocated by Henry Wallace. It is the only place in which I have agreed with Henry for so long that I am almost afraid to find him supporting my idea in that connection. But I would like to see the American and Russian leaders, alone, get together and define their areas of agreement and their areas of disagreement and find out whether or not it is possible for us to work with the Russians, because if it is not possible then we must formulate an organization in this world where we can work without the Russians to help preserve the peace. It is the suicidal course to war to simply drift along misunderstanding each other, mistrusting each other, without taking positive steps for one mighty effort to work out a basis on which these two strong nations can work together to preserve the peace. It is, indeed, possible that once Russia realizes that we are firm in our position against further aggression on her part she will come to terms with us on an enforceable agreement which stabilizes boundary lines and settles existing differences on a firm and final basis. To me, it is at least an effort which should be attempted. Should it fail, we are no worse off than we are today; should it succeed, all humanity will pay homage to its achievements.

Mr. Chairman, a fifth step which I think America should take during this interval of time which we are about to purchase through our aid to Greece and

Turkey is to turn our attention to equipping the United Nations with authorities and means so that hereafter that great international organization can meet effectively all threats to national solvency and all acts of aggression.

A sixth part of what I conceive to be an essential over-all program which must be evolved if our aid to Greece and Turkey is to become permanently effective and helpful is that we must exercise our great leadership to bring about a stabilization of international boundary lines and the settlement of prevailing international disputes. Small festering sores are likely to erupt into something serious. Let us use our great strength to heal these sores while they are yet small and easily curable.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and most important perhaps of all with the exception of the matter of atomic energy, if our approval of the President's proposal for Turkey and for Greece is to be more than an expensive gesture, we must use this time we herewith purchase to evolve and enunciate an affirmative American foreign policy of positive action based upon American traditions and American ideals rather than apologetic reactions to the words or threats or actions of any other power on earth. This new American foreign policy should be conceived by bipartisan action and not be simply the statements of the party in power accompanied by the hope that they will be supported by the party out of power.

Let us make this American foreign policy so clear and so candid that all who run can read and understand it. Let it be stated with such clarity that both at home and abroad there will be no doubt as to its contents or its motives.

Mr. Chairman, if we take these seven additional steps during the interval of stability which we secure through this aid to Turkey and Greece our money will be wisely invested. If we simply aid Greece and Turkey and do nothing more, however, that is more effective than perhaps aiding a country or two more which might solicit our assistance I am afraid we shall have forever missed one of the greatest opportunities in our entire national history. With the end of appeasement, I dare to hope we are entering the dawn of a new era which will produce the elements out of which peace can be made permanent and justice secure.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, if we were to allow political expediency to determine our vote on this bill I imagine a great many of us would vote against it. I know that the mail that I have received has been overwhelmingly in opposition, yet I am satisfied that we are going to vote as Americans and not as Democrats or Republicans. The principal newspaper in my district has editorially come out on both sides of this question, so I can see there are a great many people who are disturbed about this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, while I shall support H. R. 2616, I shall do so with some reluctance. I had hoped, as I am sure the entire membership of this House had hoped, that with the end of the cruel and costly war from which we emerged the "four freedoms" would become a reality instead of a phrase.

Abraham Lincoln once said "This Nation cannot endure half slave and half free." Mr. Chairman, if this Nation could not endure half slave and half free in those so-called horse-and-buggy days, how can this world, in this atomic age, endure half slave and half free? The great war in which we engaged to preserve the democracy of man is not over as long as great masses of the world's population are denied the guarantees of the "four freedoms." We cannot bring back the thousands of American boys who sacrificed their lives to preserve the principles in which we believe. We cannot bring back the 6,000,000 Jews and others who were consumed in the incinerators of the despots. We can, however, make sure that those incinerators are not rekindled, else the stench again assail our nostrils and end this civilization for which we have had such high hopes.

There are over a million displaced persons in the American, British, and French occupied zones. Some haven must be found for the millions whose homes are gone, whose families are gone, before even their hope is gone.

Four hundred million dollars is an immense sum, yet it is only a pittance if it helps to continue our way of life. I urge that this money be expended to the best possible advantage, that it not be used for the purchase of automobiles and other luxuries for the politicians of Greece and Turkey. I urge that it be used for the rehabilitation of the unfortunate people of those lands. I urge that we make an all-out effort to the end that Greece may become the shining example of a product of Democracy; that those countries of faint heart, and those who are discouraged, may look upon that ancient country revitalized through our help, as a country that is an example of the workings of true democracy.

I realize that there are those who say that much remains to be done in our own country and that the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey ideally lends itself to criticism from all quarters. However, we are somewhat in the position of the family who, though denied most of the necessities of life, are willing to help their unfortunate starving neighbors to acquire and possess a few of the necessities of life.

In that spirit I know this Congress will approve the legislation now under consideration, and I only hope that time will prove the decision which we make to be the right, the honest and the Christian thing to do.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I gladly yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman himself visited Europe and has been in Russia and has seen these things first hand. Is that not so?

Mr. HUBER. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I recall that he and I together saw first hand the misery that exists in the occupied countries of Europe and that is why I have a very strong feeling on this matter.

Mr. FULTON. I compliment the gentleman on his fine statement.

Mr. HUBER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. In view of the fact that the gentleman spoke about rehabilitation of the people of those countries, can you say why we in this Congress would withhold $150,000,000, a much smaller amount than $400,000,000—last week—from the people of Poland and other central European countries, and give $400,000,000 to this cause?

Mr. HUBER. When you say "we" you are referring to those who voted for the amendment that limited it to $200,000,000?

Mr. OWENS. Yes. Perhaps you did not and I did not, but the Congress did. Can you justify the action of this Congress?

Mr. HUBER. I cannot justify it, and I hope we will see the light in this and not approve further restrictive amendments to this bill such as were made to the foreign relief bill recently passed by this House.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman not agree that two wrongs do not make a right?

Mr HUBER. That is certainly one of the finest statements I ever heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gullibility of Congress is a never-failing source of wonderment to me. If there is anything in the world more gullible than a Congressman it is two Congressmen. When I saw how the membership of this House just ate up the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I could not help but form the conclusion that this Congress was not much different from the one we had back in the First World War.

Let me give you an example of the gullibility that existed at that time. Speaking on a resolution to take America into the war, a certain Congressman from Ohio said:

> Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to reserve the right to oppose in the future any attempts to send American boys to the European trenches. I do not believe that any American soldier should be drafted to be sent to the battlefields of England to fight Great Britain's battles that her own sons have refused to fight.

And a gullible Congress applauded. The RECORD shows they applauded. Did we send American boys to France back in 1917? Yes. We sent about a million of them and, as I recall it, we had 300,000 casualties. That war cost us $48,000,000,000 and left us with a net national debt of $26,000,000,000.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress we gradually took steps toward war, and the then President Roosevelt at Boston said:

I want to say to you fathers and mothers again and again and again, that your sons will never be sent to fight on foreign soil.

And again a gullible Congress applauded. They said, "We may declare war but we won't have to fight. Even if we get into war we won't have to send our boys across." That is what we also said in the First World War: "We can get into it but we won't have to fight it. All we will have to do is to say we are against you and the Germans will quit."

We fatuously believed it in 1917, just as we believed it in 1941. In the First World War we fought to make the world safe for democracy. Do you know what we got out of that war, in addition to a debt of $48,000,000,000 and 300,000 casualties? We exchanged the Kaiser for Hitler. A good trade, what?

That is what we got out of the First World War. We traded the Kaiser for Hitler. It was just like trading an electric razor for a rusty jackknife.

Then our trigger finger got so itchy we got into the Second World War. I do not know what the Second World War was all about, neither do you, whether we went in to make the world still more safe for democracy than we did in the First World War, but something like that anyway. Before they dragged us into the Second World War Churchill said: "Give us the implements and we will do the job." So we gave him 50 destroyers and billions in lease-lend.

You remember that. And again a gullible Congress applauded. Do you see what I mean?

I do not know what bird is the most gullible of all birds, but whatever the breed, I would be in favor of placing him on our national emblem. At the moment I would vote for the penguin. He resembles so much some of our colleagues.

I fear there are Members in this House today who believe that we can stop communism by spending $400,000,000 in Turkey and Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not just now. I have only 10 minutes. If I have time later I will be glad to yield later.

It has been well said that communism is brought on by maladministration, poverty, inequality, and all the other evils that mankind has been affected with since the beginning of time. You cannot stop communism with guns and bullets, no; that has been tried.

The Communists, the Russians, will not go in and take countries over by force of arms, they will take them by infiltration.

They tell you that the points that must be held are Greece and Turkey. The gentleman from Illinois fortified himself with a map to prove that was true. If he believes that we can stop Joe Stalin in Greece and Turkey with four hundred million he is more gullible than I had thought him. You know the place to stop Joe Stalin is in Germany and in Japan. If Russia takes completely over in one or both or those countries, then all the world will go Communist with the possible exception of the Western Hemisphere. You cannot get away from that. It is as fundamental as anything can be. You may spend $400,000,000—and, by the way, that amount is only the first step. There is no one within the sound of my voice who will contend for a moment that $400,000,000 is all that we will have to spend in this grand, new adventure that is here proposed. It is going to cost us billions and billions and billions. We first go into Greece and Turkey, and the next move will be Iran and Iraq. Then we will have to go into India, Arabia, Palestine, perhaps into northern Africa, India, Italy, finally into Spain, Portugal, Korea, and finally France—we do not know where our adventure will lead us, but we do know that the cost is going to threaten the solvency of our country if we carry on to the bitter end. Are we prepared for it? Can we do so with a national debt of $258,000,000,000 and over a million casualties from the late war to take care of, not to mention our national debt, with an annual carrying charge on that debt of $7,000,000,000, and with a budget for next year that may approximate thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars?

Mr. Chairman, one of the preceding speakers asked us to be realistic. I am asking him to be realistic because he was anything but realistic in his half-hour address to this Committee. Of course, it would be fine if this old world were studded with gems of generosity and altruism and all the other things that go to make up a perfect world; but, Mr. Chairman, we have a very practical problem here at hand, and that is to keep America solvent. You are proposing by this legislation to take her down the road that leads to insolvency and perhaps to communism as well.

Less than 2 years ago practically all the nations of the earth, save our late belligerents, met in San Francisco and set up the United Nations organization for the specific purpose of outlawing war and bringing to a ravaged world the blessings of peace and security.

The San Francisco Conference drew up a charter, which was hailed by the peace-loving peoples of the world as a beacon light that would forever outlaw the black specter of war, and at the same time remove all fears and substitute therefor lasting peace and security.

Let me read from that charter:

The purposes of the United Nations are: 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures.

Let me call your particular attention to the words "to take effective collective measures." In no part of the charter is it so much as hinted that any signatory may at any time adopt unilateral measures. I read on:

To take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. Chairman, that was a covenant openly arrived at, and unanimously adopted by the assembled representatives of the subscribing nations. We were one of the principal sponsors, yet now, less than 2 years later, we are the first nation to attempt to nullify it by proposing to act alone.

I am one of those old-fashioned Americans who believes that promises and agreements are made to be kept, but here we find the President of the United States proposing, and another body, by a majority vote, giving approval to a proposal to scrap the charter of the United Nations, and to reinstate the old order, which permitted any nation, at any time, to invade another country, and to kill, pillage and destroy at its pleasure.

If the House of Representatives takes affirmative action upon the proposal before us, as proposed by the President, we will proclaim to the world that the word of America is no longer good, and that henceforth our word is not to be relied upon.

The proposal before us today is freighted with possibilities for evil, the magnitude and importance of which no mortal can foresee. If the plea of the President receives congressional sanction, it means our embarkation upon a new policy that may lead to no one knows where.

What I am about to say, Mr. Chairman, has been better said before, both in this body and in the other body; however, it will bear reiteration, and it is barely possible that we may be able to present a new facet or two.

Let me state briefly the question we are asked to answer: Shall the United States alone, and in utter disregard of its pledge made at San Francisco, guarantee the future political and territorial integrity of nations situated in the Eastern Hemisphere? To decide the question affirmatively would be to depart from America's traditional policy, and to repudiate the solemn pledge we made at San Francisco. Indeed, it would mean our embarking upon a policy to attain world domination—something we have always spurned.

Great Britain has consistently played that role the past 300 years, and in carrying it on under all conditions and circumstances has succeeded in bleeding herself white and, today, we are told she is bankrupt. During the past 100 years she was obliged to fight 35 wars in order to maintain her position and prestige.

Let us ask ourselves, do we want to follow her example, and are we ready to pay the price that must inevitably be exacted of us—national bankruptcy?

We are told that it is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our freedom and economy that we alone now step into Greece and Turkey so that Russia may be halted in her march toward world domination.

Is there anyone in this Chamber who believes that once we go into these two countries with American dollars and men it will settle the immediate problem of curbing Russian ambitions? Is there anyone in this body who really believes that we can stop there without going further?

Intervention in Greece and Turkey would merely be but the first step. Later we would have to go into Iran and Iraq, Egypt and Palestine, and possibly India and Afghanistan. Who can, with any degree of accuracy foretell when and how it would all end? That secret is locked up among the riddles of the unforeseeable future, which no finite mind may explore.

Communism cannot be halted by dollars, bayonets and bullets, because it is a symptom of social and political unrest. Communism spawns and thrives on poverty, lack of opportunity, mal-administration, and the many other evils that have beset the human race since the beginning of time.

Assuming that communism can be held back by dollars, bullets and bayonets, is there anyone within the sound of my voice who is so gullible as to believe that the $400,000,000 the President asks for Greece and Turkey is all that will be required? No, no, my friends, the ultimate cost will reach astronomical proportions, and the total ultimate cost may be so great as to bankrupt and beggar the American people. Will you take that chance? Can you afford to? Have you a right to do so?

The Truman administration made little or no effort to stop communism from entering and taking over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Why this sudden zeal for what we call democracy? The answer is simple—oil. We are asked to stake the future of American sovereignty and political integrity for the sake of the enormous oil deposits in the Near East, and to maintain the life line of the British Empire, which is equally commercial in its implications. Let no one tell you differently.

We may send American troops and dollars into the Near East, and I care not how many, they would yet be insufficient to prevent the infiltration of communism if local conditions are such as to invite its entrance.

Assuming that dollars, bullets, and bayonets can hold back communism, then I ask you what are we doing to prevent the further spread of communism in a number of American Republics where the Communists are daily becoming more strongly entrenched? Let me cite one instance, if I may. I refer to the Republic of Haiti, which lies athwart our pathway to the Panama Canal. The Government of Haiti is also in financial straits, and we are in a large measure responsible for Haiti's present plight.

Briefly, we went into Haiti 32 years ago with the Marines for the purpose of restoring law and order, and remained there for a period of 21 years, the occupation only ending in 1936.

During our occupation we administered Haiti's finances, supervised her expenditures, and completely controlled her internal affairs.

In the year 1922 the Haitian Government, through a New York bank, was granted a loan of $23,500,000, at an interest rate of 6 percent. Up to the present time, I am informed, she has paid thirty-eight millions in amortization and interest on that loan. I am particularly well acquainted with the details of that transaction, as I happened to be in the country at the time it was negotiated, and have visited there a number of times since, the last time early in December.

All moneys borrowed by Haiti during the occupation were expended under American supervision, and it is a significant fact that none of it was used in promoting what might be termed productive enterprises that would have improved the lot of the Haitian people, and provided them with permanent and gainful employment.

Let me come down a little later to the period when the need for rubber in the late war became so desperate. In an attempt to help relieve the rubber shortage the Haitian Government, on its own responsibility, and upon our urging, expropriated for the duration of the war the land owned and tilled by more than 300,000 small farmers, all of whom became displaced and were compelled to seek refuge in the cities because they had no other place for them to go. Haiti, not being an industrialized country, was unable to assimilate them in the new order of her economy, and today these displaced persons constitute fertile soil for the spread of communism on the island Republic, which lies less than 2 hours from Miami.

In order to get these unfortunates back onto the soil, President Estime, who is a sincere friend of his people, early in January sent to Washington his Minister of Finance, M. Gaston Margron, a most able and estimable gentleman, for the purpose of adjusting Haiti's financial problems, and securing a few million dollars of additional capital with which to reestablish in agriculture the 300,000 peasant families already referred to. Mr. Margron was turned down by every American agency to which he appealed, and as a result the work of communizing Haiti goes merrily on.

Cuba, which is situated even closer to continental America than is Haiti, has already traveled far along the road to communism, and I am informed that the Communists use the city of Havana as their political headquarters in the Western Hemisphere. Communism has also made great strides in Mexico, Chile, and other Latin American countries that could be mentioned.

Just what are we doing toward halting the spread of communism here at home and in nearby countries? Precisely, nothing.

It would seem that the administration is indifferent to what is happening in our own front yard, but when it is told that if we do not advance $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, and send to these countries military missions which would be a prelude to the sending of troops, Europe will be completely communized, the administration all of a sudden becomes galvanized into action, notwithstanding the fact that those countries are more than 4,000 miles away. Again, the reason is oil.

Let us make no mistake. Once we embark upon the policy proposed to us by President Truman and his advisers it will mark the first step in our march toward World War III, because you know, and I know, that the course we are asked to take will sooner or later bring us in direct conflict with Russia.

If Russia constitutes a danger to the future security of America, and American institutions, then in God's name let us act intelligently and promptly, but let us do it in a manner that will be direct and effective. We now have the means within our hands to safeguard the future of America for at least a hundred years. If it be necessary to act, let us act quickly, energetically, rationally, and with effect. Let us be done with the hypocritical approach that is here proposed. Let me emphasize that the real reason we are asked to go into the Near East is to be found in the almost inexhaustible supply of oil in Iran, Iraq, and Arabia. If these pools of oil are necessary for our future security let us act, but let us act like men rather than like crawling worms.

I, for one, reject the President's proposal for two reasons. It would be ineffective and will but lead to another war; it will commit the United States and the American people to a monetary outlay that will ultimately become so great as to threaten our financial solvency.

If we are determined to combat communism, and I want to do everything necessary to prevent the spread of this pernicious philosophy, then it would seem that we should direct our talents and energies toward first checking its spread in the Western Hemisphere. That would be the sensible way of going at it. Like charity, national defense should begin at home.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it tickled me a little bit to hear the revered chairman of the Ways and Means Committee speak of the gullibility of Congress. He has evidently forgotten that he is a Congressman, too, and therefore is equally gullible with the rest of us here when he makes the statement that all Congressmen are gullible. When he makes that statement he wields the same whitewash brush on himself as well.

Secondly, he says he does not know what the Second World War was all about. I will not agree with him that he does not. However, I would like to express to him what some of us felt it was about. A lot of the people in this country hated fascism—they do not cherish communism either—and we hated fascism enough that we did something about it. We hated war, but we had to go to war to stop fascism.

When he says we are going bankrupt in appropriating this $400,000,000 and that this is only the first step, I cannot see how he makes the statement he is willing to put the program in effect in Germany and Japan, for example, saying it is necessary there, because if it will bankrupt us one place, it would in any other. The gentleman is reduced to saying that as a matter of geography, it is not necessary some place else in the world. So if it is reduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] simply to a question of geography, I think it is just as necessary over in the

eastern end of the Mediterranean as it is in Germany and Japan.

As to the gentleman's remarks on "applause" showing in old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, the gentleman must be as gullible as he would have us believe of the average Congressman who is now speaking on the issue and talking about this bill. The gentleman himself knows that previously in the RECORD when they inserted the word "applause" it was filled in by the clerks after the session was over and these items were distributed like sugar, for the particular Congressman to show in his home district that he had applause.

To be absolutely faithful to my good friend and to the present fact, I think we should note for the RECORD that while he got no applause whatever on his statements during his speech, he did get a good round of applause at the end of it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit amused during the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, at his references to the gullibility of Congress then and now. He is one of the deans of the House. He has been here longer than anybody else except three or four. It is surprising to me how he could have remained here during all those years and failed to improve the Congress. I furthermore notice that he has not become sufficiently disgusted to resign. I would like to inquire also if the Congress was similarly gullible when it recently passed his tax bill?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the masterful address by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I want to say that I, too, recall just a few short months ago the day that ended World War No. 2. I recall the load of anxiety that was lifted from a world of mothers' hearts and how the old war-torn world turned back to peace with a profound gratitude to God and with the thankfulness to the men who paid for it with their lives. These are matters that we should be thinking about. So, we, I might say, do have some remembrance of the recent occurrence. And I want to call to the attention of the House what we have done in recent months and recent years to relieve this situation in the war-torn countries of the Old World. I also want to bring out the fact that we in Congress, who represent the people, should be properly informed on the policies and programs of the State Department and the War Department.

The formation of a sound American policy in the affairs of continental Europe is long overdue, and I cannot understand the secrecy of the State Department on foreign affairs and policies about which this Congress should be advised.

The question is whether or not our Government is being directly and strategically drawn into the maelstrom of continental politics.

If we go into Greece and Turkey with our planes, tanks, guns and bayonets, backed up with our military personnel, and trouble breaks out anywhere on the British life line between London and Singapore, or between any of the nations in the Mediterranean Basin, or the Indian Ocean, certainly we will be in the middle of things and we shall become sooner or later involved.

This is an unusual venture that our Government is taking and it might commit us to the maintenance of a large army and establishment of naval bases in the Mediterranean. And, if and when, the shooting starts, we will be right in the middle of it.

What is the purpose back of this strange excursion into Greece and Turkey? Into the location which historians have pointed out as the crossroads of all wars.

It appears to be a step in the direction of imperialism. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of a policy this Nation has always avoided and Uncle Sam has never attempted to gain sovereignty over other nations, and, I do not think you want to see him dress up in a turban now. Why is Britain so anxious to pull out and have us take over?

However, the State Department seems to be determined that we horn into the Middle East with all of its feuds and hatreds. Slowly but surely we are being sucked in under one pretext or another; into the whirlpool of continental politics. The State Department and War Department should state definitely their objectives in this proposal.

Our people have not been asked whether or not they want this proposed scheme. I presume it is a product of a few minds and they are willing to be reckless with our money and with the established policy of our Government of nonimperialism and with the future of you and your sons.

This Congress should proceed carefully and cautiously and not rush headlong into a turmoil and add more debt and higher taxes which will have to be paid by every American citizen.

Remember, once we go in we are in the center of a world of trouble and there are many grave questions to be settled in this part of the world besides the spread of communism; the oil of Iraq and Arabia, the Dardanelles, the Palestinian question, Italy, Greece, and the whole Mediterranean area; they are all explosive.

It looks as though we are just getting under way in this spending program and I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we will be asked shortly to give $600,000,000 to Korea and another billion dollars to China, and about $6,000,000,000 more to France and Britain; also Italy, which is an even more strategic spot than Greece, will request a stupendous loan based on our support of the Greek-Turkish situation. And then, no doubt, we will hear from Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Iran.

So, we really are asking for it even though this country has put out in the last several years a total of $66,385,270,000, as follows:

Lend-lease	$51,000,000,000
British credit	3,750,000,000
Total foreign credit authorizations by Export-Import Bank	3,458,771,000
United States quota in World Bank	3,175,000,000
United States quota in World Fund	2,750,000,000
Civilian supplies sent to liberated and occupied areas	1,400,000,000
Credits advanced to finance sales of United States surpluses abroad	851,486,000
Total	66,385,270,000

Certainly after a $66,000,000,000 investment, we ought to be informed on our foreign policy, and the direction we are taking and what the eventual consequences may be so the American people will know exactly what it is all about.

This appears to be more than a relief and rehabilitation measure.

My record in this House and my votes on relief measures are well known. I have repeatedly supported these measures over the past several years.

I listened intently to the debate last week on the $350,000,000 relief appropriation; however, the arguments expressed were the same old catalog arguments we have listened to repeatedly year after year on relief appropriations. There is nothing new. We are constantly threatened as to what will happen to us if we fail to go along.

When is this relief spending to stop, if it is ever to be stopped?

After the slashing action taken by the House on the Interior bill when a cut of approximately 44 percent was made at an estimated saving of $134,000,000, I cannot understand, in fact I am amazed, why the Congress within a week would attempt to saddle on the backs of the overburdened American taxpayers, another $400,000,000 after approving $200,000,000, and which the other body, I am of the opinion, will increase to $350,000,000. Or a total of $750,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, we now owe $260,000,000,000 that must be eventually paid by us and paid by the generations that will follow us.

No one can say we have not done our part. I noted the remarks of Senator BYRD in the RECORD of April 22, page 3778, and I quote:

> Let us say a word as to the statement that has so frequently been made in this debate: That it is either this bill or nothing; that a do-nothing policy will bring more dire results than to do something. If we are doing nothing in foreign affairs, then why has America in less than 2 years—since July 1945—spent and obligated herself to distribute money, credit, and goods in foreign countries, exclusive of military expenditures, aggregating the sum of $16,000,000,000, to

which I have already referred? Out of this $16,000,000,000 the sum of $1,525,000,000 has been, or will be, given to Russia and her satellites. Again I ask, can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right?

Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows:

Russia	$203,000,000
Poland	463,000,000
Czechoslovakia	202,000,000
Finland	92,000,000
Hungary	18,000,000
Yugoslavia	296,000,000

More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

In view of our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly $16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than we can be expected to do within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations. Right today the State Department is urging the Congress to approve $17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, yet, at the same time the State Department requested the Congress to approve $400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey. Such a contradictory foreign policy certainly requires clarification and adjustment.

And on April 21, Senator MALONE had inserted in the RECORD, page 3730, and I quote:

UNRRA and other U. S. Government aid given to the Greeks

UNNRA aid through Sept. 30, 1946	$309,656,000.00
Lend-lease aid through Dec. 31, 1946	81,562,821.63
Credit through Export-Import Bank	25,000,000.00
Credit through the U. S. Maritime Commission for purchase of ships	45,000,000.00
Credit through the Office of Foreign Liquidation Commission	45,000,000.00
Total	506,218,821.63

Now this evidence certainly indicates we have been doing our share and more than our share, and I cannot for the life of me figure out how the Congress believes that we can afford to put up $350,000,000 for relief purposes and then $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey—a total of $750,000,000.

However, it appears that everyone thinks Uncle Sam is a rich uncle and that his pockets are inexhaustible and you can spend, spend, and spend, and there will be no day of reckoning. But I want to tell you that a day of reckoning is not far off.

I want more information on this proposed $400,000,000 program; more definite facts than have been stated here. Not just a lot of glittering generalities and promises of what will and will not be done, but a clarification of what our foreign policy is to be. The American people are entitled to know the facts.

This bill should be recommitted for further study, and in the interim I think we should take inventory as to what we can actually afford to spend under the circumstances, or we will find ourselves wallowing in the sea of bankruptcy and the old ship of state will be wrecked on the rocks of indifferent and careless thinking.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, what we are facing today is indeed a momentous decision in the domestic life of the United States of America. I face the coming hours with a good deal of uncertainty, and yet at the same time a serenity of mind in the feeling that the outcome of this debate today and tomorrow will be for the ultimate good of the United States.

Recrimination between us here on the floor is not that that establishes the kind of decision that we have to make. I believe that rather than spend our time in finding the weak points of the arguments that have been so far presented, we should be doing a little more solid thinking about the future of the United States and the destiny of the coming generation: for we are indeed faced with a decision today that is going to affect the second generation. In all our thinking we should be impressed with the idea that it is not today that we must think of, but tomorrow. I am firmly of the opinion, gentlemen of the House, that this decision which, while it may be based on matters of which we do not yet have full cognizance, is one in which we must take somewhat on faith the things that cannot or have not been said as well as to judge soundly those things that actually have been said.

I do not respond very much to oratory nor I believe do the Members of the House. But we do respond to sound thinking. If we can have a quiet and sober time of debate in trying to decide the issues, then I believe we shall be doing what the importance of the question warrants, and what we must do as Americans today. The question is: Shall we soberly follow the arguments that have been made to us about the importance of this matter or shall we rather be led by hysteria and by loud speaking? I do not care, frankly, as a veteran of both wars, whether the result carries the United States further into immediate debt because debt by itself means nothing if there might be at the end no United States to pay the debt. To me, what is important is that we formulate legislation here which when carried forward will result in the ultimate security of the United States, and then debt can be resolved.

Let us make one answer purely from the standpoint of the future security of the United States and let us so judge what is before us.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I like the statement of the gentleman very much. It made me think as I was listening to it of this question: Do you not feel that thinking calmly we are taking the first step which is a warlike move?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I think we are taking a most important move, but whether the move will be toward war or peace is the question that we must decide. I am frankly of the hope that what we are taking is a move toward peace and not toward war, if our first consideration is the ultimate security of the United States, because the ultimate security of the United States does not lie in war but in peace.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the last speaker of the afternoon, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a member of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is probably appropriate that I should speak last today, because I think I represent the average Member's point of view on this issue. I do not know of anything in Congress that has troubled me as deeply as this decision. I think my concern is also attributable to the fact that I spent some years in the service in World War II, and I know what it means to be at war. I know, too, that our action on this bill may well be the decision for war or peace. I have thought it through and I would now like to tell the House the conclusions to which I have come.

There can be little difference between those in favor and those opposed to this bill about the ultimate objectives sought to be obtained by it. These ultimate objectives are those set forth in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations:

> To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

The question is how may we best attain these objectives—by proceeding ourselves to help nations in need of assistance for their own reconstruction and even for their own defense, to help them on the side of democracy, or by doing the best we can within the compass of the United Nations, and if it is powerless at this time, to retreat again into splendid isolation.

It is our national will to strengthen and implement the United Nations and not to bypass it, but in seeking this assistance, says the President "the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required." In other words, the United Nations not being ready to do the job the President declares that the United States must do it—and that that is our foreign policy.

The urgency of the task seems to me to be incontrovertible—for while we seek to bring about that freedom of peoples which distinguishes democracy from totalitarianism we must be prepared to help ward off that hunger and the despair which open the door to an interim seizure of power by a minority trading on despair. Once seized, such power can be perpetuated by terror, propaganda, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms, and become so firmly entrenched that it cannot be

shaken off for years. Our experience in that respect is bitter. By internal disorder fed from without, as in Greece, or by a war of nerves, as in Turkey, we can be faced with the accomplished fact of such a seizure of power in either of these countries which the majority will then find it impossible to shake off.

If our policy in this bill be considered as an emergency means for dealing with the existing impasse, then, regrettable as it is, we must all recognize it as a necessary policy and support it. But if it be considered as a permanent doctrine of the United States by which we begin here and go on to take unilateral action with our men and money in every case to stop the institution of regimes we do not like and to attempt to impose our own political and economic ideas on other countries, then I would feel that the die had indeed been cast for armed conflict in our lifetime.

I believe this bill to reflect not a permanent but a stopgap policy. I have been in Greece as recently as about 4 months ago and I know the extent of the physical and psychological destruction which has resulted from the Nazi occupation and the ensuing civil disorder in that country. Greece is incapable of being free so long as her economy is shattered. A restoration of her economy will bring in its train the end of internal disorder and the reinvigoration of democracy and democratic forces. But we must show to the Greek people our solicitude for this reinvigoration of democracy and we must show them that we know why we come to their rescue, now, unconditionally. Accordingly, I shall at the proper time propose an amendment to this bill which will assure to the Greek people first, that the government with which we deal shall be truly representative of a majority of them; and second, that such government must take all measures necessary to help itself, too. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 14, after paragraph (4) insert after paragraph (5) the following: "If the President finds that the government of any country receiving assistance hereunder is not representative of a majority of the people of such country."

Turkey is yet a different test of the real intent of the policy of this bill. For in Turkey we face a strategic problem. It is this problem of an open or a closed eastern Mediterranean. Either Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, and the other countries of the Middle East, including the Suez Canal, are open to the commerce, communications, and transport of the whole world, including the U. S. S. R., or they are closed. For it is a basic tenet of a Communist society that it is closed, that it is foursquare for state trading, that it excludes the normal commerce and intercourse of the world. First, therefore, we must be sure that by immediate aid the strategic situation should not be irretrievably prejudiced, while at the same time we seek a more permanent solution through the United Nations to lift the pressure on Turkey.

In Turkey the need for assistance is said to be attributable to an international war of nerves. The United Nations is established for exactly the purpose of dealing with such sources of international friction. We must entrust to the United Nations—not later but now—a role in dealing with the problems of Turkey at the same time that we are realistic and come to Turkey's aid now—in the words of the President, "to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes."

I shall therefore propose at the appropriate time an amendment to the bill which will provide that the President set the machinery of the United Nations in motion to relieve the external pressures on Turkey, following the effective technique already developed in sealing off the northern borders of Greece at the same time that assistance is given to Turkey. The amendment follows:

Page 2, line 24, after paragraph (5), insert: "*Provided, however*, That the President, notwithstanding the assistance furnished to any country hereunder, shall initiate proceedings, unless such proceedings have theretofore already been instituted, bringing to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, any situation which threatens the territorial integrity or political independence of any country assisted hereunder and makes necessary the maintenance of fully mobilized military forces by such country."

Secretary Marshall said in his magnificent definition of democracy at the recent Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow:

To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work, or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This definition is equally applicable to nations. We cannot permanently guarantee the integrity and independence of individual nations by the aid of our money and our men on a unilateral basis. We must be ready to accept for ourselves the role of international law rather than the role of international force if we wish it to be the guide for others, too.

The United Nations has already labored effectively in the field of relieving externally induced pressures on independent nations. We must fortify it in that work. I look forward to further development in our acceptance of the judgments arrived at collectively in the United Nations by representatives of all the United Nations, at first in limited spheres, such as territorial boundaries, administration of occupied territories, disposition of enemy territories and assets, and disposition of mandates; and later in wider fields, the administration of colonies, international trade, access to the world's raw materials, international transportation and communications, international regulation of patents and copyrights and of cartels.

In summary, therefore, I urge the acceptance of the policy of this bill as a necessary and practical means for preventing the forced imposition by a minority upon the majority of a way of life the majority does not want in two threatened countries due to the pressure of economic conditions—and the resultant closing off of the Near and Middle East, but I urge coupling this action with simultaneous action to strengthen the only agency which promises to give us a century of peace in our time, the United Nations—and a simultaneous dedication by us to the human rights and fundamental freedoms within the countries we assist which are the very reasons for our own national existence.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Earlier in his remarks the gentleman said he would offer an amendment to guarantee a democratic government in Greece.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I hope that we can bring that about.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. To bring it about. The gentleman therefore presupposes that they do not have a democratic government.

Mr. JAVITS. I presuppose that the Greek Government leaves something to be desired. I would not be as categoric as the gentleman is on that score.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then in the event the gentleman's amendment is not adopted would the gentleman still support this policy?

Mr. JAVITS. I am likely to, I may say to the gentleman, although it has given me a very great deal of concern, but I shall try hard to get an amendment into the bill guaranteeing truly representative government for the countries assisted.

Answering the gentleman further, I maintain that the purpose of the United States will be to bring about a democratic regime in Greece. I think the whole of public opinion in the United States once we are in the situation will be directed, and successfully, toward that end.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it will be conceded that that was the intention declared by the British when they went into Greece. They have been there with a powerful army and they have poured in millions and millions of dollars; yet as of March 12 when the President addressed this Congress on the subject it was admitted that the situation in Greece was the same as before the British went in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I have great faith in the democracy of the people of the United States—in the strength of our belief in democracy. We can do in Greece what the Government of Great Britain did not do on that subject, for they are weakened, beset with other troubles, and have a tradition of colonialism while we have a tradition of freedom.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I heard the gentleman use an expression that has been used here by a number of men today in which he said something about the splendid isolation. Would the gentleman say that

word is the antonym of splendid intervention?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not use the term "splendid isolation" in any disposition to agree with it. I think it is a policy which can hurt the United States very materially and endanger its own security and that of the whole world.

Mr. OWENS. Is it the antonym of "splendid intervention"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EXHIBITS ORIGINAL LETTERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON AND OTHER IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS IN OBSERVANCE OF RELIGIOUS BOOK WEEK

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Religious Book Week, under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, will be observed throughout the Nation from May 4–11. The date is important. It commemorates the book burning with which the Nazis began their career in power 14 years ago. The Nazis party was an instrument expressly shaped to destroy freedom, and almost the first blow which it struck was a blow against freedom of the press.

Europe has been immemorably the scene of assaults on freedom of thought carried out by assaults on the physical bodies of books. The Greeks burned the works of Protagros. It was one of the normal functions of the Roman Senate to condemn books to death by fire. Livy and Tacitus both mention instances of such condemnation.

The practice survived pagan Rome. In medieval Europe there was hardly a state which did not make use of fire against books. By order of the Pope, Martin Luther's writings were condemned to the flames. Luther retaliated by burning the papal bull and other church documents. Calvin burned Servetus' works. The Reformation ushered in a varitable conflagration—both sides contributing. This was human history. Books were the victims.

The grounds on which books were burned were always the same, in all countries and at all times, that is, the corruption of morals, political institutions and religion.

It is of accidental significance, of course, that the last book officially burned in England was The Present Crisis in Regard to America Considered, in the year of 1775. Our Nation, coming into existence out of that crisis put itself on record as defending religion and the press in one joint statute. It reversed the official attitude of the past, that religion and the freedom to write, publish, and read were incompatible. It defended human conscience.

Our religions, morals, and political institutions have flourished healthfully ever since. Censorship scares we have had, and attacks under cover on our free press but the enraged outcry which always greets these movements has been impressive.

Today, we can celebrate religion through the medium of books with no thought of paradox, and all the Christian churches may join hands with the Jews in making the observance.

Marking the celebration in the city of Washington is an exhibit in the main building of the Library of Congress. Famous writings on religious freedoms are being displayed, among them The Bloudy Tenent, by Roger Williams, printed in London in 1644. This is the most famous work of Roger Williams, the liberal-minded clergyman, who in 1636 had led a small group of followers from Massachusetts into the wilderness of Rhode Island to form a community where religious liberties might be safeguarded. In this pamphlet, written after his return to England, Williams set forth his belief that "God requireth not an uniformity of religion" and held that men of all creeds were entitled to freedom of worship as a natural right. He further declared that the foundation of civil power lay in the people and that the rulers of a land could not exercise more power than what the people themselves granted.

Another interesting volume in the exhibit is the Virginia statute of religious liberty, adopted in 1786. After independence had been declared and State constitutions had been adopted it became necessary to create new laws for new conditions and to change inherited colonial laws which no longer suited the increasingly liberal temper of the times. The report was presented to the assembly on June 18, 1779, and was published—upon the insistence of James Madison—5 years later. Chapter 82 consisted of Jefferson's bill for establishing religious freedom, which was finally passed in January 1786, after a State-wide campaign to create a realization of the need for reform. At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War dissenting religious groups were still being discriminated against in most of the Colonies, with civil rights often seriously affected. The Virginia statute, which Jefferson regarded as one of the three great achievements of his life, provided that no man should be compelled to attend or support any one church, and that no person should suffer loss of civil liberties because of his religious beliefs.

Also on exhibit at the library is the original letter from Thomas Jefferson to the six Baptist associations represented at Chesterfield, Va., dated November 21, 1808. The letter follows:

To the General Meeting of Correspondence of the Six Baptist Associations Represented at Chesterfield in Virginia

I thank you, fellow citizens, for your affectionate address. I receive with satisfaction your approbation of my motives for retirement. In reviewing the history of the times through which we have passed, no portion of it gives greater satisfaction, or reflection, than that which presents the efforts of the friends of religious freedom, and the success with which they were crowned. We have solved by fair experiment the great and interesting question whether freedom of religion is compatible with order in Government, and obedience to the laws. We have experienced the quiet as well as the comfort which results from leaving everyone to profess freely and openly those principles of religion which are the inductions of his own reason, and the serious convictions of his own enquiries.

It is a source of great contentment to me to learn that the measures which have been pursued in the administration of your affairs have met your approbation. Too often we have had but a choice among difficulties; and this situation characterizes remarkably the present moment, but fellow-citizens if we are faithful to our country, if we acquiesce with good will in the decisions of the majority, and the Nation moves en masse in the same direction, although it may not be that which every individual thinks best, we have nothing to fear from any quarter.

I thank you sincerely for your kind wishes for my welfare and with equal sincerity implore the favor of a protecting providence for yourselves.

Nov. 21, 08. TH JEFFERSON.

Jefferson's letter reflects his appreciation of the ardent support given his campaign for the bill establishing religious freedom, regarded by him as one of his three greatest accomplishments. Many historians assert that the Baptists were the most vigorous and persistent

advocates of religious liberty in the colonial and early national periods. Their ideals of democratic church and civil government and of religious freedom appealed to Jefferson and it is not surprising to find him taking notice of their activities.

Another item in the Religious Book Week exhibit is an original manuscript page from the autobiography of Thomas Jefferson referring to the great revision of the laws of Virginia, begun in 1776 upon his motion and including, in chapter 80, provision for religious liberty. The revision was effected only after much opposition and debate. Similar difficulties accompanied the passage of his bill for establishing religious freedom, and Jefferson here relates the failure of efforts to make it partial, and rejoices in the triumph of his ideas among the majority, who like him "meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the gentile, the Christian and Mohammedan, the Hindoo and infidel of every denomination." In this respect his ideal agreed with that of Roger Williams, as expressed in the Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, that all are entitled to religious liberty as a natural right.

Still another historical book exhibited this week is entitled "Laws of Maryland at Large" compiled by Thomas Bacon, rector of All Saints' parish in Frederick County. It was printed in 1765 at Annapolis by Jonas Green. For the exhibit, the book is opened at the page containing an Act Concerning Religion, adopted in April 1649.

This was one of the most important colonial acts of the province of Maryland. This notable act was well summarized, in its purpose and content, by Charles, third Lord Baltimore, as passed that the province might "have a general toleration settled there by law, by which, all of all sorts, who professed Christianity in general, might be at liberty to worship God in such manner as was most agreeable to their respective judgments and consciences, without being subject to any penalties whatsoever for their doing so, provided the civil peace were preserved. And, that for the securing the civil peace and preventing all heats and feuds which were, generally, observed to happen amongst such as differ in opinions upon occasion of reproachful nicknames and reflecting upon each other's opinions, it might, by the same law, be made penal to give any offense in that kind."

The Library of Congress is to be commended for arranging this display of important documents related to the freedom of religion. Our devotion to this tradition is shared by those of all religious faiths and all political creeds. It is a part of the American heritage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each statements and excerpts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until May 19, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until May 19, on account of official business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 2, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2157. An act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

649. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates for the fiscal year 1948 involving decreases of $152,000 in an administration expense limitation on corporate funds and $1,100,000 in appropriated funds for the National Housing Agency (H. Doc. No. 237); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

650. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $5,261,000 for the Office of Selective Service Records (H. Doc. No. 238); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

651. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department, in the form of amendments to the 1948 budget, amounting to $15,079,000 (H. Doc. No. 239); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

652. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury; Comptroller General of the United States; and Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

653. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who have died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in the United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

654. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unlading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

656. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal; to the Committee on House Administration.

657. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Fifteenth Report of the Attorney General, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

658. A letter from the Director, Washington office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the United States War Damage Commission for the period ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

659. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 182 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a letter suggesting that the Speaker of the House of Representatives ask the House Committee on Agriculture to initiate and schedule hearings to obtain views of various groups as to quota structure with a view to a percentage increase of sugar for Cuba; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VORYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross; with amendments (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MUNDT: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3001. A bill to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 3329. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3330. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as

amended, to make available to farmers through the Federal land bank system loans similar to those made by the Land Bank Commissioner on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to transfer the existing Land Bank Commissioner loans and related assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the Federal land banks; to provide for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to repay its Government capital with interest; to authorize the Federal land banks to establish a Federal land bank system reserve fund; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3331. A bill to reclassify the salaries of certain employees in the motor-vehicle service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3332. A bill creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3334. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3335. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Albert Sidney Johnston National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 3336. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 3337. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3338. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3339. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3340. A bill to amend paragraph 1545 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for an increased rate of duty on honeycomb or Mandruka and certain other types of sponges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3341. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to certain widows of veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3342. A bill to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3344. A bill to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title 1, of "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3345. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 3346. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams, and their larger tributaries, flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston soil conservation district, the Trinity Bay soil conservation district, the coastal plains soil conservation district, and the Matagorda County soil conservation district, in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 3347. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American canal irrigation project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3348. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American canal irrigation project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3349. A bill to provide an award for arrested tuberculosis cases of World War I and World War II veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3350. A bill relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3351. A bill to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to refer the plight of Archbishop Stepinac to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 207. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorizd by rule XI (h) (1); to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to broaden the statutory authority of the Rural Electrification Administration to enable it to participate with municipalities in Alaska irrespective of their size; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the terms of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 83 of the Hawaii Organic Act so as to remove the present limitation on juries to men; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain the name "Boulder Dam"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2868, transferring the horses, property, and program of the remount section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protection of Alaska's fisheries against encroachment by any foreign power into the Alaska zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt special legislation in favor of the Territory of Alaska authorizing expenditures of Federal funds for airport purposes in excess of the sums now available for expansion of the airport facilities in said Territory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending to Alaska the present tuition system being used in continental United States, for the payment of tuition to Territorial schools for Indian and native children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Emeline Lartigue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3353. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alabama to the Chicago Mobile Development Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3355. A bill to quit title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3357. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John L. McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (by request):

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Meyer R. Brody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

439. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 44 residents of Beaver, Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. By Mr. HART: Petition of the members of Lieutenant Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress to take immediate action toward the establishment of Palestine as the homeland for Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

441. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., of Glen Ridge, N. J., respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to relieve income taxation on incomes of retired public employees up to $1,440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

442. Also, petition of the Life Underwriters Association of Northern New Jersey, favoring enactment by the Eightieth Congress of legislation amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

443. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mr. L. E. Williamson and other citizens of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

444. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Gustafson and several citizens of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

445. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Knights of Columbus, of the city of New York (Aquinas Council, 757), urging congressional action to make Good Friday a national holiday and urging further the support of the Sasscer bill for that purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

446. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of 59 citizens of Janesville, Wis., and vicinity, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

447. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Elkhorn, Wis., urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

448. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6457, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will enable municipalities to collect taxes from the Federal Government for any of its properties therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

449. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Moultrie Townsend Club, No. 1, of Moultrie, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

450. Also, petition of membership of the Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

451. Also, petition of membership of the Sarasota Townsend Club, No. 1, Sarasota, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who hast given us life and made our earth so fair, reveal to us this day Thy heart of infinite tenderness yearning for our love.

Make us to feel Thy spirit brooding over us, longing to help us in our decisions, to save us from the pressures that drive us and the tensions that break us down.

How strange it is, O lover of our souls, that Thou who art love, who dost give love to hungry human hearts, shouldst Thyself be the great unloved. Give us love to love Thee for Thy love, and to love Him who first loved us and gave Himself for us. Loving Thee, we shall love one another, and loving one another, we shall do Thy will, and doing Thy will, we shall always do right.

We make our prayer in the lovely name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 6, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hopkins, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 770. An act for the relief of Norman Abbott;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Russell F. Taylor;

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of Fred Pittelli;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Paul Goodman;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Robert Hinton;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; and

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were, on page 3, line 13, to strike out all after "treaties" down to and including "adhere" in line 15; and on page 9, line 4, after "1905", to insert "as amended."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to say that these are technical amendments to the Senate bill amending the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross. The Senate unanimously passed the bill several weeks ago. Without objection, the Senate will concur in the House amendments. The Chair hears no objection, and the amendments are concurred in.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that on recommendation of the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Chair appoints the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] to the minority vacancy on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 52)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior amounting to $715,000 and proposed authorizations for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds, in the form of amendments to the budget, fiscal year 1948, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSIONS OF SYMPATHY ON TEXAS CITY DISASTER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the acting legislative counsel of the Department of State transmitting a telegram addressed to the President of the National Congress by Ricardo Rivas Vides, president of the assembly, San Salvador, El Salvador, expressing sympathy on the Texas City disaster, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN SALVADOR, *April 21, 1947.*

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

National legislative assembly deplores recent tragedy occurred Texas and through me extends its condolences to people and National Congress, United States.

RICARDO RIVAS VIDES,
President, Assembly.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Washington, D. C., relative to the proceedings of the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning Palestine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES AND TERRITORIES—MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, while not directly related to the issue now before the Senate, I think it is of such importance to the Nation as a whole that I should read a resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, which involves the question of Federal expenditures. As we know, both Houses of Congress are now working on the questions of taxation and appropriations.

On April 9, 1947, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 21 was adopted by the Michigan Legislature. It is entitled: "A concurrent resolution respectfully urging Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories."

The concurrent resolution reads as follows:

Whereas our sister State of Indiana has shown the courage to declare against the unsound financial practice of so-called Federal aid, and the general assembly of said State has passed a concurrent resolution calling upon its Senators and Congressmen "to vote to fetch its county courthouses and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue";

It is clear that Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Washington, D. C., is intended. I read on:

Whereas the said State of Indiana has called upon the legislatures of her sister States to join with her in appealing to Congress for a cessation of this unsound political fiscal extravagance; and

Whereas when a State legislature is confronted with a Federal-aid law, the legislature must either comply or forfeit money which has been or will be taken from the citizens of the State in taxes, the effect being virtual compulsion; and

Whereas it is obvious that unless Federal aid is discontinued to all States, it will not be refused by any State; and

Whereas the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Michigan Legislature agree with Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, when he said that, "It is a fundamental truth that when a unit of government spends money that has not been raised locally through taxes, the inevitable result is irresponsibility and waste and it is old-fashioned common sense that best government is that which is closest to the people and their pocketbooks"; and

Whereas our Nation is financially embarrassed to the amount of one-quarter of a trillion dollars and should divert so-called Federal aid toward reducing its indebtedness; and

Whereas Michigan and most other States are in sound financial condition, able to handle their own fiscal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature joins forces with our neighboring State of Indiana in denouncing this practice of so-called matching dollars; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully petition and urge Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the legislatures or assemblies of the 48 States, and to the Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress.

Mr. President, I think it very significant that such a resolution should be adopted by the State Legislature. On many occasions I have understood from the people of Michigan that that is how the great majority of them feel, but very few legislators and very few people back home can take that stand, because they are always under pressure to accept the idea that, since they are putting tax dollars into the Treasury, they should receive tax dollars in return. That is not economy in Government.

I have stood on this floor and told the Senate and the country that it is costing the people more to govern themselves than it is to feed themselves. In view of that fact, the resolution is very material. Senators should carefully study the matter before compelling States to give money in aid, when it is not really needed, but when it is perhaps felt that States should "keep up with the Joneses," that is, with sister States.

I ask unanimous consent to present the concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan and request that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REAFFIRMATION OF CONSISTENT POLICY TOWARD PALESTINE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting the United States Government to instruct its representatives at the United Nations to reaffirm and carry out its established policy toward Palestine which has been in effect since 1917.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States has had an established and consistent policy toward Palestine since 1917; and

Whereas this policy has been embodied in documents and statements such as the mandate for Palestine, the Anglo-American Palestine Convention of 1924, statements of policy from every President from Woodrow Wilson to Harry S. Truman, the Joint Congressional Resolution of 1945, the platforms of both major political parties in 1945, and the Presidential statement in 1946 when receiving the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Pittsburgh respectfully request the United States Government to instruct its representatives at the United Nations to—

1. Reaffirm and carry out this established policy;

2. Take such action in the United Nations as will compel the mandatory power to administer the mandate in spirit and letter from now until its final dispositions; and

3. Compel the mandatory power to repudiate the illegal white paper of 1939 which has been adjudged repugnant to the mandate by the League of Nations Mandate Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the five Representatives in Congress from Allegheny County and the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania.

In council April 28, 1947, read and adopted.

THOMAS E. KILGALLEN,
President of Council.

Attest:

JAMES W. PATTERSON,
Clerk of Council.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by Rev. Hugh E. Wilson, Jr., minister of the Methodist Church at Opp, Ala., and 32 members of his congregation. The petition reads as follows:

To the Appropriate Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, in Particular to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the Signers of This Petition:

We, the undersigned qualified voters, respectfully request that you give favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; and that you support any other bills of similar character, if such support will best serve to secure quick relief from the offensive and injurious promotion of the beverage alcohol custom and traffic.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the bill (S. 1022) to authorize an adequate White House Police force, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 157) thereon.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, vice Col. George Mayo, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1240. A bill to transfer certain lands from the Olympic National Park to the Olympic National Forest, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1241. A bill to place the Office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction, supervision, and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1242. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1243. A bill to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1244. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers, at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1245. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and orders, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, minor;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 770. An act for the relief of Norman Abbott;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Russell F. Taylor;

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of Fred Pittelli;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Paul Goodman;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Robert Hinton;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; and

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have a letter dated April 16, 1947, from the Secretary of Agriculture, addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], President pro tempore of the Senate, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. A similar instance took place yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the matter and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit and hold hearings today during the session of the Senate.

I make a similar request on behalf of the Subcommittee on the Interior Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations; and a similar request on behalf of the Small Business Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to meet today, beginning at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the majority whip, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for acting on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and myself, in our necessary absence from the Senate on Monday, in calling up the resolution expressing the sorrow of this body over the passing of Representative CHARLES GERLACH, who represented the Eighth District of Pennsylvania prior to his untimely death.

Representative GERLACH and I entered the Congress together in January 1939, and for several years while we served in the House together, we had offices on opposite sides of the same corridor, and frequently walked together to the House, discussing along the way some of the vitally important legislation which we who were members of those fateful Congresses prior to and during the war had to consider. Mr. GERLACH and I did not always see eye to eye on legislative matters; but at all times, regardless of any differences in our views, I found him to be sincerely and genuinely concerned for the greater good of all our people.

His passing at the early age of 51 has demonstrated again the terrific strain under which Members of the Congress work. His associates in the House bear testimony to the extreme vigor with which he pursued his efforts on behalf of his constituents, efforts in many cases far beyond the call of duty.

Funeral services will be held for Representative GERLACH tomorrow, and I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this body and, in fact, of the entire Congress, in saying that when he is laid to final rest he will carry with him to the grave the respect and the friendship of his colleagues in the Congress.

COST OF WORLD-WIDE RELIEF—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rationing Relief," published in the Chicago Daily News of May 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "More on Federal Aid for Schools," dealing with Federal aid to education, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Faithful Service Deserving of More Attention," relating to the retirement pay of letter carriers, published in the Seattle Times of April 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE ATTLEBORO (MASS.) SUN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saturday Musings," published in the Attleboro (Mass.) Sun of April 26, 1947, relating to the popular election of President and Vice President, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this bill, S. 1126, calls for fundamental changes in our labor laws. Changes in laws are sometimes desirable because of change in conditions, and sometimes lapse of time, but these changes should be by making the laws better adapted to carrying out the basic principles agreed upon. Such changes should not be used to weaken those principles under the guise of maintaining them.

My objections to the bill may best be illustrated by describing briefly certain significant and fundamental economic and social situations which are peculiar to the great industrial area of New England, and especially to my own State of Rhode Island. I shall not go into the intricacies of this legislation. But I shall try to show why I feel that this bill, instead of being a mild measure to curb certain abuses, is a harsh measure cleverly and carefully designed to kill labor organizations—not directly by outright prohibition or repeal, but indirectly by the use of certain devices which while they may be legal are nevertheless deadly. The principal point I have to make has to do with the basic question of collective bargaining in our modern society. It relates not so much to the newer and highly complicated developments in this field, but rather to the moral aspects of these vital relationships between employer and employee.

The legislation now proposed purports to promote industrial peace, but it seeks to do so by a complicated and far-reaching set of inhibitions on the functioning of labor unions. It is entirely negative in its provisions. Nothing in this bill contributes affirmatively to the development of better and more stable relations between employer and employee. We may well recall the ghastly remark of the czarist general who, after his Cossacks had trampled and shot down all protesting citizens, reported "Peace reigns in Moscow." Social unrest can be stifled or temporarily suppressed by force of law or physical force, but the basic discontent continues to grow and will some day explode. We have long recognized that fear of defeat in itself does not keep warlike nations at peace, any more than the risk of detection prevents depraved individuals from engaging in criminal acts. War and crime can only be extirpated by deliberately, painstakingly, and intelligently building a healthier society. Today, in the face of atom bombs and other types of fantastically destructive scientific weapons, which threaten the end of civilization or even of man's existence on earth, men are talking about preparation for new wars. No intelligent person argues against adequate defense or necessary police measures. But real peace, either between nations or between classes within a nation, will only be built when there is a greater extension of social justice between nations, or between men and women who are citizens of the same nation, as the case may be. As a friend not only of those employed and of those employing them, but also and principally of the masses of my fellow citizens called the general public, I am willing to discuss regulatory measures applying to labor only when we are prepared to present plans for fostering and developing the institution of collective bargaining. But this bill limits, cuts down, and thwarts the whole process of voluntary dealing between the workers and their employer, that is, collective bargaining.

This proposed legislation treats labor as a gigantic and inveterate culprit. The proponents of this legislation place a great burden of culpability for strikes and other labor troubles on labor alone. No responsibility is attributed to those industrialists or big corporations who have flouted governmental recommendations and have forced the country to endure costly and needless strikes. It is fantastically unfair to ascribe to labor a ruthless monopolistic role in a society when capital has become richer and stronger and more highly centralized than at any time in our national history. This proposed legislation rests upon assumptions which are totally incorrect and presents an utterly false version of life as it is lived in our industrial communities in this year of our Lord 1947.

In this machine century two elements stand out and challenge the attention of thinking men and women. Time has been saved. Energy has been saved. The two statements mean about the same thing. Both result from the development of machinery of various sorts. It takes less time for a man to make something and he can make it with the expenditure of less energy. So he can make many more things with the same effort or in the same time. In other words, the same number of men can make the same number of things in a shorter workday, or fewer men are needed if the workday is unchanged.

Machinery made possible much greater production with less human labor and in less time. This meant great savings in the cost of production, and consequently greater profits. By far the greater share of these profits was taken by the capitalists who furnished this investment. A moderate share was given the consumer in the form of reduced prices and a very small share was paid over to those who furnished the labor or skill.

Whatever the exact figures may be, no one can deny that there has been a very great increase in wealth and also in the disparity between the very rich and the very poor. Almost all our attention has been given to the production of wealth and very little to its fair distribution. The great capitalists have overreached themselves in their efforts. They have not only by the application of economic laws but also by the manipulation of man-made laws added to their colossal fortunes. No one begrudges them their wealth except to the extent that it was accumulated at the expense of their fellow men. But now if the game is to go on, the rules must be made fairer so as to give both the workingman and the ordinary consuming citizen a better chance.

The passage of the Wagner Labor Relations Act 10 years ago made it practically possible for several millions of hitherto underprivileged citizens to achieve in their workaday lives what the Bill of Rights had theoretically accorded them 150 years before. Large numbers of wage earners have, as a result of the workings of this beneficial legislation, cast off an attitude which was characteristic of a paternalistic society, or even of a feudal order. They have adopted the role of full-fledged citizens in an industrial society. This has been accomplished through the very simple process of collective bargaining. Those intellectual bourbons in our industrial society who have fought unremittingly against the Wagner Act since 1935 now at last think they see the fruits of victory in this bill before us. These men seek a return to a social order in which whole classes are perpetually condemned to suffer under economic, social, and political discrimination. The Wagner Act did, in a very real sense, offer emanicpation to those who had the courage and character to seek fuller participation in our community life. This collective-bargaining process was not and is not concerned only with higher wages or better working conditions. It is a process which profoundly influences the character and outlook of those who take part in it. The real reason so many people hate unions and slander the National Labor Relations Board is because they have seen that factory workers, or other types

of employees, who have once built themselves effective collective-bargaining instruments, and by democratic methods have established stable and permanent organizations, are never quite the same people again. These people become better citizens, they lead better lives, and make a contribution to the whole of our democratic society.

Let me give a simple illustration of what I mean. Before unions were as extensive as they are today the average factory worker was dunned each year for a donation of a dollar or so to the community chest or for other local welfare agencies. He gave grudgingly, because there was, as a rule, an element of compulsion in this method of collection. Generally he knew nothing about the services of these welfare agencies and resented the phrase "social worker" as one who interfered with citizens in need or trouble. His individual contribution to the fund was not individually acknowledged. What he gave was lumped with the donation of his employer or of the corporation by whom he was employed. The welfare fund, therefore, inevitably took on in the worker's eyes the character of "belonging to the boss." But after the Wagner Act, and more particularly during the war years, the workers made their contributions through their unions. The whole attitude toward these contributions changed. Not only were workers willing to give and gave more than they had given in the past, but they became interested in what they were giving for. A whole new outlook toward what we call social work developed. The social agencies were aided immeasurably by this new attitude on the part of those from whom the largest numbers of its clients are usually drawn. Today labor unionists, men who make a mechanic's wage, sit on the boards of hospitals, orphanages, travelers' aid societies, child-care clinics, and so forth. No longer are these posts assigned merely to the well-to-do, or the people of leisure in our towns and cities. We have tapped a whole new fund of support and strength for those voluntary agencies which we now realize are essential to the correction of social ills, such as the care of those who are aged or infirm, or the skilled guidance or protection of those needing them—services which cannot be supplied at once out of the current income of the average citizen.

To such an extent has this change come about that in several large industrial centers trade unions, as a group, either constitute the largest aggregate givers to community chest funds, or are close to being the largest givers. But punitive legislation like this now proposed would necessarily weaken and embitter large numbers of organized wage earners who have demonstrated this high order of civic responsibility.

The opening speech on this bill by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] put the issue before the Senate rather plainly, I thought. The Senator said, in effect, that labor unions have grown too strong and should be put in their place. Yet, almost in the same breath, the Senator points out that in comparison with "the very largest companies in the United States" labor unions have achieved at best a position of uncertain equality. This, I believe, is not a true picture of the actual state of affairs in our present-day economy. But even assuming that is a correct estimate of the present economic balance of power, the Senator, by his own declaration, would definitely and deliberately put unions at a disadvantage in relation to large corporations. According to the Senator, the small businessman is being squeezed by the unions, although the fact is manifest that the influence and power of the big business corporations is vastly increasing from year to year. To correct this condition he would weaken not the big business corporations but the labor unions.

I do not wish to load down my remarks with statistics or quotations, but I feel that I should read at this point a couple of extracts from a really remarkable article on industrial mergers which appeared in the Washington Post on last April 28. This article was written by Robert E. Freer, a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Freer says, in part:

> More than 1,800 formerly independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up through merger and acquisition since 1940. Their combined asset value was $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing concerns in 1943. Moreover, it was the larger corporations each having assets of over $5,000,000 (in many instances achieved through earlier acquisitions) that accounted for some three-fourths of these recent 1,800 acquisitions.
>
> The war contributed powerfully to the trend of concentration. Government purchases and Government financing of productive facilities were channeled predominantly into the hand of corporations which already occupied positions of dominance. Surplus profits created by such channeling have contributed powerfully to the trend by providing funds for additional wartime and postwar expansion through acquisition of former competitors. Out of $175,000,000,000 of Government contract awards between June 1940 and September 1944, $107,000,000,000, or 67 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards. During the war 68 corporations received two-thirds of the $1,000,000,000 appropriated by the Government for research and development purposes in industrial laboratories.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The stock-market crash of 1929, which heralded the onset of the great depression, was preceded by a great wave of corporate mergers and a wild speculation in their securities. Today speculation in the future of merged concerns, supported by war-swollen profits, is again operating as one of the important causes of the present upward trend in merger activity. This speculation, which stems from the expectation of greater profits resulting from the elimination of formerly competing concerns, leads inexorably to the elimination of our competitive economy and thus to the elimination of the possibility of legitimate speculation.
>
> * * * * *
>
> No one has summarized the danger of monopoly any better than President William Howard Taft, under whose administration some of the most far-reaching antitrust actions of all time were taken. On December 5, 1911, he stated:
>
> "When all energies are directed not toward the reduction of the cost of production for the public benefit by a healthful competition but toward new ways and means for making permanent in a few hands the absolute control of the conditions and prices prevailing in the whole field of industry, then individual enterprise and effort will be paralyzed and the spirit of commercial freedom will be dead."
>
> The facts of the present situation constitute an increasing threat not only to our traditional antitrust policy but also to the American system of free competitive enterprise which that policy is designed to foster and to protect.

Yet the blame for our social and economic ills is placed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] not on big business in whole or in part but entirely on the labor unions.

The situation in the telephone industry is a glaring example of the evident purpose of these great monopolies to keep labor weak and ineffective. I do not care to discuss now the merits of the controversy itself, but only to use it as an illustration of the attitude of the typical large corporation toward labor. It controls the manufacture and operation of telephonic communication in this country. It exercises vast power and influence in almost every civilized country in the world. Yet the holding company in this field refuses to bargain on an industry-wide basis with the union of its employees. "Let negotiations be carried on by our subsidiaries," says the behind-the-scene power in this huge combine. Yet it is a manifest and irrefutable fact that these subsidiaries would have to submit their piecemeal bargains to the all-powerful top command before anything could be signed or consummated at the local level. The day may come when it may be necessary for the Government to apply a system of regulated bargaining, such as exists on the railways today, to certain public utilities, or even to other industries so closely related to the public welfare as coal mining. The Congress of the United States should study that problem and do it now. But to hamper the growth and efficiency of unions by various legal interferences and obstructions is an utterly mistaken, short-sighted, and morally indefensible step for this or any other legislative body to take.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to finish his remarks without interruption?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the able Senator's comment regarding the attitude of the telephone holding company, the greatest monopoly in the United States, I believe, if it be true, as the Senator believes it to be, that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has not been willing to bargain freely and in good faith on an industry-wide basis with the employees, is not that attitude a disservice to the public as well as to the employees? Does it not force employees to accept in many cases wages and working conditions which are unfair to the worker, and antisocial in addition, as an alternative to the interruption of business? In other words, if the

employees do not accept conditions which are unsatisfactory to them they are forced to strike, and that forces upon the public a great inconvenience; and then is not the Congress in the position of countenancing the continuation of a wrong practice and of having to enact legislation which would restrict labor's right to strike and compel public supervision over such utilities? In other words, is not such an attitude of unwillingness to bargain in a fair way with the workers not only unjust to the workers themselves, but an antisocial attitude?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is quite correct, and I thank him for his amplification of my remarks.

If we push workers far enough they will disobey court injunctions. In fact, this has already happened in one nearby State where telephone workers have defied a State law.

What this Congress should do is to pass legislation which will be so manifestly just and fair to all sides that it will be willingly complied with. Every Member of this Congress knows that it is unwise and also impractical to legislate for particular situations or to punish a few men or especial groups. This bill is that kind of legislation. It is directed at the excesses of a few labor unionists. It must fail because it penalizes and restricts the great body of organized labor which is using the collective bargaining process not only for the benefit of its members but also for the benefit of industry and of the general public.

Alleged racketeering by certain labor leaders should be dealt with by better and more rigorous police measures, or by suitable action in local courts of law. The fact is that labor racketeering, so called, is almost always a collusive practice in which some unprincipled employer has conspired with another unprincipled person calling himself a unionist. Monopolistic practices and restraints on trading in local distributive industries were not invented by labor unionists. Any amateur student of these situations knows that racketeering in these fields usually grew out of the failure of proper marketing regulations by local or State governments. Sometimes in urban areas it was due to contests for franchises in overcrowded areas; sometimes it was due to competition for their inadequate facilities for wholesale distribution of perishable commodities. Unionists, in the first place at least, were the cat's-paw rather than the instigators of practices which are now widely blamed on labor alone. Admittedly, hired strong-arm men sometimes go in business for themselves, but these small fry seldom last long unless they are given protection by equally criminal elements which are influential but lurk in the background and take no open risks. My point here is not abstract. What I am saying is that those who complain of criminal practices, or of antisocial, though not illegal behavior on the part of labor organizations, usually can do more themselves to correct these conditions than can the Congress of the United States by the enactment of new statutes or by reinvesting Federal judges with new and sweeping powers which, in the past, have sometimes been misused.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not believe that the Senator can emphasize too strongly the proposition which he has just enunciated, namely, that it is up to our citizenry who have knowledge of violations by labor leaders or by union leaders of either State or national laws to go to the district attorney and make their complaints. The talk about racketeering in labor is usually indulged in by people who express their opinions in the newspapers and in other public forums instead of calling the matter to the attention of the district attorney. If the district attorney does not do his duty, then it is the responsibility of the citizen who makes complaint to bring it to the attention of those who can make him do his duty.

I think that point needs to be emphasized, because it is under the assertion that all labor is led by a bunch of thieves and crooks and behind that shield that much of the legislation which has been designed in the last few months has proceeded.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator. He has emphasized very well indeed the point I wished to make.

It may prove helpful to call attention to a most interesting report lately issued by the National Policy Committee. This is a group of well-known citizens representing a broad and representative cross section of our American society. It has recently conducted a series of 17 meetings in 11 different cities on the whole question of labor-management relations. The National Policy Committee during the past 10 years has specialized in holding meetings on current problems with a view to distilling a synthesis or revealing summary of many opinions on given issues. These reports are then made available to the public. The reports published by the NPC during the war years, especially, have been definitely helpful to Government agencies and to many national bodies in framing policies on hotly disputed matters. Many nationally known experts on labor matters took part in these discussions, all of which were off the record, so as to enable everyone to talk quite frankly. The final conclusions which emerged from all these discussions in widely separated parts of the country are now being written up. But a preliminary release has been issued which makes the following statement:

PRINCETON, N. J., *April 13, 1947.*

The American people have a "yes, but—" attitude toward pending Federal labor legislation, according to a statement released today by a panel of the National Policy Committee reviewing a Nation-wide series of meetings on labor-management relations held under the auspices of that committee since December.

This panel has been meeting here at the Institute for Advanced Study during the last 2 days, and has considered reports of 17 meetings held in 11 different cities from Boston to Portland, Oreg., and from Minneapolis to Memphis. All meetings were off-the-record sessions, permitting frank interchange on the part of the 243 participants. Among those taking part were 55 from management, 54 from labor, more than 20 each from education, law, government, press, and radio. Others represented agriculture, the church, and citizens' organizations.

"Legislation is not the final answer," says the review panel of 15. "Industrial peace will grow only as management and labor both recognize their responsibilities to the public and develop better trained representatives for day-to-day plant relations as the basis for workable contract negotiations. They can't pass the buck to Government and expect to avoid the controls that neither management nor labor seems to wish."

Reviewing the discussions in these 11 widely scattered localities, the panel found it significant that there was broad acceptance in principle of labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike. There were, however, immediate exceptions to these principles at the point of application. It was agreed that labor has the right to organize, but should this include the right to force men to join a union? On the other hand, should a nonunion man "freewheel" on what the union does for its members? It was agreed that labor has the right to bargain collectively, but should this include a closed, as contrasted with a union, shop? It was agreed that labor has the right to strike, but members from all sides took a sober view of the effect nationally of the misuse of labor's highly concentrated power. Concern for sustained production was repeatedly emphasized. On the other hand, there was substantial opinion that if that right is denied in cases clearly affecting public health, welfare, and safety, the denial must be sincerely balanced by workable equivalents.

Concern was repeated that labor and management both tend to bypass the public interest. At the same time it was said that if the public wishes to intervene as a balancing factor in labor-management disputes, issues must be better understood and governmental machinery equipped with skilled specialists to operate it.

The Nation-wide series of meetings which this panel reviewed was an attempt on the part of a private organization to provide local occasions at which representatives of the contending factors could meet for discussion of issues free from the pressures of specific negotiations. The National Policy Committee has its headquarters in Washington. Its chairman is David Winton, of Minneapolis. Funds for these discussions were provided by the Scaife Foundation of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Frank Aydelotte, president of the Institute for Advanced Study, met with the group at dinner on Saturday night. The review panel of 16, chaired by William H. Baldwin, of New York City, included a number of members who had participated in the regional meetings. Among those present were Winfield Riefler, of Princeton; H. K. Thatcher, of Little Rock, Ark., secretary of the National Association of State Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture; Bradley Morison, editor of the Minneapolis Times; Sam Sponseller, of Cleveland, regional director, CIO; J. Lawrence, of SKF Industries, Philadelphia; Marion Lyndon, public relations counsel, of Boston; and Bernard Noble, of Portland, Oreg.

I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing those attending these labor-management meetings and the places

where the meetings were held. It will show at a glance by its facts and figures that this is probably the most representative sampling of informed public opinion that has been taken by any group in this country.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Attendance at NPC labor-management meetings

	Boston	New York	Philadelphia	Cleveland	Chicago	Memphis	Birmingham	Minneapolis	Little Rock	Denver	Portland	Totals
Management	3	4	9	3	4	7	3	9	2	6	2	52
Labor	1	2	15	2	1	6	10	5	3	5	3	53
Education	1	0	4	3	3	1	15	2	1	5	2	37
Law	1	4	9	4	0	3	0	1	1	1	3	27
Press and radio	0	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	0	3	0	20
Government	2	0	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	0	4	20
Finance	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	9
Citizens' organizations	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Public relations	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Medicine	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Church	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unaffiliated	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Total	11	17	48	18	11	21	38	25	11	21	17	338

Mr. GREEN. These general principles of labor unionism I have been discussing are well exemplified in the history of industry in my own New England. Textiles there for generations have been the principal economic activity. It is the industry employing the largest number of people, and the economic ups and downs of New England in recent years can be seen very clearly in any study of what has happened to the textile industry there and in the neighboring States.

Textile unionism prior to 1937 consisted of a series of small scattered local unions in a few centers such as Paterson, N. J., and in the villages of Rhode Island, and a few towns in Massachusetts. A few of these were temporarily strong; most of them were always weak. Many were organized on a craft basis, so that bickerings among different groups made collective bargaining almost impossible. The local unions which did exist, no matter how strong they were, could not bargain on any effective basis. Wages in the industry were determined by the intense competition which was national in scope. Because there was no strong national union, mills did not hesitate to move their machinery from the sections where the unions existed to those in which there was no unionism. Therefore, the local unions which maintained membership in such places as the cotton mills of Salem, New Bedford, and Fall River, Mass., the woolen and worsted mills of Lawrence, Mass., and of various mill towns scattered through Rhode Island, the carpet and upholstery shops of Philadelphia, Pa., and the silk mills of Paterson, N. J., were never able to raise the wages and working conditions of their members above the low standards which existed throughout the industry.

Other factors, in addition to the Nation-wide wage competition, made these locals ineffective in dealing with their employers. The unions did not have access to the economic information which is essential for collective bargaining. They could not afford to pay the engineers, the lawyers, or the experienced negotiators who would have been able to discuss problems on equal terms with those who were employed by the mill owners. They met a compact and determined opposition to unionism on the part of textile employers—an opposition which they could not resist, since their resources were too small to enable them to fight back with any hope of success. The vicious character of this opposition has been told in detail in the hearings of the Senate Committee on Civil Liberties, and need not be repeated here.

As a result of the failure to develop responsible unionism, textile workers, frustrated and embittered, turned to the strike as a means of revolt against their conditions. It has been estimated that more than 6,000 textile strikes took place in the 50 years prior to 1936. Many of these attracted Nation-wide attention. Such were the Lawrence strike in 1912; the recurring silk strikes in Paterson; the general strikes in New England in 1921 and 1922; the New Bedford cotton strike in 1928; the Passaic woolen strike in 1926; the wave of southern strikes in 1928, 1929, and 1930, and the general Nation-wide textile strike in 1934 which hit my own State of Rhode Island particularly hard. Many of these strikes were called in order to obtain simple recognition of the union by the employer. Others were revolts against wage cuts, or increased work assignments.

The wages and working conditions in the industry reflected the lack of unionism. Its wages were the lowest of any large manufacturing industry. In 1924 the average hourly earnings of northern cotton workers was 46 cents and of southern cotton workers 28.5 cents. By the end of the decade, in 1930, the average earnings of northern workers declined to 39.7 cents per hour and of the southern workers to 28.1 cents per hour. At the bottom of the depression, July 1933, the scale had dropped for the northern workers to 27.6 cents and for the southern workers to 20.5 cents. Competition between low-wage areas and areas still lower kept driving down the earnings of textile workers.

The differences in wage levels in the textile areas had another important significance. They caused the scrapping of spindleage and abandonment or transfer of factories. Between 1922 and 1932, spindleage in New England had declined from 18,930,000 to 10,810,000, while spindleage in the South rose from 16,458,000 to 19,052,000. The relatively greater loss was suffered by Massachusetts; the smallest losses were in Maine and Connecticut. New England suffered substantial elimination and transfer of entire business enterprises. Whereas the number of cotton mills in New England declined from 386 in 1929 to 301 in 1933, the number in the South increased from 656 in 1919 to 764 in 1927 and then decreased in 1933 to 650, about the earlier figure. The gravitation of cotton mills from what was then called a "high-wage area" in New England to the low-wage areas in the South was so great that the consequences were stranded populations, unemployment, ghost mills and towns. By 1931 the city of Fall River, Mass., a major cotton textile producing center, went bankrupt and financial control was assumed by the Commonwealth.

In 1935, the average textile worker earned but $850 for the whole year, and this was far above the depression earnings of the early 1930's. The 1935 figure was almost $300 below the average earnings for all manufacturing industry at that time. It was so low that when, in 1939, the Wage and Hour Administration raised the minimum wage in the cotton textile industry to 32½ cents an hour, 120,000 of the less than half a million workers in that section of the industry were directly benefited by the new minimum.

Because of its low wages the industry employed large numbers of women and children. The 1930 census reported 110,000 children under the age of 18 employed in the industry, and 428,000 women, of whom 35 percent were married.

Textiles was known as "sick" industry. Its low wages and poor working conditions were notorious. It was taken for granted that the textile mill community would be a slum, whether it was located in a crowded New England city or in the company towns of the Southeast. Because they went to work so young the educational level of textile workers remained low. The low wages and long hours adversely affected conditions of health which the poor housing already had undermined. Thus, the textile industry was a burden upon the Nation, a burden which helped to prevent the development of a sound national economy.

The industry was an antidemocratic force as well. A large proportion of its workers lived in communities in which almost their whole lives was dominated by the mill in which they worked. They lived in company houses, traded at the company store, attended the company

church, sent their children to the company school, and were buried in the company cemetery. Those who could read had their opinions formed by a company-dominated press. In whole textile areas the American way of life was a mockery.

However, during the past 10 years conditions in the textile industry have improved notably. This has been largely the result of the efforts and pressures of organized labor. Although wage levels in textiles have not reached those of other large manufacturing industries, they are no longer so completely substandard. Neither the industry nor its workers remain a burden on the national economy. The average hourly earnings in the industry have increased from 47 cents in January 1937 to an estimated $1 in February 1947. In 1937 there was almost no bottom to wages. Today the effective minimum ranges from 80 to 90 cents an hour, depending upon the branch of the industry. By means of collective bargaining under Federal law comparatively uniform plant and job minimum wage rates have been established in the different sections of the industry and the union has removed wages as a factor in the competition between mills. Instead of an unhealthy competition based upon wages there now exists a competition based upon relative managerial efficiency, the type of competition which should be normal in a free-enterprise economy. This has encouraged more efficient mill operation. Yet it has not hindered the growth of cotton-rayon mills in the South. The present expansion program exceeds $200,000,000—and a substantial portion is being spent by southern interests.

The union has also brought other social gains to the workers. The principle of the paid vacation has been established. Unfair discharges and discrimination in employment have been eliminated in the unionized shops. A grievance machinery has been established which makes possible the peaceful settlement of shop disputes without any interruption of production. A large majority of the employees covered by union contracts are protected by health-insurance programs paid for by the employers.

The increases in textile wages have been accompanied by a rise in the living standards of the workers which has greatly benefited the communities in which they live. There has been an increase in home ownership. Children can stay in school because their parents' incomes have improved. Retail business in textile towns has been able to expand and supply a higher quality of merchandise. Because they have an increased income the workers have been better able to solve their health problems, and doctors' and dentists' bills can be paid.

The coming of the union into the community has freed the textile worker from the economic pressure which made him a second-class citizen. He now participates fully in community life, assured that he will not suffer penalties because of such participation.

All of these gains have been accomplished without curtailing in any way the profitable operation of the textile industry. On the contrary, the rate of profit of textile employers has increased tremendously during the past several years.

In accomplishing these goals the unions in this industry have acted upon the principle that the workers' interests can best be advanced through the establishment and extension of peaceful collective bargaining culminating in the collective-bargaining agreement between the union and the employer. The machinery provided by the National Labor Relations Act has been used in all organizing campaigns, thus assuring an orderly, legal method in the place of the earlier turbulence or disorder. The election has replaced the strike as the means of winning union recognition from the employer. In almost every instance the original contracts and the contract renewals have been negotiated at the conference table. Voluntary arbitration of all disputes, and differences on unforeseen issues which may arise during the life of a contract, is written into virtually all textile contracts. Strikes are virtually unheard of during the period a contract exists. And as a this method of dealings, strikes over the result of the relationship built up by terms of new contracts almost never take place.

This is why collective bargaining is most important to the welfare of the whole country. Yet it would be impractical without labor unions. An employer cannot deal effectively with a large number of unorganized individual workers any more than America can make peace with Germany without an organized government. Just as we must help establish such a government there, so we must help maintain labor unions here.

But the pending bill is based on the will, the effort and the hope, to weaken, curb, and make ineffective those very labor unions. No matter how loudly its advocates may shout their friendship for labor and labor unions, this bill has the same effect which the enemies of labor and labor unions would have planned. The subterfuges and indirections with which its objective is obscured will not fool the union members nor the workingmen, generally, all of whom have been helped by the benefits the labor unions have brought about. The bill is a bad bill from the point of view of the general public. It is a bad bill from the point of view of my country's welfare. So I shall vote against its passage.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to present two addresses for the RECORD. The Senate is now working on labor legislation, and it may be wondered why I should introduce into the RECORD at this particular time an address delivered by Henry Ford II, on April 29, 1947. I do it, because, I believe it is material to the pending issue.

I am sorry that I cannot insert in the RECORD at this time the words of a man representing labor. There are leaders who must think, and who do think, just as the young industrialist to whom I refer thinks. It may be said that because of the young man's age, his speeches were probably written for him; but I want to say that I was present in the Press Club and heard Mr. Henry Ford speaking to the members of the press. Questions were asked, and I was convinced, by the manner in which Mr. Ford answered the questions, "right off the cuff," that he knew what he was talking about, and that what he said in the two addresses which I am about to place in the RECORD came from his heart and mind. I hope that someone representing labor will make a speech on the other side, so that I may insert it in the RECORD and thus have it receive equal consideration and attention.

I shall read into the RECORD a few sentences from the remarks made by Mr. Ford, because I think we can profitably meditate upon them. He said:

> We in America believe in certain "inalienable" rights—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is an article of faith with us that these rights belong to all men. In our opinion, these rights are sometimes suppressed or ignored, but they can never be taken away.

Those are words of wisdom, and they are material to the issue we are discussing here today. He continues:

> But we who so hotly defend our rights are apt to forget that there are obligations which always go with rights. Liberty is not license. Men and institutions in a democracy have a right to consider their own individual interests, to be sure. But they have an equal obligation to consider the interests of others. You and I have a right to drive an automobile—but not on the wrong side of the road. You and I have a right to publish advertisements—but not to make false claims against the public interest. You and I have a right to speak our minds—to say what we think—but we have an obligation to avoid damaging the reputations of others.
>
> The truth of the matter is that our "rights" are really "privileges" granted by all of us to each one of us.

How true that statement is. From our study of the Constitution we know that all the fundamental rights of the people come from the people themselves. In America the people are sovereign.

I read further from Mr. Ford's statement:

> The question which I think we might ask ourselves this evening is this:
>
> "What are the obligations which go with this privilege of freedom of enterprise?"
>
> To put it another way:
>
> "What is the price which the American people expect us to pay for the rights and freedoms we enjoy in American industry?"
>
> All of you will have answers of your own. Let me give you some which have occurred to me. My first could be this:
>
> The American people expect us to show leadership in tackling the economic problems of our times.
>
> We must accept the obligation of leadership primarily because if we do not do so, someone else will. And, in my opinion, there are no other qualified candidates for the job.

I may say that if the people back home would carry out the obligations which in a democracy rest upon them, and live up to the spirit of democracy that is within them, it would not be necessary for the Senate to consider legislation such as we are now debating, because they would be able to solve their problems individually and collectively. Daily I receive mail from those who have a special interest in a certain appropriation, telling me that under all circumstances the appropriation must be made, but when the

matter is analyzed closely it becomes apparent that only a few of the 140,000,000 people are interested in the appropriation, and that the small service which might be afforded by it would benefit only a few.

I now ask to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Ford on April 29 before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBLIGATIONS OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

I am very happy to be here.

For several reasons I feel very much at home. Many of the members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are manufacturers who make parts and materials for Ford cars and trucks. More than 3,300 of our dealers belong to chambers of commerce in communities throughout the United States.

The extent to which all of us as businessmen depend on each other is not, I think, fully realized by the American people. The Ford Motor Co., for example, relies on nearly 6,000 other companies for the materials, supplies, parts, and services which keep us going, and on almost 8,000 other enterprises to distribute our products.

What I would like to discuss with you this evening are certain problems which I believe we all have in common.

There probably never was a moment in history when people everywhere wanted so very much to get along with one another as they do now. We all want peace—now and for all time. We are all very conscious of the new and terrible power of atomic energy, and of the horrible consequences of another world war.

We want better understanding and greater unity at home, too. We see the costs of domestic discord. We realize that we have scarcely scratched the surface of what united effort by and for a free people can do when we remember what we accomplished in our war effort.

I think, also, we all feel that peace at home and peace abroad are related. We know that if America is to be strong enough to carry its responsibilities for peace throughout the world, we must be united and productive at home.

If progress is to be made the great future that can be achieved for all people, we know that we must somehow find ways of getting along better with one another. And yet, at a time when unity is our most critical need, we see a disposition on the part of many groups of human beings to challenge all other groups with proclamations of special and particular "rights"—very often insisting that they are fundamental human rights and, therefore, bound to be granted. We hear about the rights of management, the rights of labor, the rights of other groups. And on the world stage, we hear about the rights of nations.

We in America believe in certain "inalienable" rights—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is an article of faith with us that these rights belong to all men. In our opinion, these rights are sometimes suppressed or ignored, but they can never be taken away.

But we who so hotly defend our rights are apt to forget that there are obligations which always go with rights. Liberty is not license. Men and institutions in a democracy have a right to consider their own individual interests, to be sure. But they have an equal obligation to consider the interests of others. You and I have a right to drive an automobile—but not on the wrong side of the road. You and I have a right to publish advertisements—but not to make false claims against the public interest. You and I have a right to speak our minds—to say what we think—but we have an obligation to avoid damaging the reputations of others.

The truth of the matter is that our "rights" are really "privileges" granted by all of us to each one of us.

Freedom of speech is one of the privileges of free men, and we hold it very dear, but the American people certainly do not believe that the privilege gives American Communists a right to seek the overthrow of our Government.

Freedom of enterprise is another of the great privileges which Americans enjoy. More than anything else, it explains the position of the United States of America today. It is the foundation on which our immense achievements as a Nation have been built. What has given us our high standard of living is our capacity to produce, and our productive capacity has its roots in the vigorous competitive spirit which freedom of enterprise created.

The question which I think we might ask ourselves this evening is this:

"What are the obligations which go with this privilege of freedom of enterprise?"

To put it another way:

"What is the price which the American people expect us to pay for the rights and freedoms we enjoy in American industry?"

All of you will have answers of your own. Let me give you some which have occurred to me. My first would be this:

The American people expect us to show leadership in tackling the economic problems of our times.

We must accept the obligation of leadership primarily because if we do not do so, someone else will. And, in my opinion, there are no other qualified candidates for the job.

We dare not take this obligation lightly. We dare not overlook the dangers if we do not rise to this occasion. We must have public confidence. And the public judges us on what we accomplish—not in theoretical terms, but in terms of what Americans want out of life. Between 1936, for example, when things were not going well, and this year, when things are going better, the number of Americans who think that the Government should own electric-power companies dropped 30 percent.

When Government steps into our affairs, we all resent it, but in a democracy, when people feel that things are not going right, they turn to Government. Government "interference" is, to a considerable extent, an expression of public dissatisfaction. We Americans always want to "pass a law" to remedy whatever abuses we think exist. But just "passing laws" is not going to solve the problems we face today.

If our obligation as business leaders is to accept leadership in working toward the solution of the economic problems of our time, we ought to try to be clear as to what these problems are.

One of them, it seems to me, is achieving a steadily advancing standard of living in this country. It is true, for example, that Americans own 92 percent of all the bathtubs in the world. But it is also true that 21 percent of American homes still do not have running water and that 50 percent of our farm homes and 10 percent of all our homes still do not have electricity.

It is true that 60 percent of all the electric refrigerators in the world are found in American homes. But it is also true that nearly one-third of the 31,000,000 domestic and farm users of electricity have no electric refrigerators and that 40 percent do not have washing machines.

Americans brag about their air conditioning and are proud of the fact that 2,500,000 homes have oil burners in their basements. But it is also a fact that 58 percent of American homes still do not have central heating equipment.

Our Nation rides in millions of automobiles, but about 40 percent of American families do not have a car. Furthermore, about 2,800,000 adults in this country have had no formal education of any kind in spite of our great free educational system, and approximately 60 percent of all adults have gone no further in school than through the eighth grade. Less than 5 percent have gone through college.

There can be no question that the standard of living which we enjoy in this country has been created by freedom of enterprise. But it is still a statistical fact that 20 percent of all families in the United States earn less than $1,000 a year, and 47 percent earn less than $2,000 a year. And such incomes do not go far when things cost as much as they do today.

It is perfectly clear to me that if any system can create a higher standard of living it is only the democratic system which has already created the highest existing standard of living.

Perhaps for the very reason that the people of America have seen what business and industry have been able to accomplish in creating this standard of living, they believe that we are capable of finding an answer to other problems, too. They apparently believe that American business and industry can find an answer to problems like depressions and unstable employment. Certainly I think they expect us to make the attempt.

I do not for a moment underestimate the difficulties we face in tackling problems of this score. We have seen people turn to government for answers, and the world is littered with their tragic failures. Nations have turned to government controls and to dictatorships in a desperate search for security, and all that they have achieved is destitution, slavery, and insecurity.

Because I believe with all my heart in the superiority of democracy and human freedom over any other system, I believe that democracy alone offers hope of finding honest solutions to such basic problems. Our freedom of enterprise may well depend on how successfully we point the way.

How it is to be done, I for one do not know. I do know that it will take the daring initiative that is the essence of leadership.

And in trying to point the way, we face one harsh and unyielding fact: It is work, and not theories of social responsibility, which is basic to the success of all of us. Programs which merely drain off the accumulated savings of earlier and more vigorous times without paying their way serve only to sap our country's strength. The real objective is to keep adding to the capital of mankind by increased production and distribution.

The result is what counts. And we are always brought back to the basic measuring stick of output per person compared to rate of pay—whether that person sits in an office or works at a machine. All of us will be better off when we can pay a man $5 an hour because he produces $5 worth of effort than when we try to pay him $1.50 an hour for 75 cents worth of effort.

Our second great obligation as businessmen, it seems to me, is to achieve a better sense of partnership with the American people.

A successful partnership depends upon mutual understanding. And there are a great many things about business and industry that the American people apparently do not understand.

Public opinion polls show, for example, that 60 percent of the American people think that corporations make 25 percent or more profit each year. The fact is that the actual profit margin of all manufacturing corporations in this country during the 15 years from 1925 to 1940 was 3.2 percent of total sales. Furthermore, 58 percent of all corporate statements during that period showed a loss, not a profit.

Surveys indicate that 75 percent of industry's employees think that stockholders and top management of corporations take more out of the business than employees do. Yet, a recent study showed that 72 large industrial companies in the country paid 3 cents out of every sales dollar in the form of dividends; plowed back 1.6 cents into the business, paid 25.2 cents to employees in salaries and wages; and paid 64.2 cents to other companies for materials, parts, services, supplies, etc. Taxes took the remaining 6 cents. Employees who think that they get less than shareholders and top management actually get almost 6 times as much as the amount paid to stockholders and the amount reinvested in the business.

As to the share paid to the men of top management, if you add up all the compensation of officers of all corporations during the period from 1931 to 1941, it amounts to 2.3 percent of sales. Officers of large corporations--those with assets of $50,000,000 or more—get only one-half of 1 percent of total income from sales.

No partnership can be expected to work very well in an atmosphere clouded by such misunderstandings.

If a better sense of partnership among the many groups which make up industrial democracy is to be achieved, we in management also have a job of understanding to do—particularly those of us in mass production industries.

Mass production is something more than a proven means toward goals of the future. To the large percentage of our fellow citizens who work in industry, it is also a way of life, a day-to-day experience from which they must constantly draw a sense of satisfaction and personal accomplishment. If work under the conditions created by mass production is to give people this feeling of time and effort well spent, they need to know that their part—however small it may be—is an important part in the scheme of things.

So it seems to me that one of our obligations is to understand just what the things are that people want from their jobs in order to make their daily effort seem worth while.

In the field of selling we have shown great skill in finding out what people want. We have learned the economic advantage of determining what products will sell readily and in large volume. It is apparent that we have not done nearly so good a job in finding out what it is that men and women in industry want from their jobs—what they consider the essential ingredients of a satisfactory way of life under the conditions of modern industrial society.

We recently sent out a questionnaire to everyone who works for the Ford Motor Co. More than 22,000 of our people took the trouble to fill out the questionnaire. They had some very interesting things to say.

Thirty-nine percent of them feel that the policies of our company have never been explained to them. More than one-third have the impression that no effort is being made to make them feel a part of the Ford Motor Co. More than half of them think that there should be some systematic way by which they could make their views known directly to us. Sixty-two percent think that questionnaires and polls of this kind are a good thing because they give them a chance to express their views.

These attitudes exist in spite of the fact than an overwhelming majority of our employees think that our products—the cars and trucks they have a hand in making—are as good or better values than the products of our competitors. They exist in spite of the fact that more than half of our employees say that they feel free to talk to their immediate superiors whenever they want to about themselves and their jobs.

In short, while our productive techniques have met gigantic needs, they have also created problems. Mass production has given us a high standard of living, but it has very materially changed the relationships between a man and his job, between employer and employee, between management and labor. The old relationship between an employer and a group of employees he knew intimately does not exist for millions of men and women. Because the factory worker is a specialist, he no longer has the kind of satisfaction which a craftsman building a complete machine might enjoy.

It now seems clear that we have not kept the development of our human relations in industry in pace with the development of our production technology. Perhaps for every dollar we spent in scientific research for the development of better products and more efficient machines, we should have spent another dollar in research into the problems of people in industry.

To increase production efficiency, American businessmen invest billions of dollars annually in new plants, improved tools, better equipment and methods. During the last quarter of 1946 such expenditures were being made at the rate of $14,000,000,000 a year. To bring our customers new and constantly better products, almost 2 percent of total industry sales have been spent for long-range, scientific, research and experimentation.

Large outlays of this kind are farsighted and necessary. They are insurance on the life of any company. But to insure our right to freedom of enterprise we may now be facing an obligation to carry this kind of long-range research and experimentation into still other fields.

Let me summarize:

The rights which we all enjoy in the United States carry obligations with them. The greater the right we assert, the greater obligation we incur.

We pay for our rights continually by meeting our obligations, and when we stop paying we run the risk of losing our rights.

With the right to freedom of enterprise, Americans have fulfilled the obligation of making our country incomparably strong and prosperous. But our rights as businessmen may well depend upon our ability to continue to meet the problems of our great industrial democracy.

We have the obligation to work toward a better sense of partnership among all groups in our industrial democracy. We face the obligation to take leadership in tackling the economic problems of our times, to acknowledge our mistakes, and to keep on trying.

All other groups in our industrial democracy also have obligations. Unless labor unions and their spokesmen can live up to their responsibilities, they, too, risk curtailment or loss of rights. The American people as a whole have obligations. We of industry are partners with the people, and people have an obligation to be intelligent and understanding about their partners.

But a key responsibility is ours—an obligation of American business management. The American people expect us to manage. They look to us for leadership. They are more interested in the results we achieve than in the details of our business and in the difficulties we have to overcome. And we must accept the task of promoting better understanding between the groups of people who share the responsibility for achievement with us.

There are many problems ahead that we would all like to see solved, and the obligation of American business to demonstrate leadership in their solution is heavy. I have little doubt that if our free American industry devotes its traditional enterprise and energy to meeting this obligation, the people of the United States, working together, can continue to set a pattern of life under human freedom for the whole world to follow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made by Henry Ford, Jr., to the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1947.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was very kind of you to ask me to be your guest today, and I am happy to be here.

Nobody knows better than you men that there is a general tendency these days to talk about theories rather than practice. Perhaps that is because there are so many complex problems puzzling all of us, and we are always looking for simple solutions. There is nothing wrong with theory, of course. I spoke in pretty general terms myself last night on a subject which is of deep interest to all of us at the Ford Motor Co.

But behind all the elaborate theories for economic and social reconstruction, I think we should remember that the United States is pounding forward. A lot of concrete things are being done. America is really getting on with its job of providing better standards of living for more people, despite its problems.

And so today I come with no theories and no solutions. As a matter of fact, I don't even come here with any problems. Instead, I would like to deal in rather concrete terms and in some detail with the subject I know best—the Ford Motor Co. I would like to report briefly what's going on at Ford—what we are doing, how we are doing it, and what we are trying to achieve.

Let me take up the last item first—what we are trying to achieve. It is quite simple. We are trying to achieve leadership again in the low-priced-automobile field. To give you a rough translation, we aim to beat Chevrolet.

Taken by itself, that's a perfectly normal objective. It is what you expect in competitive industry. But in light of the abnormal convictions of the past few years, it has some significance. It means that American industry is back on the road toward hot, tough, competitive battles, and most of the good things that American industry has contributed to the general welfare have come out of just such battles.

According to our way of thinking, the buyers' market can't come any too soon. Competitive industry can't really flourish when the seller is calling the tune. That's a fat, unhealthy situation in a real industrial democracy. Under this system of ours, the customer always has to come first. When he isn't coming first, the system just can't be expected to operate right.

We at Ford have some right to talk like this, because we are a pretty big customer ourselves. People usually think of an automobile company only as a seller. Actually, the Ford Motor Co. is itself a huge market place for goods. We have almost 3,000 major suppliers and an almost equal number who sell us services and small quantities of the many things we need to put together cars and trucks. So, speaking with some authority as a customer, I can tell you that we have had considerable experience in this so-called sellers' market. It hasn't all been pleasant, either. We like to see suppliers compete for our business, just as we expect to compete for the public's business in selling cars. We aren't used to begging for supplies and materials. We don't like it, and we can certainly understand how our customers must feel. It is, as the man says, time for a change.

That is why we believe that one of the major jobs of our company, or any company I know of today, is to get flabby sales muscles in shape for the competitive punching ahead.

Let me say a little bit about our product. During the war years there was a lot of speculation about the postwar automobile—the dream car of the future. Many people apparently expected it to appear on the streets overnight. Actually, as you know, a new car comes into being only after the most painstaking effort in many directions. There are the elements of design, of new materials, of cost, of performance. And first and last, there is the question of the people's choice—of what they really want to buy.

Take, for example, this question of a light car. We at Ford have looked into this possibility at great length. We have studied and experimented with a car which would weigh approximately one-third less than a standard model. I think we have played all the changes on this notion, from five-cylinder engines through new metals and materials.

But during this research and experimentation, we went out and talked in planned interviews with thousands of people, the people who are our potential customers. We asked them what they meant by a light car, what they expected to find in a light car, what they could do without and what they couldn't do without.

Well, this survey showed that a great many people were very much in favor of a light car. They were all in favor of a lot of other things, too. They said they wanted, for instance, a light car heavy enough so that it wouldn't sway on the road at high speed, or when the wind was blowing against it. They wanted a light car which had an extra-heavy frame for stability, ash trays, bumper guards, room for a radio, and similar equipment.

In short, a close analysis of these returns soon disclosed that if we made a light car according to the specifications laid down by these people—by our customers, present and potential—it would weigh approximately the same or perhaps a little more than our present models.

It became obvious that to most people, yesterday's luxuries are today's necessities in an automobile and that when people talk about a light car, they are really asking for a low-priced car. Our objective, then, becomes a product in which you get more car for less money—a lower priced car rather than a lighter car. In other words, they are asking for pretty much what we are always trying to give them.

This is not to say that we have abandoned our research and experimentation in the so-called light car field. I should say that a good light car is still a distinct possibility for American highways.

Generally speaking, we are working toward wider rather than longer cars. More and more, people are coming to consider their automobile a living room on the road. They want more room to sit down in, and more of the comforts they associate with their own home. Such redesigning will undoubtedly be a matter of careful evolution.

The general question of production may also interest you. I wish I could tell you exactly what our present production capacity is. The simple fact is that we don't know, because we haven't had a chance since the war to run the string out. At present, we are making about 4,200 cars and trucks daily at Dearborn and in 14 other assembly plants around the country. We figure that this is roughly 65 percent of our present capacity. But we don't think that present capacity is enough. So we are putting up four new assembly plants—one at Los Angeles, one at Metuchen, N. J., one at St. Louis, and one at Atlanta. That should answer in advance any questions which might be handed up to this table about what we think the future of the American market is.

Of course, we would like to be up to capacity production right now. We just can't operate in anybody's best interest—yours or ours or our employees—at 50- or 60-percent capacity. But I think that there is little need for me to go into the reasons we are walking along rather than galloping along the production road. It is simply a case of not being able to get enough of what it takes—steel, pig iron, tin, and hundreds of other things.

I am glad to be able to say that supplies have steadied off considerably in the last few months, though at far too low a level as far as we are concerned. The supplies are low, that is—not the cost of supplies. Nevertheless, the supply situation is still spotty enough to make it necessary for us to keep improvising production methods, altering schedules, and doing a lot of things which have the undesirable result of forcing costs up and up.

As all of you know, the people who make our products, our employees, are an increasingly important factor in our over-all operations. As of the first of this month there were 129,172 people working for us in Dearborn and in various branches around the country. This number will be stepped up considerably when our new facilities are finished, and when we can get enough materials to push up our production rate. It is a pleasure to be able to report that in the 20 months since VJ-day, productivity has risen perceptibly, although it still has a long way to go. We know, though, that we cannot expect maximum productivity until we are really able to get into maximum production.

And saving the best news for the last, I am glad also to be able to report that unauthorized work stoppages during the last 12 months have dropped 60 percent from the preceding 12-month period and 82 percent from the average during the past 5 years.

Still another measure of what's going on in our employee relations perhaps can be found in the grievance record as of today. There is a significant decline here, too. During the 12 months which ended on April 1, a total of 12,196 grievances were filed. This compares with a total of 27,504 grievances filed in the preceding 12 months.

It would be foolish and dangerous to assign any single reason for this turn for the better in our relationships with the people who work for us. During the past year, however, we have had in our contract with UAW a company-security clause which we believe has been beneficial.

These are comforting indications. We are, however, a long way from feeling cocky about our relationship with our employees. Last night I gave the results of an employee questionnaire which we recently sent to all our workers. The replies to the six formal questions we asked were all publicized, and they showed a lot of very interesting things.

A majority stated candidly that they either were not aware or were quite hazy about company policies, and a similar majority didn't give us much credit for trying to make them feel a part of the company. On the other hand, almost 90 percent said they thought our products were as good or better than those of our competitors and that gave us all quite a lift. But it was in the so-called free response that we really got quite a jolt. More than 80 percent of the people who answered had complaints about supervision and about what they said was a lack of honest effort on our part to understand their problems and deal with them properly. We knew we were sticking our neck out when we distributed this questionnaire, and we expected that a lot of people would take a swing at us. You can see that, even if we take several large pinches of salt to account for intemperate answers, we have no reason at this moment to go around bragging that we are just one big happy family out at Ford. We are trying, though, and to the extent that the record shows an improvement, we are happy about our progress.

Obviously this whole field of employer-employee relations is one which we must get straightened away if we are to have any assurance whatever of prosperity and success in the future.

As far as our sales are concerned, we took orders for more cars during 1946 than during any year since 1929. But as undoubtedly a good many of you in this audience know, orders and deliveries these days are two different things. While we have manufactured more than 1,000,000 cars and trucks since VJ-day, this still is only a small percentage of what we could have manufactured if we had been able to get sufficient supplies. As of the first of this month, we had 1,778,259 orders on our books. And by way of giving an answer to people who say that demand is actually on the down grade, I would like to point out that this is 48.3 percent more orders than we had on hand on April 1, 1946. And during that 12-month period, we delivered 692,427 cars and trucks.

We can only guess at how sound this market is—how many of these orders are duplicates, etc. It is our feeling that this market is just as sound as we are able to make it, and with that remark I want finally to talk for a few moments about this thing called price. Price is the one thing that is finally going to determine the soundness of our market, and we are convinced that our market will remain sound only to the extent that we can keep lower prices.

As far as a mass production manufacturer is concerned, price is only cost spelled backwards. The hard fact of the matter is that our effort at Ford must always be to get costs down while getting quality up. We are trying to do that in a number of ways—by encouraging our employees in every way we know to better productivity; by working with our suppliers to get better parts at lower costs; by improving production methods; by studying and restudying all of our management procedures.

It must be apparent to all of you that it takes a great many people with a great many different kinds of ability to run well as large and diversified a business as an automobile company. This pattern of strong team operation has to start at top management. So in closing, I would like to mention some of the members of the top management team we are getting together at Dearborn. Most of them are well known to you, and they comprise the policy committee which meets frequently to decide on policies and programs of operations.

There's Ernie Breech, who is executive vice president; Jack Davis, in sales and advertising; John Bugas, in industrial relations; Mead Bricker, in general production; Del Harder, in manufacturing; Lewis Crusoe, in finance; Al Browning, in purchasing; Harold Youngren, in engineering; Bill Gossett, general counsel; Jim Irwin, in public relations; and my brother, Ben, who is learning the business.

I am very proud to be a member of this team. We think that these men as a group are going to know more of the answers than anyone else in the business, and will get us as soon as possible to the goal we have all set for ourselves—leadership in the low-priced car class.

This has been only a very broad glance at what we are doing, what we are thinking about, and who we are at Ford Motor Co. To be sure, there are plenty of problems. We don't have a problem, however, which we don't think we can whip. American competitive enterprise is a good system—the best there is. We hope we can do our share to make it continue to work for the benefit of everybody.

Thank you very much for your kindness in inviting me here and for your courteous attention.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sorry a stenographic record was not made of what Mr. Ford said in answer to the members of the Press Club. All who have appeared before them know that they can ask very sharp and very effective questions. But Mr. Ford acquitted himself magnificently in answering the questions put to him. If I did not believe that the two speeches I have placed in the RECORD came from this young man's heart and soul, as well as the answers he made in response to questions asked of him by the members of the press, I would not have placed the speeches in the RECORD, because I know that mere words, mere demagogic utterances, will never solve our problems. Results count, and unless we can obtain results from both labor and industry it will be a sad day for America. I do not believe we can solve our problems by laws alone. When the people judge the work performed by the Eightieth Congress they must remember, not so much the laws which shall have been passed, but the kind of laws passed and whether they were really needed for the welfare and happiness of the Nation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly in the very eloquent statement which has just been made by the Senator from Michigan. He hit the nail on the head in what he said respecting the effectiveness of legislation, so far as legal compulsion is concerned, something with which we are always faced in matters affecting human relationships, and of course what he said is especially true in the field of labor relations. At the moment it so happens we are considering an amendment which, however justifiable in the results it seeks to attain, yet is of such a type and is in such form that almost inevitably it will fail of its purpose.

The pending amendment would appear to be divided into two main proposals. One would limit collective bargaining units "to the same metropolitan district or county," and the other would prevent any labor organization from exercising authority over a subordinate labor organization in the determination of wages, hours, and working conditions. That, in substance, is the amendment before us.

Addressing myself to the pending amendment, I desire first briefly to review the historical background of industry-wide bargaining. The problem of industry-wide bargaining has been given so much attention and so many have the idea that the amendment we are now considering deals primarily with this subject, that I think it should be given consideration in the way in which I am now going to present it.

Although the fact is not generally known, industry-wide bargaining in the United States was first instituted almost 60 years ago when the workers in the pressed- or blown-glassware industry reached an agreement with an employers' association in that industry in 1888. Furthermore, no major strike has occurred in the industry within the intervening years.

It is noteworthy that similar conditions have prevailed in the pottery industry since 1922.

I point out that the 1946 contract between the National Automatic Sprinkler and Fire Control Associations and the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters, A. F. of L., is largely a revision of the original agreement established in 1915.

Moreover, the 1946 agreement between the anthracite-coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America, A. F. of L., is, for the most part, a compilation of resolutions, revisions, rulings, and decisions which date back to 1903.

I might cite other cases of this kind with significant historical backgrounds, but the ones I have indicated are sufficient to show that industry-wide bargaining is not a new development in the United States.

The following-named industries, with which I show the percentage of all workers who are covered by agreements with associations and groups of employers, is important in the consideration of this subject.

The first group of industries—and in this group I would say that from 80 to 100 percent of all the workers engaged are covered by such agreements—includes men's and women's clothing, coal mining, laundry and cleaning and dyeing, longshoring, maritime, shipbuilding and boatbuilding.

In the second group, with between 60 and 79 percent of the employees covered by industry-wide agreements, are baking, book and job printing and publishing, canning and preserving of foods, construction, dyeing and finishing of textiles, glass and glassware, malt liquors, pottery and related products, trucking, and warehousing.

In the third group, with between 40 and 59 percent of the employees covered by such agreements, are building service and maintenance, leather products, and newspaper and periodical printing and publishing.

The fourth group, in which between 20 and 39 percent of the workers employed in the industry are covered by such agreements, includes nonalcoholic beverages, hosiery, hotels and restaurants, jewelry and silverware, lumber, shoes, cut stock and findings, and other forms of trade.

The following are examples of true instances of industry-wide bargaining:

The first is the flat-glass industry. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co., with which organizations most of us are somewhat acquainted, control the major part of the production in this industry. They negotiate their agreements jointly with an A. F. of L. union and a CIO union, but each company signs a separate identical agreement. The two companies also collaborate in the administration of the agreement to assure uniform patterns of interpretation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York greatly appreciates the expression of consideration on the part of the Senator from Florida, but the Senator from New York does not wish further to belabor Members of the Senate on this subject. I think they have heard quite enough. In any event, it will be in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is one of the unhappy situations which I hope the Senate will some day remedy. Let me say to the chairman of the policy committee of the majority party that I hope that at some time or other the Senate will come to a recognition of the fact that at some part of the midday Senators need luncheon, and that we should make arrangements so that they can eat luncheon, and Senators will not have to speak to empty seats while other Senators are having their luncheon. This is a good illustration of the difficulty. The able Senator from New York is making a very fine address to the Senate, and yet he feels a diffidence about yielding for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, because he does not wish to call Senators from their luncheon.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York has a very strong idea that he understands exactly how some of the absent Senators probably feel.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, in the glass industry the certified bargaining agent for the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is a union composed of all the employees of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Mr. IVES. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. And the same thing is true of the Libby-Owens-Ford Co.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

I come now to the rubber industry. A wage increase agreement was signed on March 2, 1947. I think most of us recall it. It was very recent. Such an agreement was signed by the four largest manufacturers, and the agreement affected a large proportion of the workers in the industry.

In this connection I should like to point out to the Senate that I am not naming all the examples of industry-wide bargaining. I merely point out these three as good examples.

The third is the basic steel industry. The United Steelworkers of America first signed agreements with the United States Steel Corp. in 1937, and since then, with a few exceptions, practically all the basic steel industry has been brought under agreement.

The following are examples of collective bargaining by geographical areas, which I think should be considered in this connection in order to get the true picture:

The first is the hosiery industry. In the hosiery industry a bargaining relationship has existed between the full-fashioned hosiery manufacturers of America and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers since 1927. The employers' association, originally covering only Philadelphia mills, now covers a major part of the northern section of the full-fashioned hosiery industry.

The second is the textile industry. There are association agreements between the Textile Workers' Union of America and associations of silk and rayon mills in a number of States.

The third example is the maritime workers. The water-front employers'

association on the Pacific coast, for example, embraces employers of longshoremen along the entire west coast. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union negotiates a general cargo agreement with a coast-wide association which signs on behalf of the four local associations.

The fourth example is the pulp and paper industry. In this connection, I think it is not inappropriate for me to point out that the other day I received a plea from an industry in my own State against this particular amendment. This particular industry happens to be in the pulp and paper business. In the Pacific Northwest the Pacific Coast Association of Pulp and Paper Manufacturers deals with the two national unions in the field.

The fifth example is the fishing industry. The fishing industry, particularly on the Pacific Coast, where it is well organized, is an example of collective bargaining almost exclusively on an association basis. The employers, however, are organized into a number of separate associations.

The sixth example is the meat industry. The National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, composed of affiliated State and local associations throughout the United States, negotiates with the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workers of America. Their agreement recognizes that local conditions require local treatment, and that it is not practicable or advisable to include in the agreement questions affecting wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

The seventh example is the shipbuilding and boatbuilding industry. Most of the shipbuilding and boatbuilding industry on the west coast is covered by a master agreement negotiated by the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor.

The above background of industry and regional bargaining over long periods of time goes far toward indicating that stability of labor relations has been maintained to a considerable degree by this particular process; yet many persons think that the first portion of the pending amendment is intended to abolish the many satisfactory industry-wide or regional plans which have been established and have been in operation for many years. I think that question was cleared up pretty satisfactorily in the discussion which occurred on the floor of the Senate yesterday between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself. I believe that everyone should realize that this amendment has nothing to do directly with the type of bargaining of which I have been speaking; but there is a strong possibility that the time may come when it could have an effect upon such plans as I have indicated.

Industry-wide bargaining is working well in the case of pottery, rubber, large areas of the textile industry, men's clothing, ladies' garments, maritime shipping, and other industries. The consistent development in the direction of industry-wide bargaining shows that this has been a logical path of economic development. Only through industry-wide bargaining can substandards be raised. For example, whenever an industry has been plagued by the run-away shop problem, consisting principally of incompetent manufacturers seeking to compete with New York City producers by escaping to lower wage areas under non-union conditions, the result of such efforts to avoid industry-wide bargaining has been to debase labor standards, both where the industries are principally established and where competitors spring up in other areas.

Industry-wide or regional bargaining avoids the necessity of many negotiations conducted with many different employers. It represents substantial savings in time and effort both to industry and to labor organizations in negotiating contracts. It enables groups of small employers—and I want to emphasize this—to protect themselves against the large labor unions by keeping the unions on terms of approximate equality through an employer association, and avoids conditions by which unions sometimes pick off one employer after another. It enables the union to scale down the demands of any particularly militant group or to raise the demands of any particularly apathetic group of employees who threaten to put certain companies at a great advantage or a great disadvantage in their competitive markets.

This matter was thoroughly canvassed, as was pointed out yesterday, when the Clayton Act was passed, and resulted in the legislative declaration that the labor of a human being is not a commodity. This was a recognition of the fact that wages are not a mere item of cost but represent the living standards of the great mass of the people.

Furthermore, surprising as it may seem, this condition does not necessarily lead to monopoly. Employers still compete in production efficiency, worker morale, favorable plant locations, and other factors. By withdrawing labor as an element in competition the problems which have existed in coal and textiles, where benevolent employers have been unable to raise wages because of low-wage competition in other areas, are avoided.

The situation in the steel industry which has been cited during this debate is not truly typical. It offers no suitable example of prevailing conditions. It rises largely from the fact that the industry has traditionally recognized both the price and wage leadership of Big Steel. Thus the union has had no alternative except to refuse to settle until a settlement with the United States Steel Corp. has been reached.

As I have previously stated, the net effect of the incorporation of this amendment in Senate bill 1126 would be to place outside the protection of the statute all collective bargaining under all circumstances in units larger than a single employer or covering more than a single metropolitan district or county where employers are involved.

In passing, however, I should like to point out that nowhere in the bill is the term "metropolitan district" defined, and that in defining it administratively the National Labor Relations Board might well be faced with an impossible task. I have been rather curious, myself, about what might be construed as a metropolitan district. During our discussions in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare there were a number of different ideas expressed as to just what might be meant by this term. Personally, I had a feeling that if anything of this type were to be incorporated it ought to provide something which would include trade area. I think trade area far more nearly expresses the idea which many of us have when we talk about metropolitan districts. However, the matter is left as it is, and I can very well see an opportunity in the future, if it is ever incorporated in the statute, for a vast amount of litigation in trying to determine in some section of the country exactly what is intended to be included in the term.

Looking for a moment to the administrative difficulties which would be encountered let us consider the following——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Surely.

Mr. TAFT. I think the difficulty is the definition of "trade area." A metropolitan district has a precise definition. In the Census Bureau it has been used in preparing the census. So I think it does have a definite meaning. I agree with the Senator that it might be wise to make a specific definition of it, if such a definition can be framed. On the question of trade area, if we define it as an area a little larger than a metropolitan district, I do not think it really means anything. If the Senator could suggest a clearer definition, I should be glad to accept it.

Mr. IVES. The Senator will well recall our personal discussions on that very point.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. IVES. I think we cannot assume that the definition in the census report would always be the final definition of a metropolitan district. My problem, as the Senator will recall, is the fact that I thought a metropolitan district limitation was altogether too small. I do not think it is truly realistic. Presumably, we do not know whether the trade-area approach is realistic, but certainly, to my way of thinking—and I think the Senator will agree that this is merely a matter of opinion—the term "trade area" far more nearly approaches what I have in mind than does the idea of a metropolitan district. As a matter of fact, going into this matter and being realistic about it, instead of using the word "county," we might properly use the word "State." The State of New York, for example, has a provision in its Labor Relations Act covering multiple-employer unit bargaining. That came about very definitely because under the State Labor Relations Act of New York State there are many requirements in the State for that type of bargaining and that type of approach. Consequently, we found it necessary to provide in the statute a permissive section to allow that type of bargaining. Multiple-employer unit bargaining is nothing new in this country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that the phrase "metropolitan district"

should include an area which covers one or more States? Take, for example, the Port of New York Authority, which covers two States. Does the Senator think that a metropolitan district, under the meaning of the amendment, would go outside of the borders of a State?

Mr. IVES. The question of New York City and the particular area around New York City was what was bothering me when I was trying to determine what definition should be used, if it were to be used in this connection; and when I suggested "trade area," I was aware that the metropolitan district of New York in one sense includes part of New Jersey and perhaps some of Connecticut, but it certainly goes away beyond any county lines. Whether that is contemplated or not I do not know, and whether we can combine other cities with New York City in a metropolitan district I do not know. Jersey City, Newark, and several smaller cities are in the same area. I do not know what the answer is. Maybe the census definition would cover it, but I doubt it.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I asked the question is that there might be cases of bargaining which are not Nation-wide and not industry-wide, but might cover more than one municipality and more than one employer. So the question of exactly what is meant by "metropolitan district" becomes very much a fundamental question indeed.

Mr. IVES. It is fundamental to me. I desire to have the Senator understand that. That is one of the reasons why I opposed this amendment to the bill. I had visions of very serious complications in the Greater New York City area with the terminology expressed in the bill. I think very definitely if this be considered from a very serious standpoint—and presumably that is what we are doing at the present time—something should be done to write into the bill a definition of what is meant by "metropolitan district." Unless that is done, I think we might find ourselves in very serious difficulty, were this type of term, undefined, to be placed in a statute.

Mr. LODGE. In Massachusetts the metropolitan district is defined by State law.

Mr. IVES. In that case there might be no difficulty.

Mr. LODGE. It takes in Boston and a certain number of communities around Boston. But there are a number of communities that are not actually within the metropolitan district, but are on the edge of it, whose economic interests, insofar as this bill is concerned, are absolutely identical.

Mr. IVES. Of course that, again, is the problem which arises in connection with defining the term "metropolitan district." It all goes to show how almost impossible it is to write a satisfactory definition of the term, based on the conditions with which we are actually faced. We can write a definition arbitrarily, but the chances are that it would not work in some communities.

That is my thought in connection with the term "trade area." Of course, I realize that the entire United States is a trade area, if we wish to consider it in that way. So we would run into complications in that respect. I recognize that.

But it all goes to show the actual lack of consideration of this particular amendment and of this bill. We simply do not have the answers, as is perfectly evident in this instance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. At a later hour this afternoon, I intend to discuss the problem in connection with the term "metropolitan area," and I intent to point out that it is so uncertain a concept that it would give rise, in my judgment, to confusion, rather than clarity, in the handling of labor cases. But I do not have at tongue's tip the definition of "metropolitan area" as used by the Census Bureau. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has it, I wonder whether he will have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have sent for it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall greatly appreciate having the Senator from Ohio interrupt me when that definition arrives, because I think it should be in the RECORD.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. IVES. Surely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the discussion of "multi-employer." Does the Senator from New York feel that the pending amendment, if adopted, would prevent a group of employers from making an agreement with a trade organization or union?

Mr. IVES. Oh, no. As was pointed out so well by the Senator from Ohio yesterday in explanation of this matter, it would still be possible to have agreements; contracts still could be drafted. But the matter of collective bargaining and the certification of units would be absolutely outlawed.

So to a certain extent a definite limitation will be placed in the way of the arrival at such contracts or agreements. There is no argument about that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. IVES. Surely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should be very glad to have the Senator make clear for me and for others, perhaps, who are very much interested in this phase of the subject, whether it is outlawed.

Mr. IVES. It is not outlawed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understood the Senator to say so.

Mr. IVES. I said that from a practical standpoint we would run into extreme difficulties. For instance, we would run into difficulty under the following circumstances: If a question arises in a case in which a group of employers is concerned, in an area larger than a metropolitan district or a county, wherein all the employers and all the employees working for those employers in that area—and they might be different; they might be in the same industry, but conceivably they might be in different industries—when there is an election for certification purposes, to decide whether they shall be recognized or whether, in fact, they are going to have a union, then under this provision that cannot be done. So to that extent the ability of employer groups to get together with employees is definitely restricted and limited.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. IVES. Surely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me present a concrete case. Perhaps it will clarify the matter. Let us take the case of the glass workers' industry or some portions of it. They make their agreement with an association of glass manufacturers. In other words, all the manufacturers within a certain association will make an agreement with representatives of the union. Some may be outside the association, and not members of it; and in such cases they make individual contracts with those who are outside the association. Would the pending amendment, in the opinion of the Senator from New York, prevent that group from bargaining as is done today in the glass industry?

Mr. IVES. It would depend upon the area, in the first place; and it would also depend upon the kind of bargaining they were doing. If it is a question of certification, if it is a question in which the National Labor Relations Board is concerned, if it is a question of area or limitation of area, and if the area does not conform to the limitations prescribed under the bill, yes, I think the bill would interfere. But if it is a matter of agreement or contract, that is something else. In that particular instance I do not think the bill would interfere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for another question, let me inquire whether it would interfere with having the labor organization deal with the group as a whole within a State, covering the whole State, or within parts of two States. Those are two propositions.

Mr. IVES. Let us get this matter clearly in mind. The Senator from West Virginia is talking about the question of the unit of bargaining which is limited to the metropolitan district or county. The Senater is not talking about any other section or portion of the pending amendment, I take it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; my question relates to the matter as it addresses itself to the practical situation, which is what I have tried to present, namely, coming to terms as to pay, hours, and conditions of work.

Mr. IVES. Presumably, by the voluntary processes which are already available, if a system has grown up or if a policy has been established over the years, by which those matters have been arrived at, if agreements have been reached during the past, they come to be a part of the policy and tradition, and I do not think this would in any way interfere with them. But I am speaking only of this part now, not the other part, where some employers of whom I know, to wit, the employers in the set-up

the Senator has been discussing, and a few others I have heard about, have serious objection. But I shall refer to that a little later.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that those employers are not objecting, and particularly the employees are not objecting, to the present system.

Mr. IVES. No; I am talking about the situation under the pending amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. With regard to the situation in the plate-glass industry, in which perhaps the Senator is interested, let me say that the plate-glass industry is practically dominated by the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the Libby-Owens-Ford Co. The present situation is that the bargaining agent for all the seven plants of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is the union representing all the employees. I think the same is true in the case of the plants of the Libby-Owens-Ford Co.

So the contract is signed between the union, representing all the employees of the seven plants, scattered in different States, of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and with that company.

Another contract is signed between the employees of the Libby-Owens-Ford Co. and that company. However, in their negotiations they all meet together—the two companies and all the representatives of the employees.

That condition may continue under this bill exactly as it is today. The certified bargaining agent of the employees is a company-wide union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator refer to the condition under the bill or under the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I am talking about the amendment. It may continue exactly as it is under present conditions.

The only effect that I can see of the amendment on that situation would be that if the officers of the national union were to order the Libby-Owens-Ford employees to strike, they would not have to do so.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is the chief difference. That is the effect of this amendment, and so far as I can see, is its only effect. There is nothing in it to prevent the continuation of the joint bargaining arrangements which, in effect, in that case amount to industry-wide bargaining arrangements.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing to prevent that from continuing as it is. As a matter of fact, today, if the union representing the Pittsburgh Plate Glass employees wishes to withdraw from that arrangement, it can do so. I mean that those two unions are so powerful that they dominate the international, in effect, as a practical matter, in that particular industry.

So I do not see that it has any effect, as a practical matter, on the particular situation in that industry, which is dominated by the two large companies.

Mr. IVES. I should like to comment on the Senator's very able and excellent explanation, in which I concur, so far as he goes. Unfortunately, there might be matters arising aside from the question of strikes, such as the determination of conditions involved, where a particular local was concerned.

Under the second part of the amendment, a local could pull away from the parent organization and bargain directly with the employer. I do not see that that would likely happen in the case of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. or the Libby-Owens-Ford Co., but it could happen under the set-up here proposed and now pending.

I think one of the reasons why the Pittsburgh Plate Glass and the Libby-Owens-Ford people are so disturbed about the pending amendment is that they recognize that such a condition would be possible under it, whereas today, in order to do the very thing indicated, they would have to pull away completely from the parent organization. I have a long telegram from them about the matter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that if all the employees, or a large majority of the employees, of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. want to make some special arrangement which perhaps the employees of the Libby-Owens-Ford Co. do not want to make, they ought to have the power to do it, under American principles of government? There must be some 25,000 or 50,000 of them.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York is not entering into any controversy as to the merits of any particular dispute which might arise between employees of the Libby-Owens-Ford Co. and the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the company management itself. What the Senator from Ohio says is absolutely correct, but let me state the point I wish to emphasize. Suppose a particular union in a particular part of those two corporations should decide that that particular union wanted something by the way of an arrangement with the management which might not be too good for the rest of the locals in the over-all set-up, and yet at the same time something which the management itself might possibly desire. I doubt that such a situation would arise, but it could arise. Suppose a particular local had an idea of its own that it wanted to insist on. Suppose it held a key spot in the over-all organization. Suppose it said, "We will bottle you up"—I am not trying to make a pun merely because I am talking about a glass company—"We will bottle you up if you do not go along with what we are trying to do, what we want." Under the pending amendment they could pull away from the parent organization, and perhaps get away with their desires. I think that is one of the reasons why all the Libby-Owens-Ford and the Pittsburgh Plate Glass people are so disturbed about this particular amendment. Their relationship has been very remarkable over the years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been an extremely satisfactory relationship, and that, I understand, is why the workers, and the employers as well, do not want it disturbed. When the Senator gives his illustration of one particular union or unit within a plant pulling away under the pending amendment, cannot that be done today under the present law?

Mr. IVES. Oh, yes; they can do that. The difference is merely this, that under the present law the local pulling away would virtually, in effect, have to sever its connection with the parent organization. Under the amendment they could still keep that connection, theoretically, and get away with it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The whole relation, which has been good, has been based on the desire of the two sides to work together.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The same evil the able Senator finds with the pending amendment really exists today, under the present law, as I see it.

Mr. IVES. I did not intend to take up that angle of the discussion, as it will come up for future consideration, but I will say that the only difference is that today there is a condition under which such a pulling away would be far less likely than under the conditions which would prevail were the amendment to become a part of the statute. There will be something which I shall touch on a little later, not only a natural attachment, to a certain extent a local attachment, where the parent is concerned, but there will be more than that, in a way, there will be a relationship where responsibility is concerned, where the parent is involved. Put this kind of an amendment into the law, and that responsibility may pretty well evaporate in certain instances. There is a great deal to this. We do not see all on the surface; yet we do see plenty on the surface.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The pending amendment has been discussed at great length, and I think it is well worth while that it has been, because the abuses which have arisen in certain industries have been pointed out.

Mr. IVES. Yes; those abuses which might arise.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Now we are talking about the dangers which might be encountered if we change the present situation, and it comes down to a question of weighing one against the other, and the wisdom of the legislation.

Mr. IVES. Not exactly that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have not been privileged to hear everything the Senator from New York has said since the discussion started, but does he propose to offer any amendment to the pending amendment to cure the evil he speaks of?

Mr. IVES. No; because of the approach it makes, it is impossible to amend the pending amendment and do what is intended to be done by it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why is it impossible?

Mr. IVES. Because of the fundamental difficulty attached to the prin-

ciple of permitting a local to withdraw from a parent organization in any way, shape, or manner, thereby to a large extent destroying the responsibility of the parent organization. I recognize the problem. The Senator from Ohio and I are in full accord in recognizing the problem. That is not where our difficulty arises. Our difference is in the manner of approach, which developed yesterday afternoon to some extent.

I do not feel that our country is going to wrack and ruin between now and next winter if the pending amendment shall not be adopted. I mean that the adoption of the amendment, even its enactment into law, would not be the cause for any such condition. As I see it, a great deal of trouble can come about—and I shall develop that later in what I have to say—if the amendment shall be adopted. It will be very harmful—or could be in some instances—to a satisfactory, happy labor relationship between management and labor.

We should not be adopting provisions which are not going to improve that relationship, and that is what I am fearful of in connection with the amendment. I think an answer can be found, and in assuming a position on this question I did not take the negative, I did not merely obstruct and say, "No; this is wrong; the dickens with it." The answer is in the bill, but is not in the bill in the form of a provision for compulsion by law. It is in the form of a provision for the creation of a joint congressional committee one of the chief functions of which, by mandate of the bill, is to go into this whole industry-wide relationship and determine, if possible, what legislation can be proposed which will meet the problem as we know it to exist and other problems which we may find to exist, or which the committee may find to exist, and come back to the Congress next February 15, or before that time, with a legislative proposal for this purpose. The problem with us today is one the answers to which we simply do not have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator said a few moments ago that he felt that the pending amendment dealing with this subject could not be amended, that it was not possible to amend it to eliminate the evil he points out in it today, from his viewpoint.

Mr. IVES. It cannot be amended and have the amendment carry out the purpose which is intended by it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Which purpose is to permit a local to withdraw from the national organization, is it not?

Mr. IVES. No; a local can withdraw from the national organization without the amendment. A local can withdraw from the national organization today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what I thought.

Mr. IVES. The purpose behind the amendment is to allow a local to disregard the national organization whenever it may see fit to do so, and reach any agreement of any kind with the employer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. For that matter, the possibilities are very much the same; they can withdraw today.

Mr. IVES. That is correct, and in that connection probably the effect would be very similar, although there would be an incentive, under this particular amendment, to have them do that very thing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator feel that it is a bad thing, to give the local organization autonomy to act for itself when in its wisdom and for its benefit it desires to do so, and particularly in view of the fact it may do so today?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York, will have more to say on this subject in his subsequent remarks, but the answer he would give to the question is that it is not primarily a question of local autonomy, as the Senator from West Virginia himself has so well pointed out. The authority to act and the right to act rest basically at present with the local labor union. The labor union can act at the present time. It is the other things that creep into the picture to which I particularly object; and I shall in due course discuss them.

Looking for a moment to the administrative difficulties which would be encountered by the adoption of the amendment, let us consider that the National Labor Relations Board might have to carve up certain existing, long-established units, operating under satisfactory collective-bargaining contracts. Certain companies now operate as a single business enterprise with direct control of labor relations vested in a single place. In certain cases, employers engaged in the same industry have voluntarily formed trade or employer associations, to which they have delegated the right to bargain collectively for all the members.

The practice of successful collective bargaining in these industries might be seriously impaired, unless all the plants involved happened to be within the same "metropolitan district or county." It has been said, moreover, that in the shipping industry, which I cited, where the men work for one employer one day, and for another, the next, and where employers and employees have identical interest and problems, and have bargained on a broad basis historically, abandonment of the multiemployer collective-bargaining idea or policy might prove disastrous.

The provision in question would be likely to increase substantially the number of cases coming before the Board. The processing of such cases would be at times extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In regard to the maritime industry, the fact is, is it not, that witnesses in behalf of the industry testified to the effect that it would produce chaos within the industry if it were required to give up multiemployer bargaining?

Mr. IVES. That is correct. I used the word "disastrous," but perhaps had I used the more accurate word, I should have said "chaos."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of the question or comment by the Senator from Oregon, as I understand it, it is not the position of the Senator from New York that the adoption of the pending amendment would suspend or put an end to multi-employer bargaining if there were a desire to continue it.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from West Virginia understand the question of certification?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. IVES. No certification of a nature broader than that which falls within the limits prescribed in the amendment, namely, the "metropolitan district or county," would be possible. That would be the limitation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If employees, beyond that, desired the national organization to represent them, the area embraced could be broader than that of the metropolitan district could it not?

Mr. IVES. If there were no question of certification, yes; but, of course, under those conditions, the employer himself, or the group of employers, could refuse to acquiesce. Employers, in order to be certain they were bargaining within the new law, would be likely to request Board certification before bargaining or continuing to bargain with any union; that is, in any case in which doubt existed. Only by a Board certificate of recent issue could an employer be sure that the union had been expanded beyond the employees of the particular employer or the metropolitan district or county. The Board might thus be faced with a hundred, perhaps thousands, of representation cases, whenever contracts were to expire.

In each such case, as well as in cases arising under the refusal to bargain, under section 8 (a) (5) of the National Labor Relations Act, the Board would have to determine whether the union also represented employees of other employers, and, if so, whether they were all located within the same metropolitan district or county. The Board would also have to decide in each such case what the geographical limits of the metropolitan district were.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asked me to interrupt him at any time that I might have a definition of "metropolitan district."

Mr. IVES. I am glad to be interrupted at this point, because we have just now reached the subject of the metropolitan district.

Mr. TAFT. The Census Bureau furnishes the information that there has been set up in the 1940 census, and since then, the classification of "metropolitan district," in connection with each city of 50,000 or more population, two or more cities sometimes being within one district, the general plan being to include in a district, in addition to the central city or cities, all adjacent and

contiguous minor civil divisions or incorporated places, having a population of 150 or more per square mile. So that, reducing that to a definition, if we should include a definition, which I think probably I shall suggest, the definition would read as follows:

A metropolitan district shall be defined as any city of 50,000 population or more, together with all adjacent and contiguous incorporated places and minor civil divisions having a population of 150 or more per square mile.

It might be said, "regardless of the State in which it is located" because in numerous instances the metropolitan districts extend over several States. The metropolitan district of the city of New York, for instance, includes Newark, Jersey City, and the surrounding cities in New Jersey.

Mr. IVES. It also includes a small section of Connecticut.

Mr. TAFT. I have not looked up the question of Connecticut. In the case of Cincinnati the metropolitan district extends over into Kentucky. That definition is one which has been used by the Census Bureau for at least 8 years, and I think it might be desirable to write it into the provision.

There is this possibility, which I have considered also. It might be said that "the metropolitan district shall also include territory," we will say, "within 10 miles of the census district"; because there might be scattered plants in places where there is no population. They are sometimes found on the outskirts of a district.

This is not my final suggestion of a definition, but I state it at this time for the information of the Senator. I shall try to work out a suitable definition.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York thanks the Senator from Ohio. It is certainly a vast improvement over the present language. The Senator from New York, however, is inclined to believe that any mileage limitation placed on provisions of this kind would be perhaps a little unrealistic, because, after all, they affect matters of community interest to employers and employees. I do not know whether the particular definition can be broadened to include that idea or not.

Mr. TAFT. As to my suggestion regarding mileage, it is my thought that that would not affect the district itself. I imagine that the metropolitan district of New York, for instance, must extend, from one end to the other, for probably several hundred miles. I do not know how far.

Mr. IVES. If it extended several hundred miles in one direction, it would wind up in the mountains.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but I mean that from one point to another there might be such a distance.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. My suggestion was that we might add a kind of periphery around the census metropolitan districts, which are based on area population, because there might be industrial plants which would be, as they are now, often located on the extreme outskirts of the metropolitan district. However, I shall submit to the Senator later a complete definition.

Mr. IVES. I fully agree that that at least is a definition. I think it might become the subject of much litigation, if it were ever incorporated within the amendment, but we would at least know in some degree where we were.

Obviously, the necessity for making determinations of the kind I have mentioned interfere with the processing of all Board cases. I may remark in that connection that I do not think that the new definition we have listened to would completely eliminate troublesome questions, such as some of those I have already indicated.

At this point I should like to quote from a statement in the New York Times magazine section of January 12, 1947, by Dr. Sumner H. Schlichter, Lamont University professor at Harvard University, entitled "To End Strike in Essential Industries":

The proposal to prohibit industry-wide bargaining would obviously not reach the problem presented by electric light and power companies, gas companies, and telephone companies.

In these cases there is usually only one company in the market.

Even in other industries the prevention of industry-wide bargaining would not prevent industry-wide shut-downs. The United Steelworkers have no industry-wide contracts, and yet the union shut down the steel industry last winter by the simple process of terminating all of its contracts simultaneously.

The prohibition of industry-wide bargaining could impose a grievous burden on employers because it would help unions pursue the policy of picking them off one by one.

Employees who sought to protect themselves against this tactic by organizing and bargaining as a unit (as they have in many instances) would be halted by the prohibition of industry-wide bargaining. Many large employers, it is true, are strongly opposed to industry-wide bargaining, but for many small employers bargaining as a group is their only hope of gaining some rough equality with large and powerful unions.

I have already pointed that out.

The proposals that unions be limited in the proportion of men or plants in an industry which they may organize have not been carefully worked out. Occasionally one meets the suggestion that unions be limited to a single company.

This would mean over 150,000 unions in manufacturing alone.

A less extreme proposal is that any union be prohibited from controlling more than a given fraction (say one-fourth or one-third) of the employees in an industry or an occupation.

Breaking up unions into several in each industry would not prevent the public from being completely deprived of service in such industries as electric light and power, gas, or telephone, where one company ordinarily serves an entire city or region. Even in railroading, breaking up the unions would fail to protect many thousands of communities from being completely deprived of railroad service because many towns have only one railroad.

In other industries, three or four unions would be a headache.

The unions would be either in competition or in collusion. Competition would make them tough customers for employers, because each union would be afraid that its rivals would accuse it of being "reasonable" or "soft."

Hence competition between unions for prestige and influence would produce bad industrial relations and would tend to increase strikes.

Competition in the course of time would probably lead to collusion between the several unions. If that occurred the purpose of the policy of breaking up the unions would be defeated.

Collective bargaining to a large extent has grown up over the years to meet the needs not only of the employer and unions negotiating the agreement, but also the characteristic problems of the industry involved. Industry-wide bargaining in some industries has been both desirable and helpful; in a few industries it has retarded negotiations and proved inappropriate. Some of those cases have been brought up during this debate.

In many industries both employers and unions have considered it to their common advantage to negotiate contracts which cover only local areas or single plants. In other industries the bargaining unit and the terms and conditions of employment have been handled on a larger area basis.

The process of collective bargaining by its very nature should be as free as possible, if it is to be successful, and the employer and the union should be given sufficient latitude in which to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement.

It seems to be generally recognized that collective bargaining should never be placed in a legislative straitjacket.

Our economy is dynamic in character, as we all know, and our means of transportation, communication, marketing, and production are constantly changing. To deprive employers and employees of the opportunity to adapt their bargaining procedures to these changes in our economic life would promote and not reduce friction and dispute. The philosophy that strikes can be prevented by localing negotiations is without foundation in fact.

As I have already indicated, employers have frequently been handicapped by the technique used by some unions of playing one employer off against another, thus obtaining particular advantages or better terms in one plant than in another, regardless of the circumstances of the individual company or industry. Bargaining on a larger area basis tends to prevent these frictions and pressures on employers and to stabilize industrial conditions.

In this connection it should be observed that standardization of wages and working conditions reduces these factors as cost items in the field of competition. This condition, however, does not mean absolute uniformity in wages and working conditions. There are at the present time wage differentials for particular areas, even though bargaining may be on a national base. I spoke about that yesterday in connection with one of the questions which was raised during the discussion over the agreements which have been reached through the International Lady Garment Workers Union, and I think the Amalgamated in some instances, where they have plants in Connecticut and in New Jersey as well as in the city of New York. It does not pull the wage level in the outlying areas up to the New York City level, where it has to be reasonably high because of the cost of

living there, nor does it reach a condition where it would perhaps pull the New York City wage level down to the level in the outlying areas, where the cost of living is not so high. What it does is to protect the New York City level and at the same time assure the outlying communities of a reasonably high standard of living for all those employed in the particular industry.

Moreover, as I have already pointed out, wages and labor costs are not identical. For example, two employers in the same line of business may pay the same wage rates, but there may be wide differences in their labor costs due to differing types of machinery, methods of production, labor relations, and other factors.

A recent study by Lester and Roble, of Princeton University, indicates that relative stability was obtained in the several industries they studied, which include pressed and blown glassware, pottery, stone, full-fashioned hosiery, silk and rayon dyeing and finishing, flat glass, and the west coast pulp and paper industry.

Inasmuch as the general conclusions reached by the Princeton study are of importance in the consideration of this subject, I cite them. They are as follows:

1. Under national or regional bargaining, wage decisions are likely to be more sensible and farsighted, taking into consideration the economic interests as a whole, than is the case where the wage pattern for the industry is established by local bargaining, with the union playing one firm against the other.

2. Generally speaking, wage and earning levels do not appear to have risen more rapidly under national and regional bargaining than for manufacturing as a whole. Levels of wages in the industries studied are not high in comparison with similar occupations in other industries.

3. Wage patterns under national and regional collective bargaining apparently have not served to place any additional restraint on technological improvement and new investment.

4. Monopolistic or collusive practices with regard to wages and economic changes have not characterized any of the industries studied. To the contrary, elimination of wage cutting has tended to stress efficiency of management as the most important factor in competition.

5. Local interests and the interests of smaller firms have generally been well represented in wage negotiations under national or regional bargaining in the industries studied.

6. Judging from the experience in these industries, friction and labor strife was reduced through national or regional bargaining. Concentration of change in wage rates in one industry-wide determination has avoided the labor unrest and series of strikes that often accompany competition between the firms in the timing of wage changes, or competition between rival unions in exacting concessions from employers.

Turning to the second part of the proposed amendment, which its proponents state is aimed at providing more autonomy for local unions, I point out that this provision would tend further to resist industry-wide bargaining, although some of its proponents appear to insist that this is not its real purpose. Contrary to the position of some advocates of this portion of the amendment, it could actually prevent industry-wide bargaining in some areas and in some industries, since obviously such bargaining could not be carried on if the employees of each employer were independently to exercise the right to settle with their own employer. Obviously uniformity of wage rates could be achieved only with great difficulty if locals were encouraged to reach agreements on terms different from those applying to the industry as a whole.

The Secretary of Labor observed in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that in many situations in which it has been impossible to obtain settlements with local unions he has called upon the heads of international and national unions of the AFL, the CIO, and even independents, and that they have sent representatives into the field who have succeeded in inducing local unions to reach agreements which had otherwise been impossible of attainment.

He also pointed out that the committees of local unions are sometimes untrained and may be dominated by much more irresponsible elements than is the case with national or international organizations.

Almost without exception, persons who had intimate experience with employer-employee relations emphasize that national labor organizations are a restraining influence upon the membership rather than the reverse.

In this connection, I should like to read a very brief excerpt from a press report of last week which I happened to notice in reading the newspaper. It is a very good example of just exactly what I am talking about. It frequently occurs that this type of report appears in the press, although some of us, for one reason or another, do not always see them. This is an Associated Press dispatch from Pittsburgh:

WILDCAT STEEL STRIKE COSTS UNION CHARTER—CIO SUSPENDS OFFICERS, WARNS PENNSYLVANIA MEN

PITTSBURGH, April 28.—The Congress of Industrial Organization-United Steelworkers said tonight the union has suspended the officers and charter of a local at the Copperweld Steel Co., in Glassport, Pa., as a result of a wildcat strike.

The move was approved earlier in the day by directors of the union only after 1,100 strikers had been warned that a continuation of their walk-out would result in suspension.

Tom Burke, a field representative in district 18, was named to take over the local as administrator this morning.

A spokesman for the union named the suspended officers as Stephen Follier, president of local 147, John Martino, vice president; Herbert Hill, recording secretary, and Clifford Woods, Robert Housaman, Frank Lloyd, and Thomas Borucki, members of the grievance committee.

John Murray, district 18 director, said both the company and the international union were willing that the dispute, arising from the suspension of seven officers for failure to report for work, be placed in the hands of a mediator or arbitrator. The local union rejected the offer.

In this connection, again I point out the serious consequences which can ensue when the responsibility of the parent organization, whether it be a national organization or an international organization, is seriously impaired. I believe that one of the objectives we have had all along in our efforts to improve the relationship between labor and management has been to increase responsibility on the part of labor. There has been a general feeling that there has not always been a sense of responsibility so far as organized labor is concerned, which is essential to bringing about an appropriate relationship with management. I do not mean by that statement that management itself has always been clear of the charge of lack of responsibility. There are a number of cases, of course, in which that has been the case. However, on the whole the general effort through the years has been to produce some kind of procedure whereby greater responsibility can be placed upon labor. In the over-all picture this can be done only by placing the responsibility at the top. It cannot be done by placing it on the lower level. The citation which I have just read to the Senate indicates exactly the type of condition of which I am speaking.

The effectiveness of national and international unions in helping to maintain industrial peace would be seriously curtailed if they were to be eliminated from bargaining activities. For the most part, national and international unions have insisted upon the observance of agreements and upon union responsibility. To remove them from the field of participation in which their authority, discipline, and responsibility have been so effective in helping to reach many satisfactory agreements between local unions and employers, and in helping to insure observance of such agreements after they have been reached, would only result in increasing confusion, controversy, and strife.

Finally, the proposal now before us in the form of the pending amendment would not only have the effect of impairing the responsibility of our major labor organizations in many instances, but by this same process it would act as a force in helping to bring about the disintegration and destruction of organized labor itself.

On the whole, the record of organized labor in the United States has been highly commendable. Organized labor has been one of the mightiest forces in our economy by which we have been able to preserve our free capitalistic society. Removal of the influence of organized labor in large areas of our economy might well leave those areas open to sinister influences of a type which I leave to the imagination. Most of all, the elimination of trade-unionism as an influence in our society would probably contribute more than anything else to the destruction of freedom in America.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will maintain order. Under the rules of the Senate, no demonstrations of approval or disapproval are permitted.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if we had before us a proposal which would definitely remedy the undesirable conditions

which pertain in some areas of industry-wide bargaining, without at the same time producing consequences which might be even more undesirable than the conditions which would be eliminated, I should certainly favor such a proposal.

As the matter now stands, the amendment before us not only fails to solve the most serious problem inherent in industry-wide bargaining—the monopoly problem—because its provisions can be so easily evaded through indirection, collusion, and deliberate bypassing, but it also provides the medium by which to permit conditions which are far more deplorable than anything now existing that may be attributable to industry-wide bargaining. In other words, the pending agreement would not do what many think it is intended to do, and it might do much which is definitely undesirable.

Presumably the two unfavorable aspects of industry-wide bargaining, above all others, which we would seek to eliminate by this type of legislation, are, first, the industry-wide work stoppage which produces Nation-wide economic paralysis and even suffering, and, second, the tendency toward monopoly which is apt to be present in nearly every type of industry-wide bargaining. The bill before us, in its present form and without further amendment, provides the remedy by which to meet any threat of industry-wide work stoppage of the kind I have mentioned. Nothing in the pending amendment would have any preventive force in that connection or would in any way strengthen the bill in dealing with that kind of crisis.

In the résumé of the history and conditions pertaining to industry-wide or regional bargaining which I have given it would appear evident that a bargaining unit confined to a company or group of companies or employers in a metropolitan district or county is an extremely unrealistic approach to the solution of this over-all problem. As a matter of fact, I doubt that anyone knows the unit of bargaining which should be specified for this purpose.

Before any formula or limitation can be appropriately placed in the law to control this type of bargaining a careful and complete survey of all major industry in the United States would appear necessary. Even after such a survey no uniform plan or pattern might be found to be possible, and in this case further exploration and investigation along other lines would probably be required.

In any event, it should be obvious that at the present time we are very far from knowing what the appropriate collective bargaining unit should be in industry-wide bargaining.

The hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the discussions by the members of the committee among themselves, and the debate now in progress on the floor of the Senate, all indicate that we do not possess a sufficient knowledge of the subject of industry-wide bargaining to enable us adequately or satisfactorily to provide by statute at this time the remedies which ultimately must be found by which to correct the conditions which all of us recognize demand correction.

Because of this very situation, in title IV, in line 20 of page 55 of the bill itself, there appears a special mandate to the committee, which would be created by the terms of title IV, to study and investigate "the methods and procedures for best carrying out the collective-bargaining processes, with special attention to the effects of industry-wide or regional bargaining upon the national economy."

The committee, moreover, would be mandated to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 15, 1948, "the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable."

I repeat, such provision in the bill itself is recognition of the fact that we have not yet found the answers to the questions inherent in the problem of industry-wide bargaining. However, by these same provisions in the bill the way is provided by which to secure the answers we are seeking.

No, Mr. President; after listening to the debate on the amendment now under consideration, I have become more and more convinced that it can have little or no beneficial effect on industry-wide bargaining. Aimed ostensibly, we are told to provide local autonomy for trade-unionism, actually in operation, if effective, it could tear trade-unionism apart.

What we should be seeking now are means to curb monopolistic tendencies which may exist as a result of industry-wide bargaining. This the pending amendment would not do. The bill itself, however, in its present form and without further amendment offers adequate safeguards—I am talking now about the bill itself—for the protection of the individual worker and insures the exercise of appropriate responsibility where labor organizations are concerned.

By attempting more in the present instance we can accomplish little that is good, and we may do much that is harmful.

In these circumstances it would appear most inadvisable at this time to agree to the pending amendment, the terms of which at best are devious and dubious.

With overwhelming reasons for its rejection, the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I wish to commend the Senator from New York for the very able analysis of the pending amendment which he has presented to the Senate. I shall endeavor in the course of my remarks to emphasize some of the points he has made and bring to bear upon them an interpretation, from a different angle, to which I think the Senate should give heed before it votes on the pending amendment. I shall devote most of my attention to a legal argument against the bill.

I want to repeat, Mr. President, the point of view which I have heretofore expressed on the floor of the Senate as the debate on the pending labor legislation has progressed, namely, that the bill which was reported by the committee is a good bill; that it certainly goes as far as we should go in the Eightieth Congress, and therefore it should be passed without amendments such as the pending one. I say that because the bill itself will require a tremendous amount of administrative readjustment upon the part of the agencies of government to put it into effect. If we are to maintain an orderly procedure and a quick adjustment to new laws which we pass, it seems to me that we should not attempt to go so far as is being proposed in the series of amendments now pending. I am afraid that when this bill comes out of conference it probably will have some of the very bad features of the Hartley bill added to it. However, I do not want to be a party to sending it into conference with the House with such unsound and undesirable amendments as this one now pending as a part of the bill.

I may be taking the pulse of public opinion inaccurately, Mr. President, but I think not. I believe that as this debate has progressed during the past few days there has been a considerable change of public opinion as to what the Eightieth Congress should do on labor legislation. In my judgment, as more and more people come to study the exact provisions of the committee bill, they are going—and properly so—to raise the question, and put it to the Eightieth Congress, "Why don't you adopt the committee bill and stop for this session of Congress?" I have come to the conclusion both from reading the newspapers and from my own mail that a great many persons who, prior to this debate in the Senate, were asking us for much more drastic legislation on labor, did so without knowing the specific provisions of the committee bill. In fact, they had been so successfully propagandized by certain forces that many people had the idea, for example, that the committee bill purports to do nothing about secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. But now that they have come to see the teeth that are actually in the committee bill in regard to those two labor abuses, they are beginning to wonder why an attempt is being made to make the bill more drastic.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair.) Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator and of the Senate to a little pamphlet entitled "Governmental Affairs", which is put out by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The particular issue which I hold in my hand was issued on Friday, April 18, 1947. It gives what purports to be an analysis of the House bill and the Senate bill on labor. Here is what it says about the secondary boycott and jurisdictional strikes:

> The House bill would deprive unions of their Wagner Act privileges for 1 year if they engaged in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts. Some organizational strikes are made "unfair labor practices" and the NLRB is permitted to seek injunctions against them. The House bill also forbids Federal employees to strike against the Government.

That propaganda, which is issued by the United States Chamber of Commerce, does not contain one word to the effect that the Senate bill also prohibits the jurisdictional strike and the secondary boycott. Such information is just as misleading as any which is issued by any organization of labor or industry in the United States.

The mail Senators are receiving, urging them to vote for the passage of the House bill, comes largely from people who do not know that the Senate bill covers the matter of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. That misapprehension is largely due to this misleading propaganda which has been issued by the United States Chamber of Commerce, and I dare say that other organizations, as well, have issued such propaganda.

I also have before me a special number of the publication "Governmental Affairs," issued by the United States Chamber of Commerce, in which everyone is urged to communicate with his Member of Congress in support of House bill 3020, but in that issue their members are not told the truth about the Senate bill.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his remarks, because he has given us a specific example of the type of, shall I say, inadequate representations which have been made by various persons and groups in the United States as to the contents of the committee bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that a completely false inference is to be drawn from their report.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I also find that some of the columnists, in discussing the alleged "soft bill" of the committee, either have not taken the time, apparently, to analyze its provisions or, if they do know the provisions of the bill, they have not been willing to present to the American readers a fair explanation of the procedure which will be required under the committee bill in handling and in checking many of the abuses which the bill is devised to check. In fact, Mr. President, I wish to say that the committee bill goes just as far as we can possibly go if we are to have workable and enforceable legislation in connection with the abuses which we are seeking to check.

I now wish to direct my attention to the pending amendment. I think it buzz-bombs the committee bill. If this amendment becomes a part of the law, I think it will destroy the efficiency of organized labor to such a degree that all that will be left will be the shell of labor's rights to bargain collectively with employers. I make no charge as to the motives of the proponents of the amendment, because I know their motives are of the best. I have the highest respect and, let me say, deep personal regard for them. I simply believe they are mistaken as to the advisability of having such an amendment as this become a part of the law. I seriously question whether they really would wish to accomplish what I think will be the effect of the amendment if it is actually put into the law and if an attempt is made to enforce its provisions.

So, I wish to direct my remarks this afternoon to what I consider to be some of the legal effects of the amendment. I propose to discuss the pending amendment, which is described by its sponsors in their supplementary report as being an amendment designed to restore to local unions autonomy in the exercise of their bargaining rights, and thus to check the trend toward Nation-wide bargaining. Mr. President, please note that their objective is, as thus stated, to restore to local unions autonomy in the exercise of their bargaining rights, and thus to check the trend toward Nation-wide bargaining. I think that indicates rather clearly that the authors of the amendment find themselves opposed to Nation-wide bargaining; they think it should be checked. Apparently, they also think that local unions ought to have autonomy, irrespective of whatever action local unions may have taken in regard to the selection of their duly appointed representatives under the provisions of the Wagner Act. Or, in other words, I think there is implied in the statement of objectives on the part of the proponents of the amendment the feeling that bargaining should not be conducted, under any circumstances, by international unions, under the Wagner Act.

Mr. President, if the effect of this amendment were to insure local autonomy to appropriate groups of employees, and at the same time to protect them in the legal rights which they now have, and which we intend them to retain under other sections of the committee bill, then I think I should have little objection to the pending proposal, although I would question whether the same objective is not fully achieved by the committee bill as reported to the Senate. On that point I shall have more to say later in my remarks, because I do not think the amendment has given due weight to some other provisions of the bill which, in my judgment, will check the most flagrant abuses of international unions without destroying their right to represent local unions effectively in collective bargaining.

I intend to demonstrate that the amendment would have exactly the opposite effect from what the proponents claim is their objective. Instead of assuring local unions freedom of action, and freeing them from the so-called dictation of the international organization and its officers—a condition which I feel sure has been greatly exaggerated in the debate, except as to a few notorious instances—it will have the inevitable effect of breaking up local unions and placing their collective bargaining rights in great jeopardy. In my honest judgment, it will lead to weakening local unions, as well as to destroying the effectiveness of international unions.

Again, I do not refer to the proponents of the amendment, but I wish to say that there are forces outside the Senate that profess to be in favor of unionization but whose objective is to make unions as weak as possible. The only good unions they countenance are weak unions, and in my judgment the pending amendment will play into the hands of those groups which want weak unions. With a weak union, an employer who seeks to treat labor as a commodity, to be bought on the labor market in accordance with the law of supply and demand, is in a much better position to strike his unfair bargain than he is when labor is so effectively organized that the employer must treat with workers, not as commodities, but as human beings with all the dignified rights of free workers.

Moreover, I wish to point out that in my judgment the amendment will have a harmful effect upon labor-management relations from the employer's standpoint for reasons which I now present. There are three far-reaching changes proposed to be made in the bill by the amendment. First, the definition of the term "employer," for purposes of determining collective bargaining units, is to be changed so as to limit bargaining units of groups of employers to those in the same metropolitan district or county. Whatever definition may be agreed on as to the boundaries of a metropolitan area, it certainly will be an area, for the most part, within the boundaries of a county. So I think that, generally speaking, we can say that multiemployer units will be limited in most instances by the amendment by county lines. In other words, it eliminates opportunities for employers to enter into a multiemployer bargaining unit within the terms of the National Labor Relations Act. I underscore the last phrase. I am not denying that they can go ahead with multiemployer arrangements and associations outside the act, but surely that is not going to be to the benefit of employers, for reasons which I shall subsequently point out. They cannot enter into such employer associations and multiemployer bargaining units and have their rights protected within the act, if they go beyond the boundaries of a metropolitan area or county.

We need to keep that in mind, because in my judgment the administration of the new act will resolve itself down to the application, in legal terms, of the very narrow definition the proponents of the amendment have presented to us.

Secondly, the amendment changes the definition of the term "representative." "Representative," under the amendment, is defined to mean "any individual or a labor organization composed solely"—let us determine the word "solely"—"composed solely of employees of one employer, or of employees employed in the same metropolitan district or county by different employers."

So, first, we have a change in the legal definition of the term "employer" as now set forth in the Wagner Act, and, secondly, we have fundamental changes in the definition of the term "representative" as now contained in the Wagner Act.

Finally, it is proposed to make it an unfair labor practice for an international union to coerce or compel one of

its locals to include in or omit from a collective-bargaining contract, or to attempt to seek the inclusion in or omission from any collective-bargaining agreement of any particular terms or provisions relating to wages, hours of work, or other conditions of employment.

Of course, the objective is to have the Congress, through a revised Wagner Act, step in and dictate the terms of the constitution of an international union, adopted by such international union through its locals operating under the government of the international. It is proposed to have the Congress say, "You in the free trade-union movement cannot agree among yourselves, as locals, to bind yourselves by the terms of this constitution which delegates, through your own representatives, to an international union certain rights, certain prerogatives, in the interest of working out arrangements and agreements with multiemployer groups affecting wages, hours and conditions of employment.

It cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination that this amendment does not make impracticable industry-wide bargaining on the part of employers and unions. It is bound to weaken international unions, even though they have had certain duties delegated to them by the locals through the democratic processes of their international organization.

It is my opinion that this amendment, if adopted, will have the necessary effect of splitting up existing bargaining units which today are functioning satisfactorily in many places. It will in large measure weaken the bargaining position of unions which have been freely selected by employees as their respresentatives. It will lead to wage competition between employers in the same area and between employers in different parts of the country.

It is important, Mr. President, for us to pause long enough to give a little attention to the organization of an international union. Some sort of an ogre has been made out of the international union during the course of the debate. Most international unions are really a federation of local unions; that is, the local unions delegate to an international or parent body certain powers and duties and require of the international union certain services in connection with collective-bargaining negotiations.

In these larger collective-bargaining negotiations the locals, under the common practice, send their own delegates to the so-called parent negotiation, so very frequently collective-bargaining negotiations are carried on with multiemployer groups through a collective-bargaining committee consisting of the delegates of the respective local unions, with full authority from the locals to speak for the locals, and represent the locals in their negotiations.

The constitutions of the internationals vary somewhat, but I assure my colleagues that a common provision of many of them is that the collective bargaining agreements finally negotiated by the so-called joint committee consisting of the delegates of the local unions and the national officers of the international, shall be sent back to the local unions for final approval; which I think is an admirable, democratic procedure. I wish it were followed by all international unions. But there again I do not think it should be considered to be within the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States to tell the unions by just what delegation procedure they shall reach their collective-bargaining agreements.

But I want to point out that the democratic principles of international unions have not been emphasized, in my judgment, to the degree that they should have been emphasized in the debate. Rather, an attempt has been made, it seems to me, to give the impression that international unions can do no good, that the only way the workers can be protected is by denying them the right to select international unions as their representatives for collective-bargaining purposes. That right is denied them, under the pending amendment, if we are also at the same time going to give them any rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

My approach to the amendment is fundamental. Let me put the point in this way: We must analyze the amendment from the standpoint of the effect it has upon the rights of local unions and multiemployer groups under the act; for it is because of the effects of the amendment on those rights, now existing under the act, that I wish to raise my voice in argument against the amendment. It is because there are taken away from local unions and multiemployer groups what I think are certain very important rights under the act, that I do not want to see the amendment adopted.

In addition to that, I raise the point that the proposal is subject also to a negative vote on the part of Senators who want to see responsibility in union organization, through responsible international unions that have power to discipline local unions, which, in the exercise of their free rights, agree to come in and accept a charter under the international union and commit themselves as local unions to the obligations provided for in that charter under the constitution of the international union.

In my judgment, labor stability will not be produced by adopting an amendment which has the effect of undermining the international union, when it comes to disciplining its local unions; and I assure Senators that one of the effects of the amendment will be just that.

My good friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has suggested that the amendment limiting the largest possible bargaining unit that may be found by the National Labor Relations Board to the single employer or group of employers situated in the same metropolitan district or county, is designed to repeal an erroneous construction the Board has placed on the present law. Section 9 of the Wagner Act provides that the Board shall decide in each case whether the appropriate bargaining unit shall be "the employer unit craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof." The Senator from Minnesota suggests that in debate on the Wagner Act it was indicated clearly that it was the purpose of Congress to provide that the maximum unit shall be the employees of the single employer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me there is one matter that could well be cleared up; that is, the frequent reference to international unions. Does the Senator from Oregon understand that the term "international union" refers almost wholly, if not entirely, to unions in North America?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; principally American and Canadian unions.

Mr. AIKEN. That is it. The reason I say that is that certain people seem to have the idea that an international union has something to do with Russia and other countries in the Old World.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the senator raised the point, because the phrase "international union" has had a great many ominous meanings read into it. When we speak of international unions, Mr. President, we think of such international unions as the International Woodworkers of America and the United Steelworkers of America. For that matter, some of the railroad brotherhoods are international unions, too, if they cover the Canadian railroad system as well as the American railway system. But the international unions referred to are limited almost entirely to American and Canadian unions. They have a constitution with which the local unions associate themselves, and they agree to abide by its terms.

Mr. AIKEN. That has always been my understanding. I thought this a good time for the Senator from Oregon to state it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Vermont interrupted for that purpose.

As I was saying, the Senator from Minnesota implies that the Board, acting under the language of the present law, which defines the term "employer" as including any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, has justified the establishment of multiemployer bargaining units, in disregard of the intention of Congress. In my opinion, Mr. President, the Senator has stated a conclusion which is none too clear from the legislative history of the Wagner Act.

It was entirely unnecessary for the Congress in 1945 specifically to write into section 9 of the act an authorization for the Board to find appropriate regional units, city-wide units, or any type of unit broader than the single employer. I say it was unnecessary, because Congress defined the term "employer" to include anyone acting directly or indirectly in the interest of the employer.

In other words, it used a definition of the term "employer" broad enough to encompass within its framework multiemployer associations, such employer associations as the West Coast Waterfront Employers Association, and many others of similar type. Obviously, an employer association which has been delegated the right to represent several employers in collective bargaining is acting in the interest of the several employers.

The Board's interpretation of the law in this respect has been fully sustained by the courts. In other words, the courts have not found that the Board went beyond the intent of Congress when it interpreted the act to mean that the multiemployer groups in the form of employers' associations could represent several employers. That has been an issue in the courts, too.

I want to refer to a brief I have before me, in a case in the Supreme Court, at the October term, 1939, involving the maritime employers and unions. In that case, of course, a unit much broader than the collective-bargaining unit that would be permissible under this amendment was sustained by the Supreme Court. In its brief, counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, on pages 45 and 46, made the following comments:

> The bill as originally introduced and as passed by the Senate authorized the Board to determine that the appropriate unit was the "employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or other unit * * *."
>
> On the floor of the House of Representatives this provision was amended by striking out the words "or other unit" and adding "*Provided*, That no unit shall include the employees of more than one employer."

That was added in the House, Mr. President, and its objective, I think, was practically identical with the objective of the pending amendment. Of course, if that is what the Congress wanted, that was the way to do it—specifically to state in the bill what was attempted in the House, namely, "*Provided*, That no unit shall include the employees of more than one employer."

The addition of this proviso was opposed by Representative Connery, sponsor of the bill in the House and chairman of the House committee. He spoke these words in opposition to it:

> According to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, the United Mine Workers would have to deal with each separate one—

That is, with each separate coal operator—

> and they could not unite for collective bargaining as a unit in the coal industry.

I continue to read from the brief, as follows:

> In view of this pertinent objection, the subsequent action of Congress in adopting the Conference Report of the House and Senate Committee which omitted both the proviso of the House amendment and the words "or other unit" which had been in the bill as it passed the Senate, indicates an intent to permit the Board to decide upon units larger than the single employer, at least where, as in the coal and other industries, such multiple-employer units accord with existing bargaining practice. This inference is consistent with the statement of the managers on the part of the House * * * that the proviso stricken in conference "was subject to some misconstructions."

In other words, Mr. President, I think the legislative history of the bill shows just the opposite of what has been contended for on the floor of the Senate, for when the conferees were squarely confronted with the example of negotiations in the coal industry and similar industries they discovered that the language which had been inserted in the proposed bill in the House would make it impossible for the employers in a multiple capacity to carry on collective-bargaining relations with the union. So in conference they eliminated the language which was in both the House version and the Senate version, the one in the Senate version being the language "or other unit," and came out with a bill which was finally passed, which made no reference to such words of limitation.

In other words, Mr. President, it is my legal contention that we will not find in the legislative history of this law the adoption finally of any words of limitation at all as to the size of the collective bargaining unit. I think that is an important historical point which should not be overlooked in this debate, because I do not think it is our task to correct any misconstructions by the National Labor Relations Board of the National Labor Relations Act passed by the Congress in 1935. I bottom that contention, Mr. President, on the assertion that the courts have not so held, but to the contrary the courts have sustained the decisions of the Board in which larger bargaining unit practices have been followed by the employers, and by workers, too, through their international unions.

Obviously an employer association which has been delegated the right to represent several employers in collective bargaining is acting in the interest of the several employers, as I stated. I want to call the Senate's attention also to the fact that the Board's interpretation of the law in this respect was sustained in the *Lund case* (103 Fed. (2d) 815), decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Moreover, it is clear that when Congress was considering the Wagner Act in 1935 it had notice of the fact that multipleemployer bargaining was then an accepted practice and had been for many years. It had notice that it was being practiced in a great many industries, and it had notice that it had been practiced in certain industries for some 40 or more years.

I shall not take time to repeat all I said on March 10 in my major speech on labor legislation for this session of Congress, when I discussed in great detail the whole problem of multiemployer bargaining, and set out in that speech at some length the many examples of multiemployee bargaining that exist.

In the debate in 1935 the practice of multiemployer bargaining was mentioned and no indication by way of action was taken to show any intent to prevent it. In fact it can safely be said that the most outstanding examples of successful collective bargaining at that time were to be found in industries in which two or more employers—in many cases not located in the same metropolitan district or county—had delegated to an association or bargaining committee authority to enter into collective bargaining contracts in their behalf.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a few outstanding instances of multipleemployer bargaining which long antedated the enactment of the Wagner Act.

In the pottery industry an employers' association began negotiations with the union as early as 1894. At the present time this association is composed of 31 member companies and the negotiations cover about 85 percent of the general ware and china branches of the industry. As early as 1890 the pressed and blown glassware industry began negotiations for national agreements with the Flint Glass Workers Union.

In the men's clothing industry the employers are organized on a metropolitan-market basis and have negotiated with the union in that field for a period dating back 50 years. There are many other examples that could be cited in which multiple bargaining has a long and creditable history which would be disrupted if the pending amendment were enacted into law.

In fact, it is estimated that more than 4,000,000 workers in the country are covered by agreements negotiated with employer associations and groups of employers, and that there are more than 5,000 employer associations and groups of employers engaged in collective bargaining.

These figures are taken from the special report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I see no reason why employers should not be permitted to band themselves together for the purpose of collective bargaining if they find it to their advantage to do so. Of course, it will be said that even under the pending amendment employers will not be prohibited from banding together in groups not confined to the same county or metropolitan district. That is true, but I wish to point out that they will not then be able to invoke the protection of the bill should it become necessary to charge, for example, that the union with whom they are dealing is refusing to bargain.

That is a very important employer protection which the Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Oregon are endeavoring to give employers in our bill. We have set out in the bill—meeting some vigorous labor opposition—a series of employer protections against unfair labor practices of unions. Therefore to say that, of course, employers can keep right on bargaining in multiple groups if they want to beyond the limit of the metropolitan or county area, seems to me to beg the whole question, at least as to what we are trying to accomplish. What good is that sort of bargaining going to be to employer associations such as the West Coast Waterfront Employers Association, various employer associations in the flour-mill industry, and others? If they enter into such a collective-bargaining agreement with the unions they will have nothing under the bill to protect them from unfair labor practices of unions, such for example, as a refusal to bargain under a contract solemnly entered into. They have the right to bargain, say the proponents of the amendment, but I submit, Mr. President, it becomes a pretty empty right. It is very important that it be emphasized that, in my judgment, what the amendment in effect does, is really to make it of value to the employers if they

are to have any protection under the act, to bargain only through metropolitan and county-wide groups, and none larger than that. I say they will lose rights, because section 8 (b) (3) of the committee bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to refuse to bargain with an employer only if the union is the representative of the employees, as provided for in section 9 of the bill.

As we consider this amendment I want Members of the Senate to keep section 8 (b) (3) and section 9 of the bill before them, because it is the effects of the amendment on those sections which cause me to urge that the amendment be defeated, along with the other reasons I shall advance after I cover this point.

Since under the pending amendment a union cannot be a representative within the meaning of the act unless it is composed solely of the employees of a single employer or of the employees of different employers located in the same metropolitan district or county, it inevitably follows that the employer group would have no standing to charge that the union was committing an unfair labor practice, because by definition the union is not a representative compelled to engage in bona fide collective bargaining if that union is an international union or if any member of the union, even though it may be a so-called local union, works for an employer beyond the metropolitan area or the county line.

Let us consider for a moment in what position the pending amendment will place the single employer who desires to bargain with a union the membership of which is not confined exclusively to his own employees or to the employees of different employers in the same metropolitan district or county. While he would be free to bargain with such an organization, he would do so without any assurance that the union could be required to live up to the obligations which we have sought to impose upon unions by the unfair labor practice sections of this bill.

Mr. President, I fought pretty hard for that section, as the present occupant of the chair [Mr. JENNER] knows. For a while it was out of the bill, as the Chair will remember.

At one time the majority of the committee seemed to think that we ought to cover this point solely by suits in common-law courts for breach of contract. However, as I have argued, usually that procedure does not promote harmonious labor relations. Usually when labor relations become so bad that an employer is about to sue his workers in a common-law court for breach of contract, the jig is up so far as any hope of ironing out the difficulties between the workers and the employer is concerned. I said that I would go along with such a provision, and it is in the bill in another section. However, I emphasized the importance of using the unfair labor practice approach as an alternative to the suit, because I am satisfied that through the administrative law procedure and the unfair labor practice penalty which is imposed under title I of the bill as to this particular point, it will be found that most of the disputes over breaches of contract will iron themselves out even before a final decision on the part of the Board is reached. In other words, I think it is a great preventive remedy for this particular type of labor abuse.

To put it in another way, I think that when the boys know, so to speak, that there is a procedure that can force them to go before the National Labor Relations Board and justify the alleged breach of contract, they will stop breaching their contracts in the overwhelming majority of cases in which that is a practice. But let me add that I think it is a practice which is rare, if we speak in comparative terms, if we speak in terms of the thousands of labor contracts which exist, and which are lived up to to their letter every year, rather than single out from those the relatively small handful of cases in which some union has not lived up to the obligations and the trust inherent in the signature which it affixed to a collective-bargaining agreement. To the extent that such agreements are breached, unions ought to be held responsible; and we have provided in title I of the bill an unfair labor practice provision which in my judgment will prevent this type of abuse in practically all cases.

However, under the terms of the pending amendment that remedy would not avail an employer anything if he belonged to a multiemployer group which bargained beyond the metropolitan area. So I repeat that while the employer can do so, it is a pretty empty right. It is a right which he can exercise only at the cost of the protection which the bill as reported from the committee was designed to give him in respect to many union practices. I say that whatever bargaining such employer is engaged in would be bargaining entirely outside the act, for the reason that the union is not the statutory representative of the employees if the union has members who work for employers beyond the metropolitan district or the county. I do not intend to belabor the point, but I wish the RECORD to show as clearly as possible that I think this is a fundamental objection to the amendment.

To my mind, Mr. President, the most serious effect of the pending amendment would be the drastic limitation it would place upon the right of employees to select representatives of their own choosing.

One would almost think, as he reads the newspaper articles with reference to this amendment, and certainly as he listens to some of the debate on the amendment, that international union representation is imposed on local unions. That does not happen to be the case. They voluntarily become parties to the international union. This amendment would enable them to abide by the constitution of the international union according to their own pleasure; but when it did not please them to abide by it, irrespective of the effect their conduct might have on other locals which likewise agreed to become members of the international union, they would have the right, in effect, to secede from the international union—not secede entirely, but secede to the extent of repudiating the obligations which they agreed to carry out when they became members of the international union. They could secede in an endeavor to take advantage of some special offer which might be made by an employer who wished to weaken the international union.

That would be the effect of the amendment. It would add up to a weakening of the international union and, in the long run, of course, to a weakening of the local union too. This action is the reverse of the union practice of picking off weak employers one by one. Multiemployer collective-bargaining groups were formed in order to protect employers from that union practice. This is a little "reverse English," in that it would enable employers, in an endeavor to undermine an international union, to offer certain special considerations to a local union if the members of that union would accept such considerations, irrespective of the effect that accepting them would have upon wages, hours, and conditions of employment among locals working for other employers, not within the metropolitan district or county.

In section 7 we reenact the language now contained in the Wagner Act guaranteeing that employees shall have the right "to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing."

That is proposed in the committee bill, and that is the language of the present Wagner Act. In large measure, I submit, we nullify that right under this amendment when we say to employees, as proposed in the amendment, that they may not select as their representative an international union unless they are willing to forego resort to the Board in the event their employer refuses to bargain collectively.

I just finished making the point that it will have a special effect on the employer who wishes to bargain in a multiemployer group, beyond the district set forth in the amendment, with an international union, if that international union at any time decides that it will not bargain collectively with the employer. He cannot bring, under title I of the bill, an action against that union for an unfair labor practice because of its refusal to bargain. Likewise, if unions enter into an agreement with an employer, but have within their membership some employees—and I care not how many; to make my point I say that one is sufficient—who work for an employer beyond the metropolitan district or the county, and that employer then subsequently refuses to bargain, he can rely on the statutory definition of representation as set forth in this amendment and successfully allege, in my opinion, that he is not bound to bargain with the union because he has found within its membership some employees that work for an employer beyond the metropolitan area or the county.

That does not help local unions, Mr. President. That is true because section 8 (a) (5) makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representative of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a). This amendment will simply take out from under the operation of the act any so-called local union

which has members working for employers beyond the area set out in the amendment.

Since the pending amendment does not permit an international union to be designated as a representative within the meaning of the law, it necessarily follows that an employer would be under no legal compulsion whatever to bargain collectively with such an organization. The Board would, as a matter of course, be required to dismiss any such charge of refusal to bargain if it were shown that the union had in its membership a single employee of another employer outside the metropolitan district or county involved. In order to protect the rights of employees under the act, it would be necessary for unions—whether they are internationals or locals—to make absolutely sure that they do not have in their membership a single person who works for another employer in another metropolitan district or county.

No group of workers could secure an NLRB election looking toward the certification of an international union as their bargaining representative within the meaning of the act. An international union, Mr. President, simply cannot qualify as the legal bargaining agent under this proposal. Even if the international provided in its constitution, or in a solemn contract with the local group, that it would not act in any way contrary to the desires of the employees, it would still be impossible for that organization to obtain certification.

In other words, it would have the effect of throwing out, as far as operation under the act is concerned, contracts with all international unions over and beyond geographical limits of the amendment.

A local union which to any extent is composed of employees of another employer outside the metropolitan district or county in which their employer is situated, would be in exactly the same position as the international to which I have just referred. We may take official notice, Mr. President, I think we can take judicial notice, of the fact that hundreds of local unions include in their membership employees of several employers in more than one metropolitan district or county. That local could not be certified as the exclusive representative of any of the employees in its membership, even though it actually represented 100 percent in an appropriate unit. Any employer could refuse to engage in collective bargaining with that union, secure in the knowledge that he would not be violating the law. In fact, if he were to bargain with that union he undoubtedly would be violating the law, because the act and the bill require that if he bargains with any organization as exclusive representative it must be with an organization which in fact is the exclusive representative.

No other conclusion is possible, Mr. President, since the proposed amendment clearly states that a labor organization must be composed solely of the employees of one employer, or of employees employed in the same metropolitan district or county by different employers if it is to qualify as a representative within the meaning of the act.

Let me illustrate my point, so that there will be no misunderstanding. Suppose that the membership of Local 25 of the International Woodworkers of America, or of the carpenters and joiners, consists of the employees of employers A and B, located in adjacent counties but clearly not in any metropolitan district. The total membership of local 25 is 100, evenly divided between the employees of the two employers. Employer A is engaged in logging operations while employer B operates a sawmill, utilizing the entire output of logs cut by employer A. Although they are separate and distinct employers, their operations are closely interrelated and, in fact, the same person owns the majority stock in each corporation. Since the section is sparsely populated, and for other obvious reasons, the employees of A and B have banded together in one small labor organization.

Now let us suppose they desire to bargain collectively with their employers. Local 25 files a petition with the board, alleging that the employees of both employers constitute a single appropriate bargaining unit. No objection is made by the employers to the composition of the unit, but they insist on a formal Board election and certification.

Under the proposed amendment, the petition would have to be dismissed because the proposed unit is inappropriate, since it would combine in one unit the employees of different employers who are not in the same county or metropolitan district. I say, Mr. President, that that not only is absurd, but it is going to result in great wrong to a great many workers in this country, and, incidentally, to employers also who want to enter into this type of collective-bargaining arrangement.

Let us suppose that after that decision of the National Labor Relations Board—and there is no other decision that the Board could possibly make in this case, Mr. President, because under the definition provided for in the amendment it would have to find that these employees did not work for employers within the same metropolitan area or county, so that the petition would be thrown out and there would be no election and no certification of the union—let us suppose that these workers are determined to get whatever they can get under the law that will protect some collective-bargaining rights. In other words, they believe in unionization and orderly procedure. So they try again. This time local No. 25 files two petitions seeking two separate units. I submit, Mr. President, that again the result would have to be a dismissal on the ground that the local is not "composed solely of the employees of one employer, or of employees employed in the same metropolitan district or county by different employers." In other words, those hundred workers, 50 of whom work in the woods and 50 of whom work in the sawmill, working in different counties separated by an invisible line, and clearly not in a metropolitan district, cannot bind themselves to go into an effective local unit to carry on collective bargaining with their employers.

I cite this as one example. I could stand here all afternoon and change the hypothetical situation by changing facts here and there to show again what I have said, Mr. President—namely, that this amendment is to be condemned as an unwarranted amendment, if what you are after is sound labor relations in the United States and if you are interested in promoting good-faith collective-bargaining agreements. If, on the other hand, what you are after is to weaken unions, if what you are after is to make it as difficult as possible to have them effective in their relationships with employers, then I recommend the amendment. I shall be found, however, because of the effects of the amendment, in the group that vote against it.

Mr. President, what is the only solution for local 25? Apparently the only solution would be for local 25 to disband and divide itself into two separate and distinct organizations, one limited to the employees of A and the other to the employees of B

In all sincerity, I ask, Why should it be necessary to compel such an absurd result in the alleged interest of protecting the local autonomy of labor unions?

Let us consider another aspect of the proposed amendment. As I have stated, the labor organization, in order to qualify as a representative eligible for certification, must be limited in membership to employees in the same metropolitan district or county. Nowhere in the amendment is the term "metropolitan district" defined. My good friend the Senator from Ohio suggested earlier this afternoon that attention was being given to the possible definition used by the Bureau of the Census, and that at a later hour the proponents of the amendment might come forward with a definition of "metropolitan district" to be added to the amendment. However, I wish to discuss the term "metropolitan district," because, no matter what definition they bring forward, it seems to me it will work more hardships on the legitimate objectives of both multiemployer groups and local union groups whose members go beyond the boundaries of whatever definition the proponents of the amendment present; and, of course, it would work great injustices on the international unions, as well.

I should like to know whether St. Paul and Minneapolis would be considered as one metropolitan district. What are the precise boundaries of this undefined area, and who is to decide as to that? Who would define it? Let us not forget that with that term included in the measure the ground work would be laid for a specific challenge in every case as to whether a union is the proper representative; or, again, it would give the union an "out" at least until there is a legal definition as to whether the employer falls within the definition of "metropolitan district."

Presumably, it would be incumbent upon the Board to probe into this nebulous subject and in each specific case to make a finding as to whether the allegation of the party which challenged—regardless of whether the opposing party fell within the terms of the amendment—was correct, namely, that the other party had, in fact, violated the law. The Board would have to receive

evidence as to the boundaries of the district, and it would have to require the union to disclose the places of residence of its members, and where they work, in order to decide whether the union was qualified to be certified as the statutory representative.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the same objections would apply to the suggestion—although it was not made as a recommendation—or the statement of preference for the term "trade area", as made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I think the same difficulty would present itself in regard to determining the precise limits of what would be encompassed within a trade area, just as I think such difficulty presents itself in connection with determining the limits of a metropolitan area. If the Board has to decide all cases involving a challenge as to whether one party or the other has not qualified under the terms of this amendment which is being proposed, just think what that will do to the men in all industries, and particularly those engaged in seasonal industries. It is not at all fanciful, I suggest, Mr. President, to assert that nearly every union in the country, either local or international, would be directly affected by the amendment; and the rights of employees in countless bargaining units would be placed in jeopardy. It is common knowledge that in many industries, employees retain their membership in a particular local when they go to another city to work during slack periods.

It is natural for them to do so for various reasons. They may have insurance benefits or other rights which would be sacrificed if they gave up their membership in their local union. Moreover, they frequently expect to return, or do return, to resume their employment, and find it advantageous, therefore, to continue their membership while working elsewhere; but under the pending amendment, Mr. President, they could not continue their membership without jeopardizing the rights of fellow employees remaining back home in their local union. That is a common practice on the west coast. To cite one example of the seasonal shift from one employer to another, Mr. President, let me say that a good many of the men leave the woods, so to speak, during the more severe winter weather, and go to cities on the west coast and engage in other occupations, such as the maritime industry or work in an aircraft plant or any number of other occupations. Later they return to the woods, when the woods are open or more comfortable to work in, and they resume their obligations under the local union.

In some industries it is not possible for employees in a single metropolitan district or county to have any real effective bargaining strength because of their small numbers. An obvious example is the telephone industry.

In the United States there are many small telephone companies with very few employees. These employees, organized into a very small union, are not going to be very effective in exercising collective-bargaining rights; because labor, too, Mr. President, has learned that in numbers there is strength. That is one of the realities of the labor movement. Of course, if you can split them into small groups, you are in a much better position to pick them off by foisting upon them an undesirable labor contract. That is going to be one of the results of this amendment, I fear, if it is adopted.

Unless the telephone workers can select as their representative an organization which embraces employees of many employers in various counties and districts, they are little better off than employees bargaining individually.

My good friend the Senator from Minnesota has suggested that the amendment is necessary in order to vest bargaining rights in the local union and to discourage what he characterizes as the "habit" of the NLRB of certifying the international union as the bargaining agent "regardless of which particular local organized the employees of the plant concerned"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 2, page 4442.

It seems to me that the clear implication of that statement is that the Board wholly disregards the desires of the employees involved, and forces them to accept the international union as their bargaining agent. I suggest, Mr. President, that the Senator from Minnesota has been misled in regard to Board practice. There are many decisions of the NLRB which prove that its practice is to the contrary.

In a recent case the Board placed the local union on the ballot, although the petition for an election was filed by the international—*Colson Corp.* (70 N. L. R. B. 1325). Its reason for doing so was that the testimony clearly showed that the local was the real party in interest.

In another case the Board denied a request that the name of the international be placed upon the ballot. Its language in this regard is significant I think, and is as follows:

> Though the union's representative requested that it be designated on the ballot as "International Brotherhood of Boilermakers," since the locals appear to be the real parties in interest, we shall not grant the application (*Pendleton Shipyards Co.*, 62 N. L. R. B. 1409).

Other cases make it clear that the Board endeavors to place upon the ballot, and certify as the exclusive representative, the organization which the employees desire to have act as their representative.

Let us not get away from that, Mr. President. Let us not forget that when these international unions are declared the representatives of the employees under the act, it is because that is the desire of the members. The act itself provides that the employees shall be entitled to determine who their representatives shall be. Now it is proposed that Congress step into the picture and say to the local unions in this country, "You cannot select an international union as your representative, under the act, to represent you, and still have the protection of the act. If you go ahead and bargain with employers through an international union, you lose your rights unless you can show that the very narrow limits of this amendment as to metropolitan district and county are not exceeded." I do not think we should undertake to determine the desires of the workers as to who shall represent them in collective-bargaining cases.

The Board has denied a request of an international to appear on the ballot "for itself and on behalf of" a particular local, on the ground that such a designation might be misleading and result in controversy as to whether the local or the international had the bargaining rights—*Ball Brothers Company* (54 N. L. R. B. 1512).

In another case the Board denied a request that the American Federation of Labor alone appear on the ballot, when the record showed that the real petitioners were constituent units of the AFL, and it was understood by all parties that those unions were to act jointly in negotiations in the event of certification.

In other words, the Board again looked into the question of what was the desire of the workers as to who should represent them, and finding that this petition did not carry out the desire of the workers, it refused to put on the ballot the union which wrongfully sought to go on the ballot.

I think it would be more accurate to say that what the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is designed to do is not to correct a habit of the Board in certifying the Steel Workers International, or the Automobile Workers International, for example, but the habit of employees who desire those internationals to act as their bargaining agents. In other words, the attempt is to say, "You shall not have the right to exercise your desire and still have the benefit of the act."

It must be remembered, as has several times been stated on the floor of the Senate during the debate, that the heart of the Wagner Act is section 7, which, among other things, guarantees employees the right to select representatives of their own choosing. The pending amendment very definitely seeks to restrict that guaranty.

If 100 employees in a small plant desire an international union composed of several hundred thousand employees to act as their representative, because they recognize that in numbers there is strength, I say they should have the right to choose that international. Moreover, the law should protect them in that right, and make it the legal obligation of their employer to bargain with that representative, rather than to make continued bargaining entirely dependent upon the employer's wishes or caprice.

It is stated that these amendments are necessary to insure that the employees directly concerned will be allowed to make their own bargain with their own employer, free from coercion or dictation by an international union. I suggest, Mr. President, that other sections of the bill as reported by the committee amply protect employees in this respect. Take a look at section 9 (c). Under section 9 (c) of the bill employees are free, if they do not like the representation the international is giving them, to file a petition with the Board asserting that the international is no longer their representative. If such petition is filed, the Board is required to investigate, and if it believes a question of representation

has arisen, it must provide for a hearing and an election. In other words, in title I of the bill we are very careful to see to it that local unions have a check upon international unions if those international unions get into the practice of indulging in procedure which the local unions feel are to their detriment.

Let me say, Mr. President, that with that protection in the law, as provided in section 9 (c), I think international unions will be required—and it will be a healthy requirement—to keep themselves sold to the local unions, as far as the benefits and services which they can render the local unions are concerned.

I think that is a very healthy protection in the bill. In other words, it is going to protect the local union if an international union seeks to impose arbitrary practices upon the local union, because it gives the local union the right to go to the National Labor Relations Board and say, "We are fed up. We want to affiliate with another union," or "We want to form our independent union," and they have the right to that protection guaranteed them by the bill we have introduced and which has come out of the committee.

To my mind, this provision in section 9 (c) fully protects the rights of individual employees to local autonomy, and frees them from the dictation of the international.

I entirely agree with the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he said that if the pending amendment were enacted, the tendency would be for unions to break off into small segments, and for industries to move from high wage areas to low wage areas, with the result that wages would be lowered everywhere.

I see no alternative. I think it is certain that is what is going to happen to the union movement in this country, because the geographic area described in the amendment is so small that I would be willing to venture the conclusion that most of the locals in this country will have members within them who work for employers beyond the metropolitan district at least, and in many instances beyond the county itself, where they are not going to have any other choice than to break up into very small segments, and that very process of breaking up the several unions into smaller segments is going to have the effect of weakening organized labor in this country.

I submit that it is no answer to say that local unions now organized to bargain on an industry-wide basis can continue to do so if they wish. The point I have tried to make over and over again in this speech is that they would not have the protection of the act if they did so. In order to obtain the protection of the law, it would be absolutely necessary for employees to select as their representatives only those organizations which were composed solely of the employees of a single employer, or of the employees of different employers in the same metropolitan district or county. Once they selected a representative that did not qualify under this very narrow definition, they would be proceeding at their peril, and would make it possible for their employer with impunity and complete immunity to refuse to bargain with them at any time he chose to exercise the discretion not to bargain with them. As I have stated, this is so because such an organization could not be certified as the exclusive representative by the Board, and could not on behalf of the employees prosecute an unfair labor practice charge of refusal to bargain.

I close this argument, Mr. President, with these two summary statements.

First. The arbitrary and narrow definitions in the amendment itself will greatly weaken the rights of existing local unions under the Wagner Act.

It will leave the right of employers in multiemployer groups beyond a metropolitan area or county only an empty right to bargain through employer associations.

It will have the effect of destroying the effectiveness of international unions. It is aimed, apparently, to check certain excesses of international unions, but in doing so it practically, in my judgment, destroys all of the effectiveness of the international unions. Will labor take it? I do not know; we shall have to let future events determine that, if the pending measure becomes law. But I just cannot imagine, Mr. President, that international unions that have been carrying on collective-bargaining agreements for the past 50 years with multiemployer groups are going to take it lying down. I think that, to the extent they can, by devious ways, as the Senator from New York suggested earlier this afternoon, by indirection—yes, in many instances, by direct exercise of economic force—they are going to resist any attempt to make workable such an amendment as this.

The second point I make, in conclusion, Mr. President, is that I think it does great damage to the progress that has been made by multiemployer groups, who have been bringing about a remarkable degree of economic stability in many industries in the country. It was just the other day that Mr. Frank Foisie, president of the Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, called me from the floor to the reception room, and discussed with me the effects of the amendment upon industry-wide bargaining on the Pacific coast in the maritime industry.

He recognized in his discussion with me that it would leave them only an empty right, just an empty form for multiemployer bargaining, so far as the west coast is concerned. He said it would produce great industrial disruption in the maritime industry and destroy the good effects of many years of effective employer relations, which have resulted in unity of action among those employers and brought a much greater degree of stability on the water front of the Pacific coast than possibly could have been accomplished if they had been left the victims of the old union practice of picking off the weak ones, one by one, until finally the entire maritime industry might be subjected to some very undesirable employer-employee contracts.

And so when the proponents of the amendment say that this is not going to destroy industry-wide bargaining, I want to say that the amendment is a very effective weapon, by indirection, of destroying industry-wide bargaining, because, the moment an attempt is made to apply the amendment, should it become law, the employers that seek remedies under the amendment will lose all the protection that the Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Oregon have attempted to give them under the committee bill.

I sincerely hope that the Senate in its wisdom will reject the pending amendment, which is most certain to produce all the detrimental effects on industrial relations which I have attempted to outline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lodge	Sparkman
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Eaton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Umstead
Ferguson	Malone	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota on behalf of himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment by inserting a definition of a metropolitan district very similar to that which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read during a colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], which is the definition used by the Census Bureau, except that we have left to the National Labor Relations Board a little more discretion in interpreting it. I send the modification to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 18, of the pending amendment, it is proposed to add the following:

On page 8, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

A metropolitan district means generally any city of 50,000 population or more, together with all adjacent and contiguous incorporated places and minor civil divisions, which have a population of 150 or more per square mile, as determined by the Board.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, that, as I said, is the definition used by the Census Bureau, except that we have left the Board a little leeway in interpreting it. I hope we can proceed now to vote on the amendment, as modified, which I think has been thoroughly explained and debated, which in the view of its sponsors merely gives to the employee members of local unions the right to determine their own course of action in collective bargaining. It is our conviction that they are competent to do that without arbitrary direction from their international.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just come to the desk to read the definition which has been proposed as a modification of the pending amendment. It is rather vague. It says:

A metropolitan district means generally any city of 50,000 population or more, together with all adjacent and contiguous incorporated places and minor civil divisions, which have a population of 150 or more per square mile, as determined by the Board.

I take it that under this definition the Board will have to perform the function of the Census Bureau and determine the population of every community with a population of 150 or more per square mile; and then, generally speaking, the definition may or may not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators, as modified.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram dated April 29, 1947, which I have received from Mr. Pembroke Cochnauer, general manager of the San Francisco Retailers Council; also a letter dated May 1, 1947, from Mr. W. H. Mixter, vice president of H. R. Basford Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., opposing the so-called Kersten amendment, which would prohibit industry-wide bargaining. The so-called Kersten amendment is in the House bill.

I recognize that there is considerable difference between the so-called Kersten amendment and the pending amendment. However, after listening to the remarks today by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I have determined to vote against the pending amendment.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 29, 1947.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As you know community-wide bargaining between local employer groups and local unions has been practiced for years in San Francisco and other western cities. This time-tested practice which is little used or understood elsewhere has promoted industrial peace by establishment of uniformity in wages, hours, and working conditions among comparable occupations in the community and the development of responsible leadership on both sides of the bargaining table. As you know, this is fact and not theory. For example, the principal department and specialty stores in San Francisco during recent years have bargained single group contracts with various AFL and CIO unions through the San Francisco Retailers Council, which is a local union of employers. They have had no strike by any union for more than 5 years. Section 9 (f) of House labor control bill as amended would kill this practice and disestablish such local unions of employers and employees. We believe this menace can be avoided by removing from section 9 (f) of House bill or any similar provision in Senate bill all reference to number of employees in plants less than 50 miles apart. We earnestly seek your assistance.

PEMBROKE COCHNAUER,
General Manager, San Francisco Retailers Council.

SAN FRANCISCO, *May 1, 1947.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is one feature of labor-control bill H. R. 3020 passed by the House of Representatives that would in our opinion have a seriously detrimental effect on the employer-union relationships that have been developed in the San Francisco Bay area over the past few years.

We refer to the provision restricting employer groups from jointly negotiating with labor unions.

As members of the Distributors Association of Northern California, we have carried on joint negotiations of a majority of employers in this area with the two or three union groups involved. We feel that this cooperative activity on the part of employers has placed us in a position to deal on equal terms with organized labor, whereas a restriction of our right to engage in collective bargaining as a group would again place any one of us in the position where the union could exert undue economic pressure against one company at a time to achieve their desires, however unreasonable they might be.

We believe that the association activities affiliated with the San Francisco Employers Council have done a great deal for labor relations stability in the San Francisco Bay area and urge that you vote against any legislation which would restrict such group activities.

Yours very truly,

H. R. BASFORD CO.,
W. H. MIXTER,
Vice President.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to make one comment on the remarks of the Senator from New York. If we substitute for his word "responsibility" the words "arbitrary control of the international over its locals," the statement more nearly corresponds to the situation today in a great many unions.

The demand for labor legislation which is influencing the Congress to act in this field directly out of a number of industry-wide strikes called in 1946 by the international unions, frequently against the will of the local unions, who felt that they were perfectly able to negotiate contracts and settle their differences with their own individual employers. This, if adopted, will be the only one in the Senate bill which directly attacks in any way the situation in 1946, which built up the public demand for legislation in this field.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I merely want to point out that in the matter of control—or authority, as some prefer to call it—there is one feature in the labor-relations picture which is absolutely vital. There can be no responsibility unless there is some control and authority somewhere. By the destruction of such control and authority, the responsibility itself also is destroyed. I think that should be definitely understood in considering the pending amendment.

As I pointed out earlier today, this amendment is not the answer to the problem which we confront. The answer must be found. I am satisfied that the answer can be found. I am satisfied that the bill as it now stands provides the vehicle for finding the answer. Under those circumstances I see no purpose whatever in going along with a provision of this kind, which, as I previously stated, is extremely devious and doubtful.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that much of the objection which has been raised relates to the House provision, which is entirely different from this amendment.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has submitted another amendment, abolishing Nation-wide bargaining, of which I am not in favor. There has been some confusion between the two amendments. I believe that the nature of the pending amendment has been fully explained.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to enter upon a long dissertation on the pending amendment, as modified. However, I wish to point out, as I indicated in commenting upon the subject earlier, that the modified amendment does not take care of the objection which I have raised in connection with the definition of a metropolitan district. It extends it to a certain extent. However, we are dealing with a community of interest; and unless the amendment can be expressive of such a purpose it definitely misses the point which I have in mind.

With regard to the Senator's comment concerning the essence of the bill, I assume he has decided that the pending amendment is directed at the question of local autonomy. I believe that question was thoroughly explored this morning. We may get local autonomy by this process, but in so doing we shall be taking one of the most serious steps that has ever been taken toward the destruction of proper and necessary union responsi-

bility. We should bear that fact in mind in the consideration of the pending amendment.

I am sure that all Senators realize the need for more responsibility. In destroying such responsibility by the so-called local-autonomy proposal we are opening the door to the utter disintegration of organized labor. That fact should also be borne in mind in voting on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is very important to emphasize, in the closing minutes of this debate, that international unions have their constitutions, approved by the local unions. They have their conventions, to which the local unions send their delegates. It is through such democratic procedures that the policies of the international unions are determined. When we come to the major strike cases we find in most instances that such strikes are called after the delegates of the local unions, working through the international policy committee to carry out the wishes of the local union, have voted for strike action.

I think the Senator from New York is quite correct when he points out that what we are doing by this amendment is striking at the very heart of democratic trends in the trade-union movement. We propose by this amendment to take away from employers a great many rights which the Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Oregon have sought to give them under title I of the bill, because the moment we adopt this amendment we shall find that employers who wish to bargain on a multiemployer basis will not be able to bring unfair labor practice charges against any union which has one member in it who works for an employer beyond the metropolitan area or beyond the county in which the union is located.

I quite agree with the Senator from New York when he points out that if we adopt this amendment we shall be taking a step which will set responsible trade-unionism back at least 20 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe that the speeches against this amendment have utterly and completely misrepresented the situation. The amendment would destroy no union. The only thing it would do would be to take away from arbitrary leaders of international unions power which they have chosen to exercise against the wishes of their own members.

Who shall be responsible? That is the question. Which union shall be responsible? Shall the men in a particular district, knowing the situation in that district, have the right democratically to determine whether they want to sign a contract or not? Or will union members in the State of Ohio be bossed by someone sitting in Pittsburgh who has not consulted them?

We know that there is no democratic procedure in the international conventions referred to by the Senator from Oregon. It does not exist. The question is, Shall we continue indefinitely the power of international unions—in many cases not certified by the National Labor Relations Board, and in many cases not the initial representative of the men—through control under their constitutions to force men all over the United States to strike, as Philip Murray did last year? There were 500 strikes throughout the United States, hardly one of them necessary, until he chose to say, "Go ahead and settle with the United States Steel Co."

It is not a question of responsibility of the unions; it is a question of what unions shall be responsible. Are the unions who bargain with their own employers to be responsible? That is the purpose of the Wagner Act—to have one group of employees, acting as one, bargaining with their own employer. The condition which has arisen is absolutely contrary to the whole theory of collective bargaining and the whole theory of the Wagner Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if I correctly understood him to say yesterday that the effect of this amendment would not be to prevent industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Industry-wide bargaining could continue exactly as it is today, but would have to be with the voluntary consent of the unions who bargain together. Today it must be with the voluntary consent of their employers. Any employer can withdraw today, but not any union. Once the set-up is there and is approved by the Board, no union can withdraw. This amendment permits a union, if it does not approve the proceedings of the national bargaining, to withdraw and make its own responsible contract with its responsible employer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the Senator one further question? The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] yesterday brought out very clearly that under existing law no one can be compelled to bargain on an industry-wide basis. Does the Senator from Ohio agree that that is a correct statement?

Mr. TAFT. Employees may be compelled to do so if the employers have voluntarily associated themselves to do so. Then the Board may make all the unions do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the lead would have to be taken by the employers. The unions are given the right to bargain on a basis wider than that of a constituent union only in cases in which the employer takes action first.

Mr. TAFT. That is the present law; yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not propose to take the time to answer all the assertions made by the Senator from Ohio. Mere assertions about misrepresentations are not proof. I am willing to stand on the legal argument I have made against this amendment. But he makes one assertion to which I want to take particular exception, namely, if I understood him correctly, that industry-wide bargaining can continue under this amendment just as it is practiced now. Is that a correct statement of the Senator's position?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry. Will the Senator repeat his question? I am told by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] that it is not a correct statement.

Mr. MORSE. I shall repeat my statement, then, because I want it to be correct. I understood the Senator from Ohio, in answer to the Senator from Alabama, to say that industry-wide bargaining can continue under his amendment just as it is practiced today if the employers voluntarily want to enter into an industry-wide bargaining arrangement. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TAFT. It is correct. The only difference is that the union, under this arrangement, may break it up. A union made up of employees of one employer might break it up.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to point out that if this amendment be adopted, then, because of the definition of the word "representative" as included in the amendment, the rights of either a union or an employer would automatically be destroyed, so far as the application of the act is concerned, if either party brought a petition to the Board and pointed out that either the employer who was a party to the contract or the union which was a party to the contract had members within the group beyond the metropolitan district or the county. In other words, he reduces, by this amendment, industry-wide bargaining to a mere matter of form, and it does not leave the parties any protection under the act. If they enter into such industry-wide bargaining they do so at the risk of not being able to require the other party to bargain collectively under the terms of the act. Hence I repeat, as I pointed out in detail in my legal argument this afternoon, this amendment does in actual operation destroy the legal sanctions available under the act as it is now written and the additional sanction which we provide for in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and other Senators.

Mr. BALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] which I transfer to the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and I will vote. I vote "yea." The Senator from Maine is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea"; and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. If present and

voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island, if present, would vote "nay." The Senator from Washington is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that on this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is unavoidably detained, is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent on official business at one of the Government departments. If present, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. I announce also that if present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The vote was recapitulated; and the result was announced—yeas 43, nays 43.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is rejected.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to say to the occupants of the galleries that any demonstrations are contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move a recapitulation of the vote. I was on my feet and addressing the Chair prior to the announcement of the vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is too late; the announcement has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A situation similar to this one arose a few weeks ago. It should be understood that a second recapitulation does not permit any additional votes to be cast, and only by unanimous consent can votes that have been cast be changed.

Does the Senator from Nebraska ask for a recapitulation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have a recapitulation. My understanding is that, in view of the precedent which has been heretofore established, I have a right to ask for a recapitulation now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to ask for a recapitulation now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on a former occasion a vote was added to the list after such a recapitulation was ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The announcement of the result had not been made at that time, and that makes a totally different situation.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair still wishes to know whether the Senator from Nebraska desires to press his request for a recapitulation.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire not to press it.

Subsequently, during the reading of an amendment submitted by Mr. BALL, the following occurred:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the amendment will be suspended for a moment, so as to permit the Chair to correct his recent announcement. The clerks at the desk have made their own recapitulation of the votes just cast and the correct total should have been announced as 43 yeas and 44 nays. So the amendment was lost in any event.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—43

Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Brooks	Jenner	Smith
Buck	Kem	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarthy	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	McKellar	Watkins
Donnell	Martin	Wherry
Dworshak	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
Fulbright	Overton	
Gurney	Reed	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Ives	Murray
Baldwin	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Knowland	Pepper
Cooper	Langer	Saltonstall
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Downey	Lucas	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Magnuson	Tydings
Hatch	Malone	Umstead
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—8

Butler	George	Wagner
Cain	McGrath	White
Capehart	Thomas, Okla.	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL on behalf of himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. A few moments ago, when the able Senator from Nebraska asked for a recapitulation of the vote, I understood the Presiding Officer to say that recapitulation can be made for one purpose—only if some Senator desires to change his vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And that only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. That was the point I desired to raise. I did not hear that statement made by the Presiding Officer at the time. In other words, the result had been announced, and no recapitulation can be had after the Chair announces the result?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. Under the regular practice, with which Senators are familiar, there is an automatic recapitulation when the clerk reads the roll. On that recapitulation any change can be made which the situation develops. After that recapitulation, except by unanimous consent, there can be no second recapitulation on which votes are changed or added.

Mr. LUCAS. That is as I understood the rule. I was not sure the Presiding Officer had made that statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may I suggest that that is subject to the qualification that if any Senator says he is recorded incorrectly as having voted "yea" when he really voted "nay," he is entitled to make the correction?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course a vote can be corrected.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a change of vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. That situation was not envisioned by the Chair's announcement.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was by the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw my request, because of the statement made by the President pro tempore. I thought a precedent was established when some days ago the Senator from Idaho was permitted to vote after the announcement had been made, according to my thought at the time. I should like an answer from the Chair as to whether I am correct in thinking the Senator from Idaho was permitted to vote after the announcement was made, or whether the vote was cast prior to the announcement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair—and he is consulting the RECORD—that the Senator from Idaho voted before the announcement was made.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is correct, there was no precedent established, but I certainly understood the situation the other way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I was holding hearings for the newsprint committee in room 457, Senate Office Building, and either the buzzer in that room is not working, or there is no buzzer in the room, because there was nothing to indicate a quorum call or a yea-and-nay vote. I ask unanimous consent that I may cast my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator submit a request to the Chair?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I made the statement that I was holding hearings in room 457, Senate Office Building, of the newsprint committee, that there is either no buzzer in that room, or, if there is, it failed to work today, and therefore there was no quorum call and no vote call indicated in that room. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to cast my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the request. In rule XII it is clearly stated that no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer. The Senator from Indiana has other rights, if he wishes to invoke them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: If the Senate will indulge the Chair, the Chair is anxious to have the record totally clear in respect to the

parliamentary question raised by the Senator from Nebraska. Therefore, the Chair refers back to the episode to which the Senator from Nebraska referred, and reads from the Journal of the Senate for March 3, as follows:

Therefore, the Chair is simply putting the Senate on notice that hereafter, so far as the present occupant of the Chair is concerned, a request for a second recapitulation will not be recognized by the Chair until after announcement of the vote; and that thereafter, if a recapitulation is granted, no Senator who enters the Chamber can vote, and, except by unanimous consent, no Senator who voted can change or withdraw his vote

The Chair's ruling today is in complete conformity with the situation to which the able Senator from Nebraska referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to state that I remember distinctly now the statement made by the President pro tempore, but I was somewhat confused by the vote that was taken, which goes back, I think, 2 or 3 days prior to the time of the ruling of the Chair. The distinguished Senator from Idaho was permitted to vote after the vote had been recapitulated. I want to say now that I was in error in saying that two recapitulations were had prior to the time his vote was taken; but the Senator was permitted to vote, and his vote was counted at that time, after a recapitulation had been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The ruling came later. I want to state to the Chair that I thoroughly agreed with the Chair's ruling in the first instance, which I related, and I also agree with the statement just now made by the Chair. The former incident which I cited is not a precedent in the present case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is a completely satisfactory conclusion of the episode?

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated. I should say that the amendment is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 302. (a) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any representative of any employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce to receive or accept, or to agree to receive or accept, from the employer of such employees any money or other thing of value.

(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable (1) with respect to any money or other thing of value payable by an employer to any representative who is an employee or former employee of such employer, as compensation for, or by reason of, his services as an employee of such employer; (2) with respect to the payment or delivery of any money or other thing of value in satisfaction of a judgment of any court or in compromise, adjustment, settlement or release of any claim in the absence of fraud or duress; (3) with respect to the sale or purchase of an article or commodity at the prevailing market price in the regular course of business; (4) with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided*, That the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which shall not be irrevocable for a period of more than 1 year, or beyond the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner; or (5) with respect to money or other thing of value paid to a trust fund established by such representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents): *Provided*, That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; and (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, together with such neutral persons as the representatives of the employers and the representatives of the employees may agree upon and in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund and there are no neutral persons empowered to break such deadlock, such agreement provides that the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement.

(d) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(e) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this section, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

(f) This section shall not apply to any contract in force on the date of enactment of this act, until the expiration of such contract, or until July 1, 1948, whichever first occurs.

(g) For the purposes of this section, the term "representative" means any labor organization which, or any individual who, is authorized or purports to be authorized to deal with an employer, on behalf of two or more of his employees, concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work; and for the purposes of section 301 includes any other organization or fund of which some of the officers are representatives or are members of a labor organization or are elected or appointed by a representative.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], in the understanding of the Chair, desires to present a very brief amendment at this time. As a matter of personal convenience to the Senator from Vermont, would there be any objection on the part of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside to permit the Senator from Vermont to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator, and recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to offer a simple amendment to Senate bill 1126. The amendment is to insert the words "or responsibly to direct them" after the word "employees" on page 6, line 20. Paragraph (11) would then read:

The term "supervisor" means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibly to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

As an employer for many years past, and until I resigned to enter this body, I can say that the definition of "supervisor" in this act seems to me to cover adequately everything except the basic act of supervising. Many of the activities described in paragraph (11) are transferred in modern practice to a personnel manager or department. The supervisor may recommend more or less effectively, but the personnel department may, and often does, transfer a worker to another department on other work instead of discharging, disciplining or otherwise following the recommended action.

In fact, under some modern management methods, the supervisor might be deprived of authority for most of the functions enumerated and still have a large responsibility for the exercise of personal judgment based on personal experience, training, and ability. He is charged with the responsible direction of his department and the men under him. He determines under general

orders what job shall be undertaken next and who shall do it. He gives instructions for its proper performance. If needed, he gives training in the performance of unfamiliar tasks to the worker to whom they are assigned.

Such men are above the grade of "straw bosses, lead men, set-up men, and other minor supervisory employees," as enumerated in the report. Their essential managerial duties are best defined by the words, "direct responsibly," which I am suggesting.

In a large measure, the success or failure of a manufacturing business depends on the judgment and initiative of these men. The top management may properly be judged by its success or failure in picking them out and in backing them up when they have been properly selected.

Mr. President, I have not heard at any time in the discussion of this bill what seems to me an adequate explanation of the reasons for removing this supervisory force from the area of collective bargaining. The reasons are simple and direct. Unless the employer can hire and discharge, promote, demote, and transfer these men, he has lost the control of his business. He cannot run it effectively. If he cannot run it effectively and efficiently, he cannot continue in business profitably. If he cannot operate profitably, he is a bad manager, not only from the stockholders' standpoint, but also from that of the working force as well. Only the profitable business can furnish sustained employment at good wages. At this point the interests of stockholders and employees are identical.

Mr President, I assume I must ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator is entitled to offer his amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 20, after the word "employees," it is proposed to insert "or responsibly to direct them."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this merely adds to the definition of the word "supervisor." The definition in the bill is that which has been used by the National Labor Relations Board for the past 4 or 5 years; but I have no objection certainly to including the words "or responsibly to direct them." I do not think I can accept the amendment for the committee, but it is entirely satisfactory, I am sure, to all members of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the pending amendment deals with so-called welfare funds, which are becoming increasingly prominent in negotiations between unions and employers. It is very similar to, though, as changed, it is a considerable improvement upon, a similar section which was in the so-called Case bill, which was passed by the Congress last year.

Subsections (a) and (b) of the amendment are simply a broad prohibition of payment or delivery by an employer of any money or other thing of value to any representative of his employees, and a prohibition of receipt thereof by the representative.

Subsection (c) contains certain exceptions. The first one is with respect to any money due a representative who is an employee or a former employee of the employer, on account of wages actually earned by him. The second exemption is with respect to the payment of money or other thing of value in satisfaction of a judgment rendered by a court, or in compromise of litigation. The third is with respect to the sale or purchase of an article or commodity at the prevailing market price in the regular course of business. There are many employers who will obviously be selling their own merchandise to business agents of the union, they hope. Finally, the fourth exception is with respect, not to welfare funds, but to the so-called check-off. It does not prohibit the check-off, but provides that it is legal only where it is individually authorized by the employee from whose wages the deduction is made, by an authorization that is irrevocable for a period of not more than 1 year. Finally, there is the exception to cover so-called welfare funds. All it requires is that the so-called welfare fund shall be jointly administered by representatives of the employer and the union; that the specific purposes of the fund and the benefits to which employees are entitled shall be set forth in detail in the agreement creating the fund; and that it shall be in the nature of a trust fund, so that the employees receiving benefits from it will have a right to go into court to protect their interest in such benefits, if necessary. The amendment provides that where the representatives of the employer and the union administering the fund become involved in a dispute and a deadlock, and cannot agree on an impartial member of the board of trustees of the fund, the district court shall appoint an impartial trustee to decide the matter.

Subsection (d) makes the violation of the section a misdemeanor, with a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, for anyone found guilty.

Subsection (e) gives the district courts jurisdiction to restrain and to punish violations of the section, notwithstanding the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Subsection (f) is a limitation which provides that the section shall not apply to any contract in force on the date of the enactment of this measure, until the expiration of such contract, or until July 1, 1948, whichever first occurs.

Subsection (g) is simply a definition of the term "representative" as used in the section, which is required to be somewhat different from the definition of "representative" in the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. President, the sole purpose of the amendment is not to prohibit welfare funds, but to make sure that they are legitimate trust funds, used actually for the specified benefits to the employees of the employers who contribute to them, and that they shall not degenerate into bribes. More and more, unions, local, international, and regional, are demanding the establishment of such welfare funds in negotiations with employers. I have heard of many cases in which unions have even relinquished wage demands in order to secure a welfare fund, with a percentage of the pay-roll paid into the welfare fund established, and employers have frequently agreed to that procedure. In some instances I know of the payments are used to buy accident and health insurance from insurance companies which appear to have been established fairly recently, the directors of such insurance companies being well-known leaders of unions, and I have been told that the commissions on the premiums paid for such insurance are very lucrative, and go to business agents of the unions. I myself think that unless we make sure that such funds, when they are established, are really trust funds and are actually used for the benefit to employees specified in the agreement, there is very grave danger that the funds will be used for the personal gain of union leaders, or for political purposes, or other purposes not contemplated when they are established, and that they will in fact become rackets.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to add a word to the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota. I happen to have been a patron of a similar amendment to the Case bill last year which was adopted by a substantial majority. The reason that amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia last year was because Mr. John Lewis, the president of the United Mine Workers, was attempting to obtain a royalty of 10 cents a ton on all coal mined, the money thus obtained to be placed in a fund to be controlled exclusively by the labor union.

As stated by the Senator from Minnesota in his explanation, the amendment permits a welfare fund under collective bargaining, but it provides that the money derived shall be placed in a trust fund, in which the employer and the employees shall have equal representation, and shall be used for the benefit of the employees.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the amendment will be adopted. It has a specific purpose, which is to prohibit the labor unions from requiring welfare funds to be paid into the treasuries of the labor unions. It provides that the funds are permitted and allowed under collective bargaining, but that the money shall go to a trust fund which shall be

mutually administered by the employer and the employee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words about the amendment. This is a recurrence of the question which was before the Senate last year in the Case bill. Probably as good a summary of what the amendment accomplishes as could be found is stated in the committee report:

An amendment reinserting in the bill a provision regarding so-called welfare funds similar to the section in the Case bill approved by the Senate at the last session. It does not prohibit welfare funds but merely requires that, if agreed upon, such funds be jointly administered—be, in fact, trust funds for the employees, with definite benefits specified, to which employees are clearly entitled, and to obtain which they have a clear legal remedy. The amendment proceeds on the theory that union leaders should not be permitted, without reference to the employees, to divert funds paid by the company, in consideration of the services of employees, to the union treasury or the union officers, except under the process of strict accountability.

Thus the amendment makes extortion illegal and also prevents the check-off of union dues unless authorized in writing by the individual employee. Such authorization may be irrevocable for the period of contract, which is the usual form of check-off today

The necessity for the amendment was made clear by the demand made last year on the part of the United Mine Workers that a tax of 10 cents a ton on coal be paid to the Mine Workers Union for indiscriminate use for so-called welfare purposes. It seemed essential to the Senate at that time, and today, that if any such huge sums were to be paid, representing as they do the value of the services of the union members, which could otherwise be paid to the union members in wages, the use of such funds be strictly safeguarded.

There is a serious question whether welfare funds of this character should be permitted at all unless the employees are willing to join such funds voluntarily and have their earnings diverted thereto. However, a number of such funds have been established, and we have no desire to interfere with their operation. One of the subjects for study by the joint committee proposed in S. 1126 is this matter of welfare funds and their relation to social security. In some way they should be integrated with social security, and the national assistance should not be broken up into a series of industry agreements. Pending that study, however, we believe it is imperative that where such funds are in existence or are agreed upon by collective bargaining, they should not be subject to racketeering or arbitrary dispensation by union officers. Without such restraints employees would have no more rights in the funds supposedly established for their benefit than their union leaders choose to allow them. They may well become a mere tool to increase the power of the union leaders over their men, and even be open to racketeering practices.

Mr. President, I have only a few words to say about the amendment. This is another one of those instances where it seems that certain individuals do not credit the union membership with any authority whatever over the selection of or the conduct of their own leaders. I am not willing to accept that premise. I think it is not justified by experience. As a matter of fact, I think there is about as much democracy in labor unions as there is in corporations. I think the members of labor unions exercise just about as much authority over their leaders as stockholders do over the executives in their corporations and in their corporate enterprises.

Mr. President, the amendment is aimed at two things: First, it is aimed at the welfare fund and the policy of the application of the welfare fund principle to industry through collective bargaining.

The able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] have been active in the leadership of a movement to secure a national health insurance program. They have not been able to get very far with it. There has always been some excuse offered as to why it should not be adopted. There have been those who claim that it was socialized medicine, and others who found in it some other defect. Surely those who object to a national health insurance program should not object to a policy of providing for the welfare of the workers in an industry by collective bargaining agreement between management and employees engaged in the industry. I do not know of anything fairer than that. Yet the effect and the design of the pending amendment is to strike down that policy which is of growing prevalence and popularity in industry in the United States today.

When we had this matter before us in the last session of the Congress we showed that there was organization after organization, union after union, which had collective bargaining agreements in effect, under which welfare funds were provided, which welfare funds were administered by the employees themselves through their own executives, of course, answerable to the authority of the union members, the employees.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that until we adopt the national health insurance principle and policy Congress should give encouragement to the establishment of welfare funds by collective bargaining agreements between management and industry.

The other question is, primarily, Who should have the administration of such funds? For whose benefit are the funds established? They are established for the benefit of the workers. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the funds are for the benefit of the workers, the workers will be the ones chiefly concerned in their proper administration and disbursement? Can any union leader escape accountability, first, to the law, and secondly, to his own union membership, for the misuse, misappl ation, or diversion of welfare funds? Yet, this amendment is designed to prohibit the welfare fund and its administration by employees themselves, or by their chosen leaders.

Today in America we are paying a terrible price in loss of life, loss of health, and loss of man-days, because the people of the country are not receiving the medical care and attention which they require. There are differences of opinion as to how the medical attention needed by the people should be supplied. I believe that the national health-insurance principle is a wise, sound, and thoroughly American principle to apply to the health needs of the people. But until such a principle is put into practice, surely we should encourage management and labor to get together through collective-bargaining agreements and provide adequate welfare funds to supply deficiencies in the private purchasing power of the people.

In my opinion it is a tragic expense that we are requiring of the health of the people. Every year more man-days are lost, many times over, by sickness and physical disability than are lost through strikes. The bill before us has excited the national attention. It has behind it the determination of a large part of the Congress to secure its enactment; and, yet, fewer man-days are lost every year in strikes than are lost from sickness or disability which could be prevented or alleviated in most cases. Yet we have not been able to do very much in that field. Now, when management and labor, in a thoroughly democratic way, through the principle of private initiative, have worked out free collective-bargaining agreements to provide welfare funds, we come along with a prohibition which for all practical purposes would make them unavailable. I wish to raise my voice in protest against any such principle.

The second provision of the amendment against which I protest is the requirement that there shall be no check-off unless each individual member gives an individual authorization for the check-off. There again we are going behind the authority of the collective bargaining agent of the union, duly chosen by the union and certified by the National Labor Relations Board as being the bargaining agent of the union. The bargaining representatives have authority to represent the employees. They have authority to negotiate. They have authority to enter into contracts. When they enter into a contract pursuant to free collective bargaining, when the employer recognizes the principle of the check-off, and when the chosen agent of the employees bargains for and agrees to the principle of the check-off, I do not think it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to say, "We will go behind the authority of the bargaining agent certified by the National Labor Relations Board and chosen by the employees themselves, and poll each individual member to see whether he gives individual authority to management to check off his union dues."

As a matter of sheer efficiency in a plant, the check-off principle is desirable. If union dues cannot be collected through the check-off principle, it means that the union must pay someone to go around and see the individual members and collect their dues. Perhaps the collectors will trespass upon the property of the employer or take part of the working time of the worker in an effort to collect the dues when the collector can find the members together. If it is not done at the place of employment the collector must tramp around from home to

home to find the worker, who may be inclined toward recalcitrance or tardiness, and offer him an opportunity to pay his union dues.

When the employer and the employees have agreed by collective bargaining to the principle of the check-off, when the employer has accepted that practice, and when it has been properly entered into as an engagement between management and labor, I say that it is intervention in the affairs of the union for us to assert that in order to protect the individual we must require him to give individual, specific authorization to the employer to make the deduction from his wages to pay his dues through the check-off.

I have nothing further to say, Mr. President, except that this amendment is designed to carry out the policy of the other amendments, to shake the confidence of the workers in their own leadership, to break down discipline in labor organizations, to impair the collective bargaining power of labor's representatives, and to weaken labor in its effort to live. Against that policy I repeatedly protest.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Before the Senator from Florida takes his seat I wonder if he would comment on two provisions of the amendment which may be very destructive of the practices which have grown up and have proved beneficial not only to labor, but also to industry, through mutual efforts.

First, there is the general proposition that this is an amendment to correct what is supposed to be a single ill. It lays down a new way of proceeding in regard to arrangements to take care of old-age, illness, retirement, and so forth. Would not the changing of the rules naturally impede the growth of the very fine ideas connected with retirement and annuity plans?

Furthermore, I wish that the Senator, who is an experienced lawyer, and therefore very much more able to talk about the question than I am, would spend a moment or two on paragraph (e) on page 4 of the amendment. Is not this an invitation to resort to the courts in labor disputes? Does it not again open the courts, which have been denied the right to issue injunctions, to labor disputes?

Moreover, ever since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, the appeal has been to the circuit court. The cases have first gone to the administrative courts. My fear in connection with the mere mention of the district courts in this section is the same fear which I have entertained whenever the subject has been mentioned in other provisions. This is really a proposal to permit the advantage-taker to develop some kind of a case which will be embarrassing to labor, and get the case into court, whether it be a worthy case or not, thus holding up the process of growth and development in this field.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Utah.

In my reply to his first inquiry, it is my opinion that the welfare fund is as justifiable a levy upon a commodity as are payments under the workmen's compensation law. A little while ago there were those who thought that it was an invasion of private rights for the various States to enact workmen's compensation laws to compensate workers for the human wreckage and deterioration incident to industry. It has been recognized, of course, that the employer has the right to charge off deterioration and depreciation for machinery that has broken down by accident. That is a part of the cost of doing business. But if a body were broken, if a human being broke down, it was said that it would be an invasion of private-property rights if that were made a charge upon the business, a business expense. Then, thank God, the social conscience of this Nation was awakened, and, so far as I know, every State finally provided workmen's compensation laws which made human wreckage a part of the cost of doing business.

So Mr. President, we got away from the practice of an injured man's having to call a lawyer and having to give 50 percent of his recovery to the lawyer in order to get it, and possibly not receive anything at all in the end.

The welfare fund, in my opinion, Mr. President, is an extension of the same principle. Industry, in my opinion, should be charged with a partial responsibility for the care and maintenance of people who work in a plant as well as for the care and maintenance of the plant itself. That is essentially the function of the welfare fund which, for all practical purposes, is prohibited by this amendment. The welfare fund is to provide medical care for those who are ill, to provide compensation for those who cannot work because of disability, to provide some compensation for the one who is injured. There recently occurred a tragic accident in the mines in Illinois. The daily toll taken in the hazardous industries is composed of human beings. Yet there is only a partial provision for the care of people who sustain such injuries and for the loved ones who have been deprived of their support.

Therefore, Mr. President, because some enlightened employer and some enlightened employee have found a way of getting together upon this principle and have entered into a free contract for making the welfare fund as a partial charge upon the industry itself, Congress presumes to step in and say that that is an invasion of the private rights of the parties; that such funds have to be so safeguarded and circumscribed that the workers themselves, through their officials, cannot have general jurisdiction of the administration of the funds. Mind you, Mr. President, that is in cases where it is agreed by the employer that the union shall have authority for the general administration of the funds.

Anyone who contemplates the number of people who are being wasted by the profligacy of the industrial process of this land, would, it seems to me, be sympathetic toward this fine movement of private enterprise finding a way of caring for its workers, and would insist that, instead of Congress trying to thwart, retard, and retrogress the process, it should write a provision in the bill declaring it to be the national policy to encourage the establishment of welfare funds in every industry in the land.

Reference has been made to a provision in the amendment which puts the matter back in court to enjoin a violation of the statute. We are step by step whittling away the Norris-LaGuardia Act; step by step we are restoring government by injunction; item by item providing machinery by which we may retard the effort of employees to maintain a decent standard of living and a fair level of wage; getting back again, Mr. President, to the fallacious policy of trying to settle disputes by litigation in court rather than by arbitration between the parties or by friendly agreement and cooperation between management and labor in working out their differences.

So, Mr. President, I do not see any need for this amendment. I do not see any abuse at which it is directed, or any necessity for changing the situation as it exists at the present time. There are hundreds of thousands of workers all over the United States who are protected by collective-bargaining agreements in respect to welfare funds. These disputes are not settled in court; they are settled by amicable accord and understanding between management and labor.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that this amendment will not be adopted and that we shall not strike down further a very salutary practice which has grown up in industry, namely, that of providing welfare funds for the health and care of the workers of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Ives	Reed
Bridges	Jenner	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Tobey
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ecton	Magnuson	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in regard to the matter of the vote on the amendment which was rejected earlier in the afternoon, because of the interest of many Senators, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was rejected. Inasmuch as it is not in order while another amendment is pending to move to reconsider that vote and subsequently to move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, I ask unanimous consent that it may now be in order to move to reconsider, and thereafter to move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the last-preceding amendment was rejected, and he asks unanimous consent that that motion may be considered at this time and that a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table may now be in order. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that so far as I am concerned, I have no intention of seeking a reconsideration of the vote, either today, or tomorrow, or at any time while this bill is pending. My feeling is that inasmuch as the division is so close and inasmuch as so many Senators feel strongly on one side of the amendment, even if it were carried by one or two votes, it probably would not advance the progress of the bill, and it might lose votes for the bill.

Therefore, in view of the showing made on the vote, even though on a reconsideration the Senate might perhaps carry the amendment by one or two votes, I do not intend to move to reconsider.

Consequently, I am prepared to acquiesce in the decision made this afternoon, and as a result I have no objection to the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, although at the present time I have no intention of moving a reconsideration, I do not wish to foreclose that possibility completely, and therefore I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The motion of the Senator from Kentucky to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, after consulting with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who objected a little while ago to the unanimous-consent request which I made in regard to a motion to reconsider and a motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, I now renew that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky again asks unanimous consent that he be permitted, out of order, to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment recently acted upon by the Senate was rejected.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and without objection, the question before the Senate is the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment referred to was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider which has been made by the Senator from Kentucky be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent agreement which I submit, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The following unanimous-consent agreement is proposed:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, May 8, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the pending amendment proposed to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH) on page 54, after line 4, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 8, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Do I correctly understand that the requested agreement applies only to the pending amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. It is what is known as the third amendment, and it refers to the social welfare fund. That amendment is now the pending question, and that is the only question which would be affected by the unanimous-consent agreement I have submitted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thought there was a general feeling that the Senate was almost ready to vote on the amendment at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. After talking to some Senators who are interested in the amendment, I find there is a general feeling that it will be impossible to obtain a vote on the amendment tonight. That is the reason for submitting the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as further proof of the wisdom of the Senate in rejecting the industry-wide bargaining amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from the Full Fashioned Hosiery Manufacturers of America, Inc., and also a telegram which I have received from the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 26, 1947.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate:

Full Fashioned Hosiery Manufacturers of America, Inc., an association of 36 hosiery mills located in various sections of this country and comprising a substantial section of the full-fashioned hosiery industry, has carried on collective bargaining on a group basis with American Federation of Hosiery Workers since 1928. The employers in this association have found group bargaining a very satisfactory method of handling their industrial relations. We believe it has brought about a stability which would not have been accomplished through individual bargaining and has helped to create harmonious and peaceful relationships with our employees. It is our considered opinion that the advantages of intelligent group bargaining far outweigh in importance the occasional abuse thereof. Therefore our association does not favor the proposed prohibition of industry-wide bargaining.

FULL FASHIONED HOSIERY MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
JOSEPH S. KLEINBARD,
General Counsel.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May 1, 1947.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Sections 9 (f) (1) and 12 (a) (4) of title I of H. R. 3020 (Labor Management Relations Act 1947), which has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate for consideration, would operate to prohibit joint-company collective bargaining. S. 1126 (Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947), as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, does not prohibit joint-company collective bargaining, but Senator BALL is sponsoring a proposed amendment to add section 304 to title I of S. 1126, which would also make joint-company collective bargaining impossible.

The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is taking this opportunity to register its vigorous opposition to such proposed legislation which would make it impossible for employers to act jointly in collective bargaining with labor unions. This company has for many years participated in joint labor negotiations in the flat-glass industry with the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. Our experience during this period of joint-company bargaining has satisfied us beyond any doubt that such joint-company bargaining has resulted in substantial benefits to all parties involved. The two companies employ in flat-glass manufacture approximately 20,000 production workers in plants located in seven States, most of whom are represented by the Federation of Glass, Ceramic, and Silica Sand Workers of America, CIO. About 1,000 are represented by the Window Glass Cutters League of America, AFL. It is our opinion that the above provisions of H. R. 3020 and the amendment to S. 1126 proposed by Senator BALL would have a serious effect upon the operations of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and its relations with its employees.

Without going into detail we believe the proposed legislative provisions mentioned above would (1) seriously disrupt existing mutually satisfactory bargaining relationships, (2) require unnecessary and time-consuming negotiations in the future, and (3) undermine existing satisfactory standards developed through years of joint collective bargaining based on an equality of bargaining power and mutual respect of the parties.

We understand that these legislative proposals are calculated to prevent industry-wide strikes. On the basis of our experience we can state that neither proposal will accomplish this result.

Since a full statement of our views is not possible in this telegram we would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this matter with you personally at your convenience. If

you are available, please wire collect as to the time most convenient for you.

LELAND HAZARD,
Vice President and General Counsel, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., 2000 Grant Building.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, because of an engagement which I made some time ago, it will be necessary for me to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may absent myself from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BALDWIN Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America:

From Foreign Service officers of class 4 to Foreign Service officers of class 3:

William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.
Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
John K. Emmerson, of Colorado.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
Outerbridge Horsey, of New York.
John D. Jernegan, of California.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.
Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
Livingston Satterthwaite, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Scherer, of New York.
Donald W. Smith, of Maryland.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Ivan B. White, of Oregon.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Warner W. Gardner.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Alexander Sharp, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Father William Kailer Dunn, assistant pastor, St. Edward's Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the hearts of men which Thou hast made, and made for Thyself alone, allow only those desires to arise which are holy and pleasing to Thee. In the minds of these, our national leaders, place right counsels and let their efforts at lawmaking result in just works, for in their hands lie the destinies of millions of American souls, precious beyond words in Thy sight and designed by Thee to be such good citizens in this life that they may be found worthy to be citizens of Thy world to come.

Give, O Lord, to them and to us whom they represent that peace which this world has striven for by standards other than Thine and which the world, in its earthy way, cannot attain. Help their minds to the conviction that obedience to Thy commandments alone will light up the path for which we seek, will protect us from fear of all enemies, and will merit for our times that peace which is the tranquility of order, the order of creature under Creator, making of us a nation secure because we are worthy of Thy protection.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 193. An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended;

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; and

H. R. 2123. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan;

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 580. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census);

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 629. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto;

S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan;

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart;

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 800. An act to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber;

S. 874. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; and

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and with profound sorrow that I announce the death of William J. Fitzgerald, former Member of this House from the Second District of Connecticut, who served here in Washington from 1938 through 1942.

As former mayor of the city of Norwich, Conn., as deputy State labor commissioner and war manpower commissioner, as a prominent leader in the labor movement in Connecticut, he was always faithful to his trust and to his many associates. Although of different political faith, I was always pleased to call him one of my friends. I know his former colleagues here in the House join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family and many friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my distinguished friend from Connecticut in the splendid tribute that he has paid to our late colleague, as we called him and knew him, Bill Fitzgerald. His passing is a matter of keen regret to me personally, as I enjoyed a very close relationship of real friendship with him. Bill Fitzgerald was one of the most sincere Members of the House that I have ever had the honor of serving with in this body. He was a man of outstanding courage, of strong and sound convictions, and was possessed of a nobility of character which was an example and an inspiration for all to observe and follow. I feel keenly his passing, and I know that my colleagues who served with him share that feeling of regret. Again, I join with my friend from Connecticut in the splendid tribute that he has so eloquently paid to the memory of a great man and a great legislator.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, too, would like to join in the splendid tribute that has been paid to our late colleague, Bill Fitzgerald, of Norwich, Conn. It was my privilege to have served with him in this Congress in 1941 and 1942. I knew him to be a man of great character. He had a tremendous amount of energy. He was a great Congressman for the people of his district in those days. He was a great leader and a great friend of the common people, not only in Connecticut, but throughout the entire country.

I know that the Members of the House of Representatives sympathize with his family in their bereavement on his passing.

ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention not to have any 1-minute speeches?

The SPEAKER. Not until this bill is out of the way. We want to get through with the general debate on the bill today and commence the reading of the bill for amendment on tomorrow.

Mr. BENDER. Will the same situation prevail tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UTILITIES, INSURANCE, AND BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Utilities, Insurance, and Banking of the House Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials concerning the International Information and Cultural Office.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include part of a radio address and four letters.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Charles Holman.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a circular entitled "The Iron and Steel Scrap Situation."

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMERICAN HEROES' DAY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point on a resolution which I introduced making May 7 a national holiday named American Heroes' Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, May 7 is a day set apart by destiny on which all Americans everywhere are bound by the dictates of their hearts to honor the

brave men who successfully preserved our Nation by giving unstintingly of themselves to achieve victory in World War II.

May 7 is American Heroes' Day because it binds together those who fought in Europe and those who fought in the far reaches of the Pacific. May 7 is American Heroes' Day because it unites in its observance the honoring of courage in triumph with the honoring of courage in tragedy. On May 8, 1945, Hitler's minions surrendered. On May 6, 1942, after the most brilliant and sacrificial defense since the Alamo, the Stars and Stripes were hauled down from the Fortress of Corregidor.

Sacrifice, whether in sorrow or success, should be justly venerated. The accident of time has given us the means of veneration. On May 7 Americans can look back on suffering and look ahead to success. I know not how this day ought to be observed. But I do know that this is the day.

The authority for American Heroes' Day goes back beyond the Congress and the President who were created by the Constitution. It goes back to the very creators of the Consitution themselves—the American people.

To paraphrase President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this day. The brave men, living and dead, who gave us this day have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what I say here but it can never forget what they did to save the light of liberty for all mankind. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated on American Heroes' Day to the unfinished work which they who fought to save the things we love have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated on this day to the great task remaining before us—that from those who died that we might live and from those who are here with us now we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave and are giving the full measure of devotion; that we on this day are highly resolved that these dead shall not have died in vain or that these living shall not have lived in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

In the sincere hope that Members of the Eightieth Congress will concur in the suggestion to establish this day of national observance, I have today introduced a resolution asking that in future years May 7 be set apart as American Heroes' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject How the Northwest Projects Pay Their Way, and include two editorials.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief speech by the president of the University of California.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to congratulate the students of Western High School for lifting the little iron curtain and showing the American people the Communist program of poisoning the minds of the students of this Nation in our public schools and colleges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Freeport Journal entitled "Home Demonstration Work Week" and in the other a speech on soil conservation in Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, at the thirty-seventh convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 2, 1947.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a telegram received from the merchants of the city of Peabody in their determination to keep prices down and to reduce prices; second, to include a newspaper article; and, third, a radio address.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain articles.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the Greece-Turkey assistance legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair previously announced that no 1-minute speeches would be allowed today or tomorrow. The gentleman may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, if he desires.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would, of course, prefer to make my remarks on the floor, but under the circumstances I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

GREECE-TURKEY ASSISTANCE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the debate that has taken place thus far on the Greece-Turkey assistance bill clearly reveals the fact that the American people are strongly opposed to it. It reveals another important fact—namely, a determination on the part of Congress to ignore the will of the people and to launch the Nation upon another program of lend-lease that promises well to lead the Nation into World War III. If the Congress passes this bill, it will have demonstrated to all those who have eyes to see and ears to hear that constitutional and representative government have been suspended, if not abolished, and dictatorship is in the saddle.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Murray, Tenn.
Bland	Fellows	O'Toole
Bonner	Fisher	Patman
Boykin	Fuller	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Powell
Camp	Gregory	Reeves
Canfield	Hart	Scoblick
Carson	Hartley	Sikes
Chapman	Hinshaw	Smith, Maine
Clark	Jennings	Somers
Clements	Jensen	Taylor
Colmer	Kefauver	Thomas, N. J.
Cox	McDowell	Towe
Crawford	Madden	Trimble
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Domengeaux	Mitchell	West
Douglas	Morrison	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a factual statement on the car situation by the car service division of the American Railway Association.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a concurrent resolution which he introduced today.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HORAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of April 29, 1947.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] had 2 hours and 22 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], 2 hours and 45 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to yield time at the moment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending proposal to furnish financial assistance to Greece and Turkey.

I want to preface my remarks by saying I am as much concerned as any citizen in this country over the dangers of Russian expansion. Actually, I have been deeply concerned about it for many years. In fact, long before many of our present leaders felt much apprehension about it.

I can best summarize my basic reasons for opposing the measure as follows: A man who cannot gauge his starting point certainly cannot accurately predict his destination. Our present dilemma is premised on that fact. We have not stopped long enough since the end of the war to reestablish our bearings. Actually, we have not even taken time to catch our breath. Our war-time and postwar foreign policy has consisted of one makeshift arrangement after another. It has continually been a "heads you win, tails I lose" proposition from our standpoint. It has ignored every principle of basic justice. Expediency has led to one emergency after another—each one more acute than the one which preceded it. The Atlantic Charter, our basic document for a just peace, died in mortal agony on the rocks of compromise, conciliation, appeasement and despair.

Briefly, that is the record up to now.

Those who have made that record are now reversing their field. The hands which fed the soothing syrup have now reached for the sword. I concede, Mr. Chairman, that it is noble to admit a costly mistake and to take measures to remedy it. But those who have made the errors ought not object to close scrutiny of the remedy they suggest or to a full scale and careful objective analysis of its merits. The pending proposal, I submit, will not stand such a test.

I propose to show that our so-called bipartisan foreign policy has been so inconsistent, so misleading and so utterly devoid of straight thinking that it completely defies description. I propose to show that those responsible for it are as confused and bewildered in their thinking today as they were 3 years ago. I propose to show that the pending measure is born of futility and despair, and is a $400,000,000 adventure in diplomatic intrigue. That it is of hybrid origin—half belligerent and half benign. That it is half economic and half military. That it is half war-like and half conciliatory. That it is intervention in part and nonintervention in part. And that in sum, it is an unhappy conglomeration of contradictions in policy rolled together in the same ball of wax. Nevertheless, this flash bulb diplomacy generated by an alleged emergency is being handed the American people as the method by which to stop Russian aggression and establish world peace. We are told that our action must be immediate. It matters not if this may prove to be precipitous and unwise. It matters not if it superimposes a more unmanageable emergency upon the present alleged emergency. We must act now. Mr. Chairman, if it were not presumptuous on my part, I would assert that this thesis reaches a new zenith in stupidity. For more than 3 years, we have stumbled along with an unintelligible foreign policy now referred to as bipartisan. This alleged policy, although baffling and confusing to the American people, has been consistent in its over-all operation—it has constantly subordinated the interests of a just and decent peace to the appeasement of Russian communism.

No one, I think, will seriously dispute the fact that even before the end of the war we inaugurated a policy of leaning over backward to understand Stalin and his government. We have alternately compromised, conciliated, and appeased in order to be sure that he understood our willingness to cooperate with him. It is now past history that in our desire to overdo ourselves in this direction, we succeeded in compromising the rights and liberties of millions of people around the globe, and in addition, caused many governments entitled to be free to be subjugated under the iron heel of Russian communism.

The policy pattern which brought about this situation and which created the almost intolerable circumstances in which we find ourselves today, can be divided in two parts which I shall discuss in order.

First. The so-called Big Three meetings conducted during and after the war and their resultant agreements and understandings.

Second. The creation of the United Nations Organization which was inspired, directed, and brought into existence under the bipartisan guidance of our foreign-policy leadership.

Each of these courses of action generated and sparked the over-all bipartisan plan of letting the Russians do exactly as they pleased. The record shows the plan succeeded well.

I make no criticism of the meetings held by the heads of the major Allied Governments to discuss war strategy and thus bring about better cooperation and assist in the expeditious winning of the war. But the Big Three meetings went much further than that. They discussed and decided postwar questions involving the settlement of peace. Irrevocable commitments were made at these meetings affecting peacetime problems. There was compromise and appeasement—mostly on our side—affecting the rights and liberties of people and governments who were not even present or parties to such agreements.

All of these meetings are of too recent origin to require extensive review. There was Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam where the heads of the major governments, including our own, reached understandings between themselves which made possible the eventual enslavement of millions of people by Russia and destroyed the integrity of governments which we had declared we would make free. In spite of the previous meetings, we had one last chance at Potsdam to lay the groundwork for a respectable peace. But we did not avail ourselves of it.

Instead of steadfastly and forthrightly insisting that the Russians respect the provisions of the Atlantic Charter which they had previously agreed to, we permitted them to ravish and plunder the nations of Europe which had already been devastated by the war. We failed utterly to uphold one single principle for which we said our boys were fighting. Then we left Europe and its people prostrated and in the clutches of a dictator equally as ruthless as the one we had just conquered. The American people had nothing to say on this subject. Like the previous Big Three arrangements, it was never subject to ratification by the people. The fact was accomplished; the deed was done—it remained only for the American people to pour their money into this stricken area for relief supplies which actually got into the hands of the Russian conqueror. That in sum was our contribution at Potsdam toward the establishment of a decent peace.

While the President and his advisers were in Europe thus engaged in acquiescing to the demands of the Russians, our statesmen at home were engaged at San Francisco in formulating a contemporary arrangement to enforce peace which helped aggravate our difficulties.

Bear in mind that at the time of the San Francisco Conference, no final peace treaty had yet been attempted. Nor was it intended that the San Francisco Conference should write the peace. It was intended rather to create a peace-enforcing organization which would from then on maintain peace. It did not matter to our statesmen that their labors were directed toward creating an organization to enforce a peace which had not been written. They made us partners in that organization without

knowing whether we would have a good peace or a bad peace to enforce. No one in this country would want to pledge us to enforce an unjust peace yet we were at great pains to create the San Francisco Organization with our eyes completely blindfolded.

Moreover, many months were wasted on this United Nations organization which could well have been devoted to the main problem of writing a treaty of peace. So it is fair to say that we got the cart before the horse at San Francisco, because while we now have a peace enforcing organization—we still do not have any peace.

It must be apparent also by now the time wasted at the San Francisco Conference played directly into the hands of the Russians. It helped becloud the issues. It gave the Russians time to further extend their zones of aggression, and thus, place all of the Allies in a disadvantageous position when they finally got around to talking final peace.

Nevertheless, those who opposed the ratification of the San Francisco agreement and alleged that it should wait until a peace was written, were brushed aside. It was said it was a great contribution to world peace. Speaking at San Francisco at the closing session of the conference on June 26, 1945, President Truman said:

> What you have accomplished in San Francisco shows how well these lessons of military and economic cooperation have been learned. You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world. The world must now use it. If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it. If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.
>
> By their own example the strong nations of the world should lead the way to international justice. That principle of justice is the foundation stone of this Charter. That principle is the guiding spirit by which it must be carried out—not by words alone but by continued concrete acts of good will.
>
> It (the UN Charter) has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct the economic and social causes for conflict. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 5, p. 6979.)

In an address to Congress on the presentation of the Charter for ratification on June 2, 1945, the President further stated:

> In your deliberations, I hope you will consider not only the words of the Charter but also the spirit which gives it meaning and life. The objectives of the Charter are clear. It seeks to prevent future wars. It seeks to settle international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with principles of justice. * * * It seeks to remove the economic and social causes of international conflict and unrest. * * * This Charter points down the only road to enduring peace. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 5, p. 7119.)

It is clearly evident from these statements the extraordinary faith and confidence that was placed in this peace-enforcing agency less than 2 years ago. But it is an incontrovertible fact that the same nations who created this peace-enforcing organization 2 years ago have as yet been unable to write the peace which this Charter would enforce.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, its proponents asserted that although the peace-enforcing agency was created before the peace was written, disputes might arise in the interim which could properly be settled by this agency. Now we have such a dispute in the Greek-Turkey situation but we are told that UN is not prepared to meet it. So in spite of what has been claimed, it is obvious that UN cannot or will not function as of today.

Based upon the foregoing, I assert that two conclusions are inescapable:

First, we have not been able to write a final peace because under our bipartisan foreign policy we have permitted Russian aggression to extend over such widespread areas that Stalin will not even discuss peace except upon his own terms. We cannot agree to Russia's terms even though we are largely to blame for Communist expansion; and, second, the United Nations organization will not function because there is no peace written which it can enforce and it cannot function in other respects because the Russians will prevent it through the use of their veto.

Therefore, it is clear that our present difficulties cannot be resolved within the framework of the United Nations organization. Neither can they be resolved within the framework of a treaty of peace which has not yet been written. So we are left with about three alternatives:

First. We may withdraw in frustration from further peace discussions as we did following World War I; or

Second. We may proceed unilaterally as contemplated by the pending resolution; or

Third. We may join with other peace-loving nations of the world and meet directly the issue of a Russian expansion in all parts of the world, and treat it as we find it—one big inseparable problem—which cannot be settled by piecemeal procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with the assertion that we ought to let the American people decide which of these courses we should follow. Regardless of protestations to the contrary, this problem is too big and too vital to be decided by the bewildering and baffling process which has characterized our bipartisan foreign policy during the past 2 years. I think the people have had enough of our adventures in foreign policy by the expedient and makeshift method. I think they have had enough diplomacy by trial and error. I think the people are tired of crisis after crisis and emergency following emergency which have prostrated our peace efforts. I think the time has come when the people are entitled to a forthright, honest statement of aims. They ought to know where we are going and when we expect to get there. They ought to be fully advised of the burdens we intend to place upon them—both present and prospective.

The pending proposal does not give our people that kind of information. It is another expedient by piecemeal procedure. It has no definite limitations. It is another strike in the dark.

Why should the American people be led to believe that you can stop the spread of communism or Russian expansion by stopping it in Greece and Turkey—when we are presently confronted with the same situation in at least a dozen other countries of the world. Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to tell the American people the whole story. We ought to tell them that our bipartisan foreign policy has been utterly ineffective, and needs complete revision. We ought to tell them that there is only one real way of stopping Russian aggression and that is to meet it head on. We ought to tell them that it will cost more than $400,000,000 to stop the Russian tide. We ought to tell them that it may cost four billion or forty billion and maybe another war.

After we have honestly and frankly informed the American people of the situation which confronts them, we should let them make the final decision.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with this final point. The Russians are where they are today because they have had one clear objective from the outset and have pursued it vigorously and relentlessly and without deviation. Contrast this to our policy. We started out with high principles and objectives—often enunciated but seldom followed. We gave in to the Russians at every turn of the road. Each time we gave in, they fitted a new cog in their plan. We have talked—the Russians have acted. Now we have reached the crosroads and our statesmen propose that we cure the dilemma by giving the patient Castoria when he should be given castor oil.

Our problem is to stop expanding Communist domination on a dozen fronts. We propose to stop it by a half-hearted attack on one front.

There is only one way to meet this problem, Mr. Chairman, and that is to assess it in its entirety and attack it in its entirety. If we do that, I think we will come to the inevitable conclusion that the only way to stop Russian aggression is to move Stalin back to his prewar boundaries and that any other sporadic action will merely prolong the day when we have to meet this problem squarely. Moving Stalin back may be a big order. But if it is a big order today, it will be a much bigger one 5 years from today.

I repeat again that we ought not move until we make this reassessment of all the facts. Let us make one decision to meet one issue and then pursue our course irrevocably.

If we adopt the present diplomatic monstrosity we are merely adding another blunder to an already colossal list of failures in bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us for consideration is the legislation necessary to implement the message given the joint session of the Congress in this chamber on March 12

by the President of the United States. This message presented to the American people and to us who represent them a new view of our place among the nations which, whether we desire it or not, we are called upon to occupy. It is a place of great responsibility which will require a new form of courage, of vision, of wisdom and of faith. So far reaching do I believe the results of our deliberations to be that I should be doing less than my part did I not say to you in utmost solemnity that upon our decision in these next days hangs the future not alone of our Nation, but of our civilization and possibly even of man upon the earth.

In my study of world conditions and our relation to other countries during the less than 200 years of our national life, as a background for decision in my search for guidance in the records of our past, I found much that steadied me, much that gave me hope that even at this moment we will do what other Congresses have done: Lay aside our personal biases, our regional prejudices, and consider the problem before us from the broad view of what free men accept as their responsibility before Almighty God. This is not the first time a Congress has had to face decisions that have increased our influence in the world beyond our borders, nor is it the first time we have had to make decisions involving us with the people of these very same areas.

You will recall the widespread revolts of the early nineteenth century against the selfish domination of tyrants and kings. It was in 1823, only 8 years after the battle of Waterloo, that the countries to the south of us freed themselves from the bonds of the Spanish Empire. We were the first to recognize their independence. And we went still further—we issued a warning to all the world to keep hands off. It was in his address to the first session of the Eighteenth Congress convening on December 1, 1823, that President Monroe addressed his message containing the paragraphs that later became known as the Monroe Doctrine.

We were but a small country then scarce 50 years old, with a population of but 10,000,000. Mexico was still ruler over vast areas of our present land. We hadn't even inventoried our Louisiana Purchase. But, Mr. Chairman, we knew what we proposed to do. We laid down an American policy, and though the world of that day was incomparably stronger than were we, no one then or since has violated it.

It was in the turmoil of that long ago time when Greece was struggling to free herself from the bonds of the then powerful Ottoman Empire that Daniel Webster, a giant of his time, arose in the House of Representatives to offer the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an agent or commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment.

In defense of his resolution this farseeing legislator said—and I ask you to note how vividly it applies to this moment:

> The age is a peculiar one—it has a marked and striking character, and the position and circumstances of our country are no less so. • • • There has occurred no age that may be compared with the present, whether in the interest excited by what now is or the prospect it holds out as to what it shall be. The attitude of the United States, meanwhile, is solemn and impressive.

I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, if his words do not meet the conditions in which we now find ourselves. I suggest it would be well if, for a moment or two, we listen to this great American, remembering that the United States of which he spoke was a pygmy compared with the Great Britain and the Russia of his day.

The wise, sagacious, foresighted Mr. Webster continued:

> Ours is now the Great Republic of the earth; its free institutions are matured by the experiment of half a century. • • • As a free Government, as the freest Government, its growth and strength compel it, willing or unwilling, to stand forth to the contemplation of the world. We cannot obscure ourselves if we would: a part we must take, honorable or dishonorable, in all that is done in the civilized world.

Mr. Webster continues with a picture of the Holy Alliance that had been formed by Alexander I of Russia and the restored Bourbon monarchy of France to uphold the divine right of kings. Great Britain would have no truck with this. She looked upon the Holy Alliance as a device by which Russia might achieve military power over all Europe.

Spoke that great statesman one-hundred-and-twenty-odd years ago:

> What was the natural tendency of such an alliance? It was to put an end to all nations as such. Extend the principles of that alliance and the nations are no more—there are only kings.

Developing his theme he continued:

> Are we prepared to resist this doctrine? The timid shrink and succumb If it is not resisted here, and in one other spot, it will be resisted nowhere. If there is no vigor in the Saxon race to withstand it, there is none to be looked for elsewhere. • • • The radical defeat of this system—

The Holy Alliance—

> is that it divides civilization. • • • The harmony which has ever prevailed either in Europe or America has rested on the principle of the mutual interdependence of nations. • • • Take this away and there is nothing left but the sword.

Those words spoken in the Nation's Congress one-hundred-and-twenty-odd years ago can well be repeated in the very midst of this deliberation.

It was feared in 1823 by the United States and England that the Holy Alliance would intervene on behalf of Spain's efforts to regain her lost American colonies.

In referring to President Monroe's pronouncement, Mr. Webster said:

> Whatever we do in this matter it behooves us to do on principle. If, on the subject of the rumored combination against South America, we take any stand, it must be on principle that that stand is taken The near approach, or the remote distance of danger, may change policy but cannot touch principle, and the same reasons of an abstract kind that would lead us to protest in the case of the whole southern continent binds us to protest in the case of the smallest republic in Italy.

Some Members of the Eighteenth Congress expressed fear that Mr. Webster's resolution might bring us into embroilment with Turkey or with the powerful Holy Alliance. To this, among other things, he says:

> Shall we be withheld from an honest expression of liberal feeling in the cause of freedom for fear of giving umbrage to some member of the Holy Alliance? Surely we are not yet prepared to purchase their smiles by a sacrifice of every manly principle. • • •

Emphasizing the need of giving aid to Greece, Mr. Webster says:

> They look to us as the great Republic of the earth • • • and they ask us by our common faith whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy? I cannot say, sir, that they will succeed: that rests with Heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should hear tomorrow that they have failed • • • I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction that I have asked you, in the name of 7,000,000 of freemen, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice.

That was the Eighteenth Congress in 1823–24. But could any words be more adapted to the Eightieth Congress in 1947 than Mr. Webster's:

> There has occurred no age that may be compared with the present?

If there is any difference, it is only in degree. In the 1820's only segments of the world were involved. Today there is no nook or cranny to which a man may go to escape the responsibility to the great future that is his.

The men and women who faced our Revolution and our Civil War felt themselves in the toils of events beyond all others. Certainly we who have experienced two cataclysmic world wars feel events have pyramided upon us—that now it is our turn. Yes, there are those among us who in fear would dissent, but our people are a strong and virile people, who will face responsibility with as great a courage and as sound a method as those of any age, once they understand clearly what that responsibility is. They cannot be expected to choose wisely if the issues are beclouded and confused. But if we give our people the picture as it really is fearlessly and with complete faith in their considered judgment, if we, as fearlessly and with unwavering faith, accept the responsibility that is America's for the continuance of freedom upon the earth, we need have no fear as to their courage, their vision, and their faith.

What is it that confronts us as a nation? What is the decision we must make? It is clearly this: Shall we accept a place of responsibility toward the continuance of freedom upon earth, or shall we let it go by default?

It was on March 12, 1947, that President Truman appeared before a joint session of this Eightieth Congress with a message which has been called by some the Truman doctrine. It differed most dramatically from President Monroe's in that while the earlier one was scarcely taken notice of at the time, President Truman electrified the world. Why? Because the most powerful nation on earth had spoken to the whole wide world. What did that message say? It did not lay down the law. It did not preach. It did not threaten. It claimed nothing for itself. It attempted to take

nothing from others. It simply reminded a sick, struggling, and fearful world that the belief held by the United States in the right of free choice is a vital, unselfish, and living belief. That to those whose desire for freedom is threatened, who wish to remain free, we, who believe in freedom, will give help as we are able and in such manner as may be decided upon.

Neither we, the Members of this Congress, nor the American people, can proceed intelligently without an understanding of the question that confronts us, the nature of our times, the vices and virtues not only of our principal opponent, but our own as well.

The immense complexity of today's world has been curiously reduced to the simple fact that unparalleled world wars and revolutions of a single generation have brought it about that there are left but two great powers: ourselves and the Soviet Union. Neither one of us is very well prepared to take responsibility for peace in the world, but whether we are ready or not, the responsibility is upon us.

Let us look at the situation objectively, fearlessly and above all hopefully. It is very apparent that we stand at the opposite poles of thought and we might as well face the fact so evident to anyone who reads no more than the simple little books Stalin has written about Lenin and about communism. We might as well face up to it and recognize that the Soviet is a proselytizing group bent upon converting all the nations of the world to the Communist way of life. We might better remember that nothing is more dangerous than the true fanatic. He is that most to be feared of all men—the man who would cut your throat not to do you harm, but to do you good! Such is the practice of the zealous Communist.

We, on the other hand, think quite differently. It is true that we believe in the spiritual and the material wisdom of "democracy" as we define it. We have not forced others to attempt it knowing that it is not a form of government but a state of mind, a state of being, into which certain peoples are not ready to enter because their inheritance and environment are such that they do not yet understand it. Is it not true that we have always felt that this world of ours could be a little like Heaven—a place of "many mansions"—in which the inhabitants of each went about the business of living in their own way, worshiping their own gods and setting up such governments as they desire. We did not admire Czarist Russia, but we got along with her. Unfortunately, Communist Russia makes that tolerance difficult if not impossible.

In considering further the situation in which we find ourselves side by side with the Soviet Union, it would be wise to remember that this other titan is two and one-half times larger than the United States with these added satellite countries beyond her borders. "Satellite," as it happens, is the precise word. Satellites, by a compulsion of physics which they cannot resist, move in the orbits of the greater stars. Her still undeveloped riches are fabulous though at the moment we are stronger than she is.

The United States' capacity for production is greater than the rest of the world, and this although we have only 6 percent of the world population. Nor are we alone in the struggle—for others are with us. If the worst should come and the world be split asunder into two groups we would have an enormous advantage over Russia if our resources were combined with those of Britain. The United States News of May 2 just past gives this very interesting comparison of present resources on that basis:

Cropland: 67 percent of the world's cropland against Russia's 33 percent.

Coal: 84 percent against Russia's 16 percent.

Industrial production: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Steel: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Railroad mileage: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Electric power: 89 percent against Russia's 11 percent.

Petroleum: 90 percent against Russia's 10 percent.

Shipping: 97 percent against Russia's 3 percent.

It is my firm conviction that we can remain stronger if we invoke the use of our full strength. Whether the world stands with us or kneels to the Soviet is more a matter of our character than of our resources. It is a matter of our vision, our will, our understanding, our obstinacy—and, above all, our willingness less to die for our beliefs than to live for them! Without question, we are the most powerful people that inhabit the earth.

The Russian military and industrial potential is probably greater than our own, but not realizable for sometime to come. The key to Communist action is their passionately fanatic belief that the world must become wholly Communist. They do not propose to rest until that moment. No revolution, no infiltration is considered successful until it has set up a Communist state and started a revolution in another country. Whether we like it or not, that is the cold fact stated many times by their leaders.

At this moment all the world is not under the Russian heel, and there is ample evidence that all the world does not want to be under it and that it looks to us for leadership. With us they may survive; without us they are lost.

The only real weapon Russia has is communism. This weapon is effective only in the presence of hopelessness, despair, disease, and anarchy. True that the wars have conditioned the world in such wise as to make it ready for the virus of totalitarian controls. When a man is starving, and his wife and child with him, he will turn to anyone who promises him food. In a way one might say that communism is a system of receivership in bankruptcy, that it takes over when a state no longer serves its people's needs or when its rulers are so blind that they do not attempt to serve them. It is a negative system, largely made possible by default. It is the last alternative left the despairing. But this weapon of communism, this promise of bread, loses effectiveness if means are found so to strengthen the sick body so that it becomes resistant to infection.

What have we to give? Indeed, what is it that the President in his message asked us to make possible? A few of our soldiers especially qualified for assignment to training duty, technicians, specialists, trained men and trained women to go over to this strategically important area and prove that we so truly believe that freedom is an essential part of living, that we are willing and ready to give of our knowledge and our skills that the people of Greece and of Turkey may not only return to productivity of their own but that they may eat their bread in freedom and in peace.

Stalin does not believe that we have the will, the tenacity, the purposefulness, and the concrete faith in our own way of life to give ourselves to the spread of freedom in opposition to communism. He does not think that we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to use such of our wealth as the task calls for. He believes that he can win by our default. He believes that because most of the people of the world are poor, sick, and hopeless he can win by doing little, while we can win only by doing a great deal. The Russians have an awesome respect for our military and industrial abilities, but they regard us as childish, a spoiled people unhardened by privation who, when not directly attacked militarily, will not shoulder the burdens of world leadership. They believe that we will not face up to the facts and that we will not act. If they are right we shall ultimately come into catastrophic conflict with them. If they are wrong we can perhaps prevent the conflict and play the part I believe we, as a Nation, were destined to play, leading the world out of despair toward a new era of happiness and prosperity. The task is almost superhuman—the costs will be high—but I would ask you, is any cost short of the loss of honor too high to prevent war?

Let me put it this way: What price would not the families of our war dead and of our brave wounded pay to have their men back alive and well? In our hearts we know that we must pay for everything we want and that in the bazaars of life ambition, fame, success, achievement, riches, war, peace—all have their price. Therefore, if we want a peaceful, orderly world we know we can have it only if we pay for it; otherwise we shall lose not only all possibility of peace but also our freedom and the freedom of the world.

I say to you with a deep sincerity that if we turn our faces away from the road that lies ahead so clearly outlined by the frantic determination of the greatest of all totalitarian states, we and all those who reach out to us in hope of freedom will have to see the world we have dreamed of tortured and destroyed by inches before our eyes. And the last that will succumb will be ourselves.

It is quite true what men have said from this well that only a strong America can lead the world. I am too practically minded not to agree wholeheartedly with this self-evident premise that unless we pull ourselves together and stop this utterly unworthy internal strife so that our farms and factories can produce to capacity and the results

be transported wherever there is need in accordance with such policies as we may decide upon, we are of little use to ourselves or to the world. And it takes strength to do this, not just a visible, tangible strength, but also strength of spirit, strength of determination, strength of integrity and honor, strength above all things in the matter of our faith and in the destiny we must hold inviolate. It takes strength to be willing to sacrifice comfort, ease, luxury. Have we lost confidence in ourselves? Have we become devitalized? Are we so confused that we can no longer see clearly the implications of these grave problems with which we are faced?

Granted that the world of Daniel Webster, when men traveled by slow stages, was externally a different world from ours. Why—now with a bit of a tailwind I can come back from my Ohio district to Washington in a little over an hour, and all else in proportion—but the same momentous questions face us.

I have said before that this is a complicated world but, in some respects, a simple one. This is certainly true of it in its strategical aspects. There are a few lands and islands that are the strategic keys to much of the world. Among them are Greece and Turkey. It is rather terrifying, even in retrospect, to realize that during the last war our national salvation depended, perhaps, upon two tiny bits of land whose combined area is less than that of a Texas county. If Malta and Gibraltar had fallen into the hands of Germany and Italy before we entered the war, it is unlikely that a war would have continued into which we might enter.

Definitely aware of the risks involved, but unafraid of them, I see this bill as one designed to accomplish a number of objects: First. To keep two of the most strategically important countries of the world in the free nations column rather than giving them over to totalitarian domination by default.

Second. To give Greece and Turkey a breathing spell in which to reorganize their economies and begin to move toward putting themselves on their own feet.

Third. To keep open the markets of the Mediterranean and the Near East for ourselves and all others who trade there and who trade with us directly and indirectly.

On all these counts, therefore, I am for aid and assistance to Greece and Turkey. Looking back over the last 30 years it is clear that twice within a generation we have been saved not by any wisdom or foresight of our own, but simply by the grace of God, in that others held the enemy until we could come upon the battlefield and turn the tide. Now there are no others.

The time has come when we must depend less upon good fortune, more upon our brains; when we must be forehanded instead of empty-headed; when we must lead and not follow. I am well aware that the task before us is of staggering dimensions and this bill but a beginning. But I am certain we can do nothing for ourselves or for the world by deceiving ourselves into believing we can be saved by incantations or by libations to the gods. But since when have Americans faltered because a task was hard?

The world we share with other men who look to us challenges us with every new dawn to take hold of reality with all the old thrill of adventure, the certainty of attainment and the unshakable faith that the men and women who built the America we live in knew. Yes, these men fought when they had to with their women loading their muskets, but they won through with their farms, their schools, their churches, and their village stores. These same simple methods free men use are the best and most effective weapons with which the expansion of totalitarian domination can be stopped. Yes, it will cost to take them over there and show the people what free men do with such weapons, with such tools. But the question is not just how can we avoid war, or only how can we stop totalitarian expansion. The question is, in addition: How truly do we believe that freedom is worth whatever price life demands for it save only honor? How passionately do we want freedom and peace for ourselves and for the world? How ready are we to sacrifice our superficial comforts, our ease, our selfish greeds to the great future? How vividly aware are we that in very truth he who loveth his life overmuch shall lose it? Have we considered the results if we live up to Stalin's expectations and do nothing? Are we going to let freedom go by default or are we going to gird our souls for a battle with weapons that are an unshakable faith, mixed with bread, a few machines, a few military and other technicians and specialists, all bound together with integrity and the shining force of character and an unwavering belief that men can and will choose freedom if and when they have a choice?

Lincoln, with deep and simple wisdom, one day announced that this country could not exist half slave and half free. If we lift the veils of selfishness and fear from our eyes and look out across the present world we shall see without the shadow of a doubt that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. What sort of a people are we who prate of peace and whisper of more war—for the future of the whole wide world is in our hands?

Let us not minimize the greatness of this moment for us and for all mankind.

Above all, let us not turn away from the clearly defined road that lies before us, a stormy road, perhaps, but filled with the glory of struggle and of attainment. The moment of our choosing is upon us! Shall we turn off into the bypath to which so many beckon us, or shall we once again lift our eyes to the stars, and, putting our hand into the hand of God, step out upon the road of destiny?

Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest hope that this House may pass H. R. 2616 overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

In accordance with the gentlewoman's request, without objection, she may revise and extend her remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio on the very able and sincere address she has just made.

Mr. Chairman, the President, in his address before the Congress on March 12, called to our attention the grave situation confronting the world today, asserting that "the foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved."

The proposal before the House is the answer of the Foreign Affairs Committee to the President's appeal, and in the words of our report is "aimed at the establishment and maintenance of political and economic security" in the Mediterranean area.

This is not just another bill to provide relief for some foreign country. The sentimental attachment and admiration of our people for the Greek people and their legitimate aspirations, alone, would not, to my way of thinking, warrant the very serious step proposed here today.

There are some who have criticized the lack of firmness and forthrightness in our foreign policy in the past. Such a charge cannot be sustained against this bill, or against President Truman who proposed it, or against Secretary Marshall who has wholeheartedly endorsed it.

This country has stumbled into two world wars because foreign dictators and would-be dictators did not have a clear picture of where we stood. To say the least, they will not misunderstand us if we pass this legislation. It is supremely necessary that they do not misunderstand.

No man knows whether this aid program will prevent another world war. But it is my confident belief that it will help in that direction. The last war cost the United States, in addition to untold blood and suffering, $400,000,000,000. My support of this bill, which provides for one-tenth of 1 percent of that outlay of the taxpayers' money, is predicated on my belief that the outlay will prove to be a good investment, a reasonable insurance premium against another war.

The United States is the most powerful nation on earth, but we will never escape another war unless we show a willingness to go to war if challenged. War will not come to us if we accept the idea of possible war and prepare for it.

War is certain to come if the United States fails to challenge Russia in her policy of expansion and aggression. If we appease and back away as Russia expands, communism will finally become so strong that we must fight for our way of life and our national existence. The issue here is whether or not we are going to fold our tents and silently slip away to our own hemisphere and let the slow, deadly cancer of dictatorship and

the superstate eat the vitals out of weak nations on the other side of the world and finally spread to our own shores when it is too late.

No Congress could be faced with a greater challenge. The fate of our own people and free people everywhere may rest upon our decision.

It is a time-honored axiom that every national foreign policy is selfish and I would be less than frank if I did not admit that I support this bill mainly because I believe it is calculated to further the best interests of our country.

There is no obligation on our part to underwrite the British Empire. We are not obligated to step into Greece as Britain steps out. The fact remains, however, that if Britain is to continue her historic role in Greece, the United States must lend her the money to do the job, and we have already loaned her more than she can ever pay. It is better for us to spend the money, do this job, take the credit and the blame, and let the world know that from henceforth we are moving on our own power and not on the tail of the British kite.

The history of nations will not reveal more national unselfishness than has been exhibited by the United States during and since the last World War. We have generously carried on our shoulders three-fourths of the relief burden of the world.

There has been exhibited, too, clear realization by the President, by the Congress, and by all of the people of the United States that if the world is to have a just and lasting peace, it must come through international understanding and cooperation. This Nation laid the first stone in the formation of the United Nations. We have cooperated 100 percent to make that cooperative movement a success.

We had hoped all along that Russia would cooperate to bring world understanding through UN, but it is clear now that Russia never intended to cooperate. She has refused our invitations to join even one of the following movements for better understanding: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; World Bank and Monetary Fund; Food and Agricultural Organization; International Civil Aeronautical Organization; International Labor Organization; International Refugee Organization; World Health Organization.

Secretary of State Marshall has just returned empty-handed from the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Moscow. He has been unable to secure Russian agreement to a peace treaty with Austria, without which the foundation for economic recovery in Europe cannot be built. At every point he has been balked by Russia. His patience has been sorely taxed and the patience of the American people has worn thin. One can come to no other conclusion but that the Soviets prefer economic chaos in Europe in order that communism may spread by means of political chaos which is sure to follow.

Charges have been preferred against the President that, through his proposal for aid for Greece and Turkey, he bypassed the United Nations. It may have been better for form's sake to submit the proposition first to the United Nations, but, in any event, such action would have only been an empty gesture. Whether we had first gone to UN or not, the need for our doing the thing proposed here would have remained.

The important question is not whether the United States should consult the United Nations before dealing with the Mediterranean emergency in its own way. The important query is: What is wrong within the world organization which makes it necessary to do so?

The pretense that Communist Russia and capitalist United States can be good friends is now ended. That's what Lenin and Stalin have taught all along but we've just begun to realize it.

The sooner we realize that Russia did not join the United Nations in good faith, the better.

Suppose we had put this proposal for a halt to Soviet aggression before the Security Council. Does any Member of this Congress for 1 minute think that Russia would have agreed to any remedial action by the Council? The rotten pillar in the UN edifice is that any one of the five great powers can prevent, by the veto, whatever the majority wants to do. The single nation veto power was the price the world had to pay for Russian participation in UN.

The testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee shows further that the United Nations set-up is not equipped to handle the situation in Greece and Turkey. First, thanks to Russia, UN has no police force yet which could be used for bringing order in Greece. Neither is the World Bank able to handle the situation through loans at the present time. Even if funds were available through the Bank, Greece could not meet its collateral requirements for a loan.

It is plain as day that the United States is going to have to meet this challenge alone and provide this aid for Greece and Turkey or nothing is going to be done. Russia hopes that nothing will be done. The result would be to force Greece and Turkey into the arms of communism. Russia would then be free to push across the Dardanelles for the second phase of her drive for world revolution.

It is not necessary to call to the attention of this Congress again the consistent policy of territorial aggression on the part of Russia since World War II. Figures speak for themselves. First Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland were swallowed up. Finland was reduced in size and then dominated. Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria are tools in her hands. Hungary is prostrate. Germany, Austria, and Italy would have been overrun had it not been for American troops there.

The Soviet Government since the recent war has extended its boundaries or sphere of influence continuously. The following figures showing countries and populations either annexed or controlled since World War II by the action of the Soviet Government are provided by Mr. Bullitt in his book, The Great Globe Itself:

Europe:	
Poland	35,000,000
Eastern Germany	25,000,000
Rumania	20,000,000
Yugoslavia	15,700,000
Hungary	10,000,000
Bulgaria	6,300,000
Lithuania	2,000,000
Latvia	2,000,000
Estonia	1,000,000
Albania	1,000,000
Total	118,000,000
Asia:	
North China (area held by Chinese Soviet Red Army)	75,000,000
Manchuria	45,000,000
North Korea	10,000,000
Total	130,000,000

In addition, the following European countries are today under partial control by the Soviet Government, and threatened with complete control by the Soviet Government:

Czechoslovakia	15,000,000
Austria	7,000,000
Finland	3,800,000
Total	25,800,000

If the Soviet Government should be permitted to consolidate its control over these 118,000,000 Europeans and 130,000,000 Asiatics—leaving aside the other 25,000,000 Europeans it now controls partially—the manpower in the hands of the Soviet dictator would be far more than doubled. He would rule 418,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, we fought and won a great war with Russia as an ally. We had hoped that our common bond of suffering and sacrifice might make it possible for us to live in the same world with Russia in a spirit of understanding of each other's problems. The world should know, though, that if the United Nations is dead, it is Stalin and communism that delivered the fatal stroke, and not the United States.

We recognize the right of Russians to choose their own form of government, but we do not recognize the right of Russia to undermine our own. Neither do we recognize Russia's right to defeat the principle of self-determination for all nations, large or small, in matters of self-government.

President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill fully understood the probability that the communistic ideology would conflict with free democratic institutions during the postwar period so they sought to evade trouble by seeking to get Stalin's adherence to certain principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. The first three points of this charter read:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of govern-

ment under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

In 1933, when the United States first recognized the present Russian Government, Litvinov, the Soviet Ambassador, signed the following pledge in the White House:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States.

We have been disillusioned. This House has had evidence on numerous occasions, brought out by the Committee on Un-American Activities, that the Communist Party of Russia has an agency and disciples here in the United States trying to overthrow our Government by subversive means.

We might just as well recognize the purposes of the dictator in the Kremlin now. We have read of the philosophy of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. We know of their avowed purpose to bring world revolution regardless of the means used. We had hoped, however, that the revolution in Russia having attained its purpose, would not seek to force its doctrine on other nations.

It all adds up to this: We have got to stop Russia now or fight her later on. I do not say that war with Russia is inevitable but I do say that war is sure to come with Russia later on unless we show a firm hand and a stout heart now. To understand communism and its ultimate goal, we may well study the writings and teachings of Lenin and Stalin themselves. We will then know why it is so vital not only to our own security, but to the people of the world as well, that this bill be passed and aid be sent to Greece and Turkey now.

Here are some direct quotations from the pens of the master architects of the world communistic state:

A morality taken from outside of human society does not exist for us; it is a fraud. For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the workers' class struggle. * * * It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth. (Lenin, Religion, New York edition, 195; In The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism.)

No dictatorship of the proletariat is to be thought of without terror and violence. (Lenin.)

Religion is the opium of the people. (Lenin.)

We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. (Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 24, p. 122.)

From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country, questions must be determined * * * solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. (Lenin, Twenty-one Theses, January 20, 1918.)

It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of Socialism or of communism in general. What is needed is the ability to find at any moment that particular link in the chain which must be grasped with all one's might to gain control of the whole chain and pass without a hitch to the next link. (Collected Works of Lenin, first Russian edition, vol. 18, pt. 1, p. 379.)

Dictatorship means nothing more or less than the power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules. (Stalin, Problems of Leninism.)

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination that is untrammelled by law and based on violence and enjoys the sympathy of the toiling and exploited masses. (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 50.)

The revolutionist will accept a reform in order to use it as a means wherewith to link legal work with illegal work, in order to use it as a screen behind which his illegal activities for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie may be intensified. (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 101.)

To me, it is set forth clearly in the writings of Lenin and Stalin that they believe that war is inevitable between the Soviet Union and the non-Communist states.

Mr. Chairman, the march of communism must be checked now. Strategically the Mediterranean area is well suited to the establishment of our new defense line.

From a political and sentimental standpoint, the Greek people are well worth our aid. The history of the Greek people is a glorious one. This little nation is the cradle of freedom.

For 2,500 years Greece has been the focal point of clashing international interests. As far back as the fifth century B. C., she repulsed the Persians under Xerxes and ushered in the great age of Greek culture.

Phillip and Alexander conquered her and spread Hellenic culture into Africa and Asia.

From time to time she was overrun by Vandals, Ostrogoths, Huns, Avars Slavic tribes, Sicilians, Franks, and Turks. She was raided, sacked, and burned.

By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman Turks had dispossessed their remaining rivals and held all Greece for over two centuries.

Thereafter for a century, in her exhaustion, she was exploited in turn by the Russians, French, British, and Germans.

In the recent World War she fought and was winning against Italian invasion when the Germans came in and overwhelmed her.

Through the travail of centuries, the evidence is overwhelming that the Greek people clung to their love of liberty and from time to time recaptured their birthright of democracy.

Greece has again become the focal point of world interest. Recent Russian foreign policy in this area appears to seek dominance over both Turkey and Greece. The United States now proposes to counteract the Russian advance by taking over British responsibilities in the area. As the British step out, either Russia or the United States will step in.

The issue is much greater than a mere border dispute among the Balkan states, or the type of government Greece shall have. The issue is the last analysis is whether Russia and communism are to control the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

As to Turkey, the same sentimental considerations do not obtain, it is true, as in the case of Greece. The plain unvarnished fact is that considerations of our own national self-interest should induce us to bolster Turkey's military establishment.

On account of Turkey's hesitancy about entering the late war on our side, American sympathy is not so pronounced in her case. Neither is her serious plight fully understood. As a matter of fact, both Greece and Turkey face the same danger and from the standpoint of military strategy are part of the same picture. The Russians seek bases on Turkish territory. They have demanded an agreement which would in effect place the Dardanelles under Russian control. It would be folly to bolster Greece with a weak and vulnerable Turkey on her flank, or vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, the United States wants peace. The question now uppermost in the minds of our people is whether this bill is the road to peace or the road to war. Only God can read the future and only God can answer that question. In our circumscribed finite minds, the future can only be judged by the past.

I clearly remember the year 1914 when it was not dreamed that the United States could be drawn into the First World War, then raging. But in 1917 when it appeared that Germany would win and liberty die, we went in with flags flying, though unprepared. We won that conflict after terrible cost of blood and money. When I returned home from France, confused and disgusted, I was resolved to do what I could to see that this Nation be never again involved in the quarrels, jealousies, and hates of nations on the other side of the world. My thoughts growing out of disillusionment then were the thoughts of the vast majority of our people.

The United States drew into her shell again and sought to insulate herself from future world conflicts. I myself supported that policy. Nevertheless, when Hitler threatened to dominate the world and wreck our way of life once again this

Nation rose up in arms, and we were victorious again at a cost far greater than in the first instance.

By now we should have learned our lesson. The only way to prevent our involvement in another World War, with communism on one side and democracy as we know it on the other, is to prevent that war from coming about. And we will never prevent that war from coming about by a cowardly shrinking policy now.

Many, many years ago, in the infancy of our Republic, it was in this same Mediterranean area that a great American leader challenged the Barbary pirates with these words, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Today, when we are strong, it is our bounden duty to repeat that slogan to the masters of the Kremlin. We have appeased and we have sought to please Russia, only to find that each new concession called for another. Today calls for more courageous action. We must either go into the Mediterranean or get out of Europe. And if we get out of Europe now, we will not be able to stay out. We will have to go back as we have done before and pay the cost of our folly.

Mr. Chairman, the courageous step proposed here to implement our foreign policy may not prevent war. God grant that it may. Another world war in this atomic age would be the supreme tragedy for America and all mankind.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I know the gentleman feels as I do about the United Nations. I am wondering, however, if the gentleman does not agree that even though we concede that it cannot function in this instance there is still in this country a considerable bloc of public opinion that feels that notwithstanding that chance we should at least make the effort.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not dispute the gentleman's statement. I think we have by the Vandenberg amendment provided for that. We say in this bill that we are willing to step out of this thing if the United Nations will take hold and handle the problem. There is no doubt about that.

This is a serious matter, and I can readily understand how Members could be troubled about this legislation. I am not one who would doubt the honesty, integrity, and patriotism of the gentleman who has just questioned me, just because we disagree.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I use as my text the text that I heard the gentleman from New Jersey use on occasion, although perhaps not exactly in these words: "Destroy not the ancient landmarks thy fathers have set."

You know, we have quoted the Bible here on the one hand and carried machine guns in the other so much during this debate that I am sure you will pardon me for quoting a verse of Scripture.

The gentleman who preceded me referred to stabbing the United Nations in the back. The Cleveland Plain Dealer in a paragraph the other day said:

> As we understand it, after we get our passport visa, travelers' checks, and pistol permit for Greece, we are to stop by and tell the United Nations we are on our way.

The gentleman who preceded me also referred to the Vandenberg proposal. The Vandenberg proposal merely emphasizes our disdain for the United Nations, which we will permit to function only if it does what we want when we want it done for us. It is not so much a foreign policy as indulgence in a highly expensive prejudice.

Mr Chairman, the apologists for the Truman doctrine, which the Truman administration wants the House of Representatives to rubber stamp, try to make it appear that it does not bypass the United Nations. Everybody who has bothered to read the bill which the Truman administration is trying to steamroller through Congress with cries of "crisis" knows that of course the bill bypasses the United Nations. It is obvious on the face of it. It is obvious to everybody in the United States, and it is obvious to the United Nations. What the United Nations membership thinks about it was made clear in a poll conducted by the United Nations World magazine. The magazine questioned 83 diplomats from 38 countries. Eighty-two percent of the diplomats replied that the Truman policy hurt the prestige of the United Nations. The magazine reported:

> Sixty-eight regretted, as a matter of principle, that the United States did not come before the United Nations with the Greek and Turkish problems. They considered the prestige of the United Nations seriously threatened, and expressed hope that the United States would make more than a token gesture in the very near future to bring the whole Greek and Turkish matter before the United Nations.

Of course, the prestige of the United Nations is seriously threatened by the Truman doctrine. If the Congress approves the Truman doctrine it will be dealing a blow to the United Nations which may well be fatal. The United Nations is our best chance for peace. It is my considered opinion that the Truman doctrine points straight down the road to war.

Mr. Chairman, the House has been forced by President Truman to come to a decision on the basic foundation principles of our Nation's foreign policy. In the proposed Greek-Turkish military alliance bill, we have presented to us a radical departure in our foreign policy because that bill calls for a system of military alliances throughout the world. For this reason the bill before the House is in direct contradiction to the entire history of American foreign policy.

Some people have suggested that President Truman is using the so-called Truman doctrine as a 1948 Presidential platform. While this may be one of the motives, Mr. Chairman, which prompted President Truman, it by no means comprehends the vast implications of the Truman doctrine itself. Not only does this doctrine propose a system of military alliances throughout the world, but it proposes that our financial and economic strength shall be mobilized to back up that system of military alliances. We are being asked, Mr. Chairman, to pour the taxpayers' money at the rate of $20,000,000,000 a year down every international rat hole from London to Manila on the completely false premise that by so doing we will be stopping communism. Actually, the results of such a system of military alliances sustained by American wealth means higher prices and higher taxes and financial bankruptcy and an unlimited inflation in America itself. The Truman policy is not only an undeclared declaration of war, but it is also the death knell of American capitalism if it is carried out, because it means the bankruptcy of America itself.

The Members of the House might well read the article by Stewart Alsop, entitled "Matter of Fact," in the Washington Post of May 5, in which he points out that Great Britain will shortly be demanding another loan from the United States. Alsop demonstrates that the British cannot export sufficiently to meet their import needs. He states that they will need another loan. Permit me to quote:

> The other way of filling the gap is almost equally unpleasant for it depends on the United States. It does not necessarily presuppose another Government loan, with the bitter feelings such a loan would surely arouse. The British reaction to the loan is interesting. What was considered in the United States a gesture of rather fatheaded generosity is regarded here as the closest and most merciless Yankee horse trading.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask that Mr. Alsop's column appear in my remarks:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE GAP

LONDON, May 4.—Any one of the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who came to know London well during the war years would probably be surprised by the aspect of the London of 1947. He would be surprised, not because London is different, but because it is so much the same. Here are the same bombed-out buildings; the same drably dressed people, who seem, in their monotone clothes, to fade into the background of the monotone buildings; the same inedible bread sausages and the same muddy thick soup (always the same, although called by an infinite variety of French names); the same unwashed windows and unheated houses and curious people, so many of whom seem to have stepped right out of a bad Hollywood comedy about English types. There are no more sirens, no more hordes of GI's in Eisenhower Plaatz, but for the rest the London of 1947 is in all outward aspects the London of 1943 or 1944.

Yet there is a difference. The bombed buildings during the war had a slightly sinister air of courage and defiance. Now, with weeds sprouting in the mud, they are just messy. The dull clothes of the people then seemed a badge of their dogged endurance. Now they are just dreary. The spirit of durable gayety which made London, despite the bombings and whisky at $16 a bottle, the best leave town in the world, is gone. London is dull, dull and infinitely sad.

All this has its political significance, of real importance to the United States. The

first instinct of any American who makes for the first time the dreary bus ride from the airport at Heathrow to the center of London, is to ask himself how long these people are going to be able to carry on like this. How long are they going to be able to live this miserably monotonous existence, and still bear the heavy weight of remaining a great world power? The answer to that question may spell the difference between success and failure in the new determined American effort to contain Soviet expansion.

The economic situation which lies behind the drabness of postwar England is in its essence simple enough. After the war, with heavy debts replacing foreign investments, the only way the British people could survive was to export finished goods for food. But they could not instantly convert their industries and begin exporting. Therefore, the United States—essentially because the United States could not afford to see England cease to become a great power; not at all because Shakespeare was born here—lent England close to $4,000,000,000 to bridge the gap between the end of the war and the time when the export program would begin to take up the slack.

The sad fact which is now staring England in the face (and will soon confront America) is simply that the loan is not going to bridge the gap. Aside from a small fringe of fervent optimists, that is the opinion of the vast majority of economists and other observers with whom this reporter has talked.

Some alarmists doubt that the loan will last much more than a year. Optimists hope for two more years. The best estimate seems to be that the end of sterling exchange restrictions, plus the fact that there is now more to buy with the dollars, will increase the rate of expenditure so that the last dollar will have been spent sometime in the autumn of 1948. Barring a miracle, very few observers believe that by that time England will be exporting enough to pay for what she needs.

The reason is not far to seek. This country's economy simply could not survive another crisis like that of this winter, when the coal ran out and industry came to a standstill. Therefore, to save coal for next winter, industries are being limited to 65 percent of their coal needs for this summer. In other words, there will be a partial stoppage this summer to guard against a total stoppage next winter. This stoppage will further slow down the lagging export drive. Estimates vary, but there seems to be good reason to believe that by the time the last dollar is spent, there will be a gap between exports and imports of more than a billion dollars.

This gap can be filled in either of two ways. The British can tighten their belts to the backbone, and proceed to lead a sort of caveman life, which will make their present drab existence seem like lush times. An inevitable corollary is an almost total withdrawal from British world commitments, with disastrous implications for the whole American foreign policy.

The other way of filling the gap is almost equally unpleasant, for it depends on the United States. It does not necessarily presuppose another Government loan, with the bitter feelings such a loan would surely arouse. (The British reaction to the loan is interesting. What was considered in the United States a gesture of rather fat-headed generosity is regarded here as the closest and most merciless Yankee horse-trading.) But it does presuppose the untying of some of the strings attached to the loan, probably American backing for credit to England through the international bank, and above all a firm partnership agreement on foreign policy, in which the United States would agree to support some of the heavy economic commitments which Great Britain cannot afford until her economy is again on its feet.

Such measures will be attacked in the United States as the bolstering of the decadent British Empire. They will be attacked here as the hiring out of Britain as a paid mercenary to America. It is possible that either American or British opposition will make such a partnership impossible. If that happens, the future of the western effort to contain Russian expansion looks very dark indeed.

Mr. Chairman, let the Members of the House note that on Monday, the 5th, Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the British Board of Trade, warned the British people that the American and Canadian loans were running out in a much shorter period than was originally expected. Mr. Chairman, the naked, brutal fact is that the British Empire is falling apart, and before this year is out the Congress of the United States will have before it another proposal to lend the British Empire another four or five billions of dollars. That is what the Truman Policy means in regard to the British Empire.

Mr. Chairman, France today is caught in the middle of a great political crisis, and what do we find our newspapers reporting? The Washington Post of yesterday, May 6, on page 14, has a headline: "United States may boost aid to France if Ramadier keeps Reds out":

UNITED STATES MAY BOOST AID TO FRANCE IF RAMADIER KEEPS REDS OUT

PARIS, May 5.—A high American official source said tonight the United States was preparing for possible increased aid to the tattered French economy, provided Premier Paul Ramadier can hold together his new non-Communist coalition government.

This statement was made after a French cabinet minister asserted President Truman's program for aiding democracies under threat of Communist domination prompted Ramaider to oust the five Communists in the cabinet yesterday.

The American source said the embassy was drawing up a detailed report on what sort of assistance the French regime will need and how much could be expected. He said the information would be relayed to Washington in anticipation of fresh requests from the French to solve their food, fuel, and industrial problems.

The source added that a decisive factor may be whether the French Socialists, Ramadier's party, want to become a vehicle for a new implementation of the so-called Truman doctrine.

The informant said that if the Socialists consent to head an anti-Communist coalition, then Washington may be expected to lend a sympathetic ear to requests for help in maintaining Ramadier's economic policy of freezing wages, holding down prices, and increasing production.

French officials said their immediate need was for wheat to maintain the current daily bread ration of 250 grams. America has promised some wheat in June, but the French say larger shipments will be needed.

The cabinet minister, who refused to be quoted by name, said the United States held the answer to whether Ramadier's government could survive since the Communists dominate French organized labor and hold the largest number of seats in the Assembly.

He said the Communists might call out 6,000,000 workers in a general strike unless the United States rushes badly needed food and financial aid to France.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to quote this Associated Press dispatch from Paris. It reads:

High American official sources said tonight that the United States was preparing for possible increased aid to the tattered French economy provided Premier Paul Ramadier can hold together his non-Communist coalition government. This statement was made after a French Cabinet Minister asserted Truman's program for aiding democracies under threat of Communist domination prompted Ramadier to oust the five Communists in the Cabinet yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, in God's holy name, what is happening in France today? We have a French Cabinet Minister stating that President Truman's policy prompted a change in the French Cabinet, and that the present French Government can only remain in power if the United States rushes badly needed food and financial aid to France.

What will the Truman doctrine cost us in France? Perhaps another five billion?

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that William C. Bullitt, the Ambassador to France at the time of Nazi invasion, who advised the French Government to cease resistance to the Nazi troops and not to make a fight for Paris—this same William C. Bullitt reviewed the May Day parade in Paris from the balcony of the American Embassy standing side by side with Jefferson Caffery, our present Ambassador to France. What, Mr. Speaker, is William C. Bullitt doing in France? Is he attempting to assist De Gaulle in the organization of a civil war in France, with promises that in the event of such a civil war the United States Army will furnish the equipment, men, and materials, and the United States Congress will vote the financial aid and assistance needed to conduct civil war in France? Is that what the Truman policy means for France?

Mr. Chairman, Italy today is caught in a great political crisis. Permit me to quote the headline from Monday's Washington Post, page 3: "Italy Cabinet raises wages as millions threaten strike." The Italian Government is in the middle of a political crisis—and what do we find to be the answer to that crisis? The Government of Italy is demanding more and more financial and economic assistance from the United States. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article appearing in the Washington Post be included in my remarks at this point:

ITALIAN CABINET RAISES WAGES AS MILLIONS THREATEN STRIKE

ROME, ITALY, May 4.—Left-wing denunciation of American aid to Italy, new hints of the possibility of civil war, and criticism of Government policy by right-wing elements combined today to head Premier Alcide de Gasperi and his cabinet toward a crisis.

In a desperate attempt to head off unrest, the cabinet, at a meeting which ended at 1:30 a. m., decided to give a 15-percent wage increase to 1,000,000 government employees and to raise the sugar tax by 50 percent to pay it.

This action was taken in hope of averting a nation-wide half-day strike called for tomorrow by state employees.

Under heavy attack by the left wing, Gasperi was further embarrassed by new criticism within the executive committee of his own middle-of-the-road Christian Democrat Party.

De Gasperi was criticized for failing to see that Communists and Socialists shared the blame for the present economic crisis. Members demanded the party withdraw from its coalition with the leftists and join the right wing.

The powerful Catholic Action Committee, a keystone of Gasperi's party, sent the meeting a virtual ultimatum to "defend religion," against the leftists—a criticism of the compromises Gasperi had made with Communists to get a recognition of religion in the constitution.

There is bitter discouragement among Italians over delay in promised American aid, which some regard as the sole hope of preventing eventual collapse of democratic government.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote the last paragraph of this article:

There is bitter discouragement among Italians over delay in promised American aid, which some regard as the sole hope of preventing eventual collapse of democratic government.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the New York Times carried a story that there is a very real possibility of open civil war in Italy in the near future, and who, Mr. Speaker, is going to pay for that civil war?

Mr. Chairman, we confront critical economic conditions in France and Italy, and the Truman doctrine is being employed as a guarantee that the United States Government will back up with its economic, political, financial, and military strength the most reactionary forces in these nations. As Walter Lippmann pointed out in his column several weeks ago, the Truman doctrine gives encouragement to every group everywhere in the world who want to organize civil war against existing governments.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we consider the financial and military demands that the British Empire, the French and Italian Governments are making today upon us, we have just begun to draw up the lists of financial commitments and military commitments to which our President would bind America.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times yesterday in its leading editorial had this to say:

We can't pursue one policy in Greece and Turkey and another in China or Latin America.

The prime intent of the Truman doctrine and this vicious Greek-Turkish military alliance bill is to encompass the whole world, the seven seas, and the five continents in a new international system of military alliances and economic dependencies.

Ever since President Truman made his fateful speech to the Congress, intense pressure has been placed upon our State Department by Chinese diplomats in this country demanding that the $500,000,000 export-import loan be released for use by the present Chinese Government. I charge here on the floor of the House that the Chinese Embassy has had the arrogance to invade our State Department and attempt to tell our State Department that the Truman doctrine has committed our Government and this Congress to all-out support of the present Fascist Chinese government.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I insert in my remarks an article appearing in the New York Times of yesterday in which it is reported from Nanking that China is asking for additional financial assistance from the United States:

CHINA TO ASK LOAN FOR BUILDING ONLY—UNITED STATES AID HELD ESSENTIAL FOR RECONVERSION—"SELF-HELP" ADVOCATED FOR BUDGET

(By Tillman Durdin)

NANKING, May 4.—An American loan is essential for the economic rehabilitation and reconstruction of China, Gen. Chang Chun, the new premier, declared in a statement today. He simultaneously proclaimed a policy of "self-help" in dealing with the budget deficit.

Premier Chang's statement was made to the press and was released as a clarification of his remarks on Friday before the legislature delivered on Friday before the legislative Yuan. This statement is the first formal declaration made by the new premier specifically defining his new government's attitude toward American financial assistance.

The statement said:

"The problem of how to meet the budget deficit of the Chinese Government is certainly a difficult one, but the government should not depend on foreign assistance to meet that deficit. We must endeavor to meet it by a gradual increase of revenues, by stringency in nonproductive expenditures, and by domestic loans. In other words, we must adopt and carry out a policy of self-help.

"On the other hand, there are vast areas where immediately economic rehabilitation and reconstruction are urgently needed and feasible.

"Expenditures for such constructive productive projects, when they are to be undertaken, will be beyond the present capacity of our National Treasury. In this connection an American loan will be essential.

"There is no need for me to emphasize that the Government will strictly follow the principle laid down in the common political program of all the parties now participating in the Government, namely, that foreign loans will be 'used only for productive and constructive purposes and for stabilization and improvement of the people's livelihood.'"

This pronouncement says in effect that China intends to try to deal with her budgetary problem alone, but must have outside financial aid to undertake any major projects for reconstruction. In part the statement is an answer to some arguments now being put forward that China should seek a currency stabilization loan from the United States. It is believed that the Government does not plan to make a formal request for a loan just now, although tentative approaches are possible. The government has noted Washington reports indicating that the United States' view at the moment is that the present time is premature for formally negotiating a loan since United States financial aid now would look like an endorsement of the new government before it has demonstrated its capabilities.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, when we begin to look around the world and see what is happening to us today, we discover that President Truman has already deeply involved us financially and in a military way in many trouble spots throughout the world. He has made these decisions and he is asking us to rubber stamp them. His decisions are in direct violation of every commitment that the United States has made to the UN. And those acts of President Truman have no authority in law—no appropriations have been voted for such a policy, and the American people have never had an opportunity to cast their ballots for such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, when we add up the costs of these mad, insane adventures in the organization and support of civil wars throughout the world, we discover that it will come to at least $20,000,000,000 a year and perhaps much more.

Mr. Chairman, I charge that a sinister conspiracy exists in America today. A sinister conspiracy exists to draw us into open warfare on the side of every reactionary and Fascist element and in every civil war everywhere in the world.

What is the fountainhead of that conspiracy? Who is there in America that wants another war—World War III? Who is it that formulated this Truman policy? Who is it that is throwing the force of our State Department into these interminable financially exhausting conflicts?

Mr. Chairman, what is going on in the State Department? The House of Representatives has a right to know. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that a conspiracy exists in our State Department to organize World War III, and to establish a system of military alliances in direct contradiction to the entire American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make certain suggestions to the House. I would like for the Members of the House to consider certain things—first, that Admiral Leahy for a year and a half fought to force Jimmy Byrnes' resignation as Secretary of State. I wish to point out that William C. Bullitt is in Paris today—for what purpose? I wish to point out that Admiral Hillenkoetter has just been made Chief of Central Intelligence of the United States Government. Admiral Hillenkoetter was the naval attaché in Paris and in Vichy, and has been associated with Leahy and Bullitt. I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. George Kennan, who went with Bullitt to Moscow in 1933, has been made the head of the policy committee of the Department of State.

What did Admiral Leahy have to do with the formulating of the Truman Doctrine? Mr. Chairman, is the State Department being taken over by the French gang, by the associates of Bullitt and Leahy, who did business with the Vichy-Nazi collaboration government? Is our State Department being taken over by people who advised the French Government not to resist the Nazis? Why did Admiral Leahy fight the foreign policy developed by Jimmy Byrnes for 1½ years?

Mr. Chairman, these questions need answers. They cry out for answers.

We want to know what commitments are being made in our names in China, in England, in France, in Italy, in Turkey—all over the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are, in my opinion, absolutely and completely opposed to the foreign policy proposed in the Truman doctrine. They know now that this doctrine means bankruptcy, that it means higher prices, that it means higher taxes, that it means military alliance with corrupt, venal dictatorships and monarchies, that its costs are unlimited.

The American people want peace—they want the UN to grow—to prosper. They demand that our commitments to the UN—given and received in good faith—be kept. The American people, Mr. Chairman, are determined that collective security against aggression shall be maintained. In their determination, I join. I shall cast my vote against this iniquitous, monstrous, hypocritical, and diabolical departure from traditional American foreign policy.

The isles of Greece! The isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung—
Where we may break uneasy peace,
And once more immolate our young.
Fill high the bowl with U. S. dough
And fill another with our blood—
The propagandists seem to know
Just how to fill your eyes with mud.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have 10 minutes allotted to me. I should like to yield my 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman from Utah very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New York. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] cares to yield the 10 minutes, then of course, the gentleman from Ohio would be further recognized.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BREHM. May not the gentleman from Utah ask unanimous consent to yield his time to the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the time has been fixed by the rule adopted by the House of Representatives. The committee may not change that rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under the rules of parliamentary procedure, the gentleman from Utah in using his time may take the floor and then yield to the gentleman from Ohio to say what he pleases. Is not that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is, of course, stating a hypothetical situation. The gentleman from Utah has not been recognized. Should the gentleman from Utah be recognized he then may yield to anyone asking him to yield if he so desires.

The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the wise and eloquent statement made by the gentlewoman from Ohio and I think it well to repeat the quotation she gave us from that giant of his day, Webster, who said that we must not "purchase their smiles by the sacrifice of manly principles." It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I embrace the viewpoint enunciated on the floor yesterday by one of the giants of our time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] when he said that he believed this bill would be a deterrent to war.

All of us are aware of the gravity of the decision this Nation is now called upon, through its Congress, to make. We live in a dangerous age. The question for decision is how we are to meet danger. We must face it with our heads up and with no fear in our hearts. We must meet this issue in accordance with our great traditions. Courage is better than fear, faith is better than doubt. We will be false to our traditions, false to the American people, and false to ourselves if we falter because of fear—fear of either cost or consequences.

We all want to avoid war. If we could clearly foresee the future and know with certainty that defeat of this measure would, in the words of one great appeaser, mean "peace in our time," or that its passage would mean war in this generation, our votes would be unanimous. No one wants war. The tongues of our dead still enforce our attention. We all want peace. The issue, then, is one of calculated risks.

PEACE IN THIS DAY IS NOT CHEAP

That issue cannot be resolved by an appeal to fear, to sentiment, or to any other prejudice. Each must determine for himself and within his own conscience the path he thinks this country, in dignity and responsibility, must follow to lead the world in the ways of peace. The passage of this bill and the policy it embraces is costly. Once we so act, we are committed to a course we must see through. And none should indulge in the self-deception that it will not be expensive. Peace in this day is not cheap.

Neither should we be oblivious to the possibility that whenever this Nation engages in a program of halting totalitarian aggression, be it Communist or Fascist, some risk of war may be involved.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have an issue of alternatives. Does this policy lead to war or does it promote peace? If our action is to be governed by fear or the cost in dollars, there are many arguments for voting against the bill. But is that the issue? When did the citizens of this country ever modify their resistance to aggressive tyranny because we were fearful of the outcome or lacked faith in our ability to meet the cost? Pioneer Americans were not timid when, as 13 struggling Colonies, they agreed with Patrick Henry that no price was too high to pay for liberty. The signers of the Declaration of Independence knew the calculated risks when they wrote in our charter of liberty the immortal sentence:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

MONROE AND JACKSON DID NOT FLINCH

President Monroe proclaimed our famous American doctrine when this Nation was a first-rate power only because of its unflagging courage. We were then less able to resist aggression on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico from one of the weaker of the major powers of that day, than we are to resist aggression today anywhere on the face of this globe. The people knew then what the Monroe Doctrine might cost, and they were not afraid of its risks. Then a courageous stand on principle by a people unafraid frustrated the designs of any aggressor who might have considered a challenge.

History discredits France's strategy of attempting an early war of nerves. Her challenge was met by Andrew Jackson. A solvent France contemptuously refused payment of the debt she owed the United States. But when Jackson announced that he would seize and impound French shipping, she understood democratic power properly applied. Her wounded honor was satisfied, and the treaty she had made with us was carried out.

Mr. Chairman, whether Communist or Fascist, or simply a pistol-packing racketeer, the one thing a bully understands is force, and the one thing he fears is courage. In making this assertion, I disavow the demagogery of a jingo. I repudiate the tactics of a warmonger. I want peace. But human experience teaches me that if I let a bully of my community make me travel back streets to avoid a fight, I merely postpone the evil day. Soon he will try to chase me out of my house.

THEY DID NOT BELIEVE WE WOULD FIGHT

We have fought two world wars because of our failure to take a position in time. When the first war began Germany did not believe we would fight. Well-meaning pacifists sincerely desired peace. The Great Commoner resigned from the highest position in the Cabinet because he thought President Wilson's foreign policy too aggressive. Thus the Kaiser was led to believe that we were complacent and lacked courage. Unrestricted submarine warfare began, and so we went to war.

During the earlier stages of World War II, President Roosevelt at Chicago enunciated the doctrine of quarantining aggressors. Then, as in the past, there were protests. The America Firsters, led by Colonel Lindbergh, a hero of earlier days, exploited the hesitancy of many of our citizens to prepare for adequate national defense. The tactics of these ostriches and their fellow travelers encouraged, indeed if they did not induce, Hitler to ignore us and the Japs to attack us.

France could have stopped Hitler when he started into the Saar. France and England combined could have prevented the occupation of Austria or even later stopped the Nazis at Czechoslovakia. The United States, England, and France could have prevented the rape of Poland if only there had been a common determination to call a halt to aggression. Japan could have been checked before she got into Manchuria; and certainly she

would have been stopped when she declared war on defenseless China. But the siren songs of appeasers convinced us it was none of our business what happened in Europe or the world, and thus France was sacrificed to Fascist ambitions, and England's destiny was fought out in the skies over London. We refused to listen to Secretary Stimson and others with vision who saw the path on which Japan had embarked so we suffered the humiliation of Pearl Harbor and sacrificed lives which could have been spared if we had acted in time.

CARE NOT WHETHER AGGRESSOR IS COMMUNIST OR FASCIST

In view of this history, it is amazing that we are tolerant toward those who counsel fear and count the cost of human liberty and internal security in dollars. A former Vice President is crying out against the course charted by President Truman in his message to Congress in louder language than Colonel Lindbergh protested the policy proclaimed by President Roosevelt in his historic Chicago speech. Can it be that this former Vice President believes it right to quarantine the aggressors if they are Fascists, but wrong if they are Communists; and does Colonel Lindbergh reason conversely? As for myself, I care not whether an aggressor be Communist or Fascist. Whenever security of this country is involved, we are willing to draw the quarantine line—and we would rather have it on the shores of the Mediterranean than on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay or the Gulf of Mexico.

Perhaps I should seek pardon for mentioning a man who has sought and attained such notoriety by going abroad and denouncing his own country as being on the road to ruthless imperialism. I defend the right of Mr. Wallace to speak, just as I defend my right to criticize what he says, and in this case the privilege to criticize this individual for campaigning against the foreign policy of his own country among the Socialists of England and the Communists of France. I particularly denounce his suggestion that we solve the whole problem with a $15,000,000,000 bribe to Russia. But his error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

FARMER PLANTING STRANGE SEEDS

The Honorable Mr. Wallace has announced a speaking date in my State and district and my home town on the 17th day of May. If he expects to play politics with an issue affecting the security of our people, his choice of Texas as a forum is no tribute to his knowledge of people and geography. The forum for Wallace and his appeasement doctrine is not before the clear-eyed, stout-hearted Texans. Rather, it is before the sallow, deluded fringe that bores and scavenges like termites eating away the foundations of a strong building. I challenge his false and dangerous counsel. I say he is a farmer planting strange seeds in our soil, seeds of fear, seeds of false hope, dragon seeds of ultimate destruction. I know Texans and I know the people of my district. Although we have our faults like other people—and we like to believe that they are fewer than the failings of others—I warn this false apostle that Texans have characteristics which prevent us from responding to the wiles of an appeaser. Texans may disagree and fight a little among themselves, but we present a united front on any issue that may involve our national security. If we disagree with policies of our Government, we settle these differences within the framework of our democratic processes.

The argument that Russia does not want war and that we might force a war by going into Greece and Turkey simply seems absurd to me. If Russia does not want war; if she is not an aggressor nation; if she wants to live in peace and cooperate in bringing peace to a war-torn world, then our aid to Greece and Turkey will be understood and can provoke no hostilities. Who among us or among the Russians believes that Greece and Turkey plan an invasion of Russia? If, on the other hand, Russia is not willing to stop with the land she has taken away from Poland, Finland, and Czechoslovakia; if not willing to get out of Austria, but insists on a foothold in the Mediterranean now, then now is the time for us to decide whether we will meet her there and meet her now. This penetration system by which the Communists are taking over one European government after another to me smacks very much of the Hitler method. It was by that method that Hitler was able to take over Austria—but I will not further review the past. If Russia has peaceful intentions now, she will have them after this measure shall have been passed. If her intentions are otherwise, if she proposes a program of conquest, then no bribe, disguised as a loan of $15,000,000,000 or any other sum, will stop her. It will only bolster up her strength and weaken us.

ADMINISTRATION MUST NOT TOLERATE CORRUPTION—MUST NOT PERMIT PROGRAM TO BECOME A JOY RIDE FOR PROFITEERS

Yes; I am for the Truman doctrine. But it will not be enough to appropriate money to be poured into Greece and Turkey. No program, however well conceived, can rise above the level of the people who must carry it into execution. I am one who believes that competent men are available to serve their country on this job. I believe that the best brains and the stoutest hearts in this country are needed for this great work. I believe that they must and can be found if failure is to be avoided. The heights are not for the mediocre, but for the strong, the true, and the wise. I believe and trust President Truman will keep faith with the Congress and the people by staffing our mission with men who will not tolerate corruption in administering these funds and will see that it does not become a joy ride for profiteers.

WE WILL STAND UP TO RUSSIA

In voting for this bill, I do so with the hope that Russia has peaceful intentions; that she desires to live at peace with other nations; that she will cooperate in the restoration of a war-torn world; but, if it be otherwise, then I am certain as I stand here that the passage of this measure is the only course that this country can in decency take, and the only course which may avoid war.

This is one world; yes. It is one world in terms of distances and in terms of my actions affecting my neighbor whether he be on the banks of the Potomac or on the banks of the Ganges. But it is not one united world. Nor is it one world in public enlightenment.

I am persuaded that the people of the world have no grievances, one against the other. The hopes and desires of a man who tills the soil are about the same whether he lives on the banks of the Colorado or on the banks of the Danube. But there is this difference. My words today, for whatever meaning they may have, will be accessible to every man, woman, and child on this continent. But as we progress from west to east, the mists form; and the light of freedom shines through them with more and more difficulty.

To say that we will stand up to Russia, to say that we will pit the ideals of democracy against the ideals of communism does not mean that we are unmindful of our debt to her. As one American, I am humbly grateful for Stalingrad, and I revere the memory of the men who fought there and died there, for me and for you. For my part, I ask no more of them than they ask of me. To Soviet Russia and to every other nation, I would see the golden rule applied. I think we have tried to apply it. And a defense of democracy is not necessarily ipso facto an attack against Russia. I shall be the last to say that; but I shall be the first to say that when democracy lays down before any other ideology, there is no more democracy. Freedom walks upright, her head back, chin high.

Decisions must be made in times of danger, and I hope your decision will be mine. In terms of dollars the Truman doctrine will be costly. But I pray that we are still a young and courageous Nation; that we have not grown so old and fat and prosperous that all we can think about is to sit back with our arms around our money bags. If we choose to do that, I have no doubt that the smouldering fires will burst into flame and consume us—dollars and all.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman is bullied by another person, do you not think it would be more courageous to strike right out and hit him than to go into his neighbor's window and thumb his nose at him until he might strike at you?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman is not one who accepts the unqualified statement that we are being bullied, but the gentleman does say if that statement is true the time to meet that situation is right now and the way to meet it is head on.

Mr. OWENS. But we are not doing that.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. If I make a statement as to the disposition of time, will that come out of the time allotted to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Any time that the gentleman consumes will be charged to his time.

Mr. EATON. I will have to do it. First of all, let me say that I have been wrestling with the multiplication table. In common with every human being who has ever done that, I have been thrown.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is apparent the gag is in order so far as the opposition is concerned. I was instructed to submit a list of those in opposition to the bill to both the majority and minority leaders. The minority leader informs me that I have no time. Those members who have been allocated time by me please take notice.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is coming out of the time of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EATON. I would rather that the gentleman from New York use his own time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor. Does the gentleman desire to consume any additional time?

Mr. EATON. It will only take me a minute to break the sad news. I have 207 minutes of time asked for by 18 Members, and I have 95 minutes to divide among them. I have turned the matter over to my associates here, the senior members of my committee, and they have worked out a plan by cutting down, I am very sorry to say, to very small limits the time allowed to the various Members. That is, of course, in addition to the 51 minutes reserved for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. GAVIN. Yesterday you had no hesitancy in giving the proponents of the bill an additional 5 minutes, an additional 5 minutes, and an additional 5 minutes. But when I came, representing a great State with 28 delegates and 10,000,000 of people, all I could get was 5 minutes because I am an opponent of the bill.

Mr. EATON. May I have the privilege of saying, before everybody gets mad, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] was granted time under Mr. SMITH's schedule. I did not fix the time for him.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. No; I will not yield. You ask too many questions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure and have been ready to vote "yes" on the proposition for several weeks. In fact, before the President of the United States delivered his message to the Congress, in several statements on the floor I advocated firm, resolute action in the Mediterranean area. I hope that this measure will be adopted without crippling amendments and that the House will go on record in favor of this firm and realistic action in connection with Greece and Turkey.

We must keep in mind that the world has grown exceedingly small within the last few years, and whether or not we like it, we are in international affairs to stay. As has been stated again and again during this debate, we have participated in two great wars during the past 30 years. After the First World War we followed the policy of isolationism. In fact, we followed that policy into the 1930's. It seems as though we ought to learn something from history, particularly recent history, and not pursue the same course after the Second World War as we followed after the first.

As I have listened to some of the arguments against this measure, I am fearful that many would have us embark upon the disastrous course of isolationism which will lead us to untold trouble in the future. Mr. John Foster Dulles, reporting on the Moscow Conference, for instance, pointed out that the Soviet leaders would heave a great sigh of relief if we were to move out of Europe. Certainly we must not do this. If we had passed this resolution immediately after it had been presented to us, perhaps the Moscow Conference would not have ended in a deadlock.

During this debate we have been considering the foreign policy of the United States. I want to point out that when I was in the Old World in 1945 the question that was most often discussed was the foreign policy of the United States, and the comment that was most frequently made was that the United States does not have a foreign policy. After returning, I said on the floor of this House several times that if there was one thing we ought to do in this country, it is to develop a firm, realistic, resolute foreign policy in this postwar period. I take this opportunity to congratulate the State Department and the President of the United States upon this fine show of realism. It is, indeed, refreshing to see this realistic approach to foreign affairs in the Mediterranean area.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DORN. I have been trying for 2 days to get some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to tell me why we did not give the Spanish Government, which has always fought communism, at least an ambassador here in Washington. They were neutral during the war the same as Turkey, and prevented the Germans from rolling into north Africa when we were making landings. I have not had anybody answer that yet.

Mr. MERROW. That is another question outside of this Greek-Turkish situation; but I will say to the gentleman this, that if action is necessary in connection with Spain to stop communism in the Mediterranean basin, I would favor it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made some reference to isolationism. Does the gentleman apply that term to those who support the United Nations who last week voted for the relief bill?

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman has coupled two questions. He asked if I would apply that term to those who support the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MERROW. No; I think those who support the United Nations have the international point of view. Personally I would say that the vote to cut the relief bill indicates a movement toward an isolationist program.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and may be able to clear up a quandary which has been bothering me during the debate. One of the objections raised by certain Members to this bill is that this problem should be turned over to the United Nations for settlement, this whole question. In the gentleman's opinion, is it not true that in such event it would be possible for any one of the five great powers to exercise the veto on the consideration of the question?

Mr. MERROW. That is true. I believe the question of the United Nations has been adequately and ably discussed during the course of this debate. The United Nations has neither the resources nor the ability to handle this problem. Furthermore, to be absolutely realistic about it, we are playing power politics outside the United Nations. The security of the United States is at stake. The United States is the only country that has the power, the prestige, and the ability to stop the Soviet march toward world domination, and to refer this matter to the United Nations would simply weaken the United Nations, and finally imperil our own security.

General Marshall should be congratulated on the realism that he showed at the Moscow Conference. He did not give in to the Russians, he stood firm on reparations, the western boundary of Poland, and other matters. Because of that firm stand we are at last beginning to be realistic; and although Mr. Stalin hopes that by exhaustion he will be able to reach compromises I feel at least we have a Secretary of State who will stay as long as Mr. Stalin can stay and will refuse to become exhausted. We will at last by holding our ground be able to resolve our differences.

We should keep in mind that there are two basic principles in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. They have been discussed here. One is expansion and the other is the spread of communism wherever and whenever possible. The Soviet Union has annexed much territory and has extended her domination over

no less than 12 countries by puppet governments. These countries have a population of 165,000,000. She has done all this since 1939, and is trying by the practice of infiltration to spread communism all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the action proposed to be taken by the United States Government under the measure now being considered, the following questions are pertinent and should be answered:

First. What are the situations in Greece and Turkey, respectively, which call for the relief proposed by the pending measure?

Second. Why should the United States alone supply the aid required?

Third. What do we hope to accomplish by acting, and what will be the probable result if we fail to act?

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on the pending bill held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, extending over a period of several weeks, the above questions were, in my opinion, fully, clearly, and repeatedly answered by competent and well-informed authorities. As frequently happens, however, when we hold extended hearings on a measure and explore all of its possibilities and implications, we often find the answers to our most important queries buried under a mass of verbiage more or less nongermane or inconsequential. Within the 387-page report of the hearings it will be found that the above questions are answered not only by competent and qualified witnesses, speaking from an intimate knowledge of the subject, but also by documentary proof. Unless, however, the hearings are given more than a hasty perusal there is every chance that important evidence will be overlooked. May I, within the time at my disposal, give to this body not only my personal reply to the three queries, but also some of the answers appearing in the record.

First, there is a difference in the situations in Greece and Turkey, and quite a difference in the problems confronting the respective countries. And yet, each situation requires the same corrective measures and the same character of aid and assistance, which, if not received from some quarter, will be followed by the same result in both countries, to-wit, economic disaster, collapse of each government and an imposition upon their peoples of a totalitarian regime.

May I first discuss conditions in Greece? The evidence taken before our committee shows that Greece's trouble started even before World War II, and became starkly tragic during and following the years of conflict. First invaded and despoiled by the Italians, the country not only suffered a second invasion by the German armies, with resultant devastation and ruin, but also groaned under 4 years of enemy occupation, followed by the cruel and deliberate destruction by the Nazis of everything in or near the pathway of their retreating armies. It is probable that no other country in the world suffered a devastation so complete. From all this the country has never recovered; indeed, it has not even had a chance to recover.

It is further shown that during the war there went on within the Greek boundaries a continuous fight for Greek liberation. This warfare against the invaders was carried on by bands of Greek guerrillas whose arms and equipment were supplied by the Allied armies. After liberation, however, many of these guerrillas failed or refused to surrender their weapons, and coming under influences inimical to the present regime in Greece, the guerrillas are now using the same arms to defy the authority of the Government. It is also charged that these armed bands not only have the backing and encouragement of certain adjoining governments but that their numbers are augmented from time to time by bands of men from beyond the Greek border who join in raids, burnings, pillage, and killings, and then retire across the border when pursued by the Greek Army.

The nature of the influences to which these armed bands are subject and under which they operate is well known. To be absolutely plain and direct, it is the influence of the Communist and the communistic doctrine. It is known that continuous pressure is being exerted against the Greek Government and that this pressure is growing heavier day by day; that the sphere of operations of the various communistic bands is widening; and that without aid and assistance in equipping and advising the Greek Army it will not be able to long control the situation. If these bands continue to gain strength—and all evidence is to the effect that they are doing just that—they will take over the Greek Government and substitute a Soviet-controlled Communist totalitarian regime. If this is accomplished, a great hope of the world will have perished and once again the dream of the poet Byron that the isles of Greece would again be free will have been shattered.

It must be understood that this problem is not one of merely supporting the Greek Government as against a few bands of malcontents. On the contrary, it is one of keeping Greece in the ranks of the world's democracy, of keeping open and free the great seaways to the East, and of insuring freedom and the democratic way of life to the peoples of the eastern world.

I have endeavored to explain briefly the situation in Greece because of which our aid has been earnestly entreated. Let me now turn to Turkey, the other country whose calls for assistance we are asking you to heed. Here, as I have stated, we have a situation substantially different from that obtaining in Greece, and yet, should we turn a deaf ear to the appeal of Turkey, the results to that country would be exactly the same as would similar lack of action be to Greece.

While Greece is in dire need of food and clothing, as well as the training and equipment of her army for the protection of her border and use against internal disorder, Turkey is not confronted by such a problem. Turkey has no internal disorders and so far has not been troubled by ravages of armed bands, either within or from outside her boundaries. To this date also the country has remained free from any invasion of communism or Communistic doctrine. It is not, however, free from other dangers. On the contrary, never before—not even throughout the war when it had a long and desperate struggle to preserve its neutrality—has Turkey faced a graver danger than it does at this moment. Regardless of all differences between the internal condition in Greece and Turkey, the dangers to each country from external sources are identical. As Acting Secretary of State Acheson stated to our committee, and I quote:

> The inexorable facts of geography link the future of Greece and Turkey. Should the integrity and independence of Greece be lost or compromised, the effect upon Turkey is inevitable.

Is it not significant that this call for help comes to us from Greece and Turkey at the same instant; that both nations, one untroubled by internal conditions or by lack of food or other necessities of life, and the other facing all these problems, as well as actual rebellion, should both suddenly call for aid to meet the same threat from external sources. It is not only significant, but it points directly to the fact that both of these countries so linked together by and in their strategic importance have awakened to the fact that they are both facing a problem which threatens their individual liberty, their way of life and their free government; and each of the governments has determined that it cannot solve the problem alone. They feel that unless aid comes to them in this crisis, they will be in imminent danger of a complete collapse with a consequent assumption of power by a totalitarian government under the domination of the Russian Soviet. It was said by Mr. Acheson, and I quote:

> I need not emphasize to you what would more than likely be the effect on the nations in the Middle East of a collapse in Greece and Turkey, and the installation of totalitarian regimes there. Both from the point of view of economics and morals, the effects upon countries to the east would be enormous, especially if the failure in Greece and Turkey should come about as the result of the failure of this great democracy to come to their aid. On the other hand, I ask you to consider the effects on their morals and their internal development should Greece and Turkey receive a helping hand from the United States, the country with which they closely associate the principles of freedom. It is not too much to say that the outcome in Greece and Turkey will be watched with deep concern throughout the vast area from the Dardanelles to the China Sea.

Mr. Chairman, I find that it will be necessary for me to put in the RECORD the further answers to the question I propounded. And this will be done.

The question is often asked, How and why was the United States drawn into a situation apparently affecting only the nations of Greece and Turkey?

As a matter of fact, this problem came to us suddenly and with but little warning. On or about March 20, 1947, the British Government notified the United States Government that as of March 31 it would be obliged to discontinue the

financial, economic, and advisory assistance which it had heretofore been giving to Greece and Turkey. This meant, of course, that the British government intended to withdraw from Greece the military force which it had been maintaining in that country since the close of hostilities and likewise intended to withdraw from both Greece and Turkey all further economic aid and advisory assistance.

A few days after the notice from the British Government, our Government received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial, economic, and expert advisory assistance. This was not the first time such a request had been made to us by the Greek Government, similar requests having been previously made. The same is true in respect to Turkey. The number of the various requests made by both Governments to the United States and the dates of such requests are fully set out in the report of the hearings. Also, in covering this matter broadly, Acting Secretary of State Acheson, in answer to a question by Representative Jarman, shown on page 13 of the hearings, stated that everything proposed to be done under the bill now being considered was requested by the Governments of Turkey and Greece. Therefore, the charge that we are, without authority, interfering in the affairs of the two countries, is baseless.

May I now discuss for a few moments the second question I posed in my opening statement, to wit, "Why should the United States alone supply the aid required by Greece and Turkey?"

In this connection, the question may be and, in fact, has been frequently asked, "Why did not the two countries make their request for aid to the United Nations, and why should not this entire problem of Greece and Turkey not be handled by the United Nations?

This question has been repeatedly answered, and particularly by officials of the State Department as will appear on pages 341 to 344 of the record of the hearings. It also appears that as to one part of its problem, Greece did present its case to the United Nations. Charging that armed bands, operating within her territory along her northern border, were being partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in neighboring countries and were constantly shifting back and forth across the border in their hostile and pillaging expeditions, the Greek Government asked the United Nations for assistance in dealing with the situation.

This was a problem with which the United Nations had authority to deal, and supported by the United States, the Security Council proceeded to deal with the problem effectively. But as to the other, and perhaps more serious problems, namely the need of Greece for food and other supplies and funds to restore order throughout the country, to meet internal difficulties and to avert economic collapse, and the need of both Greece and Turkey for funds and expert advice in re-forming and equipping their military forces for the protection of their borders, the United Nations is not only lacking in jurisdiction, but is also without funds necessary to extend the required help.

So far as Greece is concerned, its request to the United States for assistance was urged by a Commission sent to that country last fall by the Food and Agricultural Organization. This Commission, reporting in November 1946, recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to aid it in securing funds for essential food and other imports until, I quote, "Expanding exports, international development loans, and expanding production enable Greece to balance its international account without special aid."

As stated by Secretary Acheson, this is exactly the course Greece has followed. The country has repeatedly asked Great Britain for assistance, but this assistance Great Britain is no longer able or willing to supply. The aid cannot be supplied by the Economic and Social Council, therefore the Government of the United States is the only source to which the Greek Government can turn.

While, as I have stated, the situation in Turkey, especially with reference to internal economic affairs, is different from that of Greece, the need is just as great, the danger of collapse is just as imminent and the result certain to follow such a collapse is just as inevitable. This result would be the installation of totalitarian regimes in both countries. In fact, we are at this moment facing the danger of being particeps criminis to the denial of free democratic governments to the entire eastern world.

The consequences following collapse of the Greek and Turkish Governments and the moving in of a Soviet-dominated communistic regime in both countries would be far reaching and tragic. We in America have heretofore not worried about the control of the Mediterranean, the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and the other sea lanes of the Near East which for centuries have been followed by ships of the world. Only once, and that in the early days of our Republic, did we act to insure the freedom of these lanes. Our action then against the piratical states of the Barbary Coast was prompt, drastic, and effective. Since that time in the distant past we have more or less trusted to Great Britain's interest and power to keep the seaways open. If Britain is no longer able to perform her task, are we going to try to resolve the impending issue now and by peaceful means, or shall we wait until a grimmer duty is forced upon us? Think it over.

Again, the issues before us at this moment are not only the preservation of the freedom of the Greek and Turkish peoples, and the sovereignty of their respective Governments, and not only the maintenance of the historic freedom of the seas, but there is yet another issue, one of more vital importance to this and to every other democratic government in the world of today. This bill poses to us the question, Is this Republic of ours—the greatest of all in recorded history and the pattern upon which all others have been erected—going to adopt and follow a do-nothing policy with reference to the innoculation by intimidation and force of the peoples of other countries with germs of an ideology diametrically opposed to every principle of human freedom and justice? On the other hand, are we going to show to the world that we have the courage of our conviction and intend to demonstrate our faith in the democratic way of life by standing shoulder to shoulder with all peoples who are willing to combat the spread of a poisonous doctrine?

We can do the right thing and do it now by the passage of this measure. If, however, we fail Greece and Turkey in this hour of their need, and the two nations come under the domination of another power, as they undoubtedly will, we will have lost not only all of our prestige in the eastern world but that world itself will have been lost to democracy. With Greece and Turkey under communistic control, there will be nothing to stop the spread of the insidious disease throughout all lands from the Straits of Gibraltar to the China Sea. This is not mere dicta, it is not just a statement of my personal opinion, but it is a statement based upon views expressed before our committee by men who speak out of a wealth of knowledge, wisdom, and experience.

Mr. Chairman, I want to announce, without reservation or equivocation, that I am in favor of the pending measure as it has been reported out of committee, without any change in text and without amendment. And, at this point, may I express the earnest hope that the pending measure will not meet with the same treatment and the same fate accorded to the Greek relief bill recently passed by this House. That bill, as is the one now before us, was not a measure for the mere expenditure of money; on the contrary, it was a measure involving questions of the gravest import to our country, questions calling for the exercise of fine diplomacy, questions of foreign policy to be answered only after intensive study and critical consideration.

This was the character of the study given to that measure by your Foreign Affairs Committee; for many weeks and through many hearings, each provision of the measure was analyzed and all its implications considered. Changes were made only after the most critical study and discussion and in light of the evidence we had before us. It was not hours only that we gave to our consideration of the measure, but we devoted days and weeks to the difficult task. And yet, when our work was accomplished and the bill reported to this floor—a finished product of a committee, many members of which have had from 15 to 25 years of experience in foreign affairs—what was its fate?

Here is what happened. Under the 5-minute rule there was made a concerted attack upon every section of the measure. In a wild scramble to be in at the death, amendment after amendment, many of which had been denied after hours of consideration by the committee, were offered and adopted on the House floor after but a few moments of

extemporaneous discussion. Bitter attacks on the measure were made by at least some men who evidently were wholly unfamiliar with its intent and purpose and uninformed with respect to the critical situation it was designed to meet. The regrettable part of the entire matter was the fact that some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee took an active part in this confused attempt to write a new bill on the floor. It was a spectacle to cause one to stand in awe and to exclaim in wonder as was once said of liberty, "Oh, economy, how many crimes have been committed in thy name?"

Mr. Chairman, may I remind the Members of the Congress that the passage of the pending measure is not only recommended, but requested by your Government. Your President, your Secretary of State and his assistants, your Secretary of War, your Secretary of the Navy, as well as other officials in whom you should have faith and confidence, have all joined in appealing to you for the passage of this legislation. Your ambassadors to Greece and Turkey, both of whom have an intimate knowledge of the situation in the countries to which they are respectively accredited, came across the seas to advise us to take this action. The head of this Government's nine-man commissior sent to Greece for the express purpose of making a survey of conditions in that unhappy country, and who, with his associates, spent two full months in making a complete study of the situation there, returned to his homeland to endorse this action with his approval.

Have you no confidence in the men at the head of your Government? Have you no faith in the ambassadors who represent you in foreign lands? Have you no trust in the men who head your Army and your Navy? Against these men will you accept the dicta of others who may be actuated by either unknown motives or political expediency, or will you at this fateful moment set aside all political or other prejudices and give your support to this measure and to your President, to your Government, and to your country—and mine?

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I arise to speak in opposition to the bill 2616 which proposes to provide $400,000,000 in aid to Turkey and Greece and also to provide military and naval aid and instruction to these countries and authority to train and supervise their military and naval establishments.

This bill arose out of the message of the President delivered to the House and Senate on March 12, 1947. The President stated, in his message urging immediate granting of this money and military and naval aid to Turkey and Greece, that the future foreign policy of this Nation should be changed so as to commit this Nation to go to the relief of any nation or a party or group in any nation that was threatened by Communists or other totalitarian groups in any country, and he stated that he would call upon the Congress from time to time for any additional financial aid and powers to carry out this world-wide foreign policy. Our colleague, Dr. EATON, in charge of this bill, in his speech to the House yesterday, stated that this was the most far-reaching and carried with it the most fateful decision perhaps of any measure that had been presented and considered by the Congress in the last 100 years. That is a strong statement from the author of the bill. There have been many bills of tremendous import and many fateful decisions made by Congress within the last 100 years. The Congress has been called upon to carry on the Mexican War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. Our distinguished Democrat colleague from Georgia [Mr. COX] was fair enough to say in his speech that this was not a relief bill for the hungry people of Greece or Turkey, but it is a military bill, a war measure. About all of those who have spoken in favor of the bill have been fair enough to say in so many words or by implication that this is a military measure and that it may lead us into another war. Of the score or more who have spoken in favor of this bill, not one has assured us that it would keep our country out of war.

The rule provides for 9 hours of general debate but under parliamentary maneuvering, those who favor the bill will have six or more hours while those who are opposing it will be limited to 3 hours or less. If this bill involves issues fraught with such tremendous potentialities for war and other dangers to our country as admitted by its sponsors, it seems to me that those who are opposed to it should have at least the same amount of time as its sponsors. The sponsors do not pretend to assure us that this new foreign policy of the President and the provisions of this bill will keep us out of war. They admit we are embarking upon a most fateful program. They do not give us any information from which we might have assurance of benefit to our own country. There is no clear chart of direction as to where it may leads us, the amount of blood it might cause to be shed, or the billions that may be required to follow this program through. They propose for us to sail an uncharted ship anywhere and everywhere in the world where there may be a war, a rebellion or an uprising. It is a lead in the dark; no one tells us how long or where it may lead.

I am unwilling to take such a fateful step as those who chart the ship and know not the destination or what may happen to our country. Everything is veiled in doubt and uncertainty. Through my years of service in the House and Senate, in case of doubt, I have always resolved that doubt in favor of the United States of America which I am sworn to protect and defend and not in favor of some other country or some group in some other country, and that is the course I am taking now. I am speaking against this proposal as presented and unless it is very materially amended I shall vote against it.

The gentleman from West Virginia who preceded me in favor of this bill, said: "Will our country sit here and rattle our money bags"? May I point out to our colleague from West Virginia that we no longer have money bags to rattle. We owe in admitted debts amounting to approximately $260,000,000,000. These are I O U's but not money bags. We can rattle our I O U's but not our money bags. We must be careful not to add any more I O U's. In the last war we greatly depleted the iron, coal, timber, the soil and other natural resources in this country. We have gone through an era of squandering, spending, and wasting for the last 15 years. We already have the largest per capita indebtedness and the largest per capita tax burden of any country in the world. The American people are demanding that we reduce and not increase the debts and taxes and other burdens of this Nation. As we continue to strip this country of its resources and use them in wars and in sending them to foreign countries, we intensify scarcity in our country and this increases the cost of living and millions of our people are denied many of the necessities of life. They have demanded economy in government: they voted to put out the spenders and the wasters, and this Congress is trying to economize. In doing so we have reduced and cut out many of the desirable services to the American people.

We are having very little trouble with our enemies in the late war, Germany, Japan, and Italy. Those for whom we sacrificed so much in blood and treasure and to whom we have poured out billions of dollars in relief since the war have stirred up more wars, rebellions, and insurrections. I have urged before, and I again urge, that the President and his administration call upon these people to cease fighting, go to work and provide something for themselves, but they refuse to be pacified, they refuse to again take up peaceful and lawful pursuits. We have coddled them so much and so long that they believe as some of our statesmen seem to think, that there is no end to Uncle Sam's resources and bounty. Why should they not go to work?

The millions of workers on the farms, in the shops, mills, and factories must have a large part of their earnings taken from them and their products taken from them in order to take care of the people in these countries who refuse to again enter peaceful pursuits and produce for themselves.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT TRUMAN

This bill also provides that an army of civilian employees will go to Turkey and Greece. Under the demand of the American people, a great army of useless officeholders are being released. Hon. Paul Porter, who saw the demise of the OPA and his army of officeholders, was sent to Greece some time ago to set up an organization to operate in Turkey and Greece. If this bill is passed, it will find these New Deal officeholders, at higher salaries and with high expense accounts, transferred to Turkey and Greece.

Mr. Truman and his administration have fought every step taken by the Republicans in the House and Senate to reduce the cost of government for the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1947, below thirty-seven billion five hundred million asked for in his budget. I wonder how much confidence the proponents

of this bill have in the President, although they give him a blank check for $400,000,000 and tremendous authority to spend that money as he may direct, and of course under Paul Porter, of the OPA. This bill provides that no civilian personnel should be assigned to Turkey and Greece to administer this four hundred million until such person or persons have been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI. It seems to me that if the proponents of this bill are willing to adopt the new and fateful foreign policy of the President, which likely will involve us within a year in the wars, revolutions, and insurrections in any part of the world, they would have had enough faith in the President to permit him to pass upon the loyalty of the persons he might name to carry out his policies, but, no, this bill provides that he can only appoint persons that have been approved by the FBI. I do not recall any such provision in any bill that has been considered by Congress during my service.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I cannot. I only have a brief time and cannot yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. ROBSION. I do not yield. You are one of the gentleman supporting this measure with others who insisted upon taking up more than 6 hours of the debating time, with the opposition receiving less than 3 hours. Then you ask me, with only a short time to speak, to yield.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE OPPOSED TO THIS BILL

During the recent Easter recess I visited nearly all the counties of my district and met hundreds of my constituents, Republicans and Democrats, and without exception all who expressed themselves were against this bill. I received a great many letters expressing opposition, and today, for the first time, I received a letter from a constituent of mine favoring the bill. He is a fine citizen, and I am sure that if he understood the dangers involved in this new foreign policy of the President that he would not, in my opinion, favor it. In my opinion, an overwhelming majority of those who are really informed believe as I do, that it will lead us into war and we will be called upon to make great sacrifices in blood and treasure.

Opinionaire, a forum of public opinion carried April 9, 1947, by the full network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, brought in 8,144 votes which opposed the idea of the bill. One thousand seven hundred and seventy-two favored it. This question was before America's Town Meeting of the Air April 24. The returns showed that 3½ to 1 were against this Truman doctrine. This, as you know, is a network program of the American Broadcasting Co. The Forum, a single broadcast of WINX here in the Nation's Capital March 24, brought a 4-to-1 response against the armed-assistance program. The Gallup poll of April 24 showed that 7 out of every 10 voters polled think that this will bring the United States to war.

I have talked with many of my colleagues, and they claim that their mail, like mine, is running strong against this measure. I am definitely of the opinion that if the American people understood fully and clearly the far-reaching implications of this new doctrine an overwhelming majority would oppose it.

OPPOSED TO COMMUNISM

It is needless for me to say that I now and have always vigorously opposed not only communism but fascism and any other totalitarian form of government. No word or vote of mine could be construed as favoring in the slightest degree any one of these groups, their ideals or ideologies. I have never hesitated to speak and vote in favor of any measure that would protect our country from these. I thank God that there is not a Communist living within the borders of the 17 counties of my congressional district. No; not one. There are no Red flags or sympathizers of the Red flag in the Ninth Kentucky District. We know but one flag and that is the Stars and Stripes. We know just one loyalty and that is the loyalty to the United States of America.

Quite a lot of folks have changed their views and opinions here in the National Capital. The Bolsheviks, or Communists, took charge of Russia about the time I came to Congress, March 4, 1919. President Wilson would not recognize their Government. Neither would Presidents Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover. These American Presidents regarded communism as dangerous to the welfare of this country. Then came another President, Mr. Roosevelt. He insisted on recognizing the communistic Government of Russia. He insisted that our country take these Communists to our bosoms.

Before we got into World War II, the Russians put on a great ball at the Russian Embassy. Many of those, and some of them in our Government, attended that great function of the Russian Ambassador. Champagne flowed freely. Caviar was served in abundance, and when it was over there was laid on a silver platter a billion-dollar credit from our Government to Russia and the Communists. Yes; a billion-dollar present. Now, what were the Russian, communistic officials celebrating at this great ball and feast? They were celebrating the twentv-fourth anniversary of the birth of communism in Russia, and some of those who are denouncing communism today, and were in high public office, attended that party. Was not President Truman there, as well as practically all of our high public officials who were in harmony with the policy of recognizing communistic Russia, when we have all known for years that the fundamental purpose of communism is to overthrow this Government, as ell as other governments, by force and violence?

When did President Truman get stirred up about communism? It was only a brief period of time before President Truman delivered his message to Congress on Turkey and Greece that former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, a Democrat, and who had held important positions under our Government in Europe, wrote a letter to President Truman, pointing out the dangers of communism in this country. President Truman, in replying to Governor Earle's letter, said:

> People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bugaboo," but I am of the opinion that this country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned. We have too many sane people.

It is needless to say that many of us were greatly surprised when a few days thereafter President Truman delivered this world-rocking message that we must embark on a policy to interfere in the quarrels, revolutions, and insurrections anywhere in the world if there was any threat from the Communists, and he put upon the ground that it was necessary for the safety and protection of the United States. We have wondered what brought about such a profound change in such a brief period of time.

There is no claim that there is any appreciable number of Communists in Turkey, and I wish also to venture to say that there are more Communists in the United States than there are in Greece, and several times more. The President in his message fixes the number of Communists in Greece at "only a few thousand." We have had several thousand Communists holding important jobs in our Government and receiving their pay out of the tax and bond money of the American people.

The President and his advisers no doubt took note of the results of the last November election. It might help to restore them in the confidence of the American people if they start a campaign against the Communists. The President has asked Congress for $50,000,000 to fight communism in this country and $400,000,000 to fight it over in Greece and Turkey. These Communists in this country were built up and encouraged by administrations of which Mr. Truman was a part, and those administrations blocked many efforts on the part of Congress to rid this country of Communists and communism. Is this so-called emergency a build-up for the Presidential and congressional elections of 1948? If we embark upon this policy, in my opinion, there will be many emergencies under this new world foreign policy. Let us direct our efforts first and effectively in eliminating and driving Communists and other subversive persons from public office in this coutnry.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Many persons have claimed that the Republican Party kept our Nation out of the League of Nations and that this brought on World War II. We did not go into the League of Nations. President Wilson called upon his Democratic friends in the Senate to vote against the Covenant. It had to receive two-thirds of the Senate vote. It never received more than 49 votes and that was on a reservation put in the Covenant by Republicans and some Democrats. Before the close of this war, there was a great deal of talk about having some sort of United Nations organization so that all nations who were opposed to aggression could unite and stop aggression. The first movement in this respect is what is

known as the Fulbright resolution. I voted for that resolution looking to the creation of the association of nations. The San Francisco Conference was called. It met in the summer of 1945. All of the nations of the earth except our recent enemies were invited to attend. Fifty nations responded. Out of that came the so-called United Nations organization. Its chief purpose was in case of any threatened aggression for these United Nations to take immediate steps to stop such aggression and to refer disputes between nations to the U. N. and settle these disputes by peaceful means. If that could not be done, then for these nations to unite together and stop the aggression. That has been organized for nearly 2 years.

The President says that there is threat of aggression on the part of Russia or some other country. If this be the case the matter should be referred to the U. N. and either by force or public opinion stop the aggression, but neither Greece, Turkey, United States, Great Britain, nor any other country has called upon the United Nations to handle this matter. Some people say it is too weak. It was strong enough to stop any aggression of Russia into Iran or Iraq. The United States has really ignored and bypassed the U. N. We propose to play a lone hand. An amendment is to be offered to refer this Turkey-Greece matter to the U. N. I shall vote for that amendment. The United States cannot provide the men or the money to take care of all of these problems in all parts of the world as requested by the President's message. It cost us a lot of money to help develop the U. N. We have given billions, we have altered our financial and commercial policies to encourage that organization. We have paid about 72 percent for its upkeep and maintenance and that runs into millions and now we bypass the whole thing and start out to play a lone hand. This will likely mean the death of the United Nations organization.

The President says that we must intervene wherever there is any communist threat. There is such a threat in France. The Communist Party was the largest party in France about a year ago when we turned over to France about a billion and three hundred million dollars in cash and in goods and supplies. Korea says there is a threat of communism in that country. This is also true in China, India, Iran, Iraq, and demands will likely come thick and fast within the next year. These are some of the burdens and dangers that will confront our country if we adopt the Truman policy of interfering in all the wars, quarrels and insurrections throughout the world. I just cannot see it that way. We must not play alone; let us cooperate with other nations and insist on these matters being settled by the U. N. and let each nation share its responsibility. The lone-hand will end up in us incurring the ill will and envy of nations throughout the world.

TROUBLE IN GREECE

There are some who say, Will we vote against this bill and deny relief to needy people in Greece? Greece has a population of about 7,500,000 people. Since the war, other countries and the United States have poured into Greece over a billion dollars in the way of relief of many kinds. Last week the House passed a bill providing $200,000,000 more of aid for needy people in Greece and some other counties in Europe. The President asked for only $100,000,000 in his budget for aid, but some folks, very generous of the American taxpayers' money, wanted to make it $350,000,000. I voted for the $200,000,000 bill. It was strictly a relief measure. The bill before us is not for the relief of needy people in Greece.

It has been admitted that this is a military measure. We have an American fleet now off of the coast of Greece and Turkey of destroyers, cruisers, battleships, and aircraft carrier. The Balkans have always been regarded as the "powder keg" of Europe. I wonder how long it may be until one of these ships is blown up and we have another *Maine* disaster which event projected us into the Spanish-American War. It is admitted that Turkey is not in need of any relief. Turkey looked alone to the welfare of Turkey during World War II. She played both ends against the middle. She whispered meaningless words to the British and American diplomats. Britain and the United States poured into Turkey about $1,000,000,000 of relief. She did not fire a gun to aid us; she milked us and Britain and at the same time she was furnishing supplies and consorting with Hitler and his gang. Turkey grew rich and fat. She has an army of 1,000,000 men. She wants us to support that army and no Russian, Communist, or other person has entered her territory. Of course, Turkey is not a democracy. It is a totalitarian government, and her country is ruled by dictators. It has been a nation of deceit and intrigue and cruelty for more than a century. As a boy and a young man I remember how the American people from time to time were stirred to the very depths because of the massacre of the Armenian Christians and the abduction of Christian missionaries with demands for heavy ransom. Turkey has drawn the iron curtain around Armenia. In World War I she joined with our enemies and did her best to help destroy this country. She used more discretion in World War II and worked both sides. They claim we must go over there and meddle in the domestic affairs of Turkey to keep Russia from swallowing up Turkey. No one yet has been smart enough to swallow Turkey and whatever we might do, if she got in a tight place, she would swap us out. Of course, many Turks are opposed to our country meddling in the affairs of their country.

The big trouble in Greece is that they have had imposed upon them kings and dictators to which they are opposed. Millions of Greek people love liberty, freedom, and democracy. Many years ago Great Britain and other countries insisted upon putting King Constantine on the Greek throne. Neither he nor his wife had a drop of Greek blood in them and they were not natives of Greece. He was forced to abdicate. His son, George, a young man, was forced upon the Greek people. He was not a Greek or native of Greece. He was forced to abdicate twice. During World War II he was able to leave Greece and locate in a more safe and congenial place. After World War II Great Britain urged our country to help place King George back on the throne of Greece. During King George's reign Greece had one of the most arbitrary dictators that ever ruled any people. His ascension to the throne created at once great discord in Greece. No doubt some Communists took a hand in that opposition. The things to which the common people of Greece had been subjected, no doubt, caused some Greeks to become Communists. Perhaps 100,000 people were killed in the clashes that followed. American tanks were used. I am not defending a Communist in Greece or anywhere. King George died the other day and his brother Paul, by virtue of birth, not because he was a Greek or entitled to it, became King of Greece. We now propose to send aid to keep him on the moth-eaten throne of Greece and to support and maintain the expensive group that he has around him. I am advised that King George did and this King Paul receives a salary equivalent to $200,000 in American money per year while our President only receives $75,000 per year. The big shipowners in Greece and many of the wealthy people in Greece by foul means escape paying their taxes to support the Greek Government. The President was not able to apologize for the Greek Government or for the right or left groups.

I was willing to vote for some relief for Greece but I am not willing to help keep on the throne a Greek King who is opposed by many of the Greek people that are not Communists. I wonder what we would think if some other nation should try to impose upon our Nation an expensive king and his followers. We would not submit to it tamely. It is urged that the people of the hills and mountains of Greece are the most numerous objectors. The hill and mountain people of no country, as I recall, are Communists because they do believe in God and in freedom. Why did not Britain and the United States insist on giving to Greece a democratic form of government? I do not propose to vote for a measure that helps to uphold and keep in office kings and dictators in any country of the world and I shall vote against this bill.

I am not overlooking the fact that this policy will likely involve us in another World War. World War I started in a little country right in the Balkans—the powder keg of Europe. If we are to have a war, let it be to help establish and maintain a democratic form of government, honestly elected and not to maintain kings and queens, dukes and lords.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, several hundreds of years ago in a far-off province of China, word came in that a strange malady and disease had begun to strike down the people who lived in its remote regions. Just what this disease was nobody knew or was able to find out. Reports continued to come into the capital of the province that this dread ailment was spreading into other areas. Upon receipt of this information

several members of the ruling group went before what could be compared to our United States Congress, and asked that the governing body appropriate money from the central treasury which would be used to find out what this dread disease was, whether it was contageous, and how it could be stopped. There were other representatives, however, who, because the disease was far away and had not yet particularly affected them, opposed this suggestion that any money be spent. They cried out, "Why should we spend this money when already our people can hardly pay the tax load, and when we are not certain just what the money will be used for? Some more pressing emergency may arise, and so we should keep the money on hand. Furthermore, if we give money on occasions like this, we will soon bankrupt this government."

On the strength of these negative arguments, the rulers did not appropriate the money, and within 2 years thereafter the disease of cholera swept over that province, killing over 60 percent of the people and practically all of the rulers. Today, many hundreds of years later, that province still lies prostrate and bankrupt.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we Members of Congress are in much the same situation as were those rulers in the province of China about which I have just spoken. Today we know that there is an infectious and dangerous mental disease which is attacking the people of Asia and Europe, and that many people in many countries are succumbing to this mental disease. We also know that it amounts to a plague which is the antithesis of democracy, of liberty, of freedom as we know it. We also know that if it continues its march unchecked, it will in time threaten our very existence.

We have been asked by the farsighted and courageous President of the United States to appropriate $400,000,000, the real purpose of which is to check the spread of this mental infection, which we call communism, and thereby to determine at this point in our history just how serious that mental disease is. We should learn now how far its proponents will go, what is in store for us who believe in democracy as opposed to those who believe in communism. If we turn down President Truman's proposal, the chances are that our history will be similar to that of the far-off province of China and that in a few years this mental malady will spread all over the rest of the world and eventually overrun us.

We have heard men say on the floor of this House that this money should not be given to Greece and Turkey because if we give it in this instance we will have to give it in other instances and to other countries that may be jeopardized by communism. That is true, but who in this House would not give all of his money or, in fact, sacrifice his life in order that our country and our system of government might survive? It has been said that no one knows with certainty just where this program of aid to Greece and Turkey will lead, and I must admit that we all have to agree to that assertion. When General Eisenhower took the armies of the United States across the English Channel, he did not know for a certainty what the outcome was going to be. He could not have given you a schedule of where those armies would be stopped or even state with finality that they would win. The only thing that he and the men who went across that Channel knew was that over on the other side there was an evil which threatened the future of the United States and freedom and liberty everywhere. Eisenhower did not know how many lives it would cost. No one knew how much of the treasure of the United States would be expended in order to overcome that evil, but we were committed to a policy of preserving democracy and freedom, and those evil forces had to be eliminated in order to do that. Thousands of good American soldiers died in that battle. They died for the ideals of freedom and democracy, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we all know that even though the war has been ended, the battle between democracy and freedom as opposed to tyranny and totalitarianism still goes on. If we do not continue to support those ideals for which our soldiers died by opposing totalitarianism and tyranny wherever we find it, we will be making a mockery of the lives of those young men.

Four hundred million dollars in such an instance as this, Mr. Chairman, is inconsequential, when we understand that with that $400,000,000 we might be able to stop the march of this Red disease, or discover just what is in the minds of the leaders of those forces. The right kind of information now might help us work out a practical basis of peace and avert a future war.

It has been charged by Members of Congress today, that if we adopt the program as proposed by President Truman, we will be embarking upon an imperialistic policy from which there is no retreat. I disagree with those assertions and state that they are not supported by the facts. How can anyone logically maintain that the United States is imperialistic in action or intent, when we recall that at the end of World War II we were the most powerful Nation on earth and could have crushed any nation, taken any desired possession, but by our own volition we decreased our military forces to a point where they are less than those of the Russian Nation today. We have the atomic bomb, but instead of using that for imperialistic purposes we have gone so far as to offer its secret to the other nations of the world if they will merely cooperate in peaceful pursuits and make full disclosures of the development of fissionable material in their own countries. We spent over $150,000,000,000 in order to win World War II, but unlike the other countries we have not asked for any reparations. We have not asked for any money back. Since World War II we have given freedom to the Philippine Islands, one of the richest island groups in the world. We have asked the other countries to do the same thing to their possessions. We have given up our rights in China and by every act and deed we have indicated that we are not imperialistically inclined but that the only thing we seek is the chance for people who want to live under a system of freedom and democracy to have the opportunity to do so.

It has been charged that we are bypassing the United Nations, yet I would like to point out that it was a commission of the United Nations, the FAO, which recommended that Greece seek assistance from a member nation, which is just what Greece has done by asking us for assistance. Everyone knows that if this matter were today taken to the United Nations organization, Russia would veto the proposed action. What, then, would be our course? If we went ahead with our assistance to Greece and Turkey we would with finality and with certainty scuttle the United Nations, because we would then be placed in a position of going contrary to its rulings. If we recognized Russia's veto and did nothing, we would be playing into the hands of the Communists, because they want, as Secretary of State Marshall said, "the doctors to deliberate while the patient dies."

To those who shout that we are bypassing the United Nations—where were their voices when Russia recently made a pact with Poland and agreed to send Poland economic assistance and implements of war? Does anyone doubt that Russia has been giving such aid to Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and others? Yet where is the cry that Russia is bypassing the United Nations? Two rights do not make a wrong, but does an act committed by a democracy constitute a bypass of the United Nations when the same act on the part of a Communist-controlled government is not considered a bypass?

The United Nations is unable to cope with this problem today. It has no resources, no enforcing weapons, and one of the reasons it is in such a weak condition is because of the delaying and dilatory tactics of the Communist-controlled governments. Finally, this bill, H. R. 2616, has in it a provision calling for the United States to cease this program in Greece and Turkey whenever the Security Council of the United Nations or the General Assembly finds that the program is unnecessary and undesirable.

We would be appeasing once again if we permit these negative delaying arguments to prevail, and it is a known fact that nothing is gained from appeasement. Daladier tried to appease Hitler, and France was overrun. Chamberlain tried to appease Hitler, and England was devastated. Even Stalin tried to appease Hitler, and Russia was overrun. We tried to appease the Japanese, and we were attacked. Appeasement has proven a futile, worthless tactic in the fight against totalitarianism and aggression.

We must meet the problems which might lead to future wars directly and as quickly as is possible. We must meet the responsibility of leadership for world peace and freedom for individuals.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to this significant fact, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs itself is badly confused about the purpose of this bill. I know the members of this

committee are honorable men, are patriotic and able men, but it only goes to show that when we become so steeped in prejudice we are at the point where we cannot think straight.

On page 10 of the report the committee states that it asked the State Department to set out the purpose of this bill and whether or not we intend to interfere with the government of Greece. According to this report the State Department replied as follows:

> Whatever we may do to assist Greece and Turkey, we propose scrupulously to respect the sovereignty of those countries with respect to the conduct of their internal as well as their external affairs.

That is what the Department of State told the committee. The committee follows that expression with its own statement and said:

> The Greek and Turkish Governments have themselves requested the assistance proposed in this bill. Government witnesses testified that the greatest care will be exercised to avoid any action which could be regarded as an infringement on the sovereignty of either country.

Earlier in the report, however, on page 8, the statement of the committee is as follows:

> The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece.
>
> The military programs in Greece and Turkey will be administered through small groups of United States military and naval personnel sent to those countries for that purpose. They would screen requirements and advise in the best application and use of the materials and equipment made available to Greece and Turkey.

In other words, what we will do is take over Greece and run its government. We will tell them what kind of taxes to levy, we will control their exports, and tell them what kind of imports they can have. You say that is not imperialism? It is imperialism and you cannot escape it.

We say in one instance that we will scrupulously avoid interfering with their autonomy and their integrity as a nation, and in the next breath we say we will take it over. The committee is confused and you who advocate this kind of a program are confused, in my judgment. It is going to lead our great Nation, I am afraid, into destruction. From deep down in my heart I beg you to consider this matter. It is a most serious step.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I have confidence in the integrity, ability, and patriotism of the Members of this House generally, and God knows from the bottom of my heart I respect their views. I have been taught all of my life to respect the views of any honest sincere person, even though he might disagree with me, and I believe that you are just as honest, just as sincere, and just as patriotic as I am. So I do not impugn your motives, but I do believe your judgment is very, very bad.

It is said that communism is on the march. I say to you that communism is on the retreat. The world is gradually recovering from the most devastating war in the annals of history. Communism is gradually retreating, and it will continue to retreat if that recovery continues. We will definitely defeat communism if we will just make democracy work in this grand old country of ours.

Russia is not as large today as it was a hundred years ago, it is not as large as it was 30 years ago. It used to contain all of Poland and all of Finland, as well as most of what it contains now. Russia defeated little Finland, but it did not take Finland over. Why? It is hard for any nation to take over another nation even though it is small. I say to you that communism and Russia cannot accomplish what you say they can.

I have never in my life been in a group of people who are as easily scared as you gentlemen are—never in my life. I fought in a number of actual battles, some of the bloodiest that were fought in the First World War; I fought a number of legal battles in the court room, and I have fought a number of political battles, but never have I seen anybody scared as badly as you are. You are a whole lot more scared of Russia than the people of this country are.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and he is eloquent, spoke of Mother's Day. He said that pretty soon Mother's Day would be here and he had something beautiful to say about mothers. All of our hearts responded to that. I am wondering what the mothers of our Nation will say. We have taken their lads twice, and even some of their lassies, into bloody wars. For God's sake, let us not do that again. I know your purpose will not be that. God knows I know your purpose is good; but let us think, my friends.

If I were hanged on highest hill,
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
I know whose love would follow still;
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
If I were drowned in deepest sea,
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
I know whose tears would come down to me;
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
If I were cursed of body and soul,
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
I know whose prayers would make me whole,
  Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.

I think it would be a pretty good idea for those of us whose mothers are still living to ask them what they are thinking. They are away from the turmoil and the confusion here and maybe their thoughts would be a little clearer than ours; and to those who are not fortunate enough to have a mother living, I respectfully suggest that you ask yourselves this question: What would your mother have done under these circumstances? Or what would your father have done?

The remarks I have just made were extemporaneous and since my time has expired I wish to extend in the RECORD just this one other thought at this time. Tomorrow I hope to be given some more time to speak on the floor on this bill H. R. 2616. The other thought is this:

So much needs to be done in our own country to make it strong so that neither communism nor any other ism except good Americanism will ever thrive here. For instance, I am reliably informed that the approximately 2,200,000 old-age pensioners receive an average of $35.39 per month. Does it not seem logical and reasonable to you that it would be far better to use these millions of dollars we will spend in giving military aid to Greece and Turkey in furtherance of a better old-age pension program? It does to me. And, of course, there are many other worthy programs, here at home, crying out for just as much needed help. If we impoverish ourselves by spending lavishly abroad, do we not endanger our own way of life here at home?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, probably nobody will dispute the statement that whether or not a World War develops usually depends not on what happens in the last few frantic months before it actually breaks out, but on what happens in the 1, 2, or, at most, 3 years after the preceding war. Whether, the United States of America, God forbid, is to have another World War will in my judgment depend very largely on how the United States has handled its affairs since VJ-day and on how well or how badly it handles its affairs now and in the next one or two years.

Doubtless we will also agree that only the shooting part of the World War II is over. Throughout the world today a fierce political and ideological war is being waged, a war to determine who really won the shooting war. We know who defeated the Germans and the Japanese, but nobody can really know who won World War II until it is clear what ideas, whose ideas are going to dominate in the reconstruction of the world.

This fierce ideological and political warfare is particularly crucial, it seems to me, in four main areas, because the outcome in those areas will determine our own future and that of mankind.

The first is Germany. Almost everybody agrees that as Germany goes, so will go Europe. First, because the Germans occupy a strategically advantageous position in the center of Europe; second, because they have enormous resources of the key minerals, especially coal and iron, necessary for great industrial development and production; and third, because they have more than 65,000,000 strong people, people with a real genius for organization, people who have demonstrated an extraordinary capacity for scientific invention and mechanical skills, people who have proved twice within our lifetime that they have the ability to commit themselves to an idea, and whether it is good or bad, pursue it with singleness of purpose, efficiency, and unbelievable devotion.

We know who defeated the Germans. The crucial question is: Who is going to

win the Germans—win their minds and hearts? That is why Mr. Molotov has made so many speeches on his side, trying to persuade the Germans to take over the new totalitarianism from the East as a substitute for Hitler's which was overthrown from the outside, but apparently not generally repudiated from the inside.

That is why Secretary Byrnes, General Marshall, Senator Vandenberg, Mr. Bevin, and the others have made their speeches, trying to get the German people to see that there is more for them to gain in the long run by abandoning all totalitarianisms and coming along with the western democracies. I do not think anybody can predict confidently today just what the outcome is to be. Which way will Germany go?

Much of the answer will depend on what happens in the second of the crucial areas, the Middle East, the one we are discussing in this bill to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey. Let me reduce it to a few sentences as one has to in only 10 minutes. If we do not pass this bill, every bit of the testimony indicates that Greece as a free nation will go down tomorrow. The people will have to give in to the pressures from organized Communist-directed minorities, subservient to Russia through her satellites, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania to the north. There is no use resisting what is inevitable if Greece stands alone. All she can do is try to make the best terms obtainable.

And if Greece goes down, Turkey is hopelessly outflanked. Turkey could and probably would hold on alone for a while because the Turks are tough. But they could not resist for long. There would be little point in trying. They might just as well get the best terms possible and avoid the useless murder and destruction. I do not think anyone can escape the conclusion that within a very few weeks or months Turkey would have to succumb to the inexorable, irresistible pressure from her northwest and northeast.

Then what happens? Italy goes down almost the next week. They are just hanging on by their fingernails now, hoping that there are still people in the world who believe in freedom enough to stand by those who are fighting for it. But if there are not enough people who are willing to hold up their hands, they might just as well, first as last, capitulate to the strong, disciplined, Communist fifth column within and Tito's divisions on the border.

Then France goes down within the next few months. What else can she do, I ask you? A lot of you were over there fighting. You know what condition she is in. And her largest party and most of her organized workers are controlled from Moscow, waiting for the signal. Millions of Frenchmen love freedom, but what can they do without help, moral and material? They, too, must come to terms with the Soviet.

Then Germany is effectively encircled by Soviet-dominated countries, and Germany, too, is in the Russian bag. Under such circumstances, why should Russia be expected to agree with us at this recent Moscow Conference? Why should she enter into agreements with the United States, Britain, and France with respect to Germany, agreements which would limit her in any way, if within a few months Germany is to be wholly hers, in her lap, given to her by default?

Then England would be neutralized by rocket bombs alone. She could not move by herself or even be a base again as in the last two wars.

Then there would be a so-called revolution in Spain, supported and supplied from France, not because the Communists are interested in the people of Spain but because they are interested in getting Gibraltar, which controls the inlet and outlet of the Mediterranean.

If Russia controls the Mediterranean and north Africa—read yesterday's papers regarding the Communist-inspired revolts there—then a look at the map shows that they are only half as far away from the bulge of South America as we in the United States are.

So in this bill we are not dealing with just a few little peninsulas off the southern border of the Balkans, we are dealing with the fate of Germany, which means of Europe. We are dealing with the fate of north Africa, the fate of South America, the security of the United States.

Our action here may well determine whether the 250,000 Americans who died in the last war died in vain, their sacrifice thrown away within 2 years of their death, or whether, please God, we are going to give the freedom for which they fought a chance to live and grow in the western world.

That brings me to the third of the areas where the political struggle is so crucial—China. I wish I had a long time to discuss that. Maybe I can get some time for it someday. Because as China goes so will go Asia. China, like Germany in Europe, occupies a strategically advantageous central position in Asia. China has great natural resources. China has 450,000,000 extraordinarily tough people—a weak, exhausted Government, but a strong people.

I am willing to venture the prediction that historians will eventually agree that World War II all along was a war more than anything else to determine who is going to control the development of the manpower, the materials, and the markets of Asia.

Hitler understood that. He said once that if Germany conquered all of Europe that would not solve her problem. Of course it would not. There are no undeveloped areas in Europe. He had to get Europe as the springboard from which to seize control of the undeveloped areas of the world which are in South America, Africa, and Asia. South America and Africa have great natural resources, but only Asia has great natural resources and great manpower, a billion and a quarter people, more than half the population of the world. Who is going to control the development of those resources and that manpower? What ideas are going to dominate in Asia? That is the crucial question of the next century.

The Japanese have understood that fact. That was why they fought so long and so hard to try to conquer China and then Asia.

The Russians have understood it. They poured more money and effort into the Communist movement in China beginning in 1922 than into all the other countries in the world except the United States, because they rightly perceived that, second only to the United States of America, the strategically most important country in the world to win for communism, if possible, is China. As China goes so will go Asia.

Let me approach it this way: Why did we get into World War II, or how? We got into World War II because when it came to a show-down we finally realized down in our bones what we never should have forgotten in our brains, that we did not dare let Japan, a great, expanding, militaristic nation, get control of the manpower, materials, and potential markets of Asia. Our own security would be too seriously jeopardized. So after having spent 10 years building Japan up until she was strong enough to attack us, we then belatedly said, "We will resist your further expansion. We will not sell you any more supplies." And, of course, she did attack us.

Now, when the United States of America has fought for almost 4 years at such terrible cost in men and wealth to keep one expanding, totalitarian, militaristic nation, Japan, from getting control of the gigantic manpower, materials, and markets of Asia, is it not almost incredible to witness, as we have in the last 2 years or so, a group of Americans insisting on our presenting control of the manpower, materials, and markets of Asia to another expanding, totalitarian, militaristic power, Russia? If we are to do that, I ask you why did we fight World War II?

To abandon China now can mean only that we defeated Japan, and Russia won the war. I can see why Russia and her devotees should urge it. But why should Americans urge it? How could it possibly serve our interests? It would mean that our fighting Japan was not only in vain, it was criminal—because, to be brutally frank, if Russia is to have control of Europe and some militaristic power is to have control of Asia, then it would be less dangerous to us to have Japan in control of Asia than to have Russia in control of both Europe and Asia.

How can anyone look our dead in the face and then turn around and say, "It is none of our business whether our allies in Asia are enslaved or free."

Some people advocate abandoning Asia as they advocate abandoning Greece and Turkey, because they assume the only way we can avoid war with Russia is by always yielding to her. But surely we have learned something about this business of getting peace by yielding. We tried hard for 10 years to get peace with Japan by yielding. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

Daladier and Chamberlain tried to get peace with Hitler by yielding, by appeasement. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

Stalin tried to get peace with Hitler by appeasement. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

I have three little children who sometimes wear me out by their pressure for this or that. I think, "Oh, it does not make much difference. This is only a minor matter. After all, they are nice little youngsters—why not give in this once?" Does it lead to peace? No. It leads straight to war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, look for a moment at what we have done in our desire to get good relations with Russia. A year and a half ago we had incomparably the greatest military machine that the world has ever seen—in the air, on the land, on the sea and under the sea. If we had had a single grain of imperialism in our souls, a single design on Russia, we could have imposed our will on her, or on anyone else. What did we do with that superiority? We threw it away in 6 months. How can anybody so misrepresent our actions as to say that we are "getting tough with Russia"? Look not at anyone's words. Look at the deed. There was never anything like it in history.

But someone will argue that we could afford to disarm on land and sea because we have the atomic bomb, the superweapon. Well, what did we do with that? We told Russia we would give that to her too, subject only to the condition that any use she makes of atomic energy be under the full inspection and control of a real international commission, without any vetoes, the same as any use we make of atomic energy, our own invention, our own Oak Ridge, be under the full inspection and control of that same international commission, without any vetoes by us either. Actually that was the most radical—in the true sense of the word—the most far-reaching proposal any strong, sovereign, victorious nation ever made in all history. And it was made by so-called reactionary, capitalistic Uncle Sam, I am proud to say.

If Russia is afraid of our atomic bomb as some claim, then she knows exactly how she can get it and have it under precisely the same conditions as we ourselves have it.

We went further to try to get good relations. We looked in the other direction while Russia destroyed the independence of a half dozen countries in eastern Europe.

We accepted her thesis that in order to be secure she must impose her will on about 70 or 80 million non-Russians in eastern Europe.

We offered to work for modification of the Montreux Convention so she could have free access to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles, in war as in peace.

We promised her effective control of the ports and key railroads of Manchuria—which means control of Manchuria, even though we had just solemnly promised the Chinese at Cairo that Manchuria would be returned to China.

Yes; we went still further. In order to reassure Russia that we would not interfere with what she was doing in flagrant violation of her pledges in the Atlantic Charter, one of its two authors publicly repudiated the Charter.

Pray tell, what more could we do to try to show our friendship for and good will toward Russia? But did it lead to better relations? No, they got steadily worse.

It is not because I want war with Russia; it is precisely because I don't want war with Russia that I beg us not to pursue further the fallacious notion that we can get peace with her by sacrificing our principles and other people's territory.

The outcome in Asia depends in no small degree on what happens in Greece and Turkey. If they go down, then, of course, Iran, Iraq, Arabia, Afghanistan go down like ninepins, and Russia's agents stand at the door of India, which is so divided she cannot offer either ideological or material resistance. She falls into the Russian lap like a ripe plum. The powerful Communist movement in Indo-China takes over. No one in Malayia can long resist. The long 20-year struggle of the Chinese Government against Communist imperialism will be lost. Let us not naively imagine that the tip of Korea, or Japan, or even the Philippines can long remain free and democratic with Russia dominant on the mainland of Asia.

That brings me to the last of the four areas where the struggle between the forces of freedom and of slavery is most crucial—the United States. Which way are we to go?

As Germany goes, so goes Europe.

As China goes, so goes Asia.

As Greece and Turkey and the Middle East go, so are likely to go both Europe and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, we are determining here and now in this historic Chamber whether the people of Greece and Turkey are to have a chance to go the way of freedom, as they have proved they want to. That will have the greatest influence, I think probably be decisive, in determining whether the people of Europe and of Asia are to have a chance to go the way of freedom. It will ultimately determine whether we ourselves are to be a safe and solvent and free people.

We, not Russia, are the question mark to millions and millions of men and women who love freedom and will fight and die for it, if they have hope. They look not to the Kremlin but to Washington, because they know that the decisions in the Kremlin still depend, thank God, on the decisions in Washington, the decisions in this House of the Representatives of the free men and women of the one strong citadel of liberty remaining on the earth.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to what is undoubtedly the most crucial and far-reaching debate that has been heard in this session of Congress. I shall not attempt to repeat, or try to summarize the very able arguments presented so far, in opposition to this measure.

In the limited time which I have I would like to concern myself with the human angle that I do not believe has been covered in this debate.

Charges of outside interference which have been brought here in connection with this problem have been very vague. I would like to show what will be the actual effect should this measure be passed by the Congress. We hear talk of outside aggression, of outside interference. Unquestionably there is some. I should like very much to know the nature and source of that aggression, and I would be the first of those to have the spotlight placed on that, and have it brought before the United Nations and have it stopped as it was in Iran. But if we send military aid to the present Greek Government, against whom is it going to be used? Against some foreign or alien people in Greece? No. It is going to be used against the Greek people themselves—to kill Greek people. I should like to say a word about those people. I know from personal experience what the life of the guerrilla is like. These men and women are in the hills of Greece today, ragged, hungry, tired, and beaten in body but not in spirit. Men and women who have seen 4, 5, or 6 years of a type of hell on earth that is beyond the wildest imagination of man unless you have seen it and experienced it yourself. For every man and woman surviving in the hills today there are 20 or 30 of their friends, relatives, or family people who have died in these last 6 years. I think the line which should be drawn is this: In time of war, when the whole world was in peril and we were opposed to the Nazi and Fascist forces, the might and courage of those people were on our side. There are American boys living back home today, and I include myself as one of them, because of the help of those people. Their rifles were pointed in the same direction as ours. Their attacks and their energies were directed against our common enemy.

We had also at that time in that country certain Greek people who walked as free men in Athens and other villages under the domination of the Germans; men who walked free then, under German control, who are free today, and who are in responsible positions in the Greek Government; men whom we propose today to back up against the rest of the good people of Greece. If we had lost this war, and those of us who had been overseas would have remained there as slave labor in the hands of the Germans, and God knows what would have happened to you at home—yet these men would be walking free under the Germans in Greece. Now we propose to uphold their hands, in exterminating and killing the real patriots. I am not talking in favor of any leftist or Communist elements. I am talking about the rank and file, the middle of the road, the democratic, the good people in Greece. For instance, we had at that time a man named Napoleon Zervas, a hated and despised man, who collaborated with the Germans. He is today Minister of Public Security. He is the man who today can go around and say, "I don't like what you are saying or what you are writing," and in 24

hours send you to one of their deportation camps and have you thrown into prison.

The chief of police in Athens today, named Evert, is the same man who was the chief of police in Athens when the Germans were in there.

So I caution you now, let us not go there in the name of democracy and commit the fatal error of aiding men such as Napoleon Zervas, Minister of Public Security, and Evert, the chief of police, in their ruthless, rightist terrorism and brutality and hold that up to the people of the world as a sample of what we mean by democracy.

Let us support the real democratic groups, the people of Greece; let us give them economic help and relief. Let us aid them in a program of relief and economic reconstruction. Let us extend to these people, who are battered, beaten, and down on their knees, a helping hand. Let us help them rise to their feet, and let us give them strength so they can carry on, on their own.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman taking the position that the present government of Greece is not approved by the people of Greece but that the people of Greece really believe in the guerrillas who are now in the hills and about whom the gentleman has just spoken?

Mr. BLATNIK. My opinion is there is serious question as to the present so-called representative government in Greece.

Mr. COOLEY. I was a member of a committee of Congress which within the last 2 weeks was in Greece. While we were there we did not permit ourselves to be interviewed, we interviewed the press and the people of Greece; and I for one came away convinced that King Paul and his government today represent generally the people of Greece. I am surprised to hear the gentleman plead that we give aid to the guerrillas who apparently are unwilling to cooperate with the government now in power.

Mr. BLATNIK. May I ask the gentleman if he asked King Paul to explain his role as being head of the Fascist youth organization run by the Germans in Greece, and what he did that drove people to the hills of Greece, as far as the fight for democracy was concerned?

Mr. COOLEY. None of our party asked him any such question as that. Our own representatives make the statement that at least 85 percent of the people of Greece are back of the government now in power.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is strange that after 2 years of economic and military assistance by the British that there should be as much chaos and disruption in Greece if the present government has the majority support of the people today.

Let us not approach this problem in a negative way, and go in there and support the cause of the reactionary element who are no more democratic than the Communist element. Let us approach this problem in a positive way and help the freedom-loving, the good people, the majority of the people of Greece who want to have a true democracy and a real representative government.

I take a stand in opposition to the proposal before us as the wrong way, the negative way to go about the matter. I feel it should be brought before the United Nations where this can be thrashed out before the whole world, where it can be shown who is interfering, who is the aggressor threatening the peace of the world. Let those who want peace and freedom stand up and join in putting an end to any such threat, and let those who will not cooperate, sit down and be condemned.

I say that by acting unilaterally in this case we are weakening ourselves in the eyes of the world. By the other course we could rally behind us the moral support not only of our own people but the freedom-loving peoples of the whole world. We can do that only by bringing this matter before and through the United Nations.

THE GOVERNMENT OF GREECE

Many Americans have been most disturbed regarding the direction that American foreign policy was taking ever since the President delivered his unprecedented speech to the Congress, in which he proposed military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. Public doubt and misgivings are indicated by the Gallup and other public polls, and by the large amount of mail received by many Congressmen with respect to this issue.

One may ask: What are the sources of the doubts and misgivings on the part of the public? Surely it is not the $400,000,000 loan in itself that has the people worried. There is nothing unusual about the United States making a loan or a gift to another country.

I am sure that the American people do not object to aiding the starving people of Greece. There can be no doubt that the Greek people are hungry and that they need food, clothing, and aid to rehabilitate their war-torn economy. No one can read the report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization without becoming aware of the tragic plight of the Greek people. They must be given help, and I am prepared to grant $100,000,000, $200,000,000, or even $300,000,000 to Greece for relief purposes. We are the richest country in the world, and I am certain that the majority of the American people will agree with my claim that the giving of food, clothing, and aid to Greece is a Christian duty. If only Greek relief was involved in this proposal, there would be hardly a dissenting voice heard in the Congress.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS

What are the objections to this proposal on the part of the people of the United States? Such objections are twofold. One is the effect of this action upon the prestige and future of the United Nations. No amount of double talk can conceal the fact that this action does in effect bypass the United Nations—that it is a unilateral act taken without consultation with other powers, and in disregard to our obligations under the United Nations Charter. Many people recall that it was similar actions by great powers which reduced the League of Nations to a debating society and destroyed it, and they fear that we now are doing the same to the UN before it even has a chance to prove itself.

A second source of misgivings about this proposal is the present extremist Royalist Government of Greece. The American people have no objections to giving aid to a free government, or to a people who are attempting to maintain their freedom. I, for one, am prepared to place the resources of the United States at the service of liberty and democracy anywhere at any time. But before I support a measure to help a foreign government, I would like to know whether it is a free government that we are aiding—one which respects the dignity of the individual and the rights of minorities, and protects and promotes the interests of the people. For it is one thing to support a free people and another thing to bolster reactionary and semi-Fascist governments which hold their people in bondage. Aid to democracy is logical to one who believes in democracy, but aid to prop up tottering governments which oppress their people is contrary to American ideals.

Before we take this step, therefore, we should determine beforehand whether such action will mean aid to a democratic Greece or a Fascist one. Before funds are granted, we should carefully consider the reliability of the present Greek Government, and ask ourselves whether we want to take the responsibility for its past and future actions—whether said Government will be an asset or a liability to world democracy, and whether it will be effective in checking political extremism.

To assert that we aid the cause of democracy by bolstering the present Government of Greece is misleading doubletalk. Let me remind you that the Greeks are not a free people today. Their Government is semi-Fascist in nature—a monarchy which is based upon the dictatorial control of armed security battalions recruited from the Fascist collaborators, and headed up by the most notorious collaborator of all—one Napoleon Zervas. The record of this Government has been one of inefficiency, corruption, suppression of individual liberty, and a callous disregard for the well-being of the people.

Let us examine the record of the present Greek Government, and let the record speak. We can begin by determining the nature and record of the Greek monarch.

THE GREEK MONARCHY

The claim is often made that the Greek monarchy is a democratic institution—that it is a limited monarchy, possessing few powers, such as does the British monarchy, and hence is compatible with democratic government. Such a claim has no foundation in fact and cannot be supported on the basis of recent Greek political history.

The British monarchy has for the last 100 years remained out of British politics and has become nothing but a figurehead as a result of this long period of nonparticipation. This is not so of the Greek monarchy, which has been deeply involved in politics, and has always functioned in the antidemocratic camp.

Let me point out that in 1917 the Allies forced the abdication of King Constantine, of Greece, because of his pro-German sympathies—his wife was a sister of Kaiser Wilhelm. The late King George, who was then Prince George, was also considered pro-German, and he went with his father into exile. In 1920 George returned to Greece when his father, Constantine, was recalled, and succeeded him in 1922. But King George lasted only 1 year—he was exiled for certain pro-German intrigues which came to light, and because he was connected with an attempted rightest military coup in Greece aimed at overthrowing the constitutional Government.

In 1935 King George was recalled after a monarchist victory at the polls. In 1936, however, the elections went against the monarchists and in favor of the liberals. George's answer to this last free election in Greece was the appointment of John Metaxas as Premier, who in turn abolished Parliament, suspended the constitution, and ruled by decree until George fled the country at the time of the Nazi invasion. It is generally agreed that the Metaxas dictatorship was as brutal and as despotic as the Hitler government.

KING PAUL SUCCEEDS

The present King of Greece, King Paul, is of the same political type as the late King George. Their family name was Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Glucksburg, and there is not a drop of Greek blood in Paul's veins. He belongs to one of those professional royal families of Europe who follow the parasitic trade of governing unwilling people. During the Metaxas dictatorship, Prince Paul was head of the EOM, which was the Greek Fascist youth organization. This organization was the Greek counterpart of the Hitler Youth, complete with uniforms, salutes, and creeds. The creed of the EOM, to which Greek children had to subscribe, read as follows:

> We believe in one divinely inspired and God-sent leader and savior and guide of the nation, creator of its present and future history, father of the Greek youth and outstanding fighter, John Metaxas.

Now the leader of the EOM is the head of the Greek state, and the man whom the United States is going to appoint to be the champion of democracy in Greece.

Thus we see that the Greek monarchy is something entirely different from the politically impotent British monarchy. The Greek kings have a tradition for, first, being active in politics; and, second, being antidemocratic and profascistic. Maybe our State Department considers the late King George a "great democrat," but the facts show that he was kicked out of Greece once for being pro-German; that he was exiled a second time for plotting to overthrow the constitutional government; and that he was directly responsible for the establishment of the Metaxas dictatorship.

THE GREEK ELECTIONS

It has been claimed that the present Greek Government was chosen in a free and democratic election, and that it rests upon the will of 85 percent of the Greek people. The claim that this Government has the right to speak for the Greek people is based on the report of the Allied mission which held that the election of March 31, 1946, was an orderly one and apparently represented the fair expression of the public will. This report was rendered by a mission of which few of the members could speak Greek or knew much about Greek affairs. Furthermore, it was such a small group—about 600 members—that they could do nothing more than sample a few voting precincts in the cities, and were in no position to make a fair survey of the Greek elections.

Of course, the elections were orderly. They were well prepared in advance by a royalist reign of terror which equaled anything that the Nazis had to offer. There is plenty of evidence to support this charge. On December 29, 1945, Saturday Evening Post Correspondent Ernest O. Hauser reported:

> Today, as a result of their victory, the right-wing forces are making hay while the sun shines. Conditions reminiscent of early Nazi Germany. * * * Armed vigilantes maintain order in the villages, and a private army of storm troopers, called Organization X, terrorize the city folk. * * * Neither the Greek Army nor the police object to right-wing excesses.

American Correspondent Leland Stowe reported prior to the March 31, 1946, elections:

> If the Allies want free elections in Greece, they would have sent the present Greek Army and police forces to Egypt for a vacation * * * and perhaps send 70,000 or more British troops along with them. * * * Under present conditions elections in Greece cannot fail to be anything but a farce and a mockery of self-determination. The monarchists and reactionaries—all of those who never fought the Germans or who collaborated with them—are sure to win.

Prof. Jerzy Neyman, of the University of California, who was a member of the Allied mission observing Greek elections, made the following statement just recently:

> The proposal of a loan to the Greek Government is based on the premise that the Greeks have a democratic government and that it was put in power by a majority of the Greek people in reasonably free elections. I am convinced that this premise is wrong. * * * While in Greece I witnessed fraud and terrorism on the part of the Royalist group surpassing anything I could imagine. To whoever chose not to close his eyes, it was clear that both the terrorism and the fraud were highly organized.

OSS TESTIMONY

Mr. Costa G. Couvaras, a former officer in the United States Army who headed an OSS mission in Greece for some 8 months behind the enemy lines during the occupation and for 9 months after liberation, has the following to say:

> In my capacity as a secret agent, I made numerous reports to our military authorities and the United States Government citing the terror which started in January 1945 and was growing in strength when I left Greece in July of that year. * * * In June of 1945, I investigated the situation in northern Peloponesus, the Ionian Islands, the district of Epiras, and central Greece, and I saw government-condoned terror in its rawest form. The people who had taken part in the guerilla movement were being systematically exterminated by Royalist bands and former collaborators, and I would like to state in the most categorical way, that most of the people were far from being Communists.

The Prime Minister of the Greek Government prior to March 31, 1946, M. Sophoulis, stated on March 18, 1946, that "the necessary prerequisites for fair election—law and order—do not exist in Greece today." He charged that "the extreme right is an organized violence and terrorism, supported by the tolerance as well as the active backing of the state organs."

Former Greek Foreign Minister John Sofianopoulos, Liberal Party, stated just prior to the election:

> Without a radical change in the present political situation, the elections which are being hastened by the Government and the right, cannot mean anything but a falsification and suppression of the people's will.

Another Greek Moderate political leader, and former deputy premier, the late George Kafandaris, stated in March 1946 that it was a "mockery" to send Anglo-American observers to the elections, since their outcome had been determined in advance by the beatings and murders carried out by the Royalists.

MINISTERS PROTEST

I might also point out that 11 of 35 ministers in the Sofoulis government resigned jut prior to the March 1946 elections in protest against holding the elections on March 31, asserting that elections at that time would be a farce and a mockery. These 11 ministers were: Kafandaris, Deputy Premier; Mercouris, Minister of Public Works; Novas, Minister of Education; Mylonas, Minister of Finance; Evripais, Minister of Air; Bourdaras, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs; Kartalis, Minister of Supply; Pappas, Under-Secretary of Supply; Georgakis, Governor of the Ionian Islands; Petmezas, Minister of Information; Sofianopoulos, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In addition three other ministers as well as the premier protested the holding of elections, but Winston Churchill and General Scobia insisted that the elections should be held, and so they were held.

The statistics found in the report of the allied mission to observe the Greek election are most interesting. The Greek Government announced that there were 2,211,000 Greeks who registered and eligible to vote; the allied mission stated that there were only 1,950,000 Greeks eligible to register and that only 1,850,000 were validly registered. In other words, the statistics of the allied mission reveal that the election lists were padded by 361,000 names. The allied mission admitted that only 71 percent of those registered were validly registered.

Prof. Jerzy Neyman, University of California, who was with the allied observers, states:

> In one village I personally found that 30 voters out of a sample of 38 were fake. * * * On the upper level it was established that the number of registered voters—only males—exceeded the number of living Greek males by 50 percent.

The allied observers estimated that the number who voted equaled 60 percent of the validly registered, and that 40 percent abstained. But this estimate

is based on the premise that only the validly registered voted, that the padded names were not voted, and that no plural voting took place. We must remember, however, that voting booths were controlled by the rightist elements, and that no precautions were taken to prevent plural voting. The allied mission recommended that voters' hands be stained with indelible ink to prevent plural voting. It is logical, therefore, to assume that the padded names were voted, that plural voting did take place, and that these fraudulent votes were cast for the Royalist candidates. If this was true, then the number of validly registered votes cast was less than 50 percent of the total, and the number of abstentions was over 50 percent.

THOUSANDS IN PRISON

Let me remind you also that when this election took place the Greek Government admitted that some 16,000 people were in prison, and approximately 150,000 people were hiding in the mountains. Furthermore, only the Monarchist-Fascist Parties and the Sophoulis Liberals voted—the leftist and center parties boycotted the election. It has been claimed that only the leftists boycotted the election. But the record reveals the significant fact that besides the EAM, the election was boycotted by the left Liberals, the left Democratic Party led by ex-Foreign Minister John Sofianopoulos, the Progressive Party led by former Deputy Premier Kafandaris, and the Republican Associations led by Gen. Alexander Othonaios.

Thus we see that this so-called 85-percent plurality upon which the present Greek Government rests was obtained in an election which was preceded by a Royalist reign of terror lasting over a period of many months, where the registration lists were padded by 29 percent, where only the rightist parties, and one moderate party participated, and in which the total vote cast represented less than 50 percent of the validly registered voters. On the basis of such an election, I fail to see how anyone can claim that this was a free election, and that the present Greek Government rests on the will of the Greek people.

SECURITY BATTALIONS

No discussion of the present Greek Government is complete without mentioning the Security Battalions which are the most important props to Royalist authority in Greece. Just what are the origins of the Security Battalions? They were originally established under the old Metaxas dictatorship for maintaining the Government and for hounding and exiling democratic citizens and statesmen. This instrument of oppression was continued during the occupation by the Nazis and the Greek Quislings. After the liberation the Greek Government found that the British Army and the Royal Mountain Brigade, organized in Egypt from ardent Royalist sympathizers, were unable to put down the people and restore royal authority. So the members of the Security Battalions, who were then in prison awaiting trial as collaborators, were incorporated into the army. In May 5, 1946, the Security Battalions were formally reconstituted.

Prior to the election of March 1946, Premier Sophoulis admitted that former collaborators and Greek Fascists had control of four-fifths of the police apparatus of the Greek Government.

It is interesting to note just who is the leader of the security battalions in Greece today. As I mentioned earlier, it is the present Greek Minister of Public Security, Gen. Napolean Zervas, a notorious Greek quisling who collaborated with the Germans throughout a greater part of the occupation. I have in my possession a translation of a German military report from the German Twenty-second Mountain Army Corps, which had its headquarters in northwestern Greece, which proves that Napolean Zervas was a collaborator with the Nazis and a traitor to the Greek Nation. This copy was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Costa G. Couvaras, who is a former officer in the United States Army and chief of an OSS secret mission to Greece. Yet, this Zervas is the head of the entire police system in Greece today. I might mention also that the present head of the Athens police force is a Mr. Evert, who held the same job during the Nazi occupation.

Thus the make-up of the present Greek Government is a Fascist King, a parliament chosen in an undemocratic election, and a security police force recruited from the ranks of the collaborators and Fascists and headed up by the arch-collaborator, Napolean Zervas.

RECORD OF THE GREEK GOVERNMENT

One can hardly expect the present Government of Greece to adopt enlightened policies. John Stuart Mill, the great English political philosopher of the nineteenth century, once set forth the proposition that the degree to which a government will promote the general welfare is in direct proportion to the percentage of the people who have had a voice in choosing the officials of said government. If the Mill hypothesis is valid, then one would expect the present Greek Government, resting not on the consent of the people but based upon a small clique of reactionaries and vested interests, to adopt policies which favor only the royalist minority and the vested interests.

Since the liberation of Greece, over $850,000,000 in money and goods have been poured into Greece, furnished by UNRRA, Great Britain, and the United States. Yet the economic situation in Greece is getting steadily worse. The chief reason why this condition exists is the inefficiency and corruption of the present Greek Government which has shown an unwillingness and inability to adopt sound economic policies.

For example, the Government refused to make any effort to control inflation. According to the report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the general price level in Greece has increased by 145 times between 1939 and 1946. In 1939 cotton sold for 24 drachmas per unit—the 1946 price was 1,500 drachmas. The 1939 price for wheat was 10 drachmas per unit—in 1946 wheat sold for 1,300 drachmas. The exchange value of the drachma has fallen to but a fraction of its prewar level. In 1939 the exchange rate of the drachma to the dollar was 120; in 1946 it was 5,000, or 41.7 times greater.

One result of this inflation has been the steady impoverishment of the people, especially the peasants who make up about two-thirds of the Greek population. Another result has been the enrichment of the speculators and black marketeers who took advantage of this inflation to amass fortunes.

LUXURIES IMPORTED

The Greek Covernment has refused to control the export and import of goods, with the result being that funds made available through British and American credits have been used for the purchase of luxury goods and not for necessities. Big cars, silks, perfumes, and other luxury items have been imported at the very time that food and clothing were needed by the population. Between February and December 1946 some $38,000,000 in luxury items were brought into Greece, yet during the same period only $4,000,000 worth of industrial machinery was imported.

The Royalist Government has been unwilling to make any effort to control the flow of gold and currency out of the country. American bankers estimate that over $50,000,000 in private Greek assets are deposited in American banks today, and that an additional $150,000,000 of Greek private assets are deposited in British banks. Furthermore, another $150,000,000 is owed by British insurance companies to Greek shipowners, and these credits are also deposited in British banks. In other words, there are some $350,000,000 in private Greek assets in British and American banks at the very time that the Greek Government is asking for $250,000,000 from the United States. Much of these funds have been shipped from Greece since the liberation—this could never have happened had the government made some effort to control the exportation of currency and gold.

TAX STRUCTURE INEQUITABLE

The Royalist Government has maintained a most unjust and inequitable tax structure. In the recent report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the Greek tax structure was described as follows:

Present Greek taxes fall heavily on the poor people and far less heavily, in proportion to their income, on the well to do. Most local revenues come from commodity taxes. Over four-fifths of the total tax revenues thus come from taxes which either reduce incomes to producers (especially farmers), or raise costs to consumers (mostly farmers and city workers). Less than one-fifth of the taxes is of the type which bears primarily on well-to-do persons receiving large incomes. The tax structure is responsible, in part at least, for the present exceedingly unequal distribution of wealth and income in Greece, far less equal than that in more industrialized countries. In every part of the country the great majority of farmers are poverty stricken and destitute. City factory workers or public employees are not in much better shape. Yet it is on these two classes, farmers and low-income workers, that present taxes fall most heavily. At the same time that this widespread povery exists the stores are full of all kinds of goods

at high prices and the restaurants are thronged with well-dressed people, enjoying the good food and wine, who live very comfortably despite the poverty all around them. Yet the tax burden falls on them far less heavily in proportion to their incomes than it does on the low-income farmers and workers.

In other words, the Greek Government has refused to evolve a sound tax structure because it would embarrass the wealthy crowd of aristocrats and profiteers whose interests this Government is interested in promoting. Everything that this Government has done regarding policy has been designed to promote the interests and enrich the vested interests at the expense of the people. Inflation was allowed to take place to the enrichment of the black marketeers and war profiteers; no controls over imports were instituted to prevent these same profiteers and wealthy groups from importing luxury items while the people starved; no control over gold was established to prevent hoarding and the shipment of gold out of the country to be deposited in foreign banks in the name of wealthy Greeks; few taxes were levied against the great incomes, while the incomes of the people were taxed heavily. This is the record of the present Greek Government. This Government is one which places special privilege over human rights—the rights of the aristocracy over the rights of the people. It is a Government of special privilege which functions in the interests of special privilege.

IS THIS DEMOCRACY?

It is this fascistic, undemocratic, corrupt and venal government that the United States is selecting to carry the banner of democracy in the Balkans. If it is so democratic, why are some 16,000 men and women in concentration camps? If it has the support of the Greek people, why is it that it is in danger of collapse before 13,000 guerrillas? After all, it has a trained army of 120,000 plus 10,000 British troops and still it must have the support of the United States to maintain itself. Either one or another of the following propositions must be true: Either this Government is in no danger of collapse before the attack of 13,000 guerrillas, or it is so inefficient and so lacking in popular support that it has no right to exist.

The unqualified support of the present Greek Government is a most serious mistake on the part of the United States. In the first place, it will not bring democracy to Greece. In fact, the Truman doctrine has already brought about an intensification of oppression and royalist terror. On March 31, of this year, Mr. Arthur Krock reports the following in the New York Times:

> The announcement that the United States is going to bail out Greece * * * was * * * the signal for a new campaign of repression by the Ministry of the Interior. * * * Arrests of citizens were made between midnight and 5 o'clock a. m. and within 24 hours those seized were deported to a lonely island without a public trial.
>
> In one 3-day period after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested 600 persons in Athens, mostly professional—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring that there was no longer any need to exercise restraint * * * the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the Government.

My position is similar to that taken by the scholarly Frederick Schuman, professor of political science at Williams College and America's leading authority on world politics. Recently the United States News asked Professor Schuman this question: "Should the United States help to rehabilitate weak nations in Europe as a means of stopping growth of communism?" Professor Schuman's answer was as follows:

> Your query begs the question. Everybody, except Communists, wants to stop the growth of communism. Everybody, including Communists, wants relief and rehabilitation for war-stricken nations. But communism will be promoted, not stopped, by proposals to bolster the Fascist governments of Greece and Turkey with American money and arms.

Walter Lippmann takes the same position in his April 8 column in the Washington Post when he says:

> The case of Greece illustrates concretely the basic fallacy of the Truman doctrine in its present uncorrected, unqualified, and unbalanced form. It is that the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism can be checked by subsidizing governments, parties, factions, which are most undeniably anti-Communist. A policy of this kind is bound to fail because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world and alienates the moderate and democratic forces.
>
> It assumes that mankind is divided into totalitarian Communists and Jeffersonian Democrats. It is not. There are also Nazis, Fascists, feudal lords, war lords. There are also Republicans, enlightened conservatives, liberals, progressives, social Democrats, Socialists, Christian Socialists, cooperators, labor parties, democratic planners, and what not.
>
> If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally—and in his heart a Jeffersonian Democrat—we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people everywhere. We shall embrace the extremists of the right as against the extremists of the left, when it is our interest and our duty to aline ourselves with the middle and moderate parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, upon one thing the Members of the House of Representatives seem agreed. We are in accord that we stand at the crossroads of a great and momentous decision in our national history, a decision which will undoubtedly affect the future course of the world and of the welfare of mankind. Not since the days of Genghis Khan, Alexander the Great, Attila the Hun, and Adolf Hitler has the world seen such an aggressive, conquering, ever-expanding force as now confronts mankind in the form of Soviet Russia. This force combines two elements, that of military might and that of political persuasion. Together these two elements have amassed a total of 275,000 square miles during and since the war, and in this connection I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the map I have here. If there is any doubt that this is an expansive aggressive force, only look at the map. The gentleman who said that Russia is today smaller than it ever was before in history can well look at this map also.

The red on the map indicates those areas of the earth's surface today under the complete domination of the Soviet Union. The areas in orange indicate the areas annexed by the Soviet Union. The red-checkered portions of the map indicate Soviet occupation areas. The parts in dark blue indicate the areas of the earth today in which the Soviet Union has evidenced an aggressive interest.

The world is rapidly choosing up sides, Mr. Chairman, and it is rapidly being divided into two zones, one red and the other white. The tentacles of this aggression reach in all directions, into all stratas of society, and these tentacles ruthlessly sweep aside all opposition, military and political. With an attitude of appeasement that would have shamed Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, we have lent ourselves and our strength in aiding and abetting this imperialistic design. We have spoken softly in a world in which violence, unfortunately, seems to be the order of the day. We have urged moderation and legal processes, we have acceded to almost every conference demand made by Soviet Russia. We have been parties to the partition of free lands and the subjugation of free people. We have done all of these things for one purpose, and for one purpose alone, and that purpose was to achieve the peace of the world.

We have supported and entered into the United Nations in almost all of its phases. We have entered into the United Nations realizing that while it is not the perfect instrumentality for peace it is the only hope the world has at the present time of achieving a lasting peace.

Now, in answer to an appeal which definitely falls outside of the capabilities and the Charter of the United Nations, we propose to offer aid and assistance to two nations very direly in need of it if they are to withstand the Red tide of conquest—the forces of armed political and military aggression—the same forces indicated in red on this map. We do not propose under this legislation to consign Greece and Turkey to that fate. Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania are names on a tragic roll call—a roll call that is a said epitaph for millions upon millions of men who died to insure the free determination of free peoples.

In the face of this evidence, in light of these aggressive facts, it is proposed that this Nation take immediate action to stem the sea of red and to grant economic and military assistance to these two countries. Certainly there is a calculated risk. There is a calculated risk in sitting in this Chamber under these

temporary girders. They might fall at any time. There is a calculated risk in crossing the street. You may be hit by a truck. The result of our positive action is uncertain, but should we fail to take such action, I say there is nothing uncertain about the future of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The evidence of things to come is here before your eyes.

Mr. Wallace, the vociferous tourist; the Daily Worker; and the domestic Communists are all in perfect accord. "Let us not do this thing," they say. "Let us not offer an affront to one of our great allies." The affront offered free men is here on this map. The affront is to every one who holds liberty and freedom and human dignity to be a part of his birthright.

It has been said that this is an imperialistic program. What are the facts to indicate that this is imperialistic? If there is one nation in the world today that has no recent record of imperialism, it is the United States of America. We voted fifty and one half billion dollars toward the winning of the war. We received seven and one half billion of it back. Certainly, that is a strange pattern for imperialism. We have demanded no special trade or economic concessions as the result of our participation in that victorious war. That, too, is hardly in the imperialistic pattern. We voluntarily and without strings granted independence to one of the richest holdings ever possessed by a major power, the Philippine Islands. Not only that, but we are doing everything possible to stabilize the Philippine economy and help that nation back to a sound condition. Further than that, we have asked other lands to dissolve their colonial systems and give independence to the subjects of such lands. We have given up our extraterritoriality rights in China and elsewhere. Imperialism! Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, our activity in world affairs does not bear out the contention that we have been imperialistic.

And, most of all, Mr. Chairman, if we were imperialistic, we would have no necessity for the use of soft phrases and diplomatic double talk. We hold in our hands an ace that we have been playing as a deuce for months. No nation in possession of the secret of atomic energy need tread lightly or speak softly in the pursuit of imperialism. We have, however, chosen to pursue our foreign relations in a legal constitutional and humanitarian manner. But, while we have temporized and while we have supported the United Nations in a seemingly impossible situation, the tide of armed aggression has rolled on engulfing everything that has stood in its way.

What of the United Nations? Much has been said of bypassing this great organization. I can only draw this parallel. If it is bypassing anyone to dash into the surf to rescue a drowning man, while another prospective rescuer lies bound hand and foot on the beach, then we have bypassed a bound and gagged United Nations. So long as the veto power is exercised in the Security Council the UN is bound hand and foot, and we can have no hope of success under these circumstances, in trying to rehabilitate these nations to useful membership in the family of nations through the United Nations as it is now constituted.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has said that we should put the spotlight on aggressors and on aggression through the United Nations. I agree with him. There is at the present time, and has been for several months, a mission in northern Greece investigating the incidents along the Grecian frontiers facing Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, checking on the circumstances, attempting to get at the facts in the best spirit of international cooperation. What has happened? Was the mission permitted access to information? Were they given the help and assistance that you would expect to be granted to a great international organization? No; they were not.

This morning's paper carried this item from Lake Success, N. Y.:

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 6.—The United Nations Balkan Investigating Commission informed the Security Council tonight that Albania and Yugoslavia had refused to cooperate with the Commission's subsidiary group which has been ordered to watch over the troubled Greek border area.

The Commission telegraphed from Geneva, Switzerland, that it felt incompetent to deal with questions raised by the refusal of the two countries and, for that reason, was asking instructions.

Now, if that is the sort of greeting and cooperation that is to be accorded an investigating committee operating under the United Nations, how far do you think such a commission could get at the present time in either Greece or Turkey?

The committee which has had this legislation under study has heard almost everything that can be said on the subject. No amendments that will be offered from the floor will be anything new to the members of the committee. Each amendment has been discussed pro and con. We have heard hundreds of thousands of words of testimony. We have listened to scores of witnesses, representing both the extreme right and the extreme left and all way points in between.

I intend to support this legislation, and I intend to support it without amendments, because I think for the first time in many years this Nation is speaking with a voice of authority, with a voice of principle, and with a voice in defense of certain basic rights of man.

Turkey? Much has been said about oil, and it might be well to admit that oil is a dirty period at the end of a long and unsatisfactory sentence. But the unfortunate fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that no one has yet found a substitute for oil. Not only our wartime economy but our peacetime economy operates on oil. Until such time as a substitute has been developed it will continue to operate on oil.

There are in the portion of the world under discussion three great reserves of oil. Two of them are today under the bayonets of the Red Army—the great reserves at Ploesti and the reserves south of the Urals. There remains for world consumption from known reserves one other great pool—the pool in the Middle East.

A knife has been mentioned during this debate—a knife which at one time was oratorically and dramatically plunged into the heart of the United Nations by one of the speakers, who stated that if this proposal was passed we who support it would have accomplished its death. I say that if this legislation is defeated those who defeat it will have wielded the knife and will not only cut off the hope of these lands for rehabilitation but will also have severed the jugular vein upon which we must depend for our future welfare in war or peace.

National interest, Mr. Chairman, may not be a popular thing, but I contend that it is not imperialistic to think in terms of your own country once in a while.

A great American, Patrick Henry, once said, "Gentlemen may cry 'peace, peace,' but there is no peace." I might add that where a situation like this exists there is an ideological warfare going on. It is going on from day to day. Unless it is stopped, it will engulf the Middle East, Asia, the Mediterranean world, and Africa, and then heaven help the United Nations. When two powers glare across a conference table at each other, Russia on the one hand and the United States on the other, you will indeed have sounded the death knell of the United Nations. You will never sound that knell by saving free peoples to useful membership.

I think that passage of this legislation is essential if the United Nations organization is going to become a great moral force in this world of ours, and I am equally certain that the quickest way to write finis to our civilization as we know it is to fail to face up to the facts in this world of ours as they exist today.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Evidently the gentleman feels that the $400,000,000 will accomplish the purpose of stopping Russia. Assume that it does not, then is the gentleman prepared to go to war to stop communism, or are we just bluffing with the $400,000,000?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I do not consider it a bluff at all. So far as I am concerned, I am very serious and very hopeful about our chances with this program. I cannot guarantee success of the undertaking, but I am most hopeful that a show of honest determination at this time, proving that we mean what we say, will do the job.

Mr. BREHM. I am also hopeful, but I have never believed in bluffing and I am also quite sure that Mr. Stalin does not bluff easily.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the easiest way for any Member of this House is to vote "yes" on H. R. 2616.

It is proposed by the President and supported by the Secretary of State. It is supposed to stop the spread of communism throughout the world and preserve democratic institutions everywhere. It pretends to demonstrate the determination of the United States to exercise wise and acceptable world leadership.

And it is opposed by Henry A. Wallace, Communists, and Communist-front organizations. Anyone who votes against it will be called an isolationist and a pro-Communist.

Politically and ideologically, H. R. 2616 looks like a natural.

Yet, in spite of all this, I am against it. But for exactly opposite reasons than Mr. Wallace and the Communist sympathizers.

The people of the United States want to extend reasonable help to the needy of the world. But, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 2616, is not just something to further assist in the rehabilitation of gallant Greece. It is designed to put in motion the purposes set forth in the President's speech of March 12, 1947, before a joint session of Congress.

Among other things, the President said in that speech:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.
>
> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.
>
> One aspect of the present situation which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision concerns Greece and Turkey. * * *
>
> The United States must supply that assistance. We have already extended to Greece certain types of relief and economic aid, but these are inadequate.
>
> There is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn. * * *
>
> The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no further financial or economic aid after March 31. * * *
>
> I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time. * * *
>
> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.
>
> I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.
>
> I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes. * * *
>
> If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. * * *
>
> This is a serious course upon which we embark.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be asked: Do we not have something called a bipartisan foreign policy and should not every Republican follow the President?

Follow him where?

When he says we must—cannot afford not to—spend untold billions of the American taxpayers' money for the benefit of named and unnamed foreign governments, or when he says we cannot afford to extend our program for our own veterans any further?

Mr. Chairman, I will not and cannot be a part of any such shameful sham as that.

Follow the President, Where?

When, on March 12, he said we must spend unlimited billions to stop the danger of communism all over Europe and Asia, or when he said it was a mere bugaboo in America?

When, on March 12, he announced this policy, or when, at the same time, the representatives of his State Department were urging us to provide in addition to $16,000,000,000 already spent, still more vital materials to Russia?

When, on March 12, he branded the spread of communism throughout the world as a serious threat to us, or when, 2 weeks later, for the first time, he decided he ought to clean out the Communists from his own administrative departments?

When, on March 12, he announced this policy, or when, from the end of the war down to that time and since, we have appeased and given to Russia almost everything she wanted, and furnished her with $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease during the war and almost half again as much since, to strengthen her for the advancement of the very things he now says we must give billions more to other nations to stop?

When, on March 12, he advocated unlimited spending in such amounts, in such places, and in such manner as he might determine, without the slightest regard to its effect upon our own economy, or when, on April 21, he said, "But we can provide the necessary assistance only if we ourselves remain prosperous?"

When he says we should not reduce taxes, but should pay off the public debt, or when he says we should add to that public debt a billion dollars for Greece, Turkey, and Korea and unknown billions in the future for unnamed other foreign nations?

When he says that, to save our economy, we must reduce prices, or when he advocates more and more Federal expenditures, more pay raises, and more shortages of needed materials here by shipping greater and greater quantities abroad?

When he advocates our wholehearted support of the United Nations or when, on March 12, he regards the United Nations as not only incapable of acting in what he calls the present crisis but as not important enough even to be consulted about the matter?

When he says, on March 12, that no other nation is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek Government, that the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind required and that it is absolutely necessary for us to adopt and continue his plan as a long-term policy for our own national security, or when, a few weeks later, his appointed representative to the United Nations tells that organization that if it does not like what we are doing we will abandon this vitally necessary policy upon the mere request of that organization?

When his various Secretaries of State criticize Russia for not cooperating with the rest of the United Nations, or when he announces on March 12 that our own Nation declares its right to act independently of that organization whenever we deem the organization is incapable of taking the kind of action we want?

When he says that we must protect the right of all nations to choose the form of government the people desire, or when he says that we must spend our money to compel, induce, or bribe the government they have to reject communism and subject its policies to our domination for what we conceive to be our security and purposes?

Mr. Chairman one might be able to follow the President if one could find out where he is going, and if one believed it to be the right direction; but I confess my absolute inability to follow him when he jumps upon his international horse and rides off in all directions.

Like a man with the oars in a rowboat, we are asked just to pull as hard as we can and never bother at any time to turn our heads to see in what direction we are going.

The United States of America emerged from World War II the strongest nation of the world and one in which individual liberty is still secure. We led in the organization of the United Nations. We are trying to help rehabilitate the world. We have the opportunity and the responsibility for world leadership, both of which are great and serious.

Because of this, never has there been a time when our foreign policy was of greater importance, and hence never a time when that policy should be formulated so practically, so wisely, and so carefully or with such broad vision and foresight, or when it should be so clearly limited to our ability to carry out and to give at least reasonable promise of success. And is it necessary to say that it should be founded upon the very principles in which we ourselves believe and through which we have attained such success and happiness?

So it is imperative, whatever that policy is to be, that it be not hastily concocted in an atmosphere of excitement, fear, haste, and the breathless psychological pressure of a crisis or emergency, real or fancied.

Yet, Mr. Chairman on March 12, 1947, the President of the United States confronted us with exactly this problem, with exactly the same old plea: That here is something that must be done and done quickly; you do not have time to consider another or better method; never mind whether we can carry it out, what it may cost, or what it may do to us; if you do not take this step, all is lost.

And, worst of all, he candidly told us it was to be the long-term future foreign policy of the United States.

What is this new and revolutionary foreign policy?

I have carefully read the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill—Report No. 314. Mr. Chairman, if I did not have such great respect for my distinguished colleagues who prepared that report, I would be inclined to call it a bit naive. As to the details and extent of this new policy, its reasonable chance of success, its effect upon our own economy, and whether there are other possible courses we could take, the report is crammed with conclusions but feeble from lack of facts. It assumes that, since we must combat communism, the policy proposed by the President is the only way to do it; hence anyone who opposes

it will be responsible for the spread of communism in the future. No doubt it is the only policy the President, or rather his State Department, can conceive. But it is not the only policy which can be followed—should have been adopted long ago—and the failure to follow which has produced this present situation. I shall speak of that near the conclusion of these remarks.

The committee says we are not interfering in the affairs of foreign nations, because—report, page 10:

> The Greek and Turkish Governments have themselves requested the assistance proposed in this bill.

The Governments have requested it. Of course. By why? And at what price to the freedom of the people of those countries?

Our State Department says—again page 10 of the report:

> It is our primary purpose to assist the Greek people, so that they may retain the opportunity to choose the form and composition of their government in accordance with the wish of the majority. This also applies to Turkey. We do not conceive it to be our function to influence the judgment of these two peoples with regard to their governments. * * * whatever we may do to assist Greece and Turkey, we propose scrupulously to respect the sovereignty of those countries with respect to the conduct of their internal as well as their external affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have ever read a statement that was either more stupid or more hypocritical, even from the State Department.

Let us examine it.

To get the results we want, the United States of America must dominate and control the foreign and domestic policies of the governments which are the recipients of our gifts to every extent necessary for that purpose. The committee recognizes that.

On page 1 of the report this appears:

> The principal purpose of this bill is to aid Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations.

This statement is repeated on page 10. But on pages 8 and 9 appear the following statements:

> The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece. * * * The committee was assured by the State Department that the Greek Government would be required to take adequate measures to assure the maximum use of its own resources in the program of rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the fullest support of this program by Greek nationals.

Who determines the propriety and adequacy of these measures? We do, of course. We must, to get the results we want.

Mr. Chairman, the present Greek Government, receiving our aid, is obligated to control the endorsement and support of our program by the Greek people, instead of the Greek people being free to select whatever domestic and foreign policies they choose to follow.

The report further says that the Department of State "recalled in this connection the assurance that had been given, that the purpose of this legislation is to enable Greece to help itself, and that in the administration of assistance given under the bill adequate guaranties would be required of the Greek Government to assure the carrying out of all steps necessary to the achievement of this purpose."

Now, I ask, Mr. Chairman, is the real object of this policy to assist the Greek people to rehabilitate themselves and preserve their own freedom of action? It certainly is not. It is to help a tottering Greek Government maintain itself in power so that the Greek people may be forced to follow policies and take actions which must be whatever we consider necessary for our own national security.

And on page 10 appears this statement:

> Government witnesses testified that the greatest care will be exercised to avoid any action which could be regarded as an infringement on the sovereignty of either country, Greece or Turkey.

Yet the whole purpose of this new policy of ours, the expenditure of our money, the presence of our advisers in these two countries, the guaranties we have exacted, is to control the actions of these governments for what we deem to be our own interests and security, which, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is exactly the opposite of maintaining the sovereignty of Greece and Turkey or the freedom of their peoples.

The bill provides for the rendering of financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries. But the report says—page 8:

> The terms upon which such aid is furnished from time to time can best be determined by the President * * *. It is believed it would not be wise or practical to attempt, in advance, to specify such terms for all possible contingencies in the legislation.
>
> Assistance provided under the bill for military purposes, being essential to our own security, and not in itself creating the wherewithal to repay, should be made as a clear grant. Financial assistance for current civilian consumption should also be a grant. * * * However, financial repayment obligations should not be established if there appears to be no reasonable prospect of repayment.

Can there be any possible doubt that absolutely none of this money will ever come back to the United States?

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a member of the committee, in his minority report, points out that since 1823, historians say that Greece has been sustained by loans from other countries.

Up to the beginning of 1947, the United States has made available to the Greek Government approximately $451,500,000, including UNRRA shipments of which we contributed 72 or 73 percent—see report, page 16. Within the past week or so, we passed House Joint Resolution 153 for $200,000,000. The report says: "Under the provisions of this relief bill Greece would receive" about "$60,000,000" of the original $350,000,000—now cut to $200,000,000. And to Turkey $130,979,811.

So we have made available to Greece and Turkey together $617,479,811, taking the sum of $35,000,000 as the share of Greece under the reduced foreign relief resolution. Although that bill made no express provision for any country involved, look at the committee report on the present bill, page 9:

> Under provisions of the relief bill, Greece would receive from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 for minimum requirements.

But that is not all. Last year this Congress gave Great Britain $3,750,000,000, one of the purposes being to support her empire policy so that we would not face the very situation we are facing now.

And with all of that, this bill provides for $400,000,000 more—and just until June 30, 1948. After that, still more. And to other countries still more. In contemplation right now are these additional amounts.

From hearings, section 4, paragraph (b), of the bill says:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

So we are, as usual, merely saying that we can appropriate in the future, this sum of money, or are we?

Paragraph (a) of the same section says:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

If that is not an appropriation of $100,000,000 I do not understand the meaning of the word.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to General Marshall in his own profession, I cannot consider him an outstanding expert on diplomacy, economics, or political prognostication. His training has been to wage war when war was necessary, and has never been in the field of diplomacy, the sensible object of which today should be to prevent war. Having had some slight military experience myself, I know that no good soldier is a good economist. His job is to win a war no matter what the economic or other cost. As a result, the economic waste that has accompanied wars, particularly our own, has been appalling. Nor am I a believer in the modern tradition that you can make anybody an expert overnight by either electing or appointing him to a governmental job with a title. Furthermore, I think I am justified in not placing too much reliance on the general, as the present administration, in presaging what will take place in the future if we do this thing or do not do that thing, when he, nor it, was able to predict Pearl Harbor 48 hours before it happened. Without attempting to place any blame for past performances, I think I am justified in having doubts about future ones.

Lastly, General Marshall, being new at this diplomatic game, is taking the

advice of those in his Department whom he assumes know something about the business, although many of the rest of us question the soundness of this assumption from past experience. In any event, it is clear to anyone who has followed the course of events since the appointment of our latest Secretary of State, that he is not yet running the State Department. The State Department is running him.

Mr. Chairman, I do not ask anybody to rely on my mere statement that I am not really an isolationist. Not only have I advocated adequate national defense when the majority of our people were against it, but I went further. I did something about it. After serving in World War I, I spent several years in the Reserve of the Army, 14 years in the National Guard and was mustered into the Federal service for World War II. I have advocated the creation of a United States intelligence service throughout the world so that we would never leave the people of our Nation ignorant of what was going on and with no opportunity to prepare for it. I voted for the appropriations for UNRRA—with misgivings as to its administration which were subsequently justified. I not only voted for the foreign relief bill a few days ago, but I voted against the amendment to reduce it from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000.

Nor do I ask anybody to rely on my mere statement that I am opposed to communism. For over a quarter of a century I have fought communism, in the face of ridicule and being called a Red baiter and a witch hunter. I certainly do not belong to the Johnny-come-latelies who are suddenly and vociferously opponents of communism but who for years past have been its most devoted friends and protectors.

Mr. Chairman, I am merely amused at the fright of some people at being classed with Henry A. Wallace should they oppose the presently proposed policy of the President. I have never voted one way or another because somebody else, for reasons of his own, voted one way or another. I expect to go on voting the way I think is right no matter who, for entirely different reasons, may go the same way at that particular time. And, if it be any comfort to those who are stricken with this fear, reliable information has reached me that Eleanor Roosevelt is much in favor of the President's policy. This presents either a dilemma or an out for those who suffer from this kind of fear. Either they will not know which way to go, or they can be right or wrong whichever way they go.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, with all this, there still might be some little excuse for voting for this bill, if there were no other course to follow. But there is another course, a better course, a surer course, a safer course, a cheaper course, which is now and always has been open to us. Our refusal to follow it has brought about the very conditions we are now facing. It is, to my mind, a simple and effective course. It is to say in polite, diplomatic language to Russia that she is not playing our brand of ball, so she gets no more money and no more materials out of us, nor out of anyone else so far as we can legitimately prevent it until she comes across with a few concessions about letting Greece, Turkey, and other countries strictly alone, about treaties to end the present state of technical war and a few other things in which we and the rest of the world are interested. The one thing Russia needs and has needed to hold communism in Russia and spread it throughout the world is economic strength, and that strength has been constantly bolstered by the policy heretofore followed by the very administration which now proposes to weaken our own economic strength by the presently proposed policy. Russia needs steel, machinery, food, manufactured articles, and everything we are in a position to supply. It is very late, but perhaps still not too late to adopt my suggestion. Yet the administration has not adopted it, and shows no inclination to adopt it. According to reliable information, we have supplied Russia with $16,000,000,000—$16,000,000,000; think of it—to build up her economic strength to spread her vile communism throughout the world, and now frightened of the progress and the danger it holds, the only thing we can think of is to spend more billions to counteract the effect of the billions we have spent, and are still spending, to build up.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to start out on a policy of imperialism of our own variety, let us not be hypocritical about it. Let our people know what it is, how dangerous it is, how it may ruin our own economy, and make us a fertile field for the propagation of the very evil germ we say we are going to exterminate elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, the New Deal administration has proceeded upon the theory that it can buy anything. It has tried to buy friendship. It has tried to buy off communism on our own western continents. The success has been negligible and costly. How can we expect to do better in Europe and Asia?

And what will inevitably follow an American policy of bribery and control of other nations? Corruption and collapse, both at home and abroad.

If we pursue this policy to every corner of the earth to which we are lured by the machinations of the Communists it will ruin our own national economy, which is the one big object of communism, and will we not lose the confidence and good will of the people in every country in which we have bribed and bought control of the Government? If we do not follow the policy to its logical conclusion it seems nonsensical to inaugurate it, for when we abandon it will we not lose prestige, all the money we have sunk in it, and the good will of those who liked the hand-outs and expected a continuance of them?

We fed and fed the economy of Japan, only to build her up to try to strike us down, with the loss of thousands of good American lives and billions of dollars worth of our substance. Have we learned absolutely nothing from this experience? It seems not.

I have in mind at least 15 different reasons why I must vote against this bill. I will not take time to list them. If what I have said thus far does not justify my stand, no further reasons will do so, and I will have to remain in error. But it will be honest error.

The present proposed policy of the President and the State Department which H. R. 2616 is designed to initiate, is a policy to "save the rest of the world in order to save America."

Considering conditions existing in the rest of the world, those which now need attention at home and those which will be created at home as a result of this policy, and with the realization that we are the last hope of individual liberty, so that if we go, everything goes, such a policy is clearly in reverse.

What we should have done long ago, what we should do now, is to follow a policy to "save America in order to save the rest of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to doubt the moral, if not constitutional, right of this body to continue the dissipation of the wealth of the American people for purposes which do not bring any direct benefit to them, but which are for the direct benefit of foreign peoples and foreign governments, upon a nebulous theory of some vague theoretical future, indirect benefit to the American people, or through a psychology of fear that by not doing so, they will suffer from some future calamity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it to be my duty to vote against this bill, and I shall do so.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, no one has attempted to deny that the Truman doctrine as embodied in the legislation before us is a drastic departure from our previous foreign policy, which had as one of its basic factors nonintervention in the affairs of foreign nations in time of peace. Although I realize that the record of the United States is not spotless on nonintervention in times of peace, yet in spite of our adventures into Nicaragua, Panama, Mexico, and a few other ill-advised experiments in imperialism and dollar diplomacy, we have at least given lip service to the policy of nonintervention. We have also had as part of our foreign policy another doctrine known as the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine, in brief, has been a two-edged sword. One edge was pointed toward "any attempt on their part—European nations—to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." The other edge of the sword theoretically pointed toward ourselves and it is embodied in these words from the doctrine, "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do." Any attempt on the part of the proponents of this bill to make the statement that we are extending the Monroe Doctrine to the borders of Russia and its satellites is fallacious and without foundation in historical record. The Greek-Turkish aid bill is not an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. It is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. This point cannot be denied. Let us there-

fore not try to hide behind any distortion of the Monroe Doctrine.

Two years ago, at the conclusion of the most devastating war in history, the delegates of most of the important nations of the world gathered in San Francisco. For 3 months they dedicated themselves to the task of forming an international organization for the purpose of "saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." They determined to "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security." They wanted to "insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest." They pledged themselves to "employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples," and they pledged further "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." It was upon these principles that the United Nations Charter was formed. It consisted of 19 chapters and contained 111 articles to implement and to facilitate the development and insurance of these principles. The common people of the world lifted up their hearts in hope—hope that at long last the dream of mankind for peace was to be realized. In the 2 years which have passed since then the United Nations has grown. Corollary and auxiliary international groups have been formed. In the main, the United States has taken the lead. In most instances the Russian representatives have failed to vote in harmony with the members of the General Assembly and the Security Council. I hold no brief for their lack of cooperation. In spite of this lack of cooperation, the United Nations has made progress. Various international problems have been settled, problems which are just as grave and fraught with just as much danger as the impending Greek-Turkish matter. Serious international situations in Iran, Lebanon, Spain, Syria, and Indonesia arose. These situations came up for consideration before the Security Council at the reference of one or more of the member nations. Until the present occasion the United States has persistently proclaimed that the jurisdiction of the Security Council and the United Nations be recognized as the prime instrumentality for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our delegates have criticized other members for what seemed to us a failure to recognize such jurisdiction and authority. In each of the abovenamed cases, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Indonesia, and Spain, a solution was found by multilateral action on the part of a majority of the Security Council delegates. We were proceeding within the spirit of collective security and within the framework provided in the United Nations Charter for the solution of international threats to the peace of the world.

The claim has been made by our President that the United Nations is too weak to take care of the present situation. In view of the previous collective security solutions in Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Indonesia, many of us consider this statement in need of justification. On March 12 President Truman enunciated the Truman doctrine. In my opinion, this doctrine is in contradiction to many articles within the United Nations Charter. In my opinion, the Truman doctrine is a return to the unilateral relationship between nations. It is a betrayal of the principles enunciated in the United Nations Charter, which clearly indicates that collective security of the nations of the world depends upon a multilateral approach to the problems between nations.

The whole theory of the United Nations is based upon multilateral solutions preceded by full debate and discussion in the General Assembly and the Security Council. Such debate and discussion to be held openly and in the pitiless glare of publicity. The solutions arrived at must be openly arrived at, and must be sustained by a majority vote of the delegates of the respective judicial panels. The conclusions of the General Assembly and the Security Council must also be sustained by a higher force than armaments, be they as antique as the weapons of Greek guerrillas or as modern as the atomic bomb. This force is the moral and spiritual force which is part of the conscience of the common people of the world. It is the force that framed the United Nations Charter. It is the force which alone can sustain international peace. The question before us today is not a question of isolationism; it is basically a question of whether we shall throw the great moral, spiritual, and financial strength of the United States behind the United Nations, or whether we shall turn back again to the unilateral and bilateral methods of solving international difficulties which have twice within our generation engulfed the people of the world in war. Be not deceived by the sophistry and by the plausible arguments which have been presented. Do not be scared by the spectre of war which has been raised by those who seek to support their position. It has been said within the well of this House that this is a question which has to be decided between each Member and his God, and I agree with that statement. I will probably be in the minority when the vote is cast in the House. But unless this bill is amended to bring it within the framework of the United Nations I shall vote against it, and I will vote knowing that I voted in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter, upon which rests the hopes of the common people of the world for international peace.

I consider the Truman doctrine as an undeclared declaration of war if our challenge of unilateral intervention on Russia's borders is accepted.

I do not believe that war with Russia is either justified or inevitable.

If war must come, let it come through the decision of a majority of the United Nations. Let it come with open covenants openly arrived at in harmony with the conscience of the majority of the members of the United Nations.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing upon which everyone here agrees, the sponsors of this legislation and the opponents. That is, they agree that no one knows what this will entail. No one knows where it will end. No one knows when it will end. No one knows what it will cost in either blood or money. We are asked under those conditions to give a blank check to somebody to carry out the objectives of this proposed legislation.

When our constituents ask us what this is all about, we might remember the old barber-shop quartet, we used to sing: "I don't know where I'm going but I'm on my way."

I hope your minds are more susceptible to change than mine is, because, in every part of my being, I feel this is dangerous and the wrong step to take. I was a soldier in the First World War. I was at Versailles when Woodrow Wilson was pleading the cause of the League of Nations. I came back home, and you well remember the charge was made that a few willful men destroyed the League of Nations. Are we to adopt another technique? Is another branch of the Government going to destroy an organization such as the United Nations, that every man, woman, and child with a decent respect for humanity has been praying for for 2,000 years? Yes; you say we have got to be realistic. We have used that old gag over and over again. Are we willing to forget everything we have been taught at our mother's knee. Your preachers and priests and teachers are trying to tell you today that this is not the course to follow. No. I do not think that our Government would intentionally embark upon a policy of imperialism, but I say to you when you take this step there is no retreat. You have got to make good, and the "no imperialism" you are talking about today may be the rankest kind of imperialism tomorrow. Make no mistake about it. The announced purpose of this legislation is, in my opinion, although it is directed at an ideology, a declaration of war. If any other nation would direct toward us that same threat that we now make, I would be willing to declare war on them tomorrow.

Yes; there is an alternative, and that alternative is the United Nations organization, which is intended to deal with problems of this kind. It will never be any stronger than the United States will make it. Let us give to the United Nations this difficult problem to solve. Let us give it our united support, for it can do everything we can do under the so-called new Truman doctrine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, a great philosopher once remarked that "The history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom." If we are really conscious of this blessing in our land, we must also be conscious of the lack of it elsewhere. We must be conscious of it, not only out of a humanitarian regard for others but also as a matter of our own national self-interest.

It must be obvious to most people that even were we so inclined we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. There is no need to rehearse here the well-established fact that because of recent developments in modern science our frontiers are virtually contiguous with the frontiers of others. It is desirable that a world contracted by science be united by freedom in order to preserve peace.

I have been interested in the criticisms which have been made of this measure and I should like to take up a few of these criticisms in order, if possible, to shed some light on what I consider to be the vital issue.

First, it has been said that this is not a relief bill. Of course, it is not primarily a relief bill. It is a measure which is proposed as a strategical move to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of Greece and Turkey, to protect our own national interests, and to preserve peace. The theory behind this bill is that we cannot preserve by appeasement those things which we recently gained by force of arms, and yet in a sense this is a relief bill. If military aid were not given to Greece, the relief which we propose to grant could not reach the needy who are ekeing out a meager existence in the guerrilla-infested mountains.

Furthermore, this measure constitutes relief in another sense. If we believe that man does not live by bread alone, then we must recognize that there are things other than food and clothing, which man needs. If our system of government has any meaning, it is that we reject the purely materialistic philosophy and base our lives upon spiritual values for which we are willing to make supreme sacrifices. Had Patrick Henry said "Give me security or give me death" we should not know his name today.

Secondly, the argument has been made that the policy represented by this measure is imperialistic and unfriendly to Russia. I have always felt that the Russians themselves who reside in this country must realize that we are not imperialistic. It rather surprises me to find that some of our own compatriots have doubts concerning our intentions. Was it imperialistic when the British landed troops in Greece to help the Greeks defend themselves against the Nazi invaders? Was it imperialistic when the British came to the assistance of Poland and when they landed troops in France? Was it imperialistic when we invaded North Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, and finally Germany? I believe that the reason for this accusation stems from the failure to recognize that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts—the final confession of man's inability to solve his differences by peaceful means.

Accordingly, if we were justified in participating in the world's wars, we are at least as justified in participating in the world's peace-time conflicts. We must abandon the idea that we can oppose the disruptive forces now at large in the world without interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. We must interfere. We must interfere in order to bring relief and economic aid to those who need it rather than those who do not and who use it to destroy principles which are still widely cherished. We must interfere in order that these nations shall not be a constant drain on our resources. We must interfere in order that we may rehabilitate rather than pauperize these destitute human beings. We must interfere in order to protect the American people from the use of their money in the cause of communism. More than two billion dollars in relief and economic aid have been expended since the war's end largely through UNRRA. This money did much to strengthen the antifreedom forces. It helped the very forces to which we are opposed. It assisted Communist and terrorist minorities to impose their will on freedom-loving majorities.

I am relieved that the administration has at last seen the error of its ways. I am happy that it has abandoned a policy of appeasement.

There is no question that the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, the help we have furnished to Tito, the hands-off policy in China, the uncontrolled expenditures of millions of the American taxpayers' dollars, as well as many other incidents in the administration's confused approach to postwar problems have contributed to our present predicament. Had the administration been more decisive and clear-headed we might not now be confronted with this grave crisis. Let us hope that the discords and confusions of the past can provide the harmonies of the future. Let us face the actualities as they are presented to us by our President. We must do more than use the power of money. We have been asked to "authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey at the request of those countries and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished." This means involvement. In order to bring this about, in order to shoulder these responsibilities, we must do more than simply export American dollars to relieve human distress. True charity means more than the writing of a check. True participation means more than financial and economic aid.

Now that does not mean that we should be warmongers. In a nation of our demonstrated power, in a people of our mighty achievements, a show of truculence would be as unfitting as it is unnecessary. But I am full of wonder when I hear people violently and vociferously denounce Soviet Russia and yet seek to shackle their own country in its efforts to contain the spread of despotism. I believe that instead we should talk softly but carry a big stick. It is more becoming to be patient and restrained in our utterances and firm and just in our actions. Then we shall be calling the tune; then we shall cease to revolve in the Russian orbit. We shall have created an orbit of freedom into which we can hope to include Soviet Russia.

In the meantime, we should stop apologizing for our share in the recent war.

We must renounce the hope that we can prevent World War III by methods which failed to prevent World War II. We should place our faith in the force of principle rather than in the power of appeasement. We must bolster these principles, not only by our industrial and military might but by a dynamic concept of our own convictions. It is my profound belief that a peaceful accommodation can more easily be predicated on American strength than on American weakness.

We can perhaps indulge the hope that self-assurance and firmness now will reveal the essential debility of communism. To quote from Abraham Lincoln:

> In our intercourse with other nations it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why, then, let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long-threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best.

We can work for the best through the good offices of the United Nations, and we can best prepare for the worst by an abiding sense that until the United Nations has gathered vital momentum the choice for the world lies between a Pax Sovietica and a Pax Americana. This is the issue. This is the salient fact. This is the essential challenge of the hour.

Are we prepared to nullify the tragic sacrifices so gallantly made in World War II? Are we now ready to consign the rest of the world and ourselves along with it to the ash heap of a totalitarian subjugation which differs but little from that which recently engulfed millions of lives?

It is difficult for me to understand those who trust the good intentions of other countries and do not trust the intentions of their native land; those who cry "war" and "imperialism" when the United States acts to protect the threatened and neither report nor denounce certain actions of foreign powers.

Third, the criticism has been made that we are incapable of carrying out this policy. This is a counsel of defeatism and despair which I reject. We have been capable of winning several great wars. Surely we are capable of winning peacetime conflicts. It has been said that this will result in a higher cost of living; that it will bankrupt America. While I do not believe that this will happen, I suggest to you that if the iron curtain were to be extended to high tide on the western shores of

Europe our standard of living would surely go down. May I say also that we were quite willing to make sacrifices to win a war and that, therefore, we should now be willing to make sacrifices to preserve the peace.

Fourth, it has been said that the Greek Government is a reactionary monarchy unrepresentative of the will of the majority. Am I to gather from this accusation that because Russia has a totalitarian form of government we should have refused assistance to her when she became our ally? We may find ourselves in a very difficult position if we cling to such a standard. It might also be pointed out that we in this country have not yet achieved perfection in our Government. With respect to Greece, I should like to state that although the Greek Government is not perfect it represents 85 percent of the Greek Parliament, which was chosen in a fair election under the vigilance of an Allied mission of observers.

It has been said that we should clean out all the Communists in the United States before we take action outside our own country. Are we to wait until utopia has been achieved in Greece and in the United States before we are allowed to take action to salvage some of those things for which the war was fought? Will we have the chance peacefully to preserve our respective systems? Is it not more sensible to take action in order that we may have the opportunity to evolve toward a more perfect freedom? Half a loaf is better than none.

Our choice in life is very rarely between something perfect and something imperfect; it is usually between two imperfect things. Let us not allow the ideal to be the enemy of the attainable.

Fifth, much has been made of American investments in oil in the Middle East. This question of oil is a large subject by itself. While there is no time to go into it in detail, may I say that we should not sacrifice our national interests and the peace of the world simply in order to deprive certain individuals of profits on their investments in oil. May I point out also that aside from oil there are abundantly sufficient reasons for the enactment of this legislation.

We are fast becoming a have-not nation with respect to oil, and we shall do well to look outside our own borders in order to make our strategical position secure. Oil and profit should not be ugly words. Oil has brought comfort and happiness to millions of people, but it would not have done so unless there had been profit.

Sixth, the thought has been advanced with considerable fervor that this measure would involve our fighting on foreign soil. I favor this measure because I believe it to be a deterrent of war. However, I should like to add that if we are to do any fighting, let us by all means do it on foreign soil.

Seventh, it has been argued that we are here bypassing the United Nations. On the contrary, we are proposing to take action in defense of the Charter which the United Nations is incapable of taking in time. As was well stated in the New York Times:

> It will be poor service to the United Nations if Greece has been engulfed by a Communist tide by the time the Committee makes its report.

The United Nations has neither the money, the resources, the military means, nor the power to act. I favor this bill, also, because I have high hopes for the United Nations. Amendments to this bill have been accepted by the other body and by our committee which clearly indicate that the United States has no intention of evading its obligation to consult with the United Nations. Mankind's aspirations for a peaceful world demand that the United Nations receive encouragement while the Greeks and Turks receive our aid.

Aside from all this, Mr. Chairman, there remains the relentless fact that no constructive alternative has been put forward. I realize that this is a sickening moment and I do not suggest for a minute that we are faced with a happy choice. However, we cannot find salvation or security by tieing our hands behind our backs. We cannot promote peace by cutting down on our power. We have tried that before. Ours is in a sense a tragic generation. We live in a happy land in which felicities beyond the dreams of man abound. It is hard for us to take the cold plunge. But we are now, even without this bill, inextricably involved in world affairs. Let us enlarge our conceptions to the circle of our duties. Let us accept the challenge not only within but beyond our borders. Let us remember the words of Winston Churchill when, shortly after the recent war, he said in talking to the British people:

> You must be prepared for further effort of mind and body and further sacrifices to great causes if you are not to fall back into the rut of inertia, the confusion of aim, and the craven fear of being great.

This is no time to grow tired. This is the time for greatness.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, when a group of the Pharisaical, or the self-righteous, called on Mr. Lincoln at the time he was President, they said, "Mr. President, we have our way; the Lord's on our side." To which the Great Emancipator replied, "I am not concerned as to that; the question is, Are we on the Lord's side?"

It is not my intention to be dogmatic but let me ask you, fellow colleagues, "Has this so-called debate been fair or has self-righteousness held the right of way and then adroitly put the Lord into the so-called affirmative message in behalf of this power politics proposal?" As has been stated just last week, we voted on this floor and I was happy to vote in behalf of $200,000,000 for relief, a part of which went to the people—I mean the distressed people; not a ruler—in Greece. We are willing to vote for funds necessary to assist the brave and heroic Greek people in getting food, clothing and shelter, but how can we support a military alinement with the governments of Greece and Turkey?

Of course the proposal has been blessed with counterfeit metaphysical clothing but I am concerned. Why not listen to the Lord today instead of allowing our self-will and self-righteousness to control us and then claim he has blessed power politics plus propaganda. The common people of no country want war; the common people of whom Lincoln said, "God must have loved them for he made so many." Why could not we listen to the voice of right instead of to leadership that cries, "Peace, peace" and yet detours from the grand trunk line of peace to the side tracks which can only lead us farther afield each mile we travel.

The Senate of the United States has acted on one of the most serious and far-reaching proposals ever presented to this Republic. The Senate vote which approved the President's plan for extending aid to Greece and Turkey marks the official beginning of a new era in world politics. There is little reason to believe that any action can now be taken which will alter the course decided upon by the Chief Executive and the Senate.

We owe it to ourselves and to our children, whose lives will be affected by the decision made this week, to inform ourselves completely as to the direction in which we are traveling. We must reexamine our basic aims in our dealings with other nations. We must recognize the nature of the means which are to be used in an effort to obtain the desired goal. We must anticipate the sacrifices each and every American may be required to make in order to carry this new policy to its ultimate conclusion.

The first and fundamental fact to be faced is that we are now playing power politics, and we are in the middle of the game. The sanctimonious statements made about our humanitarian concern for the Greek people, and for the Turkish people, are window-dressing for the benefit of those who would rather not look at the actual facts, some of which may not be very pretty. If we do not know it, we had better be quick about finding out; we are out to defeat Russia, by peaceful means, we hope, but to defeat her whatever the cost.

Why, we may ask, must we defeat Russia? What about the United Nations? What about the years we worked together as allies against the common enemy, Nazi Germany? What about the principle "live and let live"? What about defeating the threat of communism by making democracy and free enterprise work successfully at home?

The answer to those questions is, "Do not be old-fashioned. Do not be naive. The United States and Russia came out of the recent war the two strongest nations in the world. Unquestionably, we are now stronger than Russia. But potentially Russia is considerably stronger than we can hope to be if we do not expand our sphere of influence." These are the reasons given us for our new policy aimed at defeating Russia. We are also told, by some honest enthusiasts of the new policy, "We

should have had it out with the Russians before we brought our boys home from Europe."

Let us agree Russia is out to take over what she can of eastern Europe, the Near East, and parts of Asia, either physically or ideologically.

Let us agree, we have no stomach for the present Russian Government because it is not a free Government, but a totalitarian dictatorship, which has used cruel and inhuman means to acquire power and maintain itself in power.

Let us agree, we have committed ourselves to stand for free elections in countries throughout the world.

But let us not delude ourselves into thinking that we are planning to solve the problems raised by Russia in the Christian spirit of brotherly love. Let us not indulge in transparent hypocrisy by pretending our policy is based on love of our fellow man or on the will of God.

Let us realize that despite the support given the new Truman doctrine by Secretary of State Marshall it has yet to be shown that anyone has thought through the consequences. The bill was passed by the Senate. The present hysterical fear of Russia has swept Washington so completely that it has drowned the voice of sanity.

Our avowed aim is to keep communism out of Greece and Turkey. Why? Is it because we feel communism would be a bad thing for the Greeks or for the Turks? Examine the form of government which Turkey now boasts. Examine the nature of the present Greek Government. You begin to understand why there are Greek Communists. You begin to see that the present Government of Turkey has a great deal in common with the present Government of Russia.

No; Greece and Turkey must be written off as pawns in the new game of power politics and national self-interest.

Congressional representatives who have just returned from the Middle East admit the truth quite frankly. This is a direct move to keep Russia from gaining access to the Mediterranean.

This is a power struggle to keep Russia from getting into a position from which she might challenge the monopoly held by private British and American oil companies on the vast oil reserves in the Middle East.

This is a one-sided, one-way move to support a worn-out British Empire in its age-old power struggle against Russia.

The question has been asked: "In formulating this new policy, are we consulting with other members of the United Nations?" The answer is, "Yes, we are consulting with certain other members of the United Nations who stand to benefit by this policy. Certainly we have not consulted with Russia, supposedly a member of that group. There is no indication that we have consulted with France, for France, too, has a Communist taint. The State Department, in answer to congressional questioning, promises we will keep the United Nations informed, after we have taken the action we think best.

The question has been asked: "Are we simultaneously building up the UN so that it will be prepared to take over responsibility of similar problems?" The honest answer is a matter of history. How can a world organization function when its two strongest and most influential members are at swords' points? The official State Department answer is, "It may be that at some future time the United Nations will be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey," but, say the managers of our foreign affairs, "Even if the project were not blocked by the objections of certain members of the United Nations, much time would have been lost, and time is of the essence." So you see, there is no reason to build up the United Nations so that it will be prepared to take over such responsibility, for there is always the possibility that the decision might not be in accordance with our wishes.

The question has been asked: "Are we preparing progressively to turn over responsibility to UN?" The honest answer is "Certainly not." We are anticipating a knock-down drag-out struggle between our way of life and the Communist way of life. But is the honest answer given to the Senate when it asks a similar question? Indeed not. The intelligence of our senior statesmen is held in such low repute by the State Department that they apparently expect the following official answer to be credible. I quote: "In the longer range, the United Nations may be able to take over various parts of the economic and financial problem in Greece and Turkey. We are giving serious study and consideration to ways in which the United Nations may take hold of this problem after the present emergency is past."

The question has been asked: "Are military expenditures preparing the Greek Army to maintain order as preparation for a free choice of government?"

The answer is, according to the committee report on the bill, as follows: A total of $150,000,000 will be spent for arms, ammunition, rations, clothing, and other supplies and equipment for the Greek armed forces for 15 months, ending June 30, 1948. I quote:

> This sum will permit the Greek armed forces to maintain a determined campaign against guerilla bands during the summer of 1947 and to maintain their forces at a strength sufficient to assure internal order thereafter.

Mr. Dean Acheson, in testimony before the committee, said:

> The present Parliament of Greece was democratically elected in an election which foreign observers agreed was fair. There can be no doubt that it represents the majority of the Greek people. The present Greek Cabinet contains representatives of 85 percent of the Greek Parliament. It is not the object of our aid to Greece either to help to maintain or to help to remove the present government of the King of Greece.

The question has been asked: "Are expenditures being used to improve the basic economic needs of Greece?"

The answer, according to Mr. Dean Acheson, is that a very considerable part of it—the money asked for Greece—is to be used for the importation of current consumable goods. Further sums for what is called rehabilitation, fertilizers, and agricultural tools and matters of that sort, would be included:

> A comparatively small amount would be used for reconstruction—the building of bridges which have been blown up, and matters of that sort.

A good many beautiful and humanitarian aims have been voiced during the discussion of this bill. The trouble is, some people are going to believe those high-flown phrases. Let us be realistic. Are the American people willing to follow through? High-flown phrases win us resounding applause, today. That applause can turn to catcalls and boos in a matter of hours, if we fail to carry out our promises.

It has been argued that this is the economical way to stop Russia. Now, it may look like a bargain to some people, but, as we all know, we usually get what we pay for. The hatred we can incur by wrong guessing on the real temper of the people we are "protecting," the loss of prestige we will suffer if we fail to follow through on our stated policy, not to mention the cost of war, if war should eventually result, all these will cost us, not only money but something far more valuable—the respect, admiration, and good will of our fellow men throughout the world.

Let us remember that to raise the standards of living around the world, to insure security to others, means lowering our standards at home. In the long run we may get something in return, just as a family that scrimps and saves to invest money temporarily lowers its standards, expecting a return on its investment.

Are we really willing to make these sacrifices? Try to translate into actual food, wood, coal, and clothing the sum of $20,000,000,000, our postwar commitments in Europe and Asia, plus the staggering sum of $341,000,000,000 which went into war expenditures.

We have a right to ask, Will this initial sum of $400,000,000 be used to help the Greek people free themselves of need for our aid? Let us use a homely analogy. A child growing up depends on his parents. This is right and good. But there comes a time when the child becomes a youth, and eventually reaches adulthood. The parent who has not prepared the child to go out on his own, support himself, rely on his own intelligence and ability, has been guilty of gross negligence, to say the least.

We saw the effects of continuous support in the thirties. The elections in November proved that the people of this country wanted to get back on their own. They wanted to shake off the parental hand of Government.

Is this new policy in Greece and in Turkey to be carried out like a WPA project, or will it be a healthy building process which will enable the Greek and the Turkish people to become masters of their own destiny? Will our aid be so applied that the people who benefit from it will be preparing to go on their own in the near future?

It has been said that we must uphold the hand of the President in this matter. Let us uphold the hand of the President, by all means. But let us not uphold the

mailed fist. If we are to uphold his hand, let it be a hand raised in benediction, stretched forth to aid and lift up our fellow man, not a hand raised to strike down and crush humanity that we may stand forth as the most powerful nation on earth.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with heavy heart and acute sense of responsibility to discuss this most important piece of legislation confronting us here today. It is not easy to bring one's self to take a decisive stand or a bill about which we know so many people have such grave doubts. All of us in this historic Chamber are well aware of the far-reaching significance of what we do here today. We are actually being called upon to place our stamp on a new American foreign policy, one without precedent. One in fact, which violates all the traditions of our country. Never before have we indulged in political loans to other countries on so grand a scale. Never before have we handed our relief not to all the needy but only to those who agree with our views.

Mr. Chairman, when we hear an urgent call for blood donors over the radio these days, we do not ask about the race, color, creed, or political views of the needy man. Yet when we hear the call of urgency from foreign lands today, we ask questions about everything from the color of their eyes to the politics in their hearts. There are many here who say this measure will insure the peace. Those of us who have watched with alarm the steady developing chasm between ourselves and the Russians are not so sure that this is not the road to war. Be war necessary, every red-blooded American will rally to his flag. But let us make sure that war is necessary. Let none of us forget that when war comes, it is not you or I who are called. No; the postman rings twice and ten times at the door of every land in the country eligible to fight.

The Gallup poll shows, Mr. Chairman, that 64 percent of the people who have heard of this new foreign policy disagree with it. None oppose aid to Greece. They do oppose unilateral action by the United States. The people, perhaps better than some presidents, know the meaning of the United Nations. They want the United Nations. They say that if the United Nations is not strong enough to help Greece, let us strengthen it until it is able to work. Another public opinion poll, the Roper poll, shows an even greater majority of the people opposed to the loan than Mr. Gallup indicates. It seems clear that the people have more faith in the United Nations than some in Congress have. They know it is still imperfect, but they want to help perfect it.

Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the loan to Greece and Turkey. Under the legislation now under consideration, the United States is called upon to carry 100 percent of the burden. We are laying every penny on the line. Yet, if the plan works, and we all pray that it will, other countries also in a position to carry some of the burden, will benefit, but they will not have contributed a penny to the cause. Mr. Chairman, we have been charged with creating a new imperialism here in the United States with our unilateral aid program. I do not believe that is true. However, if we should concentrate all this aid in the United Nations, no one could have any doubts about the falsehood of these charges.

Mr. Chairman, a year before the war ended, the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference was held in Bretton Woods, N. H. Present were the ranking members and the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Present also were the now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Fred Vinson, and the now Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. They, together with men like Senators TOBEY and WAGNER, helped chisel out a new form of international finance. The two new United Nations agencies developed at Bretton Woods are the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Both the bank and the fund are capitalized at $10,000,000,000 each. Many countries are to contribute to make up this $20,000,000,000 sum. True, the United States is contributing 60 percent of the money. But it is also true that on a bad loan it is better to lose 60 cents on the dollar rather than 100 cents on a dollar. Now the very name International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should mean something in itself. I supposed the bank was set up to help war-devastated countries get back on their feet. It seems to me that to bypass the bank when we need it is to bypass the United Nations. And the United Nations is like an organ of the human body. Fail to use or exercise it long enough and it will shrivel and die. The Russians are not members of the world bank. They have no veto in its actions. The bank has been established for almost a year. Yet, it has not loaned a dime or stabilized a penny's worth of currency anywhere in the world. The spirit of the bank is being violated daily. The American members no longer think in terms of need, but instead in terms of political opportunism.

A reading of section C of part 4 of the charter of the International Bank proves conclusively that this United Nations agency can be used to help the people of Greece. It says, and I quote, "If a member suffers from an acute exchange stringency, so that the service of any loan contracted by that member or guaranteed by it or by one of its agencies cannot be provided in the stipulated manner, the member concerned may apply to the bank for a relaxation of the conditions of payment." This certainly applies to Greece today as it seems to me.

The very first chapter of the bank's charter is even more specific in its application to Greece today. It says under section B the resource shall be used "for the purpose of facilitating the restoration and reconstruction of the economy of members whose metropolitan territories have suffered great devastation from enemy occupation or hostilities. The bank, in determining the conditions and terms of loans made to such members, shall pay special regard to lightening the financial burden and expediting the completion of such restoration and reconstruction."

This, Mr. Chairman, is more than a charter. It is a mandate to us to use the International Bank in this Greek crisis. The charter of the bank was ratified overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, which at the same time, voted authorization and moneys into the billions to make it work.

I dare say that many of my colleagues when they voted for the bank and the fund saw the same possibilities I have described. It comes as something of a shock, therefore, to read the account in today's New York Times of the utterances of Vice President Robert L. Gaines. I think the article should be considered in the light of my comments and under unanimous consent, I include the article:

GARNER SEES GREEK-TURK LOANS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO WORLD BANK

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

BOSTON, May 6.—United States loans to Greece and Turkey are noneconomic operations and not the type the new World Bank will handle, Robert L. Garner, vice president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, told the Nation's mutual savings banks executives today at their twenty-seventh annual convention in the Statler Hotel.

Earl B. Schwulst, executive vice president of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, was elected president of the association. Other officers elected were William L. Maude, president of the Howard Savings Institution, Newark, N. J., vice president; Edmund P. Livingston, vice president of the Union Dime Savings Bank, New York, treasurer; John W. Sandstadt, executive secretary, New York.

In his speech and later in a brief press conference, Mr. Garner emphasized that the new World Bank, now financed principally with United States official funds, had as its intention the making of loans that would be repaid, so that prospective private purchasers of the Bank's bonds would be encouraged and at the same time international trade would be accelerated. He went so far in his press conference as to say that the Bank hoped many propositions made to it could be handled by private United States capital.

Referring to the Greek and Turkish loans, Mr. Garner said that "it has been frankly stated by the United States Government that these are in effect grants for purposes beyond the economic development of these countries."

"This type of loan," he added, "is completely different from the economic purpose loans for which the Bank is designed. The Bank has no intention of—in fact is prohibited from—engaging in such noneconomic loan operations."

Mr. Garner disclosed in his press conference that, while no decision yet has been taken on the proposed French loan, "we are hopeful we can get them started on the basis of about $250,000,000 and go on from there."

Asked whether the results of the conference had not been to eliminate partly the objective of the World Bank by making impossible loans to get eastern Europe back on its feet, Mr. Garner replied that "if you can assure western Europe of food and coal for the next year, that's the problem."

Conceding that "there's a kind of economic and political instability" in Europe and emphasizing that "to the extent you get people to work you offset communism," Mr. Garner indicated that if Polish coal could be moved into western Europe with the help of the World Bank it would help relieve the most

urgent of problems. He added, in this connection, that "the Russians are getting only a small part of Polish coal."

Prof. S. H. Slichter, Lamount professor at Harvard, told the gathering of 600 savings bank executives that the Twentieth Century Fund's estimate that national income in 1960 will be $245,000,000,000, compared with $194,000,000,000 last year is too low.

This, he explained in his speech, was "partly because the work force has been underestimated and partly because the man-hour production during the next 15 years is likely to be greater than normal." His own estimate for the national income was $275,000,000,000 in 1960, and perhaps considerably more.

T. B. King, director of the Veterans' Administration's loan guarantee service, called upon the savings bankers to protect from gouging the veterans who are building homes under the GI bill of rights. This, he emphasized, was important to the banks in protecting their part of financing of these loans.

One further word, Mr. Chairman. Today again America finds itself at the crossroads. But this time the choice between war and peace will be harder than ever before in our history. I was in the war just ended. It is impossible to translate the yearning for peace of a tired soldier on a lonely Pacific island in the dead of night, with your only company the hiss of insects and the nervous Jap rustling in the bushes only yards away. This was a terrible war. But those who stayed behind felt it only slightly. The next war will not be fought in the islands and on the beaches. It will be fought in the stricken cities of our own country, burned to crisps under the fantastic fury of exploding A bombs and guided missiles. Twenty-five years ago wars could still be won. We already know that there was no victor from the war which ended 2 years ago. The lands we devastated, we now finance. The homes we destroyed, we now rebuild. Only the dead whom we buried, we cannot resurrect. We thought long and hard before entering World War II. Before we take any step toward World War III, let us think and pray as we have never done before, that Almighty God in His divine wisdom may keep us on the path to peace, plenty, and the brotherhood of man, rather than on the road to war, ruin, and eternal anguish.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in approaching the question of what to do with this resolution which proposes aid to Greece and Turkey, I do so in a little different manner and from a different viewpoint than most of those whom I have heard discuss the problem. To me the determination of what we do today with this bill is a problem of national and international security. If we adopt this bill I am firmly convinced it will be a step in the direction of world stability and world peace.

Before asking you to accept that conclusion I think we should keep in mind certain well-established facts and circumstances which have a direct bearing on the problem of our security today.

Measured in terms of transportation the world is a relatively small world and is still shrinking fast. Also, that portion of the world in which so-called civilization has developed and flourishes is, generally speaking, the area of the globe north of the thirtieth degree, north latitude. This same area contains the trouble spots of the world. Also, in this civilized area of the world is where all of the wars of the past several centuries have been started. To the present time, the only method by which nations solve their important controversies is by means of mass murder, popularly called war. Twice in 30 years war has broken out and although the United States was not a belligerent at the beginning we became involved and turned the balance that won the victory for the nations allied with us. Any future war would undoubtedly be a world war and encompass our Nation as well as all the major nations of the world. The last war developed a new technique by starting the war without any formal declaration thereof. Any future war will undoubtedly come upon us without notice. The rapid air transit of today and the faster transit which will be here tomorrow makes it possible for aircraft to go from any part of the area of the world from which a war might come and return without landing or refueling. The increase in the destructive power of weapons has been tremendous. Furthermore, some of the most powerful and devastating weapons are relatively light in weight. It is true that the human race now has the capacity to literally destroy itself by the mass murder which we call war. We got a preview of what could happen just at the close of the Japanese war when two atomic bombs destroyed two large cities of Japan and killed several hundred thousand people. The result is that danger is right in our lap whether we want it or not. Every part of our country—the interior cities, exactly the same degree as the border cities of San Francisco and New York, are subject to attack and within the range of any possible attacker. The result is that we are really on the military alert 24 hours a day, every day of the year, if there is any serious friction between us and any other great nation. In this new age of a small world and explosive and annihilating destructive capacity of armed forces we must face the possibility of complete destruction unless some method other than warfare is found to handle the disputes and differences of nations. If some system of security other than one based on might and power and murder is not developed, the people of the world, including ourselves, can no longer live in peace and quiet.

Therefore, we all agree that we must find a system based on law and order to settle international disputes.

This idea is not new. In our own country in 1916 ex-President Taft recognized the need for such an organism and organized the league to enforce peace. In other words, he realized that there must be joint action by the great nations of the world and they must combine to be able to enforce peace if necessary. Following the First World War we made efforts to bring about international understanding and set up machinery to settle controversies between countries, without resort to war. A beginning was made but our country kept aloof and really walked away from its allies as far as the development of an international peace organism was concerned. The result was that the world relapsed into turmoil and ultimately war, within 25 years of the termination of the First World War.

The last World War engulfed the whole civilized world. Its destructive capacity was a hundred times as great in property destruction and several times as great in the destruction of human life as the First World War. In the modern war all persons are subject to attack and destruction. The entire nation is the battlefront. There are no longer any barriers of oceans, mountains, climate, altitude, and the world is truly round in the conception of those that made war. The planes and missiles fly over Arctic regions and over the highest mountains of the world with the greatest of ease.

During the war, the leaders of the Allied Nations laid plans for a world of peace. Some men criticize them bitterly today, but I believe we can truly say that these leaders honestly and sincerely wanted to lay the fabric of world peace by the creation of some type of effective international organization to settle the fights and controversies between nations.

Among one of the things that they decided was that countries which have been devastated and occupied should have the right to select their own rulers and their own form of government. That was true in the case of Greece, a country which was overrun by Nazis, badly punished and severely injured. We made that agreement with Russia and our other allies. It was a solemn agreement and not only were the nations to have this right but there was the implied agreement that once the right to determine their own form of government had been exercised that that decision would not be nullified by the direct or indirect action of one of the large countries. Greece has held an election. Its electors decided by an overwhelming vote that they wanted a monarchical government similar to the one they had previous to the war. It is no business of ours what their type of government is, so long as they do not injure their neighbors, and so long as the selection of the type by the people was their free choice.

These preliminary agreements made between the United States and Russia were the preliminary steps toward a world organism which it was hoped and believed would be in a position to develop world peace and stability. Russia has violated some of these solemn agreements entered into between its top man and our President. In some cases we have only protested. We have permitted Russia to have her way. Today, we are faced with a problem in Greece as to whether we shall allow Russia by indirection, by infiltration, by the aiding and encouraging of enemies of Greece to destroy the free choice which we guaranteed her. Russia is trying to create chaos, dissension, confusion, and even the destruction of the Greek Government. This strikes at the very foundation of the efforts and the plan to bring about a world of law and order. Therefore, I say we should challenge her right to do this. We should stop Russia from doing this very thing. We

should help Greece secure the government which she by a solemn election decided that she wanted. The sanctity of this agreement is the very foundation of the future development of orderly procedure through the United Nations to bring about world peace.

We should find out today whether Russia is willing to abide by these solemn agreements or whether they were made with her tongue in her cheek. She is talking about disarmament, outlawing the atomic bomb, and, in fact, outlawing war itself. Let us now, before we take these steps, understand whether she will permit little Greece to have the kind of government she wishes after the electors of Greece have made their choice. By taking a firm stand today it is my conviction that we will move toward world peace. The only dividend that the people of the world expect out of the terrific sacrifices made in this war is a stable and lasting peace. We are the most stable country in the world, economically, politically, and socially. We have the capacity to lead if we have courage to act today to compel Russia to abide by the agreement which she made to permit small countries a free choice of their government. Only by developing slowly but surely a course leading to the peaceful settlement of international controversies can we have real security for ourselves and our posterity. The time has come for us to make that decision in the case that we have before us.

If we lack the courage to insist that Russia abide by her agreements to allow this little country her freedom and choice in selecting her government and the right to maintain that government without interference we will be guilty of appeasement, weakness, and expediency. That in my opinion would be the road to a war, and it might be the final gasp of civilization. If we take a firm stand today, I believe that we are facing toward a world of peace. I believe we are laying the groundwork for a system of security that will be based on law and justice. I believe that Russia herself will by the passage of this bill determine that we mean what we say and she will find ways and means of getting along with us. Weakness, procrastination, passing this job on to the United Nations which is not now able to handle it, is the road of indecision that will lead to chaos, controversy, strife, and ultimately world destruction.

A firm stand today will give hope to the millions of peoples who have been saddened and ruined by this tragic war. It will give hope to those small nations who are the victims and the pawns of the aggressive nations of Europe. It will breed new confidence in the hope of mankind that, under the guidance of God and by our own intelligence and character, it can weave a fabric that will bring the peaceful world we are all looking and praying for.

For that reason and other reasons I hope with every ounce of my strength that this bill will pass by a resounding vote to tell the world that we believe in the sanctity of contracts, we are willing to risk our destiny and our power to compel obedience to agreements made. We are willing to put our leadership, our money and our men if necessary behind our effort to bring permanent peace to this tumultuous world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey. I want to know whether or not there is going to be an attempt to finish the bill tonight. We will reach the 5-minute rule, according to the Chairman, after 5 o'clock.

Mr. EATON. Is the question whether we plan to finish this bill tonight?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Certainly not. It will take all day tomorrow under the 5-minute rule, and it may go over even beyond that. We will be lucky to finish debate tonight.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, does the Greek-Turko scheme commit us to gigantic hand-outs the world over that will result in economic and social collapse in America? Those favoring this proposal cannot answer this question fully, fairly, and honestly. That is my first reason for voting against this proposal.

For there is no more certain way to destroy American capitalism than to overload it with an impossible burden. The proponents of this legislation cannot show how we can give away billions of our resources each year in peacetime without continuous inflation or war regimentation at home.

And so, this act means continuous high prices or peacetime regimentation is ahead—taking us on the one-way road toward totalitarianism.

Lenin, himself, declared that the most certain way to destroy the existing social order is to debauch the currency. This scheme sets off a new outpouring of American dollars. That means higher prices, higher taxes, and systematic and legal cheating of the humble people and the poor. That economic condition helps communism, not freedom.

Suppose you were trying to devise a way to destroy this country? Could you figure out a more certain method than to commit this country, 140,000,000 people, to underwriting the combined budget deficits of the non-Russian world?

That is what this bill anticipates—that the budget deficits of every nation in the world may be paid out of the savings of the people of America. No people can carry that kind of a burden very long.

Already food prices are up close to 50 percent from a year ago. How do you suppose this spiral reflects in the pocketbooks and the market baskets of our thrifty people? This hand-out program guarantees that that sort of inflation is going to continue.

That is the kind of economic condition that makes communism just as fast as the bayonets of Russian soldiers.

A 14-YEAR RECORD OF BUNGLING

My second reason for voting against this loan is equally important. For 14 years this administration has been playing into the hands of Russia. Their ghastly bungling has resulted in communism making more gains by American assistance in 4 years than they made by themselves in 25 years.

This administration held in its hands during World War II decisive industrial, military, and economic power. It used that power so recklessly and stupidly that Russia came out of the war the only true victor.

An earlier speaker has called the roll on the countries that have been taken into the Russian orbit following World War II. Who had the power that was used in such a manner that Russia made those gains? It was the United States that had that decisive power.

There may be those in this House who can shut their eyes to that kind of failure and place in the same hands new instruments to wield in foreign affairs, but I want no part in such irresponsible action.

It is not unlike a chauffeur having your car and driving it up and down the road and smashing up one car after another and killing people and then coming back and saying, "Let me drive another new car for you."

No; I will not agree to placing new power in the kind of administration hands that have given the Russian Government for 14 years steady gains all over the world.

I would rather put a fully loaded machine gun in the hands of a delinquent teen-ager than more opportunities for international destruction in the hands of our State Department.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Does the gentleman consider General Marshall that kind of stupid leader, or driver?

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has asked a fair question and he is entitled to an answer. The gentleman may be willing to put his trust in the hands of a man who under oath before a committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives could not remember where he was or what he was doing on the most important day in his life, but by my standards of integrity I cannot do that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Was the gentleman referring to the Pearl Harbor disaster?

Mr. BUFFETT. I was referring to that event; yes. There are a lot of facts in chapters of our history that have not not been revealed. We ought to find out where we are, how we got there, and what shape we are in, before being shoved in any new global messes involving military action.

An administration that is responsible for unconditional surrender, for postwar lend-lease to Russia, for UNRRA, for the Morgenthau plan, for Potsdam, for the Atlantic Charter going into the wastebasket, and for the sell-out of Poland and other lands does not get new instruments to menace civilization by my vote.

My third reason for voting against this scheme is because instead of restraining communism abroad, it will shore up

ruling politicians everywhere and actually promote and accelerate the spread of communism.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the ghastly failures during and since World War II ended. Perhaps it seems hard to believe that worse disasters can occur. But they can and will if this Congress votes to allow the administration to take us into an American attempt to determine the pattern of human life everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, God Almighty with infinite wisdom and unlimited power does not try to make any person behave according to His ideas. He sets down the natural laws we can live by or disobey at our own risk.

We are asked to go out on a crusade now to tell everybody in the world how to live. I do not think that God approves of such egotism. I do not think it will work. I am sure the people of America do not think it will work.

But let us see how that pattern has been working thus far.

FAILURE IN CHINA

Some time ago, it was announced that America was to help China solve its problems—and that in doing so we were going to drive communism from China.

That scheme was a reasonable facsimile of what is now proposed in Greece and Turkey. About $3,000,000,000 has been spent to date in China. Our official top man in military and political affairs, Gen. George Marshall, spent a year in China.

Marshall came home in disgust and failure. What did he accomplish? The civil war goes on. Inflation is worse than ever in China. Human butchery has taken place on a large scale in Formosa. Evil days unlimited seem to be the fate of the Chinese.

In the May 4 New York Times we have a report from an authority on Chinese affairs, Nathaniel Peffer, professor of international relations at Columbia. Members would do well to read the whole article. I quote briefly from its most significant passage.

Peffer declares:

Scant as is the hope for improvement, there is no chance of its growth so long as America continues to give even color of support to the existing government. In fact, it has already been diminished by such support as America has given in the form of maintenance of troops in the country, training of the Nationalist army, and the sale on easy terms of surplus property. That this support has been falsely exaggerated by the Communists is a consideration apart.

The help already given has worked to entrench those now in power, those who make China's outlook hopeless. Whatever America's intention may have been in keeping troops in China—and about this, too, the Communists consciously lie in their propaganda—the effect has been to stiffen the elements in power and negate prospects of reform.

Those elements listen respectfully to America's exhortations to reform, to institute democracy, whether made by President Truman, General Marshall, or Ambassador Stuart, but they have no intention of giving heed to them. They do not believe they have to. Whatever they may say openly, they believe America has to support them anyway. They believe they are in a position to blackmail America. The reason is Russia.

Privately men of that class tell a visiting American, if they know him well enough to be frank, that America is going to fight Russia. Therefore, America needs China, and it must and should stiffen up the national government. It must support the Kuomintang government against the Chinese Communists, because the Communists are the vanguard of Russia.

What they do not say to Americans but do say to each other is why, then, make any concessions to America in return for support, especially concessions by way of reforms that will cost them the perquisites and profits of monopolistic power?

And except in words they make no concessions by way of reforms.

Actually the Chinese Communists say much the same thing. They, too, think America in keeping troops in China has Russia in mind. They say that America wants a base from which to fight Russia and therefore it supports the Kuomintang regime. They hold that a deal has been made: Support for a corrupt, reactionary, and quasi-fascist regime in exchange for service against Russia.

This must be emphasized and understood in America: Many Chinese not Communist, not even radical, are coming to believe the same thing. And so far as they believe it, they have also come to the conclusion that America has betrayed not only its own traditions but its traditional role in China, which has been to foster republicanism and democracy.

Therefore—and this, too, should be understood in America—anti-Americanism is growing in China, not only among Communists and leftist students but among the liberal intellectuals and the scholar class who still make opinion. Much of it is incited by Communist propaganda—lying propaganda, no doubt—but not all.

There is an increasing conviction among all classes that America, having become supreme, is going the way of all great powers, acquisitive in its ends and cynical in its means.

A SET-UP FOR INTERNATIONAL BLACKMAIL

Mr. Peffer declares:

They believe they are in a position to blackmail America. The reason is Russia.

The logic of this statement is terrifying. One does not have to be an expert in foreign affairs to forecast what will happen once the Greek-Turko deal is passed.

Ruling politicians everywhere are going to spend much of their energies on one goal. That aim will be devising ways and means of using the threat of Communism to blackmail America for continuous handouts. And they do not stay bought.

Picture the outlook. Figure out the possibilities for politicians from everywhere in the world to come around to the back door of our Treasury and say, "Give me the dough or communism comes in the morning."

It is the slickest blackmail racket that has ever been invented for foreign politicians to get the savings of the American people. Make no mistake about it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Why do you think that they will come to the back door?

Mr. BUFFETT. I accept a correction—they may come in at the back door, the front door, the side door, or through the windows.

The Peffer article reflects our position in China.

But you do not have to take his word for it. The logic of his appraisal of the situation is perfectly plain for anyone to see.

NATIONS DO NOT STAY BOUGHT

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to look up the record and see how many countries have ever stayed bought.

Before World War II France made loans to 10 different nations. When the war came 5 of those 10, half of them, 50 percent of them, fought against France. Four of the remaining five were overrun inside of 30 days. No. 10, good old Turkey, sat on the side lines and played both sides.

That is the record of trying to buy assistance in fighting a prospective foe.

That is the record of trying to bribe somebody into coming in on your side. Look at the record of France and you will get the answer as to how far this scheme will work in giving us protection against communism.

Everywhere we are going to have from now on attempts to get hand-outs on account of communism.

A RAT RACE FOR HAND-OUTS WILL RESULT

Whispers about communism were used in this House last summer to put over the British loan. Then the Communist threat was used in silk-glove fashion. Now it is used in bombastic style—perhaps by some trying to wash out the stains of their earlier appeasing of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this act will accelerate rivalry between most non-Russian foreign governments for American hand-outs. Each will connive to get a lion's share of the resources of America before the bubble bursts. This scramble will cause a rat race between nations for aid in their alleged opposition to communism.

Every ruler abroad, be he tyrant or parliamentary politician, will claim the threat of communism is the most dangerous in his land. Then he will get the largest and quickest hand-out of American resources. At any sign of American reluctance, the pressure will be stepped up.

This scheme sets the stage for international blackmail—blackmail on a scale that will lead our kindergarten diplomats into even worse bungling than that of the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Greek-Turkish deal will promote a demoralizing rat race to exhaust American resources. With the American people betrayed and bankrupt from this outpouring, the end result might be world triumph for communism.

For once the Truman administration gets us on this blackmail roller coaster, we will be on a boom-and-bust ride toward a bloody smashup.

Mr. Chairman, this Truman scheme, like the hypocritical actions of the New Deal for 14 long years, plays into Stalin's hands. Only a badly hypnotized Congress will embark on such a reckless course. H. R. 2616 should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly stated here, by the President on March 12 and by every proponent of this legislation, that the United Nations cannot handle the problem of economic rehabilitation in Greece. That statement, in my considered judgment, is belied by the facts. I am not charging anyone with suppressing the facts here, but I am charging many of the proponents with not informing this Congress of the fact that the United Nations has gone into this Greek situation and has, through one of its most important organizations, made specific recommendations. There exists in the United Nations an organization called the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. At the request of the Greek Government itself, this organization of the United Nations sent a mission into Greece, and that mission worked in Greece from May through August 1946. It made a report. I hold that report in my hand, "Report of F. A. O. Mission to Greece." It made 85 itemized specific recommendations for the economic rehabilitation of Greece. The members of this mission are all American citizens, outstanding educators, experts in their fields, and, as much as the Committee on Un-American Activities may try, it and no one else will ever be in a position to charge any of these gentlemen with having any reputation other than that of being conservative.

For instance, the chairman of the committee is none other than Dr. Franklin S. Harris, president of the Utah Agricultural College, located at Logan, Utah.

I cannot in this brief time give you the 85 recommendations this organization made, but I want to give you some of the high lights:

1. A program of special feeding, regardless of religion or politics.

2. A program of citizen labor on repair of roads, participated in by all able-bodied males and also by the armed services.

3. Curbing inflation by rationing and price controls; expansion of industrial production; providing funds for purchase of consumer goods; setting up joint buying and selling offices of the Agricultural Bank and the Confederation of Cooperatives; and undertaking to negotiate exchange of goods with countries which still have controlled foreign trade.

4. Restoration of export markets with the use of proceeds for the balance of trade, instead of hoarding dollars abroad.

5. Larger output per farm family. Breaking up of large estates and raising the acreage of land cultivated per family.

6. Reorganization of the Ministry of Agriculture.

7. Increased support of cooperatives and extension of production credit to farmers.

8. Abolition of the spoils system and pay roll padding in the Civil Service and the accepted system of graft and perquisites.

9. Complete reform of taxes and insistence that the Government undertake to put into effect reforms in its tax system to make it less regressive, and more like that of the United States of America and the United Kingdom and other developed countries.

And the last and most important from the standpoint of this debate:

A United Nations Advisory Mission and financial aid on an international basis.

These recommendations were made by this very important body of the United Nations organization.

How do we meet it here? We meet it here by a proposal to implement the policy of doing what? Not of having these sound recommendations put into effect and bring about financial and economic stability in Greece. Our proposal here is to wipe out, to starve and kill, the opposition to the regime in Greece which has refused up to now even to show any semblance of initiating any of these reforms which may be very properly described as mere rudimentary economic democracy.

It is my contention and the contention of the gentlemen who made this comprehensive on-the-spot study and who did not spend their time speaking to only the rulers of Greece or the men in charge of the police in Greece, that these recommendations, if they were put into effect, would go a long, long way in eliminating the existing civil strife in Greece. If these recommendations were adopted, if the people who are now fighting in the hills were guaranteed the freedom about which you gentlemen have been speaking here this afternoon there would be no civil strife in Greece and there would be no problem such as the President described in his speech of March 12 and which many Members are seeking to accentuate on the floor of this House.

Why do we bypass the United Nations? Why do we insist on ignoring the recommendations of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations? Why do we insist on a program that would prevent the adoption of these reforms in Greece, reforms that would do away with the civil strife and which would give Greece at least some substance of economic stability? Why is it that we ask for legislation that would implement a policy of merely starving or destroying the opposition to a regime which refuses to accept these recommendations made by American citizens, mind you, acting as agents of the United Nations organization after a careful and exhaustive study of the problem?

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that between now and tomorrow or when we vote on this bill the Members obtain this document and spend some time with it. I am sure after they have they will know much more about the situation in Greece than they know now.

Mr. Chairman, the program before us is to starve and kill the opposition to a regime that refuses to accept these reforms. That is the program set forth in this legislation. This legislation represents a policy of refusal to do that which will really aid to eradicate civil strife and restore economic stability and freedom in Greece. Some may say, "Well, the Greek Government will be forced to do this if we adopt the pending legislation." That is impossible. The ruling class in Greece cannot maintain its sinecures that it now holds on to if these reforms were put into effect. In other words, the Fascist rulers of Greece today and the well-entrenched few families in Greece today would not be able to maintain their position of political and class rule s if these reforms that have been recommended by the United Nations organization were adopted.

In all fairness to Great Britain, it made some effort to have some of these reforms adopted during the period of its disgraceful rule there. It met with nothing but resistance, refusal, and sabotage on the part of the Greek regime which we are now asked to sustain with money and with military aid. That regime cannot accept these recommendations and survive. If it accepts these recommendations its control of the political and the economic life of Greece will be destroyed. For the present rulers of Greece to accept these recommendations means extinction for them. They will hang on to their present position and refuse to accept these recommendations. Therefore again I say, this legislation implements a policy not of reform so necessary and vital for the freedom and the economic rehabilitation of Greece, but it implements a policy of destroying, starving out, the people who oppose the regime which refuses to accept these very elementary recommendations so necessary to a democracy, freedom and stability in Greece.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I just want to ask the gentleman why it is that these very excellent recommendations of the United Nations have not been put into effect in Greece. How does the gentleman think they could have been effected?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This report was printed, may I say to the distinguished lady, in March 1947, right here in Washington, D. C. On March 12 the President came here and proposed unilateral action on the part of the United States. Certainly, that foreclosed action on the part of the United Nations to carry out these recommendations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why are we doing all this? We are doing it under the guise of stop communism, and I say while we are doing all this, we are aiding a regime which is shot through and through with Fascists, with Nazi collaborators, petty and big Quislings. Read the roll of those who rule Greece today: The Minister of Public Security, the Chief of Police, the present King, the present Queen, blood relatives, politically and otherwise, of naziism. I just wonder how our men who fought against the Nazis will feel when they learn that we are giving aid and comfort to a regime that is made up of those elements who aided and gave comfort to the Nazis. I wonder how the ex-GI will feel when he learns that we pass this legislation which provides for the shooting down, yes, of these guerrillas, some of them Communists, many of them non-Communists, but all men and women who fought heroically against the Nazis and against the Fascists, and thereby saved the lives of thousands of Americans.

Why are we doing this? We are doing this under the guise of stop communism. I have heard that used before; so have you. You heard it to justify the destruction of republican Spain. You heard it at Munich; the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and the betrayal of democracy in Europe was alibied with the same cry, stop communism. You heard it to alibi the creation of the anti-Comintern pact. You heard it to excuse the terror of the Axis.

You heard it from the lips of Hitler, Tojo, Mussolini, and Goebbels. You heard it at the Nuremberg trials from the lips of the guilty, from Goering and Ribbentrop. It was used before to excuse ruthless warfare waged on the democratic people of the world. Now monopoly capital and its agents set up the same cry in an attempt to stop the forward march of mankind toward freedom from fear and want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a short answer to the gentleman from New York who has just spoken on the FAO report. That report says that the purpose of the Mission was the long-time reconstruction and rehabilitation of Greece and was not aimed at immediate help. It went into such things as reconstruction of industry and rehabilitation that can be done over a long period of time, while this particular bill of aid and assistance is aimed at the present, immediately, so that disposes of the FAO report on that basis.

Certainly, the FAO report clearly had in mind that they would go to some other nations for help, and specifically talked of the United States helping.

Mr MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York this: The State Department on June 11, 1946, received a cablegram from Yugoslavia stating that Russia had entered into a unilateral compact with Yugoslavia for the reconstruction of Yugoslav industry, assisting its arms industry and putting it back into effect, and also giving them mechanical and other equipment for their armies. Did the gentleman on June 11, 1946, object to unilateral action by Russia in connection with this agreement with Yugoslavia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first I have heard of it. I cannot account for the accuracy of that report.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman may accept it as accurate, because I will produce the cablegram to the State Department.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. However, assuming the statement to be correct, then I say that that action as well as this action should be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. So the gentleman now disapproves the action of Russia on June 11, 1946; is that correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disapprove the action of any country that takes unilateral action on any matter that involves the peace of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Including Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including Russia, the United States, Turkey, Greece, or any other nation in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Then if I am right in my statement that we did receive such a cablegram from Yugoslavia, the gentleman condemns Russia just as he condemns the United States right here, does he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do.

Mr. FULTON. That is very interesting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think any action should go through the United Nations when that action affects the peace of the world.

Now, will the gentleman let me make a statement with respect to the FAO? The gentleman says that it made only long-range recommendations. I think that if the gentleman will read the report he will find that some of those recommendations were made to be put into effect before the initiation of the 1947 crop.

Mr. FULTON. Yes, and did they not say to go to the United States to get the money?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; they said to go to the United Nations, including the United States.

Mr. FULTON. Yes. The United States was specifically mentioned.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The United States is part of the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. I refuse to yield further.

May I correct someone else? The eminent chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives said yesterday we were "one of the principal sponsors of the United Nations, yet now, less than 2 years later, we are the first nation to attempt to nullify it by proposing to act alone." We were not. On June 11, 1946, Russia did it by specific agreement with Yugoslavia. He was wrong.

"It means our embarkation upon a new policy that may lead to no one knows where." The gentleman does not know where.

May I answer him further. I think the Republican Party should ask the gentleman what he means when he says on page 4640 of the RECORD, "Are we prepared for it? Can we do so with a national debt of $258,000,000,000?" Then he states specifically, "And with a budget for next year that may approximate thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars?" These are President Truman's exact figures, from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Republican Party.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. With this program and what will follow, it will be away in excess of what that budget indicates.

Mr. FULTON. Let me answer the gentleman from Ohio on that one. Can we help Greece? We certainly can. The gentleman says we are going to bankrupt ourselves. I do not see how anybody from Ohio, one of the granaries of the country, can stand there and say that when Time magazine on April 28 had this to say:

THE BIN

Actually, the United States could stand the drain on its food resources without even tightening its belt. Production was high. The Agriculture Department predicted a bumper 1947 wheat crop of 1,240,000,000 bushels, compared to 1,185,000,000 last year. Despite 14,000,000 more mouths than before the war, per capita food consumption in the United States had increased 16 percent. In 1946 the United States supplied the world with a net of $6,600,000,000 of goods and services, but this was only 3.4 percent of the total value of goods and services produced by a fat and wealthy land. Far from scraping the bottom of the food bin, the United States was only spooning out its resources.

May I further state that we also have the greatest industrial production right around Pittsburgh, where I come from. Look and see if anybody else can do it. They cannot. Only the United States under present conditions, with ingot output at a rate above 80,000,000 tons, can even begin to supply the immense world needs for steel. British industry has only 15,000,000 tons of steel. German industry is to be limited to 5,800,000 tons. France has some steel capacity but none for export. Russia has only 20,000,000 tons, and Japan is to be permitted 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. BENDER. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. FULTON. That we are perfectly able to go ahead on this program, and all these cries of anguish about bankruptcy from certain parties certainly amaze me.

Mr. BENDER. I read some of the gentleman's speeches in the last campaign when he was speaking about bankruptcy.

Mr. FULTON. They were good, because I won.

Mr. BENDER. But you did not win on this program. You did not win by telling them you were going to vote $400,000,000 for Greece.

Mr. FULTON. I won on a program saying that we were going to help everyone who was friendly to us, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, and that whether it was in this country or abroad we would not let anyone starve. I do not think that we should.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not hold myself out as an expert on foreign affairs, but as a soldier in the United States Army in the recent war I spent 20 months in Europe. Although I learned much about the geography, customs, habits, and political cross-currents of Europe, I know little of the economic and political structure of Greece and Turkey. Few of us have first-hand information on these phases of the question. All of us know, however, first, that these two countries occupy strategic geographic locations; second, that Russia is seeking the collapse of the Greek and Turkish Governments; and, third, that Russia is engaged in a program of expansion toward the south and west.

If we are perfectly frank, we must admit that Russia is conducting a bloodless war in Europe today. She is accomplishing the same results as if she had used her military—that is, placing small powers under communistic rule. The question is—and it is not a complex one—shall we move to stop Russian expansion? Or shall we listen to the familiar cry of the professional isolationist as we did when Japan moved into Manchuria, Italy into Ethiopia, and Hitler into the Rhineland? My answer to the

question is to act, and act now, to let Communists throughout the world know that the issue is joined as between democracy and communism; that God-hating Communists shall not overthrow the Christian brotherhood of man; that the precious blood of the American soldier was not shed to make Europe an impotent prey to the power lusts of Russia.

If we were justified in entering Europe in 1918 and again in 1944 with our troops to save democracy, then we are justified in spending our dollars there to preserve the democracy we have saved. We have waited too long now to take steps to deter Soviet expansion. Long ago we should have issued an ultimatum to Russia that unless she agreed to an accounting of her lend-lease accounts we would stop the flow of millions in manufactured goods as reparations from the American zone of occupation in Germany.

This is the opportune time for America to strike her telling blow to communism; a time immediately following the fruitless talks recently held in Moscow; a time when a tottering and weak government of France expelled its Communist cabinet members, although she is facing an industrial collapse; and a time when the President of the United States has decreed that no longer will any tainted pink disciples of Stalin and Molotov hold jobs in our departments to better sabotage our form of government. The passage of this measure at a time when our Appropriations Committee has very wisely decided to recommend the continuance of our Voice of America broadcasts to Russia will have a telling effect throughout the war-weakened nations who are valiantly fighting communism in the face of starvation and sickness.

Yes; it can be said with great truth that not one of us can foretell the eventual results of our passage of or failure to pass this measure, but I, for one, want to be recorded as favoring the spending of dollars to do something now that may prevent the spending of blood in the future.

To you who choose to take the course of an isolationist, I would say: Turn back the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and look at the names of those who voted against repeal of the Neutrality Act, against arming the merchant marine, lend-lease, and selective service.

They thought they were right, too.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the House today that quite a few of us GI's who served in World War II are disillusioned. I know those of you who were in Europe, if you will turn back with me, will remember how the Army publication, Stars and Stripes, from day to day cartooned the picture of Joe Stalin as one of the finest men who ever lived; a smiling benefactor to humanity. And they talked of the GI, when the war was over, as returning to a home with little kids playing all around—a perfect idea of Utopia. But I tell you, gentlemen, that millennium days have not come. Utopia is not here. They told us if we would just go ahead and get rid of Hitler the world would be a great place in which to live. Mr. Chairman, you have another dictator in his place today in Europe. If we get rid of him, who will be the next? I tell you frankly, I reluctantly will vote for this bill and pray that some good will come of it. I have heard a lot of talk the last few days about realism. Let us be really and truly realistic. If we are going to send this loan to Greece and Turkey, let us back it up with a great army and navy and air force second to none in the world. That is one foreign policy that America has never adopted in peacetime. That is, maintaining an adequate national defense. I favor that today as a safeguard to peace. Let me remind the membership that when the Roman legion was the most feared force in the world, that was the greatest era of peace that the world has ever known. Not a major war for 300 to 500 years. After the Dark Ages, when Britannia ruled the waves, how many nations of this world were prevented from aggression by the power of the British Navy? I tell you today that the only thing that will stop Russia at the Dardanelles is not this $400,000,000 that we are voting, but an air force right here in the United States of America that can bomb Moscow, that can strike at the industrial potential beyond the Ural Mountains. That and that alone, and the knowledge that we have the atomic bomb and are willing and prepared to use it, that and that alone will prevent Russia from moving on the Dardanelles or into Turkey and Greece.

Mr. Chairman, the Scripture says that "a wise man's eyes are upon the things about him, but a fool's eyes are in the ends of the earth." Let us not neglect our home front and the power of our home base, which is the one that really counts.

France put her trust in her Maginot line only to have her armies defeated from within. The great Roman legion, feared as it was through the then known world, was finally overcome from within. The great civilizations of the past have fallen mostly from within. I will vote for this loan, but along with it, Mr. Chairman, let us vote adequate national defense to back up our foreign policy. Let us take up where the British Government is no longer able to patrol the seas and have an air force that will put fear into the heart of any would-be world conqueror.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. In line with what the gentleman is saying, does he not think we ought to stop the sale of our surplus war materials?

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I am told, I know not whether it be true, but I am told that right now goods are being loaded on ships at Norfolk, New Orleans, and elsewhere and being sent to Russia. I am opposed to that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to extend American aid to Greece and Turkey, as I see it, is based upon two considerations: humanitarianism and the national security of the United States.

Greece resisted the Axis invaders heroically, but was overcome by superior forces and suffered tremendously from mistreatment and spoliation. She emerged from the war a shattered nation. Recovery would have been difficult at best; under postwar conditions, with rival groups fighting for control of the country, recovery has been impossible. Political stabilization is necessary in order for the Greek people to achieve economic recovery and rebuild their homeland.

The record of the Greeks in the recent war should have earned them the gratitude not only of the United States but of all the Allies, and the right to work out their future in peace, with such financial assistance as they might require. The war record of Greece and the historic friendship between the Greek and American peoples would, I believe, dispose our people and our Government to aid the Greeks from motives of sympathy, even if other considerations were lacking.

In the case of Turkey, sentiment does not sway us as strongly, though Turkey conducted herself during the war to the advantage of the Allied cause, which she formally joined in the closing months of the conflict. In the matter before us the case of Turkey is strategically tied up with that of Greece, and therefore the two countries should be considered together.

Now, the question of American aid to Greece and Turkey cannot properly be examined save in the context of the current international situation. I must confess that I find that situation disquieting. I refer mainly to the uneasy relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Frankly, I find it difficult to reconcile the occasional conciliatory statements attributed to Generalissimo Stalin with the more bellicose statements of other Soviet spokesmen and—what is much more important—the aggressive policies of the Soviet Government and its Communist adherents in other countries.

President Truman stated the situation concisely in his message to Congress on March 12, when he said:

> At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.
>
> One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.
>
> The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.
>
> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

In the face of the self-evident Soviet policy of expansion, the democratic way of life—of which the United States is the foremost exponent—is challenged to maintain its position, or to give way by default. If we are realistic, we must face the fact that—through Soviet choosing, not ours—we confront Soviet communism across a common frontier in Germany, in Austria, in Korea—and, most important of all, across a common frontier in the minds of men everywhere. The m aning of this, in my opinion, is that we must either stand our ground, or retreat. I believe that, since the Soviet Union chooses to repulse all our efforts to eliminate the barriers between us, it is to our best interest to maintain the frontiers as far from our own shores as possible, and not wait for communism to encroach upon our own territory.

Greece and Turkey comprise one area where the frontier is not stable, or where stability is threatened by Communist pressure. The United States cannot ignore the obvious evidence that Soviet communism is pressing to advance to the shores of the Aegean and into the Middle East, where the equilibrium is delicately balanced at best. It is a matter of record, as the President stated, that "the very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists." At the Paris Peace Conference, the Soviet delegate supported Bulgarian demands for Greek territory in western Thrace. The Soviet Government has exerted strong pressure on Turkey in an effort to obtain a preferred position in control of the Dardanelles and military bases on that strategic waterway, which runs through entirely Turkish territory. The Government-controlled Soviet press and radio have waged a determined propaganda campaign for annexation of territory in the eastern provinces of Turkey—an area specifically awarded to Turkey in the Treaty of Moscow, signed by Turkey and the Soviet Union in 1921. It is well to remember that these lands in eastern Turkey are adjacent to northern Iran, where Soviet troops last year over-stayed their treaty deadline by 2 months, and a Soviet-sponsored rebel group seized power until put down by the Iranian Government.

It has been charged that the present Governments of Greece and Turkey are not fully democratic, and therefore do not deserve our support. Though they fall short of perfection, these Governments were chosen by the people of their respective countries, and were not imposed by force controlled from without. I maintain that the substitution of aggressive communism for the imperfect Governments of Greece and Turkey would not solve the basic issues, but would make the solution more difficult.

I am not an alarmist, and I do not mean to imply that war is inevitable, or even imminent. But realism compels us to recognize that we are engaged in a struggle to determine which parts of the world are to be dominated by the Communists and which parts left free to choose their own way of life. I am convinced that the Soviet Government is not ready for war, and does not desire war, but is determined to keep expanding the areas under Communist domination by every means short of war. I believe that an American foreign policy exemplified by the proposal to aid Greece and Turkey is our most effective means to prevent war, by delimiting the area of Communist expansion and exploitation and by stabilizing the frontiers between communism and the democracies. Perhaps with each at work behind its frontiers, both systems can learn to cooperate for world peace—as Stalin professes the Soviets want to do, and as the United States has demonstrated it wants to do.

I desire to make one further point, concerning the relation of American policy to the United Nations. I think it is useful to recall that Great Britain was aiding both Greece and Turkey, at the request of those two countries. This arrangement was strictly a matter between governments, and was not a concern of the United Nations. When Britain served notice that she no longer could continue that arrangement, the governments of Greece and Turkey appealed directly to the Government of the United States. As for me, I fail to see the logic of the objections raised to the replacement of Great Britain by the United States as the nation supplying the financial and economic aid required by Greece and Turkey, without special reference to the United Nations. This is particularly true when the U. N., and its subsidiary organizations, are without funds to respond to the urgent requests of those two countries. Clearly, it seems to me that this is a matter that necessarily must be handled outside the U. N. As President Truman declared:

> In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

American aid to Greece and Turkey would contribute to the strengthening of the United Nations because it would contribute to the political stability and economic well-being that are essential to the preservation of peace, and to the maintenance of the national security of the United States.

May I say in conclusion that I am heartily in favor of the President's recommendation of a loan of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey and shall vote accordingly when the bill comes on for a final vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

GREEK-TURKISH MILITARY MISSION

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed policy of intervention in Greece and Turkey is limitless. President Truman said: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." This sets no reservation on the type, the scope, or the place of the proposed help and support. It is clearly global and permanent in its application.

While at first glance it might seem as though the United States would determine this policy, upon careful analysis, actual control would rest with Russia. Russia could, and no doubt would, stir up the domestic strife or the outside pressure wherever and whenever Russia wanted to force intervention by the United States. Russia would be able to force the extension of the policy to various areas of the world, carefully selected by the Kremlin. By Russia's actions, the United States could be forced to overextend itself or to abandon the policy, either of which would be most unfortunate. Indeed, either would be fatal.

Some kind of control of these countries from Washington must result. If this were not so, there would be no point at all to the program. Would we move in to prevent communism and yet allow the natives freely to choose communism? Russia has deviated from the original theory of Karl Marx in some respects. Stalin uses communism as an instrument of Russian nationalistic policy. He has abandoned the Marxian theory, as practiced by Lenin and Trotsky, of a general world revolution of international character, but he retains the theory of a world revolution for the benefit of Russian nationalism. Marxian theory still dominates Russian policy. The basic axiom of Karl Marx is that world capitalism leads to an inevitable crisis, that this crisis is the mother of communistic revolution and that, therefore, the sooner the crisis comes, the sooner will the world revolution be accomplished. Hence, the cornerstone of Russian policy is to precipitate economic crisis in capitalistic and democratic nations, particularly in the United States, the strongest one of all. Premier Stalin referred to this in his famous speech of February 9, 1946. What Russia has done during the past years in general conforms to this thesis. If the United States embarks upon a policy which will deplete and weaken its strength and its resources, then we are actually playing into the hands of the Soviet Union and the Communists. We will be doing for the Soviet Union what they are unable and impotent to do for themselves. We will be enabling the Soviets to control indirectly our own domestic economy. By forcing us to expand and affirm at her will, she will decide what we are to make and to do here at home.

The uncompromising attitude of Russia in respect to Germany supports this thought. This was the key question to settle with Russia in the Moscow Conference. Secretary Marshall failed to reach some kind of an agreement whereby the load would be lifted from the United States. He has been unable to do so. Before Moscow, a settlement in respect to Austria was widely anticipated. This failure is even more significant.

This country, with some help from the United Kingdom, has been supplying western Germany, the British and American occupation zones, with goods valued

at more than $500,000,000 per year. From eastern Germany, Russia first took factories and equipment. After the Russians found they were unable to set these factories up in Russia and make them work, the Russians then changed their method, leaving the factories in Germany and taking the goods currently produced from the factories. Russia has been taking goods currently produced equal to $500,000,000 which the United States is putting into Germany and which may have to be put into Germany at least until some kind of agreement is reached. The division of Germany gave Russia the self-supporting agricultural section of eastern Germany. The western section, under the British and American control, cannot feed itself, and never did. In this area, the vast majority of the population of Germany have poured—Germans from various other European countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, as well as refugees from the Russian zone. In spite of German territory taken by Russia and Poland, the population of the present curtailed Germany is larger than that of prewar Germany. Seventy-two million Germans are being crowded into an area one-quarter smaller than the whole prewar Germany which supported only 69,000,000 Germans. A square kilometer of German land will have an average of 200 inhabitants compared to 168 before the war. This creates the problem of either a continued drain on American resources or, according to President Hoover, letting 25,000,000 Germans starve. The situation will continue until some kind of an agreement whereby Germany can support itself eventually is reached. The French see in this the threat of a future demand for expansion by Germany and hence, a threat to France.

The net effect of the present policy is for the American taxpayer to feed the Germans so that the Germans can work and produce goods to turn over to the Russians for reparations. Almost exactly the same thing happened between 1924 and 1931. Then the United States loaned Germany over $2,000,000,000 which was never repaid but out of which most of the reparations sent to France and Britain came. Today our expenditures amount to a subsidy to Russia just as in the former case it amounted to a subsidy to France and Britain. It is entirely inconsistent with President Truman's position on the Greek-Turkish question. We are asked to supply $400,000,000 to erect a bulwark against Russia in Greece and Turkey, while at the same time the policy in Germany is to give Russia $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 worth of goods to bolster her economy for future expansion. The same can be said of the Italian Peace Treaty, under which we would supply funds and goods to Italy, while Italy would be required to pay reparations to Russia and Yugoslavia. Secretary Marshall is attempting to negotiate an agreement under which Germany can repay us for all sums advanced and can become self-supporting, and thereafter, but only thereafter, undertake the task of paying reparations to other countries. The Russian policy certainly seems to be designed to drain our resources, to keep this load upon our backs. This pattern is completely clear in every phase of Soviet policy.

In ex-President Hoover's report on feeding the Germans, he calls attention to the fact that, under a limitation imposed by Russia, and I quote from his report:

> The fishing grounds in the Baltic and North Seas are being limited against Germans fishing. As there are ample supplies of fish in these seas, it seems a pity that British and American taxpayers are called upon to furnish food in substitution for fish the Germans could catch for themselves.

Fish are one of the finest proteins in the world. Proteins are most needed in Germany. The American taxpayers are required to send protein or protein substitutes all the way across the ocean to Germany in order to supply a commodity quite freely available off their own coast line.

I used to play chess quite frequently. In chess, before making a move, you always study the probable continuation or variation your opponent will adopt. What move will he make to counter or offset yours? The Russian counter move to the Greek-Turkish program seems to me not only obvious but also deadly effective. It will be under their control.

There is another phase. Once we announce our intention of advancing loans and missions to check communism everywhere, we have advertised to every government throughout the world that they can call on us with reasonable hope of success for any Communist menace, whether real or faked. If all this keeps up long enough, one of these days we will be broke and totalitarian ourselves. Dorothy Thompson said, a few days ago, in which she developed this thought quite clearly. To quote:

> There is also a more immediate danger than that it will lead us into war. It might, instead, lead us into bankruptcy. * * * The greatest barrier against the spread of communism the instrument of Russian messianic imperialism, is a prosperous, solvent America.
>
> * * * The quickest way to communism is American bankruptcy after a failure of dollar diplomacy—more dollar than diplomacy—that, plus war hysteria.

I say, if we adopt this Truman doctrine, Russia will totalitarianize this country without firing a popgun.

We can draw some lessons from the British on this. The situation within the United Kingdom today, combined with the changes occurring externally in the British Empire, deserve constant study. Recently, speaking in Richmond, Va., Lord Inverchapel, the British Ambassador to the United States, frankly said:

> I am prepared to concede that we—
>
> The British Empire—
>
> may have overdone our expenditure abroad. In fact, we have. That is why we have come here to ask your Government to take over our financial responsibilities in Greece and Turkey.

Yet, from the accounts of Wallace's trip to the United Kingdom, there is a strong opposition to the Truman doctrine in the British Isles themselves.

It is entirely in the cards that we may be called upon to take over further British commitments, particularly those in the Britisn-occupied zone of Germany. It is reported that discussions have taken place as to what the United States should do after the British withdraw from India in 1948. Russian aid to the Chinese Communists might well force our reentry into China. All these moves and proposals must be taken into account in deciding this question.

From parts of the foregoing you can readily see why I oppose this program.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that, if we undertake this policy, we might just as well tell the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, and his Committee on Appropriations to stop trying to reduce Army and Navy expenses and other expenses, because in line with the argument made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] we are on the march?

Mr. KUNKEL. We are on the march, and as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] has pointed out, we have opened the door to every country of the world to come in and request aid from us on the ground of combating communism. How can you refuse them if they can present any kind of a legitimate case?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I shall content myself with less time than the distinguished chairman of the committee has granted me. I do not rise to suggest any particular answer for the question before us, but rather to define if I can, and for my own purposes, the nature of the problem as it presents itself to me.

I envy those of my colleagues who find this question simple and uncomplicated, and who have a completely apt answer which fully satisfies them. I notice that in such cases the answer is almost invariably on the negative, which is itself not without significance.

I also observe that a majority of my constituents who have addressed me on this subject also find the question more simple than it appears to me, and that they too are negatively minded. Perhaps they are right.

But it seems to me that the negative approach to this question is based upon a misconception of its character. There are obviously many who feel that if we can only avoid adopting this bill we will be safe—safe from war; safe from national bankruptcy; safe even from the necessity of making hard decisions.

They seem to think that this problem, like the fabled unicorn, has only one horn, and that to avoid its cruel possibilities is the ultimate good. But this question is not that kind of an animal; it is, on the contrary, a dilemma; and there is nothing merely fabulous about dilemmas; they are part of the stubborn stuff of life, of our urgent realities.

This question threatens us with two horns, on one of which we must voluntarily impale ourselves by our collective vote. Both are about equally grim. To support this bill is to abandon a national policy which had its first expression in Washington's Farewell Address; to support this bill is to advance our declared sphere of national interest to the very core of the Near East, at the hottest spot on an already overheated globe. It means that we are deliberately toeing up to the Russian bear; and that, Mr. Chairman, is quite a chore. Let us have no mistake about that.

But not to support this bill is itself an affirmative decision; a decision to abandon any effort to face up to our international problems and try to alter them to our advantage by courage and firmness; a decision to repeat past errors, rather than profit by them; a decision to repudiate the responsibility which our Constitution clearly commits to the Executive; and finally, a rejection of the leadership of the one man in America in whose wisdom, courage and proven competence we all place the highest trust.

To me, this has never been an issue of humanitarianism, in the smaller and now more generally accepted sense of the word; it is not merely a matter of "opposing the spread of communism" in foreign lands; it is rather a move in the field of international relationships, an operation of over-all and major strategy. I have neither the personal knowledge nor the experience to reach any finally satisfying conclusion as to its ultimate wisdom. But I believe that the man who has already steered this Nation's cause at one of the most critical junctures of history, is probably the best equipped American to guide us in this new emergency. I hope that none, even among my constituents will disparage him as being a "militarist"; he is a soldier, but he is also a statesman of the first order.

I am going to vote for this bill, not without the deepest concern for the future, but because, being in doubt, I revert to my basic philosophy that leadership is the sine qua non of all security, all success, and all progress; and I am willing to trust the foreign relations of America to the leadership of General Marshall.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have a task force in the eastern Mediterranean. We have a foothold in Saudi Arabia where the Arabian-American Oil Co. will pay six billions for oil concessions to Ibn Saud and his 600 sons. We will soon be in Turkey and Greece. The administration is definite about its policy in those places, but what about the vacillation in Palestine in the Near East. In the instance of Greece, compulsion comes from the East and in the instance of the Holy Land, the oppression comes from the West. May I ask, "Do we measure evil by who fosters it?"

It is difficult to comprehend the attitude of our delegates to the UN, Warren Austin and Herschel Johnson. They have given less than lip service to the declared policy of the United States on Palestine.

Now comes Secretary of State Marshall who believes it would be premature for the United States to formulate its policy on Palestine. What about the two resolutions passed by Congress which called for unlimited immigration of Jews into Palestine, for close settlement on the land and the eventual establishment therein of a Jewish democratic commonwealth? What about the planks in the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in the last Presidential campaign which advocated the same? What about the testimony of our Nation as embodied in forthright declarations of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman?

President Roosevelt said:

I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and if re-elected I shall help to bring about its realization.

President Truman said:

It is only natural, therefore, that this Government should favor at this time the entry into Palestine of considerable numbers of displaced Jews in Europe, not only that they may find shelter there but also that they may contribute their talents and energies to the upbuilding of the Jewish national home.

Perhaps Palestine is a new subject for Mr. Marshall, but it is not a new subject for the Nation. Perhaps he is being briefed by Mr. Loy Henderson, the Arabphile. I do not wonder that he is possibly confused. He must know, however, that his party is pledged, as is his chief, President Truman, to demand the abrogation of the Malcolm MacDonald white paper of 1939 which shamelessly closed the doors of Palestine to escaping Jews. He must be aware of the inconsistent attitude of our delegates at the General Assembly, who but for the delegates of the small nations would have even precluded Jewish representation from appearing before Committee No. 1, the Political and Security Committee.

Does Mr. Marshall forget the six million killed in Hitler's charnel houses? He dare not forget that. The Jews must have a voice, although they have no vote. Who is to speak for them unless they speak for themselves? Mr. Austin, apparently, does not speak for them.

There is something indecent about the way Great Britain's spokesmen and American spokesmen and Indian spokesmen, and even Arabian spokesmen, begin with an apology about Jewish suffering and Jewish martyrdom and end up with a verbal shrug. Never mind these apologies. Never mind the soft-soap. Do not bother with the dripping sentimentalities. Say your piece and do not bother to prettify it. The insistent note of hypocrisy is by this time a maddening monotone.

The Arabs in full dress and full parade have seized upon their advantage and have stated their arguments and distorted the truth before the General Assembly. But Warren Austin and Herschel Johnson would have precluded the Jews from replying. Do they not want the truth? The whole question of Palestine revolves about the Jewish stake in Palestine, and yet it is claimed they are not entitled to representation. They are relegated to the antechamber, cooling their heels while their fate is decided.

And what does all this sound and fury, this procedural tangle add up to, all this feverish debate and thumbing of memorandum, and the whispered metings between the Arabs and the British and the United States, all the sage remarks of our columnists and the breathless reporting of our radio commenators? What will be the sum total? Another investigatory commission, the twentieth of its kind. And what, too, if that commission probes and searches and listens to testimony of all sides and recommends in all sincerity what it considers the best of solutions? If not acceptable to Great Britain, then she will dismiss the commission with the usual British civility and proceed on her devastating way in Palestine.

Will this farce never be played out? Will commission follow commission in an endless merry-go-round? How much can one people endure?

Well-wishers of Jews and the Jews themselves, the people of our country, can expect little from those in the middle echelons of the British Foreign Office of our own State Department. The Loy Hendersons have their counterparts in the assistants to Bevin at Whitehall Street. Most of those having to do with Palestine were educated or spent a long period of time in the Middle East. Henderson, who is Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs, was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iraq. Gordon P. Merriam, Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs, was a teacher of English and geography at Robert College, Constantinople, and was vice consul and consul at various times at Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, and Istanbul. He was secretary of the Embassy at Cairo as well as at Tehran. In turn, Evan Wilson, assistant to Merriam, was vice consul at Cairo.

These men have all taken on the color of their surroundings and have become Araphiles. In fact, they are more Arab than the Moslems. They never walked and talked with the fellahin, the humble denizens of Arabia, but they were wined and dined by the pashas and emirs and caliphs and courted by the British Foreign Office on all occasions.

Mr. Loy Henderson had the audacity some years ago to try to explain to me that the splitting off of Trans Jordan from Palestine and the promulgation of the white paper of 1939 were not violations of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924.

We see these devil's advocates acting behind the silken curtain when they attempted unduly to influence the American members of the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. Bartley Crum in his book speaks of the action of Loy Henderson in attempting to brief him and his colleagues. He wanted to have them prejudge the whole subject of Palestine before there was any inquiry.

We see Evan Wilson as the villain of the piece. He accompanied the American members of the inquiry committee and sought to pressure them. Wilson used the phrase, "an aroused Arab world." He spoke of Britain's life line and as he did Bartley Crum "heard in my mind again the careful words of Loy Henderson."

The presence, too, at Flushing Meadows, of the State Department oil expert, Hayden Raynor, is very significant.

These are the mischief makers who sabotage the declared congressional and executive policy of the United States. Perhaps they applaud the appearance of the members of the higher Arab committee before the political and security committee. This is the same Arab higher committee, most of whose members, according to British and American intelligence reports, played the pro-Axis game in the last war. It is headed by the Hitler stooge, the Grand Mufti, who in his broadcasts from Berlin encouraged the Moslems to fight against the Allies, who organized the Arab brigade that killed Allied soldiers. He should long since have been hanged as a war criminal on a gibbet five times higher than the one from which Haman hanged.

It is high time that our State Department spurned the Loy Hendersons and Gordon Merriams and Evan Wilsons and refused to dance to the tune called by the British Foreign Office. It is high time our Palestine policy were made by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and not by our striped-trousered underling saboteurs.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are advised that the $400,000,000 provided in H. R. 2616 is to be given to Greece and Turkey to stop communism. I challenge anyone to show me how communism is going to be stopped by the granting of this gift.

I must admit, however, that it is encouraging to see the President of the United States, after all these years, finally acknowledge there is such a thing as a Communist threat in this world. There are many of us who have been trying to point out the dangers of communism to the people of this country, as well as those in high places in our Government, and as a result of our patriotic efforts have had to stand up under one of the most vicious smear campaigns that has existed in the history of our country. We were called Red baiters, witch hunters, Fascists, Hitlerites, and many other names which are all a part of the familiar technique of the Communist, left-wing, and fellow-traveler groups in this country.

Instead of stopping communism, the granting of this gift will only act as an invitation for any country in the world to come to us with the plea that its Government is threatened by communism and ask for gifts for the purpose of stopping communism. It is only reasonable to assume that if these gifts are not granted, the United States will then be charged with taking an unfriendly attitude toward those who are refused. Already many countries are lining up with hat in hand ready to ask for these gifts if they are granted to Greece and Turkey.

You can no sooner stop communism by granting gifts to the various countries of the world than you were able to stop people from drinking when the eighteenth amendment was added to the Constitution. Friendship is something you cannot buy. It is something you must earn, and, in order to earn it, you must have a definite program better than communism, and a means of conveying that program to the peoples of the world. The Communists through the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia, have had a very definite foreign policy of world revolution from the beginning of the Lenin regime. They not only stick to it but work at it consistently throughout the world in every country. On the other hand, the United States of America has not had a definite foreign policy and no one seems to know from year to year in what direction we are going. Combatting the ideologies of communism is an educational problem and not a monetary one.

It is encouraging, at least to a slight degree, to see the President of the United States recognize the threat, and I hope a practical and constructive program will be offered by him to meet this menace, particularly here at home.

I received a letter the other day from one of my constituents and he raised a question which I think very aptly states the point:

> Did it ever occur to you that a lot of people in the United States think it is more important to protect the Potomac from the Communists than the Dardanelles?

Anticipating that some Members of this House might raise the point here by saying, Did not the President in his Executive order of March 22, 1947, recognize the threat of Communists on the Potomac, particularly those employed by the Federal Government, and prescribed procedures for eliminating them from public office?" I have studied this release very carefully, and, notwithstanding the screaming headlines of the press on the following day to the effect that Mr. Truman was going to get rid of Reds in Government, there is nothing in the Executive order that will expedite or assist in getting rid of these subversives. It may come as somewhat of a shock to you to know that in the opinion of a great many people, as well as myself, who have studied this Executive order, sincerely believe that it will be twice as hard to remove these Benedict Arnolds from our pay rolls under the President's order.

Ever since we recognized Soviet Russia in 1933 we have done nothing but appease her. We have written numerous letters of protest, and our Ambassadors to Soviet Russia have made many verbal protests, but nothing was ever accomplished. We have let Russia dominate Finland, and take over completely such countries as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and let her set up puppet governments in Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and many other places. Why did we not call her hand at that time rather than at this late date?

We have actually been appeasing Soviet Russia for the past 11 years. In fact, we started appeasing Russia when President Roosevelt, through Ambassador Bullitt, in August of 1935, charged Soviet Russia with violating her pledge of November 16, 1933, the conditions under which we gave her recognition. The exchange of these communications regarding the violation of Russia's pledge makes very interesting reading at this particular time. These communications were released by the Department of State on Saturday, August 31, 1935, and they were as follows:

VIOLATION BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF ITS PLEDGE OF NOVEMBER 16, 1933—NOTE OF PROTEST BY THE UNITED STATES

(Released August 25)

The following is the text of the note presented today to the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs at Moscow by Ambassador Bullitt and thereafter made available to the press at Moscow by Ambassador Bullitt:

"Under instructions from my Government, I have the honor to call attention to the activities, involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, which have taken place on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in connection with the VII All-World Congress of the Communist International, and, on behalf of the Government of the United States, to lodge a most emphatic protest against this flagrant violation of the pledge given by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on November 16, 1933, with respect to noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States.

"That pledge, which was given by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a result of the discussions which took place prior to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, reads in full as follows:

"WASHINGTON, *November 16, 1933.*

"MR. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"President of the United States of America,
"The White House.

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Republics:

"1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable rights of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories and possessions.

"2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed interventions, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

"3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which make claim to be the Government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its

territories or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

"I am, my dear Mr. President,

"Very sincerely yours,

"MAXIM LITVINOFF,

"People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,

"Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

"My Government invites particular attention to the obligations of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contained in the paragraph numbered 4:

"In view of the fact that the aim and activity of an organization, such as the Congress of the Communist International, functioning on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, cannot be unknown to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it does not seem necessary to present material to show the aim of the Congress of the Communist International with respect to the political or social order of the United States or to quote from the published proceedings of the congress to show its activity relative to the internal affairs of the United States, as evidenced in the discussion at the congress of the policies and activities of the Communist organization in the United States and the determnation and formulation by the congress of policies to be carried out in the United States by the Communist organization in the United States. Nor does it appear necessary to list the names of representatives or officials of the Communist organization in the United States who were active at the above-mentioned congress whose admissions into the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was, of course, known to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"As I have pointed out to the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs when discussing earlier violations of the undertaking of November 16, 1933, the American people resent most strongly interference by foreign countries in their internal affairs, regardless of the nature or probable result of such interference, and the Government of the United States considers the strict fulfillment of the pledge of noninterference an essential prerequisite to the maintenance of normal and friendly relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The Government of the United States would be lacking in candor if it failed to state frankly that it anticipates the most serious consequences if the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is unwilling, or unable, to take appropriate measures to prevent further acts in disregard of the solemn pledge given by it to the Government of the United States.

"I may add that it is a source of regret that in the present international situation the development of friendly relations between the Russian and American peoples will inevitably be precluded by the continuance on territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the promise of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of activities involving interference in the internal affairs of the American people."

REPLY OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

(Released August 27)

The following is a translation of a note received by the Department of State from the American Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The note was handed to the American Ambassador on August 27 by the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs:

Moscow, *August 27, 1935.*

MR. AMBASSADOR: By note of August 25 of this year you invited my attention to the activity of the Congress of the Communist International which took place at Moscow and, referring to the note of the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov to the President of the United States of America, Mr. Roosevelt, under date of November 16, 1933, protested against this activity, considered by your Government as a violation of the obligations of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States provided for in the note of November 16, 1933.

In connection therewith I consider it necessary to emphasize with all firmness that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has always regarded and still regards with the greatest respect all obligations which it has taken upon itself, including naturally, the mutual obligation concerning noninterference in internal affairs provided for in the exchange of notes of November 16, 1933, and discussed in detail in the conversation between the President of the United States of America, Mr. Roosevelt, and the People's Commissar Litvinov. There are contained no facts of any kind in your note of August 25, which could be considered as a violation on the part of the Soviet Government of its obligations.

On the other hand it is certainly not new to the Government of the United States that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot take upon itself and has not taken upon itself obligations of any kind with regard to the Communist International.

Hence the assertion concerning the violation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the obligations contained in the note of November 16, 1933, does not emanate from obligations accepted by both sides, in consequence of which I cannot accept your protest and am obliged to decline it.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, sincerely sharing the opinion of the Government of the United States of America, that strict mutual noninterference in internal affairs is an essential prerequisite for the maintenance of friendly relations between our countries, and steadfastly carrying out this policy in practice, declares that it has as its aim the further development of friendly collaboration between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America responding to the interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the United States of America and possessing such great importance for the cause of universal peace.

Taking advantage of the occasion, I invite you to accept the assurance of my high esteem.

N. KRESTINSKI.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

(Released August 31 for morning newspapers of September 1)

In connection with the protest lodged by Ambassador Bullitt against the violation by the Soviet Government of its pledge of November 16, 1933, with regard to noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States, and the reply of the Soviet Government thereto, the Secretary of State today made the following statement:

"The recent note of this Government to the Government of the Soviet Union and the reply of that government raises the issue whether that government in disregard of an express agreement entered into at the time of recognition in 1933 will permit organizations or groups operating on its territory to plan and direct movements contemplating the overthrow of the political or social order of the United States. For 16 years this Government withheld recognition—as did many other governments—mainly for the reason that the Soviet Government had failed to respect the right of this Nation to maintain its own political and social order without interference by organizations conducting in or from Soviet territory activities directed against our institutions.

"In 1933 this Government, observing the serious effects upon peace and prosperity of the many partial or dislocated international relationships throughout the world, took up anew the question whether the United States and the Soviet Union, two of the largest nations, could not find a way to establish more natural and normal relations, which would afford a basis for genuine friendship and collaboration to promote peace and improve material conditions both at home and abroad. After various stipulations in writing had first been carefully drafted and agreed upon by representatives of the two Governments, recognition was accorded to the Government of the Soviet Union by this Government in November 1933. One of the most important provision of the agreement thus reached was the pledge of the Soviet Government to respect the right of the United States 'to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.' The essence of this pledge was the obligation assumed by the Soviet Government not to permit persons or groups on its territory to engage in efforts or movements directed toward the overthrow of our institutions. The representative of the Soviet Government declared in writing that 'coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the affixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"'4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.'

"The language of the above-quoted paragraph irrefutably covers activities of the Communist International, which was then, and still is, the outstanding world Communist organization, with headquarters at Moscow.

"In its reply of August 27, 1935, to this Government's note of August 25, 1935, the Soviet Government almost in so many words repudiates the pledge which it gave at the time of recognition that 'it will be fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics * * * not to permit and to prevent' the very activities against which this Government has complained and protested. Not for a moment denying or questioning the fact of Communist International activities on Soviet territory, involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, the Soviet Government denies having made any promise 'not to permit * * * and to prevent' such activities of that organization on Soviet territory, asserting that it has not taken upon itself obligations of any kind with regard to the

Communist International. That the language of the pledge, as set out above, is absolutely clear and in no way ambiguous and that there has been a clean-cut disregard and disavowal of the pledge by the Soviet Government is obvious.

"The American Government, having previously made oral complaints of failure by the Soviet Government to carry out its pledge and being deeply concerned over the growing instability of international relations and the dangerous consequences thereof to peace and economic recovery, sought most earnestly in its note of August 25 to impress upon the Soviet Government the sanctity of its pledge to the end that there might be between the two nations continued development of friendly and official relations and valuable collaboration in many beneficial ways. When in its reply the Soviet Government indicated an intention entirely to disregard its promise to prevent such activities as those complained of, it struck a severe blow at the fabric of friendly relations between the two countries.

"To summarize, in view of the plain language of the pledge, it is not possible for the Soviet Government to disclaim its obligation to prevent activities on its territory directed toward overthrowing the political or social order in the United States. And that Government does not and cannot disclaim responsibility on the ground of inability to carry out the pledge, for its authority within its territorial limits is supreme and its power to control the acts and utterances of organizations and individuals within those limits is absolute.

"It remains to be seen to what extent the intention indicated by the Soviet Government's reply, which is directly contrary to the fixed policy declared in its pledge, will be carried into effect. If the Soviet Government pursues a policy of permitting activities on its territory involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, instead of preventing such activities, as its written pledge provides, the friendly and official relations between the two countries cannot but be seriously impaired. Whether such relations between these two great countries are thus unfortunately to be impaired and cooperative opportunities for vast good to be destroyed, will depend upon the attitude and action of the Soviet Government."

Regardless of these protests, we have continued to appease Soviet Russia by permitting her to carry on her insiduous propaganda against our country throughout the world, and particularly inside the United States. Our present program must come as somewhat of a shock to Soviet Russia in view of our many years of appeasement.

In August of 1941 we were given the Atlantic Charter. This was the charter which was to give hope to all small nations and guarantee their independence at the termination of World War II. Let me read you the third provision of the Atlantic Charter, which is as follows:

> Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Did we stand by our commitment to that Charter when we let Soviet Russia gobble up all her satellite states? The answer is obviously "No."

A greater disgrace, however, was when the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, sold the brave, gallant, patriotic people of Yugoslavia down the river to Stalin, and permitted him to put his Communist leader, Tito, in as dictator of Yugoslavia.

We must admit in this present situation, if we will be honest, that the Communist pressure on the Greeks is due wholly to the activities and the program of Tito. Tito would not be in a position today to bring this pressure to bear on the Greeks if Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had not agreed to Tito for the dictator of Yugoslavia. He was supplied with millions and millions of dollars' worth of food and various materials, through UNRRA and other agencies, with which to build up his strength in Yugoslavia. This total amount almost equals what we are asked to appropriate in this bill. In other words, we are asked to appropriate $400,000,000 to fight a program that was set up by approximately a like amount for Tito.

Now the President of the United States has the audacity to come before the Congress and ask us to furnish money to fight what he and his predecessor are responsible for.

The most effective way to promote the forward march of communism throughout the world, and particularly in our own country, is to weaken our economy to the extent that we are no longer financially able to help ourselves, let alone the peoples of other countries.

The New Deal can accuse the Republican Party all it wants for the inflation of prices and wages, but the fact still remains that the reason prices have gone up, thereby giving labor a legitimate excuse for increased wages, is due to our own Government and the governments of other countries, with money we have given them, coming in and bidding against individuals for merchandise and commodities.

It is high time that the Congress of the United States starts paying a little attention to the people of our own country. I do not believe any individual, including the President of the United States, has the right to put the Congress and the people of our country in the position of either granting this gift to Greece and Turkey or losing face with the peoples of all the other nations. And that is exactly the position we are in today.

If the administration had not been so foolish as to appease Soviet Russia at the San Francisco Conference that brought forth the United Nations organization, when they agreed to give her the veto power, we would not be in the position we are today.

The Congress should either agree that situations of this kind should be handled through the United Nations organization, or be willing to admit the United Nations organization is a failure and is not capable of doing those things we were told it would do when it was organized. A proposition of this kind should be handled through the United Nations organization as long as it is in existence. Loaning this money to Greece and Turkey will be serving notice on the entire world that in our opinion UN has failed.

Our plight in considering this gift to Greece and Turkey is proof of the old adage that "politics has strange ,bedfellows." I assure you my reasons for opposing this gift are entirely different from those of the Communists and their fellow-travelers.

In a speech made by Daniel Webster in Congress on January 26, 1830, he had this to say:

> When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence and before we float further on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

I sincerely believe the best interest for the future of our country lies in the defeat of this gift to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is being maneuvered into a course of action simulating the one that led the Nation into World War II. Is this a mere coincidence?

I, along with many others, warned in 1940–41 that legislation forced through the Congress at that time under the guise of keeping America out of war would have the reverse effect. Each of us that were Members of the House at that time remember the repeal of the Neutrality Act, lifting of the arms embargo, cash and carry, arming merchant-marine vessels, use of American ships to convoy materials to countries at war and lend-lease. And all of this in the name of peace, but we know it finally ended with a declaration of war.

What will be the next step? Restoration of OPA? It is well known that the administration reluctantly yielded to the public clamor for ending price control and that it has been possessed of the urge to restore it. Furthermore, as the reenactment of the rent-control law last week clearly reveals, the thinking of a majority of the Members of Congress is in line with that idea.

Will the President request Congress to reenact the price-control law on the ground that this is essential to effectuate the policy embraced in the pending bill? If so, will the Members who supported the measure presently under consideration refuse such request? How could they?

All this comes at the very moment inflation is getting out of control. Carrying out of the program projected by the pending bill will add to the existing inflationary forces and will have the effect of increasing the efforts of the groups that are pressing for restoring the OPA.

Suppose the President some time later tells the Congress that conscription is also necessary to carry out the program involved in the pending bill and requests Congress to reenact the conscription law. Will the Members who are voting for the measure under consideration refuse such request? Would it be consistent for them to do so?

A vote for this bill is sanction for the administration to restore OPA and all

the political restraints and regimentation that were in effect during the war, but intensified to a degree that will make the political interferences of World War II look like a picnic by comparison.

It will simply mean the completion of the collectivist economy.

To stop Russian territorial expansion and domination is one thing. To take action against her to stop communism is something else. It is ridiculous. How can the United States pretend to be opposing communism when we ourselves are already more than half way down the road to that irreligious ideology?

It is wrong to say that the United States is not launching upon a program of imperialism. The fact is that we have already done so, as those who are familiar with the work of the International Trade Organization and other international bodies well know. Either we will have to levy tribute upon some or all of the peoples of the world to meet the cost of policing it, if that is what the cult of internationalism succeeds in establishing, or we will bleed our own Nation to death in the attempt to meet such cost.

Emotion and blind belief are also playing an important role in the passing of this bill. Does the Foreign Affairs Committee pretend to tell the other Members of Congress that it knows the whole background of the President's request for this legislation? Who believes anything of the sort after Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the Atlantic Charter, and so forth?

In going into Greece we are taking sides in a quarrel between two groups, a quarrel that is not remotely related to communism versus free enterprise, but a quarrel that relates solely to the control of the Greek state. Can it be expected that the other nations of the world will look upon this act as being proper and just? Is not this action we are taking tantamount to declaration of war upon Greece itself? Does it not involve our holding Greece by military force? Let the Members supporting this measure pass these things off lightly, if you will, but coming events will have it otherwise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I have listened to the testimony of the officials of our State, War, and Navy Departments and that presented by our Ambassadors to Greece and Turkey. All have testified that the need for this legislation is immediate and urgent and that it is essential if Greece and Turkey are to survive as free and independent nations of the world. These officials have also given the committee absolute assurance that the passage of this bill would not lead us into war.

On the other hand, we have listened to the opponents of the bill, who have testified that it is a complete reversal of our previous foreign policy, that it is bypassing the United Nations, that it will lead us into war, that it will end in a race for armaments and will eventually lead to bankruptcy of the entire world.

Thus, I have earnestly sought, how I should vote on this pending bill and after careful consideration, I will support the foreign policy proposed by our President. It has been called "dollar diplomacy" and rightfully so, but it is my belief that it is better to give dollars now than to receive bullets later.

This bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $400,000,000 and gives the President the power "when he deems it in the interest of the United States" to furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey upon the requests of their governments and upon the terms determined by him. Thus the assistance would be of four types: First, financial aid in the form of loans, grants, and credits; second, sending American officials for the purpose of assistance; third, a limited number of military men in an advisory capacity for instruction and training; and, fourth, articles, services, and information which the President may deem advisable. This has been described as giving the President a blank check for $400,000,000, but if the program is going to be successful, it is absolutely necessary to grant the President blanket powers.

Mr. Chairman, we have the testimony of State Department officials that Turkey is being subjected to severe external pressure from the north, which has forced her to maintain a large armed force for defense purposes. Her army at the present time is about 800,000 men and this has put a severe strain on her national economy. The pressure includes definite demands for portions of east Turkey and for bases that would give other powers control of the Dardanelles. This would lead to the collapse of Turkey and let Russia gain control of the entire Middle East. In my opinion this would comprise the strategic position of the United States and make it impossible to gain world peace. Thus, I think it is vitally essential that we aid Turkey to remain militarily strong. From information received, we find that the morale of the Turkish Army is excellent, and knowing the background of the Turks that they will fight if invaded, the financial aid poured into Turkey will not be wasted. In fact, I feel sure that in years to come the entire world will profit by this investment. The sum of $100,000,000 has been recommended to be used to provide military security for Turkey. No part of this amount will be used for civilian supplies. The funds will be used to modernize the Turkish Army. The purchases will be under the supervision of our ambassador and I feel sure that the members of the committee who have listened to the frank and enlightening statement of Mr. Wilson, who appeared before the committee, of the existing conditions in Turkey, that they can have no doubt as to his ability to see that the money is expended as this great body intends it to be.

However, in Greece we face an entirely different situation. The Greek Government is weak and her condition has become very acute after 4 years of war and enemy occupation. The $275,000,000 thus proposed for Greece is going to be quite a gamble. It will, however, help save a free and proud people. Greece has always been a very poor nation, one that was just able to survive on a hand-to-mouth basis. That, together with great destruction caused by 4 years of war, has left Greece in such a weakened condition that at present she is fertile pasture for aggressors and expanding neighbors. In fact, Greece has charged before the Security Council of the United Nations that her neighbors to the north have been supplying and training insurgents who have been conducting raids upon her northern civilian population. In order to combat this, House Resolution 2616 will provide $150,000,000 for the armed forces of Greece. It will permit the Greek Army to maintain operations against the Russian-inspired guerrilla forces operating from the north and also that she may defend her other borders. What Greece needs most is military equipment for mountain fighting. The other $125,000,000 is intended for civilian reconstruction and rehabilitation. This will help her repair her bridges, roads, railroads and farms. This will be necessary if Greece is to survive as a free and independent nation and enable her to return to the export market.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this legislation have charged that it is bypassing the United Nations. I deny this accusation. The United Nations is still in its infancy and it is not possible for it to do the job. For almost 2 years the United Nations organization has been trying to lay the ground work for a pattern by which the people of the world can once again live normal lives free from fear. The progress thus far has been slow because of the obstructive action of Russia. This action of Russia and her aggressive tactics toward her smaller neighbors should convince every Member of this great body that there can be no lasting peace until she demonstrates a greater degree of cooperation. So by helping Greece and Turkey we are strengthening the United Nations. I am for a strong international organization for peace and will support such an organization as long as I remain a Member of this body.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is our desire to let the world know that we are through with appeasement and are going to stand firm against Russia. Our policy is one of great sacrifice to our own people and all we ask is to attempt to bring lasting peace to the free peoples of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to obtain as much information as possible on the subject of assistance to Greece and Turkey in order that I could intelligently reach a decision on our aid to these countries. It is a gross understatement to say that this is a grave decision for us to make, as I believe we are well aware of the implications this policy may entail if enacted. I believe that we are also aware of the fact that world peace is threatened whenever totalitarian regimes are imposed on free people by aggression.

I have tried to read every written statement on this subject since the President addressed the Congress bringing this matter to our attention. I have listened to the Members of the House debate this proposed legislation both pro and con. The hearings held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have been very thorough and reflect sincerity on the part of both Houses to examine this measure carefully.

Greece fought valiantly on the side of the Allies during the recent war and continued to offer effective resistance even when she was occupied by enemy forces. The ravages of war have left Greece with many serious economic problems which can only be solved if assistance is given to her and the threat of communistic aggression is removed. Greece is in need of our assistance to bolster her economic position. In this way only will she be able to defend herself from the disrupting attacks of the Greek Communists who receive a substantial portion of their supplies from the Communist-dominated neighboring countries.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of us fought to free these countries from Nazi oppression and to remove the Hitler threat from the world only to deliver them into the hands of the Communists. We would not be accomplishing a single aim we fought for if we continue to allow freedom-loving people to be subjected to the expanding policy of another totalitarian regime.

The following testimony of Mr. Frederick J. Libby, of the National Council for Prevention of War, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is incompatible with the American ideals of freedom and fighting for that freedom.

Note: Mr. JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Congressman from Connecticut, directs the questions:

Mr. LODGE. Do you believe there is anything worse than war?

I can answer the question. Can you answer it?

Mr. LIBBY. I think, Mr. LODGE, that my answer will be that there is nothing worse than war. It sums up all the evils that there are, it breaks all the commandments, and there is always another way out.

Mr. LODGE. If we were now living under the German Nazis, under Hitler, with their race persecution, their hangings, their concentration camps and incinerators, that would be better than war; is that your view?

Mr. LIBBY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Greeks know that there are several things worse than war. They feel, I am sure, that living under a communistic totalitarian government would be worse than war. I know that I would rather fight for my freedom than to submit to either Nazi or Communist domination. I hope that all the Members of the House feel this way.

The situation in Turkey is not a healthy one either. It is reported that the Russians have 20 divisions of troops on the Turkish border. This is a war of nerves against the Turks, and their government has requested military equipment to provide the Turkish army with weapons to defend their borders. Our military leaders feel that if Turkey is compelled to give in to the Russian demands for military control of strategic areas, Turkey would collapse which would involve the subjugation of the entire Middle East by Russian forces.

Mr. Chairman, world leadership has been thrust upon the United States and whether or not we accept this leadership is a part of this present bill. If we do not accept this leadership, a less desirable leader will accept it. I do not believe this policy if enacted will lead one step toward war, but instead will be another step toward the prevention of a third world war.

It is my belief that General Marshall is one of the greatest living Americans and if we support his leadership, the United States will remain strong as we must be if we are to prevent World War III and to assist other nations in becoming strong democracies.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to this debate for the past 2 days. I am amazed and at the same time depressed at the utter callousness of warlike statements issued by certain Members in support of this bill. It has been said by some that the passage of this bill will strengthen the United Nations, thereby contributing greatly to the cause of peace. Others have said that the United Nations is a weakling and that it is incapable of meeting the crisis which confronts the world today.

Let us examine the immediate past. Two years ago we were on the eve of a great victory, culminating one of the most terrible wars in the history of all mankind. That war was so prolonged, devastating, and destructive that all of the nations of the world were convinced that it was necessary to build an organization to prevent further wars. This Nation assumed the leadership in the building of such an organization in the search for a permanent and durable peace.

Fifty-one nations of the world joined together pledging themselves to the principle of collective security, binding themselves and their peoples in a solemn obligation to work out their differences and conflicts by peaceful means rather than by force of arms. This new organization was properly called the United Nations and gave great joy and hope to the people of every color, race, and creed throughout the world. After the hundreds of years of wars, here at last was an organization by and through which the common people of all nations could achieve their dream for a continuing and lasting peace.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; I am amazed that anyone could believe that we are strengthening the United Nations when, in fact, we refuse to use it at all. The United Nations can only be strengthened by continued use of its machinery in settling those problems which affect the peace of the world. That is the purpose for which the United Nations was created. Leading educators, scientists, and diplomats of the world are all of the opinion that by ignoring the United Nations as we propose to do in this bill, we are dealing it a blow from which it will not soon recover, if ever.

I am depressed, Mr. Chairman, at the cynicism and pessimism of leaders who now regard the United Nations as being incapable of performing those functions for which it was created. This is indeed a bitter pill to the people of the world who repose so much hope and faith and confidence in the peace machinery of their own organization.

I do not share the view of those cynical leaders. I believe the United Nations can work if we have the will to make it work and will give it the opportunity. It is imperative that we do so, for only by following such a course will we travel along the road to peace.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in two world wars. In the first I believed, as most people believed at that time, we were fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy. We know now the history of the League of Nations, we know of the great spiritual and moral leadership the United States gave to the world in the quest for peace. We know now that a small group of selfish, willful men interfered with our leadership, and it was only a matter of time until the nations of the world began to play the same old game of power politics. And then we entered World War II.

Every thinking person admits that under the circumstances we had to fight in that war in our national self-interest. True, it cost us blood and treasure but it was a war we had to fight. If nations begin again to act independently of one another, maneuvering and conspiring to outdo each other in the broad field of power politics, war is inevitable. All through the centuries this had been the history of civilization. Practically all of the military leaders of the world and most of the world's politicians and diplomats regard war as inevitable. They accept without question the doctrine of Hegel, the German philosopher, who is dogmatic about the inevitability of war. I suppose it is the thinking of this group that is primarily responsible for this tongue-in-the-cheek attitude insofar as our present United Nations organization is concerned. However, there are wise leaders in this world of ours and they have the support of all of the common people who believe that war is not inevitable; that we can have peace if we have the will to have peace; that we can have peace if we remain united for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no peace in this world if each of the big powers arrogate to themselves the sole right to determine what is just or unjust. In pure and simple language that is anarchy. That course of action has always led to war. It is for that reason that the United Nations, imperfect as it is in some respects, must be given the opportunity to determine what is just or unjust if war is to be prevented. It may well be that the United Nations, due to the existence of the veto power, cannot give us a positive and definite assurance of peace, but a proper use of its machinery can focus world attention upon those who are trying to defeat its purpose. From my experience, I can tell you that the game of war is stupid, and criminal, and brutal. No nation ever solves anything by war. It is true that

sometimes we have to wage war to prove that point. All will agree that wars have become so terrible and costly that even the victor is also the loser in the end.

I should like to emphasize this point. As an American I want to do everything possible to assure and protect our own national self-interest. If the occasion arises and there is no other alternative, I will not hesitate to wage war against Russia in the protection of our own Nation. I do not believe we have reached that point yet, nor do I believe that the people from Colorado and particularly of Denver, whom I represent, believe that we have reached that point yet. That is why I urge upon the Members of Congress to use the machinery of the United Nations in the hope that we may not reach that point at all.

What can we do through the United Nations? What can we do to prevent us from taking this step toward war? We can do this. We have given $50,000,000 for food and medicine for Greece. That is a step in the right direction but it is not enough. We can, by resolution of this body, give to the President of the United States authority to spend $100,000,000, or whatever additional amount we may designate, to be used in restoring the economic stability of Greece. That can also be done through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There is no delay in that program. That can be accomplished immediately. Any military aid must come and should be given through the United Nations. There is machinery in the United Nations notwithstanding what has been said on the floor in the past 2 days. There is action that can be taken against Russia or her satellites. Vigorous action by our United States representative in that body can clearly point up the issue. If Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are threatening, let us smoke them out into the open.

Let us turn to Turkey for a moment. The situation there is critical. The President in his message states that the situation existing there is a threat to the peace of the world. In the interest of world peace, of course, it is important that Russia does not overrun Turkey. What can Turkey do about it is the question? Under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, she can petition the Security Council of that body for action. She has merely to say, "My national sovereignty is being threatened by Russia and I ask the protection of the United Nations." The matter will then go to the Security Council, which would then set up an investigating committee. There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not Russia has the power of veto. The majority opinion is that Russia, having been named as an offender, could neither vote nor veto, this being a procedural matter. However, let us assume that Russia not only had the power but exercised her veto. She would then stand indicted before all the people of the world. No; she would not dare to exercise such a veto in that situation any more than was possible when Iran asked for protection. You must understand that the United Nations has been effective in similar situations and I refer specifically to the call for help from Iran, Syria, and Lebanon.

If Turkey is fearful that the Russians are about to attack her for the purpose of seizing the Dardanelles, under the Charter of the United Nations there is a proper procedure to handle such a situation. If there is justification for such a charge, it is the duty of the United Nations to notify the Russians that any such aggressive action is contrary to the Charter, of which Russia is signatory. The United Nations could then set in motion the existing machinery to resist and prevent such an aggression. Then at that time it would be the duty of the United States to come forward, assuming its rightful leadership, and say to the nations of the world, "I stand ready to meet my obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and I ask the nations of the world to join with me in resisting this act of aggression."

No, Mr. Chairman; the path we are pursuing is not the right one. I am in complete agreement with the objectives of this bill, but I should like to travel another road—a road that leads through the United Nations. Again I want to make my position perfectly clear. I am not in agreement with isolationists who are opposed to this bill for different reasons. They are the fear mongers who have always been afraid to go forward. I am not unwilling to spend the amount of money set forth in this bill. I am willing to spend a lot of money now rather than to spend it later for war.

Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that there will be amendments presented to this bill for the purpose of bringing the United Nations into this picture. I shall support those amendments. Clearly by doing nothing we shall injure our own national security and at the same time we shall not be providing the means whereby the United Nations can function at a later time. Therefore, it is my present opinion that should these amendments fail I shall join with others who are in favor of the passage of the bill in the hope that the United Nations may in the future take upon itself what so rightfully belongs to it now.

As for those orators who feel we must act unilaterally and who feel that we, independently, can fight for the "four freedoms" all alone all over the world, in my opinion they ought to talk to the GI's back home. But I warn you that they have a peculiar cheer for that type of oratory which would place them again in military service. They are not anxious to go into another war. They have had their belly full of it for now. It is all very well for world politicians and for striped-pants diplomats to determine these great issues which lead people into war, but, I tell you, the people do not want to go to war, and I say to you that this bill, unless amended, may very well lead us into World War III.

All history is screaming at us. In this age of the atomic bomb, religious leaders, educators, scientists, and elder statesmen have implored and beseeched us to close the gap between present political thinking and the great advances made by science. Truly this is a race between education and catastrophe. As a result of World War II, on every side there is chaos, misery, and suffering. It will take a generation for some of the nations of the world to recover from the effects of the last war.

Already we have seen evidence of great political changes throughout the world. The tide of these political changes will ebb and flow until some measure of economic stability is restored to those nations most seriously affected by the war. Our greatest contribution to world peace and to our own peace is to do all that we can, without endangering our own economy, to aid and assist the people in the war-torn areas of the world in regaining their economic balance. This is the proper method to meet the challenge of communism. By proper action the people of the world will continue to look to this Nation for hope and leadership. Such will not be the case if we assume the position followed by others in the game of power politics. That is a costly game and one for which we as a people are unsuited both by temperament and tradition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, America is faced by two prongs of a foreign policy. The one prong is to pour out our money in foreign relief which inevitably will be a heavy drain on our national resources. The other prong of the foreign policy involves loans being sought by foreign governments. These also will add to the drain on our national resources and to the danger of inflation which results from an artificial activity which brings in no return.

Last week I voted for the reduced relief assistance to people of countries devastated by war because I realized, as did other Members of the House of Representatives, that to withhold food from the starving, wherever situated, is inhuman and cruel, even in the countries of our former enemies or in those whose present governments are dominated or coerced by the Soviet Union. We were, and are, firmly convinced that unless we help to keep starvation out of Europe, chaos—communistic regimented chaos—will sweep the Old World.

Now we are considering another bill, a proposal for loans approximating $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. My vote on that proposition will be in the negative.

The relief funds, voted last week, while they do constitute a drain on our resources, are temporary in nature, and are designed to help sustain hungry European peoples until they can recover sufficiently from the ravages of war to take care of themselves.

The Grecian-Turkish loans in their naked reality are military loans. They simply open the door to demands for the expenditure of not hundreds of millions but many billions of dollars over a long period of time in a policy which would involve us in every war, big or little, that would take place in Europe or the Orient for the next 50 or a hundred years.

Since this proposal by the administration has split party lines in all directions, it is not a partisan question.

What actually has been proposed by the administration is that we, the Con-

gress, commit the American people to accept and to finance a jigsaw-puzzle foreign policy, the outlines of which we can only surmise. Two—only two—little pieces of this jigsaw puzzle are laid down for the American people to see. Those are the loans to Greece and to Turkey. It is admitted that they are military loans.

If we grant these loans, what about Poland, Estonia, Finland, Rumania, Austria, Russian-occupied Germany, all the countries which are now behind the iron curtain or under the domination of Soviet influence, or which may in the future come within that zone? Are we going to lend money to all of them along with more billions to England and France and China and Italy? What is to be our attitude toward other countries which may be menaced by the shadow of "the bear that walks like a man"?

The American people, and I as a Member of Congress, want to see more of this picture. It is not enough that the door to the United States Treasury be opened while the door to this whole foreign policy is kept closed against the view of the American people.

It becomes appalling when we stop to realize the billions upon billions of dollars we have loaned in addition to our war expenditures.

We have loans amounting to $9,280,000,000 to 58 foreign countries.

We have the bulk of the money in the World Bank Fund. We have the bulk of the money in the Foreign Currency Stabilization Fund. We put the bulk of the money into UNNRA. The pattern thus far is that we not only fought and paid for two wars, one of them in the Pacific which we fought practically alone and unaided, but we are now asked to rehabilitate, to feed and clothe not only our allies, but our former enemies as well.

The question everybody in America is asking, the question uppermost in your thoughts and in my thoughts is this:

"Are we going to have to fight Russia to stop the expansion of despotism by the Soviet group over all Europe and the Orient?" If that is so, is it better to stop Russia now and compel her to move the iron curtain back to her borders, or is it better to wait for 10 or 15 years, meanwhile maintaining the strongest national defense in the world, cost what it may, and run the risk that Russia may become so strong, or that she may attain the secrets of atomic warfare, and that such a conflict would simply be mutual suicide, and the destruction of our civilization?

It serves no good purpose for us to keep that question unspoken and under cover to fester and spread until it overshadows all other questions. Let us at least have the courage to look it squarely in the face.

If the Grecian-Turkish proposed military loans are for the purpose of stopping Russia from expanding Stalin despotism, then $400,000,000 is a mere bagatelle—it is not enough. If these Grecian-Turkish loans are not for the purpose of stopping Russia, then what are they for?

What is the total cost going to be if we embark on this adventure totally out of keeping with American tradition? These are questions the American people want answered before they are led into this policy.

If we make these loans, shall we have American military and civil commissions set up in the debtor countries to supervise and police the spending of those hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, or will we turn our money over to foreign manipulators to be stolen—much of it to be used to finance communistic expansion? If we are to police the spending of this money, then we shall have embarked upon an imperialistic technique with colonial administration, whether we like the term or not.

What will be done in the case of China; Korea; India; Palestine? These are all pieces of this great jigsaw puzzle of foreign policy which the administration has thus far refused to lay down for us to see.

If, as, and when the other parts of this puzzle are brought into clear view, I shall then decide how I will vote, but until those questions are answered for the American people, I shall vote against taking this Nation into any such policy with our eyes shut and the American people blindfolded.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to my colleagues who have preceded me in discussions of this bill, I have been impressed with the sense of responsibility that they feel rests upon them in casting their votes either for or against the resolution. I have been gratified that, almost without exception, they have approached the problem with a sense of its tremendous importance, its implications and imports to all America, and free from partisan political bias or prejudice; that they have attempted to resolve any questions in their minds from the point of view of Americans, rather than as members of a political party.

I am glad that that is the case, and that this debate has been kept on that plane, for, it seems to me, the matter rises far above any considerations of partisan politics. I shall try to emulate them in my own discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for this bill because, primarily I believe that its passage is essential, is vital, to our national security, and to our national defense. However much I might be moved by humanitarian considerations, I am in complete accord with the gentlemen who feel that our first duty is to our own people, that we should not squander our substance in riotous living, and that we cannot afford to play Santa Claus to the whole world until we first take care of our domestic requirements.

To my mind, this is not a relief bill, however, not a charity, no matter how it is entitled and no matter how it is presented. Whatever may be the disguise it wears, I hope we may see beneath it the reality that confronts us. Having been in two wars I shall vote for the bill to prevent, if possible, a third world war, but if that be impossible, then to ensure that our sons, the sons of my constituents and your constituents, who will be the ones to fight it, will, at least, have an even break and will do so under the most favorable circumstances possible.

It is my belief, as a result of observation and study, that such a war, if it is to come, will have its origin in the Middle East, in Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Palestine, and Trans-Jordan. From the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, the Middle East has been the crossroads of the world, both physically and ideologically, and today, with our global air lines, it is more so than ever. Its tentacles reach into India and Tibet and thence into China, into Egypt and North Africa, into Greece and Turkey. Never, with some few exceptions like the Valley of the Nile and the Fertile Crescent, a productive land, it is yet immensely wealthy in hydroelectric power and in oil. Its resources in those things have hardly begun to be tapped.

In years gone by England has been the dominant power in that region. Today the British Empire can no longer fulfill its commitments. It is on the verge of national bankruptcy and must, if it is to preserve its national economy, draw out of that whole region. It is a truism of physics that nature abhors a vacuum. And when Britain moves out, someone is going to move in, and, unless we take steps to prevent it, that someone will be Russia. Today two countries stand on the flank of that advance, and only from their territories can that advance be hampered or stopped. They are Greece and Turkey. As a result, they are being attacked, for what is happening is but a form of military operations and unless they are aided they cannot survive as independent nations.

With their flank secure, with Salonika and the Dardanelles under the control of a vassal regime, the Russian march into oil fields of the Middle East is but a short, and a safe, step. And with the inoculation of the Arabs of that region with the virus of communism, an inoculation which will follow occupation as the night the day, it is but a step to spread the disease to their coreligionists of India, the Dutch East Indies, Egypt, and North Africa. As the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey will tell you, once an epidemic starts it spreads fast. Only by isolating the patients and imposing a quarantine can it be conquered. I am for imposing that quarantine as a matter of self preservation.

Some gentlemen have referred to this as a blank check. If it helps to prevent a third world cataclysm it will be worth all its costs, for, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio so correctly observed, civilization can ill afford another such debacle as those through which we have just passed. If it fails to do so it will have immeasurably added to our strength in any conflict which might come.

Others have referred to it as a change in our foreign policy. I do not consider it as such. To my mind, it is but the logical application, in a world grown smaller in this day of more speedy communications, of the Monroe Doctrine which has guided us over the years since

its enunciation. As the world has decreased in size our frontiers have pushed farther and farther from our coast lines until today we must, of necessity, as a matter of self-preservation, be concerned with attacks on democratic institutions and free nations wherever in the world they occur.

I wonder if the gentlemen who propose to vote against this bill have forgotten Munich and Mr. Chamberlain's remarks on his return from that surrender, that he had insured at Munich "peace in our time." All that Munich did for peace was to enable the aggressor the better to prepare for war, to permit him to grow so strong that he was ready to take on all of Europe, all the world. And he nearly succeeded. It took us 3 years to win that one.

Have we not seen enough of the results of such appeasment policies? We tried them with the Kaiser's Germany, and also again with Hitler's, and what was the result? You all know.

Are we to learn nothing from those experiences, so recently and so vividly before us? Are we again going to sacrifice needlessly the lives of thousands of our young men to stop an aggressor whom we, ourselves, have helped to strengthen? But for the change in names, we are today in exactly the same position in which the world was after Hitler had moved into the Rhineland and before his troops occupied Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Are we going to let history repeat itself, or have we, at last, learned a little wisdom? The vote on this measure, I believe, will answer that question.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for these two days with a great deal of interest to the debates. I question no one's motives, for to me it is inconceivable that a Representative of the people in this House, facing so great an issue as we face, would approach it in the spirit of partisanship or fail to do what he conceived to be his duty.

A little more than 25 years ago I engaged, I think, in the most bitter political debate in my career with a very dear friend then, as he is today. I supported the League of Nations proposal, and in the Democratic convention in my section my friend opposed it. A lot has been said through the years since that a few willful men in the United States sabotaged the League. I have come to look at it differently and to believe that our people were not prepared in their hearts and in their thinking to accept the responsibilities that go with world leadership.

But whatever the reason, we then turned away from our opportunity and left the stricken peoples of the world who were struggling toward freedom without our leadership, and without it they turned to their Mussolinis and their Hitlers. The white crosses which mark graves of our sons all over the world bear striking testimony to the price we paid for our failure to humanity.

Let us turn our minds back a moment. When World War I ended and our President went abroad, in Italy and in France and throughout the countries he went through multitudes that thronged the streets, millions of them, until traffic was jammed for hours, simply to catch a view of him. To them he represented that one great nation which had demonstrated in the 150 years of its history the truth that men are qualified to govern themselves and to build free institutions. But when he came back we would not accept that leadership. We drifted down to World War II.

I think one of the tragic examples of our failure, one that will not be a proud page in our history, occurred in 1936 when the struggling League of Nations, which was doomed without our leadership and our membership, was in session in Switzerland in an effort to devise means of stopping Hitler and Mussolini. We were there represented not as a member but by an observer who peeked through the keyhole while the conference failed and preparations were continued by the aggressors to plunge us into World War II. In the weak-kneed attitude of the freedom-loving peoples of the world we permitted Hitler and Mussolini to go their way until World War II was inevitable. No matter what one may think of the League of Nations or of the wisdom of President Wilson, I would recommend that every member before he votes on this bill read that series of speeches he made in support of it back in 1920. One passage in the speech he made, I think at St. Louis, I shall never forget. He there predicted that unless America took her place of leadership for democracy and gave assurance to the world that we meant to support free institutions, that before another generation should pass away the soil of Europe would be stained with the blood of our sons. It reads like prophecy.

The real issue here today is not whether we shall contribute $400,000,000 to aid in the rehabilitation of Greece and Turkey. Were that the controlling issue, it might be well to consider whether it would not be better to extend it through the United Nations, or as a loan through the International Bank, or by some other means as a simple gift to the stricken people who sorely need aid. But the fundamental issue is not the mere extending of aid to needy people. The bill under consideration is an expression of the policy of this Nation to aid weaker nations to maintain their freedom and to resist efforts from without to force communism upon them. The grant of funds is a necessary means to an end. It is merely the implementing of an international policy of our Government in which we are saying to the people of the world that this Nation will hereafter assume its place of leadership and give its strength and support to people who are trying to establish for themselves free government. That policy requires more than just money; it takes our leadership.

Four hundred million dollars is a relatively small contribution for the maintenance of peace. Having contributed so much in blood and treasure to win a war we should not hesitate to contribute this relatively small sum to win the peace and insure that we and our children shall live in a decent world. A world in which the people of every country, large and small, shall be free to work out their own government and their own social institutions without fear of aggression from without or sabotage from within by any other country. It is only in such a world that we can hope to maintain our own freedom. I believe devoutly in the principle of collective security, and in United Nations. Our membership in that organization is a guaranty of our support—an assurance that we shall not repeat the mistake of 1920. We are not bypassing it. The Vandenberg amendment expresses our desire to work with United Nations. That organization can take over the task whenever it chooses. This Government will withdraw when the Assembly or the Security Council desires it. In the meantime, and on a temporary basis only, we shall meet the emergency. We shall accept communism's challenge to democracy. This is urgent. This does not weaken United Nations. It gives it added strength and recognition.

The policy of President Truman and Secretary Marshall, embodied in this bill, is intended to secure these ends and I shall vote to uphold their hands and sustain their efforts in this crucial hour.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill. Like most Americans, I regret the world conditions which force us to consider such legislation. I concur fully with the views so ably expressed yesterday on this subject by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. History teaches us that the principal nations of the world have, for years, pursued foreign policies for war. What is now needed is a world policy for peace. To accomplish this end, the United States must take a positive, courageous, and realistic stand in its dealings with other nations. The adoption of this measure will, in my opinion, implement such a stand.

Yesterday, during the debate on the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] stated that it has been suggested that no one could vote for this measure in view of his oath of office, unless he felt that our first line of defense was the Greek or Turkish border. I disagree with this point of view, but for the sake of argument, let us accept it. Where is our first line of defense? It is not a static line to be found on any map or chart. It is a mobile line depending on the precarious balance between the offensive and defensive implements of war. It might well be determined by the cruising radius of tomorrow's plane, or the range of some rocket-propelled guided missile, or even some imaginative fantasy found in a Buck Rogers comic strip. In any event, the war head of the missile will be filled with a derivative of uranium and not nitrogen.

Along with most Americans, I deplore the fact that the United Nations organ-

ization does not yet have the stature to deal with this problem. I know that most of my constituents in Kentucky agree with me that the peace of the world depends upon a strong and effective United Nations. Yet, in Kentucky, no one in his right mind would think of starting a 2-year-old, carrying top weight, in a mile and a quarter race. Let us not cripple the United Nations in its infancy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, the whole 9 hours of debate allowed to discuss the Greek-Turkey $400,000,000 gift is an inadequate time to analyze its far-reaching implications, and certainly I cannot do it in the short time allotted me. It may be useful, however, to point out the profound misconception of the scope of this proposal advanced yesterday by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

In the course of the debate, he said this:

> The second thing that this bill does not do is this. I think it does not mean that we are adopting for America a permanent foreign policy called the Truman doctrine, or anything else which could be interpreted as meaning that we are going to finance faltering governments all over the world simply because they claim to be operated by free men. I do not think that that is involved in this decision. We are meeting an important problem, recognizable at two specific points, and answering it in a specific manner.
>
> This does not mean that we are committing ourselves—and our committee report makes that very clear—to faltering governments which may get into difficulty all over the world, and simply by coming to us and saying, "We need help; we believe in freedom," expect that we will aid them with hundreds of millions of dollars. These are two unique cases paralleled by no other country in the world, unless possibly you could present the case of Iran. In Iran we have already done the thing we now propose to do in Greece and Turkey.

Not a word of this statement is correct.

I am not concerned with what the gentleman thinks the bill means, or what some newspaper writers say it ought to mean. If we will take the trouble to read the President's speech to the joint session of Congress, we will know what it means.

Mr. MUNDT says this particular problem is unique. He suggests that we vote this four hundred million and stop. But the President said:

> One aspect of the present situation, which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision concerns Greece and Turkey.

This is "one aspect" for our consideration "at this time." Let me warn you that the other aspects are innumerable, impossible, and ruinous.

Mr. MUNDT said that we are not committing ourselves to faltering governments all over the world. But Mr. Truman said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.
>
> I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

And the President said:

> We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said that the instant problem is unique, "unless possibly you could present the case of Iran." But the President said:

> The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will. The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

If the President thinks that the United States has the moral duty, or even the moral right, to interfere with all governments that are not democracies, he might have also mentioned most of the rest of the world; not just Iran, but Iraq, Egypt, India, Korea. He might have mentioned the communistic threat of Togliatti in Italy, of Thorez in France. He could have referred to the totalitarian Franco in Spain, and closer to home, Argentina and Chile are not conspicuous adherents to the form of government that we in America prefer.

Mr. Chairman, it is the President's proposal that we are voting on, not Mr. MUNDT's. Four hundred million is appropriated to the President, to start America on a dark journey, a dangerous journey, an imperialistic adventure to every plague spot in the world.

There should be no misunderstanding of the Truman doctrine. The President was frank about it. Summed up, it is this:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.
>
> I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

I cannot bring myself to believe any such thing. I do not believe we have either the duty or the right to interfere with the internal affairs of foreign nations throughout the globe.

So much for the broad implications of the general doctrine.

DRESSED UP IN ATTRACTIVE CLOTHES

Mr. Chairman, this proposal would not get 50 votes in the House if it were not appealingly presented as a move to curb communism, or to contain Russia. Both objects are greatly to be desired. In common with almost all Americans, I hate communism, and am exasperated with Russia's lack of cooperation. But this bill will do neither.

Indeed, it is not even aimed at communism, which is a threat in many other parts of the world in addition to Russia; and I hope no one is so gullible as to think that one hundred and fifty million for the Turkish Army or new uniforms for the Greeks will reform the Soviets.

If Russia is to be contained it must be done by more direct and less scattered means. We must say bluntly, "Thus far and no further"; and our State Department must make up its mind which way it is going. You cannot in common sense advocate the Truman doctrine in one breath and the continuance of lend-lease in the next; nor ask $31,000,000 for propaganda broadcasts one day and extol Henry Wallace the next.

ARE WE HELPING DEMOCRACIES?

Strengthening the democracies of Greece and Turkey to oppose Russia is the old balance-of-power system, which has not kept peace in 500 years. Let us examine the nature of the democracies we seek to ally with us.

Greece is a very small country with a population of approximately 7,000,000 people, the overwhelming majority of which are illiterate. Because of its strategic location on the Mediterranean Sea—which even now must not be overlooked—it was, shortly before the time of Christ, the world's leading community, since which time it has experienced a continuous deterioration. Although the birthplace of democracy it has not for centuries, and does not now, enjoy democratic government, and particularly in modern times it has suffered a series of dictatorships including that of the notorious Metaxas, and today it is for all practical purposes a police state. There is no proof that in their government there is anything remotely like our conception of democratic government, which is evidenced, among other things, by their tax law, which bears heavily on the poor and lightly on the rich, with virtually no income tax and virtually no government revenues of consequence, so that the result is that the President's proposal asks American income taxpayers to pay for government expenses that the Greeks do not even try to pay for.

Their agricultural methods are wholly primitive, with no surplus crops except olive oil and wine. Their soil is eroded and uncared for. Their manufacturing is nonexistent for all practical purposes, and their army, while fighting gallantly against the Italians, is of no consequence in the modern world. So it is my position that they are a liability to the country which "takes them over" rather than an asset. Their only possible advantage, if we are talking about imperialism and control of the Mediterranean, is a highly strategic location, with a land easy to defend with its mountainous terrain, and of great naval importance because of literally hundreds of excellent bays and harbors.

The talk about this country as a free country or a democracy is laughable. They probably have not been for 2,000 years. For the last few years they have lived entirely on the benefit of foreign capital, principally British, although America has contributed since VJ-day about $500,000,000. Aid to Greece can be justified only as to a people who are unable and unwilling to help themselves. In the modern world there is no sense to their archaic methods of agriculture

and industry, and in their complete unwillingness to make sacrifices that we in America are now making, and have been making, to support their own Government by the taxation of their own people.

Only as a bastion or a fortress for offensive and defensive actions in the Mediterranean against Russia, as a recognized enemy, and to protect the great oil fields in the Middle East, in which American and British oil companies have a substantial interest, can we possibly justify the slightest interest in Greece.

It must also be remembered that notwithstanding the gallant fight of the small Greek armies against Italy, Greece was definitely pro-German before and after World War I, and its political history indicates that no reliance could be put on their sympathies, since for 50 years they wavered back and forth between one policy and another—and what has suddenly happened to change this situation? Nothing, except that Britain has decided that they could no longer afford to keep soldiers in Greece to protect British interests. So now we do it, while Britain can still afford to keep 100,000 troops in Palestine.

TURKEY

And what of Turkey?

Although aid to Greece might be justified on an exclusively humanitarian basis, and undoubtedly they need aid as a helpless people, aid as such to Turkey is pure nonsense. See the article of the London Statist in January 1947 indicating that Turkey is one of the well-off countries of the world. It is evident that Turkey needs no aid whatever except to revamp and modernize its military force—which force was used on the side of Germany in World War I, and in World War II was neutral until 1945, and was then forced into a technical declaration of war by Roosevelt pressure, and after the war against Germany and Japan was obviously successful. There is no possible justification for supporting Turkey by reason of its need or from any sentiment, or from past favors, and the only reasons are:

A. Turkey controls the Dardanelles and wishes to keep Russia out.

B. Turkey stands in a strategic position with reference to a considerable interest in oil fields by various American and British oil companies.

Again it must be said that it is absurd to talk about aiding democracy and resisting totalitarianism in Turkey because of all the nations in the world, including Russia, none has shown consistent totalitarianism more than Turkey for six or seven solid centuries, first under the complete domination of a sultan, and in modern times under practically the first rigid dictatorship, that of Kemal Pasha, who knew all about dictatorship long before Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

IF THE SHOE WAS ON THE OTHER FOOT?

What would happen if Russia said, "We sympathize with the evidently totalitarian government in Argentina, and we feel that the United States is attempting to encircle Argentina with pressure and propaganda, and therefore we will send money, food, and a military mission to Argentina to help her resist the Colossus of the North." I think this is analogous. If Russia took that position, the United States would declare war in 24 hours; and I think further that Russia would declare war in 24 hours against us if she had reasonable hope for success, which presently she does not have. The principle, however, remains the same. It is an act which invites war, either now or in the future.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The criticism that the United States, in acting unilaterally, bypassed the United Nations was so obviously justified that Senator VANDENBERG was prompt to present an amendment, since passed, providing that United Nations could stop this proposal, which was evidently an apology for the premature action of the President. I am skeptical of United Nations success, but we must patiently try to support it as the only means toward peace, and nothing could have weakened it more than the American attitude that we will do what we want in the Near East, and will fight all governments that we do not like, regardless of what anybody else says.

THE BOTTOMLESS BARREL

Is the Treasury of the United States a bottomless barrel? We now owe $260,000,000,000—the Truman peacetime budget is thirty-seven billion this year. To cope with such staggering sums we levy income taxes ranging up to 90 percent. In an attempt to find the road back to solvency, the House has cut about four hundred million from appropriations for our own needs. In one stroke we cancel these savings. We provide this money for people that do not tax themselves; do not try to be self-sufficient.

NONPARTISAN POLICY

It is argued that we must not oppose the President because foreign policy is nonpartisan. I understand that to mean that party politics should not be injected, and I agree. I do not understand it to mean that we must swallow whatever is spoon-fed to us by the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal will be adopted, but my conscience impels me to continue to fight it and similar demands in the future. I did not come to Congress to assist in dissipating the blood and treasure of America in the Balkans, in Asia, all over the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure, H. R. 2616

Since the President came before us on March 12 I have had very little doubt about the necessity of giving financial assistance in Turkey and Greece. The alternative to the action provided for in the pending measure is to allow these countries to become Russian dominated, then to stand idly by while Russian aggression spreads over the whole Middle East and the Mediterranean Basin. That, to my mind, is an unthinkable course to take, or rather an unthinkable piece of inaction.

Even after the last war we pursued the policy of having a sanitary cordon about Russian communism. The forces of recovery operated much more quickly after the last war and the dangers of Communist aggression were much less. You will remember that it was France which in 1920 sent Marshal Weygand to Poland and helped the Poles to preserve their freedom from Russian domination. Some of our other adventures in Russia may have been less well-advised, but despite Communist activities in the twenties and thirties, I think it cannot be said that Russia became definitely an aggressor state until after the victory of 2 years ago.

I am perfectly aware of the many considerations which cause us to shrink from pursuing this course. A constituent writes me that it is power politics for us to pass this measure. I think it is. There is no alternative to power politics except collective security, and you cannot have collective security really operative in the world while the dominant power of the Eurasian Continent is willing to pay it only lip service.

I hear it said that the Governments of Greece and Turkey are not democratic governments, that the Government of Greece is a corrupt monarchy and that the Government of Turkey, although stronger, is not what we should fancy. I have no first-hand knowledge about either of these governments and the bits of information which one receives do not always harmonize. However, our official observers at the Greek election said that it was a fair election. Over and beyond that, it seems to me that the important thing to us is that the Turkish Government be Turkish and the Greek Government be Greek. We have suffered the Polish Government to be non-Polish, the Rumanian Government to be non-Rumanian, the Bulgarian Government to be non-Bulgarian, and the Yugoslav Government to be non-Yugoslav and the Czechoslovak Government to be only pallidly Czechoslovak. There is a limit to which we can go in ignoring and appeasing and I believe that that limit has been reached.

I do not enjoy seeing my country walking a tight rope over disaster. There has been very little enjoyable about the world since Hitler came into power in Germany nearly a half a generation ago. However, we must face the facts. Hindsight makes it crystal clear that in the period from the Japanese entry into China in 1932 until the passage of the Selective Service Act in 1940 we did everything wrong. We could not get cooperation in stopping Japanese aggression in China so we did nothing. We made no serious attempt to stop Italian aggression in Ethiopia, we allowed the Axis powers to treat Spain as a proving ground for their ordnance, and we raised not so much as an umbrella when Hitler in swift succession entered first the Rhineland, then Austria, then Czechoslovakia. Even after the British and French declared war on Hitler, millions of Americans thought we could stand by while Hitler invaded Denmark, Norway and the Low countries, then France, then the Balkans. If the familiar pattern of totalitarian aggression is being pursued by Stalin as it has been for 2 years then I think the correct course is to consider what we did in Hitler's case and do the opposite.

I hear it said that Greece is a British chestnut which we are pulling from the fire. Have no illusions about that. When we pass this legislation we shall have acted for America and not for Britain. But I make bold to say that the weakening of British power in the world is a catastrophe for the United States. If, unlike Winston Churchill, Clement Attlee became the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, it will mean that the ideas we live by are losing power in the world. Inveigh as you will against the British imperialism, it has been useful to us from Waterloo on.

I hear it said that we should not try to check communism in Greece and Turkey until we have put a stop to it at home and in other countries. That, I think, is a sophistical argument. We cannot squander our resources by waging war against communism wherever it appears any more than we could send an expeditionary force to every island in the Pacific where the Japanese had landed a few soldiers. We wisely did not try to do that. Instead, we took the few vital places that took us to the gates of Tokyo. We are fortunate, in my estimation, to have the strategist of that campaign to guide us now. What we oppose in Greece and Turkey is not communism per se but the threat of Russian aggression.

Lastly I hear it said that this bill will get us into war. I do not think so. Russian aggression flows like a river downhill. If we oppose it by a dike, I think the dike will be effective. It is about the best investment we can make in flood control. In any event, this bill seems to me to afford our best chance of averting war. Our vote this week will go echoing around the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to yield to a couple of Members who wanted to speak who had been promised time to speak under the agreement, but have not been able to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the time is being charged to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen to make statements. I yield 1 minute each.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Under the agreement the opposition still has 21 minutes. Are we going to have it or are we not? I have two or three gentlemen here who would like to speak for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. On this side we have only 22 minutes remaining. Obviously it would be impossible to yield the gentleman the 22 minutes. However, if the gentleman has two speakers for 1 minute each, we will be happy to yield them that much time. We regret that we do not have any more time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to accept just that much. However, it is in violation of the understanding.

Mr. JARMAN. I did not mean to violate any understanding.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, the great sovereign State of Illinois, eight and one-half million people, of which I represent over a million persons, the Seventh District of Illinois, largest in the United States, is allowed 1 minute. When I asked the chairman to yield, he said, "I won't yield. You ask too many questions." I asked five questions in 2 days, which took a total of about 1 minute.

I just wish to say that I think it is a mighty unfair distribution of time to give one-third of the 9 hours to those opposed, then take away 10 percent of that allowance, and permit a total of 6 minutes to Members from Illinois in opposition, when you gave a half an hour to a gentleman who represents less than 300,000 people in the State of Illinois, who spoke in favor of this abominable measure.

I want time to read just one telegram out of hundreds of communications I have received against this proposition. I did not receive one in favor thereof. I will read one telegram from a man in the State of Illinois who did as much as any other person in the United States to win the late war. It reads as follows:

GENEVA, ILL., *May 5, 1947.*

Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS,
Congressman From Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I still urge you to oppose Greek-Turkish subsidy and any other gifts or loans to foreign countries unless there is a definite and guaranteed basis of repayment with interest. History has demonstrated that most loans are defaulted. This Greek deal can be a precedent for others which can bankrupt us. It is entirely political and the Russian situation is not and will not be involved except as New Dealers try to involve Russia so as to secure public approval of themselves. Certain business interests and bankers approve of it for their own selfish reasons. This is demonstrated whe National Manufacturers' Association board approves loan on recommendation of John R. Suman, vice president, Standard Oil, New Jersey. Most members of NAM in downstate Illinois are opposed to action taken by NAM. My company is resigning its membership in NAM because of the un-American position assumed by NAM board in respect to this cheap political issue.

C. M. BURGESS.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman yield me one more minute?

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry. I do not have any more time.

Mr. OWENS. That is just what I would expect from the dictators who are proposing this bill, and depriving members of their right of speech.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, during the recent hearing which was held by two of our colleagues and myself in Milwaukee with respect to possible perjury in hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, I had occasion to examine a young Communist about 22 years of age who stated that he had received only a common-school education and had become a Communist about 4 years prior thereto. He gave as his reason for joining the ranks the results which had been achieved by Communist leadership in Russia during a span of less than 30 years. While we realize the immaturity of this lad there were many remarks made on this floor yesterday and today which could easily lead one to believe that some of our brilliant members were of the same opinion as this young man, or else they are overlooking the true facts. At the time of hearing in Milwaukee, I called attention to the words of the young French noble, Alexis De Toqueville, who had visited our shores about the year 1829 and, after spending approximately 1 year here, returned to his native land when, within a few years, he completed the first volume of his remarkable work, Democracy in America. Because of the fact that certain newspaper correspondents at Milwaukee requested information concerning De Toqueville, after I had mentioned his prophecies, I shall read briefly from the last page of the first volume of that work:

> The time will therefore come when one hundred and fifty millions of men will be living in North America. * * *
>
> There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world, which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points; I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place among the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.
>
> All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the other, by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting-point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Are we to believe that this prophecy of De Toqueville is completely a thought of his own creation? It was not. While he was here he read carefully of the expressions and utterances of our founders, including Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and Chancellor Kent, all men of great vision. They foresaw the future and left their thoughts, yes, even their prayers for our guidance with reference to that matter. I particularly call your attention to

the Farewell Address of our first President, which address is often acknowledged to be the combined work of Washington, Madison, and Hamilton, and particularly to these words:

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The Nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred, or a habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. The nation prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice, the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity: gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

There are some who would scoff and say that the years have changed the situation. However, they have not. The prophecy of De Toqueville seems to be realized, and it appears that natural location and resources are more responsible than is any individual governing body. Russia does sway the destinies of that half of the globe in which she is located. Are we swaying, or even influencing, the half in which we live? If not, it is time that we begin, and not make our destiny the attempt to conquer the entire world. If we will only look about us we shall find that there are subversive influences which we should overcome on our own soil. The same is true in the lands of many of our Latin-American neighbors. What are we doing about it? Very little. Nevertheless, we would take the step on which we are about to embark before we have even received a report from the Etheridge Commission, which was assigned by the United Nations to investigate the Greek border incidents. Without any proof of an act of aggression by Russia, we would now commit an overt act, one almost as insane and unnecessary as the use of the atomic bomb on Japanese land. As I said yesterday, when I asked a question of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, which question was not answered, "If the Soviet Union has offended us, why should we not sever diplomatic relations instead of taking the same pusillanimous actions which side-stepped us into two previous wars?" But we know that we do not have any ground for offense, so we shall take the first overt step, just short of war, as we have done before. I say to you let us pause. Let us act within our own sphere, our own orbit, and show that we know how to take care of our interests over here.

The very record of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs shows a statement, page 216, by the eminent Samuel Guy Inman, guest professor of International Relations, Ohio Wesleyan University, where he said:

Every man who travels outside the United States today knows that people everywhere—even in Canada, the Scandinavian countries, Holland, and England—talk of fear of American dominance. The other great fear is of communism. The way to throw the weight of the public opinion of the world on the side of Russia is to follow the President's plan to start arranging the affairs of other nations for them.

Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, also told the same committee, at page 266, that the commission had voted unanimously that it opposed the use of relief funds and the making of loans for the purpose of political war against the Soviet Union in Greece, Turkey, and the Near East, or for supervised training of armed forces in Greece or Turkey.

Monsignor Sheen, well known for his radio addresses on the Catholic Hour, said:

War is not the answer to communism. We must not hope for the extinction of Communists, but must pray for their conversion.

It appears, however, that we are men who would be God. Are we going to disregard the advice from the past, and the mistakes of the past, and launch ourselves upon a campaign which may mean the destruction not only of our own Nation but that of the world? Do not give me an answer that opposition to such a program means appeasement, because that word is just as trite as the word "isolationism," which has been used so frequently on this floor. I inquired yesterday if the antonym of the word "isolation" is "intervention," and I did not receive an answer. The answer is that it is the antonym. That is, those who are casting the word "isolationism" at the persons who would think of America first are those who would intervene in the affairs of the other nations and thereby bring us into another world conflict. It is time we place our trust in divine providence, and at the same time mind our own business in our own sphere. We have the means of extinction at hand. We also have the United Nations organization, which we virtually created for the purpose of bringing about world peace and order. Omar Khayyam asked if the potter would destroy the pots which he marred in the making. I ask a similar question. Are we going to destroy the instrument of peace which we created, and put in place thereof an instrument of destruction and horror? Which shall we use? That is the question. The answer lies with us. May God guide our decision.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is my idea that we are in a sad hour when today this Congress is taking action that may plunge this country directly into war, and because some of us have an honest difference of opinion we are denied the right of free speech in the well of the Congress of the United States. I say if this action prevails today, then we are short-circuiting and destroying the United Nations. The proponents of this bill say that their people oppose it. If they oppose it, why do we not have the courage to take the story directly to the American people and tell them we are leading them down the road to a third world war?

Mr. Chairman, today we have before us for consideration a new international world policy. The President and the State Department have recommended that the Congress appropriate $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey. First of all we should understand that this is a gift from the taxpayers of America. The American people look to Congress for the preservation and safeguarding of the finances of this Government. I have listened carefully to the discussion throughout the course of this debate. I cannot see how we can base or predicate a vote upon any facts that have been presented to this Congress. We have discussed legislation in the Eightieth Congress touching important domestic problems and volumes of testimony have been produced for our guidance and consideration. The proposed legislation before us is based upon a small, brief document which is in itself full of contradictions. I cannot understand that it is my duty to cast a vote upon secrecy and upon a diplomacy that no Member of this House has explained to the Members. The ill-fated misunderstanding of the State Department in days gone by has led this Government down a road of international chaos and involvement.

The proponents of this bill admit that this is the most important decision that this Congress may ever be called upon to decide. We have been compelled to fight for time to briefly discuss the real issues involved. The American people do not favor this new and complete reversal of our long-standing policy in foreign affairs. When we launch upon this program we commit ourselves to a responsibility to assume the economic burdens of all nations that claim to be afflicted with the scourge of communism. Many others will appear upon the horizon with their hands out desiring relief at the ex-

pense of America. This is only the beginning. Before we launch upon this program, we would do well to take stock of our national assets. With a national debt of $260,000,000,000, how can we place upon the brow of the taxpayers of this country a burden so heavy and great as this? How can we give something which we do not have? France, Italy, China, India, and many other nations will answer the roll call when Uncle Sam announces to the world that he is Santa Claus whose heart bleeds with compassion for all the world except the financial security and development of our own people. Under the Constitution of this country we are the representatives of the people and it is our duty to safeguard and promote their general welfare. A bankrupt treasury cannot promote the general welfare of the millions of people of this country.

If we allow a smooth delivery and mass propaganda to lull us into a false decision that will lead to a complete breakdown of our financial structure we can then look to a day of inflation. Inflation will bring higher prices, cheap money, and will compel this Government to institute controls. Controls may again forge the shackles of economic slavery and controls upon our people. To me the specter of such a reality in the future is a real possibility. When that day comes we can only blame ourselves for the hardships of tomorrow. I do not speak as one unfamiliar with the hardships, blood and sacrifice of war. I had the honor and privilege to wear the American uniform in World War II. I saw at first hand the devastating effects of war upon the whole civilization. It is now time that this Congress face the real issue in this proposed legislation. We should declare to the American people that what we are doing here today may easily lead to an immediate war with Russia. I am opposed to communism every day, every week, and every year of my life, and I say to the Members of this Congress that the mere spending of money will not stop communism. We have poured billions into countries and no man or woman can stand up in this House and say that communism has been stopped by the spending of money. I shall think seriously before I cast a vote that will send the young men of this country to don the uniform in a third world war.

In one generation we have fought two world wars and when the news goes out over America that we have voted to send food, supplies, equipment, and the military necessities along with the military strength to build up Turkey and Greece the mothers of this land, and the wives and sweethearts, will experience in their hearts and souls a sad feeling indeed. I am disturbed about this whole situation. Nobody has told the Congress how much money we propose to spend. No person has informed the American people just how far we expect to go with this policy. We have a United Nations with 51 member nations. Why should we short-circuit this United Nations and destroy it. We are undertaking to solve a problem that rightfully belongs to the United Nations. I submit that it is now time that we begin to look to and after our own household. Charity begins at home. It is now time that we formulate an American foreign policy and stick to it. Much has been said in the course of this debate concerning the destruction of communism. We would do well to drive the Communists from the departments of government in America. People all over America are pointing to the fact that this Government is continuing to deal with Russia, continuing to send supplies to Russia, and at the same time proposing to appropriate money to stop the spread of communism.

In conclusion, it is my humble opinion that we can best promote the general welfare of America if we turn our attention toward home; if we spend our money to rehabilitate and care for the disabled and wounded veterans and orphans and widows; if we look after the education of our people at home; if we preserve and protect the financial integrity of this country; if we announce to the world that America will not establish a worldwide WPA but that the spirit of self-help, individual liberty, and determination must be reestablished in all countries in the world, and that no nation can look to America to save her from financial involvement and that it will not be the policy of this Government to come to the aid of any tottering empire; and that we here and now divorce ourselves once and for all time from such a policy. I would like to say that the strongest and safest course for America to take is to teach our people the spirit of self-help and to build ourselves strong and powerful and engage in military and scientific development so that no nation or combination of powers can inflict harm upon us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I regret deeply to detain you at this late hour. I would not now ask your indulgence if I did not feel so very deeply the moving hour in which we live, if I did not have a memory, if I had not been a Member of the Congress during the first great war, and, of course, a Member of Congress during the last great war. I saw us win a glorious victory in 1918. I saw us throw away the fruits of that victory. I knew that isolationism existed in the United States before that war. It was not evident to any great extent during that war, but after that war that infamy crawled out of the shadows and made itself very evident.

I hope that after more than a quarter of a century in which to find out our mistake we do not repeat that mistake and withdraw from the remainder of the world and not be willing to do a man's part in the world's great work of peace as our fighting men in two wars did a man's job on the battlefields of the earth. I trust that in our considerations here and in the other body this thing called isolationism may not again crawl out of the shadows and defeat the hopes of men and again break the heart of the world.

Woodrow Wilson came back from France many years ago with a dream of world cooperation, world concord, and world peace. That was spurned by the representatives of the people. He cried out at that hour and made a prediction that if we did not cooperate, if we did not do our part in the effort for permanent world peace, that the world within 25 years, a quarter of a century, would be shocked by a greater and a more devastating war than even that one. His prediction came tragically true. We stand today with the leadership urging upon us certain action. Whether we like that leadership or not we have it. It is the voice of America and whether that leadership is followed or spurned will have a tremendous effect upon our position and our influence in this world.

A few weeks ago our leader came to us and said:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress. The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

This bill was reported to the Senate. A great Senator in that body had this to say:

> Mr. President, in response to the urgent recommendations of the President of the United States, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously reported the bill (S. 938) entitled "A bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey."
>
> It could be alternatively titled "A bill to support the purposes of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security," or it could be titled "A bill to serve America's self-interest in the maintenance of independent governments."

Further on he said:

> This is a plan to forestall aggression which, once rolling, could snowball into global danger of vast design. It is a plan for peace. It is a plan to sterilize the seeds of war. We do not escape war by running away from it. No one ran away from war at Munich.

Another great Senator of that body had this to say:

> There is ample evidence that these armed bands are being encouraged, stimulated, and motivated from the states of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, all of which are under the domination of Russia and her communistic system.

Only this week our great Secretary of State, who is not a warmonger—God knows he has seen enough of war—in a letter to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, had this to say, and I will read only one paragraph:

> My strong conviction that immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting in Moscow.

This bill, not mangled by amendments. He is talking about this bill.

That is the Secretary of State. That is the man who planned our campaigns and led our armies triumphantly to victory. Are his words to be taken lightly? He just returned from Moscow. He thinks this aid to Turkey and to Greece is urgent, and should be given now. Shall we listen to him, shall we listen to the head of the Government and to Senators who sat around these tables trying to

bring about world concord, world cooperation and world peace, or shall we listen to some one who is so scared of war that he is willing to allow conditions to again obtain in the world that brought us into two wars?

I remember not many years ago when we were trying to prepare this country for an eventuality and an emergency if it should come. I remember when we were trying to appropriate money to build 5,500 airplanes. Men took to the well of this House and said, "Whom are we preparing to fight?"

Pull down the map and look at Greece and Turkey. What does it mean if they are absorbed into the maw of communism and accept the leadership of Russia, which they do not want to accept? That includes Turkey, Greece, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, northern Africa Italy, and maybe France. If $400,000,000 will help to stop that thing, I for one, am willing to appropriate it. Maybe if our vision had been broader, our insight keener a few years ago, and we had built up our forces, there might not have been a Pearl Harbor. They knew we were unprepared to fight and, frankly, they read speeches and newspaper articles, some of them from the United States, that made the Japanese think we would not fight. General Marshall said, "This bill."

Now, let me say just a word about one amendment that is going to be offered, as I understand, and that is about this thing of turning the matter over to the United Nations. The United Nations is impotent to handle this matter. The United Nations has not the money, it has not the power, it has not the organization to do this job. So, it would appear to me that the better thing to do and the more candid thing to do by the people who intend to support an amendment like that would be to rise upon the floor of this House and move to strike the enacting clause from this bill. If Greece and Turkey need help, they need it now; not 60 days from now, not 90 days from now or a year from now. It might be too late, my friends; it might be too late.

It is a trite expression that we stand at the crossroads. I think we do. We are the most powerful Nation that has existed on the face of the earth, comparably, since the Caesars bestrode the world like a colossus. Leadership has been offered us. People who love liberty and cry for a fair chance want us to assume that leadership and lead the world and not follow in this challenging hour, on this fateful day and in these fateful times. If we do not accept our responsibility, if we do not move forward and extend a helping hand to people who need and want help, who are democracies or want to be, who do not want to be smothered by communism; if we do not, I repeat, assume our place, God help us; God help this world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is gravely doubtful, in fact, it is almost certain that I shall not be able to add much to this discussion. Every facet of this issue has been debated with ability and with sincerity. All that one can expect to do in the situation in which I am placed is to try to pick up some of the points which may not have been overemphasized and to give as best I can the picture as I see it.

As I indicated in a 2-minute speech while the rule itself was under consideration, I am very strongly in favor of this bill. In halting sentences in conversation with some of my colleagues on last Friday afternoon I confessed to them that were I the master of my own destiny I should like to spend the rest of my life under the shade of a tree, comfortable and happy. I likened my own wishes in that regard to the wishes of the people of the United States. Indeed, we would be happy, our children would be, and our grandchildren would be, if we and they as they come after us could live that way. But fate apparently determines otherwise. The work of the world is never finished. The tasks of humanity are never finished. The struggle for liberty is never finished.

As I look across the face of the world today it strikes me that the struggle for liberty rather than having been won, or half won, is more acute than ever, and that means that instead of resting under the shade of a tree we must stand up on our feet and support our convictions.

May I look back, and I hope I shall not consume too much time, over some of our experiences? The gentleman from Texas has referred to some of them, and one or two speakers during the debate have referred to others. They have to do with the struggle for liberty and the mistakes which I believe those most devoted to liberty have made from time to time, mostly mistakes of neglect.

I wonder how many of the members of this committee have read a book entitled "The Far Eastern Crisis," written by Henry L. Stimson, who wrote that book after he left the office of Secretary of State, the office which he occupied under President Hoover. In it you will find the story of the beginning of Japanese aggression in Manchuria. In it you will find the record of his protests and his appeals to the democracies, not only to the people of the United States, but to the other great democracies of that day. In it you will find the prophecies which he made as to what the ultimate objective of the Japanese was and how it would undoubtedly affect us.

Neither America nor Great Britain nor France nor Belgium nor any other democracy rallied to his call. His was a lone voice, in a sense, crying in the wilderness, and the Japanese aggression prospered, starting from 1931, ever spreading its power and overrunning one section of Asia after another as the democracies of the world stood idle, we among them.

We know the results of that neglect—at least, I hope we have learned that lesson.

Coming on later, in the 1930's, after Hitler had seized power in Germany—I wonder if any of you have read the volume entitled "While England Slept." It is well worth reading. It is a collection of speeches of Winston Churchill delivered in the British House of Commons in the middle 1930's in which he, a voice crying in the wilderness, begged the MacDonald government and begged the Baldwin government to look, to look and understand, what was brewing in Germany, begging France to wake up, begging Belgium to wake up, begging the League of Nations to wake up—speech after speech. But he was a member of a hopeless minority. France crouched behind the Maginot Line and you know what happened to her. Belgium was overrun. The democracies in those prewar years did not meet the issue that confronted them. They dodged it.

I hope we have learned a lesson here in America, and I believe we have, that if freedom, if liberty, if democracy are to live, we must rise upon our feet and defend them.

The Hitler-Japanese combination represented an enormously strong and aggressive force. We defeated it at terrific cost. It may be partly our own fault, partly a misconception of our psychology as a people, indulged in by others, but, nevertheless, I think it is true and I think it cannot be denied that a new aggression is raising its ugly countenance; a new aggressor, strong, determined, employing tactics perhaps somewhat different from that of Hitler and the Japanese, but, nevertheless, employing tactics taught in its central school—make no mistake about that—calculated eventually to destroy liberty upon the face of the earth.

And here we are, after these failures of the past to understand the meaning of a menace launched by totalitarian powers, here we are facing the same sort of menace, and for one—and I can speak only for myself—I rejoice that for the first time in the history of what we might term modern days, America, spiritually equipped as well as materially supplied, through her President has announced to the world that she intends to defend liberty; and as she does that I am convinced from the bottom of my heart that we are actually defending our own liberty.

This bill to me signifies such an attitude on the part of the great United States; a forthright declaration in support of righteousness.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interests of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their Governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United

States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H. R. 2616, AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have three legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc., before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to include as part of the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today certain newspaper clippings and articles.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein an article from the New York Times.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix a report entitled "American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries Since mid-1945," prepared by the Division of Historical Policy Research of the Department of State. This report is referred to in my remarks at page 4600 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 under the heading of Aid for Economic Reconstruction. Due to the fact that the manuscript was excessive in length for the leave granted, I now ask unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of cost of $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a bill he introduced some time ago and include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. STEFAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PRESTON, for May 8, 9, and 10, on account of official business.

To Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 583. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 629. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 800. An act to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the

Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

661. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report as to the number of men on active duty on March 31, 1947, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

662. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620) by adding a new title thereto to be known as title XIV, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, with respect to certain subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3364. A bill to provide for retirement at full active-duty pay for any individual who has served in the Army or the Navy on the active list for a period of 50 years or more; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3365. A bill exempting from tax cigarettes sold to certain organizations for distribution as gifts to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3367. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Federal Extension Service, to cooperate with the land-grant colleges and universities in carrying out a program for the collection and dissemination of information with respect to the supply of, the need for, and the effective use of agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3368. A bill to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3369. A bill to treat certain predecessor and successor railroad corporations as the same taxpayer for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3370. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than $3.10 per 100 pounds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3371. A bill to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3372. A bill authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3373. A bill to permit certain Polish veterans to enter the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate May 7 for annual observation as American Heroes' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to invite Canada to join the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3374. A bill awarding a Distinguished Service Cross to Tony Siminoff, veteran of the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Bowie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

452. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 34 Elmwood, Murdock, and Eagle, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

453. Also, petition of 34 Weeping Water and Avoca, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

454. Also, petition of 28 Louisville, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

455. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of A. E. Brown and 22 other signers, of Deadwood, S. Dak., requesting that communism be stopped and stamped out completely in this country; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

456. Also, petition of Carl H. Loocke and 24 other signers from Hill City, S. Dak., requesting that communism be stopped and stamped out completely in this country; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

457. By Mr. EATON: Concurrent resolution of the New Jersey State Senate, opposing ratification of any treaty or agreement with Dominion of Canada or passage of any legislation to provide for the construction of St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of women's division, American Jewish Congress, urging enactment of the Federal fair employment practice bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

459. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Touro Lodge, No. 814, B'nai B'rith, urging full representation for the Jewish people in all deliberations regarding Palestine within the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

460. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition signed by 22 citizens of Jane Lew and Kincheloe, Third District of West Virginia, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

461. Also, petition signed by 29 citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging support for S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

462. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of twenty-first district council, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, adopted at a meeting held February 2, 1947, at Hollidaysburg, Pa., opposing any legislation that would permit the immigration of displaced persons from other countries in excess of present quotas, and requesting that present quotas be investigated in an effort to determine the possibility of decreasing the pres-

ent quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transporting of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464 By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Everett Townsend Club, No. 1, Everett, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

465 Also, petition of the Left Liberal Party of Greece, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to imposing the formation of a government of the center and the left in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

466 Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the program for Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

467 Also, petition of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

468 Also, petition of Puerto Rican Industrial Soldiers Association, of Guayama, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to compensation for the Puerto Rican industrial soldiers of the First World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We open our hearts unto Thee, our Father, and pray that Thy spirit may indwell each one of us and give us poise and power. We believe in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to believe what Thou hast said. We trust in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to trust Thee for guidance in the decisions we have to make.

Help us to do our very best this day and be content with today's troubles, so that we shall not borrow the troubles of tomorrow. Save us from the sin of worrying, lest stomach ulcers be the badge of our lack of faith. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hopkins, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. A act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate after 3 o'clock p. m. today by reason of public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, May 8, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending or that may thereafter be offered, to the pending amendment proposed to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH) on page 54, after line 4, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 8 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota will permit me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time taken for the roll call to be divided as usual between the two sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Elender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Wagner
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

To whom does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment was explained yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It is substantially the same as the amendment which was adopted by the Senate last year as part of the so-called Case bill, which amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia. The occasion of the amendment was the demand made by the United Mine Workers of America that a tax of 10 cents a ton be levied on all coal mined, and that the tax so levied be paid into a general welfare fund to be administered by the union for practically any purpose the union considered to come within the term "welfare." Of course, the result of such a proceeding, if there is no restriction, is to build up a tremendous fund in the hands of the officers of the labor union, to be distributed for welfare, which they may use indiscriminately. There is no specific provision with respect to it. They may distribute it to members of the union whom they like or they consider proper charity cases, and they may refuse to distribute it to other members whom they do not like.

The demand originally made by Mr. Lewis was so broad that practically the fund became a war chest, if you please, for the union. The money for welfare funds is deducted from the wages of the employees. It is money earned by the employees, and certainly there should be some restriction on the right of those who bargain collectively for the employees of any company, as to how far they can take the money earned by the employees and use it for union purposes without restriction. Obviously the man who is bargaining should have no right to obtain any personal advantage.

The amendment provides first that—

It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees.

That is, it may be said, in a case of extortion or a case where the union representative is shaking down the employer. Certain exceptions are made.

Then with regard to the check-off, which is a device by which the employer pays into the union treasury, without the consent of the particular employees who have earned the money, a certain percentage agreed to in the collective-bargaining agreement contract, the amendment provides that it is proper to make such an agreement with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization, provided that the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which shall not be irrevocable for a period of more than 1 year, or beyond the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner.

So far as the testimony shows that is the usual form of check-off. Under it the employee himself signs a slip or assignment authorizing the check-off. If he once signs such an assignment under the collective-bargaining agreement, it may continue indefinitely until revoked, and it may be irrevocable during the life of the particular contract, or for a period of 12 months. That, I think, is substantially in accord with nine-tenths of all check-off agreements, and simply prohibits a check-off made without any consent whatever by the employees.

Provision No. (5) at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the amendment deals with the question of welfare fund. It provides that the payments must be made, in the first place, as found in line 25 on page 2, "to a trust fund established by such representative"—that is by the union—"for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents, or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents."

In other words, this must be a trust fund. It cannot be the property of the union without a definite statement that it is in trust for the employees, who, after all, have earned the money.

In the second place, "such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income, or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance."

I think that covers all the welfare purposes which are contained in any of the existing welfare funds now established in a certain number of industries.

Then there is the provision under (B) that—

The detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer.

So that the purpose of the provision is that the welfare fund shall be a perfectly definite fund, that its purposes shall be stated so that each employee can know what he is entitled to, can go to court and enforce his rights in the fund, and that it shall not be, therefore, in the sole discretion of the union or the union leaders and usable for any purpose which they may think is to the advantage of the union or the employee.

Mr. President, it seems obvious that if these funds grow rapidly, as they are growing—which is perfectly proper—they should be regulated by the Federal Government. They should be in definite terms. They should not be subject to the arbitrary discretion of the union leaders, the very ones who are making the agreements and who are making the demands for the particular funds, whether the employees want them or not.

We are saying to the employee, "You have earned $100 this month, but all you get is $95. You must put $5 into the fund." That is at the behest of the union leaders. The employee has nothing to say about it. Certainly he is entitled to have us say that the fund shall be definite, that his rights shall be determined by law, and that he shall be able to demand them.

What was actually done by the Government when it agreed with Mr. Lewis? This is the agreement with respect to the United Mine Workers' fund:

There is hereby provided a health and welfare program in broad outline—and it is recognized that many important details remain to be filled in—such program to consist of three parts, as follows:

(a) A welfare and retirement fund: A welfare and retirement fund is hereby created and there shall be paid into said fund by the operating managers 5 cents per ton on each ton of coal produced for use or for sale. This fund shall be managed by three trustees, one appointed by the Coal Mines Administrator, one appointed by the president of the United Mine Workers, and the third chosen by the other two.

In this case the Government is the employer.

The fund shall be used for making payments to miners, and their dependents and survivors, with respect to (1) wage loss not otherwise compensated at all or adequately under the provisions of Federal or State law and resulting from sickness (temporary disability), permanent disability, death, or retirement, and (2) other related welfare purposes, as determined by the trustees. Subject to the stated purposes of the fund, the

trustees shall have full authority with respect to questions of coverage and eligibility, priorities among classes of benefits, methods of providing or arranging for provision of benefits, and all related matters.

This represents money earned by the employees, in the form of a tax of 5 cents a ton, which is turned into a fund, and two private persons, without restraint, have almost unlimited authority to determine how the money shall be spent. Whether the words "other related welfare purposes" make it unnecessary to furnish a definite statement, as required by this amendment, is a question. It is left entirely in the choice of two men, who do not have particularly at heart the interests of the public, to determine the terms under which the money shall be distributed.

The purpose of the amendment is to require that the fund shall be established in definite, detailed form, in the form of a trust fund, with respect to which the employees can determine their rights and can insist upon them.

Mr. Lewis' original demand was that the fund be solely in the administration of the union. He finally agreed to a joint administration. Unless we make such a provision there will be no requirement for a joint administration. This amendment provides that the employees and employers must be equally represented in the administration of the fund, together with such neutral persons as they may agree upon. In the event of a deadlock the agreement shall be submitted to an impartial umpire.

The purpose is to prevent the abuse of welfare funds. We have provided for a general study of welfare funds of this nature. There are a number of them in existence. I have before me a list of such funds. The amendment would not substantially affect any of those funds, except that with respect to some of them the appointment of an employer representative might be required, in order that there might be joint administration instead of single administration. Otherwise most of the existing funds already comply with this provision. The tendency at present is illustrated by the demand of the United Mine Workers and other demands. This is the demand made by the painters in Washington:

The parties to this agreement agree to set up a trust fund, to be known as the Painters' Insurance Fund of Washington, D. C., and Vicinity. The purpose of this fund is to provide life insurance, sick benefits, hospitalization, accident, surgical, and dismemberment benefits for all journeymen and apprentices of local unions 368, 890, and 797.

There are no specific terms. No one can tell what the fund may finally be used for. Painters are notorious drifters. They have something deducted from their wages, and then they drift on to some other city, where they may find no fund, and lose the money they have already contributed. The tendency is to demand a welfare fund as much in the power of the union as possible. Certainly unless we impose some restrictions we shall find that the welfare fund will become merely a war chest for the particular union, and that the employees for whose benefit it is supposed to be established, for certain definite welfare purposes, will have no legal rights and will not receive the kind of benefits to which they are entitled after such deductions from their wages.

As to the question of interest, it is questionable how far we should go in the matter of private welfare funds. We have a general social security system. We have a separate fund for the railroad employees. There is a number of other special funds. I believe that the Finance Committee should study the whole problem of social security and welfare funds. Very likely there should be further restrictions. There should be a requirement that such funds fit into and supplement the ordinary social security system. The subject calls for long and involved study.

This amendment is, in effect, a provision to prevent the abuse of the right to establish such funds by collective bargaining, pending further study of the whole problem. Otherwise I think we shall find that the welfare fund will become a racket. In many unions it is very easy for it to become a racket. It becomes, in effect, a tax. In Mr. Petrillo's union there is a tax on records. In the United Mine Workers' Union there is a tax on coal. Unless there are some restrictions, if such an agreement is forced upon an employer, in effect we make the officials of the union who collect the tax Government agents for collecting and distributing the tax. Under the proposed agreement originally demanded by Mr. Lewis he could distribute the fund for the benefit of schools, or he could operate anything he wished to operate in the nature of local government. The whole thing would become a great weapon of power, as it was in the case of Mr. Petrillo, to dominate the union, to please the members whom he wanted to please, and punish members whom he did not wish to please, or who refused to go along with the policy of the union.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that I have favored the idea of welfare funds. There is always involved the question of administration, and that is the question which gives us trouble. It seems to me that a welfare fund of this kind, which becomes part of a contract between employer and employees, should be administered by a governmental agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the pending amendment would place the fund under joint administration of employer and employees. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator believe that a better method would be to have it administered by a governmental agency?

Mr. TAFT. I think a complete study of the question ought to be made and that in the end there ought to be some governmental regulation of the character of the fund. This is, in a way, a stopgap provision until a further study can be made, in order that abuses may not arise.

There is a health benefit pamphlet issued by the United States Department of Labor which sets out a very considerable number, a dozen or so, of these funds, created by collective bargaining agreements, none of which are administered by the Government. It would require, I think, a pretty complete tearing to pieces of those funds if we tried to have every one of them established now or hereafter administered by the Government. In most cases they are jointly administered. In three important cases, I think, they are administered by the unions. I think that if we went further than this amendment and required Government administration it would cause such a complete upsetting of so many funds that I should hesitate to have it done until we have more complete knowledge. What we have to do ultimately, it seems to me, is to integrate these funds with the social security system in some way. Almost everyone has social security. On top of that we provide a particular industry with additional funds. Possibly the administration of such funds will ultimately be in the hands of the Government. In the meantime, for stopgap purposes I think joint administration should require that there be a trust fund, with a specific agreement as to its purpose—so much to provide health benefits, so much for this kind of hospital service, so much for this kind of insurance.

Incidentally, already, in addition to these funds, in many cases the employer furnishes group-insurance policies. If Government administration were required, the Government would be put into nearly every company, because nearly every company has something that falls within this general classification. So I think we had better not go further than this amendment does. I very strongly believe that it will prevent abuses. Funds can be set up, but after they are established they must cover definite services which are recognized as proper services for welfare funds.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the Senate agreed to a similar amendment last year and there was no substantial criticism of it, so far as I know, before the committee, and that the practice is a growing practice which is certainly liable to serious abuse, we ought to make some provision in this bill to take care of the matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator has made clear the answer to the question I wanted to ask. I have been asked by many people whether this amendment would interfere with the existing set-up of welfare funds, and I have answered them in the terms of the amendment and have told them that it would not. I should like to be sure on that point.

Mr. TAFT. I have read the pamphlets on the subject, and, so far as I know,

the amendment does not interfere with funds which are in existence, except in three instances in which the funds are administered solely by the union which must make some amendment after July 1948, with regard to joint administration, involving the appointment of a representative of the employer to participate in the administration.

Mr. SMITH. Is that the only respect?

Mr. TAFT. That is the only respect in which existing welfare funds are affected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I take the same position on this amendment at this time as I took in committee. Recognizing again in this instance the validity of the criticism of the conditions which have obtained in some instances in connection with welfare funds, as outlined by the Senator from Ohio, nevertheless, since a great deal apparently is contingent upon the establishment of welfare funds, I feel that a certain amount of delay by Congress is advisable before final action is taken, as the action about to be taken will be final, except for what may be done in conference. I recognize some violations of what we consider to be proper practices. I simply want to point out in that connection that the welfare-fund program has grown very materially in recent years. I have a table here which shows that in 1945 approximately 600,000 workers in this country presumably were covered for benefits under that type of program. Early this year there are indications that 1,250,000 are covered. The system is growing very rapidly. While we may believe we have a record of all welfare funds, I doubt very seriously whether there is such a record. I have not been able to obtain a complete record. I think that is something that needs thorough exploration.

There is one thing I want to point out in connection with the matter of welfare funds, and that is that it has been a practice in the United States for the last few years to encourage the establishment of this type of fund. This is the one thing which exists as a result of joint operations between management and labor in which labor itself—the employees—is overwhelmingly in accord.

There was a survey made not long ago which is reported in the January 1947 issue of Factory Management magazine. In the whole field of the relationship between management and labor on the question of welfare funds, or anything of that type, at least three-fourths of the employees who expressed an opinion favor such funds. That is one matter in labor relations on which the great bulk of the employees are overwhelmingly in accord. Undoubtedly it comes about because in some instances insufficient protection is guaranteed them by management, and in other instances by government. As a result of that condition which has arisen there has been a constant effort to institute more and more of this kind of protection. It has come to be a very important feature in the relationship between management and labor. It has had a great deal to do with improvement in management-labor relations.

Meritorious though the purpose of this proposal may be—and I do not question its purpose for one moment—I think it is very questionable in this connection, as it was in connection with the matter which was before us yesterday, whether we should undertake to proceed at this particular time in the way in which it is proposed in the present amendment.

I want to point out that one of the specific functions, one of the specific mandates which have been given or will be given to the joint congressional committee to be created under the bill, if it should be enacted, is to go into the welfare-fund problem, to explore the whole field, to ascertain the kind and type of fund that should exist, and to determine what kind of restrictive legal measures, if necessary, finally should be taken. Perhaps the measure proposed here may be the proper one. I happened to observe at the hearings held last winter that there was serious objection on the part of some very large employers to having any part in the administration of welfare funds. That is understandable. They feel that such funds are for the benefit of the employees; their relationship is a happy one, and they would rather leave it that way. It seems to me that these matters should be explored far more thoroughly than they have been up to the present time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out that the welfare fund which the Government has set up with John L. Lewis already contains more than $10,000,000. These funds are growing by leaps and bounds. It seems to me that they must be regulated or they will get beyond all control, and we will encounter great difficulty when we finally come to act on them.

Mr. IVES. In that connection let me point out that the UMW is an organization with a membership of 400,000 and it is not surprising that it has a welfare fund of that size.

Nor do I want it understood in any way, shape, or manner that I approve necessarily of the procedures which were followed prior to the establishment of the Government control which now exists in that connection.

The fact remains that the system of welfare funds is not going to produce anything of an ultimately serious nature in the United States if we wait until the next session of the Congress, when we should know a great deal more about it and when we should be able to act far more intelligently.

In connection with the pending amendment, there are several matters which I think have not been discussed as thoroughly as they might have been; in fact, I think they have not even been pointed out, and no one has debated them thus far.

In the first place, I should like to point to subsection (b), on page 2. I wish to inquire whether that could be construed in any way as affecting Christmas presents or birthday presents or anything of that type. The language is rather broad, and it appears to me to be vague Certainly anything of a legitimate character should not be limited by such a provision.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield, but I should like to suggest that I am speaking under a time limit, according to the time schedule.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand, and I shall be brief. I simply wish to state that I wonder whether it can be correctly assumed that the application of this provision is to be limited to representatives of unions and to contributions made to representatives of unions. Could it not be regarded as affecting contributions made to representatives of unorganized groups, and affecting, for instance, contributions provided by management for picnics or in aid of baseball teams which the employees often have, and other contributions of that character. Would not all such contributions be forbidden under the terms of this provision?

Mr. IVES. Presumably that is correct, and I think it is very dangerous to include in the bill a provision of this character, as to which there may be serious question or doubt.

In subsection (c), in line 19, there is a provision in connection with the check-off. I have no quarrel with the idea of having the check-off approved by the individual employee, if that is desirable. I do not think it is necessary, however, in view of the restrictions contained in the bill in regard to the closed shop and the union shop, to provide additional restrictions. I am sure, moreover, that many employers will not be particularly pleased with that feature of the provision as here presented, which requires each employee, at least once a year, to specify in writing that he wants the check-off continued. This would add to the bedevilment of employers, who already are overburdened by paper work, by the number of reports, and other documents they have to prepare and submit, and the numerous procedures to which they are subjected. I think that possibility should be taken into consideration in connection with this proposal.

Again, Mr. President, I think that perhaps the penalty provided in this provision is somewhat unrealistic. Presumably the penalty applies to a violation of every portion of the proposed new section 302. I do not know whether for failure to do some of the things I have indicated, persons should be subjected to a penalty of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year. It seems to me such penalties are altogether excessive for violation of some of the provisions contained in this measure; and such a condition in itself could make the entire measure unworkable.

On the whole, Mr. President, I feel that this is an extremely ill-considered proposal, and that there should be further delay before we act on it. Therefore I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes of my time to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to compel joint administration by the union and the employer of any health and welfare fund voluntarily established between the parties for the benefit of the employees. The effect of the amendment would be to strike a crippling blow at numerous welfare plans and funds which have existed and operated successfully for many years. Estimates have been made, ranging up to 1,300,000 as the number of workers now covered by such plans. A substantial percentage of those funds is administered exclusively by the unions, with the blessings of the employer. As a matter of fact, there are many employers who, having agreed to the establishment of such funds as the result of free and voluntary collective bargaining, would object strenuously to any measure compelling them to join in the administration of the funds. For them, it would mean additional record keeping, resulting in increased costs, and requiring them to devote a part of their time and energy to the supervision of activities which are not of direct concern to them. Time and energy so lost could be better applied directly to increasing production, with a consequent beneficial effect to the entire economy.

For many months I have been seeking legislation to establish a national health program. On November 19, 1945, the President of the United States in his message to the Congress strongly urged the adoption of such a program. Every person recognizes that our most precious national possession is a healthy, strong, and efficient population. But practically all students of the problem of conserving our human resources are equally agreed that we have been woefully negligent in our failure to set up even a rudimentary program for conserving those resources. The huge numbers of our young men rejected for service in the armed forces during the war was a shocking demonstration of our inadequacy, in the light of our existing and potential wealth, in this respect.

I should like to emphasize that the pending amendment constitutes a direct threat to another of our most precious heritages. The right of liberty to contract has always been regarded by us as an essential condition to the functioning of a free society. Why should we interfere with this right, when the subject of the contract is a health and welfare fund hurting no one and benefiting many? If this amendment is adopted, we shall have established a principle whereby the Government will be authorized to dictate any or all the terms of collective-bargaining agreements. Wages, hours, working conditions, and all the thousands of other aspects of the industrial relationship would then become the direct concern of the State, which, having established the precedent, would have the power to dictate the terms to the parties to the agreement. Compulsory arbitration, which my distinguished colleagues oppose because they recognize its dangerous consequences for our free society, would have been achieved indirectly, and I am sure without intention on their part.

This amendment would be a cruel provision to place in this bill, inasmuch as it is intended to strait-jacket union attempts to provide decent minimum safety and health standards for American workers and to provide some protection for the widows and children of the workers who are killed in industrial accidents.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement containing facts taken from the hearings on the Centralia disaster, before the Senate Committee on Public Lands on Thursday, April 17 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS TAKEN FROM THE HEARINGS ON THE CENTRALIA DISASTER BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

Our country is today the only country producing coal for export. We are the only country that has a surplus. We will not have a surplus long unless we treat our mine workers better, unless we decide that we will not kill so many of them every day and every month and wound them and use them up and throw them on the scrap heap. In our country they are not being replaced. Our young men are not going into the mines as a vocation. They do not have to any more. Child labor has been eliminated from the mines. Young men may not enter the mines underground in most States until they are 18 years of age, both by contract with the United Mine Workers and by the various State regulations. That means that many of them, most of them, receive an education equivalent to a high-school education. When they reach the age, with that background of education, they decide, and their family helps them decide, that they will not take up their father's vocation. The influence of their mothers, who are familiar with the horrors of the mines, operates to create a psychological point of view in the young man's mind so that he does not take up his father's vocation.

It is almost impossible to create an efficient miner by taking an adult person and putting him into a mine. They must be conditioned mentally to voluntarily assume the vocation of a mine worker, and they are not easily so conditioned when they reach a mature age. They cannot adapt themselves. They do not have the flexibility of physical structure that is required. They do not have all the nervous reactions that must operate mechanically so that they can protect themselves in the mines as much as may be possible. They constantly are oppressed with the horror of the mine. They work in the mines reluctantly, and they go elsewhere when they can.

From 1910 to 1945, inclusive, 66,140 men were killed outright. That is an average of 1,889 fatalities a year. Two thousand one hundred and thirty-five were permanently totally disabled annually. Two thousand and sixty-one were permanently partially disabled annually, with an average loss of 684 workdays each. There were 70,336 dead and disfigured bodies.

This is more men than are now employed in the mining States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, all of which are mining States of magnitude.

These 66,140 men left approximately 211,648 widows and orphans.

Sixty-five thousand men each year injured lost an average of 40 days each. That is in a 35-year period. That average runs through a 35-year period from 1910 to 1945.

In 1942 we had 462,000 men employed in our bituminous mining industry. We killed 1,245 of them that year, an average of 103 fatalities per month in that calendar year.

In 1943 we had 416,000 men employed, or 46,000 less than the preceding year. We still killed 1,225, which is only 20 men less than the preceding year, with 46,000 less employed.

That is an average of 102 fatalities per calendar month.

In 1944 we had 393,000 men employed in the bituminous industry, which is 23,000 less than the year before, the preceding year.

In 1944 we had 93 fatalities per calendar month. In 1945 we had a total of 383,000 men employed in the bituminous coal industry, which was 10,000 less than in 1944. There were 936 killed, which is an average of 78 per month. There is a shrinkage in 4 years of 79,000 men in the total number of men available for the operation of the industry.

From June 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947, this being 10 months that the Government has operated the mines, 841 were killed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, occupational hazards are a justified charge against the costs of production, and should be insured against, at least in part, by employer contributions.

Unless the American people want their coal smeared with the blood of miners, unless they have lost all regard for human values in our great industrial machine, they will reject this provision.

Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a very able article that was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1903. It is an article discussing the need of public health and welfare funds in the absence of broad national medical-care program such as proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

(Extension of remarks of Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, of Rhode Island, in the Senate of the United States, Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947)

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the April issue of the Kiplinger magazine entitled "Health Means Plans and Dollars."

This appears to me to be a most enlightening article which I believe should be available to those interested in improving the health of the people of our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HEALTH MEANS PLANS AND DOLLARS—WE MUST FIND A WAY TO MEET OUR CHALLENGING NATIONAL MEDICAL PROBLEM

"United States medicine, which has devised brilliant treatments for many of our ills, is having a hard time prescribing for its most acute problem: how to make medical services available for all who need them.

"There is wide agreement on the diagnosis: our medical facilities are badly organized and too expensive for most people. There is no general agreement on the right treatment, despite the universal interest in working out some solution. We are all potential consumers of medical services, and we are all affected by the health of our community.

And our overburdened doctors need relief from a system under which they can't take care of all the sick, even with charity treatments.

"Although the Nation's health cannot be put on a dollars-and-cents basis, employers should be concerned with the terrific inroads, largely preventable, which illness makes on production. Before the war between four and five hundred million workdays were lost annually from sickness—about 40 times the number lost through strikes. The loss of consumption power may be even greater.

"Here is what's wrong in the judgment of the American Medical Association, individual doctors, lay experts and Government officials:

"The traditional fee system of payment for medical services is too costly. Most people can afford emergency pills and treatment, but not preventive medicine or prolonged, catastrophic illness. Some estimates say about 20 percent of the population can't pay even for minimum medical needs.

"There are not enough doctors, especially in rural regions, slums, and small communities. Many doctors are underpaid. Few have time to keep up with developments.

"Hospitals and other facilities are too few, poorly distributed, often antiquated.

"Medical research is haphazard. We spend a hundred dollars for research on infantile paralysis, which afflicts relatively few, for every 25 cents spent on mental disease, which afflicts millions and fills more than half the Nation's hospital beds.

"Many people, particularly if they have no trouble meeting their own medical bills and deal exclusively with comfortably established city physicians, find it hard to accept so sweeping a diagnosis. But the clinical facts are disturbing.

"According to the AMA, in 1940, most individuals and families with incomes under $3,000 needed help in meeting medical bills. That amounted to well over 75 percent of the population. People who borrow from small-loan companies need the money most often to pay medical bills.

"For many an ailing individual the high cost of sickness poses the question of how much medical attention he can do without, and for how long. The grim consequences of such enforced self-denial showed up in prewar medical statistics, which brutally dispose of the notion that the United States is the healthiest Nation on earth.

"This country had higher infant death rates than seven other countries; higher cancer, heart, nervous, and mental disease rates. The average life expectancy at birth was higher in 4 countries; at 20 years it was higher in 8 countries; at age 40 in 11; and at age 60 in 12. The subsequent revelation that about 40 percent of young Americans were unfit for military service for medical reasons has hushed our big talk about national health standards.

"It's not primarily the doctor's fault that protracted illness and preventive medicine are so expensive, although it is a fact that organized medicine, through the American Medical Association, has demonstrated a minimum of social awareness in facing the mounting medical crisis.

"But the individual practitioner usually is too busy with his never-ending responsibilities to think about broader medical issues. He carries an appalling load. In most cases the family doctor has fully earned the respect and affection which millions of Americans have for him. He has a habit of quietly scaling down bills for needy patients, and carrying a load of charity cases without talking about it.

"So many doctors have concentrated in the cities that demands on country and small-town doctors are proportionately higher. These small-community doctors are often the ones with poorest facilities, largest practices, and lowest incomes.

"The main effort to bridge the economic gap between patient and doctor has been through voluntary group-insurance plans as a substitute for the fee system of payment. During the last two decades, many Americans have got partial coverage against sickness through one of these plans.

"But they have three fatal defects: They don't offer adequate coverage, they have proved too expensive for lower-income groups, and they don't include enough people.

"Like most commercial health-insurance policies, group-insurance plans tend to restrict services and to neglect thorough treatment. Some group plans provide only hospitalization for limited periods, but over half our medical bills are for treatment given outside of hospitals. Less than 5.4 percent of the population has insurance for physicians' services, and about 2.5 percent have complete home, office, and hospital coverage. Only one American out of four has any kind of health insurance at all.

"Many of the people who have had experience administering group-health plans say that these are only a necessary stopgap in the absence of a national-health plan.

"There are signs that the tide is setting in the direction of such a national program as a logical extension of social security. Opinion polls show a majority in favor of pay-roll deductions to provide national-health insurance. And in the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats joined to provide Federal funds for the construction of more hospitals and clinics, and for treatment and research in mental health and other fields.

"Congress hasn't acted on the problem of providing medical services for those who can't afford them. But it may do so during the present session. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, has revised his health bill, and reintroduced it, with the support of the AMA. Given the Senator's influence and the Republican desire to win votes from those who would benefit by the measure's provisions, chances for his bill look pretty good. Its main provisions:

"Coordination of civilian Federal health functions in a new Federal Health Agency.

"Appropriation of $200,000,000 yearly to assist States in providing medical care and hospital services for individuals and families unable to pay for them.

"Cash contributions by States at least equal to the sum advanced from the Federal Treasury.

"Approval of State programs by the Surgeon General, with appeal to a national health council in event of disagreement.

"Enactment of the bill, according to its proponents, would probably make some basic medical services available to the poorest 20 to 25 percent of the population; opponents say only 10 percent.

"Critics of the bill object strongly to a provision that applicants would have to prove their inability to pay. Too many States require a means test as proof of this inability to pay. This is a throw-back from the concept of social security to that of public charity. It seems needlessly humiliating, say the critics, that sick people should have either to exhaust their savings or stigmatize themselves as paupers, to obtain emergency medical care.

"The Taft bill also minimizes basic public interest in good health for everyone. We do not maintain schools only for those who are too poor to go to private schools, nor libraries for those who are too poor to buy books. Why offer medical care to the indigent, and exclude middle-income families for whom, also, medical services are too expensive?

"Another criticism is that the Taft bill, by providing only emergency relief, forestalls any attempt to combat disease on a Nation-wide scale. Some doctors think tuberculosis could be wiped out in the United States within a generation, syphilis within a shorter time. But this could be done only through a Nation-wide campaign, with services readily available to everybody.

"One major political force interested in going beyond the provisions of the Taft bill is United States labor. With hopes of big wage boosts collapsing, union negotiators are now going down the line for fuller health coverage as well as cash benefits paid for by employers. Management will be hard put to refuse this demand altogether.

"In the next few years an estimated 8,000,000 workers are likely to get new or increased health protection as a result.

"Senator TAFT's prescription, limited coverage for bottom-income groups, differs, of course, from the unions' proposal—full coverage for all union labor. But by one of the ironies of politics, both efforts may have the same long-run effect.

"Once you provide basic medical care for 35,000,000 citizens under the Taft bill and for additional millions of industrial workers under union contracts, the objection to going the whole hog diminishes. The cost would be much cheaper if it were spread over the whole population. And coverage would be more complete. The financial and administrative burden of health and welfare clauses would be taken off private enterprises and placed on official agencies.

"One proposal for such a program has been embodied in the administration-sponsored Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It is expected to be financed by a 3-percent pay-roll levy divided between employees and employers, plus a general appropriation for research and training.

"Payments from this fund would be entrusted for disbursement to the Surgeon General, who would also set standards. But day-to-day administration would be left to States, local communities, and existing medical groups. Doctors would continue, if they preferred, to practice on the present fee system, with payments made to them out of the insurance fund. Doctors who wished to practice on a full or partial salary basis could do so. Those who wished to remain completely outside the system would be free to do so.

"Patients could go to any general practitioner in the system. The doctor also would be free to accept or reject patients.

"It's worth noting that the British Medical Association once fought a national health system based on compulsory health insurance just as stubbornly as the AMA does now. After a conservative government set one up anyway, the British Medical Association swung to support. One reason—doctors' incomes went up.

"Like a number of distinguished medical men, some United States business leaders have come to regard a national-health program as a desirable extension of our present social-security laws. Executives like Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., Gerard Swope, president of General Electric, and David Sarnoff, of RCA, feel this way.

"Total cost of a national-health program has been set at $4,000,000,000 yearly. That's about what we pay now, in doctors' bills, taxation for public-health service, etc., for such medical care as we get. Socially and economically, it would seem sensible to organize medical services for faster progress toward the goal of medical science, which is not just care in sickness, but positive health for the individual and for the entire community."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take the remainder of the time myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reinforce the comments made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and invite attention to one or two additional points.

The amendment provides — under penalty, for violation, of imprisonment of not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than $10,000, and the repeal of the protection of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act—that health and welfare funds shall be set up, not in the manner in which the employer, the employees and their representatives may find most suitable to their local needs, but as directed by the Congress of the United States. They must be held in trust, and their purposes are to be limited to payment of medical and hospital care, pensions, sickness, disability, and accident insurance. There must be a written agreement between the employer and the employees, and employees and employers must be equally represented in the administration of the fund, and in the event of disagreement between them, machinery is provided for the settling of such disputes. In other words, it requires employer participation in the funds and in the administration of the funds. The best information I have been able to obtain is to the effect that there are now some million and a quarter employees covered by some form of health or welfare plan.

For many years the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in New York has sought to establish for its members vacation funds. It is notable that an effort to establish such a fund would, under the amendment, subject the leaders of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union to spend 1 year in jail or pay a $10,000 fine or both. I am not, for my own part, convinced that the garment workers of the city of New York are less in need of vacations than other persons in our life; indeed, I can go further and say that it seems to me affirmatively desirable that not only garment workers, but all workers, should have reasonable vacations provided for them. After many years of striving to gain this objective the garment workers now have a vacation plan to which the employers contribute and which is administered by the union, the employers not participating. This plan would be illegal under the amendment here proposed. I should be grateful if some Senator would explain to me why the effort to obtain what seems to me to be a thoroughly desirable objective, concerning which there has not been the slightest objection from the employers, the union, or the employees, should suddenly become a crime.

As a member of the committee I will state that no adequate exploration of this problem has been made either by the committee or, so far as I am aware, by anyone. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, it is a problem which needs exploration and study, but certainly not the passage of legislation at this time.

These plans operate in an infinite variety of ways. In the normal case they are administered jointly by the employer and union representatives. But there are certainly many cases where particular funds are administered solely by the trade unions. There has been no adequate exploration of the extent to which this problem is already covered under existing State law. I assume that the thought of the proponents of the measure is that the placing of large amounts of money in funds of this kind in the hands of trade-union officials may lead to improper use of such moneys, or their diversion to purposes other than those specified when the funds are established. Yet it would seem to me, as a lawyer, that if such funds are established the trade-union officials who administer them thereby become trustees, subject to all of the common law and State safeguards against misuse of funds by trustees. In other words, I think we should look to the laws already on the books so far as concerns protecting employees from the misuse of such funds by officers who violate their trust.

In all States the standards imposed on trustees are extremely high, any misuse of trust funds is universally subject to criminal penalties under State law, and there has been no demonstration that such laws are inadequate to handle the problem which the proponents of the measure profess exists. In any event, I suggest that it is frivolous for us to legislate on a matter of such importance to the working men and women of the country without having before us as a minimum the following information:

First. A detailed knowledge of the number and form of such plans, the number of employees covered by them, the purposes for which they are sought, and the methods by which they are operating, and then, having that knowledge, I think we are under an obligation to study them. A study even of the data which is available has not been made to date.

Second. The extent to which such funds are now subject to supervision of State authorities or subject to control under State laws.

Third. The informed opinion of industries in which such funds have been established concerning their modes of operations, the reaction of employees to them, and observations as to the way in which they have operated in the past.

For my own part, it seems to me that we should do everything in our power to encourage the voluntary establishment of such plans, rather than take any steps to discourage them. To the extent that industrial evils or abuses can be met by such funds, the State and Federal Governments will be relieved of the necessity of themselves making appropriate provisions for them.

When I say we ought to encourage the establishment of such funds, Mr. President, I speak as a critic of certain tendencies in American unions to which I have adverted on many previous occasions, namely, they should not become merely dues-collecting organizations, rather they should render service to their members, not only collective-bargaining service, but they should render the type of service which the objectives of most of these welfare funds seek to accomplish.

I think that what is attempted by way of an amendment such as the one now pending is the prevention of unions from being as effective by way of service to their members as they should be if they are to carry out what I consider to be the great objectives of the trade union movement. Many people do not want unions to obtain such objectives because they know that such programs will strengthen unions.

I feel confident that trade unions and employers working together are more competent to know the evils, and to provide adequately for their correction, than are the State or Federal Governments, yet I am equally confident that if industrial hazards or uncertainties are not handled by the principals, the Government will be called upon to step in and handle them for the members.

We cannot know the peculiar hazards of each industry when we sit here and vote upon such legislative proposals as the one before us. For example, silicosis is a disease peculiar to the mining industry, and I think the mining industry should grapple with the problem of welfare funds which may be necessary in order to check the spread of that deadly disease. Airline pilots have their own perils, in regard to which they may desire to negotiate, and I think properly, as to welfare funds. Phosphorous poisoning is one of the disease problems of the match industry, and I think it quite proper that we should encourage the present trend in the development of welfare funds, to provide service to the employees and the members of the unions in regard to such problems as that. Instead of looking to legislation to take care of such problems, it seems to me that we should in the first instance encourage private parties to handle the problems themselves.

We hear much criticism of the tendency toward having government solve all problems which may arise to confront the people, yet, in the face of the extremely healthy trend evident in the trade-union movement in the direction of performing services for the welfare of union members, we have legislative proposals made which would discourage that type of participation in a private enterprise system.

In closing, I wish to call attention to some of the things shown in the record of the hearings in regard to this worker welfare problem. For example, the witness, Harvey W. Brown, as appears at pages 1616 and 1617 of the record, points out that the limitation in the use of funds that is proposed does not include sickness; and Dubinsky, at page 1341, points out that it does not include unemployment. Why should they not be included? To the extent that they may be included it appears that they are narrowly circumscribed.

I desire to comment on the compulsory features of the amendment, so far as employers are concerned, because here again it will be found, as we found in the case of the industry-wide bargaining problem, that industry is far from being united in regard to what should be done concerning welfare funds.

There are a great many employers who do not want to have any participation in welfare funds; they certainly do not want to be required, by the compulsion of law, to take part in welfare funds; and yet, unless they do take part, by compulsion of law, under the pending amendment, such funds cannot be set up. I see no more reason in this instance

for imposing compulsion on employers than for imposing compulsion on unions in regard to group-insurance funds.

Employers in the garment industry and, for that matter, generally have expressed no interest in administering this fund. So says Dubinsky, testifying in regard to employers in the garment industry.

Where employers were given equal participation, many of them voluntarily asked to be relieved of it. That is the testimony of Potofsky, and also the testimony of the witness, Mr. Raymond H. Reiss, as found on pages 2320 and 2321 of the record.

It was pointed out by Dubinsky, in an argument which I think is very sound, that the cry for equal participation is more often an expression of opposition to the contribution itself. On pages 2203 and 1344 of the record will be found testimony bearing out that statement.

Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly upon statements made at the committee hearings by the distinguished chairman himself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], when the matter of welfare funds was under discussion. On page 1582 of the hearings, in a colloquy with Mr. Potofsky, the chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you could provide the joint management if you had to.

Mr. POTOFSKY. We have done it at the request of the employers. The employers who had other interests besides clothing did not want to be burdened with the responsibility of administration. We like their advice and cooperation. They did not want to be involved in it in the event some member of the union had a complaint and went to court.

The CHAIRMAN. I never did think the joint management proposal was very important. Of course, what we were trying to reach at the time this was set up was the demand made by the mine workers' union that a percentage be turned over to them for welfare with no specifications and no description of what it was to be used for. In fact, it could be used for almost any governmental purpose. It seemed to be necessary to prevent the extension of that sort of fund. Of course, in your case you would comply with those provisions that require the rights of the members be specified in the trust agreement. There is nothing in our law that interferes with you as far as that is concerned.

Mr. POTOFSKY. You would make honest businessmen and honest union officers subjected to prison and fines for no reason whatsoever. Here we have arrived at a plan and your law would subject——

The CHAIRMAN. I am assuming that we shall change the joint-management feature. What about the rest of it?

But the joint-management feature has not been changed in the amendment, Mr. President. I submit that the joint-management feature is opposed by a great many employers for just such reasons as I have set forth in the argument this morning.

There are basic objections to the amendment which I should like to summarize. First, I desire to comment upon employer interest in the fund. Is not the fund, Mr. President, really for the employees? Should not the employees, therefore, have the right to administer it? If in free collective bargaining with an employer they are able to obtain by negotiations which are entirely satisfactory to him the creation of such a fund, why should we, by law, say to the employer, "We compel you to be a participant in the administration of the fund"? I ask, Mr. President, has there been any convincing proof that the many union-administered funds have been badly administered? There have been many assertions about it in this debate; but, as a lawyer, I draw the distinction between assertion and proof. I say that one will look in vain in the record for any substantial proof indicating that the funds, generally speaking, are so badly administered as to justify a need at this time for the adoption of this particular amendment. Let us first get the proof, let us first get the evidence we need, before we adopt such an amendment as this.

Next, I wish to comment on the effect of the amendment upon collective bargaining. The Members of Congress sitting in the Capitol cannot possibly see all the problems affecting all the workers in every industry. It may be that harmony is really threatened in an industry, because of inadequate health or welfare provisions. If that is what has produced the great unrest in a certain industry; if that is what is causing a great many workers to leave one industry and seek employment in some other industry; if that is what is causing many "quickie" strikes—as I think will be found to be the case in certain industries in which at least allegations are made that the employer's orders are detrimental to the health and safety of the workers, and so, therefore, they do not intend to carry them out until the health and safety problem can be solved—I say the approach should not preclude handling the matter by free collective bargaining. That would be a much better approach than to say to the employer that he must handle this particular problem of collective bargaining in this very limited way, as provided for in the amendment.

I do not think problems such as this should be solved by congressional fiat.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think tha once again the Senate of the United States is being called upon to vote for an amendment which has not been carefully thought through, insofar as presenting the objective data that are needed to support it and to enable Senators to render a valid judgment. So I agree with the Senator from New York that this certainly is a matter that should be postponed, so far as the Congress is concerned, until further study can be given to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the sponsors of the amendment have never presented it as a final solution of the problem of welfare funds. It has been insisted that there has been a tremendous growth of such funds within the last few years. I cite the February issue of the Monthly Labor Review of the Department of Labor, which states that, whereas in 1945 only 600,000 workers were covered by such funds, in early 1947 approximately 1,250,000 were covered.

In speeches to their respective conventions last fall, both President Green of the A. F. of L. and President Murray of the CIO stated that the obtaining of welfare funds would be a major objective of the whole labor movement; and in practically every negotiation of which I have knowledge this year, one of the demands presented to employers has been a demand for a welfare fund, created by a percentage deduction from the pay roll.

All that is sought to be done by the amendment is to protect the rights of employees. After all, on any reasonable basis, payments by an employer to such a fund are in effect compensation to his employees. All that is sought to be done in the amendment is to see to it that the rights of employees in the fund are protected. The heart of the amendment is subsection (A), on page 3, which reads:

Provided, That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance.

It covers sickness insurance, contrary to the statement by the Senator from Oregon. All it will do, Mr. President, is to keep so-called welfare funds from becoming the subject of a racket, and to see that the rights of employees who, after all, earned the compensation represented by the funds are protected.

The argument has been made that the business agent of a union negotiating a welfare fund has been selected by the employees, and the Congress has no right to go back of that and question the authenticity of his agency, or question anything he does pursuant to it.

What are the facts, Mr. President, in most of the unions? Bargaining agents are selected by majority vote; not by all the employees in the unit, but by all the employees who vote in an election. Union meetings are admittedly very often attended by only a small minority of the members. As a matter of fact, I have in my hand a letter from a member of local No. 1486 of the United Steelworkers, CIO, who points out that a quorum at a meeting of that local, which includes some 350 members, is only 25 members, whereas there are 69 officers and members of the various committees. Obviously a meeting of that union might take action by the barest minority—5 or 10 percent of the members. Yet the business agent of that union, under the present procedure, on motion in that kind of a meeting, with that kind of authority, to negotiate respecting the welfare fund which is the result of the work for the employer of all the employees. I think it is a violation of section 8 (2) of the Wagner Act, which prohibits an employer's support of a union. But no complaints have been brought on that point, and it has never been decided.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I know he has very little time left, and if he does not desire to yield, very well.

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon what the Senator from Minnesota said in a previous sentence, is it his contention and

is it the contention of the sponsors of the amendment that the employees for whose benefit this fund is established cannot be trusted to administer it in their own behalf, and that they must be protected against themse'ves by the amendment which has been offered and is now before the Senate?

Mr. BALL. It is the contention of the sponsors of the amendment that the rights of the employees need to be protected against the absolute control of this fund by the officers, agents, and leaders of unions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who are selected by the employees themselves.

Mr. BALL. Who, it has been frequently alleged, and it has been proved in the courts, are not above mishandling union funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator really means, then, is that the employees who have the right to select the business agent, ought to be protected against their own right to select the business agent on the theory that he may not represent their interest, and may not properly administer their funds, although he is chosen by them to do so, and therefore the employer ought to be permitted to take it over.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a union can become a representative of all the employees in a unit by obtaining in an election a bare majority of the votes cast in that election, which may be far less than a majority of all the employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. So with a Member——

Mr. BALL. I do not yield further.

Mr. BARKLEY. So with a Member of the Senate. He can come here if elected by a bare majority.

Mr. BALL. The business agent to represent them may be selected by much less than the majority of all the employees who are members of the union. The action authorizing the business agent to negotiate with respect to the question of a welfare fund may be taken at a union meeting at which only 10 or even 5 percent of the members are present.

The amendment covers not only union members who presumably have some voice in the selection of the business agent, but all employees.

I have a copy of the plan of group insurance for members of the retail clerks welfare fund, local 1049 (AFL) and the first point is that—

> By motion of our union, members of the fund consist of only those people who are regular members of the Union whose employer has signed for the welfare fund. As a further condition precedent each member must be approved by the Trustees

What kind of control over the membership does such a provision affecting a welfare fund give to the leadership of the union? Obviously members who get out of line in a meeting are likely to be disapproved by the trustees. If they fall behind in their dues they lose their rights to the benefits which, after all, they have earned by their own labor. All we are trying to do is to protect their rights in the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, I cannot do so. I should like to finish, and after I have finished I shall be glad to yield.

I have a letter from a sportswear dealer in Philadelphia who says that he pays 4½ percent of his gross pay roll to the International Garment Workers' Union. In return they are supposed to benefit the employees with a week's vacation and a health center. He says that—

> Each employee gets less than one full week's vacation, and when they are sick they are supposed to get $10 each week. When the employee's sickness runs over two or three weeks, they have a hard time getting the sick benefit money due them. I know this as a fact, as I had this experience happen to my employees in my factory.

In regard to the fund which is set up to provide for paid vacations for the employees, the same correspondent writes that—

> When a union member does not pay his dues or his assessments, the first thing that is attached is the 4½-percent fund. For an illustration, if an employee is to get $40 for vacation out of this fund, and if they are $6 behind in dues and assessments they only get $34.

In other words, when the union has complete control of this fund, when there is no detailed provision in the agreement creating the fund respecting the benefits which are to go to employees, the union and its leadership will always come first in the administration of the fund, and the benefits to which the employees supposedly are entitled will come second.

Mr. President, all we seek to do by the amendment is to make sure that the employees whose labor builds this fund and who are really entitled to benefits under it shall receive the benefits; that it is a trust fund, and that, if necessary, they can go into court and obtain the benefits to which they are entitled.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply wanted to inquire whether all these funds were not trust funds, and if so, does not the court of chancery of the State have full jurisdiction to do practically what the amendment proposes to do?

Mr. BALL. No; they are not trust funds. They are not set up in the agreements as trust funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The answer is that the amendment requires that there be specified in the agreement the exact terms under which benefits are to be received. The complete terms with respect to benefits must be set out in the agreement. If it is only a trust fund for welfare purposes, with no specific terms or regulations, a court of chancery cannot write a welfare fund system into it. The court has no power to do that. No single employee can bring suit under such a general fund provision and prove that he personally has any rights whatever in the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had in mind that at least he could require an accounting under the terms of the fund.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; he could require an accounting, but the accounting may show that the money has been spent to establish a school in some district, or provide an advantage to a certain number of individuals to whom the union wanted to give money, and not to others. He would have no individual rights unless there were provision in law for the inclusion of specific terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Wagner
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. BALL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is necessarily absent on public business. If the Senator from Rhode Island were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine, if present, would vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and the Senator from Maine is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin would

vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is absent by leave of the Senate on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—48

Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Fulbright	Overton
Bricker	George	Reed
Bridges	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo
Buck	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bushfield	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Jenner	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	McCarthy	Thye
Capehart	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McKellar	Umstead
Cordon	Martin	Vandenberg
Donnell	Millikin	Watkins
Dworshak	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	O'Conor	Williams

NAYS—40

Aiken	Kilgore	Myers
Barkley	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lodge	Revercomb
Cooper	Lucas	Saltonstall
Downey	McCarran	Sparkman
Ecton	McFarland	Taylor
Ellender	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Magnuson	Wagner
Hill	Malone	Wilson
Ives	Maybank	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	

NOT VOTING—7

Baldwin	Holland	Wiley
Green	Tobey	
Hatch	White	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL, for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORARY DEGREE RECEIVED BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on yesterday one of the distinguished Members of this body received a very signal honor in his own city of New York. The distinguished and brilliant senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] was given an honorary degree by the College of the City of New York, in his own home town. I cannot resist congratulating him at this time, and I know that many other Senators also wish to do so. I am sure that the Senate of the United States is as proud as he is that that degree has been conferred on one of its Members.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 53)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Post Office Department, amounting to $10,924,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CHECKS

A letter signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were 853,450 men on active duty on March 31, 1947, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

OFFICES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the housing laws in such manner as to allow the occupancy of housing units by families other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families

"Whereas present Federal legislation covering the subject of housing, particularly with reference to occupancy, as set forth in title V of Public Law 849 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, specifically restricts occupants of dwelling units constructed thereto to distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families; and

"Whereas, in addition to distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families, there are many other classes of distressed persons in the Territory of Hawaii who are unable to obtain dwelling accommodations; and

"Whereas these conditions cause an increase in and spread of disease, infant mortality, juvenile delinquency and crime, and constitute a danger and menace to the health and welfare of the inhabitants of the communities of the Territory generally; and

"Whereas about 45 percent of the applicants for such housing are such distressed persons, other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families for whom the Territory of Hawaii and the Hawaii Housing Authority have no housing available: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation amending the above-mentioned title V of Public Law 849 of the Seventy-sixth Congress in such manner as to except housing in the Territory of Hawaii, developed and administered thereunder, from the mentioned provisions relating to the occupancy of such housing, and to permit such housing to be occupied by other classes of distressed persons, in addition to distressed families of servicemen and veterans and their families, in the proportion that the number of such other distressed applicants bears to the total number of applicants for such housing; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority of the United States, and to the director of region 6 of the Federal Public Housing Authority."

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring action by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the plan proposed by the United States in dealing with the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit the use of at least six live-duck decoys to each blind in the central zone or migratory States while continuing the present prohibition in the Northern and Southern States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BROOKS on May 5, 1947, p. 4462, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. THYE:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing certain pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II

"Whereas the primary obligation to assist veterans who have served their country in time of war rests upon the Federal Government; and

"Whereas more than 26 years have elapsed since the cease-fire order was given on November 11, 1918, bringing to an end actual combat in World War I; and

"Whereas there survive 3,752,600 veterans of World I ranging in age from 44 years to 90 years, with an average age of 54 years; and

"Whereas the death rate of these veterans exceeds by 12 percent the death rate of nonveterans of corresponding age, resulting in 49,511 deaths among them in 1946, and the deaths of 1,011,469 since the end of World War I; and

"Whereas, many of the survivors suffer from disabilities related to their war service which they have never been able to establish, and many others are acquiring disabilities relating to their age; and

"Whereas their service to their country in a time of peril should be recognized by their Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for veterans of World War I and World War II pensions in the sum of $75 per month at age 60; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the Minnesota Territorial Centennial in 1949

"Whereas the organic act of Congress to establish the Territory of Minnesota was enacted March 3, 1849; and

"Whereas plans are being made for a Statewide celebration of this centennial in 1949; and

"Whereas in other State observances commemorative coins have been issued by the United States Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*, That Congress be requested to enact such legislation as is necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half-dollar coins, dated 1949; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Historical Society upon payment therefor and that said society be, and it hereby is, authorized to arrange for the sale and distribution thereof; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of State, and Congress of the United States to direct our representatives in the United Nations to support the long-established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration

"Whereas at the 1945 general session of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota a joint resolution was adopted approving the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national home as called for by the Balfour Declaration and the mandate entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations, and calling for the abrogation of the white paper restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine and limiting the purchase of land in Palestine by Jews; and

"Whereas, since the adoption of said resolution, said restrictions have continued, and the displaced Jewish persons of Europe have been prevented from finding in Palestine the home which had been promised to them by 52 nations of the world, including the United States of America; and

"Whereas the attainment of a just peace and the maintenance of a peaceful world requires a righteous and equitable settlement of the Palestine question, to the end that the hundreds of thousands of homeless Jews of Europe may, as of right, be afforded the opportunity to enter Palestine and there reestablish the Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the United Nations, at the request of Great Britain as the mandatory power, is convening a special session of its General Assembly to consider the Palestine matter on April 28, 1947: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Government of the United States, through the State Department and the President, direct our representatives in the United Nations to support the long-established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation, be now enacted permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States

"Whereas an inequity exists between the citizens and residents of the several States of the United States in that residents of nine States having community-property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income-tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of the 39 States not having community-property laws; and

"Whereas, by reason of the premises, legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States, which fact gives rise to a discrimination in respect of income taxes which should be removed; and

"Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequity by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized now to enact into law, as a part of the Internal Revenue Code, H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; and be it

"*Resolved*, That the attention of the Congress of the United States be invited to other bills now pending in the United States Senate and in the United States House of Representatives embodying the principle of the aforesaid Reeves bill (H. R. 1759), among which bills are the following: Amendment to H. R. 1 (Knutson bill), introduced by Mr. BUTLER; S. 626, introduced by Mr. CORDON; S. 649, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS; S. 550, introduced by Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2219, introduced by Mr. ANGELL; H. R. 2002, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON; which principle is hereby approved and recommended for enactment by the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 122 citizens of Garnett, Kans., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 1,721 citizens and voters of Kent and Sussex Counties, Del., praying for the enactment of S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The petition calls attention to the pernicious effect of this advertising in that it is a constant invitation and enticement to drink. It furthermore points out that the American people expended $7,707,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942, and that during this period there has been a corresponding increase each year in crime.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 512. A bill to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; with amendments (Rept. No. 158); and

S. 597. A bill to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 159); and

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture; with amendments (Rept. No. 160), and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of March 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

APRIL 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; amount $7,102.20.

Walter E. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW.; Bureau of Internal Revenue; amount, $5,905.20; to March 25, 1947.

O. BREWSTER,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1246. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the actual

or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1247. A bill to rescind Executive Order No. 7868, April 15, 1938; and

S. 1248. A bill to provide that moneys received from certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1249. A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 1250. A bill for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WILSON) introduced Senate bill 1251, to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program, to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and other plants on a Nation-wide scale, to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1252. A bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL SOIL-FERTILITY POLICY AND PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and my colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program. I suggest that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1251) to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program, to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and other plants on a Nation-wide scale, to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. THYE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WILSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPRESENTATION OF SMALL BUSINESSMEN ON GOVERNMENT POLICY-MAKING BODIES

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the 3,650,000 small business concerns in the United States are owned and operated, on the average, by 2½ persons or a total of 9,125,000 persons, constituting 92 percent of our entire economy; and

Whereas these concerns employ about 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners and produce about 45 percent of our entire output of commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small businessman of America to equal representation as an entity, with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be and hereby are respectfully urged to accord the small businessman of America representation on such Government agencies including particularly policy-making bodies created by executive appointment.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, WELFARE, AND EDUCATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1239, to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The latter committee now has before it a bill dealing with the general question of the reorganization of the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, and Senate bill 1239 comes within the scope of that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter concerning the portal-to-portal pay bill, addressed to the President of the United States, and signed by various persons, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF REV. DR. JOSEPH TISO—EDITORIAL FROM THE MESSENGER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Victim," dealing with the execution of Rev. Joseph Tiso, wartime President of Slovakia, published in the Messenger, official publication of the diocese of Belleville, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

PUTTING THE PRESSURE ON CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STROUT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Putting the Pressure on Congress," written by Richard L. Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor, May 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Washington Post of May 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW A LOBBY TRICKS—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How A Lobby Tricks," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?—POEM BY HAROLD C. PATCH

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an original poem entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" written by Harold C. Patch, of Perkinsville, Vt., which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS OF EUROPE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MCGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "People Without Countries," published in the New York Times of May 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STORY OF NEW HAVEN'S INDUSTRIES—BY HENRY H. TOWNSHEND

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Story of New Haven's Industries," written by Henry H. Townshend, and published in the Journal of the Union and New Haven Trust Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

LUCAS OFFERS A TAX PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lucas Offers a Tax Plan," from the Chicago Sun for Sunday, May 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION—ATTITUDE OF ALEXANDER WHITNEY TOWARD CLOSED SHOP

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement at this time because I must go to a committee meeting. On May 1, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4362, in regard to an interview I had with Mr. Alexander Whitney some 5 or 6 years ago, at which time he told me of an incident which had occurred in a convention of railway employees held many years ago. A delegate to the convention offered a resolution which provided that no man should be permitted to work on a railroad unless he belonged to a union, whereupon, the president of the railroad brotherhood, stepping to the front of the platform, said, "I urge the gentleman who offered this resolution to withdraw it; and, in the event of his failure to withdraw it, I urge the delegates to defeat it, because in my opinion the people of the United

States do not want anyone to be forced to join a union in order to work."

I went on to say further that the president of the union said, "Let us make our union so good and so efficient in the service they render that the workers will want to join them in order to obtain the benefits they will receive as members of the union."

I do not want to leave any false impression. Mr. Whitney seemed to feel that I left the impression with the Senate that he was opposed to the closed shop, and he telegraphed me, asking me to make a correction or statement so there would be no misunderstanding in the minds of Senators.

I simply wish to say that Mr. Whitney, at that meeting in my office, 5 or 6 years ago, definitely told me he thought there should not be an enforced closed shop, but that he believed, where an employer and the employees voluntarily agreed that a closed shop was in the interest of all, it should be permissible.

I had no intention of leaving with the Senate, and I do not believe I did, the impression that Mr. Whitney was against the closed shop, because I knew that Mr. Whitney had appeared at the House hearings and had offered amendments which clearly showed that he now believes that a closed shop should be admissible if the employer and the employees are in favor of it.

I make this statement on the floor of the Senate in order that there may be no misunderstanding of anything I may have said regarding Mr. Whitney.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any person to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction in proceedings instituted by or on behalf of the United States, or by any party suffering loss or damage or threatened with loss or damage by reason of any violation of subsection (a), to prevent and restrain violations of such subsection. It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to prevent and restrain violations of such subsection.

(c) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover the damages by him sustained, and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

(d) The provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and the provisions (except sec. 7, exclusive of clauses (c) and (e) and secs. 11 and 12) of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, shall not be applicable in respect of violations of subsection (a), or in respect of any contract, combination, or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce, to which a labor organization is a party, if one of the purposes of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, distribution, or competition, or impose restrictions or conditions upon the purchase, sale, or use of any material, machines, or equipment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not want to unnecessarily take up the time of the Senate, and I have no intention of making a long speech, nor is it my intention to go into any detailed discussion of the pending bill, because I feel that the subject has been fully covered from all angles.

As I see it, the big issue upon which the Senate is called upon to vote at this time is the fundamental question of whether we shall or shall not pass legislation the purpose of which is to establish fair and equitable laws governing the relationship between employer and employee.

In many statements carried by the press recently and in some discussions here on the floor of the Senate, question has been brought out as to whether the Senate in passing legislation should attempt to so "tailor" that legislation as to meet the desires of the executive department of Government. I should like to make my position on that point very clear. I have always contended that the Constitution of the United States established three separate branches of government: The legislative, the executive, and the judicial. I have always contended that good government required a definite and clear recognition of that constitutional provision, and that there should be no disposition on the part of any branch of government to interfere with another branch of government. I am persuaded that the question for us to determine is what is the best labor legislation to pass, and then it will be up to the President of the United States to determine, when the bill reaches his desk, whether he desires to sign it.

If you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, you will find that when I entered the United States Senate about 5 years ago I stated at that time, in the first speech I made on the floor of the United States Senate, that as a Senator it would be my purpose to study carefully all matters of legislation presented, and to decide about it on a basis of what was best for the general welfare of the country, and that when I did that I would not be concerned about whether my vote received the blessings of the gentleman who then occupied the White House. That was my position at that time, when the New Deal was flowering in full bloom. It has been my position since and it is still my position.

When I first entered the United States Senate, I came to the office of Senator from that of Governor of the State of Texas. We were at that time about to enter a World War. I then thought that I could foresee grave danger to the war effort and grave danger to the welfare of this Nation if Congress did not act promptly to curb the unbridled power which had been placed in the hands of irresponsible labor leaders. I then urged amendments to the wage-hour law, and if those changes had been made, they would have discouraged wartime strikes which retarded the war effort, and would have prevented the mass of portal-to-portal suits which later engulfed this Nation.

I recommended that, both by constitutional amendment and by statute, the open shop be established as the principle of employer-employee relations throughout this Nation. I advocated the enactment of legislation which would protect the honest workman of this Nation, who sought to follow a lawful vocation, from the assaults of the goon squads and the labor racketeers. I urged the enactment of legislation that would prevent racketeers from collecting fees from honest workmen, solely for granting to them a permit to work on essential production necessary to the war effort.

I urged then that the National Labor Relations Act be so amended as not only to protect employees from coercion by employers, but also to protect employees from coercion by labor-union agents. I urged the enactment of legislation that would make labor unions responsible under the law, in the same way that all other citizens are responsible under the law. I introduced specific measures designed to accomplish these objectives. Those things I did about 5 years ago, Mr. President.

I offer no criticism for the delay of Congress in finally getting around to action on those suggestions. I am glad to be able finally to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and lend my support to legislation today which is designed to accomplish those broad objectives.

The only objection I can offer to the legislation which we are about to vote on, is based on the fact that in my humble opinion, although I regard is as highly constructive, I do not believe it goes as far as such legislation should go. Frankly, I should like very much to have an opportunity to vote for the labor bill which passed the House of Representatives, but I realize that in the passage of all legislation in the end there must be a meeting of the minds of at least a majority of those charged with the responsibility of enacting laws. I am persuaded that we shall enact some constructive labor legislation at this session of the Congress.

If anyone has any doubt about the need for amending the National Labor Relations Act, all on earth it would be necessary to do would be to read the report of the Smith committee which investigated the National Labor Relations Board several years ago.

Mr. President, I think all of my colleagues in the Senate know that I am not exceedingly fond of any Government bureaucrats, but I do want to state for the RECORD, here and now, that I think the present National Labor Relations Act is the worst piece of legislation ever enacted by the Congress of the United States. Furthermore, I think it has been the worst administered of any single piece of legislation ever enacted in the United States. I think the welfare of this country demands that the proposed revision of that law be made, and that it be made at the earliest possible date. I am fully persuaded that the amendment of that law would in no sense damage the welfare and the progress of legitimate labor organizations. I think it would serve to protect the workingman. I think it would serve to protect the rights of the employer, and at the same time protect the interest of the general public.

Mr. President, I think no other Member of the United States Senate is more sympathetic than I am toward the cause of the laboring people. When I say "laboring people," I mean the honest men and women who toil; I do not mean the communistic labor-leader racketeers who do not toil, but who live in luxury at the expense of those who are honest and who toil to make an honest living. I believe firmly in the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and I believe in the right of labor to strike during peacetime, when necessary. I think these are fundamental rights which should be, and which are in the proposed legislation, adequately protected.

I believe that labor unions, as such, should be granted the same protection that other citizens are granted.

I believe that labor unions should be made responsible under the laws with which other citizens must comply. I do not think anyone is justified in giving labor unions legal immunity when they practice coercion, or when they seek to exercise the secondary boycott, or when they engage in violence, or when they seek to evade their responsibility for damages with which they may rightly be charged. There is no reason on earth why we should allow labor unions special exemption from laws with which all other citizens must comply.

Without going into a detailed discussion of the pending legislation, Mr. President, I express it as my opinion that it is a fair summarization of this legislation to say that its broad general purpose is to make some progress toward making these vast organizations of labor responsible under the law of the land, at least approximately as responsible as other people are.

The trouble with this Nation today is that for many years the fundamental purpose of government was prostituted by the New Deal, and legislation was enacted to curry favor with the big labor bosses in order that at election time the votes of those mass organizations would be available. I hope we have reached the end of that road. I believe that when the people on November 5, of last year, voted a change in the power of the Congress of the United States, they had two things fundamentally in mind.

One was that they wanted to see the Congress enact labor legislation which would make those labor bosses responsible under the law, the same as other citizens are. I think the people voted for a new Congress in the belief that this Congress would break the stranglehold which those labor racketeers had on the throat of the American people. So far as I am concerned, I expect to cast my vote to carry out that purpose.

There is another thing the people had in mind last November.

Mr. President, I believe the people of this Nation at that time voted for a change in the Congress because they believed the time had come when we should move constructively to reestablish free enterprise in this country, and that we should so amend our tax laws as to give the average citizen of this Nation not only an opportunity to make money, but to keep part of what he makes. If I correctly analyze the thinking of the American people, it was the desire and the determination to achieve these two major reforms which brought about a change in the parties controlling the Congress of the United States.

I have never been exceeding concerned when I cast my ballot about whether I was voting with Republicans or voting with Democrats, but I have been concerned about whether or not I was voting right, and at this time I am positive that in voting for constructive labor legislation I am voting right, and I am equally certain I am voting for what the American people want. I believe that if either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party falters in achieving these two major objectives—constructive labor legislation and constructive tax reduction—the people when they get a chance to vote on the issue again will reemphasize the position which they have already taken.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is anything seriously wrong with either our domestic or foreign affairs that another good national election cannot cure. I have implicit faith in the rank and file of the people of our Nation after they finally catch up with their public servants and learn the whole truth about what has been going on.

If the republican form of government is to be continued in this Nation, if free private enterprise is to be continued, if the right of individuals are to be protected, as the framers of the Constitution of the United States believed they would be protected, then constructive labor legislation, at least going as far as we are proposing to go at this time, becomes absolutely essential. There is only one thing that would give me more satisfaction than that which I will derive from supporting the legislation now proposed, and that would be to vote for even stronger labor legislation.

When I refer to stronger labor legislation, Mr. President, I mean legislation that will free the honest laboring men and women of this Nation, and the honest consumers of this Nation, from domination by the iron rule of the ruthless communistic labor-leader racketeers who have enslaved the working people to such an extent that they cannot work on any job without first buying a work-permit card, and then taxing the consumers hundreds of millions of dollars annually to support their racket.

Mr. President, I was born in poverty, and reared by hard-working parents. I have performed hard manual labor much of my life. I understand the problems and hardships of the laboring people, and my sympathies are with the sons and daughters of toil. I never have advocated or supported any legislation except that which I considered to be beneficial to the working class of people. I am one who believes that the rank and file of the working people of this Nation are possessed of abundant brains and common sense, and that they do not need any big-time fat-headed bosses to tell them when to work, when not to work, where to work, and where not to work, and what their own talents and services are worth.

The honest laboring men and women of America built this country into the mightiest Nation on earth, and they did it without the aid of any communistic racketeers to mislead them. I am in favor of giving back to the working people the freedom and liberty to which they are entitled and which they once enjoyed, so that America can turn from the left and continue to the right on the road to a greater and greater America of tomorrow.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. President, that while the pending legislation is not nearly as good as it should be, I

yet consider it to be the nearest thing to a laboring man's bill of rights that has passed the Senate during the past 14 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am loath to mention again what I have said several times, that I think the wise procedure for the Senate to follow would be to drop the amendments and proceed to vote on the bill as reported by the committee, and leave the matter of final consideration of the bill with the conference committee. There seems to be a disposition not to follow such a course, but a definite disposition on the part of those who have offered amendments to carry the amendment program through, and attempt to make the bill as strong as it was originally written, before the committee took it under consideration and made several changes.

Mr. President, in the amendment which has just been adopted there is reference again to the injunctive process. In the amendment which is before us now there is reference to that process. In the portal-to-portal pay bill as agreed to in conference and now awaiting the signature of the President of the United States there is another reference to the injunctive process.

It seems to me there is a disposition on the part of individuals and organizations that for years had access to the courts in an effort to settle labor disputes, to reintroduce into our country's practice once more all the confusion, all the unfairness, and all the injustice, which grew up under the use of the injunctive process as practiced before the Norris-LaGuardia Act became law.

I am fearful about a return to the conditions of those times, because it would mean absolutely no justice at all to the laboring man who undertook to strike. Time in its simple essence means everything to those who are striking. Any kind of a slowing up process, of course, makes a strike all the harder to endure, and makes it all the harder for a strike to succeed. I cannot see but that we are taking a step about as backward as any step we have taken in the history of our country when not merely in one amendment but in two amendments, and in two major bills, if the pending bill shall become the law of the land, we offer an open invitation to the courts to interfere and an open invitation to the attorneys who want to take advantage of the law to interfere in labor disputes.

Mr. President, I am not the only one who fears a return to the use of the injunctive process in labor disputes. In a report of the case against John W. Lewis, in the Supreme Court of the United States, there is recited a bit of Senate history in regard to the reintroduction of the injunctive process, with emphasis on the fact that as late as the date of passage of the Smith-Connally Act, the Senate, and, therefore, the Congress, refused to act upon an amendment designed to do what will be done by the pending amendments, if adopted—that is, to return to the situation that existed prior to the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

For the purpose of the record, so as to make the point clear, and to bring home to Senators the complete reversal of policy within the course of 3 or 4 years, I want to read from the concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Frankfurter. I am happy to read from this opinion because it emphasizes the fact that the Senate understood the danger, and that it avoided stepping into the position which Senators seemingly bid fair to step into today. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, at page 62 of the report, said:

By the War Labor Disputes Act, Congress created a new relationship among the Government, the plant owners, the employees. The rights, duties, remedies incident to that relation are those given by the act. Congress naturally addressed itself to possible interferences with the Government's operation of seized plants. It dealt specifically with this subject. It gave the Government specific remedies which it might invoke against such interference. Remedy by injunction was not given. It was not merely omitted. A fair reading of the legislative history shows that it was expressly and definitively denied. As reported out of the Senate committee, S. 796 provided for plant seizure. It did not include the injunction among the remedies for interference with Government operation. But when the bill reached the floor of the Senate, Senator CONNALLY, sponsor of the bill, offered and urged an amendment giving the district courts jurisdiction to restrain violations of the measure.

Set forth in a footnote to the opinion are the remarks made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in the course of the discussion, as follows:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. • • •

"I am very anxious that there shall be additional statutory protection to the uninterrupted production of war necessities, but I am wondering whether, in order to achieve that purpose, it is necessary for me to impinge upon a very profound hostility I have always had to the use of injunctions in labor disputes. I voted for the original Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I have always felt that one of the most useful things we ever did, not only as a matter of fair play but in respect to the status of the courts, was substantially to separate from court jurisdiction the responsibility of in effect umpiring labor disputes.

"What I wish to ask the able Senator from Texas, if I may, is this: In his proposal, on page 4, it is provided that any person who willfully violates any provision of the act is to be guilty of a felony and subject to a fine or imprisonment. Is not that a conclusive penalty? Is it necessary, in addition, to go back into all the old injunctive process in connection with labor disputes?"

Mr. President, note how fearful the Senate was that the amendment might become an invitation to return to the injunctive process. The recently enacted portal-to-portal pay legislation is such an invitation. The amendment which was adopted by the Senate a few moments ago constitutes another invitation. The pending amendment is a third invitation. To any fair-minded person, it would seem to me to be apparent that Senators, by their vote on the amendment just agreed to, have repudiated the philosophy of the Senator from Michigan; they not only want to extend an invitation to the courts to employ the injunctive process in labor disputes, but they are almost making it compulsory.

"Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a legal inquiry really. Of course, it might be that we could get along without the provision. Like the Senator, I voted for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I favored the policy embodied therein. This provision, however, applies only to plants taken over by the Government. It seems to me that if the Government is to operate a plant, it should have the widest and the fullest authority to operate it as it wants to do and to prevent interruption. Therefore, because of the attitude of some who were interested in the bill, I inserted section 5. I do not think the bill would be very seriously crippled if it were eliminated, but I think it is improved by its remaining in. I do not think it would be fatal to strike out that provision, but I hope that will not be done.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his frank statement. When the Government has taken over the operation of a plant and it becomes in essence a Government operation, it is rather difficult to resist the argument that the Government should not be deprived of any instrumentality in the enforcement, virtually of its sovereignty.

"Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. Nevertheless, I apprehend that the very fact that the injunctive process is restored in the Senator's bill is the reason why it appears in the additional amendment offered by the able Senator from Ohio, where, it seems to me, it becomes decidedly more offensive, using that word in the sense in which I have used it."

The reference is to an amendment proposed by Senator TAFT authorizing injunctions in any circuit court of appeals at the request of the Attorney General in case of failure to obey orders of the War Labor Board, or whenever "operations are hindered or reduced by lock-out, strike, or otherwise." This applied apparently to plants in private operation.

That ends the footnote. Mr. Justice Frankfurter continues:

He accepted, somewhat reluctantly, the amendment of Senator WAGNER to limit the proposed amendment to an injunction at the behest of the Attorney General, precisely as was here sought and granted. On motion of Senator Danaher, this proposal was rejected by the Senate after full debate, participated in by Senators especially conversant with the history and scope of the existing remedies available to the Government. With this remedy denied to the Government, the bill was passed and sent to the House. The House did not like the bill. Its version did not see fit specifically to add to the limited-seizure provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940, although apparently it assumed that there could be seizure under existing law in the case of failure by defense plants to produce as a result of labor troubles. Instead, the House version provided stringent antistrike and antilockout provisions as to plants in private operation, and by specific amendment to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the district courts were authorized to restrain violations of such provisions. But this pro tanto repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia Act was not made available to the United States as a remedy against interference with operation of plants seized under the earlier 1940 act.

The bill then went to conference. What came out was, so far as here material, the bill that had passed the Senate. The United States was granted power to seize and operate defense plants whose production was hampered by labor disputes. Specific remedies were formulated by Congress against interference with the Government's operation. The injunction was not included. In neither House was further attempt made to reintroduce the Connally proposal giving the Government relief by injunction. Nor was it suggested that the Government had such redress under existing law. On the floor of the Senate, Senator THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, said:

"Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Danaher], and the Senator

from Texas [Mr. Connally], the sponsor of the bill, whether there is a unanimous opinion on the part of those three great lawyers that there will not be a reopening of the district courts to industry-labor disputes? * * * I should like that point to be made so firmly and so strongly that no lawyer in the land who would like to take advantage of the situation created by the mere mention of the words 'district court' will resort to the court in order to confuse our industry-labor relations.'

Mr. CONNALLY answered:

"Mr. President, * * * I think I speak for the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut and also the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Van Nuys], although he is not present, when I say that there is no jurisdiction whatever conferred by this bill providing for resort to the United States district court, except the one mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut, which is merely the right to go there for a civil action for damages, and no jurisdiction whatever is given over labor disputes. Does that answer the Senator?"

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making that statement and I hope it will satisfy the lawyers of the country.

"Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it will."

Under these circumstances the bill became law, and the seizure giving rise to this controversy was made under that law. The separate items of this legislative history cannot be judged in isolation. They must be considered together, and as part of the course of legislation dealing with injunctions in labor disputes. To find that the Government has the right which Senator CONNALLY'S amendment sought to confer but which the Congress withheld is to say that voting down the amendment had the same effect as voting it up.

Events since the passage of the act underscore what would appear to be the controlling legislative history of the War Labor Disputes Act, and prove that Congress saw fit not to authorize district courts to issue an injunction in cases like this. To meet the grave crisis growing out of the strike on the railroads last May, Congress, upon the recommendation of the President and the Attorney General, deemed additional legislation necessary for dealing with labor disputes. The proposals in each House carried a provision which authorized an injunction to issue for violation of the War Labor Disputes Act. Senator Mead proposed an amendment to delete the provisions for injunctions. In the debates that followed no one suggested that the new proposal was unnecessary, that the jurisdiction proposed to be conferred already existed, or that if granted, as requested by the Attorney General, it would not, as Senator Mead claimed, repeal pro tanto the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The debates show clearly that what was contemplated was a change in the War Labor Disputes Act, whereby a new and an additional remedy would be authorized.

Mr. President, there is a footnote at this point which I should like to read:

See, particularly, the statements of Senator Mead (p. 6023), Senator Morse (pp. 6021, 6022), Senator Pepper (pp. 6022, 6023), Senator Wagner (p. 6022), Senator Wheeler (p. 6025), Senator Barkley (p. 6028), Senator Fulbright (p. 6024).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter continued:

The bill never became law. As is well known, as the debates clearly shows, as Senator CONNALLY admitted, the War Labor Disputes Act was directed primarily against stoppage in the coal mines.

At this point I read another footnote:

Senator CONNALLY said, "Mr. Lewis appeared before the Truman Committee 3 or 4 weeks ago. I happen to be a member of that committee, and when he said he did not regard his no-strike agreement as binding * * * I determined then that if I could get this bill before the Senate, I was going to bring it up and press it in order that if he did disregard the agreement, the President or the Government of the United States would have a weapon with which to meet the threat and the danger" (89 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3886).

I continue to read from Justice Frankfurter's opinion:

The situation that Congress feared was exactly that which has occurred and which underlies this controversy. To deal with the situation, Congress gave the United States the power to seize the mines. To effectuate this power, the Government was given authority to invoke criminal penalties for interferences with the operation of the mines. Senator CONNALLY sought more. He wanted Congress to empower the district courts to enjoin interference. The Senate did not want an injunction to issue and voted the proposal down. The Senate's position was adopted by the conference committee. The House of Representatives yielded its view and approved the conference report. The whole course of legislation indicates that Congress withheld the remedy of injunction. This Court now holds that Congress authorized the injunction.

I concur in the Court's opinion insofar as it is not inconsistent with these views, and, under the compulsion of the ruling of the majority that the court below had jurisdiction to issue its orders, I join in the Court's judgment.

Mr. President, I, of course, do not want to pass judgment upon the decision of the Supreme Court. I am not interested here in taking sides in the controversy in regard to that issue. I am interested merely in the one simple fact, which is that what the Congress of the United States feared, and what especially the Senate of the United States feared when it discussed the problem, was of so great importance at the time that the Senate decided to leave the invitation to use the injunctive process out of the bill, and it was never included in it. Now come these invitations one after another, so that by the time the bill receives the President's signature and becomes law, in addition to the portal-to-portal legislation, the injunctive process in labor disputes will have been restored into the practice and the law of the land to such extent that the Norris-LaGuardia Act will have become absolutely and completely a dead letter. If that is what Senators want to do, that is exactly what they are going to accomplish. If they feel that the restoration of that unjust process is going to bring labor peace to our country I think they are mistaken beyond words, and I think that anyone who knows the history of our country knows what the result will be.

Mr. President, I wish to turn to some of the other provisions of the bill. I want to repeat what I said in regard to the sensible handling of the bill, and show, by a rather formal statement, that the bill was handled in a very remarkable way by our committee. In this connection I wish to speak of the Reorganization Act, and commend what those of us who were on the Reorganization Committee did. One of our anticipations has been realized, because day after day and week after week there was a full attendance of all 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the consideration of the bill. No bill in my experience in Congress has received better consideration in committee than did this bill. I believe that the committee, regardless of any feelings about the outcome, regardless of how individual Senators may vote, deserves the commendation of the Senate for the serious way in which it discussed and debated the provisions of the bill. Literally we debated for hours many of its provisions.

I start with the observation that, practically speaking, the field of debate necessarily runs the entire range from the President's recommendations, up through S. 1126 as amended and reported. S. 1126 as was hoped it might be reported, and the amendments intended to be adopted to S. 1126. All of these lie in the long shadow of the House bill, which has passed the House and is the very next bill on the Senate Calendar to S. 1126. So any consideration of labor amendments and acts which would ignore the entire range of possibilities would be optimistic to say the least. In this instance, with anything on the calendar, everything is on the calendar, the sky is the limit, and the nonvigilant stands to lose his shirt. Indeed, the amendments intended to be proposed, as printed, indicate the buoyancy felt by some members of this committee toward matters on which they were outvoted in committee. They frankly hope for better going on the floor. So far in this debate they have had better going in every particular except one.

S. 1126 as reported has been carefully analyzed in the reports, parts 1 and 2, and in the latter a record has been made of the objections thereto. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have discussed at some length the points contained in the minority report filed by me on behalf of the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Florida, and myself. This report, too, has anticipated some of the amendments and met them critically. In view of these facts, I shall not be overanalytical with respect to the pending bill as it lies on the calendar before us, and as it was reported from committee.

Instead, I shall deal simply, and I hope clearly, with the very real threats to our liberty, as we have come to enjoy it, that could eventuate through a radical and careless treatment of labor amendments influenced by passion or pique. Any return to the shameful conditions of the early thirties when labor had its charter would be so palpably brutal as to be fraught with danger. Because coal has been so much in people's minds let us take coal, and recall the reign of terror in an important coal-mining area of Kentucky, brought about by oppression of workingmen and their families in almost every known and conceivable form. I sat through hearing after hearing. The return to a combination of cruel management interlocked with abusive local government is a frightening prospect, the more so in the face of the fact that a little taste of freedom has been enjoyed.

Surely the minority report to accompany S. 1126 suggests a better way out

than simply to open up to management the opportunities to conquer labor in the old associated-industries manner, so that again company police, company jails, company commissaries, and company scrip, backed by Federal law and by local government iniquities, might combine to picture to the workingman the true hopelessness of being born to do honest toil.

Mr. President, this is not the first time I have called attention to this fact, and I know the Senate will forgive me; but the civil-liberties hearings did not continue merely for months. They continued for years. The abuses which were disclosed during the course of those hearings will stay in my mind as long as I live.

Furthermore, I think it is not out of place to call attention to the fact that during the great coal strike of 1922 all the coal mines in my State were under martial law. I was sent by the governor to administer martial law at the mines, and to command the troops there. I know what these things mean from first-hand knowlege. I know the feeling of terror on the part of those engaged in the coal strike, and their conviction that no such thing as justice existed for them.

In my separate opinion I credited the present Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the ability and the capacity necessary to a thorough and useful consideration of this subject. The 13 members of this committee locked themselves in a room, juror fashion, for many hours. I honestly believe that its 13 members could not, if they were permitted to stay at the controls, bring themselves to be punitive toward labor, or to become overemotional about our problem, to vitiate any of our important acts, or to destroy the hope of those who have emerged from a long class struggle. I say this for the simple reason that rubbing elbows with the unions either actually or from hard study of their activities is good for the soul. Many an individual who might not otherwise have been at all liberal has become partly so, through intimate contacts with his fellowman. I believe that when men of intelligence make an honest study, one need not worry too much about the result. I will say by way of bouquet, that the 13 individuals on this committee are men of heart and men of study. Labor law now is incapable of being digested in a few minutes or even in a year's course of study at a university. We on the committee appreciate that fact. Most of us have been in the labor field, in one way or another, for many years. Even though some elements or even whole segments of the public might wish it, Senators should not sit down with a grouch and a few hours' reading, and react with a tough labor bill—so tough, in fact, that they might innocently be doing a thing not less reckless than if they were to repeal the Anti-narcotics Act, or carelessly let the Post Office out by contract.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has suggested it would be very useful if those who are interested in the problems of labor and management had closer contact with such problems in life before they came to consider the problems in the Congress or in committees. For instance, if a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had been employed in the coal mines for a short period or in the copper mines of the West, had observed the operations of those properties, and had been closely in contact with the workers and management he would have a very much better understanding and appreciation of their problems.

I recall that when I first went to Montana I had the opportunity of having that kind of experience. I worked for 3 or 4 months in one of the copper mines at Butte and belonged to the union there in that early period of my life. Shortly before I reached Montana my understanding was that the miners were working 10 or 12 hours a day in the copper mines of Butte. Those mines, as they become deeper, grow increasingly more dangerous to those who work in them. Because of the increased depth and by reason of the dust and gases that originate in the mines the conditions are very unhealthful for the miners. They may become affected by what is known as silicosis, which is a very deadly disease. In my early days in Montana I knew a great many miners who were suffering from silicosis. They were walking up and down the streets and dying on their feet. Of course I naturally gained a sympathy for them in their condition, and as a Member of Congress it has always been my desire to be of assistance to them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Montana. I know that what he says is true. Neither of us has lived a full lifetime, but in our lives we have seen a complete transition in law and in practice from the good old days when any kind of an organization was considered a conspiracy and when labor was definitely a commodity. We have seen some freedoms granted, and we have seen the right of majority rule extended under our labor laws.

Both the Senator from Montana and I know that if this bill becomes the law of the land, and if the portal-to-portal pay bill becomes the law of the land, we shall revert to the good old days and once again labor organizations may be considered a conspiracy. Men may not be free to join a labor organization; they may be without any redress at all, and may again become a commodity, and as such become subject to the laws governing property.

Mr. MURRAY. That expresses my fear very clearly. It seems to me that by legislation of this kind we are running into the danger of returning the conditions which prevailed in those days. I recall that in the early history of the operation of the mines in Montana the local management was there on the ground to deal with the problems of the miners. It was a very simple matter for the miners to have their grievances adjusted and be able to get along with management. But after the great consolidations became established and the offices were removed to New York City and there was nothing but absentee management, the situation was entirely different. The management built tall fences around the properties, and placed big searchlights on top of their hoists. They established a detective system and defied the unions in their efforts to improve their conditions. When the employees became unruly the management would call in the militia. I do not want to see those conditions return in this country. I think we are taking a very dangerous step if we enact legislation of the character which we are considering.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I again thank the Senator. I am as fearful as is he that an invitation to use one old process means an invitation to use all the old processes.

My gratitude may be limited as to some, but it is given in abundance to those earnest colleagues of mine on the committee who helped temper the most ambitious of the antilabor bills. And I am everlastingly grateful, of course, for the wisdom of the founding fathers in providing for a two-house legislature.

As Senators know, members of this committee in some cases would go further than the bill which was reported. Their attitude is reflected through their amendments and their honest admissions. I myself do not want to adopt the bill which was reported. Certainly the whole Senate is entitled to consider a labor bill, and certainly, according to my lights, those of us who would have preferred to follow the President's recommendations nonetheless were able to prevail upon those who wanted strong measures, or to outvote them, or to bring to bear at least the tempering result of compromise, so that what we produced on the Senate floor, considering the times, was a relatively wonderful product, inasmuch, if nothing else, as it would not, if enacted, emasculate labor. But these amendments will. If one wishes to have his imagination run a bit, let him look at the next number on this Senate Calendar and he will see what I mean. But this does not mean that I am happy. It means simply that I am not terrified.

Moreover, the Senate committee, a group of men who seriously do know their subject, with all its learning, came out with a $150,000 proposal to learn more. I say this to their credit. I cannot repeat in too many ways the danger of reaction on one of these rights-of-man subjects undertaken lightly and in ignorance of facts other than that there are occasional strikes and that the people do not like to be inconvenienced. One does not cut off his leg because of his corns.

It would be a simple matter, in every sense of the word, to annul the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Unfortunately I can imagine an assembly becoming so inflamed as to take the achievements of a century and a half and destroy them in a moment of whimsy. The Social Security Act is younger in time, but no one in his excitement would take away that act. What, then, is the difference? In the former case we overcame some of the evils of government by injunction. But

the average person does not know what that is, so he will not be very angry if it is taken away, because he will not know what was taken away, and he will not hold anyone responsible. That is why it is easy to take away one of the more technical applications of the abundant life and not have it noticed that anything important was stolen.

In Labor and the Law, Professor Gregory, of the University of Chicago, has done a remarkable work in bringing legal matters within the understanding of the layman. In this way he reduces the injunction racket to the following terms. After describing the difference between a law court and an equity court, he states of the latter:

Their judgments usually consisted of orders either to do or undo some acts or to refrain from entering upon or continuing a threatened or already undertaken course of action. They did not have to use juries in reaching their judgments. They could fulfill their functions of preventive justice by issuing a temporary restraining order or injunction, pending the actual trial, in order to be sure that the harm threatened could effectually be avoided. * * * And if the order of an equity court was not obeyed scrupulously, this disobedience was an offense which could be punished summarily as a contempt of court by the court itself, acting without a jury—such punishment being immediate imprisonment for as long as the occasion warranted

Gregory proceeds then to show how in 1880 from a railroad strike this very fashionable restraint to be was opened up and became widespread.

As soon as the labor injunction became established in the late 1880's, almost anyone with an interest in obstructing the activities of labor unions could promptly secure temporary restraining orders for the asking. Continuance of a strike or boycott, after a restraining order or injunction was issued against it, brought down on the heads of the offenders the vengeance of the court, through the exercise of its contempt power, unrelieved by the tender mercies of a jury. Hence, strikes, picket lines, and boycotts were easily broken up almost before they were begun.

An employer with a strike or union pressure on his hands went to a judge, regardless of whether he was actually sitting on the bench at the time, submitted to him affidavits made out by his own agents to the effect that the strikers or other union folk were about to commit or were committing, and would continue to commit, alleged unlawful acts at his plants, all of which would cause irreparable damage to his property, and prayed for a restraining order pending suit for a permanent injunction. Judges usually issued such orders on request, frequently in the absence of anyone representing the persons to be enjoined—

A barber, according to the author—

usually patronized by railroad men, was held in contempt for violation of the broad injunction issued in the 1922 railroad workers' strike because he had hung in his window a sign to the effect that no scabs or strikebreakers were wanted as customers.

At this time I do not wish to engage in a lawyer's discussion of the cases under the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the little Norris-LaGuardia Acts. I do want to point out that the House bill virtually would repeal the act. Repeal of the act would leave conditions as described above. I offer the example only to show how reckless treatment of one important subject may result. Certainly we can do better; I pass, at least for time being, from the injunction—I may say the deadly injunction—with the statement that the Norris-LaGuardia act was enacted in 1932 and was signed by President Hoover.

I started to say that had laws of this type, including, of course, the National Labor Relations Act, jelled as long or as understandingly as our older laws, one would as readily abolish the amendments ratified after the Civil War, or the sixteenth and the nineteenth amendments to our Constitution, as to return to government by labor injunction, or to invite the return of labor spies and hooded men either by making the open shop mandatory or by providing some equally loose relaxation. I have heard remarks which might lead one to believe that the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments are all wrong. But no one would take seriously any effort to amend them, because they are concerned with the progress of a nation and its victory over weakness. No one in his right mind would repeal the amendment granting women suffrage. Occasionally a Hitler will bully, browbeat, and hypnotize a nation into a reversion to twelfth century living for a limited period; but as a rule peoples go forward, not backward.

I believe that even the most conservative members of the committee recognize that there is no turning back. One risks his neck in consenting to refinements of law, because that opens the door. In the minority report, we have suggested some refinements. Nonetheless, the risk of opening the whole subject would not be great were everyone as certain as is the committee in its recognition that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act are as fundamental to American life as are the measure against narcotics and the laws for the protection of our specie and currency. Unhappily, we had to have a Lindbergh baby incident to bring forth the Lindbergh law. But we will not turn back. Outrages against whole populations brought about the types of laws we are defending.

As an ex-chairman of the committee, I naturally was interested in following the tenor of the hearings. This committee has another ex-chairman, who also was greatly interested. I think I dare say for our side of the table that neither of us suggested that Ludwig Teller testify. Ludwig Teller is a labor lawyer of some recognition, but I am sure that he was suggested as a witness in view of the feeling shared by some that some steps have to be taken in regard to labor.

Yet Mr. Teller stated that the Ball proposal on industry-wide bargaining is—

administratively unworkable because I do not think you can stop one affiliated local union from getting into contact with another affiliated union and making certain arrangements or adopting a common front.

In the Los Angeles area there was, as I recall, a fictitious third party, so that managements could get together and talk illegally. But that is another story. However, the present proposals invite the return of such conditions, and would do so in three ways.

Mr. Teller added the happy prophecy that—

as we get back to normal bargaining, we shall find that the unions, even the steel union, are going to be more amenable to local settlements. There is a going back, I believe, to local bargaining that I think is discernible.

Mr. Teller did not exactly foresee that the steel business would, in a trice, reach a state of happy satisfaction, evidently, for all concerned, and with no satisfaction to those who would bait labor. But Mr. Teller, indeed, was in a foreseeing mood. He said, with some truth:

I still recall the glee of the General Motors employees as they ran out of the plant when the strike was called. Now, that was partially, I believe, war fatigue.

A little later on he declared:

So the war did come to an end and a lot of abnormal practices were indulged in. * * * I will say that if we use that crisis as a basis for things, then we might as well give up hope of continuing under the democratic process.

The same restraints were evidenced in Mr. Teller's testimony with respect to secondary boycotts. Any proposal to sweep away all secondary boycotts would be ruthless and ill-conceived, as the following testimony would indicate:

The so-called secondary boycott should be regulated. Labor unions should have a right to engage in concerted activity against those who aid employers involved in labor disputes, but third parties innocent of participation in the primary dispute should be protected from such concerted activity. * * *

In discussing this problem from a legislative point of view I think we have got to recognize that labor unions have a legitimate interest in furtherance of their economic activity to proceed against the company which is helping the person primarily engaged, and there are scores of judicial decisions so holding. I do not think those judicial decisions which have so held so many years should be overturned in the face of the fact that we recognize the desirability of labor unions. On the other hand, there are many cases where labor unions go outside the purview of their legitimate right to engage in secondary boycotts, going against third people so as to exert some kind of influence against them to affect the primary person or calling a city-wide strike, for example, because of a dispute with one employer in the city. Those all should be outlawed. But the legitimate interest in going against a company which aids another company which is engaged in a labor dispute, with knowledge thereof, I do not think should be outlawed.

I hold no brief for Mr. Teller, or for Mr. Teller's brief, which was filed in full, and I do not agree with all of his conclusions; but I do wish to stress the point that men of his wide experience and study in and of labor matters do not go mad. They do not conceive or support all of these wild schemes to rebuke, chastise, and destroy. Their expressions are continent and their ideas are worth reading and hearing. I did not summon Mr. Teller. I do not know who requested his appearance before our committee. But he added some distinction to our meetings, and I am grateful for the arrangement which included his testimony. I asked that a Negro girl be permitted to file a brief, and my request was granted in a moment. I requested that the Reverend Toner testify, and that request was immediately granted. If any request to

make the hearing full and fair was denied, I know nothing of it. I repeat that the committee's considerations were serious, and to some extent microscopic. That is the kind of study the Senate is entitled to. As a corollary, the restraints exercised by the committee should be a guide to Senators, and let me say that, if I dared hope this body would outcommittee the committee in that trend, I should be greatly pleased.

Mr. President, in the remarks which I am about to make concerning Senate bill 1126, to rewrite the Federal law dealing with labor relations and labor disputes, I do not intend to discuss its provisions in detail. That has been done and will be done by many other distinguished Members of this body. I have little doubt that the discussion pro and con on each of the bill's provisions will be important and enlightening. I propose, however, to confine myself to the significance of the bill in the light of the national labor policy which we in Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government have developed during the past 15 years.

On Wednesday, April 23, in opening the debate on this bill, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], told us that the problems dealt with in S. 1126 are "infinitely complicated." He said:

> I suppose there are at least 50 amendments to the present law in the pending bill. Wherever we found an injustice we tried to correct it; and, of course, the net result of correcting a number of injustices is incidentally to decrease some of the power of the labor-union leaders. It seems to me that our aim should be to get back to the point where, when an employer meets with his employees, they have substantially equal bargaining power, so that neither side feels that it can make an unreasonable demand and get away with it. If neither side feels that it can get away with certain demands, I do not believe that the demands will ever be made. If there is reasonable equality at the bargaining table, I believe that there is much more hope for labor peace. That is the method pursued by the bill which is now before the Senate. It is not an antilabor bill. It is not a bill inspired by a desire to wreak vengeance on anyone because of what he may have done. It simply proposes to deal with the causes of labor trouble and the injustices and inequities of the present law.
>
> Basically, I believe that the committee feels, almost unanimously, that the solution of our labor problems must rest on a free economy and on free collective bargaining. The bill is certainly based upon that proposition.

This is a very interesting statement on behalf of the proponents of the measure now before us. I should like to discuss point by point the philosophy behind the bill, as so ably stated by the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Certainly, few of us would disagree with the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee that the bill is "infinitely complicated." That is not surprising, for in legislating in the field of labor relations we are inevitably faced with complications. Labor relations involve something more than the play of economic conflicts and adjustments; there are involved in every case and every situation in this field complex problems of individuals and groups of individuals. In the solution of these problems vital interests are ordinarily at stake, with the result that situations which should, because of their complexity, receive the most calm and dispassionate study and appraisal possible, are frequently highly charged with feeling and emotion.

The debate which has been going on since VJ-day over the need and desirability of new labor legislation is proof itself of the truth of what I have said. The air, the press, and the Halls of Congress and the legislatures of the States have been filled with charges and countercharges, with threats and counterthreats, with calls to action against allegedly irresponsible union leadership and calls from union leadership to maintain the status quo.

In the atmosphere which has been generated it is difficult for us here in Congress to be able to see clearly and to understand the problems which should be dealt with by Federal legislation and what measures should be adopted for dealing with these problems. It is difficult for us to escape the emotionalism which characterizes discussions of these matters elsewhere. Yet, if we are to legislate as the Congress of the United States representing all the people of this Nation, we must attempt to disentangle the subject matter from its emotional trappings, and study and deal with the problems which are now before us calmly and dispassionately.

It is fortunate that as we consider the bill we do so at a time when industrial conditions are more peaceful than at any time since VJ-day. According to figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on April 29, 1947, work stoppages in the first quarter of 1947 were at their lowest levels since VJ-day. The time lost in establishments directly affected by such stoppages was less than one-sixteenth as great as in the first quarter of 1946. It would be no less important, however, to deal with this matter calmly and dispassionately even if this were not the case. The interests involved in the legislation are too vital to allow us to take hasty or ill-considered action. I applaud the statement of the chairman of the committee that the bill does not "wreak vengeance on anyone because of what he may have done." I hope that our consideration and action on the bill will be undertaken throughout in the spirit of that declaration.

In recent years a tendency has grown up of seeing labor relations primarily in terms of clashes in a quest for power between ambitious labor leaders and the managers of giant corporations, with the public caught squarely and helplessly in the middle of every controversy. Under this view, the rank and file of union members are regarded as mere pawns who are maneuvered into and out of the shops in which they work to suit the interests, or sometimes merely the whims, of their leaders. It is easy, if one accepts this view, to justify legislation which operates "incidentally to decrease some of the power of the labor union leaders" as promoting not only the general welfare of the majority of the people but also as advancing the welfare of the great mass of rank-and-file working people in the unions. It is easy to believe that as we decrease the power of labor union leaders we increase the freedoms of the rank-and-file members. We should be aware, however, lest the result of the legislation we adopt may be the restoration of old tyrannies, not the development and expansion of freedoms for the common man which we all seek.

We have heard the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, which recently passed the House and is now pending on the Senate Calendar, described as a new "Magna Carta" of the individual worker. As we consider this bill, it seems to me we will do well to bear in mind a few salient facts of labor history. We will do well to consider the laws which the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare now asks us to amend in the light of the conditions which gave rise to their enactment, the evils they were designed to remedy, the national policies of which they are expressions and implementations. Only if we bear in mind these facts will we be able clearly to understand the needs out of which our present national labor policies have developed, the essential elements of these policies, and the manner in which the bill now before us will affect these policies.

I referred a moment ago to the attitude which many persons today, including Members of Congress, appear to take toward the relations between unions and their leaders, on the one hand, and the rank and file of union members, on the other. In the past we have had a more realistic viewpoint expressed by experts in the field and by authoritative organs of Government. The reasons why individual workers are willing to surrender some of their freedoms by joining unions, as all persons do when they join organizations or associations, were very well described by Chief Justice Taft in the opinion of the Supreme Court delivered by him in the case of *American Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U. S. 184, 209), in which he said, and I quote:

> Labor unions * * * were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employer.

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary of this body, which was submitted on February 4, 1932, by our respected and courageous former colleague, the then senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris, recommending favorable action on the bill which was shortly thereafter enacted and has become known as the Norris-LaGuardia Act (Rept. No. 163, 72d Cong., 1st sess.) had this to say on the subject of the reasons why workers join unions and why their right to do so must be protected and implemented by safeguarding legislation:

> The right of wage earners to organize and to act jointly in questions affecting wages,

conditions of labor, and the welfare of labor generally is conceded and recognized by all students of the subject. An increasing necessity for the organization of labor has been brought about by modern economic conditions and methods of doing business, which have in the main been developed by the aid of governmental authority.

It is obvious that existing conditions under which large employers of labor possess unprecedented power to dictate contracts and conditions of employment have been developed through governmental grants of authority to form corporations and organizations of corporations, whereby thousands of owners of property are enabled to combine hundreds of millions of dollars of capital and, in this way, substantially to control and sometimes to monopolize opportunities for employment. Such a power, unrestrained by the organization of labor, would permit employers arbitrarily to fix the wages and conditions of labor under which millions of men and women would find their only opportunity to earn a living.

A single laborer, standing alone, confronted with such far-reaching, overwhelming concentration of employer power, and compelled to labor for the support of himself and family, is absolutely helpless to negotiate or to exert any influence over the fixing of his wages or the hours and conditions of his labor. A man must work in order to live. If he can exercise no control over his conditions of employment, he is subjected to involuntary servitude.

The efforts of the workers to preserve their freedom of association and their freedom in association to influence the fixing of wages and working conditions present questions which are unique and demand specific legislative action.

I call to the Senate's attention the fact that this report was submitted, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted, before the present administration, which has played such a large part in shaping our modern national labor policies, came into office on March 4, 1933. These policies are often thought of as the work of this administration exclusively. It is well to recall at this point that these policies were not initiated by this administration but received their first formulation during the Republican administration of President Hoover. The policies which have been developed by the present administration have in actuality merely been extensions of legislative safeguards of the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing which were first erected in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Since some of the provisions of the bill now before us would operate to waive the safeguards of the right to organize and bargain collectively, which are written into that act, it is not amiss, I believe, to recall to the Senate at this time the public policy of the United States set forth in section 2 of the act. That section reads:

In the interpretation of this act and in determining the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States, as such jurisdiction and authority are herein defined and limited, the public policy of the United States is hereby declared as follows:

Whereas under prevailing economic conditions, developed with the aid of governmental authority for owners of property to organize in the corporate and other forms of ownership association, the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment; wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; therefore, the following definitions of, and limitations upon, the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States are hereby enacted.

Mr. President, I pause to repeat what I said at the beginning of my remarks, relative to my strong reasons for opposing the pending amendment. It makes possible the return of all the evil practices attempted to be eradicated by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It represents a turning back of the clock, a return to the time when a lawyer, wishing to take advantage of the law, might, through the aid of the courts and the power of the Government, work against associations which the Chief Justice of the United States said were so essential to a man's liberty, and which the Congress said were so important, in order that workers might in some way or other preserve their rights.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act did not purport to cover the entire field of labor-management relations. It dealt only with an abuse of governmental power which had come to be regarded as intolerable and which had been used to destroy labor organizations and virtually all types of concerted activities to secure improvements in the wages, hours, and working conditions of wage earners. The act ended the period which the Democratic Party in its platform as long ago as 1896 described as "government by injunction."

The Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawed the so-called yellow-dog contract and prohibited the issuance of restraining orders or injunctions by any court of the United States against (a) strikes, (b) membership in unions, (c) payment of strike or unemployment benefits, (d) lawful assistance to persons involved in a labor dispute in any court proceeding, (e) publicizing the facts concerning labor disputes, (f) peaceful assembly to promote the interests of labor in a labor dispute, (g) advising, agreeing with, or urging others to do or not to do any of the foregoing. Mr. President, do we here in the Senate want to change those elements of our national labor policies which are written into the Norris-LaGuardia Act? Do we want to sanction for any reason or in any situation a return of the "yellow-dog" contract? If we do, we may be sure that it will not be labor peace that we are promoting, but labor warfare, discord, and confusion. Do we want to say that there are situations where injunctions against strikes or joining unions should be permitted? If we do that, we will be reversing the whole trend of our national labor policy beginning with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. For the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively and to engage in other concerted activities for mutual aid or protection we will be substituting Government compulsion and judge-made law once more. Yes, Mr. President, this is what we do when we authorize injunctive remedies without regard to the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932—the Norris-LaGuardia Act—entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, except in the particulars I have mentioned, does not prohibit the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. It merely limits the conditions under which such injunctions may be issued and the manner in which such suits are to be handled by the Federal courts.

Doubtless there are few today who would challenge the basic policy contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That act was not passed hurriedly. Senator Norris' report, to which I have made reference, recites the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary had been considering the subject of injunctions in labor disputes for several years and that the subject received active study either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate in the Seventieth and Seventy-first Congresses, as well as the Seventy-second Congress which finally enacted the measure into law. The committee had the benefit of the advice and assistance of eminent economists and attorneys who made a special study of this particular subject. I mention this fact, Mr. President, at this time because I believe that we cannot in dealing with the subject matter in the bill now before us, act intelligently without the benefit of the advice of experts in the field of labor relations and labor disputes. In preparing the Norris-LaGuardia Act the Judiciary Committee under Senator Norris recognized this fact. Unfortunately in the preparation of the pending bill the assumption seems to have been that the way to proceed is to legislate first and study afterwards.

At this point I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the hearings before the committee, in part 4 of which is set forth a lettter signed by teachers and professors of economics urging the committee to study the problems which it had before it for consideration before attempting to legislate in this field. Those teachers and professors are from every State and section of the country. I believe the committee has made a serious mistake in ignoring the advice of these experts and the advice of the President of the United States, and in failing to call upon disinterested experts to assist them in studying the problems in the field of labor relations and labor disputes. I think it would be well for the record of this debate to contain the letter to which I have referred. It reads as follows (hearings, part 4, pages 2402–2403):

AMHERST, MASS., *March 1, 1947.*

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: We, the undersigned, regret the decision you and your colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have made to proceed at

once to hearings on specific proposals for labor legislation. We had hoped that instead you would support the recommendation made by President Truman that a joint commission be established to make a thorough investigation of the underlying causes of labor-management disputes before the passage of any long-range legislation which might fundamentally alter the structure of labor-management relations in this country.

We write you as a group of economists, political scientists, and other educators who have taken a keen interest in the problem of labor-management relations. We are convinced that no adequate solution to the problems of industrial unrest, which have disturbed the Nation's economic life since the end of the war, will be forthcoming except as the result of a careful, patient investigation of the present structure of collective bargaining, the problems on which it is most difficult to reach agreement in negotiations, and the present operation of the Wagner Act.

We are glad that your committee has announced a comprehensive and lengthy schedule of hearings. We do not believe, however, that committee hearings, valuable as they are as a forum for the expression of public opinion, can produce the objective record of factual material which is needed at the present time. Your committee hearings, as scheduled, must necessarily take place against the background of pending wage negotiations between several major industries and the unions representing their workers, and cannot help reflecting the pressures arising from this situation. Furthermore, the testimony heard will be directed at the bills under consideration by your committee and many of them seem to us to be punitive legislation designed to destroy many successful collective-bargaining practices and to jeopardize the rights of workers rather than to find solutions to existing problems.

We strongly oppose any legislation which attempts to wipe out the gains made in the last decade granting the workers a somewhat more equal bargaining position with industry, and which propose now to place workers economically at the mercy of their employers. We hope that your committee will realize that only a forward-looking approach to the problem of labor-management relations can lead to any real solution and prevent reprisals against workers which will endanger all democratic rights.

Sincerely,

COLSTON E. WARNE,
Secretary for the Signers.

In saying that the committee should have undertaken careful study of the field of labor-management relations, with the aid of competent and expert students in this field, before attempting to legislate on the many problems dealt with in the bill before us, I do not want any Member of the Senate to infer that I am opposed to the enactment of any labor legislation at this session of the Congress. In the statement of minority views, in which I have been joined by the senior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from Florida, we have made specific reference to those provisions of the bill which we regard as acceptable, either in their present form or with modifications. Our primary concern is not that Congress shall not enact any labor legislation but that it shall not enact any antilabor legislation. It is our belief that there are provisions in the bill which are antilabor in their effects. It is my belief that the inclusion of such provisions in the bill has occurred not because any member of the committee wishes to saddle labor unions and their leaders with unjust or unfair restrictions, but because the committee has not had either the time or the expert assistance in studying the problems dealt with in the bill and the provisions which are necessary for the development of sound labor legislation consistent with the basic purposes of our national labor policy which will promote real industrial stability and peace.

I have already referred to some of the policy considerations which prompted Congress to enact the Norris-LaGuardia Act. We should not be unmindful today of the conditions which prevailed at the time this act was made a part of the law of the land. In an article in the Washington Post of January 5, 1947, Post Reporter Alfred Friendly tells the story of one labor injunction which graphically illustrates the nature and effect of judicial intervention in labor disputes during the era of "Government by injunction." The story is as follows:

The time was September, 1927, and the period was one which is known as the age of "Government by injunction."

The United Mine Workers were striking certain collieries in Pennsylvania. As was the custom, the companies fought the union with injunctions.

One concern procured an order from Judge Langham, of the Pennsylvania State Court, which, among other prohibitions, forbade the striking miners from "congregating on the Magyar Presbyterian Church lot, or any other lot, lots, place or places," at the time the nonstrikers were entering or leaving the mine, and "from singing song or songs in hearing of the employees * * * of a threatening or hostile nature."

The vice president and general manager of the corporation explained why the injunction was sought:

The church lot was the only place, he said, which the company did not itself own, on which the strikers could gather and from which point—with the aid of field glasses to be sure—they could observe operations at the pit head. By their singing, the strikers had "intended to intimidate our men."

How far was the church from the place the workers had to pass to go into the mines? More than a quarter of a mile. Could the words of the songs be heard by the workers? A Senate investigating committee considered it "very doubtful * * * unless the winds were very favorable."

And what were the intimidating songs which had been sung and which, under injunction, could no longer be chanted? Well, there was Hymn No. 166, entitled "The Victory May Depend on You"; No. 66, "Sound the Battle Cry"; No. 266, "Nearer My God to Thee"; and No. 44, "Stand Up for Jesus," with which the strikers had really played dirty pool. They had changed the words to "We Are on the Winning Side."

That injunction, if not typical, is at least illustrative of the type of court order which American corporations procured from 1880 to 1932 to smash union organization and wage drives. Hundreds upon hundreds of such injunctions were obtained in what, it now is clear, was one of the most grievous perversions of the law in its long and perverted history.

The Committee on the Judiciary in its favorable report on the bill which became the Norris-LaGuardia Act dealt with another problem which is raised by the provisions of the bill now before us which seek to "decrease some of the power of the labor-union leaders." It is provided in the Norris-LaGuardia Act that—

No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association and no organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

The Judiciary Committee in its 1932 report pointed out that—

In most cases where strikes occur involving a great many employers and employees and covering a comparatively large territory, there are often unlawful acts committed in the way of injury to property or to persons. It is not the intention of the bill to protect anybody, whether he be employer or employee, from punishment for the commission of unlawful acts either as against property or persons. But no person or organization should be held thus liable unless he or it caused the unlawful act or participated in it or ratified it. It has often occurred that employers themselves have secured the services of detectives who, under the guise of labor men, had gained admission into labor unions. When this happens, these detectives are usually doing everything within their power to incite employees who are on strike to commit acts of violence, and such detectives, contrary to the definite instructions of labor-union leaders, sometimes commit unlawful acts for the express and only purpose of laying the foundation for injunctive process, of bringing discredit upon the union, and of making its officers and members liable for damages.

In case of a strike, where the officers of the labor union are doing everything within their power to prevent acts of violence from being committed by any person, the law should fully protect them and save them and the members of their organization who are following their advice from liability in damages because of unlawful acts of persons who are either directly or indirectly connected with those who are trying to defeat the purposes of the strike.

In the bill before us we have provisions defining certain unfair labor practices by labor organizations and providing for suits for violations of collective bargaining contracts. Without the safeguarding clause which is contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act providing that unions shall be liable only upon clear actual proof of authorization, participation in, or ratification of such unfair labor practices or contract violations, these provisions may well, in the language of the 1932 report, "go far toward the destruction of organized labor." The chairman of the committee in his explanation of the bill has stated that one of the major objectives of the bill is to insure "reasonable equality at the bargaining table." He expressed his belief that if this were accomplished there would be much more hope for labor peace.

Parenthetically it may be pointed out that equality at the bargaining table does not necessarily insure labor peace. The major controversy and conflicts in the field of management which have occurred since VJ-day do not, in my judgment, grow out of difficulties in the structure of collective bargaining established by the National Labor Relations Act. These conflicts and controversies

arose because of basic conflicts of interests which have accompanied the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

It was inevitable that following the termination of active hostilities in the war with Japan major shifts in our economy should take place. It was inevitable that there should be major changes in opportunities for employment and in the wage structure of industry. The result of these changes has been that after VJ-day there was an immediate downward pressure on take-home pay—the money that the worker took home in his pay envelope at the end of the week or month, as the case may be. This pressure took the form of loss of overtime, down grading of jobs, reconversion lay-offs, and other direct reductions in the worker's income. Beginning with the temporary holiday in price controls in the summer of 1946, the worker's income was also pushed downward from another direction; namely, increased prices. Confronted with these twin pressures on his income, it was not surprising that the workers through their unions fought with every means at their disposal to protect the standards of living which they had attained during the war years.

Let us look at some of the facts. According to BLS data, take-home pay in terms of 1939 dollars for the average worker in manufacturing with a family of four decreased from $31.11 per week in August of 1945 to $29.69 per week in February 1947 This may not appear to be a substantial decline. However, during this same period average hourly earnings for manufacturing rose from $1.02 to $1.17. On a weekly basis, this amounts to about $5 a week. If these wage concessions won by the workers during that period had not occurred, the worker would have faced a decline in take-home pay of about $6.50 per week, instead of the $1.50 that actually occurred.

Unless this Congress takes action to enact into law the sound program of social legislation which the President has recommended, including the extension and broadening of our Social Security System, better housing, a comprehensive national program to reduce the incidence of the high cost of medical care, and provision for a fair minimum wage, it will, in my judgment, do little toward eliminating the basic causes of labor disputes and assuring labor peace. As has been said in the minority views which I and the senior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from Florida have submitted in opposition to the enactment of S. 1126 in its present form:

> The problems involved in attempting to deal with the difficult and complicated labor controversies of this time are not merely matters of governmental machinery. We cannot approach these problems solely on the basis of prohibitions and restrictions on the activities of private citizens, whether they be employers, labor organizations, or their members. The causes of labor-management controversy lie deep in the complex industrial and financial structure.
>
> Without attention to the problems to which the President directed attention in his message on the state of the Union, such legislation as the Congress may enact may well take on unwittingly the character of vindictive, punitive legislation, against which the Congress has frequently been warned. Measures to extend and broaden the Social Security System, to provide for better housing, to establish a comprehensive national health program, and to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to a level commensurate with present-day conditions are pending before the Congress. In the absence of action on these measures by this Congress, the proposal of the majority may well promote, instead of resolve, the industrial discord and strife which they, like we, wish to avoid.

Leaving aside, however, the question of whether improvement of the machinery of collective bargaining will go very far toward promoting labor peace, how is it proposed in the bill now before us to assure "reasonable equality at the bargaining table"?

In his explanation of the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act during debate on the measure in the Senate on May 15, 1935, the distinguished senior Senator from New York whose name has become so closely associated with this act that it is normally known as the Wagner Act, told this body:

> The national labor relations bill does not break with our traditions. It is the next step in the logical unfolding of man's eternal quest for freedom. For 25 centuries of recorded time before the machine age he sought relief from nature's cruel and relentless tyranny. Only 150 years ago did this country cast off the shackles of political despotism. And today, with economic problems occupying the center of the stage, we strive to liberate the common man from destitution, from insecurity, and from human exploitation.
>
> In this modern aspect of a time-worn problem the isolated worker is a plaything of fate. Caught in the labyrinth of modern industrialism and dwarfed by the size of corporate enterprise, he can attain freedom and dignity only by cooperation with others of his group. This truism has been paid at least the lip service of universal opinion. It is on the page of every treatise and in the platform of every political party.

Just as the Norris-LaGuardia Act had for its purpose the ending of the era of "government by injunction" when judge-made law rather than free collective bargaining was the method of settling labor controversies, so the National Labor Relations Act put an end to practices by employers which impede the process of free collective bargaining. The Wagner Act is frankly designed to protect workers and their unions from employer practices which make a mockery of collective bargaining. Thereby it assured more equitable distribution of the Nation's goods among the people of this country and more harmonious relations between those in industry, employers and workers alike, who produce those goods.

How does the Wagner Act accomplish these results? As I have said, that act sets up procedure whereby certain unfair labor practices may be prohibited by the National Labor Relations Board. Each of these unfair labor practices is specifically designed to assure free collective bargaining between an employer and his employees through representatives of their own choosing. The act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to interfere with or coerce employees in the exercise of their right to form, join, or assist labor unions to bargain collectively through the representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. Just as the employer is to be free to organize his business in the manner he chooses consistent with the laws of the United States so his employees are to be free to form unions without interference from their employer.

The act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor union or to contribute financial or other support to it. This provision, too, is designed to assure that unions shall be freely organized by employees and that the employer shall not be allowed to evade his collective-bargaining responsibilities through the mechanism of employer-dominated unions. It is obvious that there can be no bargaining if the same party sits on both sides of the bargaining table. This provision assures that there shall be two parties to collective bargaining—the workers through their union and the employer through his representatives.

The act also makes it an unfair labor practice for employers to adopt employment practices which discriminate against employees because of membership in a labor union. It is obvious that unless employees are free from "yellow dog" contracts and other devices to discourage union membership free collective bargaining between unions and employers is impossible.

The act also makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board under the act. This provision is designed to make certain that employees may utilize the procedures to assure collective bargaining which the act provides without danger of reprisals from employers.

Finally, the act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees. There is no need to labor the point that this provision is specifically designed to promote and assure free collective bargaining.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is nothing in any of these provisions which in any way gives to labor a bargaining power superior to that of the employer. There is nothing in this act which requires amendment in order to assure reasonable equality at the bargaining table.

How does the bill attempt to assure equality at the bargaining table? It defines certain unfair labor practices by labor organizations as well as by employers.

Does making it an unfair labor practice for a union to interfere with or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances assure equality of bargaining? If this provision is designed, as the chairman of the committee has suggested, to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to insist on bargaining on an area or industry-wide basis, then it may have, in effect, the exact opposite of that intended. This

section then deals not with the procedure of bargaining but with the scope of bargaining itself. Limiting the subjects of collective bargaining does not make for free collective bargaining. On the contrary, it restricts collective bargaining and promotes industrial strife and confusion.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to enter into a union shop or maintenance-of-management agreement an unfair labor practice assure equality of bargaining? This provision deals with the administration of collective-bargaining agreements, not with the procedure of collective bargaining.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to engage in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts assure equality of bargaining? Admittedly, there are abuses in labor's resort to unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes which are proper subjects of Federal legislation. We have indicated in our statement of minority views that it would be reasonable to proscribe unjustified secondary boycotts as unfair labor practices and to set up machinery for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes. This problem, however, has nothing to do with assuring equality of bargaining. It makes no contribution toward establishing a relationship of equality at the bargaining table.

Will making it an unfair labor practice for either an employer or for a labor organization to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement assure equality of bargaining? This provision, like the provision relating to the administration of union shop and the maintenance-of-membership agreements, relates to the operation of collective-bargaining agreements, not to the procedure of collective bargaining.

In only one particular does the definition of unfair labor practices by labor organizations have any bearing upon the question of how equality at the bargaining table is to be assured. It is proposed that, just as it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, so it would be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to refuse to bargain collectively with the employer. Another provision of the bill, for the first time, attempts to define collective bargaining. The bill provides that failure by the employer to follow the procedures set forth in the definition of collective bargaining is to be regarded merely as an unfair labor practice subject to a cease and desist order from the Board. Violation of these procedures by a union, however, subjects the employees not only to such a cease-and-desist order, but also to loss of status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act. This additional penalty discriminates unfairly against the employees. Its effect is very far from assuring equality at the bargaining table. Under this provision, the act would operate to force employees to resort to economic self-help upon the failure of the officers of their union to perform in every detail the procedural requirements of collective bargaining, and would, in effect, destroy collective bargaining.

Mr. President, the multiplicity of new definitions in the law which the enactment of the pending measure would bring about, together with the right and invitation to resort once more to the courts, would constitute, of course, an invitation to a return to confusion and to the days when men actually lost their rights through the action of the courts and through the action of other branches of government.

The National Labor Relations Act was adopted, to use the words of the chairman of the committee, "for the one purpose of equalizing or permitting a large number of employees to act as one; in effect, to compel them to act as one if the majority desired such action." He concedes that giving workers that power of collective action was justified because of the undoubted advantage previously possessed by employers in dealing with their employees, and that making provision for concerted employee action resulted in placing workers on a sound and equal basis. He further asserts that much of what he calls the injustices and inequities of the present act are the result of its biased administration by the original Board, and that the present Board, fair as he concedes it to be, is so hampered by the inequitable precedents established by its earliest predecessor that it is impossible to rectify the situation without legislation.

But Senate bill 1126 contains many provisions which are wholly irrelevant to the problem of remedying injustices and inequities to employers. For example, the bill outlaws the closed shop. But the act neither created nor imposed the closed shop, it merely recognized it. In fact, the Wagner Act even limited the union shop, as well as the closed shop, by permitting it only where it resulted from an agreement with a union which was not employer-dominated or assisted, and which was the recognized bargaining representative of a majority of the employees in the unit. Hence it would be more accurate to say that if the closed shop resulted in injustices or inequities, the Wagner Act eliminated those abuses by imposing the democratic principles of free choice and majority rule.

It is likewise far from clear how protecting the rights of professional employees, as this measure professes to do, helps in any way to restore the employer to a position of equality. Professional employees, as such, cannot be regarded as representatives of management. They are employees in exactly the same fashion as are all other workers. Separate or special treatment for that group, if it is to benefit the employer, can only do so by dividing his employees and emphasizing their conflicting, rather than their common, interests, thereby defeating the very purpose of the act. The same considerations apply with equal force to the special treatment Senate bill 1126 proposes to give to craft unions.

The chairman of the committee acknowledges that the Supreme Court has held that the Wagner Act does not deprive the employer of free speech. Would an injustice be corrected by providing by legislation that employers be given a right they already enjoy under the strongest of all guaranties—the protection of our Constitution?

Many of the so-called inequities to which reference has been made in the course of this debate are conceded by him to have existed only during the early days of the Board. If these abuses no longer exist—and from the necessary implications of the chairman's statement, it must be presumed that he, too, believes they no longer exist—then why legislate against nonexistent injustices? Why abolish the Board's Review Section? Why destroy the Board's discretion to order elections for certification of bargaining representatives? Those provisions of Senate bill 1126 seem to me to be instances of legislating for the mere sake of writing legislation.

This measure compels labor organizations to file detailed annual financial statements and reports with the Secretary of Labor as a necessary prerequisite to resort to the Board to invoke any of the remedies or procedures provided by the act. I have exercised both my mind and imagination to their limits, and I cannot for the life of me see how these provisions in any way aid the employer to escape from his allegedly unequal status under the present act. The chairman of the committee admits that today many unions do keep their members informed of the union's financial activities. No abuse exists which these provisions will remedy. As a matter of fact, compelling unions by law to file such reports is the very acme of inequality, because no other form of voluntary association today is compelled to do the same.

In his state of the Union message, the President of the United States recommended legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act. Those recommendations manifested a clear-sighted recognition on the part of the President that the activities he advocated outlawing were not activities whereby labor organizations achieved the purposes of the Wagner Act; but he was careful not to recommend a total ban of the secondary boycott.

It is unmistakably obvious that the secondary boycott used in aid of an attempt to secure the legitimate goals of trade unions, such as higher wages, shorter hours, more favorable terms and conditions of employment, and the maintenance of hard-won working standards, is not only morally defensible, but in many instances utterly essential. Deprived of the use of this economic weapon for the purposes I have mentioned, labor unions would frequently find it difficult, indeed impossible, to attain that position of equality of bargaining power with their employers which the Wagner Act was designed to confer upon American workers. Is this what is meant by restoring equality of bargaining strength as between employer and employees? Does the Wagner Act legalize the secondary boycott used in aid of legitimate union goals? Clearly the answer must be "No."

In passing the Wagner Act, Congress wished to provide a means for reducing and eliminating inequality of bargaining

power between employees and their employer which leads to wage cutting and depressed purchasing power and to intolerable industrial strife. Congress could have attempted to develop minute and detailed regulations of every aspect of industrial relations. It chose, instead, to adopt a legislative scheme designed to establish a parity of bargaining power which would enable employees by their own voluntary associated action to negotiate for the elimination of the evils of low wages, long hours, and substandard working conditions. In choosing this course of action Congress took a long step forward toward the realization of a free American way of life by the workers of this country. Genuine freedom of contract was secured, genuine freedom of contract which can exist only where the bargaining is between parties of equal strength, that genuine freedom of contract which constitutes the backbone of our tradition and the secret of our unrivaled freedoms and our unparalleled development and economic well-being.

S. 1126 represents a marked retreat from the philosophy of labor-management relations embodied in the Wagner Act. It goes far beyond the correction of abuses, and weakens organized labor and restores the imbalance which prevailed prior to the Wagner Act's adoption. It drives a wedge through the legislative rampart which has thus far protected us against Government regimentation. For if the unions of free American workingmen are weakened, as is proposed in the bill before us, Government regulation of every detail of the relations between workers and employers and of the internal conduct of each will follow as the night follows the day.

The chairman of the committee has told us that S. 1126 represents a return to the principles of free enterprise and free, collective bargaining. In fact, this measure increases manyfold the amount of governmental intervention and interference both in the collective bargaining process and in the internal affairs of labor unions. Instead of returning to free and voluntary relations between labor and management, S. 1126 takes a radical departure from these principles, as an examination of what it does will readily reveal.

Let us take, for example, the various provisions of the bill which waive the requirements of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in the obtaining of injunctions in certain types of labor disputes. In jurisdictional disputes, the National Labor Relations Board would be required to get an injunction from the Federal courts before proceeding with its responsibilities in connection with determining the dispute. The Board would be permitted to seek an injunction in cases where unfair labor practice proceedings were brought on the basis of alleged breach of a collective bargaining agreement. The emergency provisions of the bill allow the Attorney General to apply to the Federal courts for an injunction against a threatened or actual strike which he considers imperils the national health or safety. The effect of these provisions is that the Government becomes a party to many labor disputes, and would undoubtedly be a party to all major labor disputes. It is easy to forget that when the injunctive process is authorized in labor disputes the Government is necessarily brought into such disputes. In this connection, I think it will be well for the Senate to weigh carefully the words of the 1932 report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in recommending favorable action on the Norris-LaGuardia Act:

> It has long been recognized by students of law and government that the power to make law and the power to enforce law should be separated as a protection against tyranny. To prevent executive tyranny, the legislative power has been carefully separated from the executive power in our scheme of Government and to prevent judicial tyranny it is equally necessary to preserve the separation of the legislative power from the judicial power.
>
> A warning against the growing exercise of legislative power by the courts in injunction cases was uttered long ago by the great commentator, Blackstone, in the following language:
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is amazing to realize that in the last 40 years there has developed in the American courts the practice of writing a special law to fit the individual case by judges in issuing labor injunctions; and that thereupon the judge, who himself wrote the law, has undertaken to prescribe the penalty for its violation and to punish the violator without permitting the accused to enjoy a trial by jury or even to insist upon a trial before another judge. It cannot be successfully claimed that the courts have not written into these injunction cases a new law of labor dispute, fitting the law to each particular case, and then enforcing this new law made by the court.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is difficult to see how any civilized people could indefinitely submit to such tyrannical procedure. It is not difficult to understand how such cruel laws, made not by any legislature but by a judge upon the bench, should bring our Federal courts into disrepute. Neither is it difficult to see how such injunctions, violating the conscience of civilization, should frighten persons against whom such injunctions are issued into desperation. What free American citizen is willing to submit to the violation of his sacred rights of human liberty and freedom?

Under the bill, the law would be made by the judiciary at the suit of the executive branch. What is this but an increase in governmental control of labor-management relations and Government intervention in the collective-bargaining process beyond anything we have ever known in the history of the United States?

Or let us take the provision for elections to be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the question of union security arrangements—and I might say that it is perfectly clear to me that removing the question of union security from the area of free collective bargaining, and subjecting it to statutory conditions, is in itself an instance of increased rather than decreased Government intervention. In requiring Government-supervised elections in such cases we have more, not less, Government control and regulation. I should have thought that it would be more consistent with less Government control to let the membership decide for itself whether it wanted union security, without compelling resort to a Government agency, and to encourage employers voluntarily to bargain collectively on any issue with the freely chosen representative of their employees, without requiring a Government agency to step in first and give that representative its imprimatur.

Or consider the provisions which open the Federal courts to damage suits for breach of collective bargaining agreements. Not content with the unfair labor practice provisions relative to breaches of collective-bargaining agreements, the authors of S. 1126 now propose to give the Government two bites at the cherry. It must be remembered that these provisions do not, in fact, give a remedy where none previously existed, although some care has been taken to create the impression that they do. What these provisions really do is to invite the Federal district courts to police the parties in their adherence to their collective-bargaining agreements by dispensing with the sensible statutory requirement of a jurisdictional amount of $3,000 and the constitutional requirement of diversity of citizenship. I am firmly convinced that this is a vain effort, because I am sure that the suits contemplated by these provisions will not be regarded by the courts as presenting any Federal question. But this is beside the point I am making—that the cry of free enterprise and voluntary collective bargaining is not based on fact, and that S. 1126 will actually vastly increase the number and the complexity of Federal controls.

Another instance of increased Government controls which would result from the bill is the provision which would allow an employer to ask the National Labor Relations Board to decertify a union as collective bargaining representative when he thinks it may no longer have the majority which would entitle it to represent his employees. This section would place the might of the Federal Government behind an employer who simply did not wish to bargain. As I understand the law now, when the employer doubts the union's majority, he need only refuse to bargain, and the law will protect him should it be determined that his doubts were justified. But under this bill, he could call in the Federal Government to certify him in that refusal. Apart from the obvious usefulness of this provision as a delaying device, to be used in bad faith as well as in good, I can see no sense in bringing in the Federal Government to do for an employer what he can do for himself under the law as it stands.

But it would require the most fantastic reasoning of all to square with the concept of free collective bargaining and less government controls the emergency provisions of the bill. I suppose there is virtually unanimous agreement that close attention must be given to the problem of strikes which tie up the economy of the entire Nation or endanger the health or safety of a substantial proportion of its population. The President recognized this in his state of the Union message, and we have pending in this body a resolution which would carry out his recommendation that particular study be given to this problem and to

finding a solution which will not endanger our basic democratic freedoms.

Senate bill 1126, however, with fine disregard for democratic freedoms, purports to have the solution. In the course of working it out in practice under the provisions of the bill, it would involve intervention by the Attorney General, the Federal courts, the Federal Mediation Service, the President, Congress, and the National Labor Relations Board. Indeed, it would appear that the entire Federal Government must drop whatever it is doing and go to work on such a strike. The role of the parties themselves is practically negligible, and the role of the employees most insignificant of all, since they would be required to submit to an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the issue whether they wish to accept the employer's final offer. If, as has been so often said, "labor unions have come of age," it would not seem that it is necessary to have them speak to employers through an agency of the Government. I confess I am unable to see how the vast labyrinth of governmental machinery through which these disputes would be processed can possibly be termed a decrease of governmental controls or a device for promoting free enterprise and voluntary collective bargaining.

Mr. President, of course I cannot look into the future. Senators know the past; and they are aware that in the matter of labor relations it was bad. In a case arising under a State statute enacted in 1898, the Supreme Court of the United States for the first time upheld a law protecting an employer in the matter of hours of labor, and diminishing, as claimed by those who were seeking to overturn the law, a man's freedom to bargain as he wished, to contract as he wished, and to work as he wished. With that decision, a new period began in industrial relations.

The Supreme Court decision recognized a public interest in the length of time that miners could work. It recognized in the second place, that a man's right to work is not absolute, without reference to the rights of other men to work. It recognized that the conditions under which a man works may be either beneficial or detrimental to his fellow workers, that his right is a relative right.

There came into existence a theory of attempting to improve labor standards by law of protecting the worker in his rights. As a result of this, two laws were enacted, the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. By the enactment of those two laws the Federal Government moved into a sphere supposedly belonging exclusively to the States. As a result of decisions by the United States Supreme Court on the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Eight-Hour-Day Act, in 1938, attention turned to the Congress. The Supreme Court repudiated earlier decisions holding that manufacturing, agriculture, and mining were of purely local concern, and declared that no commercial activity within the United States could be considered as of purely local concern. The Court began to share with the people a recognition of the fact that, once a surplus is produced in any community, that surplus becomes of national concern and ceases to be a matter merely of local concern. Under later decisions by the Court, that principle has become established in the fundamental law of the land.

The pending measure does not imply that the laws enacted in 1898, 1935, and 1938 were wrong; on its face, it approves them. It reenacts certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, with a modification of the right to strike. The rights of the laboring man are recognized, and he is assured that Congress will not take away those rights. The pending measure then proceeds, not in 10 pages or 20 pages, but in 40 pages, to lay down new definitions, extending an invitation to those who wish to take advantage of the law to make use once more of the power of government to bring about a return to the labor conditions of the early thirties.

Mr. President, not a single speaker has advocated such retrogression. No one supporting the pending measure has favored wiping the National Labor Relations Act from the statute books. In fact, provision is made in the bill to increase the functions of the National Labor Relations Board. But the new definitions, the new invitations to use of the injunctive process in labor disputes, and the recently enacted portal-to-portal pay legislation indicate a complete right-about-face in labor legislation.

It is said, Mr. President, that that is because of dissatisfaction over strikes and other industrial disturbances. When the Full Employment Act became a part of the law of the land provision was made not only for a fiscal budget each year, but also for an economic budget, giving some idea of the expenditures required of the Government in order to insure full employment.

Now, Mr. President, we are not only forgetting that philosophy, but we are proposing to return to the conditions of a period when punitive legislation was indulged in. We are again proposing to invoke vindictive measures; we are trying once again to make use of the hate process and the advantage-taking process in order to restore to one side, which had all the advantage in the 150 years of our history until 1935, the advantage it previously had. Is there anyone in the legal profession so pure that when hired by a client he will not work for the advantage of the client and use every advantageous means the law allows him to use? A lawyer who would not avail himself of all the legal advantages would be an unfair lawyer, an unfair advocate. When we invite a return to the methods and practices of the past we may rest assured that they will be indulged in, not for the benefit of the American people, not for the benefit of the American workers, not for the benefit of industry in the long run, but for the benefit of the advantage takers, and the result will be chaos, unemployment, and a return to those "good old days" when men stood entirely for property rights, and when the individual rights were quite forgotten.

For one I do not wish to return to those days, Mr. President. I, for one, am not the least bit interested in seeing the new freedoms which have come to the American workmen wiped out, no matter how much I may disapprove some things which some American workmen have done. I have seen these things at close hand. I have seem them in England and in many other countries. I know the spirit of peoples. I know the boycott from living in the land where the boycott had its origin, and where it was the most exacting instrument to keep a government from imposing unjust taxes upon the people. I have seen the great British Government brought to its knees inside of 12 hours by the power of the boycott among the money-changers in the British Colony of Hong Kong. I know the force of the boycott. I know how it works, and I know its purposes. I know that it is only through the use of such methods that the under-dog has had any kind of chance at all in the world.

Mr. President, I do not want to see a return to the time when, in the name of justice for everyone, there was in reality justice for no one, when, in the name of equalizing conditions, conditions were made more unequal.

Mr. President, the enactment of the pending bill into law and the enactment into law of the portal-to-portal bill will mean an open invitation for return to the "good old days." In considering those measures Congress has not taken into consideration the simple facts of our present economic system. The facts are simply told and easily digested. I read from an editorial published in the La Follette Progressive, as follows:

> The facts are simply told and easily digested: Fact No. 1. Corporation profits have soared 34 percent in a single year and are now at the highest peak in the war or peacetime history of the United States. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)
>
> Fact No. 2. Prices for consumers during that same year have soared 19 percent. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)
>
> Fact No. 3. Wages for labor advanced only 14 percent during the same year—and in some fields much less or not at all. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.)
>
> Fact No. 4. Savings of American individuals during the same year have dropped to the lowest level since 1941 and to half the amount saved in 1945. (Source: official figures of the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission.)
>
> The whole story is right there. American labor, at the peak of its productivity, finds more and more of the wealth it creates going out in profits. Meanwhile, its own cost of staying alive is shooting skyward. At the same time it is being cut off from its financial and psychological anchor—security in the form of savings.

Mr. President, those are economic facts. In considering the measures to which I have referred no one described the conditions up to the last war and the strikes which took place then. No one pointed out how prices went up and how prices came down; how there were minor depressions and major depressions, until finally there was the great depression. No one took into consideration the whole economic field in spite of the fact that we passed the Full Employment Act. No one in the Government has given us the real facts about these conditions.

Can we have anything but unrest in a time when insecurity exists? There is one little town in the United States where one branch, one activity of the United States Government is located. Due to the action of the Congress in cutting down expenses 69 persons have been taken from the pay roll in that single office. That means undoubtedly that 69 families in that small town are without income, because the bread-winning members of the families are out of employment. Do we not have gumption enough, do we not have knowledge enough to look back to what happened after the last war and try to learn from past experience? A movement is now underway to cut down expenses, and deprive people of their work. Is it not time for us to change our philosophy of government in that regard and not produce unemployment? If the Federal Government continues in the course it has begun to follow the State governments will follow suit; then big industry will follow suit; thereupon little industry will have to follow suit, and we will have self-imposed unemployment at a time when production is the greatest, when demand is the greatest, when purchasing power is at its highest. We will actually and willfully be paying no attention to economic facts, but will deliberately be bringing about a condition which cannot help but end in a mighty wave of unemployment and another depression.

Mr. President, I have been connected all my life with a business, and have lived through good times, bad times, panics, rich men's panics, money panics, actual depressions. I do not have to go outside the experience of my own family to know how terrible such things are. I do not want to see panic and depression times come back. But, Mr. President once we begin breaking down the very foundations on which the habits of our citizens are built, and on which they have learned to depend, we shall find that uncertainty, lack of confidence, and fear, will bring about a dangerous economic condition. If we continue to cut away these foundations, the end will not be far off.

I predict that if the portal-to-portal measure becomes law, that if the House labor bill becomes law, or if the bill now pending in the Senate becomes law, and we ask the Government of the United States and the courts of the United States to interpret all the new definitions which are written in those measures, we will be compelled to go through a period as long as the one we have heretofore gone through in attempting to discover what is the basic law of the land in regard to industry-labor relations; we will have to do all that over again, and the new interpretations will cover page after page of the law reports.

Mr. President, that is not the American way of establishing stability. That is not the way in which during the past 150 years we worked out the best and most stable government on earth, a government of law. When once great fundamentals have been established it is better to build on those fundamentals, and have them reinterpreted, than to invite the courts to move into the field of law which for 50 years the courts have been told to stay away from. Such action on the part of Congress will not bring about industrial peace, labor peace, or governmental stability. It will result in bringing into American life confusion, uncertainty, and in the end such confusion and uncertainty cannot help but promote evil in our body politic, in our social system, and in our economic life.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a substitute for the pending amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment offered by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE), it is proposed on page 54, between lines 4 and 5, to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any person to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the promises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relation Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators.

SEGREGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which House bill 1098, to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation was ordered to a third reading and passed on May 6, be reconsidered.

The object in asking for reconsideration is to correct the language. The Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, has pointed out to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee [Mr. BUTLER] that by the language of the bill interest is charged on interest in the funds of those tribes. The Comptroller suggests that the language be changed so that only the principal, and not the interest, would be subject to interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Wyoming know of any objection to the amendments which have been suggested by the Comptroller General?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I know of no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator intend to ask for consideration of the amendments and repassage of the bill at this time?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Subject to the right to resume the unfinished business, I have no objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The amendments are very brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which House bill 1098 was ordered to a third reading and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 1, on page 1, line 10, after the word "amount", it is proposed to strike out "to a trust fund" and insert "in the principal"; in the same line, after the word "account", it is proposed to strike out "for" and insert "to a principal trust fund account and one-half of the total amount in the interest account to an interest trust account for."

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, on page 2, line 5, after the word "The", it is proposed to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Comptroller General of the United States"; in line 7, after the word "and", it is proposed to

strike out "to" and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury shall"; in line 10, after the word "interest", it is proposed to strike out "earned" and insert "shall accrue on the principal fund only"; in line 11, after the words "per annum", it is proposed to insert a comma and the word "and"; in the same line, after the words "credited to the", it is proposed to strike out "principal" and insert "interest"; and in line 15, after the words "credited to the", it is proposed to insert "principal."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 8, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross;

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when the proposed compact between the United States and the Dominion of Canada with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway was presented to the Senate, the bill undertaking to improve it and implement it, together with the compact—or treaty, as I prefer to call it—was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Since then another bill has been introduced and has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

When the St. Lawrence seaway treaty was before the Senate, together with the first bill, known as the Aiken bill, and was under the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Commerce, that committee was headed by the late Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina. Blessed be his memory. The late Senator Bailey was not only a great student, a man of profound knowledge, and great ability, but was very thorough in any undertaking to which he applied himself. He wanted all the information he could obtain with reference to the treaties which existed between Canada and the United States regarding boundary lines and boundary waters, and also all the information he could obtain with respect to the proposed compact. Therefore, among other things, he addressed a letter to each of the American-flag steamship lines operating from Atlantic and Gulf ports and on the Great Lakes asking the various steamship lines whether they expected to utilize the seaway if constructed, and to what extent, and requesting their views generally on the subject matter of the proposed treaty. He received replies from practically all the steamship companies to which he addressed letters. He addressed them to the American lines operating along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast and to quite a number of steamship companies operating on the Great Lakes.

He received 32 replies. He was anxious prior to his death that those replies be laid before the United States Senate. That task has been assigned to me. I regard it as a very solemn obligation. I am proposing now to discharge the duty which I owe to the late Senator Bailey.

I shall not at this time enter upon a discussion of the treaty. I merely wish to read these letters in order that they may appear in the body of the RECORD. I ask that I may proceed without interruption until the reading of the letters has been concluded.

The first letter which I shall read is from the Robin Line, Seas Shipping Co., Inc., 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y. It is dated April 12, 1946, addressed to Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, and reads as follows:

SEA SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 12, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12, 1946, in which you requested my views on the proposal to construct a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and install power production facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. You asked whether we have any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with our own ships.

At this time, we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with any of our vessels. The vessels which we own and will operate in commercial service are all large and could not safely navigate the proposed 27-foot channel when fully laden. This condition is true of a very great majority of commercial vessels under the American flag today.

The proposed seaway might be helpful to foreign shipowners who have vessels of medium size and with comparatively shallow draft. The majority of American shipowners seem to be opposed to the proposition since they anticipate that the seaway would be used by foreign-flag vessels with a consequent reduction in freight available to American-flag vessels using the major seaports of the United States.

It does not appear to me that the proposed seaway would offer any very great savings to shippers. Water transportation via the Great Lakes and New York State Barge Canal is available to Midwest shippers and I doubt that the savings afforded by direct steamer service from the Great Lakes ports would be of any great consequence.

Leaving aside any power production or national defense considerations which may or may not be sufficient to justify its construction, I consider the proposed seaway to be economically and commercially unjustifiable. It does not appear to me that there is any possibility that it would ever be a self-liquidating project, since I understand it is to be free of toll.

There have been widely varying estimates of its cost, and even if the most optimistic view is taken, it appears to me that the savings which might be effected would redound to the benefit of one section of the country and one segment of its economy to the prejudice of other very important regions and industries.

There are also, as you know, very conflicting views as to the volume of freight which might move on such a waterway. It would be open to navigation at best for only about 7 months of the year. If it should be used to the extent which its advocates visualize, other forms of transportation would undoubtedly suffer and the shippers using the waterway might find themselves unable to secure adequate transportation for their products during the months in which the proposed seaway would be closed to navigation.

Another consideration which seems to have been overlooked by many of the proponents of the seaway is that in order to accommodate the volume of oceangoing traffic which is contemplated, it would be necessary to construct very extensive and costly harbor improvements at ports on the Great Lakes. This would add very greatly to the over-all cost of the seaway and no doubt impose a burden on States and/or municipalities along the Great Lakes.

I have seen no figures which convince me that the proposed seaway would not constitute a direct drain on the Treasury of the United States, nor that the gains to the national economy would in any degree offset this drain. Consequently, the expense would come from the pockets of the taxpayers, and, in my opinion, it is most necessary that efforts be made to reduce governmental expenditures, reduce our public debt instead of increasing it, and reduce taxes, in order to stimulate business, industry, and employment.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR R. LAWES, JR.,
President.

The next letter is from the Colonial Navigation Co. of New York City, dated April 4, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, and reads as follows:

COLONIAL NAVIGATION CO.,
New York City, April 4, 1946.

Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Since our operations have been confined to the coastwise trade we have not given detailed study to the project, but from my knowledge of the characteristics of American ships operating in the foreign trade, it would appear that the 27-foot depth of the channel would not be sufficient and, further, that because of the fact that for a large portion of the year the waterway will be closed because of ice conditions, it would not seem to warrant the large expenditure of money necessary to carry the project to completion. There are, I understand from statements submitted, a great many other objections, but I think the shallow draught—plus the very great cost—should be sufficient to dispose of the project unfavorably.

Very truly yours,
J. B. DUNBAUGH,
President.

The next letter, which is from the American Petroleum Transport Corp. of

New York City, dated April 2, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, reads as follows:

AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12, relative to the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

I have always felt that this seaway is not justified, that the expense would be totally unwarranted for the traffic involved, and that the present waterway can handle all of the traffic that is required from the ocean to the Great Lakes and return.

It is my firm belief that this seaway would be of very little benefit, if any, to American steamship owners, and I see no possibility of this St. Lawrence seaway being used by our ships.

Very truly yours,
AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.

Mr. President, the next letter is from Cargo Carriers, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and is dated April 1, 1946. It reads as follows:

CARGO CARRIERS, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 1, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We appreciate your letter of the 12th asking for our opinion with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway.

We have no plans for the use of this seaway, although we move large amounts of freight from points on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan to the seaboard, both for export and for domestic use, and we also forward substantial quantities of this freight from the seaboard to foreign destinations, principally Europe. Our business is the transportation of bulk commodities, principally grain.

Further it is our belief that the amount of goods moved direct from Great Lakes points to foreign countries over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, if constructed, will be disappointingly small, very much less than claimed by the proponents of the seaway.

In order to bring about a movement of goods directly between foreign countries and points on the Great Lakes, or between points on the Atlantic seaboard, and points on the Great Lakes by way of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, it would be necessary that ships built for operation on the Great Lakes also operate on the ocean and that ships built for ocean operation also operate on the Great Lakes. We do not feel that either of these operations would be practical or economical for the better classes of ships now in operation.

Practically all of the ships operating on the Great Lakes are a special type of construction, built for operation only on the Great Lakes. It is our opinion, and we believe the opinion of all other operators, that these ships could not operate successfully on the ocean. They carry large cargoes at comparatively shallow drafts because of their length in proportion to their other dimensions. Because of this greater length in proportion to the other dimensions than is used in ocean boats, these Lake boats would not be safe for ocean operation.

Just before the war, and during the war, there have been built a great number of new cargo vessels, enough to carry a large part of the commerce of the important maritime nations. These new boats, such as our country's Liberty ships and Victory ships, require a channel much deeper than 27 feet when they are fully loaded; many of them requiring channels as deep as 35 feet. Inasmuch as the plans for the proposed seaway appear to provide a channel of no more than 27 feet, we cannot conceive of these newer, better, and more economical ocean ships going into the Great Lakes with cargoes or to get cargoes.

It may be said that these ships can go to a port on the Great Lakes, such as Duluth or Chicago, and load enough cargo to put them down to a draft of 26 feet or 27 feet, and then complete their cargo by loading to their full draft at Montreal or some such port as that. No doubt that could be done, but it is our opinion it is not economical for ships, especially those with heavy operating costs, to travel more than 2,200 miles with only a part cargo one way, or even both ways.

It may be possible to make changes in the plans for the seaway which would provide a channel as deep as 35 feet. However, if this were done, we would think it would increase the cost to a point which would be considered prohibitive even by those who now favor the seaway. In the case of grain, we do not see how the cost of the transportation alone between a Great Lakes port and a foreign country would be reduced by shipping direct under the cost of the transportation which is now in use. The saving, if any, would be the saving due to the elimination of the cost of transfer from lake ships to ocean ships. At most, this involves two transfers between Duluth and the foreign country at an aggregate cost of no more than 2 cents per bushel. It is our opinion that the greatest possible amount of grain exports over the proposed seaway would be an average of 50,000,000 bushels per year. Assuming the maximum possible saving of 2 cents per bushel, the total possible saving on grain would be $1,000,000 per year.

It is our belief that should the seaway be completed, it would be found that very few large ships, and therefore a comparatively small amount of freight, would make the trip direct between our Great Lakes ports and foreign countries. It occurs to us that there may follow a demand for some encouragement for such business to use the seaway. No doubt it would be suggested that some sort of Government subsidies be provided to encourage the through transportation and use of the seaway. We may be needlessly concerned about this, but such a demand seems to arise whenever any new vessel operation is found to be unprofitable and uneconomical.

In this letter we have tried to confine ourselves to approaching the matter from our own point of view as a vessel operator. A number of other thoughts and comments which we have with respect to the proposed seaway have been reported in the newspapers and news letters as having been well covered in Senate committee hearings. In case more detailed information, or a statement of our views at greater length is desired, we shall be glad to furnish them.

Yours very truly,
F. J. HAYS.

The next letter is from the Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., of New York City, and is dated March 30, 1946. It reads as follows:

MOORE-MCCORMACK LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 30, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, in which you have asked for our views with regard to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, with vessels which would be adaptable to operation on the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, the Welland Canal section, and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the high seas.

We are operating the following overseas routes:

1. North Atlantic ports and South Atlantic ports of the U. S. A. to the east coast South American ports.

2. North Atlantic ports of the U. S. A. to the Scandinavian and Baltic ports.

3. Pacific coast ports of the U. S. A. and Canada, to the north coast and east coast South American ports via the Panama Canal.

Of the 16 vessels which were taken over by the Government (only a part of which have been thus far returned to us for private operation) and seven additional C3 vessels which are now in the course of construction, and three other vessels which we plan to build in the immediate future, there is but one—a C1 vessel—which could navigate safely the 27-foot channel of the proposed seaway.

Of course, all these ships could load to a depth which would permit them to traverse this seaway, but it would mean they would have to complete this loading at Montreal and other St. Lawrence ports, in order to give them full cargoes, thereby further building up Canadian commerce and commercial activities.

As ship operators, we are opposed to the construction of this proposed St. Lawrence seaway, for we do not believe the construction of such a seaway would be to our interest or to the interest of the country. It is our opinion that such a seaway, if constructed, would be of particular value to foreign operators of small vessels. The diversion of traffic between the interior points and the Atlantic seaboard ports would militate against the maintenance of a strong and efficient American merchant marine.

No plans have been made by the company to utilize the St. Lawrence seaway. The position of the American steamship operators has been ably presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee by the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and from the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, copies of which statements are attached for your convenience. We endorse the position taken by these two associations.

Very truly yours,
ALBERT V. MOORE,
President.

I next read a letter from the United States Lines Co.:

UNITED STATES LINES CO.,
New York, March 28, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: You were kind enough to ask me in a letter received a few days ago my opinion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as authorized in the joint resolution pending before Congress.

You inquire as to the "feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway." Answering this, and speaking out of my long experience as a steamship operator, I must say that the waterway would be too shallow. The proposed 27-foot channel between Montreal and Lake Ontario would, in reality, be only a 24-foot channel because only ships of that or lesser draft could use it. Remember that a vessel should have a clearance of about 2 feet, 6 inches, and that in addition a ship will draw 6 inches more in fresh than in salt water. Our Maritime Commission insists that owners and operators shall sail their ships "full and down." This is the answer to proponents of the seaway who are already arguing that ships using the seaway take abroad smaller loads to keep within the 24-foot draft.

Another reason why the project is unfeasible is that for about 7 months in each year it would be closed by winter. In addition, the canalized section at many points would be dangerous. Navigation would be extremely hazardous. Ships would menace each

other when passing, and the rocky shores of the canalized area would mean sinkings and in many instances total losses in case of collision. Then, too, fogs are prevalent and there would be few spots where the channel is narrow for ships to anchor with safety. All in all, from the point of feasibility, the proposal to spend hundreds of millions to provide this seaway is a fantastic one.

As to economy of navigation, there can be none because in its broader aspects, the seaway discriminates against this Nation's merchant fleet. Into the merchant ships constituting this, our American taxpayers have poured more than $50,000,000,000. It is plain that the seaway would help reverse the American policy of "fostering" an American Merchant Marine. You might ask why, and my answer would be because only about eight percent of our merchant ships could use it and many of those ships are already obsolete. We have a war-built merchant marine of more than 5,000 vessels. Only about 400 of these have a draft of 24 feet or less. And remember, a small vessel such as might navigate the seaway is relatively as costly to operate as a large one and will carry only about one-third the cargo and earn only about one-third the money that its big brother will. The preponderance of ships able to navigate the canalized river would be foreign (more than 70 percent). Most of the traffic would move in tramp ships, none of American register, and to the great detriment of our regularly operated American lines. Moreover, hazards encountered in the canalized section, due to narrow channels, currents and fog, would send the insurance rates soaring.

Another thing: Nearly 100,000,000 tons of iron ore are lifted by America's tremendous lake fleet annually. The presence of this fleet in time of war is a national necessity. But if the seaway is constructed, this fleet now carrying ore to the American railroads will languish and ultimately become dissipated.

And what of the domestic carriers which now give regular and satisfactory service from the Great Lakes to our American eastern seaboard? Will the railroads be satisfied (and keep rates down) if permitted to serve lake traffic only 5 months in the year?

In turn, how can the American steamship companies on the east coast afford to give virtually daily sailings to Europe during 12 months in the year when for 7 months cargo would be diverted from the east coast and carried in foreign tramp ships paying crews subnormal wages? Rate structures, built up through the years, would be shattered.

I shall not attempt to quote statistics to demonstrate that our port of New York, the greatest in the world, will inevitably suffer if the St. Lawrence seaway is built. The loss of commerce here will run into the hundreds of millions. Proponents of the canal have indicated their belief that the traffic diverted from New York would amount to only about 8 percent of the amount which goes through this port normally. They fail to emphasize that this 8 percent by value would amount to almost 25 percent. As an example, may I quote the following:

"Custom figures for 1938 fixing $413 a ton for passenger cars foreshadow an annual loss to the port of New York of $20?,937,000 in value should automobile carryings be diverted to the seaway. What would be the loss to New York City, suffered by longshoremen, shipowners, brokers, truckers, warehouses, and pier rentals, cannot be estimated."

Concluding your letter, you ask me to say:

1. Whether the seaway as proposed would provide a saving to shippers and would prove attractive to shipowners.

2. Whether our company, the United States Lines, plans to navigate the seaway.

The answer to these questions is a blunt "No." Need I add that I am irrevocably opposed to the construction of this project?

Thanking you for providing me with this opportunity to express my views, and with kindest personal regards and warmest wishes,

Most cordially,

BASIL HARRIS.

Mr. President, I now read a letter from A. B. Sharp, president of the Eastern Steamship Lines:

EASTERN STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
Boston, Mass., March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: This refers to your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

I cannot add anything to the mass of information that has been submitted to Congress on this subject during recent years, except my personal opinion.

New England is largely against the project, but I think I am not particularly biased on account of being located in this area, as I grew up on the shores of Lake Michigan and have been here only a few years.

From the standpoint of the seaway operation, I see nothing whatever in it for a company in domestic steamship service, as the length of the haul as compared with the land haul from any American port on the Great Lakes to any American port elsewhere, would positively prevent successful steamship operation. I believe that anyone familiar with present day steamship costs and rates, and land transportation rates, must necessarily reach this unequivocal conclusion. Any studies that I know of that have been made in the past in this connection must now be thrown into the waste basket, as steamship operating costs are so much higher than they were when private steamship operations ceased almost entirely because of the war—increases in steamship labor nearly 100 percent; repairs and maintenance probably more than 100 percent; fuel over 50 percent.

With respect to use of the seaway for foreign commerce, there is no possibility of its use in competition with foreign-flag ships unless the Government pays large subsidies. This would appear to accomplish only the elimination of income for the labor and capital now engaged in competitive land transportation, transfer a large part of the income to foreign labor and capital, and place a heavy burden on all the taxpayers of the country.

With respect to both domestic and foreign trade, it must be borne in mind that a preponderant majority of American ships in the enormous fleet which has been built and is now available for ocean operations, consists of large vessels which could not sail the seaway with more than about 60 percent of their carrying capacity in tons of cargo. The 27-foot proposed depth of water simply would not permit it. Smaller foreign craft now in existence, and many more building, would surely have an overwhelming advantage in foreign trade, and again there is no way to overcome this advantage unless the Government builds another fleet for use in the seaway, and provides it with subsidies sufficient to make competition possible.

To me this proposal is a wild, uneconomical scheme which will cost vast sums of money to place in operation, and will impose a never ending additional great burden upon the people of our Nation.

Very truly yours,

A. B. SHARP,
President.

The following is a letter from Arnold Bernstein, of 17 Battery Place, New York:

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Chairman
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Responding to your letter of March 12, I would say that generally speaking I favor the development of natural waterways and installation of power facilities made possible thereby.

I can give no opinion with regard to any specific development, except perhaps to comment on the effect that a new seaway from the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River would have on changing the movement of ocean cargo.

If such a seaway could be operated throughout the whole year and not be closed by ice through the winter months, I would favor this project, despite losses and inconveniences that may be anticipated during the initial period of readjustment and adaptation. Since this new seaway could be used for 6 months of the year only, however, I should think—

(a) Assuming that export and import will reach the prewar level, a substantial percentage of the traffic of the whole lake area will use the new seaway instead of going overseas from New York;

(b) Water transportation does not involve only supplying ships and shipping needs, but railroad yards, warehouse facilities, piers, bunker facilities, and many other installations run by experienced organizations;

(c) Deviation of a great percentage of cargo means proportionate idleness of such installations in New York, and at the same time the construction in the new loading and discharge ports of the same kind of facilities;

(d) The lines serving the various world routes from New York and out ports will either lose the traffic diverted to the new seaway to new lines founded for this purpose, or will have to open branches of their service, allocating part of their tonnage to the traffic carried directly from the Lakes. Since the most important lines combine passenger and cargo service, and since the passenger service can hardly be transferred from New York, in many cases the provision of additional cargo steamers will be involved, creating quite a serious problem for the established lines.

Without careful study, I do not feel qualified to give an opinion in regard to the benefit industry and agriculture may gain from the project. However, for the reasons indicated above, it seems to me doubtful, at least as far as shipping and port facilities are concerned, if the gain reasonably to be expected from the new seaway would justify the new investment, and at the same time, losses that New York as a world harbor must expect from the loss of part of its traffic.

Respectfully,

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN.

I now read letters from 23 other steamship companies whose names appear on the headings of the letters:

MARINE TRANSPORT LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have endeavored to keep informed concerning the proposed seaway to the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and the construction of power facilities contemplated by pending legislation before the Congress, and about which you deal in your letter of March 12.

After careful examination into the possibilities of use of the improved waterway facilities projected, and after considering the

information gathered as to present and prospective traffic, we arrived at the conclusion that, so far as transportation is concerned, the expense for the seaway project would be unwarranted. We accordingly felt that there was no justification, insofar as our company is concerned, for extending our operations into the Great Lakes area via the St. Lawrence, other than in small ships which from time to time have been suitable for such trade under existing conditions. Our considerations lead us to believe that no substantial savings to shippers would result from the development proposed.

From the standpoint of the American merchant marine, it seems to me that the project might prove to be disadvantageous, altogether aside from the matter of initial and recurring costs for the development, both construction and maintenance.

Yours very truly,

W. N. WESTERLUND,
President.

ALCOA STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.

The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In you letter of March 12 you ask for our views regarding the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and inquire whether we plan to navigate the seaway with our ships.

We have no plans for using the proposed seaway. If the seaway is used to any considerable extent for overseas shipping the vessel operators, port facilities, and the railroads serving the United States north Atlantic ports will suffer the disadvantage of a peak during about 5 months of the year and a slump during the balance of the year, resulting in higher costs and less efficiency. Conceivably, an increase in ocean and rail rates would follow. Such a prospect would certainly discourage modernization and improvement of the facilities at Atlantic ports.

Considering the capital required for construction of the canal, the handicaps of seasonal operation, and the adverse effects on the railroads and north Atlantic ports, we doubt very much whether the project can be considered an economic one.

Yours very truly,

HERMAN LEWIS,
President.

GRACE LINE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Committee on Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12 asking for our views in respect to the proposed construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River. This project has been under consideration for a long time and has received careful thought and study by the shipping industry of the country. I believe it entirely correct to say that the shipping companies are practically unanimous in their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway plan insofar as that plan would contemplate the development of oceangoing traffic as contrasted with that part of the proposal relating to the development of electric power. The American Merchant Marine Institute, whose members own and operate the major portion of the American flag merchant fleet engaged in foreign and domestic deep-sea trade, and of which we are a member, has expressed its opinion on the subject with our entire concurrence in a letter to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, under date of February 26, 1946.

Replying more specifically to the questions raised in your letter regarding this company's possible interest in operating its vessels through the proposed seaway if it is constructed, I have to advise you that Grace Line has nearly completed a construction program of 18 new vessels, not one of which could safely navigate the proposed seaway without leaving unfilled some 15 to 20 percent of their cargo capacity. Your familiarity with shipping matters will enable you to understand without further explanation that no vessel can compete in international trade unless it is able to take full advantage of its size and capacity.

The normal peacetime operations of the Grace Line are between the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports of the United States, and the countries to the south of us in Central and South America. Such of the cargo normally carried in our ships as originates from or is destined to the Great Lakes area is moved to and from seaboard by existing transportation systems such as railroads, canals, and trucks. Particularly as to our ships servicing the United States Gulf area, the Mississippi Barge Canal System has offered cheap and efficient transportation of export and import cargo to the manufacturing centers of the Middle West. Insofar as trade with Central and South America is concerned, it is inconceivable to us that there would be any economy in the transportation of goods originating in and destined to the Great Lakes area via the circuitous route of the St. Lawrence waterway and thence along the entire Atlantic seaboard on the water routes leading to the south.

It is conceivable that there might be some economies for shippers from the Great Lakes area to northern Europe by the use of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, but it is our considered judgment and that of the entire shipping industry that such economies would, in the aggregate, be insignificant as compared with the cost of construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed seaway.

I trust that these individual views may be of some value and would be delighted to reply to any further questions which you may have.

Respectfully,

R. R. ADAMS,
President.

CALMAR STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12 in which you advise that there is pending before the Congress a joint resolution to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own vessels and are unalterably opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway for the following reasons:

1. Vessels that may use this proposed seaway will only be able to load up to a draft of 24 feet. At the present time the vessels we are operating, fully loaded, have a draft of 28 feet 6 inches, and the vessels we propose to operate will have a draft of 27 feet 8 inches. Due to the lesser density of fresh water, a vessel will draw 6 inches more than in salt water. The port rules of Montreal require 2 feet 6 inches bottom clearance for the issuance of a sailing permit. Therefore, our vessels could never load full cargoes if we were to use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

2. We load our vessels at Baltimore, Md., and Philadelphia, Pa., and discharge them at Boston, Mass., New York, Philadelphia, Pa., and Baltimore, Md. The time for safe navigation on the Great Lakes and through the proposed seaway will be limited to about 7 months a year, depending on weather conditions. To retain dock facilities for only 5 months out of a year at the ports mentioned, such facilities to be idle during the 7 months of open navigation on the proposed seaway and Great Lakes, is economically unsound.

3. The suggestion has been made that American operators could use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway by only partially loading their vessels instead of bringing them down to their legal load marks. In our opinion, the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would provide little, if no savings to shippers, because of necessity vessels that load such part cargoes and must incur 8,238 miles of extra steaming, would have to secure a great deal higher rate for cargo loading at lake ports.

4. The proposed St. Lawrence seaway has no attraction to the ship operator, both from the standpoint of economy and from the standpoint of business.

The proposal for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is in our opinion economically unsound and highly detrimental to the best interests of the American merchant marine.

Very truly yours,

H. W. WARLEY, *President.*

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM & TRANSPORT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to your letter of March 12 regarding the joint resolution which is now pending before the Congress to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, we have no plans to navigate the proposed seaway with our ships if and when such legislation should be approved.

Our company operates along the Atlantic coast and points adjacent thereto in the 17 States from Maine to Florida. The seaway would therefore be of no benefit to us. From an oil-tanker angle, it would be rather difficult for any company to utilize the seaway as at present outlined. As you are aware, the large quantity of T-2 and T-3 tankers built by the United States Government, and which were necessary for the successful prosecution of the recent war, will make these tankers practically the standard for the carriage of oil on ocean waterways for a large number of years to come. These boats have a 30-foot draft when fully loaded in salt water and would have a draft of very close to 31 feet in fresh water. The proposed channel for the seaway being limited to 27 feet would absolutely eliminate the use of the T-2 or T-3 type of tanker.

Inasmuch as the normal movement of oil by tanker is from the Gulf coast, the distance to be covered to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, which is approximately latitude 50° north, and then the long southwest movement through the seaway and the Great Lakes, would increase the cost of the movement of products to such an extent that the writer does not see how it would be possible to compete with the more efficient pipe-line movement of crude and products from the Gulf to the central and northern portion of the United States which now obtains.

From the standpoint of the petroleum industry, there certainly can be no justification for the tremendous expenditure which would be required of our Government to make this artificial waterway, and also the heavy annual upkeep which would be necessitated by its use.

Very truly yours,

JAMES PATTERSON,
Vice President.

MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have your inquiry of March 12 concerning the probability of navigation between the ocean and the Great Lakes through the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The commercial interests in the Mississippi Valley have generally opposed the seaway. The ground of opposition has been that it would divert import and export traffic from the Mississippi system which has already been improved by the National Government at heavy expense.

I have not actively opposed the project, personally, because I have grave doubt that a large two-way traffic could be practically developed. The Great Lakes can and do handle the exportable surplus of grain at costs as low as anything known in ocean transportation under the United States flag.

If the seaway were constructed as planned, it would enable lake boats to carry both American and Canadian grain down to Montreal and shift the transfer point from Buffalo 500 miles farther toward the sea. That would be the big exportable surplus which might attract ocean ships into the Great Lakes. However, in the reverse direction, the canal would be available to merchandise from western Europe and little else and I doubt whether Middle West distributors of this limited type of freight, when divorced from the great distribution through Atlantic and Gulf ports, would give a paying two-way traffic for many ocean-going ships. Furthermore, while the depth of 27 feet is adequate for Great Lakes boats and most Great Lakes harbors are hardly dredged to this depth, 27 feet would necessarily prove a very definite limitation which would bar the newer and better ships which are now being built for ocean traffic. For example, the standard C-2 and C-3 vessels, the Libertys and Victorys, cannot safely be loaded to full draft and navigate this channel and certainly 30 feet over the miter sills of the 15 locks would put a very definite limitation upon the seaway's future value.

At New Orleans, we have a lock 75 feet by 600 feet with 30 feet 6 inches over the miter sills which leads from the Mississippi River into the newer inner harbor. This is proving such a limitation upon our harbor development that we are presently urging the United States Government to give us a direct seaway from inner harbor to the Gulf with a depth of 40 feet and a bottom width of 600 feet. It is our belief that any port served by a channel of lesser dimensions will be greatly limited in its future expansion.

The fleet of the Delta Line is made up of standard C-2 and C-3 ships. We operate between Gulf ports and the east coast of South America. The St. Lawrence seaway would offer no inducement to us.

The barge rates on the Mississippi River from New Orleans, offer the cheapest entrance to the port of Chicago of any we know. It is our judgment that the cost of operating deep-sea ships through inland passages of 2,250 miles with the time spent in passing through 15 locks, would be more expensive than the single cost of one transfer from ship to barge at New Orleans in view of the existing barge rates for a 1,500-mile haul from New Orleans to Chicago.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE BRENT,
President.

AMERICAN SOUTH AFRICAN LINE, INC.,
New York, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Thank you for your letter of March 12, asking my views on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

I have given this subject detailed study and consideration and have reached the conclusion that, whether or not such a project is completed, it is not economically feasible for American South African Line to use it. In the following paragraphs I shall try to set forth my explanation for this belief in greater detail.

The first question to be considered is the draft of the channel. The proposed draft is 27 feet. American ships are expensive to construct and expensive to operate. To enable some degree of competition with foreign lines, we have increased the draft of our ships so as to carry more cargo per voyage. The new fleet of American South African Line is composed of United States Maritime Commission C-3-type vessels. These ships have a draft, when down to their marks, of 29 feet 1 inch. Minimum navigation requirements of the St. Lawrence seaway require 2 feet 6 inches between the bottom of the hull of the vessel and the river bed. Another 6 inches of draft would be lost by reason of the fact that these ships would be operating in fresh water rather than in salt water.

Homeward cargo from South and East Africa is mainly manganese and chrome ore, that is weight cargo. If our ships were to use the St. Lawrence seaway, instead of loading them to the marks, 29 feet 1 inch, they could only be loaded to a draft of 24 feet. For a ship of the C-3 type, approximately 58 tons of cargo are required to change the draft 1 inch. This means that, if one of our ships were to be loaded for the passage through the St. Lawrence, she would carry 3,498 tons of cargo less than her capacity. This is not economically justified.

With the high cost of American ship construction and operation, as opposed to foreign-flag lines, I do not believe it would be sound policy to construct smaller ships specifically for this trade. The St. Lawrence is considered safe for navigation only 7 months of the year. If special ships were designed and constructed for this trade, they would not be able to compete with our present vessels during the balance of the year, inasmuch as their cost of operation would be about the same but carrying capacity would be so much less. It would not be sound economic policy to leave these ships idle for the 5-month period the St. Lawrence is not navigable. On the other hand, their presence in other routes, during the off season, would only cause great confusion and disorganization in the shipping industry.

If our ships were to go to the Great Lakes ports, we should have to add a considerable sum to our cost per voyage, resulting in a greatly increased cost to the shipper. This increase would consist not only of the expense of vessel operation for a longer time per voyage than at present, but we should also have to include the cost of maintaining branch offices or agencies at each of the ports of call for the entire year. I do not consider it advisable to open and close these offices for only a part of each year or to shift the personnel to various other offices at off seasons. The operation of a ship requires too much detailed knowledge of a port to make such shifting of personnel sound policy.

Another question of vital importance is the question of safe navigation. It is understood many parts of the St. Lawrence seaway will be blasted out of solid rock—that, in parts, the channel will be suitable for one-way passage only.

This area is noted for the frequent occurrence of fog and mist. If one of our ships were to be caught in a narrow stretch of this channel, in a fog or mist, it is considered the ship would be in extreme danger, and this danger would be greatly aggravated by the possibility of the current of the river swinging the vessel onto the rocks. I do not believe a conscientious steamship operator is justified in jeopardizing a large oceangoing vessel by sending her on such a voyage, with its attending risks of loss of life, cargo, and vessel.

These added risks would contribute substantially to an increase in insurance rates. This too, would be reflected in increased rates to the shipper.

In view of the foregoing, I wish to repeat most emphatically, the St. Lawrence project would not be attractive to American South African Line, nor do I believe it would be attractive to the vast majority of American ship operators. Further, considering their long-range interests, I do not believe it would provide a real saving to shippers. On the contrary, I believe it would seriously disorganize present services from North Atlantic ports and would react to the detriment of both shippers and ship operators.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to set forth my views on the St. Lawrence project and hope that they will be of assistance in determining your own actions with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 104.

Yours very truly,

JAMES A. FARRELL, Jr.,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 12, addressed to Mr. John A. Werner, president of the Fruit Dispatch Co. and asking his opinion as to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, has been referred to the undersigned. The Fruit Dispatch Co., a subsidiary of the United Fruit Co., handles the distribution of our principal product, but the operation of the vessels is under the control of the parent company and for this reason Mr. Werner has turned your letter over to me.

For the past several years we have followed rather closely the arguments for and against this project and it is my considered opinion that the rather doubtful gains of a few sections of the country do not warrant the vast expenditure involved. I have read varying estimates of the cost of this project, ranging from $300,000,000 to almost $1,000,000,000, a large portion of which would be assumed by Canada. Is it not possible that Canada might find it difficult to meet this huge expenditure, thereby further increasing the portion that would have to be paid by United States funds?

First of all, it appears that the proposed 27-foot channel would preclude something over 90 percent of the American merchant marine, a good part of which was constructed during the war period, and over 80 percent of the world's tonnage, from using the seaway. In any event, because of the winter freeze the St. Lawrence would be navigable for only about 7 months of the year, and the same holds true to a lesser extent for the Great Lakes.

So far as this company's normal peacetime operations are concerned, it is imperative that the banana, a perishable commodity, reaches its markets with the least possible delay after the fruit is cut in the Tropics,

and even though the fruit is carried in refrigerated vessels it would be decidedly unwise to expose it to the extended additional distance that would be necessary in transit to Great Lakes ports; not only from the point of view of the additional mileage involved but also the necessarily reduced speed of the vessels in transiting the proposed seaway. It would be much more economical to discharge the fruit at United States Atlantic and Gulf ports and rail it to the interior markets.

Under these circumstances, even if the seaway project should become a reality in the future, it is most unlikely that this company's vessels will ever make any use of it.

I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded us to express our views in this matter.

Yours very truly,

J. J. KELLEHER.

STRACHAN SHIPPING CO.,
Savannah, Ga., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: Your letter of March 12 has been received.

Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, and Milwaukee, and perhaps other outports of the Great Lakes, have for some time been served by relatively small vessels capable of navigating the present locks and crossing the Atlantic Ocean, this service having been initiated and operated by Scandinavian owners.

It has been my understanding that these vessels have been able to select freight which gave the highest revenue and the operation must have been profitable because I understand now that the war has ended it is about to be resumed.

A very large volume of traffic originates in the Middle West and it appears that the contemplated seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River would be utilized, but I am incapable of expressing an opinion as to whether the projected channel for larger and deeper draft vessels would justify the enormous construction cost.

Again, I seriously doubt if the large, fast, expensive American flagships would be able to compete successfully in this trade when their cargoes on regular runs would likely be made up of a large percentage of low-paying freight. There must be a considerable slow-down in negotiating 15 locks, and I am sure these vessels would not be able to run at full speed in the canal.

It also seems to me that vessels with slower speed, and perhaps these would be largely under foreign flags, would get the greatest benefit from this seaway development, because of their cheaper cost of construction and operation.

One thing that impresses me is that at present ships that are operating in the Atlantic and in the Gulf are compelled to make a number of ports of call in order to fill, and if this traffic from the Great Lakes area, which now largely moves to the eastern ports and to the Gulf, is withdrawn, it would make it all the more difficult for the ships serving the eastern and Gulf ports to fill, and would perhaps mean either curtailing of service or additional ports of call.

This proposed direct service from the Lakes, would unquestionably provide some savings to shippers during the open season.

While we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own ships, and have made no careful study of the possibilities, it does not appear to me that this trade route will prove very attractive to American ship operators.

RONI W. GROVES,
Partner.

SEATRAIN LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

We wish to advise that we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway and we have been very skeptical that the additional cost over and above that required for power development would be warranted from a transportation standpoint. We doubt if the difference in cost between rail transportation through the seaway for only portions of the year is so great as to warrant any large expenditure for such a seaway.

Very truly yours,

GRAHAM M. BRUSH,
President.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, 1946, relative to the projected St. Lawrence seaway, have to advise you that we are opposed to it.

Most of the reasons for our opposition are set forth in the statement made in behalf of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York by Mr. Cornelius H. Callaghan, executive vice president of said association, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on February 28, 1946, which statement has our full endorsement.

Thanking you for having written us, we are,

Yours very truly,

MORRIS MALKIN,
President.

MERCHANTS & MINERS
TRANSPORTATION CO.,
Baltimore, March 16, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of March 12 regarding the seaway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic and regret that my experience and knowledge of that particular section and business is not sufficient to warrant me to express any view on the subject.

Regretting my inability to be of any help in this matter and with kindest regards,

Very truly yours,

A. D. STEBBINS,
President.

PLANT SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of 12 March about the St. Lawrence seaway.

My observation is that, aside from every other consideration, sending vessels through 15 locks would be a most hazardous undertaking at any time, and it strikes me that the cost of insurance on vessels navigating such waterways would be greatly increased Accordingly, from the standpoint of risk and increased cost of insurance, the seaway would not be attractive to ship operators.

From the standpoint of savings to shippers, I believe that any cheaper inland freight rate to shipside would be greatly offset by the higher freight rate that the ship owner would have to ask for the increased risk and expense just mentioned.

I have no plans to use the St. Lawrence seaway at all, and, as far as I am concerned, I earnestly hope it will never materialize.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE PLANT,
President.

WILSON LINE, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In reply to yours of March 12, the Wilson Line is not interested in operating steamboats on the Great Lakes or through the proposed new locks and channel.

However, I am greatly opposed to the joint resolution before Congress to authorize these improvements, inasmuch as the railroads would be adversely affected, and I believe that they will have a hard enough time in the next 10 years without this competition.

Very truly yours,

GEO. B. JUNKIN,
President.

STOCKARD STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of March 12 asking my opinion with respect to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, it is my opinion that this seaway is of no practical value. I do not question the feasibility of constructing this seaway, but purely from the point of view of a shipping facility the seaway is absolutely unsound. In the first place it can only be used for 8 months out of the year because of ice conditions. The present shipping facilities available to Montreal and to New York are just as economical to operate as would be the case should ocean-going vessels proceed to load at Chicago and/or other Great Lakes ports.

The seaway would provide no savings to shippers nor would it prove attractive to ship operators except possibly to a few foreign flag lines that presently operate from the Great Lakes to the United Kingdom, European Continent, and Scandinavia during the summer season. Ship operations between ports other than those mentioned in the preceding sentence are more economical via the eastern seaboard of the United States. This can be accounted for by the fact that the earth is round, and if you calculate distances from Chicago to places other than northern Europe, including the United Kingdom, you will find the excess steaming distances too great (say, from Chicago) to make it economical.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway, and sincerely hope the taxpayers' money will not be wasted on this venture.

Yours faithfully,

L. N. STOCKARD,
President.

BARBER STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 14, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have received your letter of March 12, with reference to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, and I am enclosing herewith a statement which I made

a short time ago, which will acquaint you with my views as to this project.

For the many reasons advanced in my memorandum, I consider the project unsound economically and o no practical value commercially, and to specifically answer your question, my company has no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own ships.

In closing, might I express the hope that the replies which you will receive from the steamship owners, whom I gather you have circularized, will be such as to lead you to the conclusion that you should vote against this proposed bill?

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. BARBER.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., April 8, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR EAILEY: Your letter of March 1[illegible] to Mr. Zemurray, president of the United Fruit Co., relative to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, has been referred to me for reply.

As indicated in your letter, the project calls for a usable channel of 27 feet deep. This will prevent the use of vessels drawing more than 24½ feet. It is my understanding that less than 8 percent of the total American merchant marine has this light a draft, and, of course, practically all of this light-draft tonnage is already in use in other trade routes. It, therefore, seems highly doubtful that the St. Lawrence seaway project can have any material advantage to the American merchant marine. It seems more likely that any ships using the seaway would be foreign-flag ships. The operation of small ships under the American flag because of the highly increased cost of wages and other costs is becoming more difficult. The St. Lawrence seaway, in my opinion, would be wholly unattractive to American flag operators.

* * * * *

One of the principal arguments in favor of the waterway is that it might reduce the ocean rates on grains and other bulk commodities moving from the Great Lakes area into foreign commerce, and that this would be of benefit to the farmers of the Middle West. I suggest that the freight on these commodities is paid by the foreign purchasers and it is doubtful whether a slightly lower freight rate to these foreign purchasers would be of any value to the shippers of the Middle West.

This company does not plan to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM JACKSON,
Vice President.

LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., April 26, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Apology is made for delay in answering your letter of March 12 re the effect of proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway on United States flagships and asking if we have any plans to send our vessels into the Great Lakes.

Because of the high cost of building American ships and operating them, they cannot compete with foreign flagships unless subsidized. For American ships to enter the Great Lakes trade, they would need to be subsidized just as they are on the high seas. Would Congress authorize such a subsidy when the Great Lakes seaway would be in fact a competitor of the domestic transportation lines in the United States?

Then there are 15 ship locks to pass through

Foreign flagships would go into the Great Lakes during the open-water season. For the most part, these would probably be tramp ships which do not, as a rule, conform with the rules and regulations applying to regular liners, which would mean disturbance to the economy of the regular liners and to the domestic carriers.

Thus the opening of the Great Lakes seaway would in fact be a subsidy in favor of foreign flagships and against the United States merchant marine.

The transportation system of the United States is organized to use existing and developed seaports and domestic transportation, which would be disturbed by the Great Lakes seaway.

The railroads which would compete with the seaway would need to lower their rates not only for the 7 months of navigation but year around, thus again giving the east and west drift of commerce an advantage over the north and south drift, on which much money is being spent.

The Great Lakes region now enjoys low import-export freight rates and has an advantage over most of the country.

It is felt the proposed seaway would be decidedly detrimental to southern ports, from which our company exclusively operates.

We are attaching hereto pamphlet prepared by the Mississippi Valley Association, also copy of letter from American Merchant Marine Institute, dated February 26, to Senator HATCH.

We have no plans to send our ships into the Great Lakes.

Very truly yours,

J. T. LYKES,
President.

CHICAGO, DULUTH & GEORGIAN
BAY TRANSIT CO.,
Detroit, Mich., April 11, 1946.

Hon. Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please do accept our apology for delayed acknowledgment of your letter of March 12 to our Mr. D. Dwight Douglas, president, regarding Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

We note the contemplated plans and data for this project, and we have endeavored to keep in touch with the progress of this proposal.

As to our own service, we are an exclusive passenger line, operating the steamers *North American* and *South American*, between the ports of Chicago, Duluth, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo, in regular service during the period May 15 to September 15.

The probability of operating our present ships outside of the Great Lakes area is most remote, as our company has been built on service on the Lakes. There is a definite demand for such service, and we hope to continue it and improve upon it as time goes on

Passenger lines on the Great Lakes, as you are aware, are restricted by legislation, permitting capacity operation only during 4 months of the year—May 15 to September 15. During the other 8 months of the year capacity is reduced to such an extent that we cannot operate.

The proposed seaway, therefore, would have no direct benefits insofar as our operation as presently set up is concerned.

We appreciate having this opportunity to express our views.

Very respectfully,

EMERY B. HATCH,
Vice President and General Manager.

DETROIT & CLEVELAND NAVIGATION CO.,
Detroit, Mich., March 18, 1946.

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12, 1946, in connection with the proposed changes in the St. Lawrence River.

So far as the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. is concerned, we would have no use for the St. Lawrence waterway, however we do feel that the locks should all be the same size as the Welland locks for national security. We believe that the present depths of the locks would suffice.

Yours very truly,

JAMES T. MCMILLAN,
President.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *March 20, 1946.*

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 12th has remained unanswered owing to the writer being absent from the city.

We do not feel that there is any transportation by water that is cheaper than that which prevails on the Great Lakes. We therefore feel that there is no economy in the proposed seaway, as we do not feel that the boats that are adapted for the Lakes and ocean navigation, can compete with our Lake boats for the long water haul from the head of the Lakes—Lake Superior—and Chicago, to the St. Lawrence Gulf. It is only at times, when there is a bigger demand than we have boats, that the rate between the head of Lake Superior to the gulf ports would be of any interest to ocean-borne traffic.

We have had the practical experience in the movement of large tonnages of grain from the Northwest to Montreal, and the majority of years in which we have been in business, there is no ocean ship which could compete with the rates which prevail for the movement of this grain from Duluth and to Fort William to Montreal, and also from Chicago.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN STEAMSHIP CO.
JOHN J. BOLAND.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 20, 1946.*

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Referring to your letter of March 12, 1946, we have given careful consideration to your inquiries concerning the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as a navigation project. In treating with your letter, we have rephrased the inquiries in question form and have added, under a new heading, additional comments in which we believe you will be interested. The questions, answers, and additional comments are:

'Would it be feasible and economical to navigate the proposed seaway with vessels which would be adapted to the Great Lakes and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the Atlantic Ocean?"

Typical ocean-going cargo ships are not equipped to navigate locks. Great Lakes vessels are equipped with mooring engines and chocks of special type for passage through locks. Ocean ships have smaller rudders than Great Lakes ships and are not designed for navigating canals and narrow channels with swift and changing currents. Great Lakes ships are not designed or suitable for ocean navigation, nor could they be loaded or unloaded expeditiously in ocean ports. Loading and unloading machinery in

Great Lakes ports is highly specialized and the design of the ships is such that they are coordinated with the dock machinery. To our knowledge there are not now in existence ships which embody both Great Lakes and ocean characteristics. While such a ship might be designed, it could not be operated as economically as the vessels built for special service in one or the other trade.

"What are the distances from Duluth, at the head of Lake Superior, on the one hand, and Chicago, on the other, to the Gulf of St. Lawrence?"

The distances stated in your letter refer to Cabot Strait lying between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic. The distances from upper Great Lakes ports to the Gulf of St. Lawrence would be about 300 miles shorter. The distance from Duluth to New York via the St. Lawrence is 3,014 miles and via the New York State Barge Canal, 1,477 miles. The distance from Cleveland to New York via the St. Lawrence is 2,204 miles and via the New York Barge Canal, 667 miles.

"From the viewpoint of a ship operator, do you believe this seaway, as proposed, would provide savings to shippers and prove attractive to ship operators?"

The savings claimed for traffic on the waterway are based on the carrying of full loads in ships of the largest class able to navigate a 27-foot channel, or, in some cases, on the assumption that the rates to or from Great Lakes ports would be the same or only slightly higher than rates to Atlantic coast ports

It seems doubtful that full cargoes could be often assembled on the Great Lakes for transport to one or two foreign ports. Failure to obtain such cargoes would militate against any great amount of traffic in manufactured products. The passage by ocean vessels through a distance of some 2,000 miles and return, including the navigation of several locks and many miles of restricted channels, would add appreciably to the cost of operation, although the distance from Chicago to Liverpool is only about 836 miles farther than from New York to Liverpool.

There is a possibility of some savings in the transport of grain from the Canadian Lake Superior ports, Fort William, and Port Arthur, because of saving in transshipment. The saving might amount to 3 cents a bushel or $1 per ton. The cost of capital charges, operation, and maintenance of the St. Lawrence, however, would mean a United States subsidy of some two or three dollars per ton for the amount of traffic likely to develop, while the savings would relate mainly to Canadian grain.

The maximum draft of a ship navigating the seaway could probably not exceed 24 feet. It was determined in 1941 that only about 13 percent of American ocean ships would be able to traverse the proposed St. Lawrence seaway at full draft. Doubtless there were built during the war many American ships which could navigate the proposed seaway. However, when fully loaded, those ships draw in excess of the maximum draft which the seaway would furnish. Thus their economy in the Great Lakes trade would be impaired. Our opinion is that seaway commerce would be carried mainly in foreign-owned tramp ships operating on much lower costs as to capital charges and crew wages than American vessels. Such vessels, entering the Lakes for grain, would be at liberty to bring foreign coal to Canada at ballast rates replacing our exports of coal to Canada. These export shipments by lake vessels in 1944 exceeded 12,000,000 tons.

"Have you any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with your own ships; if so, how many?"

This company owns and operates 18 ships of the Great Lakes bulk-cargo type, having an aggregate trip capacity of about 165,000 tons on a 20-foot draft. The largest is 621 feet length over-all and carries in excess of 15,500 gross tons at a full draft of 24 feet. We have no plans for navigating the St. Lawrence seaway. The passage is more hazardous than the routes of our present traffic. Our ships are not fitted for ocean navaigation. The expense of operation due to initial costs and wage rates, as compared with foreign tramp ships would make competition impracticable without a subsidy, which has never been required or requested for the Great Lakes industry, although transportation rates on the Lakes are only about 1 mill per ton-mile.

COMMENTS CONCERNING OTHER ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED SEAWAY

Since the hearings before your committee in 1944 on the Aiken bill, you are thoroughly familiar with the manner in which the 1941 agreement deals with navigation rights. We venture, however, to review this subject from the standpoint of the Great Lakes ship operator. Navigation rights of American ships in Canadian waters, and of British ships in American waters, are secured through existing treaties. By the treaty of 1871, American ships are given the right of free navigation in the St. Lawrence River from the place where the international boundary leaves the river to the sea. The Treaty provides that this right of free navigation is subject to local laws and regulations not inconsistent with that right. Reciprocal rights of navigation are secured to the ships of both countries, in boundary waters, by the treaty of 1909. For purposes of navigation, Lake Michigan, which lies wholly within the United States, is considered part of the boundary waters. The 1909 treaty contains two conditions not found in the 1871 treaty. Those conditions are (1) any restrictive laws or regulations imposed by either country upon the ships of the other, shall operate with equal effect upon its own ships and (2) any tolls imposed for the sale of canals and locks by one country upon the ships of the other, likewise must be applied with equal force to its own ships.

Since the greater portion of the navigation project would lie in the lower St. Lawrence River, the protection afforded by the 1909 treaty, with respect to the equal applicability of tolls and other restrictions, would not be applicable. It seems most unfortunate that the United States should be committed to a reciprocal policy for the Great Lakes, and that the same policy is not expressly extended to waters which lie wholly within Canada. The opportunity for discrimination, if not an actual temptation to place burdens upon the American ships for competitive purposes, would seem too great to permit a disparity of this kind to remain.

We are advised that by article IV, paragraph (d) of the 1941 agreement, Canada would be assured sufficient waters from the Great Lakes to maintain her own channels, at and below Montreal, at such depths as she might choose to improve them. There is some opinion that in the event the navigation project is completed, Montreal would grow as a port of transshipment.

Because of the navigation hazards of the St. Lawrence River, it would be uneconomical to operate large ships between Great Lakes and ocean ports. It has been suggested that a special Great Lakes type ship could be developed so that cargoes moving from Great Lakes ports for export, could be transported to Montreal for transshipment in ocean vessels. There is very definite trend toward deeper draft for ocean ships. To enable such ships to operate profitably as far inland as Montreal, Canada might very well improve channels of the lower St. Lawrence River to greater depth. The river is already improved from Montreal to Quebec and beyond. Substantial improvement of the navigable channels in the lower St. Lawrence, would be of no avail unless the greater depth were compensated by dams or by the use of additional water. That additional water, according to the agreement, would be obtained by increasing the flow of water through the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario. Lake Ontario is the smallest of the Great Lakes. To maintain its level with increased abstraction of water would require greater flow from the other lakes; thus the entire system would be adversely affected.

It is a well-established national policy, reflected in domestic law and in the 1909 treaty, that the waters of the Great Lakes should be preserved for navigation and commerce. Both the Federal Government and the Great Lakes States have opposed the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Drainage Canal, on the ground that the abstraction would adversely affect the levels of the Great Lakes. By the 1909 treaty, Canada and the United States, bound themselves to refrain from making any diversions, in their respective waters, which would affect the level of the waters in the territory of the other, except as the other gave her consent. The provision of the 1941 agreement, with respect to the maintenance of channel depths at and below Montreal, would obviously sacrifice the Great Lakes for the lower St. Lawrence River.

The history of navigation, through the St. Lawrence River, shows that it serves British commerce to a greater extent than United States commerce. If the navigation project is completed, that situation would be accentuated. The British Isles have always been large consumers of grain grown in the Canadian Northwest. The Ottawa conference of 1932 gave tariff preference to Canadian wheat transported from the growing fields to Liverpool by British facilities. Canadian wheat loaded at Fort William-Port Arthur, Ontario, on Lake Superior, was formerly transported in large volumes by means of American ships to Buffalo, N. Y., and then transshipped either by way of New York or Montreal. The imperial preference had the effect of routing Canadian wheat down the Great Lakes in Canadian facilities. If the United States intends to participate in the proposed navigation project and finance the greater portion of the cost, the United States should insist that Great Britain refrain from asserting discriminatory measures against United States ships.

We greatly appreciate this opportunity to make known to you our views concerning the proposed seaway. It will be considered a pleasure to respond to any further inquiries which may occur to you.

Respectfully yours,

THE PIONEER STEAMSHIP CO.,
J. T. HUTCHINSON, *President*.

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1946.

Hon. J. W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Because of absence from my office, your letter of March 12 regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, has just come to my attention. I do not believe that there is very much that I can add from the viewpoint of a bulk-vessel operator on the Great Lakes to the facts and conclusions already presented before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Lake Carriers Association. This group, which is composed of substantially all the operators of bulk-dry-cargo vessels operating on the Great Lakes, has made a thorough study of the St. Lawrence waterway proposal and, in my opinion, you can have full confidence in the facts and the conclusions they have presented.

In answer to your first question, it would be folly to say that the proposed seaway would not provide savings to some shippers, nor prove attractive to some operators. However, it is my opinion that it would not provide sufficient savings to a sufficient number of American shippers, nor prove attractive

to a sufficient number of American ship operators to justify the required expenditures. I personally fail to see where a sufficient number of Americans will be benefited to justify the expenditure of the public's money on the enterprise.

In answer to your second question, our company is engaged in the transportation of iron ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our vessels are not adaptable to ocean navigation and, furthermore, the expense of operation due to initial cost and high American wage rates would make it impractical to compete with foreign tramp ships. We therefore have no plans for future navigation of the seaway should it materialize.

I trust that the above answers your questions. If you have any further questions, I would be only too pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.

THE TOMLINSON FLEET,
Bay City, Mich., March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On my return from Cleveland, I find your letter of the 12th, addressed to me as president of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., 2900 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio. I am very glad indeed to hear from you in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

About 40 years ago the State of Michigan authorized a sum of money to be spent and the Governor, Fred M. Warner, to appoint a commission to see what could be done about improving the St. Lawrence waterway. I happened to be selected by Governor Warner as a member of that commission and I am the only one of that original Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission left, the others having passed on. Our commission set to work at once to interest other States in this great project and eventually we had 23 States contiguous to the Great Lakes that had formed associations favorable to the St. Lawrence waterway.

When this matter was called to the attention of President Coolidge, he decided that it was time to appoint a commission from the United States to act jointly with a similar commission from the Dominion of Canada, and he appointed as the United States St. Lawrence Commission the following:

Herbert Hoover, chairman; William C. Breed, New York; James P. Goodrich, Indiana; James E. Davidson, Michigan; Charles L. Allen, Massachusetts; James R. Howard, Iowa; James F. Noonan, Missouri.

Joint board of engineers: Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers; Col. William Kelly and Lt. Col. George B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers.

To work in conjunction with the American commission the Canadian Government appointed the following engineers: Duncan W. Maclachlan, Department of Railways and Canals; Oliver O. Lefevre, chief engineer, Quebec-St. Lawrence commission; Brig. Gen. Charles Hamilton Mitchell.

Many meetings were held and Herbert Hoover, with the commission and engineers, has been over this route three times. After years of study, preparation of plans and specifications and estimates of cost, we recommended the St. Lawrence route as the cheapest, most accessible, and best route, not only to shorten the distance to the seaboard, but to show the best promise in the reduction of freight rates.

At about this time the Dominion of Canada commenced work on its new Welland Canal locks in anticipation of the St. Lawrence project being completed. These locks now connect Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, so that the only impediment preventing the use of the St. Lawrence seaway by oceangoing ships is the rocky shallows in the river for minimum distance of 21 miles, or a maximum distance of not more than 24 miles.

I am president not only of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., but of all the companies noted at the head of this letter, except the Sierra Steamship Co., of which my son is president. All the ships owned by these companies are large, modern, steel freighers and there are 11 of them altogether. They are now engaged in the general lake trade, carrying ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our largest ships carry considerable grain from Duluth, Minn., down through the new Welland Canal onto Lake Ontario and to Oswego, N. Y., which is right near the St. Lawrence River entrance to Lake Ontario. The new locks installed by the Dominion of Canada are splendid in every way and will take care of at least 80 percent of all ocean tonnage.

My family has been engaged in the Great Lakes transportation for upwards of 75 years. In the early days the ships were small wooden sailing vessels, carrying about 21,000 bushels of grain, but as time advanced we kept pace with shipbuilding progress and have built larger and larger ships for our fleets.

Buffalo, N. Y., is my former home. My father and mother were both born there, as were all their children. I am still interested in companies doing business in that city and would not do anything to hurt Buffalo. However, all the lower lake ports can get along very well without stevedoring business; that is, the transferring of freight from lake ships to the railroads or canal boats navigating the Erie Canal. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway will be a wonderful thing for America, and particularly for the fifty-odd millions of people residing in the middle section of the United States.

Thank you for your inquiry, and I shall be very glad to answer any specific questions that you have occasion to propound.

With sincere regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

JAMES E. DAVIDSON.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the reorganization bill, passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it became mandatory upon the House and the Senate to agree upon a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. The act required the Budget Committee to make a report by February 15, which is now almost 3 months past.

For the benefit of certain Senators who may have forgotten certain sections of the Reorganization Act, I propose to read into the RECORD, with some care and emphasis, section 138, under the caption of "Legislative budget." Section 138 is as follows:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

Mr. President, as one can readily conclude from the express provisions contained in this section, the budget report is long overdue. I ask in all seriousness whether anyone has seen the report, or can anyone give me a lead as to whom I might discuss this matter with, in order to ascertain whether or not a report will ever be forthcoming? I am certain that Senators on both sides of the aisle have waited daily for the report of the Legislative Budget Committee. In fact, the American people have long waited for an answer. It was only last week in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee that John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who was testifying on the tax reduction bill, emphatically stated that he and the American people were tremendously disappointed over the apparent indifference and lethargy of the Legislative Budget Committee in its failure to comply with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, no labor bill, no tax bill, no appropriation bill, nor any other important piece of legislation can supplant the absolute necessity for immediate action upon the part of the Legislative Budget Committee. It would indeed be interesting to know the inside story of why this budget is permitted to sleep so peacefully in Republican pigeonholes. Every Member of the Senate knows, and the country knows, that the people were entitled many weeks ago to some kind of a budget report, good or bad, even though it was based on a speculative guess.

Mr. President, the Congress did not pass the Reorganization Act in a spirit of flippancy or misunderstanding. I was under the impression that we meant what

we said and said what we meant, and voted accordingly, when the bill was passed. I noticed in Sunday's newspaper that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated definitely that under no circumstances would the Republican leadership violate the Reorganization Act by continuing this session of the Congress longer than July 31, as provided therein. But, we find the Senator conspicuously silent on compliance with section 138 of the Reorganization Act—a section far more important than that which fixes the adjournment date.

Three months have passed and no report on the legislative budget has been made. Not a single sound, constructive statement has been made by the party in power as to why no report has been made. The leaders of the majority party sit by silently, day after day, taking no steps to move this committee to action.

This afternoon I learned directly from the lips of one member of the committee that for the past 30 days there has not been a meeting between the conferees of the House and the conferees of the Senate upon this very important question.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the conferees should agree on some budget figure at once. Failing in what is their legislative responsibility, they should report immediately their inability to agree and ask for instructions. This, as every Senator knows, is the rule of the Senate—a sacred rule—yet for weeks we have seen this rule violated with total indifference and bold impunity by the majority party.

In the debate upon the legislative budget it was said that the fixing of a budget ceiling was not legally binding upon the Appropriations Committee or any Member of the Senate—and that is true—but it was also said repeatedly by many Senators, and emphatically by the senior Senator from Ohio, that a budget ceiling constituted a moral pledge to which he would rigidly adhere; but alas, there is no budget. It is buried along the side of other Republican campaign pledges and promises. One is inclined to believe that the Republicans have found the answer to the question, "Oh, grave, where is thy victory?"

Mr. President, it is significant that from the very convening of this Congress, section 138 of the Reorganization Act has been given little or no consideration by the majority party. The ink was hardly dry on this section when the political saboteurs moved in. The Legislative Budget Committee did nothing in the way of fact-finding previous to the time when the Senate was called to vote upon a cut in the President's budget.

That was the primary reason why the Senator from Illinois refused to vote either for the $6,000,000,000 cut or the four-and-one-half-billion-dollar-cut when the question was debated upon the floor of the Senate.

Individual Members of the Senate were compelled to reach a conclusion upon pure speculation, followed by more than a rough guess. We all remember that not one line of written testimony was submitted to the Senate upon which a reasonable judgment might be based. As will be recalled, the House voted blindly for a $6,000,000,000 slash in the President's budget, and the Senate voted for a $4,500,000,000 decrease in that budget. At the same time the Senate specifically said by a record vote, upon the motion of the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that we should apply $2,600,000,000 on the national debt. In addition to the foregoing figures, the House passed H. R. 1, reducing taxes $3,800,000,000.

Mr. President, to act intelligently upon these grave fiscal responsibilities we need the budgetary yardstick required in section 138 to guide us effectively. That is particularly true if we apply efficient and businesslike methods in our attempt to reduce expenditures, and the national debt and taxes. The slipshod method now employed by the Republican leadership may ultimately prove a financial boomerang to extravagant pledges and promises.

Mr. President, so long as the Senate of the United States, in dealing with the fiscal policy of this Nation, places the cart before the horse, I respectfully submit that Members of the Senate are in no position to denounce and condemn some of the business methods of the executive branch of Government. I say with the utmost sincerity that a limitation of authorized expenditures would be tremendously influenced by a sound budgetary report, which is not forthcoming, and apparently never will be so far as this session of Congress is concerned.

I pause at this time to ask any Member of the Senate or any member of the Legislative Budget Committee to advise the Senate and the country why some kind of budget report has not been made, and whether one will be made.

I hear no answer to that query. At least some Members on the opposite side of the aisle are listening, because I see smiles upon their faces.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does it occur to the Senator that the Senate and the House have wasted valuable time which, in these days when the country is facing a real crisis, could certainly have been devoted to more serious matters? We could have used that time to better purpose than to debate the legislative budget for a long period and then bury it in a conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is eminently correct. If we had never expected to make use of the budget which is specifically required under the legislative provision, section 138 of the Reorganization Act, we should never, as the Senator says, have taken valuable time of the Senate to debate the question for days.

Furthermore, if the conferees cannot agree they should come back here and advise the Senate that they cannot agree. They should have done so weeks ago. They should have asked for instructions, or asked for new conferees, to see whether or not some compromise could have been reached upon this important legislative question.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator will recall that during the debate on the budget the whole subject was referred to merely as a pious hope, a wish, or a New Year's resolution. I think none of us expected much more than what has already happened.

Mr. LUCAS. Some referred to it as a pious hope and a New Year's resolution, but others referred to it as a part of a rule being laid down by the House and the Senate which they would be morally bound to follow. In other words, it was said to be a moral pledge which both branches would be bound to follow. It was important. We destroy the heart of the Reorganization Act if we do not comply with section 138.

Mr. MYERS. When the budget was discussed on the floor of the Senate those who supported the $4,500,000,000 and those who supported the $6,000,000,000 cut frankly admitted that they were not bound by it, and frankly admitted that there was no intention of acting in accordance with the Reorganization Act, which, as the Senator knows, provides that once a budget is established, any appropriations exceeding the budget shall require joint action of the two Houses of Congress. That was the whole theory and purpose of the legislative budget. It seems to me that it is extremely serious that we wasted so much time when other legislation was necessary, and other matters were confronting the Congress and the country. Our Legislative Calendar would be much further advanced if we had not wasted that time in the early days of this Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. The Senate and the House of Representatives should not have led the American people to believe that there would be tremendous cuts in the Federal budget—and that was the impression created during the debates both in this branch and the other branch—unless we expected to go through with what we were talking about. As a result of what we were doing upon the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, the American people obtained the impression that a substantial cut was to be made in the budget—either $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000. The two Houses cannot agree. The budget is lost somewhere between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Under the Reorganization Act the American people are entitled, in view of the debate in the two bodies, to some answer from those who are responsible for the legislative budget.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Of course there may be some difficulty in the conference because the Senate determined that at least $2,600,000,000 of savings should be applied to debt reduction, and there was a serious difference of opinion among the conferees as to whether we should have debt reduction or tax reduction.

Mr. LUCAS. I am coming to that.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator think that there is any difficulty due to the fact that the conferees have concluded that they cannot approach even a $4,000,000,000 cut?

Mr. LUCAS. There may be something to that suggestion. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I noticed today a recapitulation of the cuts so far made in the budget estimates. They have gone over 47 percent of the total amount requested and they have not approached $2,000,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall discuss that a little later.

Mr. President, referring again to section 138, only one part of it, I read as follows:

Giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President—

They must—

report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year.

Mr. President, is not the Congress entitled to those figures, as we consider all the appropriation bills? The primary purpose of enacting section 138 was to provide a yardstick or a guide for the Appropriations Committee to follow as it considered the various appropriation bills from time to time. Certainly, the Finance Committee was entitled to that report, if that committee were to report out any sound and equitable tax legislation. The only budget we have before us is the President's estimated budget, and, apparently, that is the only one any committee will have before it as it considers these vital problems affecting the economy and the stability of the Nation.

I respectfully submit that the Congress is in a vulnerable position economically if it passes any tax bill before the report of the Legislative Budget Committee is agreed upon, and before it knows the total amount of appropriations which the Appropriations Committees will report, in comparison with the President's budget.

Section 138 also provides that if estimated receipts exceed the expenditures, such a report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt.

That is what the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had in mind when he submitted a resolution to reduce the national debt $2,600,000,000, which was agreed to, as I remember, unanimously. I do not think there was a dissenting vote.

Mr. President, is this the fly in the political ointment which keeps the conferees from reporting a legislative budget?

Can it be that those who have for political reasons talked the loudest about cutting the President's budget $6,000,000,000 realize they are up against a stone wall in accomplishing this fact?

Can it be that when they recapitulate budget cuts, debt reduction of $2,600,000,000 and a tax reduction of $3,800,000,000 they know a budgetary report of any kind would shatter their dreams or nullify their promises?

Mr. President, since we do not have the legislative budget required by the Reorganization Act, it is necessary to use the President's proposed budget and his estimates of expenditures for consideration of our fiscal policies. The revised estimate for receipts submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, which is the President's figure, is in the sum of $38,800,000,000. The President's budget estimate submitted to the Congress on January 10, 1947, was $37,500,000,000, leaving a net balance of $1,300,000,000.

The Members of the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority passed a resolution saying they were going to cut the President's budget $6,000,000,000. I think it is extremely important that the Congress and the country be brought up to date on what has been accomplished by the House of Representatives in attempting to achieve that worthy objective.

I presume that everyone will agree that interest on the national debt is an obligation that must be met if we expect government to survive. That amount for the fiscal year 1948 is $5,000,000,000.

I presume that the great majority of the Members of the Senate will agree that those in the Treasury Department who are experts in calculating refunds due under tax laws are in a better position to make estimates on tax refunds than any other group of people. Everyone knows that the $800,000,000, which the House Appropriations Committee took from tax refunds is a bookkeeping transaction only. Remember, Mr. President, tax refunds are something that cannot be changed by altering the estimate. The amount of tax refund depends upon the tax laws. For example, under our present law, a man's income tax is withheld every pay day from his salary and is remitted by his employer to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We all agree that that is a good idea. One pays his tax systematically and regularly during the year. But if his salary goes down during the year, or he is unemployed for a few weeks, or if he has unusually heavy deductible expenses, he will find that the Bureau of Internal Revenue owes him money at the end of the year. Whatever the Bureau owes in refunds cannot be changed by any action of the Appropriations Committees, unless the Congress is willing to assume the responsibility for repudiating debts due and owing taxpayers. Such a course would be the end of government. It would be cause for rebellion and insurrection.

Again, if taxes are cut for the fiscal year 1948, a man who paid at the high rate for the calendar year 1947, before the reduction takes effect, will find he owes the Government less than he expected. Therefore, his refund is bound to be increased by changing the tax laws during the year.

This gesture of cutting $800,000,000 is an empty one. It is a phoney. Eventually it will not save any of us a cent. So, Mr. President, I am convinced that any fair-minded man who will eliminate politics in this budget must agree that during the fiscal year 1948 the $2,100,000,000 estimate by the Treasury Department is a fixed obligation which we shall have to pay.

The third item I wish to discuss deals with international affairs and finance. The President's proposed budget for these items calls for $3,500,000,000 which, as we all know, is a sharp decline from the fiscal year 1947. I am certain no Member of Congress wants this Government to default on its loan agreement with the United Kingdom. No one desires to default on our occupation responsibilities in Europe and the Far East. No one wants our Government to default on its obligations to support the United Nations. This part of the budget is important to our future peace, prosperity, and security. We have agreed to provide war damage for the restoration in the Philippines and for the relief of displaced, tired, and hungry people in Europe. No one will want our Government to default on our obligations to support the United Nations. To my way of thinking, this part of the budget is tremendously important to our own peace and security and our future prosperity. If we should fail in our foreign policy, our domestic policy is threatened, because in this atomic age no domestic policy standing alone will maintain and insure for America our high standards of living.

The President in his proposed budget estimated we would need $3,500,000,000 to carry out our international commitments. Since he made that estimate the Senate of the United States, at his request, has passed the Greek-Turkish loan, committing this country to an additional international obligation in the sum of $400,000,000. The Foreign Relations Committee has reported out unanimously another relief bill authorizing the appropriation of $350,000,000 for relief purposes in foreign lands. Neither of these items was contained in the President's proposed budget. So, in my judgment, $3,500,000,000, called for by the President, is the minimum. No doubt it will be more, in view of the Greek-Turkish loan and the relief bill for aid to foreign countries. Insofar as this presentation is concerned, however, I shall leave the figure at $3,500,000,000.

Another item in the President's proposed budget which the Appropriations Committee will find great difficulty in cutting deals with veterans' services and benefits. The President's estimate for the fiscal year 1948 is $7,000,000,000. Obviously this is a large item in the budget, but it is necessary if the Congress provides education and rehabilitation for deserving veterans in conformity with the laws the Congress of the United States has passed. This not only includes education and rehabilitation but also covers pensions, hospitals, and other veterans' benefits which we of the Congress so gladly supported when the bill was before us for enactment.

Another item which the Appropriations Committee has not considered deals with the improvement of the transportation and communications systems and the development of natural resources of America. The President in his budget

estimated for this purpose a total amount of $2,300,000,000, of which the largest single item is $443,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. We all know that a determined effort will be made by those interested in the development of rivers and harbors, good roads, and atomic research to prevent a cut in this appropriation.

Our agricultural program which has not yet been considered by the Appropriations Committee amounts to $1,400,000,000, according to the President's estimate. This includes price supports guaranteed by law, soil conservation, and rural electrification. I imagine there will be a fair-sized agricultural bloc in the Senate which will support that program to the limit.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that only this afternoon, before he spoke an agricultural bill was introduced by several Senators; and the appropriations required by that bill, if it is enacted, will be even greater than the appropriations required by the programs the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I shall refer to a number of bills which have been introduced, asking for authorizations of appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill to which I referred was introduced only this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I deem it advisable to call attention also to the President's budget which deals with social welfare, health, and security, wherein he requests appropriations of $1,700,000,000. A substantial portion of this sum is for aid to the aged and other dependent persons. It also includes money for crime control and protection of public health, and grants to States for vocational education. It will be interesting to see whether any appropriations for the aged people of this country, or flat grants to the respective States of the Nation, are cut.

At this point, I shall recapitulate, Mr. President, to show the President's estimate of items that will remain firm and rigid:

President's estimated budget	$37,500,000,000
Expenditures (President's estimate):	
Interest on national debt	5,000,000,000
Refunds due under tax laws	2,100,000,000
International commitments	3,500,000,000
Veterans' services	7,300,000,000
Total	17,900,000,000
Balance	19,600,000,000

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wish to say to the able Senator from Illinois that I do not entirely disagree with him in his criticism of the fact that the legislative budget has not come back to the two Houses of Congress for action——

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because I think that it was the intent of the Congressional Reorganization Act, the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act, that the legislative budget should be reported to the two Houses of Congress for action.

Nor do I disagree up to this point with the figures the Senator from Illinois has read in regard to certain fixed charges which probably cannot be affected by the Congress. Under those circumstances, they leave a relatively narrow area in which the Congress can operate in respect to reducing governmental expenditures.

But I wish respectfully to point out to my able colleague, the Senator from Illinois, what I pointed out on the floor of the Senate the other day when the Department of Labor-Federal Security appropriations bill was before the Senate for consideration, namely, that we can talk all we want to about economy in Government, but the only place that we can practice economy in Government is on the specific appropriation bills, when they come before the Senate or before the House of Representatives for action.

To date, during the present session, the Senate has had before it only one regular appropriation bill. That was acted upon on Monday of the present week. In connection with that appropriation bill, the Senate had only three yea-and-nay votes, when the Members of the Senate could stand and be counted specifically as being either for or against economy in Government.

I mention these matters at this time only because a few moments ago there was a brief discussion on the floor of the Senate on the subject of economy in Government and reductions in the budget.

As shown on page 4515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in connection with the vote on one item proposing an increase in the expenditures of Government, my able colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] voted "yea," in favor of an increase. My able colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who also spoke a few minutes ago, did not vote on that particular question. My able colleague the Senator from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] voted "yea," in favor of an increase in the budget.

On page 4526 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Monday it is shown that my able colleague the Senator from Illinois did not vote; my able colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] voted "yea," in favor of an increase in the budget; and my able colleague the Senator from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] did not vote on that question.

On the third, and last, yea-and-nay vote relative to economy, the three able Senators who have joined in the recent discussion today did not vote on the question of economy at that point.

I merely wish respectfully to point out that the only place where we can practice economy is on the particular appropriation bills as they come before us for action on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from California. He has made a very able contribution to the debate, as he always does. If he can get any satisfaction from any vote which I have cast in the Senate, he is perfectly welcome to it. But such matters as that do not relieve the majority party of the responsibility which they assumed when they took over the reins of control in the Congress on January 3 of this year and when they told the American people what they would do. I have only one vote, and it does not count for very much. Republicans have a majority of the votes in the House and a majority of votes in the Senate, and they can do whatever they want to do in regard to appropriations. They can cut the appropriations in half or reduce them 30 percent or reduce them any percentage which they wish, because they have the power to do so.

I voted for that increase because I thought it would be false economy to decrease such an appropriation at this time.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I say to the Senator from Illinois, as I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, that I think the Senator from California was very fair in the hearings. I congratulated him then for his fairness and for his ability. However, I think the premise of his remarks today is wrong. At the times which he has mentioned, I did not vote to increase the budget; I voted, according to the dictates of my mind and my conscience, for good Government, for efficient Government, for the right kind of Government.

In regard to the yea-and-nay votes which I unfortunately missed, let me say that if I had voted on those questions I would have voted in the same way I voted on the other question. If I had voted on the questions to which the able Senator from California has just referred, I would have voted for the adoption of the amendments which were offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and for the adoption of the cancel amendment which was offered by the Senater from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], because I am convinced that we are not going to have efficient Government with those appropriations reduced as they have been.

In view of those reductions, I think the normal functions of government are not going to be performed as they should be performed. I say to the Senator from Illinois that I directed a specific question to the Senator from California, asking where in the Office of the Solicitor, or where in the Bureau of Labor Standards, or where in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, economies could be made. The Senator had no answer. Another Senator rose and merely said, "We do not think they want to economize. We think they can economize if they desire to do so."

But, Mr. President, at no time during either the debate on the legislative

budget or the debate on the Department of Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill was I able to elicit any information as to how those functions could be properly and adequately performed following the cuts in the budget or in the appropriations which were made at that time. It was frankly admitted that the work load of those agencies in the next fiscal year will be equal to or greater than their work load in the present fiscal year. However, it was said that they did not cooperate.

Frankly, Mr President, the Senator from California did not agree with the budget cuts made in the House of Representatives; frankly, he took the position that those cuts went entirely too far, because he was willing, and properly so and fairly so, in the committee to restore some of the items which had been eliminated by those cuts. He thought the hatchet had been wielded with too much force and had cut too deeply. He thought the cuts which were made were too drastic, and in the committee he acted to restore some of the cuts.

I desire to go a little further. Not only do I disagree with the action of the House of Representatives on those matters—and in that respect I am in accord with the Senator from California—but I also am in disagreement with the action of the subcommittee of which the Senator from California is chairman. Of course, I think he has acted with the best of motives, and I think he was sincere in what he did, and I think he may believe that he is able to prove the correctness of his position.

But I voted, not for greater expenditures, I say to the Senator from California, but for what I believe would be efficient government.

Mr. President, it is easy to twist a phrase. It is easy to attribute to others, either to me or to other Senators, motives which were not our motives.

I repeat my statement of the other day that the budget items for the agencies to which we have referred were materially reduced by the President, and the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended appropriations which they believed represented amounts absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of the Government. The fact that we agree with the experts, and the fact that we agree with the President does not mean that we are not in favor of economy. It only means that we were not in agreement with the able Senator from California. I believe that the premise upon which he based his remarks was an incorrect or a wrong premise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, but I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not care to interrupt the Senator again, but I merely wish to say to my able colleague from Pennsylvania, for whom I have the highest regard, that I am not quarreling with him at this time, and with his position on the Labor and Security appropriation bill, which was passed last Monday. I merely desire to point out that if one entertains the view that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States can support, during peacetime years, a governmental structure which requires the expenditure of $37,500,000,000, 2 years after the war, as recommended by the President of the United States, and if one believes that our economy can support such a vast expenditure of Federal money, of course he is entirely within his rights to vote that way, and in so doing he should uphold the budget figures submitted by the President of the United States. But if Senators believe that the people of the United States cannot support such a vast expenditure during peacetime, then the only way to curtail the expenditures of the Government is for the Congress of the United States to take into its hands the matter of governmental economy, and the only way we can get economy is by voting for it, and not talking about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The very able and distinguished Senator from California referred to peacetime years. Most of the $37,500,000,000 budget to which the Senator refers, I think he will agree with me, was made necessary by the exigencies of the war which has just been concluded. The big items in the appropriation bills of the last year, and which will be in the appropriation bills this year, are the appropriations for veterans, for paying the debts created by the war, and the like. So I do not look upon the budget and the appropriations for this year in the light of a peacetime America. We are paying our war debts, we are paying off our veterans and building new hospitals, we are giving veterans aid from every angle. As the Senator from Illinois well said a little while ago, we are paying $5,500,000,000 on the debt created because of the war alone. So, while I agree with the Senator from California that certainly in peacetime we could never afford a $37,500,000,000 budget, we are far away from a peacetime budget. We are paying on obligations which were created in the wartime years, 1941–45. While I appreciate very much what the Senator has said, I think he must agree with me that we have not quite yet returned to peace, insofar as appropriations are concerned, because so much of the money we appropriate goes to pay debts created in the years when we were in the war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am under no delusion that we can go back to a figure we had prior to the war. I fully recognize that, and that is one of the reasons why I did not support the House in its $6,000,000,000 cut. It was because we have certain international commitments, and due to uncertainties in the international field we have to maintain adequate armed forces in the air, on the land, and on the sea. But I wish to say to the able Senator from South Carolina that I still sincerely believe that even when we take care of those matters, and meet the necessary expenditures for veterans, in the other functions of the Government of the United States there is still a lot of "fat" which could be cut out.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from California that there is still a great deal of "fat" that could be cut out. But when the Senator speaks of the $37,500,000,000 figure he knows that the appropriations for the normal functions of Government, outside war expenditures, outside the War and Navy appropriations, are less than $6,000,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate all the contributions made by Senators. Especially am I impressed with the arguments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from California. He has practically corroborated everything I have said in the short address I have made today before the Senate.

First, the Senator agrees with me that there is a certain number of items in the budget, which I have noted, which are almost fixed and almost untouchable so far as any decrease in the appropriation is concerned.

Second, he says the time has come when we should quit talking about economy in government and do something about it, and that is why I am making my remarks here today, because the majority party, from January 3 on, has been talking about a $6,000,000,000 and a $4,500,000,000 decrease in the President's estimates as contained in his budget. There has been much sound and fury and little action along that line on the part of the majority, which causes me to come on the floor of the Senate and invite the attention of the Senate, as well as of the country, to the failure of the majority party to accomplish what they said months ago they were going to accomplish in the way of cutting the budget.

Mr. President, my opinion, shared by the great majority of Congress, is that the $17,900,000,000 is a near must in executive expenditures. This means that if the Republicans are going to cut expenditures by $6,000,000,000, they will have to perform this major operation upon the $19,600,000,000 balance I have just indicated.

Included in that sum is $11,200,000,000 for national defense, the largest budgetary item in the President's estimate.

Mr. President, if it be concluded that no material cuts can be made in the items composing the $17,900,000,000 as requested in the President's budget, it is axiomatic that a reduction of approximately 37 percent must be made in the remaining items of the budget in order to accomplish a $6,000,000,000 reduction, set as the objective of the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to observe just what has been done with the appropriation bills to date. The appropriation for the Interior Department, that little simple appropriation the country heard so much about not long ago, was estimated at $295,420,420. It was cut in the House to $161,413,513. The amount of the reduction was $134,006,907. The percentage of reduction was 45.4 percent. That was

in the small appropriation for the Interior Department, where the majority put the meat ax to work.

Then we come to the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriations. The estimate of the President was for $4,099,-123,500. The amount as passed by the House of Representatives was $3,202,-050,750. It was in that appropriation they included the $800,000,000 for tax refunds. The amount of the reduction was $897,072,750. But if we take off the $800,000,000, as they have to do as a bookkeeping transaction, it means they cut it $97,000,000.

For the State Department the estimate in the President's budget was $279,537,-623. That was cut in the House committee to $219,128,058. The amount of the reduction was $60,409,565, or 21.6 percent.

The estimate for the Commerce Department was $286,989,000. The amount recommended by the House committee was $191,057,000. The amount of the reduction was $95,932,000, or 33.4 percent.

For the Department of Justice the estimate was $111,470,000. The amount recommended by the House committee was $108,396,500, a reduction of $3,073,-500, or 2.8 percent.

For the judiciary including all the Federal courts, the estimate was $20,-624,900. The amount recommended by the House committee was $17,146,450, a reduction of $3,478,450, or 16.9 percent.

The total estimates to date, in the President's budget, which have been considered by the House Appropriations Committee or by the House itself, amount to $6,856,577,743. The total passed by the House, or recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, is $6,383,-779,053; a reduction of $472,798,692, or a percentage reduction of 6.9. That is a far cry from the 37 percent or 38 percent reduction that is necessary in order to reach the $6,000,000,000, or even the $4,500,000,000 budget reduction figure.

Mr. President, I ask that the table from which I have been quoting the figures be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriation bill	Estimate in President's budget	As passed by House or recommended by House Appropriations Committee	Amount of reduction	Percentage of reduction
Labor Department and Federal Security Agency	$1,763,412,200	[1] $1,684,886,780	$78,825,520	4.5
Interior Department	295,420,420	[2] 161,413,513	134,006,907	45.4
Treasury and Post Office Departments	4,099,123,500	[1][2] 3,202,050,750	897,072,750	21.9
Additional funds for tax refunds on basis of Treasury estimate		800,000,000	−800,000,000	2.4
State Department	279,537,623	[2] 219,128,058	60,409,565	21.6
Commerce Department	286,989,000	[2] 191,057,000	95,932,000	33.4
Justice Department	111,470,000	[2] 108,396,500	3,073,500	2.8
Judiciary	20,624,900	[2] 17,146,450	3,478,450	16.9
Total	6,856,577,743	6,383,779,053	472,798,692	6.9

[1] As passed by the House of Representatives.
[2] This difference between the estimate of the President and the amount shown in this column includes a downward revision in the estimate of the Treasury of the amount of tax refunds to be made of $800,000,000.
[3] As recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, assuming that no material reduction can be made in the budgetary items in the total sum of $17,900,000,000, I now add to that sum the total amount of appropriations which has been passed by the House of Representatives, or its Appropriations Committee, for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency, the Department of Interior, the Treasury Department, and Post Office Department, the State Department, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice and the judiciary, namely, $6,383,779,053.

From this sum a total of $2,100,000,000 must be deducted on account of refunds due under tax laws, since this amount is included both in the appropriation for the Treasury Department above, and in the irreducible minimum of expenditures below, $2,100,000,000; leaving a balance of $4,283,779,053; plus estimated cost of irreducible expenditures, $17,900,000,000; totaling $22,183,779,053.

I now return to the $6,000,000,000 cut promised by the House of Representatives. If that objective is reached, it would mean that the President's budget would be cut from $37,500,000,000 to $31,500,000,000.

Total expenditures accounted for above, $22,183,779,053.

Balance, $9,316,220,947.

If the judgment of the House of Representatives is sustained and $6,000,000,000 is cut from the Budget, this means that $9,316,220,947 is all that remains for military expenditures, public works, flood control, support to prices of agricultural commodities, soil-conservation payments, support for the aged, blind, and for widowed mothers. Included in this amount is the expense of the Congress, Presidential offices, and a number of small Government agencies.

It must be remembered that the President's estimate for the national defense alone was $11,200,000,000. Just where it will be possible to reduce expenditures $6,000,000,000 in these perilous times is a ponderable question that only the stars can answer.

It must be giving some folks a severe headache, as golden promises run headlong into indisputable facts.

If the House version of the legislative budget should prevail, its $6,000,000,000 cut would require a 16-percent cut of the total budget estimate of the President. Even if the Senate version should prevail, and $4,500,000,000 were cut from the President's proposed budget, that would require a 12-percent cut in the President's total estimate. It is significant to say that in many items in which a drastic cut has been ballyhooed, the House Appropriations Committee has actually been successful in making a cut of only 6.9 percent.

Mr. President, there are those in the Congress who are constantly telling the American people that bureaucrats are entrenched in the Federal departments, wasting the taxpayers' money, and that if it were possible to remove the bureaucrats from the pay roll of the Government in Washington, a total of $6,000,-000,000 could be saved. Human nature being what it is, I do not doubt that there is some loafing in Government departments. I do not doubt that there is some overlapping of agencies and duplication of effort. I am for removing from the Federal pay roll every individual whose elimination does not impair the essential services of government. But I submit that even with a $31,000,-000,000 budget, personnel in quantity as well as quality is needed to administer effectively such a fund.

The distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. HOLLAND] was at one time Governor of Florida. He understands what it means effectively to administer a fund. If proper personnel is lacking, or if the quality of personnel is lacking to administer it properly, there will be false economy in government.

It is difficult to keep qualified individuals in Government. We have all seen industry lure from the Government pay roll, by offering much higher salaries, thousands of the Government's best trained men, among them many who while they were in Government service were the objects of the most bitter attacks by those who cry "bureaucrat" every time they get an opportunity.

Parenthetically, I should like to say that all the loafing and wasting of taxpayers' money is not confined to the executive branch of Government. I do not think anyone would contend that the Senate of the United States has any monopoly on efficiency and economy, even when the Republicans are in control.

Mr. President, based upon commitments and obligations we are duty-bound to honor, and based upon actual appropriations made by the House of Representatives to date, I undertake to say that unless the essential services of Government are sharply curtailed and the budget for national defense severely cut, the $6,000,000,000 pledge by the House of Representatives will fall short by billions of dollars. Assuming, however, that we should be successful in cutting the President's budget $2,500,-000,000, which would result in appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 of $35,000,-000,000, I submit what seems to me to be some more interesting figures:

Total revenue is estimated at	$38,800,000,000
If our expenditures are	35,000,000,000
The balance would be	3,800,000,000
The Senate voted overwhelmingly to pay on the national debt the sum of	2,600,000,000
Balance	1,200,000,000

If we pass a tax bill that costs the Government $3,800,000,000, we could easily drive the Treasury Department into bookkeeping transactions which will ultimately lead us into deficit financing, in balancing the budget without paying a single dollar on the national debt. Mr. President, I notice that some who once denounced the Government of the United States for going into the red, as the Senate proceeds with certain fiscal policies, today apparently have little fear of red ink.

However, in fairness, it should be said that there is a school of thought which holds that tax reductions will actually increase the Treasury receipts, and that tax relief and substantial reduction of the national debt go hand in hand. There is precedent for that theory. It happened back in the twenties. But I respectfully submit that there is no comparison between the twenties and the forties. Everyone knows that we have at the present time the highest national income in history, and the evidence of the experts before the Committee on Finance indicates that for the fiscal year 1948 it will not run over $170,000,000,000. That is based upon the theory that there will be no unforeseen economic calamities, and no dangerous recession.

Mr. President, there is another factor which cannot be ignored at this time by the Congress in formulating a sound fiscal policy of government. There is no man in the Senate who has not and will not continue to experience pressure from occupational, regional, and local groups. They are all for cutting Federal expenditures to the bone, until any cut threatens their share in Government disbursements. All Senators have received resolution after resolution from organizations in their respective States, demanding economy at all costs. But the moment one of their pet projects is threatened by a general economy movement, the lip service they gave to cutting expenditures in Government immediately fades from the picture. They become special pleaders for cause. They have no hesitancy in advocating the enactment of legislation carrying the authorization for appropriations which will bring something to their community or section of the country at the expense of the Federal Government.

And so it seems to me, Mr. President, highly appropriate at this time to place in the RECORD an estimate of the cost of a number of bills which have been introduced by the majority party in the Congress, seeking appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, which are not included in the President's budget. In making this estimate, when I found more than one bill introduced for the same project or the same purpose, I listed an estimated cost of only one, in an effort to avoid duplication in this tabulation and to ascertain as nearly as possible what would be the cost of carrying out the provisions of the divers and sundry authorizations proposed by the majority. Obviously, the total amount does not carry the accuracy of official budget estimate. It could be more; it could be less.

The bills I am about to enumerate are not all that have been introduced, because a number of Democrats are also the authors of many bills seeking additional appropriations.

I read the list I have prepared of bills pending in the Senate, as follows:

ADDITIONAL COST OF LEGISLATION PENDING IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS INTRODUCED BY REPUBLICAN MEMBERS

IN THE SENATE

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

S. 652, Mr. GURNEY: Universal Military Training Act of 1947, creates a Universal Military Training Corps, $1,486,000,000.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES LEGISLATION

S. 82, Mr. FERGUSON: Authorizes 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave annually for classified substitute postal employees, $49,171,000.

S. 447, Mr. LANGER: Provides for annual and sick leave for rural mail carriers, $16,000,000.

S. 674, Mr. BALDWIN: Substitute postal employees shall receive compensation for overtime service on the basis of 150 percent for hourly rate of pay, $14,000,000.

S. 549, Mr. LANGER: Grants postmasters an additional $200 per annum, in addition to their base pay, after 10 years' service, and an additional $200 per annum for every 5-year period of service thereafter, $12,200,000.

S. 203, Mr. LANGER: For 3 years, rural carriers shall receive an additional equipment maintenance of 2 cents for each mile traveled, $8,776,000.

VETERANS' SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE

S. 203, Mr. LANGER: Increases subsistence allowances to veterans receiving educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to $100 (now $65) in the case of a person without dependents; and $125 (now $90) in the case of a person with dependents, $765,000,000.

S. 112, Mr. KNOWLAND: Increases the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving compensation both for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education or on-the-job training to $250 (now $175) for veterans without dependents, and $300 (now $200) for veterans with dependents, $145,638,000.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

S. 644, Mr. BALDWIN: Increases the wartime service-connected death compensation or pension, payable to surviving widows for children of World War veterans, $32,764,000.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S BENEFITS

S. 429, Mr. WHITE: Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, extends to merchant seamen hospitalization, vocational and educational benefits; provides for loans and disability benefits, $20,000,000.

MISCELLANEOUS

S. 654, Mr. GURNEY: Authorizes appropriation of Federal funds for the purchase of land for the construction of armory and the construction or purchase of warehouses or other storage facilities, $15,000,000.

S. 582, Mr. CORDON: Authorizes annual payments to the States, for the benefit of their local units, of 2 percent of fair value of national forest lands, situated therein, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, $12,000,000.

S. 586, Messrs. CORDON and MORSE: Provides for an additional Military Academy and Naval Academy in Oregon or California ($175,000,000 over a 5-year period), $10,000,000.

S. 321, Mr. GURNEY: Amends the Pay Readjustment Act so as to increase to $936 annually (now $780) the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, $1,400,000.

S. 672, Mr. GURNEY: Authorizes leave of absence for officers and employees of the United States and the District of Columbia who are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, without loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating, for duty with troops, field exercises, or instruction for not more than 15 days in any 1 year, $1,600,000.

S. 597, Mr. BUSHFIELD: Forest Pest Control Act—the Secretary of Agriculture, either directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government, or any State, may conduct surveys on forest lands and take action to prevent or eradicate insect pests and tree diseases, $600,000.

S. 230, Mr. GURNEY: For the construction of aviation facilities in the United States Naval Academy, $12,000,000.

S. 286, Messrs. LODGE and SALTONSTALL: Authorizes a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps at or near Boston, $6,000,000.

It might just as well have been at Hartford, Conn., but it was Boston, Mass.

AGRICULTURE

S. 669, Mr. LANGER; S. 109, Mr. REED; S. 68, Mr. BUTLER: Authorizes the payment through the Commodity Credit Corporation of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn of the 1945 crop, not sold before April 18, 1946. Reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and now on the Senate Calendar, $337,000,000.

I want to say with respect to this legislation that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Illinois who is now speaking were the only two Senators who voted against the proposal for the expenditure of $337,000,000, and I anticipate a pretty good scrap here on the floor of the Senate when the agricultural bloc begins fighting for that $337,000,000.

S. 724, Mr. CAPPER: Farm labor supply program. Six months' extension of the farm labor supply program beyond June 30, 1947, $10,000,000.

We already have passed that bill.

S. 800, Messrs. MORSE, CORDON, and JOHNSON of Colorado: Authorizes building of access roads to standing timber to assist the veterans' emergency housing program, $10,000,000.

S. 814, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming: Wool Act of 1947, 2-year period, $42,000,000.

S. 528, Mr. CAPPER: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, 5-year period, $50,000,000; fiscal year 1948, $10,000,000.

So it goes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the remainder of the bills as I have prepared it. The bills speak for themselves without taking the time of the Senate to read them in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS

S. 938, Mr. VANDENBERG: Aid to Greece and Turkey, $400,000,000.

Senate Joint Resolution 77, Messrs. VANDENBERG and CONNALLY: Provides for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization. Authorizes annual appropriation, contribution, and expenses, 4-year period, $208,000,000.

(In fairness, it should be noted that these bills are part of the program of the President and required by the present international situation.)

EDUCATION

S. 199, Mr. AIKEN: Education Finance Act of 1947, authorizes for the purposes of more

nearly equalizing the educational opportunities among and within the States and increasing the amount to be appropriated year by year, fiscal year 1948, $400,000,000.

S. 472, Mr. TAFT: Education Finance Act of 1947 (same as Mr. AIKEN'S bill), $150,000,000.

S. 866, Messrs. WAGNER, ELLENDER, and TAFT: Housing bill, increasing per annum to a maximum of $160,000,000 in the fifth year, then declining to $140,000,000 for 40 years thereafter, fiscal year 1948, $38,000,000.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

H. R. 1889, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma: Veterans' Adjusted Service Compensation Act of 1947. Eighteen to twenty-two billion dollars over a 5-year period, approximate figure in 1948 (sponsored by VFW), $2,000,000,000.

H. R. 1122, Mr. LEMKE: Veterans' Rehabilitation Act, several billion dollars.

H. R. 1820, Mr. HAGEN: Provides for computation of double time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay of enlisted men with 30 years' service, effective from July 1, 1942, $17,000,000.

MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

H. R. 871, Mr. RUSSELL: Creates a National Mineral Resources Division, $100,600,000.

POSTAL SERVICE

H. R. 2364, Mr. HAGEN: Grants first-, second-, and third-class postmasters increases in salary, depending on service, $38,000,000.

H. R. 1271, Mr. STEVENSON: Revises provisions relating to compensation of rural letter carriers on the basis of 5 tours of duty per week, $15,653,000.

H. R. 1185, Mr. COLE of Missouri: Additional allowances to third- and fourth-class postmasters, $2,583,000.

H. R. 1188, Mr. COLE of Missouri: Rural mail carriers serving heavily patronized routes shall be paid equipment maintenance of $1 per hour for the time spent serving a route, $1,595,000.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

H. R. 1815, Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Creates National Science Foundation, between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

H. R. 1367, Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Authorizes construction of experimental submarines, 4-year period, $30,000,000.

MISCELLANEOUS

H. R. 2161, Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Extends from 5 to 8 years the period during which the Secretary of the Interior may construct and operate synthetic liquid fuels demonstration plants and increases the authorization for these purposes, 3-year period, $30,000,000.

H. R. 115 and H. R. 116, Mr. MCDONOUGH: For a naval and military academy in the southern district of California ($10,000,000 for each academy), 3-year period, $20,000,000.

H. R. 1341, Mr. ANDERSON of California: Authorizes construction of a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., 5-year period, $28,750,000.

Mr. President, I did not reach the bills which have been introduced by Members of the House of Representatives. There is one to which I wish to call particular attention, introduced by Representative SCHWABE of Missouri, who seeks a bonus for veterans, by introducing the Veterans' Adjusted Service Compensation Act of 1947, which would require the expenditure of from eighteen to twenty-two billion dollars over a 5-year period. For the fiscal year 1948 it would cost $2,000,000,000.

Following is the summary of the bills introduced by Republican Members of the Senate and the House:

Summary

Estimate of proposed expenditures contained in bills introduced by Republican Members of the Senate for the fiscal year 1948	$3,700,000,000
Estimate of proposed expenditures contained in bills introduced by Republican Members of the House for the fiscal year 1948	2,300,000,000
Total	6,000,000,000

It is a coincidence that the bills which have been introduced by the Republican Members of the House and the Senate total $6,000,000,000, the exact amount which the House of Representatives some time ago voted it would cut from the President's estimate.

I do not undertake to argue the merits or demerits of these bills, Mr. President. No doubt I could support some of the bills which have been introduced, indeed, I have supported some of them, for instance, the bill which proposed to implement the request by the President of the United States for a Greek-Turkish loan. I supported that bill, and was glad to do so.

I place this picture before the United States Senate and the country to show exactly what is going on at the present time so far as the question of economy in Government is concerned. I bring it into focus merely to show the Senate and the country the character of thinking of the majority in Congress while it struggles with the fiscal policy of the United States.

EMPLOYMENT LEVEL UNDER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the preachment of the Senator from Illinois, which convinces me, as it does other Senators who have heard his remarks, that we must admit we are still living in another New Deal emergency.

Mr. President, it is not so material whether we agree under the reorganization plan to cut $6,000,000,000 from the President's budget ceiling, or even $4,500,000,000, or $3,000,000,000, or any other amount. What is consequential is that in the consideration of every appropriation bill coming before this body we attempt to effect every possible economy consistent with good government.

I should like to take a minute to refer to an official report released yesterday by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not at this time. The report is for the period ending March 31, 1947.

I read as follows:

Paid employment in the continental United States at the end of March totaled 1,944,372 * * * a net decrease of 21,776 during the month. A total of 310,179 employees were stationed outside the continental United States, a decrease of 10,642 from the 320,821 * * * reported at the end of February. Thus a grand total of 2,254,551 persons were employed on March 31, 1947, a net decrease of 32,418 during the month.

I recall with a great deal of interest that last June when the Congress had before it the pay raise act, the Bureau of the Budget, representing directly the views of the White House, made representations to the legislative branch that on June 30, 1947, the end of the current fiscal year, we would reach a post-war level of 1,611,000 in the paid civilian employment of the executive branch of Government. If during the three remaining months of the current fiscal year, April, May, and June, the reductions are comparable to the reduction in civilian employment during the month of March, the last month available in the figures presented by the United States Civil Service Commission, we shall have on June 30 of this year a total of 2,157,297 employees in the executive branch of Government.

Mr. President, that will represent a total of 546,297 in excess of the budget ceiling presented by the Bureau of the Budget last June for the end of this fiscal year. I present these figures so that Members of this body will have tangible evidence that the executive branch of Government is not cooperating in any way with the legislative branch to effect the reductions in paid civilian employment which are essential if we are, in fact, to effect the economies which are necessary if we are to cut even a single dollar under the President's budget of $37,500,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

I present these figures because there has already been organized resistance on the minority side in the consideration of the first regular appropriation bill for 1948 considered by this body. It will be interesting to observe, in the consideration of the 11 other regular appropriation bills, whether there will be only lip service to economy, as has been pointed out by the speaker who preceded me, on behalf of some of the Members on the minority side. I am confident that we shall have more than lip service.

Mr. President, we can rightfully expect a continuance of the organized resistance against every proposal and every movement made by the majority party in both branches of Congress in an effort to effect economy and efficiency and cut below the $37,500,000,000 ceiling proposed by the President for the coming year.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I ask to have read and propounded to the Senate. This agreement is in three parts; and if Senators will listen to the several divisions of it, I think it may be helpful in reaching an agreement of some kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 9, 1947, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the amendment proposed to S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE), on page 54, after line 4, relating to boycotts and other unlawful combinations, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 9 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the first portion constitute a separate unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I thank the present occupant of the chair for bringing that fact to the attention of the Senate. Up to this point the agreement has to do only with the amendment now pending before the Senate, which is known as the Ball amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to offer an amendment. It is not quite ready. Would I be barred if this agreement were consummated?

Mr. WHERRY. It would not bar the Senator, except that at 1 o'clock there would be no opportunity to debate the amendment; but the Senator could offer an amendment after 1 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator to refer to another amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Any amendment may be offered up until 1 o'clock, when we propose to vote on the pending amendment. After that time an amendment could still be offered, but it would not be debatable. Between now and 1 o'clock tomorrow the Senator can offer any amendment he wants to offer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Any amendment to the pending amendment would be voted on at 1 o'clock tomorrow, but any amendment to the bill itself would not be affected.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a different thing. I am speaking only with reference to the Ball amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the next portion of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered further, That debate on any amendment thereafter proposed shall not exceed 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of such amendment, and that when no further amendment is to be proposed the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered.

Provided, That after the disposition of the so-called Ball amendment and until the third reading of the bill has been ordered, no debate shall be in order except on a pending amendment.

Ordered further, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 3 p. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, passed by the House; that the bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill 1126 as amended; that the third reading of the bill be considered as ordered; and that a vote be immediately taken upon the final passage of the said House bill 3020.

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, May 13, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 3 p. m. shall be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the said bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand the proposed agreement, the pending amendment would be voted upon on Friday at the hour fixed in the proposal, and thereafter any amendment which might be offered to the bill could be debated for not more than one-half hour. Let me say, Mr. President, that I have no desire to delay the final passage of this proposed legislation. However, I am faced with a situation, which addresses itself to me as one of very great importance, which compels me to object to any agreement for a final vote on Tuesday, May 13, at 3 o'clock p. m. as proposed. I therefore object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection long enough to permit the Senate to consider the first part of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement and see if we can agree on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska proposes a unanimous-consent agreement to the effect that at 1 p. m. on Friday the pending amendment and any amendments thereto shall be voted upon. The clerk will read that portion of the proposed agreement, which the Chair understands is being offered as a separate unanimous-consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 9, 1947, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the amendment proposed to S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE) on page 54, after line 4, relating to boycotts and other unlawful combinations, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 9 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand the part which has just been read deals solely with the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and any amendments to that amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it is to be acted upon at what hour on Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. At 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To that part of the proposed agreement I do not object.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to make sure that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not preclude offering further amendments after the pending amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. When the pending amendment is voted upon at 1 o'clock, the Senator could offer an amendment, but there could be only limited debate on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator could offer an amendment——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator please propound his question again?

Mr. AIKEN. Would adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed preclude the offering of further amendments to the bill, after the amendment now before the Senate is disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. No; not at all.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the unanimous-consent agreement now proposed relates wholly to the pending Ball amendment and to amendments thereto.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the proposal now

submitted would shut off or limit debate on any amendment proposed thereafter to the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement which has been proposed? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask that the second proposal be read. I should like to explain that I think there are seven other amendments which have been offered to the bill, and which remain to be acted upon by the Senate. Additional amendments may be offered, of course. We are attempting to have the Senate agree that each Member of the Senate will not use in excess of 30 minutes on any amendment which has been offered or on any amendment which may be offered to the bill or in further debate on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. How much time would that allow?

Mr. WHERRY. The total time consumed by all Senators would be unlimited up to that point; the agreement would provide that debate would continue until the time limit has been reached.

Mr. AIKEN. How much time would that permit for debate on the bill, after the amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. The agreement would limit debate on the amendments and would not permit discussion of the bill during the time when the amendments were being debated.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the debate on the amendments consumed all the time until the time limit was reached. That would leave no time for debate on the bill itself, I assume.

Mr. WHERRY. That would not happen if no further amendments are offered; but if sufficient additional amendments are offered so as to require further debate, there would be available all day Monday from 11 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the afternoon, and then on Tuesday from 11 o'clock in the morning until 3 p. m. That time would be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There are now pending or are to be offered, as I understand, approximately seven amendments, of which two are merely formal, and probably will be accepted with little or no debate.

So, under this proposal, the debate on five amendments would last two hours and a half, and therefore probably would conclude at half past 3 on Friday afternoon, at which time, when all amendments which then had been offered had been debated and voted upon, there would be a third reading of the bill, and that would cut off the offering of further amendments.

Thereafter, the time available for debate on the bill would be indefinite, and the time for voting on the bill would be indefinite, unless the Senate fixes an hour certain for voting on the bill itself. The Senator from West Virginia has objected to such a proposal.

So I take it that the Senator from Nebraska is now offering only the second branch of the proposed agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It provides that after the vote is had on the Ball amendment, the Senate shall then proceed to vote on all other amendments, with half an hour's time allowed to each Senator to debate each amendment, and that when all the amendments are adopted, there will be the third reading of the bill. Then the bill will be open to debate indefinitely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, is the question now before the Senate the adoption of the second part of the proposal, which limits Senators to 30 minutes of debate on the amendments which are pending or on any which may be offered?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are advised that there are seven amendments. I know of another amendment which will be offered. I feel definitely that 30 minutes is too short a time, and would cut off discussion. I know of past occasions when it has been regretted that such agreements had previously been entered into.

So, Mr. President, I feel that I must object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia withhold his objection, and state how much time he believes might be required for the additional amendment to which he has referred, so that we might suggest an amendment of the proposed agreement, in order to allow ample time for debate of all the amendments?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall withhold the objection, to say to the able Senator from Nebraska that I do not wish to agree to fix any particular time for debating the seven amendments and an additional amendment, which I know will be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire of the Senator from West Virginia whether the amendment which he says is to be offered will be an amendment to the bill or an amendment to the pending Ball amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, it will be an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that we have been debating this bill for 2 weeks. The bill has been debated fully; practically every feature of it has been debated. The subject matter covered in the amendments has been debated. It seems to me that the Senate should stay in session until all the amendments are disposed of. Therefore, I think the Senate should hold a night session tomorrow night, until it has been possible to complete action on all the amendments and to have the third reading of the bill.

I have no particular desire at this time to press for a vote on the bill itself, but it seems to me we can reasonably hope—and I say this after talking with the authors of the amendments already offered—to take final action on the amendments by Friday afternoon. But if we do not do so, I believe we should stay in session thereafter. So I ask Senators to count on a night session Friday night, with the idea of completing action on the amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is obvious that the second part of the agreement, fixing a time limit of 30 minutes on each pending amendment or each amendment which may be offered following the disposition of the pending amendments, cannot be agreed to. The usual form of agreement is that during the pendency of a certain matter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than a certain time on the bill or on any amendments thereto.

I would suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if he would put his request in a form to read, that following the disposition of the pending amendment and any amendments thereto at 1 o'clock tomorrow, during the further consideration of the amendments to the bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the bill or on any amendment thereto—which would give any Senator an hour—such a proposed agreement might be accepted and that would still leave open the question of debate on the bill itself, after all amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, but it seems to me that really would not accomplish what we have in mind. It seems to me there would be no limitation in that event.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be an hour's limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be better than none.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1126, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from West Virginia has definitely objected to the second part of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I further to understand that the Senator from West Virginia has objected to an agreement fixing the hour of 3 o'clock on Tuesday as the time for final vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have objected to such a proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. According to the Chair's understanding, the third portion of the unanimous-consent request has not been offered independently; and the objection lies to the second portion, which was offered independently.

Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to offer the third portion independently?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I shall not do so, because the Senator from

West Virginia has said that he would object to such a request, if I made it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, I would object to a request for a final vote on the bill itself at the time suggested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, if I may do so with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia what time, if any, he would agree to have a final vote taken on the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From my own point of view, I feel that between Friday and sometime on Wednesday we might work out an agreement as to a time for a final vote on Wednesday; and if Senators desire to fix a time on Wednesday, I would make no objection, as I view the matter at this time. That would give an additional day on the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that we should proceed under the first part of the agreement. I understand that it has been ordered that the Senate will vote on the so-called Ball amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, and that the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow will be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] will have charge of the time for the proponents and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] will have charge of the time for the opponents; and after the vote is taken at 1 o'clock, we shall proceed with the amendments, which may then be pending.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I give notice that the Senate will remain in session tomorrow night if it is impossible to finish voting on the amendments tomorrow afternoon.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all grace and mercy, vouchsafe to keep us this day without sin, that we may pledge a sincere dedication to our country and its vital needs. Grant us deeper thoughts and experiences of Thine own divine nature, out of which have sprung the affections of men and of angels. O stir in us that quality of character, that sturdy courage, which will make us superior to all circumstances.

Dear Lord, in the hours of memory there haunt us duties undone, deeds neglected, and acts unworthy; O forgive us and grant unto us strength to be equal to the unprecedented tasks before us. Make us messengers to homeless hearts, to loveless lives, and to the multitudes without a compass, that we may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and Thine shall be the praise forever, in the name of Him who is our eternal hope. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the late Charles L. Gerlach.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $243.50, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and ihclude two letters.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] upon the observance of the birthday anniversary of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Young Women's Christian Association, which letter is addressed to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. I have his permission to put this in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THEY SPEAK FOR AMERICA

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the four teen-age Americans who Tuesday afternoon relighted the torch of American patriotism. By their own reaction to a Communist Party line speech deriding America, they proved that love of God, love of country, and love of the American Constitution and flag are still the paramount emotions in the hearts of young Americans.

These four young Americans, three girls and a boy, walked out on a eulogy of Russia and Russian communism. They demanded that pro-Russianism, procommunism and un-Americanism bordering on sedition be barred from American schools. They protested against being forced by their principal to listen to statements that they recognized as false about the superiority of life in Soviet Russia compared to life in our own United States.

They had not read the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, on the floor of this House when he pointed out that the average wage of workers in the United States is $46.40 per week, as against $14.40 in Russia.

From their own knowledge of their own country, however, they knew that the pro-Soviet utterances of Mrs. Aleksandra Pavlovna Lewis, Russian-born, and an invited guest at their school, were the baldest form of lies and propaganda. They did what all red-blooded Americans should do under similar circumstances. They refused to give the consent of silence. They walked out.

Their action was as dynamic and can well be as far-reaching in effect in 1947 as was the Boston Tea Party, which first showed the temper of the people of the United States in regard to personal freedom.

For 14 years the educational system of the United States under the New Deal has been drugged by the enforced opiate of so-called progressive education. For 14 years the communistic thinking of the New Deal has recognized Russia, fostered communistic ideologies, and sought to plant in the minds of an entire generation of young Americans a willingness to accept internationalism, communism, and total regimentation of the people.

Through the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress, the Young Communist League, and more recently American Youth for Democracy, the international educational agencies of the Comintern have sought to kill patriotism in America.

The action of these four students at Western High School Tuesday proves that the torch of liberty still burns brightly in the minds of American youth. Their act must not be allowed to pass without fitting recognition by the House of Representatives—the directly elected representatives of the American people. We know from the reaction of the people at the polls last November that we are through with communism within these United States. I am glad to know these four young people will be honored by the Members of this House early next week in a fitting manner.

And we can well thank God for this proof that the little red schoolhouse has not become the big Red school system.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the public and Members of Congress are being bombarded with half-truths and falsehoods. For instance, it is urged that Cuba is the only dependable source of sugar for the United States and, therefore, should be given a near monopoly of that market. Proponents of this falsehood cite the wartime sugar record of our domestic areas and claim that this demonstrates the undependability of domestic producers as sources of sugar.

WAR RECORD

First, here is the record of sugar production since the outbreak of World War II compared with the prewar average—in short tons, raw value:

Year	Cuba	Domestic	
		Cane sugar	Beet sugar
1935-39 average	3,128	2,385	1,520
1940	3,127	2,335	1,897
1941	2,734	2,306	1,588
1942	3,800	2,479	1,726
1943	3,230	2,466	998
1944	4,738	2,039	1,056
1945	3,923	2,258	1,278
1946	4,476	2,026	1,551

Now, let us see what happened. In 1940, the first year of the war, the domestic beet area set a new production record. During the first 3 years of World War II, this domestic area maintained its output above prewar average. Cane-sugar production, in contrast, did not increase until 1942, the third year of the war; in fact, it decreased in 1941, especially in Cuba. Since 1941 Cuban production has been above prewar, but with sharp fluctuations, which certainly do not demonstrate unusual dependability. Production in the domestic cane-sugar areas since 1943 has been reduced by unfavorable weather in Puerto Rico, Florida, and Louisiana by a labor shortage and a strike in Hawaii in 1946, and generally by the impact of the war on these sugar-cane producers in a country fully at war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Boston Herald May 7 relating to T. Bertram King, Director of the Loan Guarantee Section of the Veterans' Administration; a letter from the East Boston Social Centers Council; a letter from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; and a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., all endorsing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, and all of which I agree with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brilliant speech by my illustrious predecessor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Plain Talk.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Bates, Mass.	Gifford	O'Toole
Bell	Gregory	Ploeser
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Powell
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	Preston
Camp	Hart	St. George
Canfield	Hartley	Scoblick
Chapman	Hinshaw	Scott,
Chiperfield	Jones, Wash.	Hugh D. Jr.
Clements	Kearns	Sheppard
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	McDowell	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Utah	McGarvey	Taylor
Dingell	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Mansfield, Tex.	Tibbott
Domengeaux	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	West
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Wolverton
Fenton	Morrison	
Fuller	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Legislature, two editorials, and a telegram.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cumberland News.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain tables and documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain newspaper clippings and other data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had completed the reading of the first section of the bill.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after "paragraph", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that today is the sixty-third birthday of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. The policy on which he is now embarking is the most significant, probably, that America has ever undertaken. It is going to do one of two things: It is going to make Harry Truman one of the great men of all history, if he follows through and cleans out communism in this country, or if he fails to do that, if he fails to follow through, it will probably have exactly the opposite effect.

Christian civilization and atheistic communism cannot long continue the way we are going. I wish you would look at the Washington Post of this morning. I feel like dubbing that publication the American Pravda. On the front page it has the picture of a Communist propagandist who went out here and insulted the students at Western High School on yesterday. On another page it has an advertisement of a Com-

munist meeting here tonight. This Communist meeting is brought here for the purpose of trying to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

The measure now before the House, which President Truman has recommended, definitely lines him up on the side of those of us who have been fighting this Communist menace for years. If he will just follow through and help us to drive this pernicious influence from American soil, he will have saved our Christian civilization, and as I said, will go down in history as one of the great leaders of all time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say in connection with the subject matter of my remarks is said without rancor or ill feeling, but I believe it is my duty to bring to the attention of the House and to explain to my colleagues who requested time yesterday just what the situation was when debate was closed. It was the understanding that the opposition was to have 3 hours. At the beginning of the session on yesterday, the clerk of our committee advised me that on the majority side we were entitled to 51 minutes and from the minority side we were entitled to 73 minutes, and he suggested that I submit the names of those who were to speak in opposition. I submitted those lists to both the majority and minority leaders. The majority leader fulfilled his obligation under that agreement explicitly. The opposition received 51 minutes from the majority side. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] refused to recognize the list that I submitted to him, and when the time had expired there were still 19 minutes due the opposition.

I call your attention to the fact that as the debate closed the distinguished former Speaker and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] were both given, I believe, 18 minutes of time. There was no time for the opposition. The House should know that because I believe an agreement has been violated, contrary to the understanding between the parties.

I make that explanation because there were six or seven men on our side who wanted to speak and who had no opportunity to do so.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I know the gentleman did not intend to say that the minority side did not recognize any of the men on his list because I am sure he will recall that some were.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I did not say that, my distinguished friend.

Mr. JARMAN. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You did recognize the opposition to the extent of some 48 minutes, but that still left us 19 minutes in the hole.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I understand that the gentleman absolves the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; I said you fulfilled your agreement explicitly.

Mr. EATON. I sincerely thank the gentleman for that bill of health.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hope that as debate now proceeds under the 5-minute rule there is going to be no effort to shut off the opposition. Hardly a man who stood in the well of this House has failed to call attention to the seriousness of this situation. Even under the rule only 9 hours is allowed to debate this important problem. In the past we have spent as much as 20 hours on other matters which were only half as important as this. So I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we can have plenty of time under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I regret very much there was a misunderstanding yesterday but the misunderstanding came about in this manner: Anyone who came to me from the opposition, I granted time. I was looking for people on the opposition in order to give them time. The mistake I made, if it was a mistake, was that I thought everyone had to come to me and ask for time, and I gave them time. Let me say to the gentleman that I had given out all of my time when I came to this table yesterday morning. Shortly after that the gentleman sent a list around and I told him that was not the way I understood the agreement. I am very sorry that I did not have the names the gentleman had on his list, but I had no more time. I gave the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] 20 minutes. I certainly would not have given him 20 minutes had I known you wanted time for other speakers. I just want to say, if there was a mistake made, I yielded to everyone on this side who came to me and asked for time. I did not know the gentleman had a list over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wish to make this statement: The gentleman fully understands, of course, the difficulty the chairman has in trying to give time to the very large number on our side who wish to speak. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the House owes it to the gentleman from Wisconsin and those associated with him in their attitude toward this bill that he have this time now. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee at this time grant the gentleman the 19 minutes for use as he sees fit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to my distinguished chairman, I think that is out of order, and that we should proceed under the 5-minute rule. This is water over the dam. I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader that we want to be fair, but you did recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], and we still had 19 minutes coming.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry; that was not my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is always unfortunate that in the affairs of the House of Representatives any misunderstanding in respect to time should arise. However, it seems to have arisen on this occasion, as it has on other occasions during the time I have been here.

I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman: As far as I know, there is no inclination to push this measure through without full and adequate time under the 5-minute rule for discussion of the various proposals and amendments that will be made, and opportunity afforded Members to speak on the measure as they see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I know of no reason why consideration of the bill in the Committee cannot proceed through the day and through tomorrow, if that is necessary, in order that Members may have full and complete opportunity to present their views on this very important matter, while at the same time we make reasonable progress in consideration and final action on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I would like to suggest to my leader, however, that in this matter of time, the Rules Committee should fix the limitations and fix the conditions when situations like this arise.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while the House is considering the very important request of the President for a $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, it is necessary that we of the Congress carefully inquire into all aspects of the Middle East situation, and particularly the current financial condition of Greece, the principal recipient of the proposed aid. It is particularly important that the Greek Government be required, as a condition of the

pending loan, to tax every available source of income. For this purpose I want to call to the attention of the Congress a situation permitting Greek nationals living in the United States to evade taxes, which I believe should be corrected.

There are living in the United States a considerable number of Greek nationals engaged in business who are not subject to income taxation by any country under present law. The Greek Government does not tax its citizens living abroad. Apparently the United States Government is unable to do so, in many instances, because of present loopholes in the Federal income-tax laws. It is only just and right that these Greek nationals should be required to make tax contributions for the governmental services and benefits which they enjoy while living in our country.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I might also add that the Greek Government does not even tax its citizens at home.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am not dealing with that matter now, I am dealing with those Greek nationals who are living in the United States.

Also, at a time when their country is in a very precarious financial condition and is asking the people of the United States for help, these Greek citizens should bear their share of the burden. Mr. Maximos, the Prime Minister of Greece, has expressed his country's willingness to fully cooperate with the United States and to work toward correcting any inequities which exist at this time. I believe both Governments will be not only willing but anxious to correct this tax situation, which has heretofore been overlooked.

At this time I would like to tell you gentlemen about the aspect of this situation, with which I am most familiar. The tax evasion I have described is especially noteworthy in the field of shipping. Greek shipowners, before the war, operated very extensively under the Panamanian flag, through Panamanian corporations which they owned and controlled. Substantial tonnage was also operated under the Greek flag. Under a series of international treaties made pursuant to section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code, the United States has for many years exempted the income of Panamanian, Greek, and other foreign shipowners from taxation within this country, in return for reciprocal exemptions from taxation to American shipowners on profits earned from activities outside the United States. These international agreements were intended to avoid the danger of double taxation, but they have been misused so as to provide the equivalent of tax exemption. This abuse should be stopped. Thus, in the case of Greek shipowners operating under Greek and Panamanian flags, these exemptions have operated as one-way streets. The Greek shipowners were exempted from taxes otherwise payable to the United States, although American shipowners received no benefits, because no taxes would have been levied in Greece or Panama. Moreover, through the device of Panamanian operation and residence outside of Greece, Greek-owned vessels, in many cases, escaped requisition by Greece during the war. They were brought into the Allied shipping pool only after the United States and Panama became belligerents.

From the information I have received, it is apparent that wealthy Greek shipowners are now reinvesting their war-swollen profits, upon which no taxes have ever been paid to any government, in ships purchased from the Maritime Commission under the Ships Sales Act. Approximately 100 of these ships are planned for operation under the Greek flag and I believe that a similar number have been or will be purchased for operation under the Panamanian flag. Because of the low wages and other reduced operating costs, owners of these Greek and Panamanian vessels are now earning fabulous profits. Many of these owners reside in the United States. Panama has no income tax law. I believe that, except for trivial amounts, these shipowners have successfully evaded payment of taxes to the United States as well as to their own impoverished homeland. Profits earned by Panamanian corporations are allowed to accumulate to the credit of the corporations. These funds ultimately are withdrawn in the form of loans which are, in reality, disguised dividends, or are reinvested in additional tonnage or are otherwise transferred to safe custody of the beneficial owners without payment of an income tax thereon.

To be fair, I regret that I must state, while the subject is being discussed, that in some cases it appears that American citizens have attempted to use Panamanian corporations in order to escape payment of taxes to our Government. I appreciate that there may be sound operating reasons for operation of some ships under the Panamanian flag, but it is apparent that, in certain cases, the American shipowners practiced this device primarily to avoid payment of taxes to our country. This abuse should be corrected also.

I am confident that millions of dollars of tax revenue will result from the imposition of taxes upon the amassed wealth of those Greek millionaires and the inflated income of those Greek citizens now residing in New York and other cities. If we are to provide relief, we must make it our business to see to it that the beneficiaries of our relief exercise the maximum degree of self-help. We must insist upon their doing all in their power to help themselves. Greece should be required to enforce democratic responsibilities upon its citizens as a condition of our loan to them. Particularly I refer to the responsibility to finance their government to the utmost of their ability, which is especially vital during this critical period.

I am writing today to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asking that an investigation of this matter be made immediately, that any violations of existing tax laws by these people be immediately stopped and prosecuted, and that if such tax avoidance is deemed legal under existing statutes, desirable amendments be recommended.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was an exchange between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], which occurred over the policy of the Russian Government in agreeing unilaterally with the Yugoslav Government for the transfer of material for the Yugoslav Army and for the giving of long-term credits to the Yugoslav Government such as we are intending to give here to Greece and Turkey. I will read that exchange from the RECORD because it concerns a cablegram to the Department of State dated June 11, 1946, a copy of which was not available on the floor at the time.

The essence of the debate was that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] unbelievably said that if such a cablegram or telegram had come into the State Department giving the fact that Russia had taken unilateral action first with one of her satellites, Yugoslavia, in 1946, he then would condemn Russia. So I am here to nail that down and have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] publicly on this floor condemn Russia, which I think is a real gain for the American people. I will read the exchange that occurred in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 on page 4724, referring to this cablegram:

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first I have heard of it. I cannot account for the accuracy of that report.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman may accept it as accurate, because I will produce the cablegram to the State Department.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. However, assuming the statement to be correct, then I say that that action as well as this action should be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. So the gentleman now disapproves the action of Russia on June 11, 1946; is that correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disapprove the action of any country that takes unilateral action on any matter that involves the peace of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Including Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including Russia, the United States, Turkey, Greece, or any other nation in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Then if I am right in my statement that we did receive such a cablegram from Yugoslavia, the gentleman condemns Russia just as he condemns the United States right here, does he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do.

Mr. FULTON. That is very interesting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think any action should go through the United Nations when that action affects the peace of the world.

I hold in my hand from the State Department a copy of that cablegram dated June 11, 1946, received by the State Department at 3:10 p. m. on that day. It is addressed to the Secretary of State from Moscow and states among other things, and I will not read the entire cablegram:

Questions were reviewed of interest to both sides in regard to Jugoslav treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar cooperation of April 11, 1945, and full agreement was achieved on all questions involving economic collaboration, trade, supply of material to Jugoslav army, and close cultural and political collaboration.

Watch particularly what Russia does with the situation right in this same area; yet you find a lot of people here complaining, among them some Republicans, that we are the first country to step outside the United Nations and take unilateral action. This is clearly wrong because the next paragraph I shall quote, shows it:

> Government, U. S. S. R. agreed to supply Jugoslav army with arms, munitions, et cetera, on conditions long term credit, and also to assist in reestablishment Jugoslavia's own war industry.

I believe that ties the gentleman down. For once the gentleman from New York is siding with the American Government and is not agreeing with every action that Russia has taken. This, in my opinion, is a great advance in this Congress.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. KEE. Who signed that telegram?

Mr. FULTON. It is signed by "Smith" and it is also captioned "Repeated Belgrade as 29."

The cablegram designation for our State Department is No. 3953 Plain Moscow, 1834, eleventh.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemena from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Is the telegram signed by General Smith, our Ambassador to Russia?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct, by our own Ambassador.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the able gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there not another agreement made with the present Government of Poland?

Mr. FULTON. There are other unilateral agreements by the Soviet Government with various satellite countries. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Council not so many weeks ago made that charge, and in support of it quoted excerpts from newspapers in Poland and the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULTON. So that is the second action taken by Russia, unilaterally, outside the United Nations' sphere, and on the very type of subject matter that we are proposing today concerning Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that over a period of time since VJ-day we have supplied South American countries with war materials, and nobody has ever complained?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There was nothing ever said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate we have heard praise of the insurgents and the guerrillas in the hills of northern Greece and Macedonia, but the fact of the matter is that these insurgents are under the domination of the Soviet Union. We admired the courage of Benedict Arnold as long as he led the Revolutionary forces to victory, but as a traitor he was despised by America and rejected by England. The classic speeches of Demosthenes 2,300 years ago in denunciation of the aggression of Macedonia are applicable in 1947. His orations made him immortal, but his cries and warnings were in vain. He saw that the forces of aggression were threatening Greece from Macedonia and as 2,300 years ago the master of Macedonia, Alexander, invaded and destroyed Athens, and from Athens proceeded to the conquest of the world, so today Russia with her communism the master of the insurgent forces in Macedonia is threatening to engulf not only Greece, not only Turkey, but the entire world.

We have heard something about the selfish rich of Athens collaborating with the Germans, and about the tax evaders among the wealthy Greeks temporarily in the United States. Unfortunately, we have tax evaders in our own country, and unfortunately in the cities of the South and the cities of the North there are the selfish rich. I have no respect for those who put the dollar above their country, and I despise the tax evaders, whether they reside in the United States or in Greece. The purpose here is aid to Greece and Turkey. Let us keep to the main issue.

If there is one nation more than another that is sympathetic with the struggles for freedom and for liberty in countries great and small, that nation is the United States.

I shudder to think what would have been the fate of the colonists had it not been for the aid and assistance extended to them by France. I know that the forces of selfishness are ever present. When Washington and his ragged and barefoot heroes were at Valley Forge, I know that the rich Tories were in Philadelphia giving aid and comfort to the British, but I also know that another Philadelphian, Benjamin Franklin, was at that very time in France pleading for the cause of the Colonies.

The Governments of Greece and Turkey are not perfect. They have their problems. Greece has been invaded, her cities destroyed, her highways obliterated, and her industry wrecked. Reforms will not be easy; rehabilitation will be difficult.

The government in Greece is a coalition government. It represents the best that the majority could agree upon. The first lesson in democracy that patriots must learn is that the majority must rule. The insurgents in northern Greece must abide by the will of the majority.

One small nation after another has been absorbed and is today under the power of Soviet Russia. If a helping and powerful hand had been extended, these nations might be free today.

While communism is marching on, other nations and other countries, especially the small nations of the world are looking to the United States for help and for assistance and for leadership. If we fail them they too may succumb to the threat of communism.

In this momentous hour, I cannot remain silent. I urge the passage of the pending bill.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has its weakness; it is in process of organization and perfection. The proposed bill does not bypass the United Nations. Its representatives in Macedonia have been rebuffed. The United Nations has been prevented from aiding freedom in Greece by the refusal of the communistic forces in control in the hills of Macedonia and in the neighboring satellite countries under the dominion of Russia to cooperate. Moreover, Russia has veto power, and the veto power and policy of Russia have prevented successful conferences for peace and a successful functioning by the United Nations.

THE OBJECTIVES

I extend to say the objective of the bill is to promote peace to enable countries to work out their own destiny without infiltration or domination by any outside power. Peace is jeopardized whenever a totalitarian regime is imposed upon free peoples, either by conquest or infiltration, either by direct or indirect aggression.

During World War II the Greeks fought valiantly against the enemies of the United States and the Soviet Union. Greece was wrecked by invasion. The Greek Government has charged before the United Nations that insurgents receive supplies from neighboring countries under the dominion of Russia.

Sometimes we are prone to criticize Turkey for failing to enter World War II. The fact is that Turkey rendered invaluable assistance. She prevented Germany from not only obtaining possession of the Dardanelles, but from conquering Cairo and thus advancing through Egypt and north Africa.

On March 12, 1947, while Secretary of State George C. Marshall was doing his best to secure a successful peace in Moscow, President Truman appeared before the Senate and the House and announced that a grave situation confronted the world, and that our responsibility required us to aid Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism.

APPEASEMENT

We tried appeasement with Japan in Manchuria and China, and it failed. We tried appeasement with Mussolini in Ethiopia and with Hitler at Munich, and

appeasement failed, as appeasement always will. We have been patient with Russia. We have seen one peace conference after another fail because of Russian opposition. The program of Russia is to delay, absorb, and dominate. Russia has absorbed one country after another while delaying peace in disregard of her obligations to the United Nations. Today Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the border of Greece are a threat to the gateways to the Orient. If Russia takes Greece and Turkey, she is fast on her way to conquer India and China.

THE ISSUE

The issue is whether freedom or communism is to obtain. The issue is whether the Americanism of the United States or the communism of the Soviet Union is to obtain in the world.

SOBER THINKING

Our way is not easy, but our duty is plain. We must be patient with Greece and Turkey as we have been with Russia. We are dealing with a government in Greece and a government in Turkey that are not perfect. We might as well admit that we have our limitations in the United States. We must display both faith and patience. We must be firm. We must not be any more satisfied with conditions that obtain in Athens than we are with conditions that obtain in some American cities. The road to freedom and to peace is always hard. Aggression must always be resisted. We have been most generous. Russia has been bluffing. It is time to call her hand. The President of the United States, Secretary Marshall, and their advisers, both Democratic and Republican, urge the passage of the pending bill. The responsibility is great. The cost will be high. We have much to lose but much more to gain. Russia must understand once and for all that appeasement is no part of our foreign policy, and that all governments, great and small, in their own way, without aggression, infiltration, or domination, must be permitted to work out their own destiny.

OBJECTIONS

It has been asserted that the funds advanced under the bill might be used in paying loans of Greece and Turkey to other governments. This objection has been fully met by the express terms of the bill.

It has been next suggested that the whole matter be referred to the United Nations. I have already answered this objection. At present the United Nations is without the power or the funds to render the aid needed. Moreover, Russia has plainly indicated that her veto power would be asserted.

Again it is urged that the program will lead to war. We have tried to make one agreement after the other with Russia. The bill does not provide for combat forces. Russia is out to get all that she can, but she does not want war. At least she does not want it now. Her plan may be for war in the future, but she does not want it now. The program is to prevent war.

FOREIGN POLICY

The United States has endeavored in every way to get along with Russia. The proposed program is unprecedented. The time has come for the United States to say what it means and mean what it says. We now mean business. There is a point beyond which the United States will not retreat.

There is no partisanship in our foreign policy. It is supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Republican Senators and Republican leadership cooperated with Democratic Senators and Democratic advisers in the recent Moscow Conference just as the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other body have previously cooperated with former Secretary of State Byrnes. Previous conferences have failed because of the refusal of Russia to agree.

All nations must be able to work out their destiny free from coercion. Governments have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will in violation of the Yalta agreement in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. One small country after the other has come under the influence of the Soviet Union.

The small nations must have assistance if they are to survive. They are looking to the United States of America. It is time for action. They must have the assistance of the United States if they are to work out their own destiny.

There are two ways of life. The choice must be free. One way is based upon the will of the majority. The other is based upon the will of the minority being forcibly imposed upon the majority. One way of life is communism. The other is freedom, which is synonomous with Americanism. The tree of freedom cannot grow in the soil of communism. The seeds of totalitarianism are nurtured by misery and want. They grow in the soil of poverty and strife. They reach their maturity when hope for freedom has died. Free people in the free countries of the world look to the United States for aid in maintaining their freedom. The proposal does involve risk. It may involve war, but the best way to promote peace is to be prepared for war. If we fail to assert and maintain our leadership in the struggles for peace, we will not only jeopardize the welfare and the future of the United States, but we will endanger the peace of the world.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure passes without crippling amendments. The strategic and political aspects of the issue which we have been discussing here for several days are all important. In the first place, Soviet Union has a foreign policy of expansion and of spreading communism wherever and whenever possible, with the ultimate goal of world domination. The security of the United States of America is at stake. We must never lose sight of this fact. In the first place, Turkey and Greece are the outposts against the spread of communism in the Mediterranean area; in fact, the military aspects of this measure are more significant in many ways than the relief aspects as far as the security of the United States is concerned.

What will happen if we do not extend aid to Greece and what will happen if we do not extend aid to Turkey and protect the strategic Dardanelles? In the first place, Greece will fall under the domination of the Soviet Union. Turkey will probably yield to the demands that are being made by Moscow. The whole Middle East would then be in danger.

When I was in Iran over a year ago the members of the Parliament in that country said the ultimate object of the Soviet Union is the annexation of Iran so that Russia may have access to the oil of the Persian Gulf. I have heard a great deal said about oil in connection with this issue, and some say they do not like the smell of oil. I like the smell of oil, and I will tell you why. It is necessary to our economy in peace, and it is crucial in time of war. Our automobiles run by oil, our houses are heated by oil. Oil is essential to every man, woman, and child in this modern world. If the Middle East goes, the Soviet Union will press westward, and finally the western gateway of the Mediterranean will come under the control of Moscow. The Mediterranean Sea will become a Soviet lake, and then definitely the security of the United States will become imperiled. We can either deny this aid to Greece and Turkey or we can give it. If we deny it, it means that we intend to retreat from our present position of world leadership.

I am amused to hear some say that we cannot afford this policy. Can we not afford to maintain our place of leadership? If this great country cannot do this, then it means that we must retreat, and it means that the center of political gravity will shift from the city of Washington to Moscow, an eventuality which I for one will oppose to the end. If this program is going to cost $400,000,000 or if it costs 10 times that much to stop the march of communism in the Mediterranean area, it will, in my opinion, be money well invested.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please tell us how the appropriation of $400,000,000 will stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. Well, sir, this is the first step, and if it requires more money, I, for one, am willing to vote it.

Nobody can predict with accuracy the future. No person possesses omniscience, but certainly if $400,000,000 cannot stop communism in the Mediterranean, let us appropriate enough money to do this job. Let us call the bluff of the Soviet Union and we will soon find out whether or not Mr. Stalin wants to fight. I believe he will stop short of that point where the United States of America and Great Britain are willing to take a stand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In other words, we are on our way, but we do not know where we are going.

Mr. MERROW. Do you know what the future is going to be in 2 or 10 years from now?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Again, I ask the gentleman a question which I asked a week or so ago. If $400,000,000 or 10 times that

amount fails to stop it, then does the gentleman advocate going to war in order to stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. I will say to the gentleman if that becomes necessary to protect the United States we probably will go to war. We did not want to do anything when Mr. Hitler took the Rhineland and walked all over Europe, but finally we sent millions of our boys to Europe and spent billions of dollars. Let us not forget recent history. Firm and resolute action before Nazi Germany occupied the Rhineland in 1936 or before the many other annexations of territory by Germany would have, in my opinion, avoided the Second World War.

Mr. BREHM. Then, why not save the $400,000,000 and go to war right now and get the thing over with?

Mr. MERROW. Are you willing to do that?

Mr. BREHM. I would be willing to do that if it is to be our policy to stop communism—let us stop it and let us quit bluffing.

Mr. MERROW. I want to call Russia's bluff immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the large number of Members who want to speak, the Chair desires to state the policy that the Chair will try to follow in recognizing Members. Inasmuch as the Chair does not know whether Members intend to speak for or against the bill, the Chair will follow the principle of alternating between the majority side and the minority side.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, there is now pending a committee amendment to which, I believe, there is no opposition. Pro forma amendments to strike out the last word could well be deferred until the committee amendment is acted upon. Would it be in order to dispose of the committee amendment and then proceed with the pro forma amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is the will of the Committee, the Chair will put the question on the first committee amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if that is done, will it in any way prevent the Members from speaking for 5 minutes in discussing this bill under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry, but will answer the gentleman by saying that the matter of recognition of Members to speak will proceed on the basis of Members being recognized if they seek recognition. Beyond that, it will be the policy of the Chair, or at least the policy of the Member now occupying the chair, to alternate recognition between the majority and minority sides.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, all I am interested in is that the Members will not be deprived of speaking on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the control of the Committee and not in the control of the Chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in order that the Committee may have clearly in mind what we are voting on that the Clerk may read the committee amendment again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after the word "paragraph", insert the following: "*Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 15, strike out the word "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 2, line 20: Strike out the word "countries", and insert "countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: Insert after (4) (A) after the word "information", page 2, line 19: "Except atomic weapons, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information relating to atomic energy or any of the foregoing other than as may be permitted in any general international agreement."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill describes in broad and essentially unlimited categories the kinds of assistance which the President of the United States is authorized to give to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. If you will turn to section 3 (c), line 6 through line 12, to 3 (d), you will see that we are not talking about International Harvester machines. Since there are no limitations on the types of weapons or information which may be transferred, I call your attention to the fact that the President is thereby, in his discretion, empowered to furnish atomic bombs, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information concerning any of the foregoing to either Greece or Turkey or both.

In pointing this out, I need not emphasize that no reflection of any kind on the President or on his purposes is intended. On the contrary, I believe the President himself has the right to ask Congress to be meticulously precise as to its wishes in this matter. The authorization to give weapons must be at least as definite as an appropriation bill. Since the House is not in the habit of giving funds without specifying both the exact amounts and the purposes for which each amount is to be used, there is no justification for vagueness or carelessness in saying whether or not Congress intends to authorize the President to give atomic bombs or top secret information to the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

Nor can we escape responsibility by saying, "Oh, all that has been taken care of by the Atomic Energy Act." I have been advised by most competent legal authorities that the Atomic Energy Act itself does not prohibit the President, in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief, from transferring, as he may deem essential to the national defense, such weapons, substances, or information to any foreign country.

It is frightening to think that this bill, as now written, authorized the transfer to two such governments as those of Greece and Turkey, weapons, materials and information incorporating what Congress has repeatedly and excitedly declared to be the most vital element in the bastion of our security.

If there were a bill before you to give atomic bombs to Britain, I believe you would reject it out of hand. Surely materials and information which cannot be shared even with Britain and Canada—who participated in and contributed to all phases of our atomic energy development and therefore have a claim to such fruits, apart from the fact that they really know our secrets anyway—must not be entrusted to Balkan governments which are neither, to say the least, stable nor dependable.

Months were spent in determining whether the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission had sufficiently demonstrated his loyalty to our form of government, whether he sufficiently understood the principles of democracy, to make him a fit person to guard our bombs and our knowledge. We have not spent 5 minutes inquiring into the beliefs of King Paul of Greece to whom, under this bill, the President would have the authority to hand over anything or everything related to atomic energy.

Of course, the President may be relied upon to do nothing which would, in his opinion, jeopardize the common defense. Yet he should be instructed and backed up by a clear statement from Congress covering the point. For the subject of atomic bombs has been injected both in the hearings of this bill and in the debate on the floor.

On this issue, therefore, I offer an amendment which in no way impairs the authority of the President to furnish assistance except that it prohibits the transfer to Greece and Turkey of atomic weapons, fissionable materials—the main ingredient of the bombs, source materials from which these ingredients are derived and information relating to any of the foregoing or to the production of atomic energy so long as such information is held in secrecy classification by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentlewoman from California on the drawing of her amendment. It is well drawn, but it puts us in a peculiar quandary when it comes to deciding how to

vote on it. It might well be called a Henry Wallace amendment because it is one of those amendments which if you vote against it means you might want to send atomic bombs over there, but if you vote for it you as much as say you do not trust the President of the United States because he might send them over unless he is restrained.

As for myself I wish to say directly that while I am a Republican I have full faith and confidence in the Government of the United States of America and I have full faith and confidence in the man who is the President of the United States of America, who represents me as well as everyone here in this room, Harry Truman.

Let us simply put this amendment on the basis of confidence. If Henry Wallace has no confidence in Harry Truman and the Government of the United States, maybe some of us do. If therefore you wish to vote a lack of confidence in the President's exercising his emergency powers that still remain to him, then vote to make a certain area of the world consisting of Greece and Turkey to be under a limitation of our power and our foreign policy. Our power and foreign policy are based not only on the population here but on our strength.

We in the United States are trying to get an agreement internationally over the control of atomic energy and its use, and for the control of atomic weapons. We should not have any restraint on us when we go in and deal openly and broadly before the United Nations for such an agreement. I hope you will not tie the hands of the American Government which represents you by any such amendment, and I hope you will not throw a cloud on the President by implying that he might use such a thing unless we do something to control him and tie his hands.

Further than that, if you add this limitation, we lawyers of the House know that when you start outlining things that you will not send, it means that you will send everything else. Under this reasoning it means that you would send all the supersonics, all the jet planes, all our long-range guns, it even means that you would go into chemical warfare and send over disease germs to spread over countries. I do not want to be taken as saying that I agree to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur absolutely in the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is not a question of who is President. If we had anyone else as President I would thoroughly agree with the gentleman and his argument.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have complete confidence in the President so far as matters concerning foreign affairs are concerned and the exercise of judgment in those matters. I am sorry that the distinguished gentlewoman from California has offered the amendment. I join with the gentleman in his able argument and strongly urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, my distinguished colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact also that the atomic-energy law prohibits this Government from giving any information in regard to atomic energy to a foreign power without authority from the Congress?

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly correct, and this amendment again tends to cast a doubt upon Mr. Lilienthal and the Atomic Energy Commission now handling the matter in secret for this Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this bill is passed, then adoption of the pending amendment would merely be giving encouragement to Communist Russia to continue her aggression and her undermining of the United States of America?

Mr. FULTON. That is right. It contains, in essence, the same principle as the old Neutrality Act. We were going to make ourselves impotent and powerless in certain parts, which would let the forces we are trying to stop operate freely.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have such very great regard.

Mr. FULTON. That is returned.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The President as Commander in Chief is permitted under the Constitution in the defense of our country and would be permitted to send atomic energy or information about atomic bombs. As I said before, this is not a reflection on the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. This, of course, is no reflection upon the President.

Mr. FULTON. Why is it not a reflection upon him?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The question of atomic bombs has been interjected into the hearings and into the debate on the floor of the House. This bill is being passed in the hope that it will aid our program for peace, and it should not be passed with the idea abroad that this is an atomic-bomb bill.

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentlewoman from California? If this is no reflection upon the President of the United States, she then infers that the President of the United States would not send atomic bombs anyhow in his own discretion. If he would not send them anyhow, then the particular amendment becomes useless.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. FULTON. Because then it is a mere, idle gesture, and this bill is no idle gesture. If, on the other hand, it might be construed either here or abroad to be a condemnation or a tying of the hands of the President of the United States, the amendment should be voted down. So the gentlewoman is in a dilemma and must choose whether her amendment is merely useless or a lack of confidence in the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about following the President. I wonder if he recalls a former President on one occasion telling the Congress that he had more information on foreign affairs and knew more about foreign affairs than the Congress did, and that the Congress should leave the question to him and he would keep us out of war. Shortly thereafter we found ourselves in war. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. FULTON. I do, and may I make a short answer on that. It will be recalled that the President of the United States under the Constitution of our Government is given full and free power over our foreign policy. We in Congress can consult, advise, and implement his foreign policy, but whoever he is, I am going to take his judgment. I take the judgment of the Congress on declaring war. Of course, the Congress and not the President declares war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a good amendment.

Now, the gentleman just suggested that he had full faith and confidence in the President, and I will say to him that I believe he does not have any more faith than I have in the President, generally speaking, but I believe he is just a little bit in error, because the committee itself put a provision in the bill indicating that they wanted some safeguards on what the President could do. I believe one Member speaking yesterday called attention to this fact, and in the bill itself the committee put in this provision:

Provided, however, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee itself wanted a safeguard in there, and to say they have full faith and confidence, that the President may have just any free hand to do what he wants to do, I believe, is begging the question just a little bit.

Now, I can see nothing wrong in that because I am telling you that in the action we propose to take today—and I oppose this bill in its essence—we are scaring the people of the world to death,

and you can say all you want to. We are scaring the people about this matter.

Somebody said communism is on the march in Europe. I say that communism is on the retreat in Europe, and it is; and as the world begins to recover, it will retreat more. What about Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, and Switzerland? You hear nothing about communism in those countries. Why? Because the leaders there are evidently giving their people good government, and communism grows and spreads where there is squalor, where there is degradation, where there is confusion; and wherever you find democracy and good government, communism cannot grow.

Gentlemen, when we give good government to our people communism will not grow here. You cannot destroy a false political philosophy or a false religion by bullets. It is impossible. It is like a ghost. You cannot shoot a ghost, because it has no tangibility. There is nothing corporeal about it. You cannot hit a ghost, you cannot see it. It is intangible, and you cannot kill the things that are in the minds of people by bullets and force. We can and we will stop Russia or any nation, or any group of nations, that might come against us by force. We will do it. But we cannot stop communism by force. We will merely spread it by such use. The way to defeat an erroneous philosophy is to give those who accept it a true one—a better one to take its place.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated that communism is on the decline in Russia and other countries that he named.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg your pardon. I did not say in Russia. I said in Europe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, where in Europe?

Mr. MORRIS. All right, where in Europe? Did you not know and does not every sensible person know that——

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said where?

Mr MORRIS. Just a moment. The gentleman asked me. Let me answer it. Did you not know, and does not every sensible person know, that when we helped Russia defeat Germany that we were of necessity giving some impetus to communism? Every sensible person knows what happened. And just as soon as we did that, and Germany was defeated, communism took a big impetus temporarily. I say to you there is less communism in Europe than there was immediately following the war, and everybody knows it that has any judgment about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much impressed by the gentleman's philosophy that bullets have no effectiveness in stopping ideas. I just wondered what a glorious thing it would be if the gentleman would deliver that speech on the floor of the Legislature in Oklahoma City, in view of what happened on yesterday.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but that is a little bit too direct an action for us to take at this time, I believe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I interpreted the gentleman's answer to my question a moment ago, he would say, then, that it was a calamity that we defeated Germany?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I did not say that, but those who are on the other side have been implying that all the time. That is just what they have been implying. Those who are supporting this bill have been leaving that implication all the time. They seem to be suggesting that we created a worse Frankenstein than we had before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. After the gentleman makes that speech down in Oklahoma City, will he go up into South Dakota and make it there?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, if the occasion arises I will make it there, too.

Let me leave this final thought: For something like a hundred years, as I recall it, the best brains and the best minds and the best hearts and the best people in Europe said that Christianity and Mohammedanism could not live in the same world. They had about five or six wars, and they, those of the Christian faith, made crusades to the Holy Land to rescue the Holy Land from the so-called infidels, the Mohammedans, and they fought and killed each other, and each side became just as barbaric as the other, as people generally do in war, but they finally decided that they could both live in the same world, and so can we if we will just keep our feet on the ground and not lose our heads.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said a while ago that this bill is no gesture. The bill states in its title that it is to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey and continues, in subsection 1, "By rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise." Every Member of Congress knows that this is not a loan nor credit, but it is a gift of $400,000,000. We were told to go to the aid—I say aid—of Greece and Turkey, but from listening to the debate every Member here and all the people of this country ought to realize this is for no other purpose than to build up an army in Greece and Turkey and to give them everything that is possible in the way of aid and assistance in fighting anyone who wants to take the Dardanelles. It is a war measure. That is the meat in the coconut. It is also for the purpose of protecting the oil interests in the East. These are the only two things for which this bill is intended, and the American public should know it by this time.

A WAR BILL

If you want to go to war again pass this legislation. I do not want to go to war, and I do not want America to go to war. I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I say to you it is a war bill in a camouflaged style.

It was only last week that we on the Committee on Rules discovered it after the Committee on Foreign Affairs came in and gave us that information.

What does this bill do? It provides for this $400,000,000 which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations to see whether we have $400,000,000 for this purpose—for armament; build up our own armed forces. Furthermore, this bill should have been reported to the Committee on Armed Forces of the Congress rather than to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It never should have come here from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They administer tariffs, armed forces, and agriculture.

Let us analyze this a little. We have been here for the last few weeks with the Committee on Appropriations trying to cut down the expenses of Government. We cut out from the Department of Interior appropriations some $150,000,000 that they wanted to use for reclamation and for the parks of this country and for fish hatcheries and other things that the American people want. But, no, we would not give them that. Here we are today, however, asking for $400,000,000 to be given to the President of the United States to go over to Turkey and Greece and build up a great army for Greece and Turkey to fight some other foreign country. Oh, call it an indirect war bill and you name it correctly.

Gentlemen, as sure as you are knee high to a grasshopper, let me tell you that I believe that army we are building up over there is just as liable to be used against us as it is to be used against Russia. I am afraid of it, and I do not want any part of it. If you are after Russia, say so, and stop fooling the American people. You are not fooling Russia.

You may think you are going over there now and start in on a policy that this country never thought or dreamed of a few years ago, to build up armies in those two countries, but how soon are we going to be asked to build them up in every other country in the world. Why, it is the most ridiculous and preposterous idea that I have ever heard proposed. Thank God it is not a party measure, because if my party—the Republican Party—were proposing a thing like this I would think they were screwy. This can be named the Truman bill.

This country is now in debt to the extent of $257,720,000,000 as of May 5. That is the greatest debt that any country on the face of the earth ever dreamed that they would owe. Four hundred million dollars may mean $40,000,000,000 before you get through with it. Forty

billion dollars, added to the $257,000,000,000, is enough to wreck this country financially. If you carry this country of ours down financially you will wreck it. A nation that is not financially strong is weak.

I am telling you Members that there is nobody in this Chamber who knows what $400,000,000 is. You have been so used to squandering the money of the taxpayers of this country that you are just simply cockeyed. You do not know what $400,000,000 is in volume. I want to tell you that you ought to get down to a little bit of arithmetic. Ten cents make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us get back to the old fundamental principles that we were taught when we went to school and which we understand. Let us get a little common sense. Let us return this bill back to the committee and do something different than what we are trying to do here. You are taking America into a third world war. You know it; so do I. Let the American people in on it, and see what they think about it. America wants no more war in Europe. We had enough of that. No. 1 under Wilson, No. 2 under Roosevelt, No. 3 now under Truman. It is time to stop it. Do it now. Vote this bill down.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I hope we will be able to consider it on its merits and on the basis of how it affects the legislation we are considering. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, it might be difficult to vote against an amendment which indicates that it is to protect the atomic secrets, but is that what this amendment proposes to do?

As you know, the Atomic Energy Control Act was handled by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. We spent many weeks on it. It is a very complicated measure and one that received very careful consideration. Under the existing law, all matters relating to fissionable material and atomic energy are placed in the custody of the Atomic Energy Commission. That Commission is prohibited by existing law from disclosing to a foreign nation the secrets with reference to atomic energy until such time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that all of the secrets, and our interest in them, are fully protected.

The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] argues that that does not control the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. Perhaps that is true, but it is equally true that we cannot in this bill control the powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. His powers as Commander in Chief come to him under the Constitution. We cannot in this legislation restrict or abridge the powers which the President has.

I think the danger in this lies in the fact that, under the well-known and generally understood rule of statutory construction—the expression that one excludes all others—if we now adopt an amendment to this bill which would provide that fissionable material and atomic-energy information shall not be delivered to Greece and Turkey, the logical statutory construction is it may be delivered to every other nation in the world. So, in order to avoid a very highly probable construction that the adoption of this amendment would exclude Greece and Turkey from receiving atomic information and permit every other nation in the world to receive that information, I think it is highly important that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to practically all phases of this debate, I think this bill could very appropriately be called a bill to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to crawl on the anti-Communist bandwagon. This bill, stripped of all of its artificiality, is nothing more nor less than subterfuge of the lowest rank. It makes my stomach turn to have Members of Congress rise in the well of the House and speak of this bill as a protector of human rights and liberties. The same individuals who are such loud proponents of this bill are the same individuals who accepted the crimes of Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran with silence. The matter of freedom and liberty did not concern them then. So let us reason this thing out, concretely and specifically. Let me ask you this simple, profound question: If Greece, which is now involved in nothing more than a family quarrel, civil war—if Greece were located in South America, would we be here today voting an aid bill for Greece? Of course we would not. Their freedom and liberty then would not be of concern to the Members of this Congress.

Let us take the case of Turkey. Suppose Turkey were located in Africa instead of where it is, do you suppose for 1 minute we would be here passing an authorization bill to help the people of Turkey? Of course not. How in the name of common sense, then, can anyone talk about freedom and liberty and talk about Turkey in the same breath? Has anyone here ever heard of the philosophy of government that is exemplified by the Turks ever being on the side of the United States of America in the entire history of the existence of their country or our country?

I remember when I was a little boy, in 1915, how I left the farm on behalf of my father and we went from one farm to another and I was collecting dimes and pennies and nickels and dollars for the relief of the starving Armenians. That was in 1915 when the Turks massacred and slaughtered in cold blood, 2,000,000 Armenian people. Their only solution of the Armenian problem was to slaughter the Armenians. Never have they been a democracy. Never have they fought on the side of democracy. And here you are going to pass a bill to aid the Turks in order to defend freedom and liberty. Stripped of all of its artificiality, as I said in the beginning, many Members of Congress and many leaders in the United States of America and our State Department are on the hot seat. They went over to Yalta and Potsdam and Teheran and they appeased. They handed over Finland and Lithuania and Latvia and Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania to the Communists. Do I hear the hearts of any of those men who are interested in freedom and liberty for the Turks and the Greeks, do I hear their hearts bleed over the enslavement of those people that our country delivered to the hands of the Communists?

Do I see hearts bleeding about freedom and liberty for those countries? Not once do I see it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that communism is playing out in those countries?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, yes. I will read you the last axiom from the Communist manifesto. You are not going to stop communism or ban communism through any such stupid bill as this. You have got to do something else to stop it. Listen to this. This is an axiom from the Communist manifesto:

> Communism will be vigorous and united only as long as it is feeding on the properties of others. When the Communist comes to the place where it can no longer feed on the "host," it must feed on itself and die.

If it had not been for the United States of America dishing out $2,000,000,000 since the war ended to finance communism in Europe, you would not have the threat of communism in Greece and Turkey today; you would not have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there is no one who has been more disappointed, and I might say disgusted, with Russia's disinclination until a few days ago to indulge in discussion of a final settlement of lend-lease matters than I have; in fact, I have been considerably disgusted with Russia's conduct since the end of the war generally, as most of you have. There has, however, been a misapprehension about that lend-lease matter. I intended to try to clear it up yesterday, but when I came here and saw the long list of requests for time that the ranking minority member had, including requests from opponents as well as proponents of the bill, I did not even mention it to him.

It will be recalled, particularly by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that in the original lend-lease agreements there was nothing said about time or amount of payment. That was all left to a general settlement after the war. The time came, however, when we could foresee the end of the war and realized that when it came there would doubtless be in the lend-lease pipe line many heavy-industry articles which, though valuable indeed for war purposes if they reached the recipient countries during the war, would be equally valuable to their economy after the war. Under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act, therefore, the United States entered into

agreements with all lend-lease recipient countries, including Russia, to the effect that as to whatever was in the pipe line when the end of the war came the recipient country could either cancel her orders therefor or tell us to conclude the manufacture of the material and agree to pay for it, generally over a 30-year period and in the case of Russia at 2⅜ percent interest. In other words, it was very much to the advantage of the United States to enter into those agreements.

When the end of the war came in the case of Russia there was in the pipe lines considerably more than $250,000,000 worth of goods. Russia canceled the orders for much of it and told us as to the $250,000,000: "We would like for you to continue the manufacture of those goods and we will pay you in 30 years for them 100 percent with 2⅜ percent interest." We agreed to that. Two hundred and thirty-three million dollars of this $250,000,000 had been shipped to Russia before discontinuance of shipments at the end of December, leaving $17,000,000 only. Now as to that $17,000,000, some on the floor have labored under the misapprehension that it is entirely oil refining machinery. Some of it is oil refining machinery; some of it is railroad equipment for Russia's wide-gage railroads. It was all built to Russia's specifications and would not be worth anything to us except for junk. Now, as to the oil refining machinery there are a number of parts for oil plants in this $17,000,000. The big bulk of the plants have already been shipped. If you ask why there are parts remaining, I call attention not only to the difficulties of transportation recently but I also call attention to the cars you see running around Washington with wooden bumpers and I ask, What good to us would those wooden bumpers be? What good to us would be parts of oil gages or of oil refining plants which we could do nothing with but junk if we did not send them to Russia? Not only is it a solemn contract that we entered into but it is a solemn contract for the best interests of this country which has been fulfilled 93.2 percent. I do not believe my colleagues, with that knowledge of the situation, will entertain any objection to our country carrying out its agreement with Russia, whether we like its form of government, whether we wish that form of government to spread out over the United States or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending Douglas amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, let me indulge upon the committee in a bit of ancient history. Many centuries ago Greece was the cradle of democracy. I believe that over the whole period of the history of humanity Greece has emerged as the only genuine democracy known to the world.

You will recall when any great questions were being decided by the ancient Greek legislature the populace would gather ostracons on the beaches before Athens and cast them on the various issues. The pile of ostracons which was the largest decided the question. The lawmakers were then directed by the people to vote as they had expressed themselves and as the people wanted them to.

That was purer democracy than we have today, for no representative in this House can be so certain of the feelings of his constituents as were the Greeks of old. The land which gave us our concept of government ought to receive our help when her own freedom is threatened.

Greece today—and I think I speak with all accuracy—is in jeopardy. The cradle of democracy is being overturned by forces in the Old World with which Americanism is at odds. I say the time has come when the American Nation must take a stand in the interest of downtrodden peoples like the Greeks.

A century and a half have passed since those Barbary pirates swept the Mediterranean clear of American seamen. You will also remember the inspiring tales recorded that our leaders of that time raised up and cried, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Today, Mr. Chairman, I say that the issue is again presenting itself. When a decade ago the hosts of Adolf Hitler swarmed over Europe and crushed innocent and helpless peoples under their heels, the American National rallied, and we joined forces against the Nazi oppressors and wiped them off the face of the earth. Now, it is obvious that there are other "isms" and other oppressors raising their gargantuan heads, their ugly visages, and threatening the peace of the world and the future of our generation. The time has come again for us to take a definite stand. It is our duty to protect the underprivileged and the unfortunate members of the human race. They, too, no matter how small, no matter how humble, must be able to assert themselves in the great family of nations so that freedom, liberty, and equality will be perpetuated throughout the entire world.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that we should take a definite stand. I want to ask this: In the gentleman's opinion, if Greece comes under the control of Moscow, will that not make Russia a Mediterranean power and imperil the security of the United States?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I can answer that in this way: That America has never retreated. We have never surrendered our position in international affairs, and I do not think that now is the time to begin. I think that the only recourse we have is to see that the seven seas and the lands all over the globe are made as free as possible. It is our bounden duty and our responsibility to see that the freedom the Constitution of the United States personifies and guarantees should be preserved, not only here but wherever the forces of oppression have raised their heads.

I say that the question is here before us. We have debated at great length on this question and it is time we come to a decision on it. I hope that we decide wisely and that we will be able to chart a course of action which will preserve representative government and freedom throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, in common with a lot of other Members of this House I spent about 4 years in the Army. One of the discouraging things is that many of these young fellows have risen here in the last 2 days and spoken about their disillusionment that now that we have won the war we are facing another series of disillusionments. But that is one of those things that cannot be helped. When you get rid of one tyrant, one dictator, if another one raises his head that issue has to be met head-on.

In common with a lot of these same fellows who have spoken here who have served overseas, I was overseas, in Belgium, France, England, Luxemburg, and Germany, for 2 years. The only difference between my situation and theirs, I expect, is that due to the type of work in which I was engaged I had a chance to go into an average of 15 or 20 French, Belgian, and Luxemburg homes each day. Some days I would go into the home of a baron or a count, and the next day I would be in the home of a peasant who was wearing wooden shoes. Having the curiosity I have, I studied and tried to find out everything I could about the very thing we are debating here today. After having watched the way the Communists work in France, Belgium, and the other countries over there, I say to you that we all know the same pattern and techniques of infiltration will be followed and is being followed in Greece and in Turkey, and it is being followed in this country. To those who are not afraid of the threat of communism which is facing this country I say this: It has been mentioned here that the countries that do not want communism are not having it. They mention Belgium, Denmark, and other countries. Those countries are not in the same position that the war-devastated countries are such as Greece, Italy, and part of France, because when the Germans retreated, as any soldier will tell you, although Belgium, Denmark, and those

places suffered through the occupation, the Germans did not take their livestock away, they did not tear up the railroads, they did not leave the forces there that make for communism such as we have in Greece, Italy, and other Balkan countries.

Some Members have raised the question here of the cost of this policy. When this subject was recently mentioned by one Member of this House another Member said, "Thank God no bombs fell on this country." One gentleman over here, thinking he was making a wise remark, stated "that a bombshell fell on the Treasury of the United States to the tune of $400,000,000." When you start talking like that, do not think for one minute that a bombshell did not fall in the hearts of thousands of mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts in this country when they got those terse messages from the War Department which said that their sons or their husbands were killed in action. We cannot think in terms of dollars in this matter.

I am going to support this bill, I do not care whether it costs $400,000,000 or $4,000,000,000, as long as it will stop the mad rush of communism that is sweeping over Europe, the Middle East, and is making inroads in this country. We should spend any amount of dollars that is needed to stop this insidious thing. I think this business of dollars and cents is one of the most false arguments that can be propounded here on the floor, because if you have more incidents in this country such as went on out here at Western High School, in Washington, D. C., the day before yesterday—and God knows how many have gone on in this country that we do not know about because other students have not been sufficiently trained to see what is happening under their very noses—we are not going to have a United States Treasury here some day, when this force of communism reaches Greece and Turkey and marches on into the Middle East and reaches Iraq and Iran and the oil fields over there. Some of the people speaking for this bill seem to be afraid to talk about oil. When the Russians get into Iran and Iraq, when they get the oil fields there, they are going to be in a position to wage war for a hundred years. It will not be like Hitler's Germany, when we landed on D-day and when Patton executed the break-through in France, when the reason we were able to go through there was that Hitler ran out of high-octane gasoline. If Communist Russia gets those oil fields, it will have all the oil it needs to wage war, and it will get them if it can go into Greece and Turkey; and it will be able to go in there in 24 hours if we do not give those countries some form of relief.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that not only is the Near East in danger but if the Communists take over Greece, Italy is gone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are millions of Americans of Italian blood who are hoping that Italy will be saved. If the Communists go into those countries, the chances of Poland's being reclaimed will be gone for many generations. It is amazing how some people overlook the responsibility they owe to the land of birth of their forebears.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we Americans seem to have the greatest national faculty of embarking upon a program and then placing upon our own hands manacles and handcuffs which render it impossible to carry the program through effectively. As I said here yesterday, there will be a number of restricting amendments offered on the floor, amendments which have not the intent or the purpose of rendering it possible to carry this program through to a successful conclusion, but amendments which have instead the purpose of destroying the successful application of this proposed legislation. In proposing the support of this legislation I do not do so with a bleeding heart, as was indicated broadly by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] in commenting on this bill. My heart does not bleed for the people of Greece or the people of Turkey, but my heart is very much concerned over the Red tide of aggression which is sweeping over the earth. I am deeply concerned about whether or not $400,000,000 will do this job. But until we stop counting the cost of this program in terms of dollars and start counting the cost in human lives and freedom if we do not carry through, we shall continue our policy of shrinking back from the stark realities of life today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do you know of any standard by which you can measure a man's life or his leg or his arm in terms of money?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Those are abstract things, and I agree perfectly that you cannot measure those things in terms of dollars and cents. There are higher values in life—values that cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Among those things are freedom and basic rights.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman did not mean to say that the intent of the bill was to deliver the atomic bomb to Greece or Turkey, did he?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I did not make that statement, or even infer it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No; I thought you were speaking on the amendment, and I was led to believe that that is what you are implying.

Mr. JACKSON of California. No, indeed; that is not my intention.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not this bill provide that we shall do whatever is necessary with no limitations?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I believe that is the intent of the bill and if that is not the intent of the bill, then we are stultifying ourselves so that we cannot hope to achieve our purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. In conclusion, I can only offer the suggestion that almost every amendment that will be here offered has been considered in its entirety by the members of the committee. Very little new will be offered on the floor of this House today in the way of amendments. We have heard most of the arguments pro and con. We have heard scores of witnesses and taken hundreds of thousands of words of testimony.

Again, I suggest to the committee that if you want this program to succeed—if you want to try to make an effort here and now to stop this type of international aggression, then you support this legislation without major amendment. If you want to see it fail, if you want to see us going into this project without any chance of winning through, then you will support many stultifying amendments that will be offered from the floor.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman made the statement that all amendments that will be offered have been considered in the committee. I have an amendment which I propose to offer which was not considered by the committee.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I beg your pardon if I am in error on that point. I should say, almost all of the amendments have been considered in the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman assume that he has thought of all of the possibilities and that he has all of the wisdom and all of the light that might come upon a question of this great importance?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I can assure the gentleman that was not my intention. However, I think if all the alleged wisdom on both sides of the issue was not heard by the committee it was because the other experts did not show up to be heard, because we have had more authorities on both sides of this question than I even imagined existed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on this matter of amendments I want to suggest that I do not think the bill before us is any sacred cow nor do I think that it is the arc of the covenant and that anyone who touches it will fall over dead. I do not think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has all of the wisdom of this House. Let us be frank about it. Our committee has heard in executive session our two ambassadors and certain military officers and representatives of the Army and Navy. I think we do have knowledge superior to many of the Members on the floor on many phases of this

matter. On the other hand, it seems to me that we have to consider amendments on their merits, to write the best piece of legislation we can. For instance, I disagree with some of my colleagues on the pending amendment. I think the pending amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is an amendment that cannot hurt the bill, because if there is any conceivable possibility that the President of the United States would give our atomic information to Greece or Turkey, that possibility should be barred.

Remember, this bill starts out by saying, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law"; so that the power given in this bill amends former legislation. On the other hand, if this amendment is defeated, I cannot conceive of the President furnishing any atomic information or atomic energy information to the Greeks or to the Turks. I think the gentlewoman from California is going to propose shortly two amendments which I consider very, very bad. I am therefore going to oppose them when the time comes. It seems to me we have to keep our eye on what we want to do here and consider these amendments on their merits and not vote them up or down because of any preconceptions or prejudices. I urge that you give such attention as we deserve to the members of the committee who heard the testimony. Some of my colleagues differ with me on this particular amendment, but the important thing is to bear in mind the very important amendments which will be offered, which are destructive of the program, and which will be offered later. I hope that neither the proponents nor the opponents will waste their energy on amendments that are not too important one way or the other.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman has made a very fair statement regarding his position and that of the committee. From my point of view, the committee did an excellent job. I think when the Vandenberg amendment was added, about all the repair work that could be done was done. But does not the gentleman from Ohio think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] advanced a valid argument? That is, the implication that under the amendment of the gentlewoman from California the information could be made available to others and not to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. VORYS. That is an argument that should be weighed. I simply want to say that on this amendment I cannot conceive of the President failing to carry out exactly what is contained in this amendment. Therefore, whether it is in the bill or not seems to me not of any great importance. On the other hand, I recognize the great wisdom of some of those who have spoken on this matter. My only plea was that we consider these amendments on their merits. I beg of the committee to give to us on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who have had greater opportunity to learn some information which cannot be of record, such consideration as we deserve. At the same time I do not want to have the question of whether this bill goes through untouched by amendments, be the question that determines whether or not we have a sound foreign policy. That is all I had in mind.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that the gentleman is of the opinion that the committee has produced a very fine bill and that the committee seemingly has a greater grasp or knowledge of this entire subject matter than most of the membership of the House, and in view of the fact that the gentleman has spoken any number of times, I wonder if the committee would not permit us, who have not had such an opportunity, to take a few minutes to express ourselves as the debate goes on.

Mr. VORYS. This is the second time I have opened my mouth in this debate, but I agree with the gentleman that all should have an opportunity to express themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how any Member can support this amendment, whether he is for this bill or against it. This measure is going to pass. If it is going to pass, then we certainly ought not to begin to appease Russia in advance.

I am the only man in either House of Congress who has stated openly that he was in favor of breaking relations with Communist Russia. Do not kid yourselves, they are already making war upon us.

I think this amendment would tie the hands of the President of the United States and give comfort, if not aid, to Russia in case of a conflict for which they are preparing.

I have been fighting this battle against communism for many years. I have taken more punishment, more abuse, than any man in either House of Congress.

This is the first time a President of the United States has come out on our side, and I am not willing to tie the hands of Harry Truman, because I know that if we get into war, if it is necessary to use the atomic bomb we will use it. Let me disillusion the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. If he thinks communism is on the wane in either Europe or in this country he ought to attend the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He ought to have heard the testimony of Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, the other day. He ought to have heard the testimony of Mr. Bullitt. We asked Mr. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia, what would happen in the event Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it. He said that it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], that I read into the RECORD the statement of the leader of the Communist Party who is going to speak in Washington tonight. You speak about its being on the way here, it is marching right up to your very door. I read into the RECORD where he said time and time again that they were for a world revolution overthrowing all governments and making communism the dominant power of the world, he said, they were just as sure to take you over as the world stands.

And, he said: "When that day comes it will not be a Government of the United States but it will be a Soviet government and behind that government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Do not deceive yourselves. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that they are working all over this country, and it was no accident that this tool of Russia went to Western High School here in Washington day before yesterday and for 55 minutes poured into the ears of those children anti-American doctrines and arguments that were so shocking that the students got up and walked out.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] what I said before: I have never agreed to and have never been satisfied with seeing Poland, the home of Kosciusko, turned over to the ruthless bunch of lawless brutes who are now destroying the Christian people of Poland.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that there is nothing for us to worry about so far as communism is concerned in this country?

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to get to that point. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Of course it is here, threatening the security of this country. I am going to call on the President of the United States to join us in driving communism from American soil. The President is my friend. He is a man I can talk to. He is the most human individual I have ever seen in the Presidency of the United States. But let me tell you this, he is a Christian gentleman, a deep-water Baptist, if you want to know the truth, the only Baptist that has ever been President of the United States. Oh, no. I know that you are going to say that Harding was a Baptist. I understand he was a Baptist only by marriage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me impress upon you that if the Communists take over this country there will be no Baptists in Missouri, there will be no Methodists in Mississippi, or Presbyterians in Iowa, there will be no Catholics in Louisiana or New York, there will be no Episcopalians in Virginia, because when the Communists take over all Christian churches will be closed. It is

written in every Russian booklet today that "religion is the opiate of the people." Communism is out to destroy Christianity and everything that is built on Christian principles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I remind the gentleman of the fact that 2 weeks ago the President said we need not worry about that; it is a bugaboo here, that is all.

Mr. RANKIN. I have some doubt whether the President made that statement. May I say that the President of the United States realizes the danger that civilization is in today, and this amendment will not help him to meet that danger.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman referred to remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] about what had happened in Poland. Is it not a fact that what happened in Poland and what is happening in the rest of eastern Europe points out the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what the Communists want to do in the United States, and they say so in every Communist convention where they know we have no one listening in.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman think that the Government of the United States of America can afford to finance those who are fighting communism, and at the same time finance those who are in favor of communism?

Mr. RANKIN. No; and I voted against aid to the ones who are fighting on the side of communism.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman know that our Treasury Department today is buying every ounce of gold that the Russian Government produces?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. O'KONSKI. And we are paying them $36 an ounce for it.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Christian people of Poland are looking to the Christian people of the rest of the world for protection, and they will get it through this bill a great deal quicker than they would by our placating or appeasing Communist Russia. Communism and Christianity cannot live in the same atmosphere; communism and human liberty cannot continue to exist on the same soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for 5 years I have been in Congress listening to security problems presented before the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on the Armed Services. While I cannot add anything to what has been said on this particular problem, I think I approach it from a different viewpoint and with a different attitude than many of the speakers who have talked here today, yesterday, and the day before.

In my opinion, this is a problem in international and national security. To understand what the security situation of the world is today, I suggest that every one of you take a look at a globe and you will find that from 30 degrees north latitude, up over the Pole, is the area of the world in which we have so-called civilization. That is also the area in which all the trouble spots of the world are contained. That is the area in which all the wars of the last three or four centuries have been germinated. Due to rapid air transit we can get from one part of the world north of 30 degrees north latitude to any other in the same area in one trip. The rapid airplanes of today can go from any major point in the particular part of the world in which trouble may start to another point in the same area, and with modern weapons can destroy any city or other congested area therein.

We have a situation that in the event there is a major difference between us and a great power there is the possibility of us being attacked on any day and any hour. You know that the destructive capacity of weapons has stepped up so tremendously that we can truthfully say today that an army or an armed force has the possibility of destroying every nation in the world; in fact, modern wars come without warning, and they come to every household in the country. There is no longer any front any more. The whole nation is the battleground. Therefore, in contemplating these problems and listening to experts on all kinds, it is my considered conviction that there is only one true security system which fits the world of today. That security system is one that is based on law, one that is based on order, one that is based on a vehicle whereby the controversies of great nations can be settled in some orderly, peaceful way. In my opinion this problem before us today brings in focus the matter of trying to foster and develop the idea of peaceful settlement of controversies. If we do not find some way to handle the matter by peace, by some method of adjudication, the world, in my opinion, is doomed to destruction.

Why do I say that what we have before us today focuses that particular question? This is the reason for it: During the war, and in fact for many years before the war, but especially during the war, our leaders contemplated that when this war ended they would find some way to bind the world together, to settle their problems in some lawful, Christian way other than by mass murder, which we call war. The result was that the Allied leaders made certain agreements, and one of those agreements that we have before us today, was that a country which had been devastated, like Greece and others, should have the right to hold a free election and select the kind of government it wants. That meant they were to have the kind of a government they wanted, irrespective of its kind.

Now, what do we have? Greece exercised that right. The record in this case shows that 85 percent of the people selected the government they now have. We may not like that type, but that was their selection. Now we find that one of the great powers, that agreed to that proposition, is by infiltration, by encouraging brigands and bands, is robbing that particular country of her right to select and have the government that she wants and which she by a free election selected. I say now is the time to find out by a firm, aggressive, frank attitude and statement whether Russia intends to comply with her agreement, and to allow Greece to have the government of her choice, or is she trying to destroy that right by creating turmoil and revolution in Greece?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Now is the time, right here and today, to find out whether Russia intends to abide by this preliminary agreement so we will know whether she will abide by the agreements we may make hereafter. She is talking about limiting armaments, doing away with the atomic bomb, and various things of that kind, indicating that she also wants a peaceful world, and if we can find out now by the action proposed in this bill, which we can, whether she will respect agreements, we will know how to talk to her and deal with her in the future.

I tell you that if Russia and America cannot get together in a solemn agreement to stop this mass murder that we call war, we are living in a very dismal world and a very gloomy outlook for our children.

I have traveled around the world. I have talked to doughboys and sailors in all parts of the world, and the one thing they told me above all others was this: "Mr. JOHNSON, you and your friends must find a way to avoid future wars, to keep faith with the eleven or twelve million men who fought this war and with our comrades that died and were wounded." We have to find some way to establish a world of peace through agreement, through peaceful methods. If we take a firm stand today, we will find a way to make an accord with Russia, as well as stop her onrush down through the Mediterranean and over the rest of the world. This is the test. Are we going to take a chance? Are we willing to sacrifice? Are we willing to pledge our honor and our money and our men that we will take a stand for liberty and for adherence to solemn agreements solemnly made, to the end that in the future our children and grandchildren may have and will have a peaceful world?

The passage of this bill will do that. It will let the world know that we are

demanding that those with whom we agreed stand by their commitments, the same as we are doing. It will give hope to the nations involved that we will protect their right to a free choice of the government under which they are to live and protect their right to sovereign integrity after they have made their choice.

It will let the world know that we hold sacred commitments to protect small countries. It will notify our Allies that every country is entitled to its autonomy and that its right to a free and independent life shall not be nullified. In other words, we want agreements to be kept and observed, be they preliminary ones or final agreements. The basis of law is that contracts are sacred. If we can establish that now, then we may move forward to the hope of a world of peace. Drifting, temporizing, evading responsibility and leadership, and doing the expedient rather than the right thing, will bring us turmoil and even disaster. If we take our stand firmly now, it will result in a show-down, and my prediction is that it will lead ultimately to accord with Russia and to peace that will be lasting.

That is why I hope this bill gets an overwhelming vote of approval.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment now pending. I think it would be a serious mistake to adopt that amendment at the present time in view of the consideration we have given the matter. As we all know, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 585, which is the law that controls the use and the handling of atomic energy and of fissionable materials, together with information of a confidential nature regarding them. That law before enactment was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs, it was considered by a special committee of the United States Senate over a long period of time, it was considered by both the House and the Senate over a long period of time, and then it went to a committee of conference. We worked long and carefully in framing the bill, especially in framing the penal clauses of the bill. I think to amend by indirection that statute—and that is what this amendment would do—is a serious mistake.

I fully agree with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he refers to the fact that on page 13 of that statute under the heading of "Control of information" there is a prohibition which we placed in the law against any information covering atomic energy being delivered to a foreign power without first obtaining the passage of a concurrent resolution from Congress. I think that alone makes this amendment repetitious and unnecessary.

But I go further, Mr. Chairman, and say this: On that same page of that act we find 14 or 15 prohibitions against the use of atomic energy and against the dissemination of information covering fissionable materials. We find that these prohibitions are couched in most careful and exact language. This Congress attempted to make the unlawful disclosure of atomic information to foreign powers one of the most serious crimes known to the penal statute books of America. It is a crime which may be punished by death and, in the event lesser punishment is desired, he may be punished by long years of imprisonment as much as life imprisonment, and the imposition of thousands of dollars in fines.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it not a fact that the same act on page 9, section 5, subsection 7 (d) makes provision that the Commission shall not distribute any fissionable material to any foreign government?

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. Those provisions of the law as we passed them in the last session of Congress make this amendment useless and repetitious. As I said, I think when we are dealing with the lives of people and with crimes which may be punished by death, we ought to be very careful before enacting amendments to any such a law by indirection.

I am not worried about what the President of the United States may do in this case. I am not worried about what this commission controlling atomic energy may do. I am certainly not worried about what we may do to the Communists in Russia to stop this propaganda that has been spread all over the world for the last 20 years. They say that the best way to kill a snake is by stomping it on the head. I believe that is right. That is the reason why I rise at this time against this amendment, and I hope the Committee will not adopt it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened here with a great deal of interest during the last 7 days. I am greatly confused as to what this proposal is all about. What I would like to have made clear to me is: What is our foreign policy? What is the policy of our State Department? As I said the other day, is it to remove this communistic threat or is it to protect the oil fields of Iraq, Iran, and Arabia, or is it to protect the Dardanelles, or is to protect Greece? Just what are we trying to do in venturing into Greece and Turkey.

We hear talk constantly about the threat of communism. Yet the other day in the Senate debate Senator BYRD said:

> Out of the $16,000,000,000 the sum of $1,525,000,000 has been or will be given to Russia and her satellites. Again, I ask, can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right? Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows: Russia, $203,000,000; Poland, $463,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $202,000,000; Finland, $92,000,000; Hungary, $18,000,000; Yugoslavia, $296,000,000.

Certainly, no one will question whether Yugoslavia is a satellite of Russia.

> More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

I cannot understand this talk about $400,000,000 to remove the threat of communism in Greece, and yet we are pitching hundreds of millions of dollars into Russia through her satellite nations.

Senator BYRD continues:

> In view of the fact that our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly $16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than can be expected today within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations.

And in answer to a question by a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs about oil, he says this:

> Right today, the State Department is urging Congress to approve $17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, and yet at the same time the State Department requests Congress to approve $400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey.

Now, what is this all about anyway? I cannot understand. We dish out hundreds of millions to Russia on the one hand to assist them and hundreds of millions on the other hand to stop them. Somebody ought to clear the air as to what is our foreign policy. Where are we headed for? American people have a right to know. Is this our first step in imperialism? Is this an attempt to put a turban on Uncle Sam? As I said the other day:

> It appears to be a step in the direction of imperialism. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of policy that this Nation has always avoided, and Uncle Sam has never yet tried to gain sovereignty over any other nation, and I do not want to see him attempt it now.

From all the talk you would think it appears to be a very critical situation, and yet the bill is for the purpose of aid to Greece. I would like to know just what it is all about, and if some member of the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee can tell me what our foreign policy is to be, I certainly will be pleased to hear from him.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, many long years ago Aeschylus, the tragic poet of Greece, said: "He hears but half who hears one party only." During the course of this debate, we have certainly heard more than one party. Many members of both parties have spoken. In this debate we have heard both sides of the important proposition fully and ably discussed. This has been one of the best debates I have ever had the privilege of hearing during my membership in this House. We have had the privilege of hearing many excellent speeches. As I have listened to the debate, I have been very much impressed by the sincerity of each of the speakers. I accord sincerity to all who have spoken. During the course of the debate, however, I have been reminded of one brief sentence uttered by Paul as he stood on Mars' Hill, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive

that in all things ye are too superstitious." The distinguished gentleman who has just addressed us appears to be somewhat superstitious and rather suspicious. He still wonders about the foreign policy of our Nation. I believe that for once in the life of this Nation our foreign policy is easily understood and that above all it is now forthright and fearless. I believe that our foreign policy is clearly understood even by the man on the street. I am somewhat surprised to hear Members of Congress stand in this Chamber and express wonder and ask many questions concerning the foreign policy of our Republic. I believe that the foreign policy of our Nation is now generally known by our people.

Today is the second anniversary of victory in Europe. The great conflict which ended 2 years ago today was cruel and costly. In the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea, gallant men won great victories; yet today the documents of peace have not been written. In the First World War gallant men won great victories, but the fruits of victory were lost. Woodrow Wilson, our great and beloved statesman, came back from France with high hopes for world peace, only to die of a broken heart mid the ruined fruits of victories which were won on the fields of carnage and at great cost in blood and treasure. In the First World War men thought that civilization had learned the supreme lesson, but they were mistaken and millions died in vain. While it seems that we must always deal with great uncertainties, it at least appears reasonable to believe that had our Nation followed the admonition and advice of the great Wilson the world would not have been cursed with the cruel conflict which ended in Europe 2 years ago today. We are now wondering whether the fruits of the last great victory will be lost. We are wondering whether those who have been liberated from the yoke of oppression and from the cruel heels of tyranny shall again be immediately enslaved by a bloodless conquest which is sweeping across the earth. One needs only to look at a map to know and to understand what is happening in the world. Shall those who have been liberated be denied the blessings of free government and unfettered elections? Shall the Yalta agreement be a mere "scrap of paper" and a fraud on the people of the world? Shall we abandon the fight for freedom and break faith with those who have so recently died on the altars of freedom? The governing authorities of some nations even now respect only strength—they respect power and despise weakness. If we are to remain strong and powerful, we must at all times be fearlessly frank and eminently fair in our dealings with our own people and with the peoples of the world. I do not like unilateral trading and star-chamber sessions. I agree with Woodrow Wilson that the policy of our Nation should be at all times "open covenants openly arrived at." Can we study recent history and fail to know that we are still living in a world of secret covenants secretly arrived at? Certainly we are not here dealing with an important matter in secrecy. Our policy and our program have been openly announced and loudly proclaimed. We are not engaged in unilateral trading. We are about to make a loan to nations in distress, and nothing we are about to do is incompatible with the letter or the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. The purpose of this loan is known throughout the world, and no nation has a right to challenge us or to question our motives.

Men of great prominence and Members of this House of great influence have stated that America is embarking upon a program of imperialism. Every act in the history of our Nation belies that statement. Certainly Greece and Turkey know and understand the history and the ambitions of America. Neither the people of Greece nor of Turkey question our motives nor fear the consequences of our generosity. Both countries have asked for our help and assistance. If Greece, the very cradle of democracy, should fall, Turkey could not stand alone, and with Turkey would go Italy, and with Italy, would go Europe. If we are to deny this aid and assistance to either Greece or Turkey, we might as well strike out the enacting clause.

While there was no doubt in my mind as to this important proposition, my convictions were fortified during a recent visit to both Greece and Turkey. As you know, I was a member of the delegation of the American Congress which attended the first postwar meeting of the Interparliamentary Union which met in Cairo, Egypt, Monday, April 7. The delegation was headed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY and was composed of four Members of the Senate and six Members of this House, equally divided between the members of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. In returning from Cairo, the delegation had an opportunity to visit Ankara, the new capital of Turkey, and Istanbul, the ancient city of Constantinople; and in Greece we visited the ancient city of Athens. At each place we conferred with members of our own diplomatic corps, with ordinary citizens, with members of the press, and with high Government officials of both countries. We had conferences with the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister of Turkey, and in our conferences with both officials and with members of the press, members of our delegation propounded questions in an effort to obtain, in a short space of time, as much information as possible. We stated at every conference that we were not there for the purpose of answering questions but rather for the purpose of asking questions. I do not believe that any delegation could have obtained more information in the short time at our disposal.

Easter Monday morning I was in Greece. I stood at the Acropolis in the ancient city of Athens and looked down on Mars' Hill on the very spot where Paul stood when he spoke to the men of Athens, and I was conscious of the fact that though I was standing upon the ruins of Greece I was in the land of democracy and among people who loved freedom. In addition to talking with many Greeks, with members of the press, and with diplomats, we conferred with the Foreign Minister, with the Prime Minister, and with King Paul, and Queen Frederika. I hold no brief for any Greek who in any way collaborated with the Nazis. While I know a little something about the heritage of both King and Queen, I frankly confess that I know very little about their attitudes or action during the recent war. I do not, however, hesitate to say to this House that I believe that King Paul and Queen Frederika are both personally popular and that the Government of Greece is now generally popular. I do not hesitate to express the belief that both Turkey and Greece will fight to the last man in the defense of their territories and in the defense of the integrity of their governments. I believe that every man in our delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, believes that the people of Turkey hate and despise communism and that the Government of Greece today is even more popular than it was at the time of the death of the late King George. The new King has a pleasing and dynamic personality and is more popular than was his deceased brother. He has at his side Queen Frederika with whose great simplicity and sincerity all of us were impressed. They are both social-minded and have taken an active interest in the welfare of the underprivileged boys and girls of Greece. They appear to be anxious to pull their broken nation together and to lead it in the pathways of peace and progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that every member of our delegation was very favorably impressed with the attitude of every Greek official with whom we conferred. We were told by our own diplomats of a little incident which might give us an idea of the attitude of the present Queen of Greece. This incident was verified by the Queen herself who discussed it with us freely. She had been advised that the Communists were holding a meeting in some part of Greece. She insisted upon attending the meeting. She said that if they were Communists there must be some reason for it, for they would not be Communists unless they had grievances or causes, and she wanted to know the facts. When she insisted, she was told that it was not the proper thing for her to do, but she was determined to attend the meeting. She went to the meeting and gave them a chance to speak to her, and she in turn addressed them. She told them of her great interest in their problems and of how anxious she was to better their lives. When she had finished her speech was loudly applauded, and she was taken upon the shoulders of those there assembled as evidence of their approval of her attitude and conduct. This incident occurred just before she became Queen. Now both she and King Paul are in a position to vindicate themselves before the peo-

ple of Greece and before the people of the world. They both seem to realize that they now have a great opportunity to serve the people of their country; yet, they both also seem to appreciate the difficulties to be encountered and the weaknesses of their government when surrounded by the strength of other powerful nations. After all, we must confess that it takes a little courage for a frail woman to go from the home of royalty to a meeting of distressed and complaining citizens or subjects and to discuss with them their plight and their problems.

In the brief space of time allotted to me, I shall not attempt to discuss the many issues involved in this proposition. We know that it may be fraught with dangerous consequences. The future is uncharted. We must have faith, although we know that at this moment our ship of state is sailing on uncertain seas and may even come upon the rocks. I have great mental comfort and satisfaction in the knowledge of the fact that I am doing what I sincerely believe to be right in voting to grant this aid to the devastated and war-torn country of Greece and to the burdened and distressed people of Turkey. The people of Turkey might not fight communism merely because of their love for America, but I believe that they will fight to the last man for the integrity and freedom of their own nation, and I further believe that both the Turks and the Greeks will prove worthy of the confidence we are about to place in them by granting them this loan.

If our foreign policy is to stop communism, we had better stop it in the Black Sea, at the Bosphorus, in the Sea of Marmora, or at the Dardanelles, or at some place far distant from our own shores. Here we are dealing with a vital spot in this world. These helpless people will be easy prey to communism without the aid and assistance which we are here about to give them.

Our brave men fought for freedom, and to the institutions of freedom we are devoted. If we fought for freedom, are we not at least willing to try to keep men free?

Byron once wrote a poem which is an inspiration to those who have looked so recently upon the land of Greece:

> The mountains look on Marathon
> And Marathon looks on the sea;
> And musing there an hour alone
> I dream'd that Greece might still be free.
> For standing on the Persians' grave
> I could not deem myself a slave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 12 words.

Mr. Chairman, in this momentous debate, so far reaching in its implications, sincere and conscientious legislators on both sides of the aisle are to be found arrayed in opposition. Here is no place for bitterness, for recriminations, for name calling—least of all, for attempt at political advantage. A great responsibility faces each one of us. We must each meet it squarely and unflinchingly.

It is true that the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have held 17 meetings on this bill and listened to volumes of testimony, are deserving not only of our gratitude for a conscientious job well done, but also, it seems to me, to a rather unusual degree of our confidence in the conclusions at which they have arrived. With only 1 negative vote they have urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Their searching investigation, however, does not relieve us of our duty to study and analyze this great question.

The principal objections to this measure, at least those which have troubled me the most, are these:

First, it is said that this is a step which will lead to war. If I felt for one moment that such would be the effect of my affirmative vote, I could never support this bill. One who has actually seen the unspeakable carnage and devastation of armed conflict, hates war, and loves peace with an unmatched passion. Although great uncertainty beclouds the future, no matter what our action here may be, it is my considered judgment that our extension of this aid to these two countries in our effort to thwart the disruption of their internal economy and their seizure by minority groups inspired by outside pressures, is the most important step, at the moment, which we can take looking toward international peace and stability. It must be apparent by now that plain speaking, backed up by forthright action is the only language which some of the nations with whom we deal seem to understand. A policy of appeasement, a querulous, weak-kneed attitude, will never work. Strength is what they understand and what they respect. Therefore, it seems to me, that such a demonstration of our firm resolve to assist those independent countries which stand in the way of further expansionist aggression is the mightiest blow we can today strike for peace.

Second, it is said this procedure bypasses the United Nations. This argument is made, not alone by those with ulterior motives for whom it is purely an alibi, but by many sincere critics of the program. To the extent that these opponents say that steps should have been taken before, or simultaneosuly with the submission of this matter to the Congress, to present it to the United Nations, I am in agreement. That step was taken after we were asked to act. How much better it would have been to have done so before. Of course, it would have been futile as it is now for two reasons: One, because the United Nations has not yet the funds nor is it yet functioning to meet such a situation as is here presented, and two, any such action as that here contemplated would be blocked by the veto of a single power.

It is exceedingly important, however, that we do nothing to undermine and everything to strengthen the United Nations. Such an organization is our only hope for a permanent and enduring peace. I have on many occasions said, and I reiterate it now, that I believe wholeheartedly in the principles of this international organization and yield to no one in my fervent desire to see it work. It is my hope that the action which we take in Greece and Turkey will be limited to that which would have the approval of the United Nations if that organization were presently set up to function.

In this bill as originally drawn, I was greatly worried about this proposition. I am not at all sure that I could have supported the measure as originally recommended by the President. It seems to me, however, that by the amendment which is now a part of this bill, whereby the President is directed to cease the program of aid to these countries at any time when he is notified by the United Nations that the continuance of such assistance is deemed unnecessary or undesirable, as to which this country waives any right of veto, effectively takes care of any objection that the United Nations is being ignored or in any way bypassed. True, one country alone cannot, through sinister motives, prevent the continuance of this aid, but if a majority of the nations of the world, which have associated themselves together in this international organization, determine that we do not need to or should not go further, and they so notify us, we must stop. Although that is to some degree a surrender of a measure of sovereignty, in this world now so compact and so interdependent, we should not complain of this restriction on our unfettered action. This amendment completely negatives any claim that we in this country stand for unilateral, as opposed to joint and mutual action.

Third, it is contended that we cannot afford this expenditure. My answer to that is we cannot afford not to extend this aid. True, we must maintain a sound domestic economy. We are committed to reduction in the expenses of government. I have supported measures to that end. I shall continue to do so. But I cannot believe that our national economy and stability hangs by so tenuous a thread that the expenditure here contemplated will bring upon us the disaster which some have pictured. If my original thesis is correct, that this is an important step toward peace, as I devoutly pray and firmly believe it is, it is certainly peace at a modest price. Measured alone in dollars and cents, it represents an expenditure of approximately $1 for every $850 spent by this country winning World War II. That does not mean, of course, that we can do this thing 850 times without ruining our country, any more than we could go through another war without the same result, but these figures should serve to give us a perspective toward the problem we are now facing. No one can say with certainty that this plan will succeed, but it does seem to me far from accurate to depict this program as a fatal blow at the vital and vigorous economy of our Nation.

Fourth, it is said that we should not use our resources to bolster up or strengthen reactionary undemocratic foreign governments. I hold no brief for the regimes now in control of either Greece or Turkey. They are far from perfect. They, by no means, represent the choice of leaders or governmental

systems whom freedom-loving Americans would voluntarily select. Our representatives should insist, as I believe they have a right to do, without being charged with improper interference in the internal affairs of another nation, upon a clear demonstration that the governments of those countries are the choice of a clear majority of the people. But the reason I am for this bill is not because it helps Greece and Turkey, but because it helps the United States. It is unfortunate that the only vehicle through which this aid, extended in our own enlightened self-interest, can be accomplished, is not more to our liking, but we must operate with the tools which we have, fortified by the very substantial provisions for our protection incorporated in section 3 of this bill, requiring free access to United States observers to assure the effective utilization of our assistance, permission to representatives of the press and radio to report fully, prohibition against transfer without consent of any article or disclosure of any information to one not an agent of the government concerned, prohibition against the use of any such financial aid to make payment on any loan made by any other foreign power, and an injunction upon each government concerned that it must give full and continuous publicity as to the scope and progress of our economic assistance. These are all assurances which the governments of Greece and Turkey must give, and in default or breach of which our aid shall be withdrawn.

Finally, it is contended that this measure represents a committal of this Nation to a policy of imperialistic expansion which is contrary to and violative of American tradition. Only a tiny minority in this country voices this objection, to only an infinitesimal fraction of whom I am willing to concede sincerity of motive. This is the argument of those who see so much to condemn in the United States and so much to commend in the Soviet Union. We have no territorial ambitions. No thinking American seeks to establish an empire beyond the seas. Never in all history has any nation interested herself in the welfare of the peoples and stability of the governments of foreign areas with loftier motives or more unselfish purposes. Our only self-serving objective is the creation in this world, whose oneness daily becomes more and more apparent with dramatic clarity, of a universal condition of peace, tranquillity, and security wherein all peoples may live together in mutual friendliness, forbearance, and tolerance. To ascribe to the proponents of this legislation an aim at world domination by an imperialistic United States is a figment of wild imagination and a creature of subversive rationalization.

I have discussed and attempted to point out the weaknesses in the principal objections to this bill because they are admittedly troublesome and because any one of them, if firmly entrenched in a Member's mind, is sufficient cause to justify him in a negative vote. Again I say this is not an easy decision, but from those who oppose the program I ask a constructive alternative. Somewhere, some time, we must check the forces of expanding aggression, the existence of which no thinking person can deny. We can do it now in Greece and Turkey, or we can do it later, at some other place; indeed, we can wait until those forces threaten our own shores. I, for one, prefer to take a position now. Not one of militancy, but of firmness and determination. In that course lies our greatest hope for peace.

By this bill we will buy time, time to put our own house in order and root out or at least subject to the pitiless glare of publicity those elements in our domestic economy and our own Government who would disrupt and destroy our way of life to substitute another, time to build a United Nations organization which can effectively function in like crises, time to establish and fortify with adequate safeguards the international control of atomic energy, time, I pray to God, for nations to become more acutely aware of the utter futility of armed struggle and the necessity, if we are to survive, for the establishment of a practical, workable, enforceable program of international disarmament.

My conviction that this measure should pass will lead me not only to vote for it but to vote against crippling amendments which would undermine the program. That is not to say that I shall support none of the amendments which may be offered. One which I intend to offer or to support, if offered by some other Member, and which I have been hopeful might have the support of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have so diligently and faithfully studied this problem, would limit the number of military and naval personnel in either Greece or Turkey to 100. The witnesses who appeared before the committee testified that it was contemplated to send not more than 70 to Greece and probably a lesser number to Turkey. The limitation I propose gives an adequate leeway. The adoption of such an amendment would serve to show to the world, if our protestations have not carried conviction, that there is no intention, under any circumstances, to send combat forces into these countries. We all concede, I believe, that such a policy would be fraught with perilous possibilities. We must permit no loophole whereby the military minded might, under any circumstances, take a step to involve this Nation so deeply that it could not, with honor, extricate itself short of war. We, as a Congress, must not, by indirection, delegate our responsibility in that regard.

Finally, when all is said and done, we are faced today not with a theoretical problem but with a fact. Our President has announced to the world, whether we agree with him or not, that he is asking the Congress to meet, at this time and in a specific place, a direct and definite threat to the peace and security of the world. He has stated that on the 12th day of March our policy of appeasement is at an end. For this Congress to repudiate him and the statement which has echoed around the globe, would be a declaration that we are a divided nation, would be an open invitation to further aggressive tactics and would be, in my judgment, a devastating blow, not to the President, not to the Democratic Party, but to the position of world leadership whose mantle is now ours, and to the future peace, security, and well-being of every man, woman, and child who proudly claims this great Nation as his own.

[From the Washington Post]

ATTENTION TO REALITIES

Members of the House who are still arguing that the protection of Greek and Turkish independence should be left to the United Nations might well ponder events since the proclamation of the Truman doctrine. Secretary Marshall has asked them to bear in mind the failure of the Moscow Conference. This failure demonstrated that the Russians are betting that the drift they are inducing will wind up in a catastrophe which will expand the area of communism. Encouragement of drift is to be seen in other matters which await Russia's participation. For instance, look at what is happening to the UN's European Commission. This was set up belatedly to study European reconstruction, and got under way only after Russia's satellites, alarmed over the end of UNRRA, pushed Russia into it. It is meeting currently in Geneva. A wrangle is going on there on the perpetuation of the bodies which are the only means available for holding Europe together as an economic entity. The immediate subject of argument is the transport organization. According to the New York Times' correspondent, Russia is seeking to kill it. The inference cannot be resisted that Russia is seeking to use the European Commission, not to put Europe to work, but to prevent other people from doing so.

As we have said several times already, the United Nations has neither the finance nor the police to do what is required in the Near East. The recent report of the military staff committee of the United Nations makes for doubt, indeed, whether the UN as at present organized will ever be in such a position. It is this committee that was intended to put force at the disposal of the world organization. But a wide area of disagreement between Russia and the west is reported by the military staff committee. The Russians are revealed as not ready to contribute a contingent or a base to the United Nations on a permanent basis for the purpose of building up a unit which could be trained as a United Nations unit for police work. They object even to interchange of military information. Distrust of world organization could not be better demonstrated than in this military staff report. The United Nations is thus being hog-tied from acting as anything more than a hortatory body. In these circumstances, if we were to leave it to the United Nations to attend to the Greek and Turkish requests for aid, we should, in fact, be making the idlest of idle gestures. It would be dangerous living for this Nation to trust an organization which is not able to develop any teeth or any authority to look after our national security, for that is what is involved in the Greco-Turkish bill.

Nor can we even rely upon the United Nations to do the elementary job of finding out the facts. The Balkan committee of the United Nations has had a trying time in investigating the border situation in Greece. It is now in Geneva engaged in writing its report. In early April the Post wrote of the need to keep the border under observation, and on April 18 the Security Council authorized the Balkan committee to return a subcommittee for that purpose. Now comes the news that Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania will not work with this subcommittee. Albania refuses even to recognize it. Yet, in the face of this progressive sabotage of the United Nations, some Americans are

still taken in by Muscovite charges that, in responding to Greek and Turkish requests for economic and military aid (the pattern of which, incidentally, has been set in Russia's own pacts with her satellites), we should, in some mysterious way, be bypassing the United Nations. We hope the House in the vote on Greco-Turkish aid will have the wisdom that comes from attention to realities, and think of it as self-aid.

[From the New York Times]

A CHALLENGE TO UN

A serious challenge to the authority of the United Nations has come from three of Russia's Balkan satellites—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania. These countries have served notice on the Balkans Investigating Commission, created by the Security Council to investigate violations of the Greek border, that they will refuse to work with the Commission's subsidiary group authorized by the Security Council to continue surveillance of the border until the Council can act, and will in particular bar this group from their territories, where the border violations originate. Albania, which has been playing hide-and-seek with the United Nations, says that it refuses even to recognize the subsidiary group.

The issue arose as a result of the Security Council's adoption on April 18 of an American proposal to the effect that, pending a new decision by the Council, the Investigating Commission, now drafting its report in Geneva, "shall maintain in the area concerned a subsidiary group composed of a representative of each of the members of the Commission to continue to fulfill such functions as the Commission may prescribe in accordance with its terms of reference." The Commission's terms of reference, as laid down in the Security Council's resolution of December 19, 1946, explicitly authorized it to conduct its investigation in such territory in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia as the Commission considered necessary, and to call upon the governments, officials, and nationals of those countries for relevant information. Despite this, Yugoslavia now takes the lead in barring all further surveillance beyond the Greek frontier.

Under article 25 of the United Nations Charter all members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. The Investigating Commission has promptly referred the Balkan challenge to the Council, and the Council's decision will go far toward determining its authority.

In this incident we have another answer to those who charge that in trying to aid Greece the United States is bypassing the United Nations. The bypassing is being done elsewhere. And the clear evidence of that fact should be taken to heart by every Congressman trying to make up his mind how to vote on the Greek-Turkish aid bill now before the House.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

OVERSELLING THE UN

The language of Trygve Lie's appeal for the submission of all international problems to the United Nations "even when the most vital national interests are at stake" was somewhat ambiguous. But if he intended what his statement has been interpreted to mean—namely, that the problem of aiding Greece and Turkey should have been submitted to the UN—then he has done a disservice to President Truman's effort in behalf of those countries and, perhaps more importantly, to the United Nations itself.

Mr. Lie, Secretary General of the UN, did not mention Greece or Turkey by name. He did say, however, that "the bedrock on which the United Nations can build solidly and securely for the future" is a readiness of members to resort to the UN and to live up to its "solemn principles and purposes."

From this language, two inferences can be drawn. One is that he was rebuking President Truman for moving directly to aid the governments of Greece and Turkey without recourse to the UN. And the other is that the UN would have been competent to deal with the problem if it had been dropped in its lap.

So far as the first point is concerned, there is not a great deal to be said except that its effect, if it has any effect, will be to hamper the effort which this Government is making to check the spread of Communist-dominated regimes into the eastern Mediterranean. If Mr. Lie believes that any useful purpose can be served by this, it can hardly be denied that he has the right to express himself. But the implication that submission of the case to the UN would have enabled that institution to "build solidly and securely for the future" is another matter.

The trouble with this is that the UN is not even remotely competent at this time to deal with an issue like that involved in the Greco-Turkish question. It has no funds for loans to either Government. It has no facilities for extending any kind of military assistance to those Governments. And, most important of all, the Russian representative on the Security Council, by the exercise of his veto, could prevent the extension of any aid, even if the UN were capable of assisting.

For Mr. Lie to ignore these plain facts, and to talk at the same time about building solidly and securely for the future, is merely to play with words, for the strong probability is that submission of the question to the UN, far from strengthening that agency, would tend to wreck it.

One of the troubles with the UN today is that it has been "oversold." Through the medium of loose statements many people have acquired a grossly exaggerated notion of the contribution to peace and security which the organization is capable of making at this time. The danger of this is that when the truth becomes generally known there will be cynical reaction in this country that will seriously undermine American support for the UN. This is something that Mr. Lie and others, who seem disposed to overplay their hands, would do well to keep in mind.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I did not spend Easter Sunday as did the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] hobnobbing with Greek Royalists. I believe his sincerity but I do know, however, that there have been various official reports concerning the very corrupt and undemocratic Government of Greece, and I do happen to know that Fredericka, the present Queen of Greece, consort of Paul, was a Nazi, a direct descendant of Kaiser Wilhelm. She is not going to change overnight, and I am not going to take my impressions about the Greek Government from royalty and others having royalty opinions in the city of Athens. He talked to officials and even the press but all of them probably held to their prejudices and bias in favor of the royal couple. I would rather go into the very heart of Greece and talk to the peasants and get their reactions as to the bribery and the corruption and the coercion that exists in the Greek Government.

But, aside from that, my inclination has been to vote for this bill, but I had grave doubts as to the wishes of my constituents. I received many conflicting reports in the form of telegrams, letters, and verbal communications, and I determined to take a poll. I secured from the Board of Elections of New York City an exact list of all the voters of my district, and I sent to every election precinct or district 150 ballots. In all, I sent out 24,000 ballots to my district on which was printed the following:

I favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey. I do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The constituent was asked to check one of the two questions, affix his signature, and address, and mail back the ballot to me. Not more than one questionnaire or ballot was sent to each family.

I have received in my office thus far almost 5,000 returns; over 20 percent. I have spoken to direct-mail advertisers, and they tell me that is a very excellent return. The result of the poll showed that my constituents oppose decidedly military and financial aid to Greece and Turkey. For every return indicating approval of such aid there are three cards indicating disapproval; in other words, my district is opposed to this loan in the ratio of 3 to 1.

It is interesting to note that in hundreds of instances the vote is in favor of financial, but not military aid. Others favored such aid provided it was channeled through and controlled by the United Nations. Hundreds wished to eliminate Turkey from the terms of the bill. Hundreds of others opposed the aid because of the autocratic governments of Turkey and Greece.

The following conclusions are inescapable:

The preponderant majority of my constituents do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

They would favor it if only financial aid were advanced, if it were channeled through and controlled by the United Nations, and if Greece and Turkey were truly democratic countries.

The poll was taken without any advance publicity. Pressure groups could not have exercised any undue influence because the greatest number of returns came in the first few days after mailing. The vote was consistently 3 to 1 against the loan throughout the daily count. That ratio did not vary.

I was put to considerable expense to conduct this poll. I deemed it worth while, however. My district is just as intelligent as the district of any other Member. My people are just as alert and awake. I desire to represent my people. That is my duty. Despite the preponderance of view against the bill, I tried to argue with many of my constituents, I tried to change their view but could not. They are my last court of resort. Their view must prevail against my inclination to support the administration especially when opposition is on a 3-to-1 basis.

If the imbalance had been say 1 to 1½, or even 1 to 2, I would have allowed my tendency to vote for this bill to bear the weight in favor of the aid, but I cannot buck up against a tide of 3 to 1 against that aid. Therefore, unless the amendments to be offered by the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] are carried, I must perforce vote against the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, after the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is disposed of, I expect to offer a series of amendments, the first amendment on removing the military provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am revolted by the sham and hypocrisy of the so-called Greek-Turkish aid program. The American people feel a warm and generous sympathy for the courageous Greeks who drove the Nazi invaders from their soil and who have suffered so much both at the hands of foreign oppressors and domestic tyrants. But the administration is using those sympathies to drum up support for a program which will not help the brave Greeks so much as it will give aid and comfort to their oppressors. If the Greeks are starving—and I have no doubt they are—why is the major portion of the appropriation destined for military purposes rather than relief? If our goal is the economic rehabilitation of Greece, surely this requires a long-term and well-thought-out program, a program in which other nations as well as ourselves should participate. Instead, we propose to put weapons in the hands of the Naziphile Greek Government, to shoot down those very Greeks who were most militant in resisting the Axis forces, who endured incredible hardship while their King luxuriated in Claridge's Hotel in London. I have misgivings even about the smaller sum which is destined for relief. In the past, relief for Greece has been gobbled up by the rich men of Athens, protected by an archaic system of taxation and foreign-exchange laws which permit them to send all their wealth out of the country for safekeeping. It is for the benefit of these rich idlers that American taxpayers are being mulcted.

And what of this noble impartiality which with the same hand lavishes gifts upon Greece and upon Greece's traditional enemies the Turks, persecutors of Greek Christians as well as Jews for thousands of years? If the Turks are suffering anything, it is indigestion over the swollen profits they amassed during the war by gouging the Allies for every ton of wheat and every pound of chrome. I tell you it is absurd and odious for us to pretend that we are helping to establish democracy and prosperity in Europe when we ally ourselves with the craven and corrupt Greek monarchy, and give generous gifts to Turkish war profiteers.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Greek people are in great need. But they are not going to be helped by sending them guns and tanks. There have been too many guns and tanks in Greece already. The corrupt Greek monarchy has been maintained in power by guns and tanks—by British guns and tanks and by American lend-lease guns and tanks in the hands of the British. When the British took over in Athens they were ruthless in their determination that any opposition to the monarchy—a monarchy that served the interests of the British—should be suppressed. Greeks were forbidden to hold public meetings. Newspapers could not be published without British permission and British censorship of their contents. A curfew was proclaimed between 7 p. m. and 7 a. m.—no Greeks were allowed on the streets of Athens between those hours.

An American in Athens in late 1944 has reported an example of just how this curfew was enforced. A little Greek vendor of odds and ends—some cigarettes, bits of wire, shoe laces, and other trifles which were very precious and rare in Nazi-pillaged Athens—had an orange crate on the corner opposite the hotel in which the UNRRA mission was billeted. A customer stopped about 5 minutes to 7 p. m. The American watched the transaction from the window of the Acropole Palace Hotel to see the bushels of drachma notes change hands. One hundred billion drachmas equaled about 1½ cents in American money. There were few one hundred billion notes and payments were made in millions, one billion, five billion and such notes. The counting of fistfuls of paper took time. The customer left with his cigarettes about 7. At 7:03 the little Greek tradesman was busy packing his stock into his orange crate when a British patrol car came by. There was no questioning. There was no arrest. The patrol turned its machine gun on this "law-violator" and riddled his body with bullets. In the spot where he had tried to make his meager living was a pool of blood and bits of flesh scattered over the pavement. This was British enforcement of "law and order" in the early stages. The repression by the British grew more widespread as time went on.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that there have already been too many American guns in the hands of the British and in the hands of the Greek monarchy imposed by the British. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the United States should have no part in bolstering up a corrupt monarchy which could not last 5 minutes in Greece without outside help. I say that if we are going to ship relief to Greece let us ship relief and not guns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that if we do send relief to Greece we should see that it gets to the Greek people, and not to the royalist clique. What happened to the foodstuffs which the United States sent to Greece? What happened was that they were sold for fancy prices to the few wealthy Greeks around the King and his circle, and the people of Greece continued to die in the streets.

American members of the UNRRA mission have reported that the only place that they saw lend-lease food from the United States was at royalist cocktail parties. Chicago sausages, California sardines, American cheese were lavishly served at cocktail parties while the people of Greece wasted away from starvation.

The Greek monarchy helped to finance itself by the sale of American food at exorbitant prices. The Greek Government does not believe in taxes. To this day it raises a large part of its revenue through the sale of relief supplies—supplies for which the people of the United States have taxed themselves to give to the poor of Greece.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not send guns to Greece. I say that if we send food we should see that it gets into the hands of the people who need it and not into the hands of a corrupt monarchy.

I have heard many Members who are in favor of this speak of Greek freedom and Greek democracy. There is no democracy in Greece. The gentleman from North Carolina spoke of visiting the ruling princes of Turkey and Greece. He saw the wrong people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the delegation went to Athens and conferred with the wrong people. Can he think of anyone better to confer with than our own diplomatic corps who were there at the time and with the press, including representatives of the American press, and with the officers of the Greek Government and citizens of Greece? We were only there a short time. I am not attempting to speak as an authority on Greek affairs.

Mr. BENDER. Will my friend tell me how long he was in Greece?

Mr. COOLEY. We were there 2 days and nights. We conferred with these people and did not waste a minute in our effort to obtain information.

Mr. BENDER. Did the gentleman confer with any of the poor people of Greece who are starving?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; we certainly did. We spoke to representatives of the poor people. The gentleman seems to be objecting to the fact that we accepted an invitation from the King and Queen of Greece. I regret that the gentleman was not along with us because I think he would have accepted the same invitation.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I am glad I was not because I am not given to dining and wining with royalty. I am just an ordinary citizen from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does not this projected program in effect set the United States up as the dictator of Greece?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman states a fact.

You know when we go into this business we are like the fellow who was going into the rabbit business on a very small scale. But the rabbits would not cooperate and pretty soon he was in a big business. That is exactly what we are doing here.

The gentleman from New York spoke of $400,000,000. This is just the beginning. When Britain pulls out of India next year, we will have 400,000,000 Indians on our hands. God only knows what that policy will result in. When the French come in next year with their

hands out, and the British come in again before this year is up for more money, then we are in the same position as the fellow who wanted to go into the rabbit business on a very small scale. You cannot operate on a small scale and our economy cannot stand the impact of the cost of this.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUFETT. The proponents of this program are not honest enough and do not dare to come here and tell us the whole story for they know it would be defeated. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENDER. They know that, and they would not come here and ask us at one time to provide all the money that is required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we have had very illuminating debate on this first amendment. I am wondering if we cannot make an arrangement to come to an end on this one amendment. I want to give everybody a chance to speak but there will be plenty of opportunity on other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman submit a request at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that I think the debate on the amendment is over, so long as the Members know there is no stopping of debate on the section. It seems to me the Chair might put the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. May the amendment be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Red Cross bill is on the Speaker's desk for signature.

I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BENDER and Mrs. DOUGLAS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California rise?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 2, line 24, insert the following additional clause:

"*Provided, however*, That none of the aid herein authorized for Turkey shall be furnished until the President shall have advised the Congress that the United States has requested the appropriate agency of the United Nations to inquire into conditions in Turkey and to take such action, if any, as may be necessary to safeguard the national integrity of Turkey, and that the United Nations has failed within 1 year after the enactment hereof to take action which in the President's judgment is adequate for that purpose."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed in this bill to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey. It seems perfectly obvious that the conditions prevailing in these two countries are not the same. Greece is in the midst of civil conflict, Turkey is not.

Facts have been presented to the committee to show that Greece is in extreme need of aid. The facts show that Turkey is not in imminent economic peril or in dire need of outside assistance. Turkey at the beginning of the war had somewhere around $45,000,000 in gold. Her total gold and foreign exchange resources today stand at $245,000,000. Of this $227,000,000 is in gold.

When we talk about aid to Turkey we are talking about military aid. There is no evidence that economic aid is needed in Turkey or that the Government of the United States expects to extend economic aid to her. We are falling into the ancient error, it seems to me, of preparing for war without attending the issues which create war.

The amendment which I now offer is motivated by my unshakable conviction that military assistance to Turkey is a problem for the consideration of the United Nations and not for the consideration of any single country or group of countries however unselfish and benevolent their intentions.

The Vandenberg amendment reflects our grave uneasiness and doubt in embarking upon a foreign policy of military assistance to Turkey in the absence of sufficient evidence made available to the American people or Members of Congress justifying the widely publicized conclusion that Turkey is imperiled by outside pressures.

What are the facts to buttress our position committing the Nation to so grave a step? I do not say there are no facts; I say that we have not yet learned those facts. I say, too, that the United Nations alone is in a position to make an impartial examination into all the truth of Turkey's claims and to make the facts available.

What I propose in my amendment is wholly consisten' with the purposes underlying Senator VANDENBERG's amendment. It goes further, however, in that instead of saying that the United States will do so-and-so unless the United Nations at some later date says "No," my amendment says that the United States will not do so unless the United Nations fails to take action within a specified period of time. There is a vast difference between steaming ahead on our own subject to countermanding orders from the United Nations and giving the United Nations in the first instance precisely the kind of responsibility it was set up to discharge.

I urge taking the question of Turkey to the United Nations. Let me remind you that the reason we propose giving military aid to Turkey is to help Turkey maintain her army so that she can resist outside pressures. I say we should bring the matter of outside pressures on Turkey before the Security Council, which was set up to establish and maintain the peace of the world.

Russia has no right to bring the kind of pressure against Turkey which requires Turkey to maintain an army she cannot afford. If she is doing so she should be called to account. And she should be called to account for her actions before the nations of the world.

I am not against aid to Turkey, if the reasons for aid are clearly spelled out before the world's tribunal, the United Nations.

What we are doing if we give military aid to Turkey is to say to Russia, "Here is 10 cents on the dollar, we will put down the other 90 cents if it is needed." We say further, "We are backing the national integrity of Turkey and that Russia had better not bring undue pressure upon her in the settlement of the Dardanelles question," because it is the Dardanelles we are talking about in this bill in its relation to Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, we can express our interest in the Dardanelles just as well in the Security Council of the United Nations or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as we can by giving Turkey money to maintain her army and not forfeit the moral leadership that is ours and ought to be ours in the world. We run no risk by carrying the alleged Turkish problem to the United Nations. If Russian forces rolled over the Turkish border we would be at war. The sum of $100,000,000 which we propose to give to the Turkish Army in this bill would accomplish nothing. The Turkish Army could not stop the Russian Army

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my understanding correct that if the question were taken to the Security Council it must be by an unanimous vote of the Big Five?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, I say "No." Neither in the Security Council nor in the General Assembly can the discussion of any subject be barred. The only time that the veto works is when direct action must be taken by the Security Council. The United Nations forced the Russian troops to leave Iran with no more power than they have now. If the Russians rolled over the border of Turkey, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts we are in war.

We have an interest in the Dardanelles. I do not question that interest, but we can express that interest as well in the Security Council or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as by giving aid to the Turkish Army. We should work through the world organization which we helped create, and in which, I am convinced, lies the one hope of peace for the world. We can always do what we propose to do here if the United Nations fails to act.

My amendment provides that the President shall instruct the United States delegate to the United Nations to request the United Nations to study conditions in Turkey and to evaluate the contentions of the Turkish Government insofar as they purport to show that the national integrity of Turkey is threatened by pressures from outside sources.

No group is better qualified to judge the Turkish position and to weigh the reality underlying Turkey's alleged fears than the United Nations. For such purposes was the United Nations established and only if it discharges these functions vigorously and with the full cooperation of the United States can the world preserve the hope of lasting peace.

The amendment allows a period of 1 year during which the President of the United States is to get this train of actions under way. If within that time the United Nations acts, presumably the President will await its report before deciding on the next step. If, on the other hand, the United Nations signifies that it is unwilling or unable to accede to our request, the President upon advising Congress of the fact is thereafter at liberty, within his discretion, to furnish such military assistance to Turkey as is authorized in the bill before us.

One final word. The issue in the Turkish question is the problem of the future of the Dardanelles. At Yalta and at Teheran the United States and Great Britain solemnly pledged their assistance to the U. S. S. R. in bringing about a revision of the Montreux Convention, which gives Turkey its present stranglehold on the straits. The problem has not been settled; not even fully considered or debated formally among the interested powers. It will not be settled—on the contrary it can only be complicated and confounded by unilateral action on our part. It can only be settled by the United Nations since it is a problem of vital concern to the peace of the world. The amendment I propose seeks this solution. Let it be arrived at by a world tribunal prepared to examine and evaluate competing claims to get at the facts and to do equity. Let the United Nations decide and let the United States be the leader in championing this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after paragraph 5, insert "*Provided, however,* That the President, notwithstanding the assistance furnished to any country hereunder, is directed to initiate proceedings, unless such proceedings have heretofore already been instituted, to bring to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, any situation which threatens the territorial integrity or political independence of any country assisted hereunder and makes necessary the maintenance of fully mobilized forces by such country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of my amendment at this moment to juxtapose the choice before the committee and that is the reason this is brought up as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California. My amendment says that we shall aid Greece and Turkey now, but simultaneously with such aid the President shall take the action provided by the Charter of the United Nations in cases where a situation exists likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and this is exactly such a situation. The gentlewoman's amendment proposes that we shall wait a year, giving the Security Council an opportunity to decide this issue before we do anything. Obviously, if we wait until that time, we will be defeating the purpose of this particular legislation.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not wait 1 year; wait 6 months.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is very necessary that the Committee understand clearly the difference between the approach the gentlewoman from California is making to this question and the approach being made by the gentleman from New York. They both seem to do the same thing, and both seem to be something that this Committee endorses and supports, and that is to bring in at the proper time and in the proper manner the United Nations to determine the extent of these outside pressures being exerted upon the Turkish border, and to determine whether or not the United Nations is able to carry out its mandate and its authority to correct that kind of disturbance. But I believe that we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as a substitute because it does provide now that we go right ahead, as we are expected to do under the present proposal, and make this relief available, and that puts a few extra teeth into the Vandenberg amendment by assuring the world that we propose to go before the United Nations and call attention to these outside pressures, and solicit the support of right-minded people throughout the world to bring those pressures to an end. It in nowise cripples the purpose of the basic legislation but it does bring the United Nations in specifically as the Vandenberg amendment would do it more generally.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. May I point out that there is a doctrine in this legislation. The legislation itself, insofar as Greece and Turkey are concerned, it has been clearly shown, is a stopgap. It is designed to stop a situation which it is said cannot be controlled in any other way. But the doctrine that is in this bill is the Vandenberg doctrine. What is that doctrine? It is that while we keep the situation in the world from deteriorating further we at the same time, though we are the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, subject ourselves to the judgments of the United Nations. We demonstrate in this way our faith in the United Nations and our will to make it the strongest force for peace among the nations. The League of Nations was wrecked because no powerful nation would accept as binding upon itself the judgments of the League. We must not repeat that mistake.

The Vandenberg amendment is a condition subsequent; in other words, it says that when the United Nations asks us to stop assisting any country because it is unnecessary or undesirable we will do so. But this amendment is a condition precedent, because we say at the same time that we go in and do something which we have to do, which there is no one else to do, we invite you, the United Nations, to consider our action, the situation which brought it about, and what can be done to deal with that situation. That is the purpose of my amendment, and I believe it is part and parcel with the Vandenberg doctrine.

May I call the attention of the Committee to the provisions of the United Charter itself which envisage this very situation. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter, read as follows:

3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. We are coming to the aid of Greece and Turkey because we say there are threats to their territorial integrity or political independence. Those are exactly matters with which the Charter charges the United Nations, and therefore under this amendment we have both lines of action going forward together. We stop deterioration of the international situation which cannot be stopped now in any other fashion, and at the same time we subordinate ourselves to the judgment and activities of the United Nations by asking it to proceed in the same situation. This has already been done in Greece. The charges by Greece that her northern neighbors, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, have invaded her northern border are under investigation by a United Nations Commission. The same thing has not been done in Turkey. If the external pressures on Turkey are too subtle for detection by the United Nations, then those pressures are too subtle for detection by the United States. Therefore, the United States should agree that there are external pressures that may be considered by the United Nations, while the United States comes forward with the material means by which the condition of the countries it proposes to assist can be stopped from further deterioration now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. As I understand it, what it does is to take away the curse of unilateral action and bring about a more multilateral action on the part of this country in connection, insofar as possible, with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly my intention.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But we do proceed without referring it to the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; we refer it to the United Nations and proceed at the same time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In that respect, is it not a good argument from the standpoint of Russia to say that we are the aggressors?

Mr. JAVITS. No, sir, because we submit ourselves to the mandate of the United Nations. How can an aggressor submit himself to the United Nations and still be considered an aggressor?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I understood the gentleman to say that we proceed according to this act and at the same time we place this entire matter in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. Or the General Assembly.

Mr. BLOOM. The Security Council, according to the Charter, is the only part of the United Nations that has a right to proceed in this manner. There must be some danger. This matter we are proceeding on now is an internal matter. It has nothing to do with an outside danger, like the border episodes that exist today in Greece. Nothing like that exists in Turkey. You cannot at the same time proceed under the legislation we have before us now and ask the Security Council of the United Nations to proceed. That is impossible, because as soon as we go to the United Nations and ask them to proceed with reference to Turkey, then we are a party to it. If we make a complaint to the United Nations that the peace and security of the world is threatened by the actions in Turkey, we are destroying everything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes. I should like to have this cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Turkey has requested of the United States that we go in and help it at this time. If we say to the United Nations as to Turkey, "This is not a unilateral agreement at all; you take this in your Security Council and act upon it there," we are destroying everything we are trying to do for Turkey.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two difficulties in the argument just made. One is that the President of the United States came here and invoked our aid for Turkey specifically on the ground that Turkey was being submitted to such external pressures as to imperil her integrity and political independence. External pressures, as I said before in my argument, cannot be so subtle that they can be detected only by the United States and not by the United Nations.

The question is also raised as to whether the United Nations could act. The United Nations Charter itself settles that question. It draws a clear distinction between disputes to which the gentleman referred and situations. Article 34 states:

> The Security Council may investigate any dispute or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the General Assembly may consider such a matter, for article 10 states:

> The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter.

Also article 11, paragraph 2, states:

> The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations.

One further very important point—in the General Assembly there is no veto power. If the United States proceeds in the General Assembly, the veto power of any great power raises no difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. With reference to the external difficulties of Turkey, they are merely this: That the Turkish Government has been compelled for years to keep a large army on the border because it is threatened, not on the border by Russia, but far away from the border, and Turkey is always afraid that Russia is going to come down into Turkey. That is why she has been put to this tremendous expense to keep this large standing army on the border for years.

Now, you differentiate between the General Assembly and the Security Council. If you want to do anything at all, you cannot go into the General Assembly with this. You must go into the Security Council. If we go into the Security Council and it is at the request of the Government of the United States, we foreclose ourselves from voting in the Security Council on this measure.

Then, you will have to get the other three powers in the Security Council to vote; otherwise, you are foreclosed yourself. Therefore, Russia will come in and beat you because you have no voice in it at all in the Security Council.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the points that the gentleman has raised. We must remember that U. S. S. R. has demanded from Turkey the right to fortify the Dardanelles jointly with Turkey. There are constant radio broadcasts into Turkey from the U. S. S. R. keeping Turkey on the anxious seat in this war of nerves. Those are the very reasons we are going to render assistance. The United Nations Charter in the articles I read enables the United States to proceed before the General Assembly if it does not want to go before the Security Council on these issues.

May I also point out that the Vandenberg amendment waives any effect of the veto in the Security Council on the action of the United Nations regarding this assistance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Was this amendment presented in the full committee that the gentleman is now offering and, if so, was any disposition made of it?

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment which has been here presented was presented in a different form carrying the same idea, however, before the committee. The committee at that time by a division rejected it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, may I say with reference to the Dardanelles, to which the gentleman has referred, that that is an entirely different question. In the dispute about the Dardanelles, Russia is the only nation that is concerned with the dispute who has not even replied to any suggestion which might be made with reference to the Dardanelles. Russia does want to go into the Dardanelles in one way. She wants to have her forts and men there. When she gets that, she will be in Turkey. Then, it will be too late to think of any legislation of any kind and you are beaten. There isn't any question about the Dardanelles situation. The gentleman is wrong. He knows that Russia is the only nation that has not yet suggested any statement or any kind of condition on which the Dardanelles should be operated in the future; and that is a positive fact.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the founders of the United Nations would favor very much the proposition that the United Nations should on the application of the United States, as a most devoted follower of the United Nations, act on this proposal.

Everything that has been said here indicates that there is external pressure on Turkey; and that is the only reason we are assisting. It cannot be economic difficulty in Turkey, as the gentlewoman from California so eloquently explained. The only reason we are going forward with this bill at all as to Turkey is on account of external pressure on her. If that is the reason and if the pressures are not so subtle that we can detect them, then they are not so subtle that the United Nations can fail to detect them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman there is one substitute amendment pending. Another substitute may not be offered until that is disposed of.

Mr. BENDER. May I offer an amendment to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute may be offered but not another substitute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

At last we have come to the meat of this whole situation. That is, do you want to proceed as outlined by the United Nations? Do you want to use the procedures and the facilities of the United Nations and make a multilateral approach to this problem, or do you want to make a unilateral approach? It all boils down to that. When all of the scare of communism, all of the cry that Turkey is in economic distress is cleared away, that is all there is to it. We know that Turkey's gold supply has gone up during the war from $45,000,000 to $245,000,000. She has got rich during the war by sitting still and not playing with either side, in spite of some of the things that have been said. She remained neutral and it was a profitable enterprise for Turkey. Now we come to the crux of the situation. Do we believe all the glittering pledges and promises that we made in the United Nations? Do we stand for the principles of collective security, or are we ready now to throw the United Nations in the ditch, and, by omitting to send to her this problem, say we are ready to go on our own and guarantee the sovereignty and integrity of every nation in the world, beginning first with Greece and Turkey and then going on to Korea, Indonesia, India, and on and on? Are we, a Nation of 140,000,000 people, to take over the great burden of policing the world, or would we like to have some help from the 47 nations or the 51 nations which have been supporting us in the United Nations? This is not the first problem that has been put up to the United Nations. Let me call to your attention the fact that there have been four. Lebanon-Syria was one problem. A complaint was made that the British and French troops were remaining in the country, contrary to the Charter agreement.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I cannot yield. Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution expressing confidence that British and French troops would withdraw, and in May they were withdrawn.

In Indonesia there was another complaint which the Council, after consideration, decided against investigating.

In Spain there was another complaint, with a like result.

In Iran there was a complaint that Russian troops had not withdrawn from Iran, and in April Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution to the Security Council asking Russia to withdraw, and on May 6, according to the report of the Iranian Government, Russian troops withdrew from Iran.

So we have four precedents of serious international situations arising. Those situations were referred to the Security Council. Action was taken on them. This is the second anniversary of the United Nations. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] helped to write those principles—those principles of multilateral approach to the problems of the world; of collective security. And you are departing from the sober principles written therein in this Greek- and Turkish-aid bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have only 5 minutes.

This is the crux of the situation. Let us get down to it now. Do you believe in the United Nations? Do you want to support the principles of the United Nations? Or do you want to go alone?

I did not talk on the atomic-energy resolution. I am a member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Atomic Energy. I do not want to talk on it now. I know, maybe, a little too much about it. I saw the explosions at Bikini. I visited the Japanese cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I know that we have the bomb. I do not know whether Russia has it or not, or whether she will have it within a year's time or whether it will take longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes, that I may ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to know whether we will be allowed the same liberality when some of us come to speak in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question the Chair cannot answer.

Mr. LEMKE. Very well. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In the countries to which the gentleman referred I believe he stated troops were present. That is an entirely different situation from what we are debating here today. There are no foreign troops in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sorry but I cannot let the gentleman take all of my 2 minutes. There are certain conditions——

Mr. BLOOM. But I asked that the gentleman might have an additional minute that I might ask him a question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In each of the countries the gentleman mentioned there were foreign troops and that is why it came to the Security Council; but here there are no foreign troops involved.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman deny the fact that situations can be brought to the Security Council without the presence of troops in the respective countries?

Mr. BLOOM. But the gentleman did not say that. The gentleman is right, a member nation can bring anything it wants to the Security Council.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right; the gentleman has answered. That is all I asked the gentleman to answer.

Mr. BLOOM. But there is no similarity between those situations and the present one.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is a similarity in that an international situation arises at this point and when it arises any nation in the world can bring it to the attention of the Security Council. It does not have to be exactly the same situation. It can be brought to the Security Council by any member of the United Nations, and that is where it should be brought unless you want to embark upon a unilaterial imperialistic program similar to the kind of program which has brought on every war in history. Here at last we have an opportunity to work through a United Nations organization and approach these things in a multilateral way. We say the United Nations is impotent, it is too weak. Mr. Chairman, how is it going to get strong unless it is provided exercise?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that it be read in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York:

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and Turkey."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "these countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "or Turkey."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 18, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it goes beyond the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if the page references are to the substitute amendment or to the bill.

Mr. BENDER. They are references to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the page references and line references describe the substitute amendment or what?

Mr. BENDER. They describe the substitute amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York to that part of the bill which has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get this clear. We have a pending amendment and we have a substitute for that amendment. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to the substitute. The amendment consists of several references to pages and lines. Are those pages and lines a part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as a substitute?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, they are part of the bill, which has already been read.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not constitute an amendment to the substitute and the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last several words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with any legislation attempting directly or indirectly to have this bill channeled toward the United Nations, we have to realize if that is done, for all practical purposes, this legislation and its effects and purposes will be defeated. As I view the situation, we are not bypassing the United Nations or its Charter.

The Charter of the United Nations does not authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." Both Greece and Turkey have solicited our aid for the speedy recovery and independence of those small countries. President Truman in his message to the Congress specifically said we are not bypassing the United Nations.

Let me briefly review the history. On at least three occasions the Greek problem has been presented to the Security Council, two times by Russia, when they claimed the British troops in Greece were a threat to peace, a charge which the Council rejected both times. It was presented again by the Greek Government on the ground that Russia's Balkan puppets—that is, certain Balkan states that are Russia's puppets—were waging an undeclared war against the Greek territory. On the latter charges a United Nations commission was appointed and they have been in Greece for some time. They have made investigations and they have made a report.

In connection with some remarks made by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who would want to create the impression that the guerrillas are patriotic, fighting people, are not either Communists or controlled by the Communists, I call his attention to a report already made by the commission showing that the Communists in Greece were trained in Yugoslavia—that is the guerrillas—and also that the manual of arms which has been used by the Greek Communists or guerrillas was printed in the Greek language by the Russians in Moscow. My friend apparently has failed to keep in touch with current history.

The report also shows that the fighting along the northern border continued despite the presence of the United Nations commission in Greece.

We also must keep in mind that the Charter provides:

The members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

What is happening? There are Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland. We will not talk about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. There is no more talk about their independence. I hope they will ultimately regain their independence. There are Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, admitting that from a military standpoint the latter has to gravitate to the East, but they belong to the West. We know what that means. We can interpret that language when we read it, coming from the head of that government.

Now, this threat against Greece. Greece and Turkey are like an apple, so geographically situated. You cut the apple in half. You cannot let one disintegrate and expect to save the other. You have to consider both parts together. You might just as well quit if you assist one and not the other. It is like cutting an apple in half and expecting to save one-half against the forces of destruction.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. A vital question in my mind is, Are we, by this, bypassing the United Nations organization? Does the gentleman contend that we are not bypassing the United Nations by this measure?

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to discredit or bypass the United Nations by this move and want to make sure we are not doing so now. Does the President of the United States make that clear in his message to the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The historical facts support that position. Now, let me continue. Back of Greece, what is there? Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is gone. We might just as well face the facts. I am not anti anything. I am pro in what I believe. I am pro-American; I am prowestern civilization. I believe in a civilization that all who believe in a Supreme Being possess. That is what our civilization is. Whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, we have and believe in the western civilization and what it stands for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The question is this: Does not the gentleman know that the committee itself in its report says that some of these bands are bands that we armed during the other war? That is shown on page 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not change the situation at all. That does not change at all one statement that I made concerning the United Nations Commission, because in that war, in the war against Hitler, we armed anybody who would or was fighting Hitler. We were crossing the bridge with anybody in order to lick the first enemy and the immediate devil. Now, let us face the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One gentleman said a while ago that the present King of

Greece was pro-Fascist and was in England during the war. If he had been pro-Fascist he would never have been in England during the war.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a frank observation worthy of consideration.

But, let us go further. If Greece goes, Italy goes. If Italy goes, Europe is gone. Now, we have to face these facts realistically. If we just sit back and remain inactive, then Russia, with its onrush of international communism, simply takes over country after country with its minority forces, militantly operating, by any means that they can employ to obtain control of a government, and when they do, they liquidate the decent elements within the government. Tito is in Yugoslavia, a step across the Adriatic from Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is bound to go. That means the control of the Mediterranean. If there is one thing we have learned from history it is that the country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the country that controls Europe controls Asia and Africa. History has indisputably portrayed that lesson to us based upon hard experience.

What are some of the reasons why we are not bypassing the United Nations? Neither the United Nations nor any of its related organizations are in position to render the kind of help required, and even in the time necessary. The United Nations has no military force to enforce any decisions made by the United Nations organization. In the meantime, help cannot be given because the United Nations organization and its agencies have no money and could not loan money to either Greece or Turkey until security was assured. That is one of the conditions precedent to an international agency's lending money to any government, that security must be assured before the nation can receive a loan.

When an emergency exists, and everyone who studied the facts knows that the United Nations cannot act to meet the emergency, by our extending emergency aid we are not only acting in our national interest but are helping to establish the conditions which alone can enable the United Nations to function at all.

The United Nations is pretty much like the Thirteen Colonies were under the Articles of Confederation; that is the way I view it. We have to strengthen it. The United Nations is more or less impotent now, and it is impotent due to one country's failing to cooperate with understanding.

We have no imperialistic designs. Not so long ago the Members who serve here and in the other Chamber passed a law giving the Philippines their independence. Most of the Members here now were here then. Certainly, the United States is not imperialistically inclined when we are the first great Nation in the history of man to give up voluntarily territory of which we were possessed.

We have to act affirmatively. The challenge is direct. It is a challenge to our way of life. Nation after nation is being taken over. The way it is going, we have reached our last line of defense from the angle of our civilization in Europe. We cannot afford to let Greece go. We cannot separate Turkey from Greece because of their geographical location. This involves Austria, it involves Germany. We know why the last conference at Moscow was a failure. They wanted to sap and destroy Austria economically. They would agree to Austria being a free nation, but it would not allow Austria any economic ability to maintain its freedom. The Russians have taken everything out of the area of Germany over which they have control, and they are now trying to sap the areas under the control of the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, I hope these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to all the amendments and to make a statement which I have here to make.

Mr. Chairman, before this very illuminating debate ends, I should like to take a few moments to present my views of the foundation principles of the United Nations Organization and its relation to individual countries and to this particular problem. However, at this point I have a communication of the utmost importance which I wish to read, bearing upon the amendments now before us.

Personally, I hope that all three of these amendments will be defeated, and that we will not festoon this legislation with all kinds of unworkable suggestions, all of them coming from high motives and a desire to settle the problem, but as a practical result lowering the efficiency of the legislation and making it more difficult to enforce than it is now.

I have here a communication from Senator Warren Austin, with whom I was associated during the preparation of this Charter, and who I think you will all agree with me is one of the soundest and sanest thinkers in this Nation. He has been appointed by our President to represent this Nation in the United Nations Organization as our chief ambassador.

Yesterday I sent him a telegram asking him, if he did not consider it prejudicial to his official position, if he would be willing to inform the House, in this time of confusion, of his views on the reference of this legislation to the United Nations. He said, in answer to my telegram:

NEW YORK, *May 8, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

In answer to your telegram:

In my opinion the United States program for aid to Greece and Turkey does not (repeat) not bypass the United Nations. On the contrary it would be a most essential act in support of the United Nations Charter and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

The United States took the initiative in explaining the proposed United States program to the United Nations Security Council; my statements of March 28, 1947, and April 10, 1947, set forth in full the reasons necessitating the American-aid program and the relationship of this program to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

I informed the Security Council on behalf of the United States that the United States will immediately register with the United Nations for publication by the Secretary General copies of agreements connected with the execution of this program which may be entered into between Greece and the United States or between Turkey and the United States.

The Security Council, on the initiative of the United States, is already acting on that aspect of the Greek question with which it is now prepared to deal—the conditions on the northern Greek frontiers.

No organ of the United Nations can at this time provide financial and military assistance to the Greek Government of the emergency character required.

The proposed American program will assist in restoring stability and security in Greece and maintaining them in Turkey. When stable conditions are restored in Greece it should be possible to provide such further financial and economic assistance as might then be required through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and related specialized agencies.

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to yield to me for some questions. I asked him whether he was convinced that the enactment of this measure would not be bypassing the United Nations organization and he gave me his prompt and positive reply that this does not do so. He further called attention to the President's message to the effect that this move does not indicate our intention to side-step the United Nations. To me that was gratifying assurance, for I want our Nation and our Government to continue to foster, to support, and to utilize properly and fully this new international organization which we helped make.

Now that we have heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the committee, read the letter from Senator Austin, our representative in the United Nations, to the effect that this move is not contrary to or inconsistent with our solemn duty as a member nation to the United Nations, we may feel further assured. My feeling of confidence in General Marshall as Secretary of State and of Senator VANDENBERG as one of the builders of the long-hoped-for United Nations organization deepens my assurance that they are not planning to do anything to the detriment of this young organization which is the hope of the world.

I have all along felt that the American Government made a colossal blunder when our Government repudiated the League of Nations a quarter century ago. It seemed certain to me then and still does seem certain that the power and influence of the United States was actively needed after the First World War to make the League of Nations effective, and we denied it then by our "act of omission." Destiny seems to have given America another chance to play her full and rightful part as befits her place in history. Opportunity did knock again and after a second terribly costly war we did join with more than 50 nations in organizing an international body to achieve justice and to prevent war. And now if before that babe is out of its swaddling clothes the Government of America repudiates it, not by an act of omission this time, but by a deliberate act of commission, it would be a far greater blunder than before. If the passage of this bill

means that America is "Driving a dagger into the heart of the United Nations organization", as has been claimed, I cannot support this move, for I am sure the American people do not approve anything that weakens, and will not permit anything that destroys the effectiveness of the United Nations organization. America will not desert this hope. That is why I have sought the assurance we have just received.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and the substitute be again reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill to give aid and assistance to war-devastated Greece and some financial support to Turkey. These two countries are strategically located overlooking the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Turkey controls the Dardanelles. The independence of those two countries and their freedom from Russian domination are of vital importance to the future peace and security of the world.

We must not appease the Communists by bowing and scraping when our legitimate actions and policies are opposed by them. Those people recognize strength and firmness.

The passage of this bill will encourage free people in their resistance to the forces of communism. It will, in my opinion, be a deterrent of war and a promoter of peace. The appeasement of Japan and of Germany during recent years, so fresh on our minds now, led only to war. Let us profit from history, repudiate all evidence of isolationism on this subject and here uphold the Truman Doctrine as the symbol of hope and encouragement to free people to maintain their freedom and their national integrity.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no legislative proposal ever submitted to the Congress since I became a Member on January 3, 1939, has caused me as much concern as the matter now before us; namely, a bill to implement President Truman's foreign policy as submitted to the Congress on March 12 of this year.

Not a day has gone by since President Truman addressed a joint session of the Senate and House that I have failed to devote some part of the day to thought or study of this proposal. I recognize the importance of the decision we will make here in the House this week.

Those who urge that we vote for an appropriation of $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey have been quite frank in stating that this should not be considered as a loan. It will be an outright grant. Nor do the proponents any longer claim that it is a relief bill in the usual sense of the word "relief." It has been admitted that about 75 percent of this appropriation will be spent for military equipment and supplies. It is also admitted that we will provide military personnel to serve as advisers for the Greek and Turkish Armies.

This proposal came as a shock to me. It is such a radical departure from what I envisioned would be the United States foreign policy following VJ-day. I recognized then and now our responsibility to aid other nations who as a result of the war badly needed food, clothing, medical supplies, seed, fertilizer, and so forth. Recognizing this responsibility, I voted last week against the motion that prevailed to reduce the foreign relief appropriation from three hundred and fifty to two hundred million dollars. I wanted to lean over backward in my effort to support fully the efforts of our Government to render relief to the hungry people abroad. Greece will receive a large part of these relief funds.

I said a moment ago that this program is so different from what I thought we would work out through the United Nations organization. It was my hope that we would unite with all other peace-loving nations of the world in a United Nations organization, and one of the first objectives of the UN would be to prevent any country from interfering with the sovereignty of any of its neighbors.

Some argue in connection with this legislation that we are not bypassing the United Nations organization. I just cannot understand that reasoning. We very definitely are embarking on a unilateral policy. No other member nation of the United Nations is participating with us in our effort to strengthen the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. We are going it alone, and the consequences will be ours alone.

It has been said during this debate that we must supply this military aid to Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism. If that be the real reason for this appropriation, just how far will this program lead us and what will be its ultimate results. Are we going to provide funds to strengthen the armed forces of every nation in the world now threatened by the spread of communism? Certainly communism is a threat to France, to Italy, to Belgium, and even to the British Empire. Certainly no one will contend that we have the resources to make huge military grants to each of these powers.

I am not at all concerned by the charge that has been made that those who oppose this appropriation are alining themselves with Henry Wallace or that the opponents of this measure are sympathetic to Stalin's ambitions. In coming to a decision I have considered only the effect this foreign policy, if approved, will have on the future of the United States and on the United Nations' program as proposed in its Charter.

I have received a substantial number of letters on this Greek-Turkish aid proposition since President Truman first proposed it. With one exception, no one has written to me in favor of the whole program. Some urge "relief for Greece." Others propose that we send surplus military equipment to Greece and Turkey but no military personnel. Some favor aid to Greece but positively no aid or assistance for Turkey. Most of the people who have written to me and others with whom I have talked feel very strongly that this whole matter should be handled by the United Nations.

If, as the proponents of this legislation say, the United Nations is not prepared or strong enough to take over this task, that organization could be strengthened. I cannot understand why the United States acting alone is stronger than the United States acting with even a majority of the nations making up the United Nations organization. No member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has as yet explained how Russia could make use of her veto power to prevent other member nations of the UN from acting to prevent Russian expansion. After all, was not the real purpose of the United Nations to maintain world peace through force if necessary?

Very little information has been given us upon which we could base an intelligent decision. I finally decided to vote no on this proposition; and in reaching that decision, I have followed the dictates of my own conscience, after using to the best of my ability the brain with which I have been endowed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue the remarks I began yesterday but which I did not have time to complete.

We have heard a lot said about our foreign policy but I still do not know what our foreign policy is. I did not know during World War II what it was, nor did any of the men in my outfit, nor any of my six brothers with whom I served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II.

I expounded a foreign policy yesterday that is new to this House but one which I believe will work, that is that the United States maintain its armed forces so strong that we will be in a position where the other nations of this world will have to appease the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of Members on this floor talk about the League of Nations. I have heard a lot of people over the country say that if the United States had just joined the League of Nations after World War I we would have prevented World War II.

I heard the distinguished minority leader last night insinuate that very same thing, that if we had only joined the League of Nations it would have prevented World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I refute the argument that if we had joined the League of Nations with 100,000 men, no Air Force, a scrapped and depleted Navy, that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito would have listened to us; but I say to you that had we joined the League of Nations, built a great Air Force, maintained our military power, then the chances are we would have prevented World War II.

The United Nations will not work today unless the United States of America maintains its armed might; and I say that in times of modern warfare to talk about the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, one or two bombs would neutralize the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, or the Panama Canal. The only force that we can make sure will preserve the peace and security of the United States of America, as I said yesterday, and repeat today because I sincerely believe it, and the past history of the world proves it—is an Air Force that can strike at any portion of the world, an Air Force capable of dropping and willing to drop any weapons known to modern man. Knowing that we will use these weapons the Russians, realists that they are, will listen, but they will listen to nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Page 2, line 11, after the words "in an advisory capacity only", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and add the following: *"Provided, however,* That not more than 100 such personnel are to be utilized in either country at one time under the terms of this act without further authorization from Congress."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very clear. It simply is to put into legislative language the understanding that has been agreed upon informally between the War Department and the various committees of the House and the Senate which have been dealing with this particular legislation. Many of you have been worried, as many good Americans outside of Congress have been worried, lest this aid to Greece and Turkey take on the aspect of an expeditionary force. That is not the intention at all of the administration spokesmen who sponsored it.

We have received the most solemn assurance that human beings can give that that is not their intention, that the only purpose of military men being sent to either Greece or Turkey is to advise and to counsel so as to enable their military people to learn to use the types of weapon which they are going to buy from us or perhaps be given by us.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the hearings in this connection. If you will look at page 108 of the hearings and follow me as I read the testimony you will see what I am driving at. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was interrogating Secretary Patterson about the size of this military contingent and Secretary Patterson stated:

Secretary PATTERSON. I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate.

Then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] proceeded:

Mr. VORYS. Does that cover both Greece and Turkey, the estimate of 10 to 40?

Secretary PATTERSON. That would only be in the case of Greece.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder about Turkey.

Secretary PATTERSON. In the case of Turkey, it would be comparable. We do not at all have the detailed knowledge in the case of Turkey that we have in the case of Greece. I think I indicated that in my statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Secretary, following up the line of questioning identified by Mr. VORYS, I think it would be very comforting to the American public if we could put something into the legislation which would spell out the facts you have talked about today about a military mission.

The language is a little indefinite.

That is as to the matter of a limited number of military personnel. Then I asked him this direct question:

Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?

Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

The Secretary says specifically he has no objection to that kind of limiting amendment. I appeal to you now as Members of a body having coordinate responsibility of government, along with the executive department, to measure up to your joint responsibility and write into this legislation those facts and understandings and agreements which the executive departments have given us in connection with this bill. Most of you have made campaign statements registering your desire to stop blank check legislating by Congress. Well the time has now come to do something about those statements. By writing in a number limitation such as I propose we measure up to our responsibilities and we retain added congressional control of both our foreign and domestic policies.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Was the amendment which the gentleman is now offering offered in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. It was discussed in committee, but I think it was not offered.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman quoted Secretary Patterson. Is it not a fact that later on in the testimony the Secretary said that he thought it would be unwise, and that he made a mistake when he said he did not see any objection to limiting the number?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find such testimony in the hearings, I will be happy to have him read it to the House. I am unable to find such testimony.

Mr. RICHARDS. Did not the Secretary later on change his position?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find anything in the hearings to indicate that, let him read it. I cannot find it there.

Let me point this out. I feel this way about this amendment. The War Department comes to us frequently as it does to the Committee on Appropriations and says, "We want some money to run the Department." I do not think we should give them an unstipulated amount simply because we have confidence in the War Department, as we all have. I think the Congress has the responsibility to place limitations on that amount, and I think we have the responsibility to place limitations on the amount of power which we vacate as a legislative body. We are vacating some authority in this bill necessarily, and I am simply asking that we limit the amount of power that we vacate in this matter of sending military personnel abroad in this bill to 100 men to each of the countries, because Secretary Patterson has said those are all the men that he intends to use; twice as many as he intends to use, in fact. Let us therefore put in writing as a part of this legislation this limitation which can always be changed should necessity arise by subsequent action by the Congress.

My plea is simply against writing blank-check legislation unnecessarily. It is a bad habit to get into and we should avoid it when we can. We have an opportunity to do so now. I urge your support for this clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise mainly in order to propound a question or two to the author of the amendment, if I may have his attention.

Is the gentleman sure that this amendment was not considered and voted down in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure. I say, it was discussed in committee. I do not recall that it was voted down, because the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered a substitute, and I am not sure that either of them were voted on. It may have been.

Mr. JARMAN. Is the gentleman sure that Secretary Patterson did not later on say that he made a mistake when he said, "No."

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure about any mistake Mr. Patterson may or may not have made. I am only sure about what appears in the printed record, and I am sure he has not said anything on the Senate side or the House side to contradict that.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is not sure that he did not hear him say that?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am sure that I have not heard that he did not have any objection to any kind of limitation exceeding 100 men.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is sure that he did not hear him say later on that he was opposed to it, is he?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know what the gentleman is driving at. I ask the gentleman from Alabama the same question I asked the gentleman from South Carolina, if he has any reason to think there is other testimony in the record, let him read it to the Committee. Here is the sworn testimony of the Secretary on page 108.

Mr. JARMAN. I will answer that by saying we had many executive sessions.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that the specific question was asked of the Secretary in executive session and the Secretary said that he did make that statement in the opening meeting at the time, but that he wanted to change his mind, and he said that he would prefer not to have the number of people limited in the bill. That was in executive session. That is why it is not in the record.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. My remembrance of the Secretary's testimony is that his original agreement upon the size of the mission in Greece and Turkey would be predicated upon whether or not the mission now there, the British mission, would remain, but I very definitely remember, and I agree with the gentleman, that the Secretary said it would be most unwise, in the second hearing, to tie the hands of his Department or of the Navy Department in reference to this point.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I ask my colleagues of the House, please, do not tie the hands of our departments in an important matter such as this, in view of the testimony we have about it here today.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. May I say that in my opinion this is a crippling amendment. If we have any confidence left in the President of the United States and in the State Department and in General Marshall, we should not put this amendment into this bill.

Mr. JARMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman who is one of the ablest members of our committee, and I might add that we should not do so if we have any confidence in the Secretory of War, who is—well, I will not say what party he belongs to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was present at the hearings when the Secretary of War said he saw no objection to such an amendment limiting the number of military advisers to be sent to Greece and Turkey. Then I was ill for a few days and missed two committee meetings, but I certainly did not hear until just now of the reported retraction of his statement. However, if the Secretary of War later came before the committee in executive session and asked that we not put any restriction of this sort in the bill, which would leave the door open to an expeditionary force, that is all the more reason, I think, why the amendment should be adopted.

I am for this bill. I have crusaded for 16 years against appeasement of any country expanding its territory by aggression. I spoke the best I could for this bill on yesterday and will again if I get a chance. But what I am for is our aiding free countries struggling to maintain their independence, by our sending over material assistance and selected officers and men to review and screen the needs and requests and to see that the assistance we send is well used. I cannot for a moment support the bill if perchance by any stretch of interpretation of language it could permit an expeditionary force, or even a battalion of our armed forces to go into these countries either in addition to British troops or in substitution for British troops. If the day should come when that sort of thing is needed, I feel that those in charge must come again before the Congress and make their case. If they make a good case, Congress presumably would support it. But I cannot go along with any other interpretation, and I am constrained to support and urge the committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman well knows that the bill provides that these military men we send over are to act in an advisory capacity only. By no means could that interpretation be stretched to mean combatants.

Mr. JUDD. Then, what possible objection can the gentleman have to putting into the bill that which would so enormously reassure the people of America. I think we would pick up a great many more votes here in the House of Representatives, if all were sure military personnel is to be limited to a definite number of officers and men for training and by no possible construction include, to use the gentleman's word, combatants.

Mr. KEE. The objection I have to it is this. The Secretary returned to the committee after he made the statement quoted by the gentleman from Minnesota and said it would be crippling to his Department if they wanted to send a few more advisory men, and asked us not to insert any limitation.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman object to 200, then?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. It was stated at the time, if I remember correctly—this was in executive session; perhaps I should not say that—it was stated that if they thought of sending a battleship over there and they had more than a hundred men on that ship, according to the bill, they could not send the battleship over there.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly the gentleman is not suggesting that sending battleships would come under the authorization of this act. Of course, they could be sent by the Commander in Chief for visits under his present authority.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not mean for military purposes or for war purposes, but they could not go over there if it could be construed that they would send that many people on one ship.

Mr. JUDD. This reads "in an advisory capacity only." Surely we would not be sending over a battleship in an advisory capacity.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman was talking about combatant troops.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly right. I do not know exactly the attitude of the former chairman. He says, "I am telling you what happened in an executive session here or an executive session there." I believe an executive session is an executive session, so I am not going to discuss those matters. But let me say this: My amendment says, under the purposes of this act, limit it to 100. It has nothing to do with a battleship, because sending a battleship over there is something else. I am talking about the purposes of this act and the 100 limitation which Secretary Patterson said is twice as many men as he needs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not talking about battleships or soldiers being sent over there. That is not in the realm of possibility under this bill. What I wanted to ask the gentleman is this: Would it not be ridiculous to embark on a courageous policy such as is proposed here today and spend $400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money under a limitation that only 100 military advisory personnel could be sent, and then tell the Secretary of War or the President that even if he deemed it necessary he could not send 150 men over there to see that that money was wisely spent?

Mr. JUDD. I will state to the gentleman that I am willing to amend the amendment to increase the limit to 200. I certainly do not want us to be crippled or hampered in doing well what we are authorizing. My point is that we must not authorize more than was told us or than we have told the House and the country is the purpose of this bill. It is to make our people sure that we will not under this bill be sending over any large groups. I know that we do not intend to do that, but a great many millions of Americans are more disturbed on this point than on any other.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment is just one more illustration of the feeling that a great many people have that if we only tie our own hands we are safe. I say this with considerable reluctance because I have a very high regard for the gentleman from

South Dakota. He is a good friend of mine. But over the years in this country there seems to have been a feeling on the part of many fine citizens that we should be fearful of our own power and that, therefore, if we can shackle Uncle Sam we are really going to be able to have peace.

In the first place, the British mission in Greece—I do not have the exact figure before me—I believe numbers around four or five hundred. If they for some reason or other have to withdraw, under this amendment we could not provide the personnel to take their place.

I believe that the reason for this amendment is the fear that some incident may arise between some American in uniform and—some Greek guerrilla, perhaps—which would arouse in us back here a desire to pursue the matter with explosive consequences. I would just like to say that one of my oldest friends was a naval attaché in Warsaw, a colonel in the Marine Corps. He was murdered and I do not recall that there was much about it in the press.

I would like to say further that you do not avoid trouble by simply limiting the number of military personnel. A civilian can be a cause of disturbance just as readily as a man in uniform. I believe that the men in uniform that we have to worry about are not the Americans. I believe that it is time that we made our meaning entirely clear, and that if we are going to pass this measure we should not handicap those who are charged with its execution.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman spoke about shackling Uncle Sam. If this bill passes, do you think we are shackling Uncle Sam by giving $400,000,000 under this program?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call the attention of my friends the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the specific language of the bill, which is very plain and capable of only one construction. I quote:

by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries in an advisory capacity only.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts stressed that language.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I got the implication from the gentleman's remarks, which I might add were very frank, that these forces that we are sending over might possibly replace the British who are there now numbering about 500, I believe.

Mr. LODGE. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. They are not forces. These are men we are sending over to screen military and naval demands and to act in an advisory capacity only, according to the language of the bill. The British have a large mission there, and it might become advisable or necessary, in view of the fact that most of the equipment will be ours, that the British retire some of their men and that we take their place.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Are the British there in an advisory capacity or in a shooting capacity? Are they armed or are they just advisers?

Mr. LODGE. The British mission is there in an advisory capacity. The British forces which consist, I believe, of a brigade—about 10,000 men—are there for policing purposes.

Oh, the mission is there, naturally, not in a shooting capacity. The purpose of the mission is not to shoot. The purpose of a soldier is to shoot.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But if we go there we will shoot.

Mr. LODGE. No. I am talking about combat troops.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They will be armed, will the, not?

Mr. LODGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am afraid he has not quite got the distinction in mind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that under the present language we could have an adviser in every company in the Greek Army or even in every squad?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose it would be impossible for any lawyer to draft a contract or a law that could not be abused by someone who wanted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD to the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Strike out the figure "100" and insert the figure "200."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to limit the proper activities of the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy in carrying out this act which I feel involves what may ultimately be almost a life and death matter for the United States. I mean just that in all seriousness. But I cannot believe we ought to pass this piece of legislation without making crystal clear to every mother and father and citizen in the United States exactly what we are doing. I cannot believe, on the basis of any testimony I have heard, that they can rightly object to a limitation of 200 by the War Department and 200 by the Navy Department. That seems to me a generous estimate of what "a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only," could mean. So I hope that many who have been opposing this amendment to limit to 100 will accept it on the basis of 200. It seems to me it improves the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. This is the first time in my life I ever heard of any missionary advocating that this country send military men to try to Christianize people. I have never heard any missionary or a church advocate that we should send only a hundred or 200 armed men into any country to try to aid and assist them in a Christian way. I hope the gentleman will eliminate all armed men that we are talking about sending into Greece and Turkey, and send more missionaries and more medical missionaries over there.

Mr. JUDD. So far as I know no one has suggested we send military men to any country to try to Christianize people. We are suggesting that it is right and proper and sensible to send military men to threatened peoples to help them retain their independence instead of allowing them to be murdered or enslaved as people have been wherever Communists have taken over. It so happens that my own church has had missionaries and medical missionaries in Greece and Turkey for many decades. Does the gentleman think he can send missionaries to any people dominated by Russian communism? If the gentleman will examine the record of the person who is speaking, he will discover that all during the 1930's, when I was taking fragments of American scrap iron out of the bodies and brains of innocent Chinese men, women, and children, I was trying my best to get my country to adopt a policy of not helping an aggressor, a policy which would prevent murder of the people of Asia and of the United States. I am for this bill because I believe it will prevent, or greatly reduce, the murder of people in Europe and probably of Americans, too. I think that is a worthy cause for a missionary, especially a missionary doctor, to support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has just said this is a question of most vital importance to the welfare of our country. He is correct in that. But if his statement is true, why shackle the United States? If the amendment limiting the number of this kind of personnel to 100 is bad, then it follows that a limitation of 200 is bad. I think it would be unwise for the Congress of the United States to embark on a policy such as we propose here today, costing $400,000,000, and then to say to the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, "You must go over there and carry out the purposes we have expressed in this legislation, but you are limited to 100 or 200 of a certain kind of personnel that it is absolutely necessary for us to have on the ground to make this program a success."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The phraseology of the bill is "a limited number and in an advisory capacity only." These phrases have got to be considered together. "Limited" means the minimum number

necessary to carry out the policies of this act.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope this amendment and all amendments to it will be killed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The word "limited," to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers, means absolutely nothing unless Congress exercises its right and authority and describes it in certain terms. "Limited" could mean 100,000 as well as 100 or 200. It all depends on who is administering the act. We are defining the word "limited" as meaning not more than 200 to act in an advisory capacity.

I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is what the British say they are doing with 10,000 men in Greece, acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize, of course, that a logical argument can be made from that angle, but what does the gentleman have to say about the phrase "advisory capacity only?"

Mr. MUNDT. I say in answer to that that the British say their troops are over there solely in an advisory capacity, yet they have 10,000 of them there. I suppose they are advising the people to maintain law and order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill contemplates that part of the aid to be sent to Greece may be such things as airplanes and tanks.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, how can we expect to train these people in the use of this mechanized equipment with 100 men or 200 men? I do not think it can be done. We have got to have mechanics and servicemen.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is absurd to think so.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering if the gentleman had figured out in dollars and cents the cost of 100 or 200 or many more? And also I think it is important that this membership should know that we are not talking in the terms of the brigade of British soldiers that are there in camp, we are talking only in terms of permission.

Some of us have felt very deeply troubled because there was no limitation in this, because of some of the rumors that have been going about. I believe it is because of that that this amendment has been offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. If we could reassure the people of this country that what we are sending into Greece is a mission, not troops; that it is a limited mission and that we do not propose to permit the situation to become such that the army could use the $400,000,000 and nobody else get anything the people would feel better. The point and purpose of this proposal, as I see it, is not troops but it is economy of various kinds, bankers, specialists, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that somebody is letting the cat out of the bag. One of the things which really concerns the people of America in the consideration of this legislation is this question of military personnel. The bill says "a limited number of members of the military services." How many constitute "a limited number"? I think the best evidence on this point is to be found in the hearings before the committee at page 351 where the following statement is made:

> Secretary Forrestal suggested before the committee that perhaps at the outset 3 or 4 naval officers and possibly 20 or 25 men would be sufficient for the limited purpose of advising the Greek authorities. Secretary Patterson indicated a rough estimate of approximately between 10 and 40 Army officers might be adequate for similar purposes.

They are only supposed to serve in an advisory capacity.

The Mundt amendment raises the figure to 100 men in Greece and 100 men in Turkey. In the substitute amendment presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] the figure is raised to 200. This is a limitation which the fathers and mothers of America want. I am sure that much of the correspondence Members of Congress have received on this bill is to the effect that the people of the country are generally in favor of giving relief to the starving women and children of Greece, but they are afraid of the military features of the bill.

I do not care whether you call members of the military services advisors or not. It is very easy under this loose language to have 15,000 or more advisors on the ground. It seems to me that the statements made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as to the number of men actually needed as advisers should bear great weight. The hearings specifically state the number they need. The amendments proposed therefore are generous indeed and we should write the limitations into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in order to allay the fears of the fathers and mothers of America it is my firm conviction that a definite limitation as to the number of military personnel and advisors that are to go into Greece and Turkey, should be written into the bill. Therefore I shall support the Judd substitute and if that fails, I expect to support the original amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Preferential motion offered by Mr. BENDER: "Mr. BENDER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, you have a demonstration of how hell will break loose in Greece and Turkey in the way hell has broken loose here in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Apparently there is a difference of opinion as to what this person heard and what the other person heard. One thing I know is that day before yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and a number of other gentleman were in my office at which time there was present a young lady who was employed by UNRRA in Greece and who was shot by British bullets in Greece.

You are going into a shooting business when you go into this thing. When you go into this on the $400,000,000 basis, you are just beginning. For example, this story has been kept out of the newspapers, and so far there has been a successful attempt to keep it secret, but I understand that behind the walls of the State Department there is great excitement and frantic scurrying around over the report that American equipment for five full divisions of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army in China has fallen into the hands of the Chinese Communist forces.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I expect there is considerable agitation in the State Department. But this is just the sort of thing which we can expect under the Truman doctrine of sending military supplies to unrepresentative regimes on the theory of stopping communism.

All we will accomplish is to promote and prolong civil wars. Yes, we can send American materials of war to Greece and Turkey, to every trouble spot in the world—but we will wake up to find that the same thing is happening to it as is happening in China.

If this is the State Department's way of maintaining American prestige and security in the world—by dropping American taxpayers' money down the drain—I say it is a very poor way indeed.

This bill provides that two-thirds of the money is to be spent for military equipment to engage in civil war in Turkey and Greece. Now you are talking about sending 100 men or 200 men. What difference does it make? Hell will break loose just as hell is breaking loose on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Foreign Relations as the result of the controversy over this matter.

My friends, we are advocating that this thing be handled by the United Nations. That is not isolationism. I heard the distinguished gentleman from

Texas last night make an eloquent appeal against isolationism. Well, it is isolationism to engage in this unilateral program of ours when we have the United Nations to work through. Why not refer this matter in just that way?

I say that we are not going to be rushed into immediate passage of this measure if we have to sit here all next week. I trust there are a sufficient number of persons on the floor of this House who are interested and wish to be heard. We have good amendments on the desk here. We have amendments that should be considered in the manner in which we consider amendments on other measures.

This is the most important measure that we have had before us since I have been a Member of Congress during the past five terms. No other legislation has been as important as this. No other legislation will involve us in so much trouble, in so many heartaches, in so much bloodshed, as this measure will. I trust that we will consider this and not give this thing the bum's rush which obviously is attempted here in considering this amendment in 5 or 10 minutes. Let us take plenty of time. We can stay here from early morning until late at night. The majority leader said, "How about your amendments?" I said, "I am going to offer every one of them." He said, "Do you think we ought to meet in the morning at 10 o'clock?" I said, "You can meet at 9 o'clock and you can sit until midnight; you can meet on Saturday and you can meet on Monday and consider this thing the way it should be considered and not in a slipshod, haphazard manner."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My point of order is that on the pending amendment the period of debate is 10 minutes; 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, if someone claims 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if no member of the committee or anyone else desires to rise in opposition, I seek recognition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, according to the rules defined by the distinguished gentleman, the point is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not press the point of order.

Mr. EATON. I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why do we not vote on this amendment now?

Mr. EATON. Of course, that is what I want to do. Everybody understands what this does. It kills the bill. If we want to kill the bill, let us vote on it and decide now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 37, noes 127.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement to limit debate on these amendments. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. BUSBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think it was generally understood that everyone was going to be given a chance to debate this bill and the amendments thereto. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would not press his unanimous-consent request because I do not like to be in the position of objecting. I think every Member that is on his feet ought to have 5 minutes to speak on these amendments, because we are getting into the same situation here as we did before, of turmoil, of everybody hollering to vote, vote, vote, and not listening to the debate. I think it would be a good thing under the conditions if the Committee rose.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that there would be no effort made as we progressed here a reasonable period of time through today, and tomorrow, if necessary, to limit debate in the consideration of this measure. The gentleman from New Jersey indicated in connection with his request that debate be limited to 10 minutes on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto that he wondered how many wanted to speak. I am quite sure he would be perfectly willing to amend his request. It is not a motion, it is a request subject to objection. No one wants to force anyone to object. If those who want to speak will rise and so indicate, then the time can be adjusted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that on this amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; and the amendments thereto. That does not limit debate. If everyone who wants to speak will rise, I am quite sure the chairman will amend his request in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The request as it stands is for a limitation of 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from New Jersey care to amend his request?

Mr. EATON. I would be glad to do so. I want everybody to have a chance to have his say. How many wish to speak on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a tally by the Clerk shows 14 Members have arisen.

Mr. EATON. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of both the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I have a like amendment at the Clerk's desk which would limit the military personnel in either country to 100. I mentioned that earlier in the debate today. It is not particularly material whether the number be fixed at 100 or 200, but certainly it seems to me there should be some limitation on the number of military forces which we send to these two countries.

The Secretary of War testified at page 108 of the record, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that anywhere from 10 to 40 military personnel is the present estimate in Greece and a comparable number in Turkey. Following that, he was asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I quote:

> Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

Now the point is made that on some other occasion, at some other place, he corrected this testimony and asked, in effect, for no limitation whatever on the size of the forces which we might send to these countries. I have the highest regard for our distinguished Secretary of War and am very anxious that none of my remarks should in any way be construed as critical of him. I am sure that he would be, as many of us would, the last one to take any step which would involve this country in armed conflict. He has been a fighting soldier and knows what war is. I realize, too, that considerations of security may require that not all of the testimony which was given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be spread upon this record. It is only natural that the Secretary of War, in the discharge of his duties, should prefer to have complete and uncontrolled discretion.

If these amendments should fail I shall still vote for this bill for the reasons I have given earlier today. But it is my sincere hope that a majority will see the merit in the proposal which has here been made, for I cannot escape the feeling that we, as a Congress, are charged with a heavy responsibility to see to it that nothing is done to alter the essential character of the legislation which we are about to adopt.

No one from the distinguished committee which reports this bill, no one in the unanimous report of the parallel committee in the other body, has indicated to us that it is the intention to send any substantial numbers of American officers or men to either of these countries. The committee report, here, at the bottom of page 4, says:

> Combat forces are not to be sent to Greece or Turkey. The military assistance provided in the bill is to consist only of arms and

other supplies for the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. These supplies are to be provided on the basis of investigations and recommendations by small military missions sent out by the United States in an advisory capacity only. Testimony of Government witnesses indicates that the military mission to Greece would probably not exceed 40 and the naval mission would probably be less than 30. In the case of Turkey it is expected that the missions would not be larger.

It is in reliance upon these assurances, given to us in entire good faith, that many of us are supporting this measure. Those assurances, I know, will still hold good if these amendments are defeated. But it seems to me that we should, by the adoption of one of these amendments, make it crystal clear to the mothers and fathers and wives of the young men of this country that we have not embarked upon a militaristic venture, that forces are not being sent to these countries to fight, that they are not shooting soldiers, but simply advisers to the appropriate authorities in these two countries.

The point is made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that the words "limited" and "advisory" in section 1, paragraph 3 of this bill should be accepted as sufficient indication of a limitation. I may say to the gentleman that during my service in the China-Burma-India theater we were supposed to have a limited number of military personnel in China for, if not advisory, at least, training purposes only. But that number ran into thousands and thousands of officers and men. For the most part, and with few exceptions, they were not there to fight a shooting war, but for advisory and training purposes of the Chinese Army. I know nothing of that kind is intended in this present measure. If it were, I would never support it. It would be a negation of the first point made in my remarks earlier today that this is a step toward peace and not toward war. But my point is that the people of this country are apprehensive and we should give them the assurance, by clear language, that no such purpose is envisioned by this legislation.

As I said before, I should not want to undermine this bill by supporting a crippling amendment. I do not consider these, Mr. Chairman, to be such. They seem to me to be clarifying provisions which should merit our favorable response.

I regret that I find myself in disagreement on this point with the distinguished chairman and majority of the members of this committee which has labored so assiduously over this bill. I could not be easy in my conscience, however, were I to oppose an amendment which simply, as I construe it, says that we mean by this bill to carry out exactly what the committee has told us in their report, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree with me also that when a man of the responsible position of Secretary of War, not just in an offhand remark but through a discussion of several pages of hearings insisted that he does not expect to use over 40 or 50 men and says he does not object to a limitation of 100, certainly he would not object to a limitation of over 200. Yet, there are those who say they have heard whispers in the dark that he does object. There is still time before we vote to go to the telephone and call him and then tell the House in public that he wants no limitation. I do not think he is going to say that. Congress has a responsibility in this matter.

Mr. KEATING. May I say to the gentleman, if the Secretary does mean that, there is certainly no evidence before us to that effect, which I am sure he, as a distinguished former jurist, would agree we should have, to form the basis for any decision to oppose these amendments. In the absence of any such testimony, we should accept the record before us to the effect that about 70 military and naval personnel in both these countries is the number contemplated.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate committee brings out the same point. I think the country has the right to have the assurance of Congress that we are supporting the Secretary of War in his suggested limitation, but let us not have any more blank checks. They can become dangerous and expensive experiments.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman entirely and thank him for his helpful comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

We certainly ought not continue to try to fool the American people, try to soft-soap them and give out sop to the American people that we are entering into this thing of the United States becoming the world policeman and that we are going to limit it by legislation to a hundred or two hundred men. What is the purpose of this bill? One of the purposes is to furnish military aid to equip and train a Turkish Army of about 500,000 men. We are going to send tanks and guns and everything else that is necessary over there to equip the Turkish Army. Now, we are attempting to salve the American people by saying there is not going to be any war come of this, because we are just going to send a hundred or two hundred men over there in an advisory capacity. Does that make sense?

I am opposed to this bill, but even so, if you are going to pass the bill I do not want to hamstring the people who are going to put the legislation into effect by saying, "You can have only 100 or 200 people to go over there to spend all these millions of dollars in Turkey." This legislation is a military project. No one denies that. I cannot just understand how my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, and the gentleman from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT, for both of whom I have the greatest respect, could offer such amendments as these if they are genuinely for this bill. It would be the same thing if we would say to the President of the United States, "We are going to declare war on Russia tomorrow but we are going to limit you as to military strength. You can have only three or four divisions to fight the war with. We think that is enough." We ought to be frank about this thing.

Now, under this bill we are going over there. What for? To fence Russia in. Is anyone so gullible as to believe that such an undertaking is a job for 100 or 200 men?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is taking a consistent position. At the top of page 108, when the Secretary was asked about the number of men, he said:

I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate. We base that in part upon the assumption that the British Military Mission will continue in Greece for the time being at least.

But if that estimation does not come to pass, what if the British Mission does pull out? How many men would you need then?

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I think the gentleman is correct. It seems to me to be child's play to get up here and say we are genuinely for this thing, we are going into this all-out Truman policy to police the world if necessary, but we are going to limit you to a couple of hundred men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you hear the Secretary of War before your committee the other day testify that the United States was going to be the boss of the world?

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not remember that; but this policy, of course, contemplates just that.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to heartily commend the gentleman on his very statesmanlike attitude. He is opposed to the bill; but if it is going to pass, he does not want the President to be hamstrung. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question. I wonder if it would have made any difference whether we had a law on the statute books prohibiting the sending of over 20,000 men abroad on the day of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman's question answers itself, of course. You can tell the American people that we are going to send their boys over in an advisory capacity but when the first American boy is shot everyone knows that the American people, of course, will then spend all the money they have and all the men they have and then the third world war will be under way. That is the reason I am opposed to the bill, and certainly I am not going to try to soft-soap the American people now by saying that we are going to send only a hundred or two hundred men.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not also a fact that if we are going to stop Russia and if it is going to do any good, we have got to convince Russia that we mean it; and we will never convince her that we mean it by sending a few men over there and then saying we are not going to back them up.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

If my friends who are supporting the Truman policy of having America police the world, and take on all comers who disagree with Mr. Truman all over the world and who favor this sort of military alinement, they should frankly tell the American people that they are backing the policy with every dollar we possess and with the lives of every American son who can tote a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to granting military aid in any form. It will be a dangerous precedent. I do recommend, however, that any money spent in either country should be used to build schools, hospitals, missions, and so forth, and to feed the hungry.

I believe in relief and reconstruction.

I agree with Paul A. Porter, chief of the American Economic Mission to Greece, in that outside assistance is required for the survival of a democratic Greek state and we must make available funds for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

I have always favored a foreign policy of friendly relations with all countries and domination by none.

Why now this sudden anticommunistic action, when we permitted the division of Poland and the overrunning of the Balkans by the communistic forces, in fact, aided them; permitted placarding and the dissemination of material and propaganda in Italy so that in the last election the Communists polled 1,250,000 votes; informed the world through our action in the United Nations Assembly in that we condemn General Franco, who is the only man that has been and still is fighting communism?

Communism cannot be fought with money or bullets. It can be fought successfully only by feeding the people, sheltering the people, making them feel secure and free of fear and want.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, am not in favor of this bill due to its military-aid clause, and therefore will vote against it.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the attempts to define what "advisory capacity" means from a military point of view. Let me tell you it is absolutely meaningless.

I have seen the preliminaries of two World Wars in which this Nation has been engaged. I remember the maneuvering very well, as, being an adult in the naval service, I knew that I should be an active participant in them. Mr. Chairman, the present set-up is the same in substance as those which led up to World Wars I and II. In both cases we gave powers to the President which permitted him to get us into the war without the consent of the Congress. The Congress believes that it has the sole power to declare that a state of war exists for this Nation. It is merely fooling itself—suffering under a delusion—for in both of the two great World Wars we have fought the Nation was in the war under Executive directives before the matter was put up to the Congress. The Congress was merely a rubber stamp; it only confirmed what was already a fact—that a state of war existed. Are we going to do that again by granting this blank-check authority in this bill? Are we going to allow the administration to maneuver us into a position from which there is no way out except war or backing water in the face of the world? Are we going to send unlimited military personnel to get us embroiled in European squabbles? I know that the bill says that military personnel shall act in "an advisory capacity only." But just what does that mean, anyhow? Are American military aviators sitting in the observers' seat alongside the pilot in a combat plane advisers or combatants? Are American naval officers on board a fighting ship which may be sunk by the enemy advisers or fighting personnel? You know the answer as well as I do. They are combatants, and there is no other way to look at it. They are just as much combatants as were the American Army aviators who were sent to China to fight against the Japanese while we were still neutral.

Military and civilian personnel occupy quite different places in the category of reasons for international trouble. Civilians can be expended without any great accounting therefor, but military personnel abroad are recognized as clear-cut representatives of the nation they serve. When the time comes that some of the "members of our military services" who are acting in "an advisory capacity only" are killed in combat with Soviet forces we shall howl for vengeance and the fighting part of the third world war will be right on our doorsteps.

Perhaps we think that the probable gains justify the risks we shall assume. In that event I have no criticism. My sole object is to bring the terrific risks of this bill to your attention.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Gladly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman from Oklahoma made a statement to the effect that the reaction in this country would be terrific if only one American were killed in this undertaking. Last summer when Yugoslavia shot down six of our American flyers, there was nothing done about it. They were not even brought before the International Court of Justice of the United Nations for an accountability of their actions. I doubt very much if there is going to be any arousing over this situation since we passed that incident over.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman satisfied if we are to take action to stop communism in Greece and Turkey that we ought to immediately take it from a military standpoint?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I would not quite say that. I am very much distressed about where we are going from here, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I concede that the proposition to make these loans to Greece and Turkey is such that even the closest friends could differ about it.

I criticize no Member of the Congress for voting for this proposal, although I intend to vote against it for what, to me, appear compelling reasons.

We are given only two little glimpses, so to speak, of this whole proposition, the final pattern of which may be, and probably will be, a third world war. If this eventuates, we would have to fight alone and unaided. There is not a nation in all Europe which could or would engage in another war at this time to help us even though they were so inclined. This time they would expect us to do it all—finance it, fight it, and feed them while doing it. The result undoubtedly would be an impoverished America left depleted of its resources, insolvent, confused, and bewildered in a world of chaos.

The administration—and I refer, of course, to the executive branch of the Government—has not seen fit to be frank with us. They have not informed us as to what the whole of this new foreign policy is, or what it involves.

We are asked to extend loans which we must concede are military loans to be directed explicitly at preventing the expansion of Soviet despotism throughout Europe, Asia, and the Orient.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of propositions on which the Congress and the American people are entitled to enlightenment before this proposal is voted on.

In the first place, is this the first step in a move to actually stop Russia, even though it may lead to another long and bloody war?

In the second place, if it is the first step in a move to force the iron curtain back to the borders of Russia, does anybody know what the total cost may be in blood and money? The American people have been told nothing about these two problems.

If this is a proposition to stop Soviet expansion in Europe, $400,000,000 is a mere drop in the bucket, and when the demands of all other nations—if this program is embarked upon—have been met, the cost will not be hundreds of millions but many billions of dollars. If

it is not to stop Russia, then we are embarking upon a course repugnant to every American tradition. Our reward will be the hatred and the enmity of those we seek to help. Finally, we will have to pay all the costs and do all the fighting, whether we stop Russia or not.

If we are going to stop Russia, what are we going to do about all the nations which are now behind the Stalin iron curtain—nations like Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, honest little Finland, Estonia, Russian-occupied Germany? The American people have been given no light on that question.

If we are going to make these loans to stop Russia, how much more are we going to have to lend to Great Britain? How many more billions are we to lend to France? How many more billions must we hand to Italy? How many more millions must we lend to China? What are we going to do about India? What are we going to do about Palestine?

To embark upon this program, even though we do not engage in war in the next 15 or 20 years, means the maintenance by the United States of America of a national defense stronger than that of any other war machine in the world, at an expense which would constitute a further crushing burden on our taxpayers for the next 10 generations. The administration has given us no light on that problem.

If we embark upon this new course, which constitutes a complete and radical departure from our traditional American policy, and furthermore, an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, are we prepared to finance all the countries of the world? Are we prepared to police with troops all the countries we would have to subjugate? On these grave questions the administration gives us no light.

If we embark upon this course, we will either hand over more multiplied billions of our money in gifts—they are not loans—to be administered by foreigners with the result that large portions of these hard-earned billions will be stolen, and that other portions will go to finance Soviet puppet governments in satellite states as has already been the case with UNRRA. Either this, or else we will have to police with special commissions of Americans, both military and civil, the expenditure of these billions in such countries. If we do that, then we shall have adopted the British colonial policy and an imperialistic technique whether we like it or whether we do not. The administration has given us no light on that subject.

Are we going to have to maintain a great standing Army, an extensive Navy, manned by American boys and girls under compulsory military service, in order to provide troops constantly to police the rest of the world while we shell out the money? The administration has given us no light on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, of course, but I told several of our people that I thought the Committee was going to rise around 5:30. I spoke to the Speaker. I have not yet spoken to the majority leader or the Chairman of the Committee. I wonder what the majority leader would think about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. We tried to get some limitation on the debate simply for the purpose of determining how many wanted to speak. It was indicated that we might run as long as 70 minutes, and on that we concluded to go along and see what might develop. There are different opinions as to whether we might proceed to vote on this amendment if the time could be shortly concluded, but if it cannot, then certainly there should be no reason to hold the Committee late tonight, because I propose to have the Committee come in at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it would be a merciful thing that, when the gentleman from Michigan completes his 5 minutes, the Committee might rise.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if, pending that, we could reach an agreement on how many more want to speak.

Mr. RAYBURN. There were 14 a while ago.

Mr. BLOOM. There are three on this side that are not here at the moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the matter is under the control of the Chairman of the Committee, but if he sees fit to have the Committee rise at the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, certainly that would meet with my approval.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, whatever the answer to these questions may be, I feel very deeply that the American people should be given at least all possible information, if not definite answers, before we, their representatives, are asked to vote to commit our Nation to this course.

Before taking this step, I believe we should again look at the money we ladled out in lend-lease while we sent our millions of troops into the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Pacific theaters of war, from which hundreds of thousands of them never returned.

I think we should remind the American people that previous experience tells us that these so-called loans are not loans at all: they are gifts. I think, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the American people ought to be reminded that these loans are not just pieces of paper; they are not merely disks of metal. They represent our raw materials, which are rapidly disappearing; they represent the wealth, the real wealth; they represent the toil and sweat and the energy, the very lifeblood of our American economic structure and of our American citizens: goods and services, manufactured goods, toil and sweat and energy and wealth pouring out of this country, never to return.

How long can the American people endure this constant drain upon their resources? The administration has given us no hint of the answer to that momentous question.

Mr. Chairman, how long can one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million Americans labor and sweat to feed the hungry peoples of the rest of the world, to rebuild shattered agriculture and the shattered industry of the other nations of the world? Is there not a grave danger that, instead of rescuing the rest of the world from starvation and ruin, we may so deplete our financial and material resources that we will go down to ruin and chaos with them? The administration gives us no light on this question.

Every economist in this country knows that the great depression of the 1930's was an aftermath of the First World War. The billions of dollars and the loans and expenditures which we made in that war and after that war were not repaid. These debts will never be repaid. Those loans represented goods, raw materials, energy, sweat, and toil, and they took so much of the lifeblood out of our American economy that, when the European nations repudiated their debts, our economy was prostrated by exhaustion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the time when we should review the costs in money we have already poured out—the billions, yes, the hundreds of billions, we have already spent in foreign wars. I, therefore, shall include as a part of my remarks a statement from the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945, showing the amounts foreign nations still owe the United States from World War I. That amount in the aggregate is $14,000,000,000. Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement showing how the expenditures of $50,500,000,000 given away by the United States in lend-lease was apportioned between nations.

Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a short statement showing how the United States settled lend-lease at an 89-percent loss.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the RECORD also a statement showing the quotas for the International Monetary Fund for the countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference.

Following that, I desire to insert an article from the Washington Post of yesterday, May 7, 1947, showing that the United States is the only nation permitting the World Bank to lend its money while the other nations that agreed to put money into the World Bank have not done so.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a statement showing how the International Monetary Fund functions. The administration has given us no information lately on the condition of this fund. The American people are entitled to know what has happened to the $2,750,000,000 we have put into that Fund.

Next I desire to insert in the RECORD a table showing the countries which received aid from UNRRA. I also desire to insert in the RECORD a short article showing how Americans have made generous

contributions to foreign peoples even outside of UNRRA.

I now want to introduce a statement showing as of March 8, 1946, how many foreign assets other nations possessed in the United States—and they run into the billions—while we are being besieged with demands and pleas for loans and for charity by almost every government in the world.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on Sunday, March 30, 1947, an article in the Times-Herald, under the signature of Lloyd Norman, showed that we have outstanding, outside of lend-lease, $9,280,000,000 in loans to 58 foreign countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to close my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "Where's the Money Coming From?"

This information should reach the people of the United States, because it is the citizens of this country who will have to do the fighting and the dying, as well as the paying, if there is another war. Our people, for generations to come, must do the paying for all this even though there is never another war.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I cannot vote for this proposition and be faithful to my solemn oath of office.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945]

FOREIGN NATIONS STILL OWE UNITED STATES FOURTEEN BILLION FROM WORLD WAR I—THIS DEBT WILL NEVER BE PAID

Foreign countries still owed the United States $14,791,340,307 in World War I debts on July 1, 1945, the Treasury said yesterday.

"Total indebtedness" includes unpaid principal, interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements, and interest accrued and unpaid under the agreements.

The United States has forgiven no World War I debts.

The following table includes total payments, by countries, of principal and interest on the debts. The debts of Russia and Armenia were not funded, however.

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal paid	Interest paid
Armenia	$27,391,079		
Belgium	503,579,077	$19,157,630	$33,033,642
Czechoslovakia	175,072,336	19,829,914	304,178
Estonia	24,491,700		1,248,431
Finland	8,574,063	1,157,868	5,847,626
France	4,006,635,664	226,039,588	260,036,302
Germany (Austrian debt)	26,024,539	862,668	
Great Britain	6,415,664,782	434,181,641	1,590,667,175
Greece	36,873,535	983,922	3,143,133
Hungary	2,740,938	73,958	482,924
Italy	2,052,213,409	37,464,319	63,365,560
Latvia	10,114,980	9,200	752,349
Lithuania	9,064,140	234,783	1,003,172
Poland	306,497,824	1,287,297	21,359,000
Romania	74,926,280	4,498,632	292,374
Russia	448,079,238		8,750,312
Yugoslavia	63,396,719	1,952,000	636,059

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 16, 1946]

FIFTY AND FIVE-TENTHS BILLIONS SPENT BY UNITED STATES IN LEND-LEASE

(Verbatim excerpts)

The extent to which the United States shouldered the production burden of World War II was made evident * * * in a Treasury Department report revealing the grand total of lend-lease as $50,596,698,000.

In reverse lend-lease the United States received a total of $7,000,387,000.

* * * the British Empire and Soviet Russia were the principal beneficiaries of America's aid.

A total of $31,367,559,000 worth of the weapons and tools of war went to the British Empire, and lend-lease assistance to Russia totaled $11,266,642,000.

The United States received from the British Empire in reverse lend-lease a total of $6,319,792,000, and from Russia a total of $2,212,000.

The report covers lend-lease operations from March 11, 1941, through August 31, 1946.

Besides the British Empire and Russia, top recipients of American weapons, supplies and services were:

France and possessions	$3,230,660,000
China	1,557,399,000
Netherlands and possessions	246,000,000
Belgium	153,235,000
Greece	71,526,000
Norway	52,216,00
Yugoslavia	32,027,000

The American Republics received a total of $459,410,000, Brazil being the No. 1 recipient with a total of $332,919,000.

Aid to the British Empire included more than $3,000,000,000 worth of ordnance and ordnance stores, $6,000,000,000 worth of aircraft and aeronautical matériel, $3,000,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, $5,000,000,000 worth of ships, and $2,000,000,000 worth of miscellaneous military equipment.

Russia received more than $1,569,000,000 worth of aircraft and air equipment, $1,770,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, $1,256,000,000 worth of ships, and $789,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

Over all, the United States sent to its allies $8,559,000,000 worth of aircraft and air matériel, $7,044,000,000 worth of shipping, $6,327,000,000 in tanks and other vehicles, and $4,382,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

UNITED STATES SETTLED LEND-LEASE AT 89 PERCENT LOSS

(By Jack Doherty)

(Verbatim excerpts)

A Senate committee probe of the Anglo-American $650,000,000 lend-lease settlement began * * * with revelation we are getting back less than 11 cents on a dollar and with charges that United States methods of surplus-property disposal abroad are contributing to a system of cartels.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, told the Senate War Investigating Subcommittee that the settlement turned over to the British Government at cut prices stores of goods which the British could then dispose of at a profit.

FERGUSON and Senator Mead, Democrat, of New York, pointed out that Great Britain had forbidden direct sales to Britons of surplus property by the United States, even though the goods were located in the British Isles. This left the British Government the only practical customer for surplus goods and strengthened British bargaining power, they charged.

Subcommittee Chairman Tunnell, Democrat, of Delaware, said in an opening statement that the writing off by this Nation of the $6,021,164,850 British lend-lease account for $650,000,000 will probably set a pattern for settlements with other nations whether we like it or not.

He produced figures showing that with the settlement now an accomplished fact, the United States settled for 8½ cents on the dollar for unconsumed lend-lease stocks worth $5,552,144,850.

The United Kingdom also received $351,000,000 worth of surplus property which was still in the possession of American forces there, Tunnell said. This part of the account was settled for 17 cents on the dollar.

The third part of lend-lease settlement was on goods in the pipe line at the end of the war, for which Great Britain agreed to pay $118,000,000 of a balance of $118,020,000.

Quotas for International Monetary Fund for countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia	200
Belgium	225
Bolivia	10
Brazil	150
Canada	300
Chile	50
China	550
Colombia	50
Costa Rica	5
Cuba	50
Czechoslovakia	125
Denmark	(1)
Dominican Republic	5
Ecuador	5
Egypt	45
El Salvador	2.5
Ethiopia	6
France	450
Greece	40
Guatemala	5
Haiti	5
Honduras	2.5
Iceland	1
India	400
Iran	25
Iraq	8
Liberia	.5
Luxemburg	10
Mexico	90
Netherlands	275
New Zealand	50
Nicaragua	2
Norway	50
Panama	.5
Paraguay	2
Peru	25
Philippine Commonwealth	15
Poland	125
Union of South Africa	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,200
United Kingdom	1,300
United States	2,750
Uruguay	15
Venezuela	15
Yugoslavia	60
Total	8,600

[1] The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the fund after the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign the agreement but before signature takes place.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, page 546.

Subscriptions to the Bank for Reconstruction and Development allocated to countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia	200
Belgium	225
Bolivia	7
Brazil	105
Canada	325
Chile	35
China	600
Colombia	35
Costa Rica	2
Cuba	35
Czechoslovakia	125
Denmark	(1)
Dominican Republic	2
Ecuador	3.2
Egypt	40
El Salvador	1
Ethiopia	3
France	450
Greece	25
Guatemala	2
Haiti	2
Honduras	1
Iceland	1
India	400
Iran	24

Iraq	6
Liberia	.5
Luxemburg	10
Mexico	65
Netherlands	275
New Zealand	50
Nicaragua	.8
Norway	50
Panama	.2
Paraguay	.6
Peru	17.5
Philippine Commonwealth	15
Poland	125
Union of South Africa	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,200
United Kingdom	1,300
United States	3,175
Uruguay	10.5
Venezuela	10.5
Yugoslavia	40
Total	9,100

[1] The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the Bank after Denmark accepts membership in accordance with the Articles of Agreement.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, p. 550.

[From the United States News of July 6, 1945]

HOW THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND WILL FUNCTION

1. Forty-five nations pour $8,800,000,000 in gold and various currencies into the Fund. United States puts in $2,750,000,000 in dollars; Britain, $1,300,000,000 in pounds; Russia, $1,200,000,000 in rubles, and so forth. All put in some gold.

2. Nations then get together to decide what each currency is worth. Dollar must be valued at $35 an ounce for gold. Pound is likely to be $4.03; Canadian dollar, 91 cents. Values will be determined by agreement between Fund and members.

3. Members then agree to stop using money to regulate trade, to abandon currency warfare. They have 3 years to make adjustments, and, after 5 years, currency controls are supposed to be removed.

4. World trade resumes. A British importer wants to buy United States automobiles. He gets his bank to buy dollars with British pounds, so he can pay the United States factory for the shipment.

5. But many British importers may clamor for dollars, more dollars than England has. Then England goes to the Fund to buy dollars with more pounds. She can buy $325,000,000 a year—one-fourth of her total original contribution in pounds.

6. England cannot buy dollars from the Fund, however, without using some of her own gold and dollar reserves. The agreement is that, for each dollar bought from the Fund, England will use another dollar out of her own reserve.

7. Also, if British sales in the next year produce a surplus of dollars or gold, half of the increase must be given to the Fund in exchange for the Fund's pounds. This need not be done unless Britain's own reserves exceed her Fund quota.

8. Fund levies a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent of the amount of dollars bought. After 3 months, interest begins at one-half of 1 percent a year for 9 months, and steps up to 4 percent after 4 years. Meanwhile, Fund will try to correct British trade balances.

9. Before Britain buys too many dollars from the Fund, however, she will want to lower the value of the pound so as to make British goods cheaper and increase sales in world markets. She can lower the pound as much as 10 percent—to $3.63—after consulting the Fund.

10. If this doesn't correct the situation, the Fund can allow England to reduce the pound still more. But England can't make the cut unless the Fund approves, and the Fund can approve only if a cheaper pound is considered necessary.

11. Finally, all countries may be like Britain in this example and rush to buy dollars. That would make dollars scarce in the Fund. The Fund then can ration United States currency among members, and members then can act to protect their own dollar reserves.

12. The trade of each country is supposed to balance over a period of years, which will bring a balance in Fund accounts. If this doesn't happen, the International Bank will make long-term stabilization loans to reach a balance.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1947]

UNITED STATES ONLY NATION THAT LETS WORLD BANK LEND ITS MONEY

United States alone among the 44 nations in the World Bank has agreed to let the bank use its subscription payment to lend to other nations, an authoritative source said yesterday.

The other 43 say they are not in a position now to have their currencies lent out to other nations. This hold-back was described as unimportant at this particular time, however, since none of the nine members asking $2,553,875,000 in loans wants anything but United States dollars.

The bank's stock of subscribed dollars will be only $721,392,500, even after the United States finishes its subscription payments 3 weeks from now. The only way the bank can add to them in the near future is to get dollars from private American investors.

The bank is preparing now to borrow from these investors, so it will have more to lend to members, by selling—probably sometime this summer or fall—its own bonds in this country, in denominations as small as $1,000.

FRANCE FIRST IN LINE

Before then, and probably this month or next, the bank is expected to begin making loans out of its subscribed capital.

France is reported in informed quarters to be first in line for a loan, although it is more likely to be $200,000,000 than the $500,000,000 she applied for. Denmark, which wants $50,000,000, is described as due for a loan soon also.

The hold-back by virtually all members in permitting the bank to lend their currencies does not greatly worry officials of the bank, well-posted sources say, because the officials hope their permission will be given by the time their money is wanted.

The hold-back is attributed to the fact that many of the members were hard hit by the war and, at a time when they feel they must borrow to stage an economic comeback, they also feel they are in no position to put out money to lend.

NOT READY TO EXPORT

When a nation's money is lent out, it serves as a sort of ticket to buy in that country, and the hold-back members are said also to take the position that they aren't yet able to produce enough goods to sell freely for export.

Hold-backs in permitting the loan of subscribed funds are authorized for members under terms of the Bretton Woods agreement under which the bank and its twin, the World Monetary Fund, were organized a little over a year ago.

Members can hold back on that part of their subscriptions put up in their currencies, but not on the 2 percent of subscriptions they were required to pay in gold or United States dollars.

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1946]

TABLE OF UNRRA AID

(Verbatim excerpts)

Following are tables from a report of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. They break down the amount and kind of assistance furnished each of the principal beneficiaries:

Shipments program through Dec. 31, 1946, in thousands of tons

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear [1]	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation [2]	Unclassified [3]	Total
Greece	1,306	27	9	287	693	727	3,049
Yugoslavia	1,084	73	20	161	695	352	2,385
Poland	67	3	2	17	42	25	156
Do	806	80	27	386	493		1,792
Czechoslovakia	608	40	24	267	404		1,343
Italy	1,844	105	14	410	7,238		9,611
Austria	365	4	1	164	47	177	758
White Russia	72	6	1	44	22		145
Ukraine	209	19	2	41	112		383
China	1,094	155	37	558	907		2,751
Other programs	57	90	5	6	4	34	196
Total	7,512	602	142	2,341	10,657	1,315	22,569

[1] Includes textile raw materials.
[2] Includes coal and all raw materials except textile raw materials.
[3] Military shipments and items awaiting specification.

Shipment program through Dec. 31, 1946, in millions of dollars

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear [1]	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation [2]	Unclassified	Grand total
Greece	164.0	25.0	10.3	50.8	40.9	57.0	358.0
Yugoslavia	139.6	75.9	21.6	40.0	109.4	43.0	429.5
Albania	5.5	5.4	1.9	6.6	7.1	2.0	28.5
Poland	180.5	84.5	30.0	80.0	99.0		474.0
Czechoslovakia	107.0	29.5	26.5	33.4	73.6		270.0
Italy	195.7	55.9	16.0	29.5	127.4	.5	425.0
Austria	54.0	2.0	1.5	19.1	9.0	31.7	117.3
White Russia	28.9	7.4	1.2	5.7	17.8		61.0
Ukraine	100.2	21.7	2.8	17.4	46.9		189.0
China	131.5	95.9	41.3	80.0	186.3		535.0
Other programs	14.3	23.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	15.1	58.3
Total	1,112.2	436.2	155.6	363.5	719.9	149.3	2,945.6

[1] Values, f. a. s.
[2] Includes textile raw materials.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 11, 1946]

AMERICANS GENEROUS EVEN OUTSIDE UNRRA

(By Robert Taylor)

Verbatim excerpts

United States citizens have contributed out of their pockets, for foreign relief, one-third as much as their Government invested in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The figure you most often see is the $2,700,000,000 which the United States put into UNRRA's treasury—three-fourths of the total UNRRA budget.

The one you don't hear about is the $925,000,000 for voluntary contributions from September 1939 until this spring.

* * * * *

At the time the President's War Relief Control Board quit business last March 31, 596 private agencies which had registered for foreign war relief had collected funds and supplies amounting to $597,621,366.

UNRRA received another $150,000,000 in voluntary contributions.

In addition, the American Red Cross dispensed $32,000,000 for emergency civilian war relief in foreign countries between September 1939 and last June.

Also, the Red Cross handled distribution of another $146,000,000 for other agencies, most of it coming out of allocations of Federal funds and material.

The resulting total of more than $900,000,000 is greater than the amount all other nations contributed to UNRRA.

Heaviest collections in the voluntary aid campaign were by the American Jewish Joint Distribution committee, $48,840,231; United China Relief reported $40,316,755; United Palestine Appeal, $32,511,604; and American Society for Russian Relief, $27,707,859.

In 1939, Polish relief ranked highest; in 1940, 1941, 1942, British; in 1943, Russian, and in 1944 and 1945 international causes got two-thirds of all contributions.

Since the War Relief Control Board ended, the State Department, at the request of President Truman, has maintained a Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Private foreign aid groups may register voluntarily with this committee, providing they agree to file their programs, budgets and audits.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

FOREIGN-OWNED ASSETS IN UNITED STATES TOP THIRTEEN BILLIONS, TREASURY SAYS

(By Walter Trohan)

Foreign-owned assets in the United States totaled almost $13,000,000,000 on June 14, 1941, and most of these assets are not only intact, but have greatly increased in value since that date.

This was disclosed * * * by the Treasury Department with the publication of a census taken by the Department's Foreign Funds Control Division. The census data will be used in unfreezing foreign-owned assets over which the division exercised wartime supervision.

The gross total of all foreign-owned assets in the United States as of the census date was $12,739,000,000. Included were such assets as deposits in American banks, investments in American securities and enterprises, interests in securities and trusts, real estate and other types of property.

Ownership in these assets was vested in 160,000 sources—individuals, partnerships, corporations and governments. These are spread over every country in the world.

The Treasury Department estimated that the foreign-owned assets have increased in value to approximately $14,000,000,000 from 1941 to December 31, 1944, exclusive of gold earmarked for foreign account. Earmarked gold more than doubled in that period going from $1,916,000,000 to $3,937,000,000. The total of foreign assets and gold as of December 1944 was approximately $18,000,000,000.

Foreign deposits in the United States rose by $373,000,000 and stood at $4,031,000,000 as of December 31, 1944. In addition, foreign countries purchased more than $1,500,000,000 of United States bonds between 1941 and 1944. The Treasury said changes in foreign holdings of long-term assets could not be determined easily, but it was estimated that net foreign purchases were 120 millions from 1941 to 1944.

* * * * *

Enemy-owned assets totaled $519,000,000. Of this Germany owned $198,000,000; Japan, $160,000,000; and Italy, $130,000,000.

Of the total of almost thirteen billions of foreign-owned assets, five billion three hundred fifty-two and four-tenths millions are charged in the census to the British Empire. * * *

Of the British total, three billion two hundred and thirty-eight and nine-tenths millions is charged to the United Kingdom. * * *

The foreign-owned assets charged to the United Kingdom included $281,000,000 in bullion, currency, and deposits. The British own $441,000,000 in American securities, hold $677,600,000 in enterprises and $1,441,600 in miscellaneous assets. * * * The French empire owns $1,081,000,000 of American assets.

Canada, next to the United Kingdom, is the largest holder of American assets at $1,742,800,000. Next is Switzerland with $1,210,600,000, and next is the Dutch Empire with $1,164,700,000.

Soviet Russia owned only $28,100,000 of American assets.

"WHERE'S THE MONEY COMING FROM?"

(Digest of an article in the January 1944 Monthly Bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, discussing a new book carrying the title headlined above, by Stuart Chase)

(Verbatim extracts)

Mr. Chase gives full support to the "owing it to ourselves" argument about internal debt, and plumps unreservedly for the theory of the compensatory economy—that is, where the Government takes responsibility for maintaining full employment by spending freely and running into debt in periods of depression, and siphoning off purchasing power and retiring debt by taxes in periods of boom.

The war has demonstrated, Mr. Chase argues, that the country can, if it only makes up its mind to do so, lift employment payrolls, and production to peak levels. (The trouble with pump-priming in the 'thirties, he says, was that the Government never spent enough.) After seeing that the Government can spend money all out and put people to work for war, Americans, he observes, are going to be hard to convince that the Government cannot do the same for peace. * * *

Discussing in his new book the question where the money to support Government spending is coming from Mr. Chase says:

"The question of where's the money coming from has one answer in the case of the individual, and quite a different answer in the case of all individuals united in a Nation. * * * If you have no money, you cannot buy that beautiful new car. Period. But if you, and all your fellow citizens, want to buy a beautiful new river development project or a beautiful new war, there is nothing to stop you from doing so. * * *

"In your collective capacity you can put men and machines hitherto idle to work. When this pool is exhausted, you can transfer manpower from making cars to making tanks. You can issue claim checks (money) for the new war production, and then tax them back or borrow them back in a closed circuit. You can buy your war and its costly equipment right up to the limit of the nation's manpower, machine-hours, and materials. There will be no difficulty about the money. * * *

"Except for our fears and financial traditions, the same formula can be followed in peacetime."

Analyzing this argument, it will be seen that it comes down basically to the same philosophy as that embodied in the statement that we need not worry about a national debt that is "owed to ourselves." * * *

In the passage cited above, the author appears to assume a smooth, almost automatic, flow of funds from the Treasury through the processes of production and distribution and back to the Treasury by way of taxes. * * *

This argument is obviously similar to the National Resources Planning Board proposition that "costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield." * * * The process sounds easy and simple; the difficulty is that funds do not flow from the Treasury into the economy and back to the Treasury in the smooth and automatic way that is suggested. * * * It is generally recognized that government spending means either bigger and bigger deficits or higher and higher taxes. * * *

This raises the exceedingly knotty problem of who is going to pay the taxes. * * *

In other words, the formula for where's the money coming from appears on analysis to be less simple than it sounds. Evidently there are reasons other than mere fears and financial traditions to be considered. Discussing the thesis that government spending and building up of debt need occasion no concern because the money spent or paid out in debt interest remains within the system, Dr. Albert Hahn, former chairman of a large provincial bank in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Germany, writing in the Banking Law Journal for July 1943, points to some interesting similarity with arguments circulated in Germany during and following the First World War. He says:

"To everyone who lived through the German inflation, this argument arouses strong, but very unpleasant, memories, for it is obviously identical with the dictum formulated in Germany during the First World War, 'The money remains in the country.' This dictum provided the solace to the conscience of German authorities as they followed the lax fiscal policies which resulted in inflation and the misery that came in its wake.

"But what of the statement itself? Is it true? It is not only true—it is too true. It is a truism like the arithmetical equation that 10 minus 10 equals 0. This argument, of course, can be applied at whatever level of government debt one might choose to mention, anywhere from $1 to trillions and trillions." * * *

The theory of the compensatory budget or compensatory economy, as Mr. Chase puts it, has gained a wide following over the past decade. * * * It represents a mixture of economic defeatism born of hard times, and of an exhilarating sense of having discovered something new from the experience of seeing at last what really big-scale government spending can do. * * * All * * * share in common the view that it is the government's job to keep the economy operating on even keel at full employment, injecting purchasing power into the system by increased public spending and investment as private spending and investment falls off, and following a reverse course as the cycle changes. Implementing government spending, Mr. Chase advocates a highly flexible tax system—one designed to penalize idle money and drive hoarded savings into spending or investment when the economy needs stimulating, with a shift over to some form of spendings taxes when things begin to go too fast and need restraint.

Admittedly, here is a very interesting blueprint for permanent prosperity—if it would

work. Actually, it is difficult—even with the most sanguine stretch of the imagination—to see how it could work.

In the first place, it is impossible to turn public expenditures and taxes on and off like the spigot of a water pipe. Much less is it easy to alter on short notice the structure of the tax system at the behest of economic planners bent on using it as the lever to control business cycle fluctuations.

While it is usually easy enough to expand Government expenditures—appropriation bills are almost invariably popular—it is quite another matter to contract them. * * * The result is that every period of big spending leaves the Government on a permanently higher level of costs, with more debt and more taxes. * * *

And comparable difficulties arise as to taxes. While plenty of people like to see Government expenditures increased, nobody really like to see taxes go up. * * * Despite the most compelling reasons for tax increases in wartime, both to pay for the war and to sterilize surplus purchasing power, we have witnessed the spectacle of months of wrangling over tax bills; and not even yet have we a tax program that is truly anti-inflationary in the sense of going to the heart of the problem of reaching excess income where it is being created. * * * Politics has dominated. * * *

If we are unable or unwilling to tax adequately in wartime, when the need is so clear and when there is a spirit of patriotism to help, what chance would there be in ordinary times of raising taxes on large masses of people to cut off a perfectly good boom which everyone was enjoying and would doubtless like to see continue indefinitely?

Mr. John Chamberlain, literary critic of the New York Times, expressed the difficulty very well when, in reviewing Mr. Chase's book, "Where's the Money Coming From," he said:

"What bothers me is the failure of people to see the implications of Mr. Chase's ideas. If there is to be deficit financing in a 1933–39 period, there must be high taxation in a 1940–43 period, when the economy is booming. Yet Congress, at the moment, shows no willingness to tax with any rigor. I suspect that this is an almost unchangeable fact of human nature, this unwillingness to pay off in good times what has been borrowed in bad times. When it's raining is obviously no time to mend the roof. But when the sun comes out we don't want to mend the roof either. Things are too pleasant on the ground."

Mr. Chase concedes in his book that his system would require a "serious psychological adjustment" about taxes. "Americans", he says, "traditionally regard taxes as a burden and a waste if not an outrage." But, says he, "If they want a compensatory economy and not something much more radical, they will have to change their ideas and begin to think about taxes the way they have been taught to think about insurance. You pay now in order to avoid calamity later."

Perhaps Americans ought to think about taxes that way; but will they? Maybe, before piling up a lot of debt on the compensatory spending theory, it would be a good idea to know.

A second, and even more basic, objection to the compensatory budget idea is that it vastly oversimplifies the problem of maintaining economic stability. It would be a fine thing indeed if all that was needed to keep the economic machine hitting on all cylinders at just the right pace would be turning on and off the stream of funds from the Public Treasury. But it would be well to pause and think a moment of the full implications of this doctrine.

What it means, first of all, is applying a single specific—Government spending—to all the ills to which the economic system may fall victim. * * *

What it means, secondly, is attempting to shift to the Government responsibilities that in a democratic society must rest primarily with the people. * * * Why should anyone worry when the Government underwrites everything? * * *

The fact is that society cannot function under a system that encourages irresponsibility and indiscipline, and which protects everyone from the consequences of making mistakes. * * * Necessity is the mother not only of invention but of adjustment. Except as there are incentives and pressures to eliminate sources of disorder, sore spots in the economy tend to get sorer and sorer, until finally the treatment breaks down. * * *

The argument that because we willingly pour out great sums to win a war we can do the same in peace is by no means original with Mr. Chase. * * *

It is true, as Mr. Chase says in the first quotation cited above, there will be no difficulty about raising the money. * * * The real question is, What are the consequences of this kind of finance? * * *

"Where did the money come from?" asks Mr. Chase, pointing to the vast military programs of Russia, Italy, Japan, and Germany. "Where did Britain and America get it for their colossal war outlays?"

We know the answer to that. They got it out of varying degrees of credit and currency inflation, coupled with taxation beyond anything ever dreamed of before and unprecedented regimentation of their people. * * *

When we hear it said that because this and other countries can "afford" to spend great sums for carrying on the war, we can "afford" to spend in peace, we have to bear in mind that the ultimate consequences of this war spending are not yet known. The chemist does not stop in the middle of his experiment and draw final conclusions as to the results. * * * It is a question of what the cost will be in terms of inflation, taxation, and the kind of an economy we are going to have.

In war, we spend money and run into debt, not because we can afford to * * * but because * * * almost nothing else matters. Even though we knew that the spending of these sums would eventually bring national bankruptcy and financial chaos, as it has done for many warring nations in the past, we would still do it. * * *

The economy in war is not and cannot be—at least in a democracy—a criterion for the economy in peace. War represents a tremendous distortion of normal peacetime values and practices and ways of living, and there is no warrant for assuming that because certain things are done in war they can be, or ought to be, done in peace. * * *

What has been said is not to imply that the Government should not give assistance in times of economic crisis. * * *

The main point to be stressed is that * * * we be thoroughly aware of what we are doing, and not mistake palliatives for cures. Real curative measures consist of making adjustments, discovering and eliminating bad policies and practices, cleaning up weak spots, and so forth, so that the economy can get a new start. When government spending comes to be used as a substitute for such essential—though often painful and unpleasant—processes, it becomes a menace instead of a help.

Nor should it be supposed that in taking the road of Government spending we are necessarily avoiding "something more radical", as suggested by Mr. Chase. Government spending tends to be like a drug, in that it takes larger and larger doses to get results; and all the time, debt and taxes get higher and higher. There is no surer route to statism than by the way of the tax collector, for when private enterprise ceases to become profitable and lags, the state takes over. One of the factors handicapping recovery in the thirties was the draining off of the source of risk capital by taxation, together with the large slice of the profits of successful ventures taken by government. * * *

In going forward with whatever relief programs may be deemed necessary and desirable from time to time, let us do so with eyes open to the limitations and dangers of such measures. Let us not be misled by any assumption that "because we did it in war we can do it in peace," or delude ourselves that we can keep ourselves afloat by pumping out Government money for all sorts of projects, and increasing debt, so long as "the money remains in the country", and "we owe the debt to ourselves."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an amendment to the pending bill which I propose to offer tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The amendment referred to is as follows:

Page 4, line 22, after the period add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3a. There is hereby created the Foreign Funds Control Commission which shall be an independent agency of Government directly responsible to the Congress.

"The Commission shall consist of three members—a Director, the Comptroller General, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

"The Director shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term of 5 years and shall serve until his successor has qualified. The Director's salary shall be $15,000 annually. He shall be a natural-born citizen of the United States. He shall have had a-broad experience in the administration of Government funds and without previous prominent affiliation with any major political party.

"The Commission is hereby directed to administer all funds hereafter granted by the Treasury of the United States or previous grants if directed by the Congress to foreign countries, their nationals and agencies of whatever kind or nature.

"The work of the Commission shall be organized under no less than three general divisions (1) the executive under the supervision of the Director, (2) audit and accounting under the supervision of the Comptroller General, and (3) investigation under the supervision of the Intelligence Branch of the Treasury.

"The Director is hereby authorized to engage such personnel, to acquire such office equipment, accounting records, printed matter, and office supplies as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"The Director shall have the assistance of other Government departments such as the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines and Mining, Bureau of Fisheries, State, War, Navy, Treasury on matters generally coming within the scope of the respective department's functions and to the end that the best expert advice obtainable may be at the service of the Commission in administering the funds so granted; and it shall be the duty of the said agencies to cooperate in every practical manner possible.

"The main office of the Commission shall be located in Washington, D. C. Field offices shall be established and operated in whatever country is given a grant and shall be maintained in operation in that country for whatever time may be required to properly administer the funds so granted.

"The Commission shall submit quarterly reports of its administration to the Congress which shall be published for the general information of the taxpayers and bond buyers of the Unite States."

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our very able and outstanding colleague the Honorable JOHN TABER, a Representative from New York and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has been very highly commended by Arthur Krock in an article which appeared in the New York Times on May 6, 1947. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Krock's article:

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR—CONGRESS ECONOMIZER IS TARGET OF MANY, AS WERE HOLMAN AND MANN EARLIER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The way of the transgressor is a primrose path compared to that an economizer in Congress must tread, and Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn, N. Y., provides the most prominent current illustration of that fact.

As chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, he suggests a Pilgrim father in the savage wilderness as he strives to check and reduce the ever-growing costs of government, for every time he swings his axe in the Federal fiscal forest he is the target of arrows from all directions. But they seem to bounce off him harmlessly, as far as diverting him from his purpose is concerned.

At the moment Mr. TABER is under fire from marksmen of all sorts as he seeks to lop off or cut down this appropriation or that. The aim of some is as good as their individual objectives, when the latter are considered separately from the general retrenchment program with which Mr. TABER is firmly dealing. The aim of others is not so good, and their causes are motivated by self-interest or an exaggerated idea of the importance to the Nation of the Federal project they are trying to save from the chairman's axe. But this is always the case when any real attempt is made to retrench Government spending.

Groups of the general public are interested in protecting various Federal activities from abolition or sharp reduction through the use of the appropriating power of Congress. But Mr. TABER is certain that the public as a whole wants billions sliced from the President's budget of $37,500,000,000 and will approve this result without too much concern over details. He does not, however, expect to become a popular figure in Congress or outside it—watchdogs of the Treasury never do. He does not look for any official rewards or promotions—watchdogs of the Treasury rarely attain them. But he does not seem to mind.

In this respect Mr. TABER resembles two other Treasury watchdogs who served in the House and were successful defenders of the funds supplied by public revenue. One was William S. Holman, of Indiana, the other was James R. Mann, of Illinois, and both, like the Representative from Auburn, were members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Holman, who was elected by his rural Indiana district to Congress 16 times in 40 years, was born on that frontier in 1822 and as a Jeffersonian Democrat applied himself to project the Virginia statesman's ideas into the industrial age that succeeded the agricultural. A historian records that, in Holman's view, most people were poor and highly taxed; Federal spending benefited those who least needed help; one outlay bred another, and in the end swollen bureaucracy would destroy democratic institutions. To save money he even opposed expanding the Library of Congress and improving the Capital City, for when economy becomes a legislator's main purpose in life he often fells a tree in trying to clear out the underbrush. But Holman's struggle against waste, extravagance, and purely political spending saved hundreds of millions to the taxpayers.

Mann was a later figure in congressional history; he lived until 1922 and he served a Chicago district from 1897 until he died. He had a hand in railroad regulation, the pure food and drug law, measures to restrict corporate abuses and the White Slave Act that bears his name. But it was as Speaker Cannon's agent, and then as minority leader, in blocking loose, extravagant, or otherwise bad legislation that his great public service was performed. Much in this category died at his hands, because of his ability, the consequence of incessant study, to find the weak spots in bills, and the amount of money he saved the American people cannot be estimated.

Mr. TABER is taller and more portly than these earlier watchdogs but he has the same grim expression and saw-edged voice that goes with it. He looks and dresses like a banker-farmer, doesn't talk off his own particular subjects, runs his committee with a hard hand, takes little interest in the party line except when on appropriations he draws it, and is the terror of all bureaucrats. Their fear of him is as great as his distrust of them, for between him and them it must be continuous war to the knife if he is to enforce real economies in Federal spending.

The New Yorker will reduce the budget effectively if that can be done by any leader in Congress over the massed and shifting opposition this effort always encounters. Those who support his general objective are constantly breaking away in favor of some particular project, but he realizes that every time he yields to one such group he will have less influence in combating the next. Therefore, some good enterprises will suffer with the bad at Mr. TABER'S hands.

But if there are to be any important cuts in Federal spending, this consequence is inevitable under the present system—until or unless a President comes along who will really take the lead in economy and real budget reform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign the Republican Party made 10 campaign pledges. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a magazine article showing how those pledges are being definitely and actively fulfilled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made over radio station WHDH in Boston.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the State Department to me dated May 5, 1947, and also some telegrams to the Department of State from Ambassador Smith from Moscow to the Secretary of State dated June 11, 1946, which were referred to in debate today in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFEAT THE "WOOL GRAB" BILL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous threat to the security of every American family is the steady and alarming increase in the cost of living.

Every household is worried about this problem.

As prices go up, up, outstripping incomes and leading us inevitably, unless checked, to that explosive point which is followed by business collapse, unemployment, and despair, Americans are anxiously wondering what we, their elected representatives, are doing to forestall disaster.

In the Congress this week there appears a bill, S. 814, already passed by the Senate and amended by the Agriculture Committee of the House, which will, if passed by the House, give spur to the inflationary menace.

The wool-price-support program is due to expire unless legislation is approved to extend it, but under the proposed bill, it will be extended and intensified to the point where the Government will lose, industry will suffer, and every consumer in the United States will pay through the nose.

Our domestic wool growers were never able to supply one-half of the raw-material needs of our manufacturers of worsted cloth. Furthermore, they could not supply them with the long-fiber raw wool necessary for quality worsteds. Even when given tariff protection, domestic sheep raisers cannot do the job.

But when they seek preferential treatment over all other agricultural commodities, as in this bill, it is time to call a halt. Wool needs some support, but no more than that given 160 other agricultural items, which is 90 percent—except cotton which is 92½—of parity for 1947–48. Parity is a Government index of farm-operation costs, similar to the cost-of-living index. The wool growers want 100 percent of parity.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman to say that no other crops had a support of more than 90 percent?

Mr. LANE. I understand, with the exception of the one I mentioned, 92½ percent. I stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that flax, for example, has a support price of 150 or 160 percent of parity. I think others can be found in that same category.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Why our extensive worsted industry and its workers, which suffered from substandard conditions for many years and only recently arrived at steady production, good wages, and good profits, should be asked to bear the burden is beyond all semblance of economic justice.

We believe that the Government has done more than enough for one segment of our economy—the wool growers. We cannot afford to keep on sending good money after bad. In spite of a 34 cents per pound tariff, foreign wool—and better wool—imported from 23 different countries, can still be sold at less than the support price which the Government is paying to wool growers in the United States. Uncle Sam is presently stuck with a 400,000,000 pound wool surplus which he can't get rid of. And he bought it at above-market prices. On this program, to date, he has lost over $38,000,000 without counting the increased costs to consumers from artifically supported prices.

Now, through the proposed legislation, he is being asked to shell out another $100,000,000 through indirect subsidies to wool farmers by outright Government purchase of the 1947 and 1948 wool production in the United States at the highest prices over a 27-year period.

As if this weren't enough, we are now being asked to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lay an additional import fee on foreign wool, over and above the 34 cents per pound tariff already levied. This new impost, up to 50 percent ad valorem, can be added at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is altogether too much power to give to any man, and especially at a time when so many other controls, justified only by the emergency of war, have been dropped. It amounts, in effect, to a nationalization of the raw-wool industry.

Clinton M. Hester, of the National Wool Trade Association, estimates that the subsidy "means a minimum of $1 extra cost on at least 75,000,000 wool garments bought annually by Americans."

The imposition of these import fees would curtail wool imports, resulting in a contraction of manufacturing and a drop in employment, bringing sudden and severe deflation to many of our industrial communities.

This dangerous precedent could well open the door to high-tariff logrolling for other commodities, which, at the present crisis in the price structure, could plunge us headlong into a depression which would rock the foundations of our constitutional government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I can see why the gentleman might feel it is unwise to start delegating power to the members of the President's Cabinet, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under section 22 of the AAA Act the President already has those powers that are in this particular bill. They have never been exercised by the President in that way, but he has the power at the present time.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Representatives of our State Department, at the Geneva Conference, are negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. There is a distinct possibility that these agreements will lower the tariff on woolen textile manufacturers.

In Massachusetts, the heart of our textile industry, the workers were, at one time, among the lowest paid group of industrial workers in the country. By dint of persistent efforts and cooperation among management and labor and government, we have built up this depressed industry to the point where it is turning out the finest fabrics in volume. The industry is showing a profit and is paying an average wage throughout of $1.20 an hour, in keeping with the progressive standards of American enterprise. This contrasts sharply with the 35 cents per hour average in English textiles, and even lower wage rates elsewhere.

We cannot survive a double squeeze exerted by a lowered tariff permitting woolen products manufactured by other countries with cheap labor to compete in the home market, and jacked-up costs for the wool our industry needs, which will result from 100 percent parity on the domestic clip, plus increased import fees on the better wool we require, and get, from abroad.

Traders, industrialists, workers and consumers will fight S. 814, Report No. 257, until its final and well-merited defeat.

It is not that we are closing our eyes to the case for the domestic wool growers. In a spirit of compromise, fair to both sides, we recommend and will support a measure along the lines of the Herter bill.

This would give a Government guaranty of support to wool farmers at 90 percent of parity, equal to the support of other agricultural commodities. It would permit free-enterprise merchants to go on with the job of purchasing, storing, preparing, and distributing the domestic wool clip, as they have done successfully in the past. It would take the Government out of the wool business, where its performance has been a dismal failure during the postwar years of 1945 and 1946.

During that period, a huge stock pile was accumulated in spite of a record demand for wool. This was not due to foreign competition, because tariff protection amounted to 35 percent of the value of domestic wool. The workings of the parity law had no effect on the situation until late 1946. Poor judgment by the Government is alone responsible.

S. 814 would extend and aggravate the dangers to trade and industry. It would fix the price of wool for 2 years at over 100 percent of today's high parity, and could be 130 percent or more should parity drop to wartime levels, as is confidently expected. Under S. 814, losses to the Government and the taxpayer would be enormous. It would stymie private enterprise and force the Government to be the only buyer of wool. And once the Government gets the wool, it cannot dispose of it except at a loss.

Such ill-advised legislation might well tip the scales of our whole economy from recovery to collapse. Once the chain reaction for preferential treatment sets in, it is hard to stop.

The American consumer is demanding that we do everything in our power to bring about a gradual reduction in prices.

Here is the test of our abilities and our intentions.

In the fight against inflation, the defeat of S. 814 is imperative.

REDUCTION AND CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have received reports from Members of Congress and from people all over the country inquiring about the reduction and curtailment of postal services. I have been advised that postal workers are reporting to the public that service is being curtailed as a result of economies being effected by the Eightieth Congress. In several instances, this is being developed into a partisan attack on the present majority in Congress.

I do not believe that this campaign was originated in the Post Office Department in Washington, for high officials of the service have advised me that the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill did not necessitate any curtailment of essential services. I regret that there has been any aspect of partisanship in the matter, and I am sure that where this has been injected it has been entirely on local levels. Yet because the issue has been raised I feel that I, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Post Office appropriation bill for 1948, must take cognizance of the charges that have been made, not only in defense of the majority party, but also of my colleagues on the minority who served faithfully on the subcommittee, who approached the question of appropriations in a nonpartisan manner, and who joined in submitting a unanimous report to the House. The bill was not amended on the floor nor by the full committee, and on March 11 the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill passed this body by a unanimous vote of 387–0. I therefore make it clear that it is my desire solely to state the position of the House, both majority and minority, in answering political charges that have been made against this bill.

In some localities carriers have advised the people whom they serve that deliveries will be made less frequently, or will be curtailed entirely, because insufficient money was appropriated. In the Post Office Department's appropriation bill for 1948, the House approved an appropriation of $295,300,000 for city delivery service. This is $7,300,000 more than

was available for this service in the current fiscal year. The amount passed by the House represents a reduction of only one-tenth of 1 percent from the budget requests, or only $338,000 less than the President asked for. Obviously such a small reduction from the estimates would not have the effect of curtailing any carrier service.

I do not believe that it is the policy of the Post Office to curtail service, for the First Assistant Postmaster General made this statement to the subcommittee in February of this year:

During the war it was the policy of the Department to restrict city delivery service to the minimum requirements that will meet the bare needs of the public. Following the termination of the war the Department has been restoring this service to prewar standards as rapidly as practicable. Indicative of this is the fact that the number of regular city delivery carriers increased from 57,993 as of June 30, 1945, to 65,770 as of June 30, 1946, an increase of 7,777.

I have every reason to assume that postal officials in Washington are giving active consideration to the restoration of prewar delivery service, and I feel that the Congress is and has been cooperating with the Department in this respect. It is not only because two deliveries a day are a convenience to the public that such service should be restored as rapidly as possible, but also because mail held over night presents a storage problem for the local post offices, and facilities for this storage are not always available.

This House also has been most generous to the Post Office Department in providing for post office clerks. Even in the face of the Nation-wide demand for economy, the House increased the amounts granted for delivery service, and also placed the largest single increase in the bill, $9,784,000 over the 1947 figures, for clerks in first and second class post offices. For this purpose $487,000,000 was placed in the bill, a reduction of less than one-tenth of 1 percent, and this is in addition to $24,000,000 for clerks in third class post offices—about half a million dollars more than granted in 1947.

It can be pointed out that during the month of March 1947, 2,529 people were added to the Post Office rolls, and 1,794 of these were in the bureau of the First Assistant Postmaster General, who has charge of clerk and delivery service.

I do not believe that the propaganda being put out now about curtailment of service due to insufficient appropriations made by the Republican-controlled Congress is inspired by the active authorities in the Post Office Department here in Washington.

The appropriation bill to which I am referring is the bill for the fiscal year 1948, which starts next July 1. The Post Office Department is at present running under appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 which were passed by the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress, and on page 1881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 10, 1947, you will find the boast of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that the Post Office subcommittee last year cut much deeper into the budget estimates for the Post Office Department than did this year's subcommittee. On page 1886 you will find this statement by the former chairman of the appropriations committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], now ranking minority member:

As has been said, this bill cuts the estimates for the Post Office Department only $14,000,000. Why, we cut the Post Office budget last year $19,000,000. And this is not the most significant feature of it. They are cutting the $14,000,000 this year from a budget which exceeds $1,500,000,000. Last year we cut $19,000,000 from a budget of only $1,200,000,000.

Further along, the gentleman makes this statement:

You cannot point out a single dismissal in the entire Post Office Department.

And then he says this:

I deplore and deprecate the reckless and profligate extravagance of these spenders who now refuse to cut the budget on a $1,500,000,000 estimate as much as we cut it last year on a $1,200,000,000 estimate.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] then asked this question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

Do I understand that in this bill which provides for 490,000 bureaucrats in the Post Office Department not one bureaucrat is cut off?

And Mr. CANNON answered:

Not one single bureaucrat. Not a single Communist. Not a single boondoggler. Of all the teeming hordes of parasites and chiselers and loafers and fan dancers and subversives we were told last November were infesting the Department of the Government, not a single one is being separated from his soft job in the entire Post Office Department. Every one of them is being retained by this bill—at the largest salaries ever paid in the history of the Government.

It is obvious that these members of the minority did not think then that there would be a curtailment of service under the 1948 bill. In fact, they objected that we did not cut more deeply and curtail some services.

And they also point out why there is any difficulty with the postal service today, and why in part it has been necessary for the Eightieth Congress to pass two deficiency appropriation bills to enable the Post Office to struggle along till June 30. If postal service is being curtailed today, my friends, it is because the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress did not grant sufficient funds, and if the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had not approved two deficiency bills for the Post Office all service would have been drastically curtailed and severely crippled.

THE WOOL SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about this wool situation. First of all, I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts to the fact that the bill he is opposing was sent to the House by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson, and was referred by our distinguished Speaker to the Committee on Agriculture.

I am sure that if he would look at the other side of this picture he would not really take the position he takes here today. I personally feel that the embarassing wool situation is a result of the war. The first accumulation or stock pile we had in this country came as a result of the war. The first 300,000,000 pounds were brought over here from Australia to be kept safely so that the Japs could not get hold of it. We seem to forget the commitments we made to the rural people. Some people appear to think that those commitments are scraps of paper. There is too much of that attitude in the atmosphere at the present time. If any administration—I do not care what administration it is—desires during wartime to make definite, certain commitments and certain promises, then when the war is over say, "We are not going to follow them out," they can, if they so desire, take that position. I do not subscribe to such a position.

There is no reason to get into any partisan or political controversy in connection with this wool problem. This accumulation of 460,000,000 pounds of wool came as a result of the war. The wool people were promised a price that may seem high to some people, but it must be remembered that wool never skyrocketed like some other farm products did. It was frozen at that time. The price was frozen for the purpose of providing wool for the war. We cannot just walk out on the wool people. While wool showed a 14-percent advance in price, some other farm products doubled in price.

I say, in all fairness, if we are going to bring this wool bill on the floor and make a political football out of it, I am sure a lot of people are going to have a red face because, so far as the Republicans are concerned, we are trying to get our good Democratic friends out of a mess that they got themselves into. They should not be criticized for being in the mess either. I think every one of us owes an obligation to try to get rid of this 460,000,000 pounds of wool with the least possible loss to the United States Treasury. We should be sure that we do not ruin the sheep business in America too.

I say that for several reasons. First, we have not any forty or fifty million dollars to lose; second, if we go to work and lose forty to sixty million dollars on this wool program, together with the $90,000,000 loss we sustained in supporting the potato price, part of which loss was due to maladministration, we might as well forget the whole Steagall amendment and the whole support program. Do you, my colleagues, wish to run out on the Steagall amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I hope when this bill comes on the floor of the House every Member will approach it from the standpoint that it is a war casualty, that we can get rid of that stock pile without any great loss to the United States Treasury;

that we should make a nonpartisan approach to iron out the problem.

I have listened about how wonderful this imported wool is, but I call attention to the fact that the wool which the boys in the American Army wore was domestic wool. It was good enough for them. If it was good enough for them it is good enough for the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if and when the wool bill comes on the floor I hope we can approach consideration of it in such way that the bill will be passed unanimously; we need not think about any particular segment of this country but think about the welfare of the United States Treasury, the welfare of our country and about fulfilling the commitments we made during the war to the rural people of America. They have performed their work well and for the best interest of America we should religiously follow every commitment of the Steagall amendment.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF VE-DAY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular coincidence that on this the second anniversary of VE-day we find ourselves still concerned about the plight of this troubled world.

Two full years have come and gone since our victory over Germany, which was followed a few months thereafter by a like victory over Japan. Surely all of us had a right to hope for peace, especially after the expenditure of such unprecedented quantities of both human life and wealth.

We have now for some days been debating the pending bill, which provides for financial assistance to Greece and Turkey, with the hope that we may thus further stay the hand of aggression and ultimately secure the peace we so much desire.

It is not easy to decide what position one should take concerning this important matter. We cannot take snap judgment in order to properly decide this important issue. We must not only call upon our own strength and wisdom but rely upon God Himself.

Our decision on this matter may, for all we know, determine the future of the entire world.

Years ago the poet Lowell gave us these lines:

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

These lines seem to be most appropriate at this time. The passage of this bill is by no means absolute assurance that the free countries of Greece and Turkey will survive, but, in my judgment, the failure to pass the measure will mean that the ever-expanding influence of communism will engulf these countries.

Turkey and Greece constitute the ramparts of democracy along the Mediterranean shores and we dare not longer sit supinely by and allow time to be swallowed up by communism where not even a semblance of freedom would be left.

Some weeks ago the President in a personal message delivered to us in this very Chamber pointed out the gravity of the international situation with reference to the spread of communism. The Senate after full and thorough hearings has already passed this measure. Our present great Secretary of State, a man with as comprehensive knowledge of world affairs as ever lived, has repeatedly urged the prompt and speedy enactment of this measure. Whether to follow or not to follow the President's program for aid to Greece and Turkey is a fateful and difficult decision to make, but the decision must be made and I am convinced that to decide against this measure would mean that we have all but forfeited our last hope for eventual universal peace.

We are standing today almost alone in this confused world demonstrating that a living, working democracy can live.

Our Nation alone holds out the hope for dispelling the fears for the future which now besets the world. We are leading the peoples of this earth by precept and example to that state of security and peace for which our sons have given their lives.

Ours is the responsibility for preserving and extending democracy and freedom. That responsibility cannot be shirked. Great Britain's international influence and power has been seriously impaired. We must take our rightful place of leadership. We can only exercise and discharge our responsibilities if we are alert and strong, and if we stand determined against the spread of communism.

The passage of this measure today will give heart and courage to our friends around the world. Our affirmative action will restore faith in democracy as a dynamic power for good throughout the earth. We must by our acts here and now further repudiate isolationism and appeasement in a world where these policies have and are leading us down the road to war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), from May 8 to May 13, 1947, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

BILLS AND JCINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 8, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. An act to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. An act to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

663. A letter from the Chief Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a certified copy of the special findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion of the court in a case that was decided May 5, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

664. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; without amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3376. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend section 73 of the Organic Act of Hawaii, relating to opening of agricultural lands for settlement; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3378. A bill relating to the completion of Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3379. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act to include embezzled vehicles and aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3380. A bill relating to the computation of Federal grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 3381. A bill to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the educational benefits granted therein to veterans of World War II to the widows and children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3382. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to remove the obligation of employers in certain on-the-job training programs of reporting payments of overtime salaries or wages to veteran trainees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3383. A bill for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3384. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3385. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3386. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 149, a bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2180, a bill which extends to Puerto Rico the benefits of the Reclamation Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the housing laws in such manner as to allow the occupancy of housing units by families other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John A. Hogg and Mrs. Leona Pearl Hogg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3390. A bill to provide that the name of Fred S. Knisley be added to the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

469. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 33 citizens of Unadilla, Dunbar, and Syracuse, Nebr., urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

470. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mr. R. A. Sjobery, secretary, Federated Shop Crafts, Aberdeen, S. Dak., and 151 other signers requesting support to defeat H. R. 2169 and H. R. 2310, which propose to amend the so-called Crosser amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

471. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of South Jersey Association of Water Superintendents, urging a restoration of the authorization for the United States Geological Survey to do ground-water work and that adequate funds be appropriated for such work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

472. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of the Englewood Zionist District, Englewood, N. J., relative to the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. By the SPEAKER: Petition of a New Haven emergency committee for displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 2910, the Stratton bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

474. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

475. Also, petition of the Model Agri-Pisci-Poultry and Cattle Farm, South Arcot district, India, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the availability of funds for a farm-trust plan in India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose wisdom our finite minds cannot comprehend, we rejoice in the revelation which Thou hast made of Thyself as the guiding intelligence and the overruling Father.

Grant that in all the deliberations and decisions of this day we may be sensitive to the leading of Thy spirit, holding our own desires in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will. We pray that we may appropriate with increasing tenacity of faith the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

May it be the goal of our aspirations to attain unto the likeness of our blessed Lord. Help us to hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction when the chasms which divide the members of the human family shall be bridged by friendship, and all the barriers which impede the progress of the Kingdom of Brotherhood shall be supplanted by the kind and gentle spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this morning; and I make a similar request for the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations, that it may sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, commencing next Tuesday at 9:30 o'clock in the morning, will hold hearings on the Export-Import Bank Act. The purpose of this announcement is to give notice of the hearings not only to the Members of the Senate but to the country. It will be borne in mind that the act expires on June 30, and in view of the rather chaotic world condition it is very important that we secure the opinions of the best-informed persons as to what should be done in relation to continuance or discontinuance of the Export-Import Bank.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Whereas Puerto Rico is an agricultural country in which the welfare of the population depends primarily upon returns from the land; and

"Whereas the land resources of Puerto Rico are extremely limited in relation to the large number of people dependent upon them, there being less than an acre of tillable land per inhabitant; and

"Whereas the total production of wealth in Puerto Rico could be materially increased by the development of storage dams and canals for the irrigation of large areas of potentially rich land now relatively unproductive because of a lack of sufficient rainfall; and

"Whereas the insular government, like the States, is not in position to finance large irrigation projects on favorable terms: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be urged to give favorable consideration to H. R. 2180, which provides that the Reclamation Act, approved June 17, 1902, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto, be extended to include and to apply to Puerto Rico, and if they so desire it, to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, as mentioned in the resolution.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this concurrent resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate of the United States, and to Senator BUTLER, Congressman WELCH, the Resident Commissioner, and the Governor of Puerto Rico."

A resolution adopted by the Irish societies and kindred organizations, Los Angeles, Cal., relating to the political status of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of the members of the Jacksonville Townsend Club, No. 1, and the members of the Crescent City Townsend Club, No. 1, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Industrial Soldiers Association, San Juan, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation granting the same allowances and privileges to industrial soldiers of Puerto Rico as those granted to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to allow controlled burning of certain areas within the Francis Marion National Forest so as to provide a safe refuge for the propagation of wild turkeys

"Whereas the pure-strain wild turkeys are fast vanishing from the State of South Carolina, and those few remaining largely inhabit the county of Berkeley and that area of said county embracing the Francis Marion National Forest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be hereby memorialized to authorize and empower such agencies thereof as have jurisdiction to allow controlled burning of certain areas within the Francis Marion National Forest, S. C., so as to provide and effect a safe refuge and refuges for the propagation of such wild turkeys."

(Mr. MAYBANK submitted a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.)

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution protesting the order of the Secretary of War inactivating the United States Army post at Camp McCoy and memorializing Congress to take steps to prevent such order from taking effect.

"Whereas according to a recent Washington news release the Secretary of War has issued an order inactivating the United States Army post at Camp McCoy and placing that camp on a caretaker basis which will require displacement or discharge of 1,800 troops now quartered there along with the post complement of 350 and civilian workers numbering 461; and

"Whereas it is evident from recent letting of contracts for the construction of 50 temporary housing units at Camp McCoy and existing plans for utilizing the post facilities by the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the Wisconsin National Guard, that the order was not prompted by military expediency, but that it issued only as a matter of financial necessity; and

"Whereas existing disputes with world powers over international affairs will not permit jeopardizing our national defense; and

"Whereas as a sound measure of security in these turbulent times, Camp McCoy, one of the outstanding camps in the Nation for complete training of troops under all weather conditions, above all others, should continue to be used by the War Department as an active Army post: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin vigorously protests the closing of Camp McCoy as an active Army post and memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to continue to make Camp McCoy available to the United States War Department as an active Army post; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of War, to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A petition of sundry citizens of Colville and vicinity, in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senate this morning is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 9, 1947, at the hour of 1 p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be offered, to the amendment proposed to S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. GEORGE) on page 54, after line 4, relating to boycotts and other unlawful combinations, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further, That on said day of May 9 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a quorum call be had, and that the time consumed by the roll call may be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair will restate the question. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself and other Senators. The time between now and 1 o'clock will be equally divided between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield myself the time necessary to explain the amendment, which has not yet been done. The amendment deals with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, which are universally condemned. I think the committee bill deals with them one way. It is proposed in the amendment to deal with them in a different way.

In subsection (a) of the amendment, which is amendment D on the desk of Senators, and No. 4 in the supplemental views, on page 54 in the committee report, there is one change made in the printed copy, to eliminate from the definition a direct organizational strike by employees of an employer, by inserting in line 8, on page 2 of the amendment, after the word "any," the word "other," which means that the only thing covered is an organizational boycott to force another employer, not the employer of the employees conducting the boycott, to recognize and bargain with a labor organization which has not been certified as the representative of his employees. The way amendment D reads in the printed copies on the desks of Senators it would cover a straight organizational strike by employees who do not bother to come to the NLRB for an election. In my opinion, that kind of an organizational strike is quite thoroughly unjustified today, because there is a democratic procedure by which the bargaining agent can be determined.

Subsection (a) of the amendment is identical in defining secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, with the language in the committee bill, S. 1126, on page 14, paragraph (4) of section 8 (b), beginning in line 23 on page 14 and through line 9 on page 16.

So there is no difference between the definition of secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike in the pending amendment and the definition in the committee bill. The difference lies wholly in the remedy proposed. Neither is there any difference in the proposal to grant injunctive relief against secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. If Senators will turn to page 33 of the bill, subsection (1) of section 10, they will find that it reads as follows:

> Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4 (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 8 (b)—

That is the definition of secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike—

> the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred. If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall—

He has no discretion—

> on behalf of the Board, petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

That means that when the regional attorney of the NLRB seeks an injunction the Norris-LaGuardia Act is completely suspended, as are sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act. We do not go quite that far in our amendment. We simply provide that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not apply, with certain exceptions. We leave in effect the provisions of sections 11 and 12. Those are the sections which give an individual charged with contempt of court the right to a jury trial. Section 12 gives an individual charged with contempt the right to file a notice of prejudice against the judge, and obtain a different judge. We also leave in effect section 7, exclusive of clauses (c) and (e) of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I have before me a copy of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Section 7 is the section which deals with the conditions under which courts may now issue injunctions in labor disputes. We leave that whole section in effect, with the exception of the paragraphs requiring the court to make two findings, namely:

> That as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted upon complainant by the denial of relief than will be inflicted upon defendants by the granting of relief.

That is one of the five findings which the court has to make under the law, and which have completely eliminated any possibility of injunctions in labor disputes, because that is obviously an almost impossible finding to make. How can the court make that kind of determination?

Subsection (e), which is also suspended, requires the court, before it issues an injunction, to find "that the public officers charged with the duty to protect complainant's property are unable or unwilling to furnish adequate protection."

That, again, is a pretty tough requirement to place upon a court. In effect, the court must find that the mayor, the police chief, and the governor are not fulfilling their oaths of office in enforcing the law.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the entire contents of section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, with the exception of subsections (c) and (e), are left in full force and effect by the amendment which the Senator is advocating?

Mr. BALL. That is absolutely correct. As the Senator knows, section 7 requires that before a temporary injunction or restraining order is issued there must be notice to the opposite party and a full open hearing in court. The only exception to that is a provision for a temporary restraining order without notice and without hearing, where it is alleged that irreparable damage will be done if it is not granted; and such temporary order is good for only 5 days. Then there must be a hearing and notice, and compliance with all the requirements of section 7.

Mr. DONNELL. Section 7 begins with this language:

> No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, as herein defined, except after hearing the testimony of witnesses in open court (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath,

and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered, and except after findings of fact by the court—

Such findings are enumerated in the following subsections. As I understand, subsections (a), (b), and (d) are left in full force and effect by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The Norris-LaGuardia Act further provides in section 7, in the portion left in effect by the Senator's amendment, that the hearing shall be held after due and personal notice thereof has been given to all known persons against whom relief is sought.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator's amendment, in which I have the pleasure and privilege of joining, leaves in full force and effect everything in section 7 except subsections (c) and (e), to which the Senator has referred. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, any union against which a charge is made, and against which relief is sought, will have greater protection, will be granted notice and full hearing in open court under our amendment, whereas under the provision now in the committee bill, which wipes out all the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act, there is no such guaranty of notice and open hearing. So I think we go a little further than the committee bill does.

Mr. DONNELL. By saying "we go a little further," the Senator means that there is further protection to labor in his amendment than there is in the provisions of the bill to which the Senator refers.

Mr. BALL. That is absolutely correct. A great many persons do not realize it, but the sacrosanct Norris-LaGuardia Act is completely suspended anyway in the current National Labor Relations Act whenever the Board goes into court to obtain an enforcement order for one of its decisions. Organized labor did not object to the suspension of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in that case, I suppose presumably because under the present act the only ones to whom it could apply are employers. Organized labor was perfectly willing to have the Norris-LaGuardia Act completely wiped off the books when it came to enforcing Board orders in labor disputes against employers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that the right of the Board to seek an injunction, as now stated in the Wagner law, does not apply except against industry but not against labor.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no provision in the law at present that an injunction can be obtained by the Board against labor.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. That is what I said. The present act is entirely a one-way street. It operates only against employers in labor disputes. The Norris-LaGuardia Act had to be suspended in order to enforce the Wagner Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the pending amendment which would require notice to the other side, and hearing, including the right of cross-examination?

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator was not in the Chamber when I explained that the pending amendment goes much further than the committee bill in safeguarding the right of the parties against whom the injunction is sought. We leave in complete effect section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, with the exception of subsections (c) and (e).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks sections 7, 11, and 12 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 7. No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, as herein defined, except after hearing the testimony of witnesses in open court (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath, and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered, and except after findings of fact by the court, to the effect—

(a) That unlawful acts have been threatened and will be committed unless restrained or have been committed and will be continued unless restrained, but no injunction or temporary restraining order shall be issued on account of any threat or unlawful act excepting against the person or persons, association, or organization making the threat or committing the unlawful act or actually authorizing or ratifying the same after actual knowledge thereof;

(b) That substantial and irreparable injury to complainant's property will follow;

(c) That as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted upon complainant by the denial of relief than will be inflicted upon defendants by the granting of relief;

(d) That complainant has no adequate remedy at law; and

(e) That the public officers charged with the duty to protect complainant's property are unable or unwilling to furnish adequate protection.

Such hearing shall be held after due and personal notice thereof has been given, in such manner as the court shall direct, to all known persons against whom relief is sought, and also to the chief of those public officials of the county and city within which the unlawful acts have been threatened or committed charged with the duty to protect complainant's property: *Provided, however,* That if a complainant shall also allege that, unless a temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice, a substantial and irreparable injury to complainant's property will be unavoidable, such a temporary restraining order may be issued upon testimony under oath, sufficient, if sustained, to justify the court in issuing a temporary injunction upon a hearing after notice. Such a temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and shall become void at the expiration of said 5 days. No temporary restraining order or temporary injunction shall be issued except on condition that complainant shall first file an undertaking with adequate security in an amount to be fixed by the court sufficient to recompense those enjoined for any loss, expense, or damage caused by the improvident or erroneous issuance of such order or injunction, including all reasonable costs (together with a reasonable attorney's fee) and expense of defense against the order or against the granting of any injunctive relief sought in the same proceeding and subsequently denied by the court.

The undertaking herein mentioned shall be understood to signify an agreement entered into by the complainant and the surety upon which a decree may be rendered in the same suit or proceeding against said complainant and surety, upon a hearing to assess damages of which hearing complainant and surety shall have reasonable notice, the said complainant and surety submitting themselves to the jurisdiction of the court for that purpose. But nothing herein contained shall deprive any party having a claim or cause of action under or upon such undertaking from electing to pursue his ordinary remedy by suit at law or in equity.

* * * * *

SEC. 11. In all cases arising under this act in which a person shall be charged with contempt in a court of the United States (as herein defined), the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed: *Provided,* That this right shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice or to apply to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

SEC. 12. The defendant in any proceeding for contempt of court may file with the court a demand for the retirement of the judge sitting in the proceeding, if the contempt arises from an attack upon the character or conduct of such judge and if the attack occurred elsewhere than in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice. Upon the filing of any such demand the judge shall thereupon proceed no further, but another judge shall be designated in the same manner as is provided by law. The demand shall be filed prior to the hearing in the contempt proceeding.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, as I pointed out, under the definition in the pending amendment with reference to secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, the final injunctive relief is identical, except that the rights of unions accused of such practices are actually better protected by the pending amendment. The suspension of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is not quite so broad in the amendment as in the committee bill. The committee bill and the proposed amendment differ also in this respect: First, under the amendment an injured party—and he is usually an innocent third party—suffering from a secondary boycott or jurisdictional strike, is given the right to go directly into a district court and seek injunctive relief, whereas, under the committee bill, such an individual is forced to go through a bureaucracy, the National Labor Relations Board, and let the regional attorney for the National Labor Relations Board decide whether his case should be presented to the court. The committee bill gives the court final jurisdiction. May I say that in the great majority of cases a secondary boycott or a jurisdictional strike is conducted simply by employees

of employer A, B, or C grouped into a union and assuming for themselves a prerogative for using their economic force to dictate to the employees of employer X the terms and conditions under which those employees shall work. The employees are the primary objective and the primary victim for secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. It is quite true that a great many employers are the secondary victims, and quite a number of them have been driven out of business by such practices.

I have said that the pending amendment would simply give to those employees and to their employers the right to go directly into court to protect their right to freedom from this kind of racketeering pressure, whereas the committee bill routes them through a bureaucracy, and that bureaucracy possesses the right to say whether the court shall finally pass upon the merits of the case.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the transportation of farm produce into large cities. Is it the Senator's opinion that if injunctive relief remains in the hands of the individual speedier remedial action will be taken than if it were left in the hands of an administrative governmental agency?

Mr. BALL. It is clearly apparent that if the regional officers of the National Labor Relations Board first have to satisfy themselves that the charge is justified and that a complaint will develop under National Labor Relations Board procedure, the regional attorney—not the injured party—has the right to go and is directed to go into court. Obviously that will require anywhere from 1 week to as long as 6 weeks. The Senator knows that the farmer has been one of the major victims of secondary boycotts in hauling perishable produce to market, and that kind of relief will not help him in the slightest degree. It will not be helpful to small business concerns that are secondary victims of boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. Most of them do not have the capital to carry on their business under such conditions.

Mr. WHERRY. The second observation which the distinguished Senator made was an answer to a question which I expected to ask with reference to the small businessman. I am intensely interested in conditions in my section of the country, where truckloads of farm produce, livestock, and milk are being stopped on the highways. I think we ought to provide assurance that perishable products will reach the market. That is one of the things in which I have been much interested as related to this amendment. While I do not want in any way to contribute to the passage of legislation which would be unfair to any union or group of laboring people, yet, in the absence of any other provision to permit the farmer to transport perishable produce into the cities, this amendment offers the only assistance at this moment, so far as proposed legislation is concerned.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator, and I agree with him completely. I think the secondary boycott is one of the most vicious abuses of economic power now being indulged in by labor unions. It is being used in some cases to create the tightest kind of little monopolies, and in other cases virtually to dictate the terms on which small businessmen, farmers, and other persons may do business with each other. In the Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York markets, the farmers hauling their produce are compelled to obey 100 percent every rule laid down by the teamsters' union, or they cannot do business; and that in supposedly free America.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer to paragraph (d) on page 4 of the Senator's amendment which provides for suspension of sections 6 and 20 of the act of October 15, 1914. Do I correctly understand that that is the Clayton Act?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I right in understanding that section 6 is that provision of the Clayton Act which specifically exempts labor and farm organizations from the provisions of the antimonopoly law under certain conditions?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am having some difficulty with one of the answers which the able Senator gave me in regard to his amendment. Sections 11 and 12 which are mentioned in the amendment refer to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, do they not?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. Section 11 simply gives an individual accused of contempt of court the right to a jury trial. Section 12 gives the defendant in a contempt proceeding the right to object to the sitting judge on grounds of prejudice. Section 7 is really the heart of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and that section is left intact, with the exception of subsections (c) and (e). Subsection (c) requires the court to find, first:

> That as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted upon complainant by the denial of relief than will be inflicted upon defendants by the granting of relief.

Which is an impossible finding for any court to make. It also requires the court to find that the public officers charged with the duty of protecting complainant's property are unable or unwilling to do so. Again, that is a finding which few courts will make.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot agree with the statement that injunctions should be granted in cases where it can be said that the court has no discretion. I do not think this is a proper amendment. I do not think a court of chancery should grant an injunction unless there is irreparable damage shown with respect to the plaintiff. That is a well-established rule.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will get a copy of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and read section 7 he will find that there are three other findings which the court has to make, which we leave unchanged. One of them, under subsection (b), is that substantial and irreparable injuries to plaintiff's property will follow.

Mr. FERGUSON. I also believe that an injunction should not be issued in a case in which the plaintiff would not suffer greater damage than will be inflicted upon the the defendants if the injunction were not issued. I do not think that an injunction should be issued in such a case.

Mr. BALL. That is not the requirement. The requirement on the court is to find as to each item of relief granted that greater injury will be inflicted upon plaintiff by the denial of relief than will be inflicted upon defendants, by granting relief. That is a matter of pure conjecture which no court could indulge in, in making a finding of fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot agree with the Senator. I think if a court had evidence before it the court could determine that fact and should determine the facts before it grants an injunction. The difficulty in the past has been that the courts would sit in chancery and would allow a bill of complaint to be passed up to them and would sign on the back of it, "Let an injunction be issued as prayed for in the bill."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, is the Senator from Michigan aware of the fact that under the committee bill the National Labor Relations Board attorney can go into court and obtain an injunction against a secondary boycott or a jurisdictional strike, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is completely suspended? There is no requirement that the court make any finding, no requirement of notice to the other party, no requirement of a hearing in open court.

Mr. FERGUSON. But still there has been a trial.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry; if the Senator from Michigan will read subsection (1) of section 10 of the committee bill, on page 33, he will find that no hearing is required. There is simply an investigation by a regional attorney. In any event, we are defining very clearly, in this amendment and in the pending bill, secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, and the definition is the same. We are defining clearly what we want to make unlawful. There is no serious disagreement in the Senate as to the fact that we should stop such kinds of racketeering practices.

All I am objecting to in the committee bill, and all that I propose to change, is the requirement in the committee bill that before the court is permitted to pass on such questions and to protect the rights of employers and employees injured by such racketeering practices, the National Labor Relations Board shall first screen the charges, before the courts are permitted to pass on them. So far as I am concerned, I have considerably

more confidence in the courts than that. I do not think it has ever been a sound, liberal policy to place an appointive, administrative official between a citizen and his right to go into court and protect his rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I come back to this proposition: If this amendment is adopted, before an injunction can be obtained by an individual or by a district attorney, will it be necessary that there be a hearing, with the right of cross-examination, and a determination by the court that, under the circumstances of the particular case, an injunction should issue; or can the court grant a temporary restraining order after hearing only the plaintiff?

Mr. BALL. The provision in that respect is identical with the provision now in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It requires notice, public hearing, and cross-examination of witnesses in open court, except that the act now permits a temporary restraining order to be issued for not more than 5 days, on a showing that irreparable injury will occur if such temporary restraining order is not granted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I correctly understand that a preliminary injunction or a restraining order can be granted without a hearing?

Mr. BALL. Yes; for 5 days. We are not proposing to change that provision in the slightest degree.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BALL. Anyone can go into court now and try to get that kind of relief. But if the order is issued, it is good for only 5 days. Before it can be extended, there must be notice and a public hearing.

Mr. FERGUSON. But there has to be a finding such as we have previously discussed, that greater damage will be suffered by the plaintiff than by the defendant; is that correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes; that is the case now. Of course, under that provision, no injunctions have been issued.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I call attention to the further fact that with respect to the issuance of a temporary restraining order, the provision of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which is retained in force by the amendment offered by the Senator, reads as follows:

> No temporary restraining order or temporary injunction shall be issued except on condition that complainant shall first file an undertaking with adequate security in an amount to be fixed by the court sufficient to recompense those enjoined for any loss, expense, or damage caused by the improvident or erroneous issuance of such order or injunction, including all reasonable costs (together with a reasonable attorney's fee) and expense of defense against the order or against the granting of any injunctive relief sought in the same proceeding and subsequently denied by the court.

That provision of section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act will, as I understand, remain in full force and effect under the amendment in favor of which the Senator from Minnesota is arguing.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

The pending amendment would change the committee bill in two other respects. First, the language in subsection (c) would permit any person injured by such racketeering practices to sue and to recover damages actually suffered and the cost of the suit. That is similar to the provision of the Taft substitute.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The amendment in favor of which the Senator from Minnesota is arguing gives, as he has indicated, to the concern or plaintiff that claims it has been injured, the right to control its own litigation, to hire its own lawyer, to take such steps as it deems proper, and to go into such court as it deems proper to proceed in.

Mr. BALL. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Whereas, if the Senator's amendment is not adopted, the matter must be submitted to the National Labor Relations Board, and there there must be some investigation, and there some official of the Board must decide whether in his discretion, rather than in the discretion of the man who claims to be injured, the litigation should be filed.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And thereafter, if the representative of the National Labor Relations Board shall decide that the proceedings shall be filed, control of the litigation is exclusively vested in the representative of the National Labor Relations Board, rather than in the person who claims to have been injured. Is not that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. That is my main reason for offering this amendment, namely, to take away the placing of a bureaucracy of government—an administrative board, if you please—between the injured citizen and his right to go into court and protect his rights under the law.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota know of any reason under heaven why, if a person claims he is injured, he should not be entitled to engage his own attorney, go into the court which he selects, and direct the conduct of his litigation, rather than, if he lives in the State of Nebraska, for instance, to have to send his complaint to some regional office of the National Labor Relations Board, or possibly to the Board itself, in Washington, and thereafter await the determination of someone who was never selected by the person who has been injured, and perhaps never was even seen by the person who has been injured, as to whether any proceeding should be filed? Does there occur to the Senator from Minnesota any possible justification for such a provision as that?

Mr. BALL. I certainly do not think there is justification for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for bringing out that point so clearly, because it seems to me that the person concerned should control his own rights of litigation, and should not have to depend, when it comes to the question of going into a court of law and applying for damages or for injunctive relief, upon the judgment of some bureaucrat in whom is lodged the power to determine whether such a course should be followed.

This amendment, as I understand, would permit a person to go into any court and there use his own judgment in regard to the question of applying for injunctive relief or in regard to the question of whether he should sue for damages. Am I correct about that?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield further to me, I wish to place myself on record clearly and conclusively in favor of giving to the person who claims to be injured the right to select his own counsel, the right to initiate his own suit, and the right to control the litigation, rather than to be restricted to a particular course of action by some official of the Government who is without personal interest in the matter, and have to await the determination by such Government official as to whether the rights of the person shall or shall not be protected. I wish to place myself clearly and squarely on record as being in favor of what seems to me to be a fundamental principle of American citizenship, namely, that if a person claims to be injured, he shall have his right to a day in court for himself, rather than to have to leave to some Government official the determination of whether he shall or shall not have his right to a day in court.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator. I think he has expressed what I have always regarded as fundamental liberal doctrine. The liberal principle of government is to define clearly in the law the rights, responsibilities and duties of citizens, and permit them to go directly into court to have their rights and duties adjudicated; not to delegate vast arbitrary power and discretion to some administrative agency of government to decide whether or not a citizen's rights shall be protected in a given situation.

Mr. President, there is one other change the amendment makes in subsection (d). That subsection provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, with the exceptions previously noted, as well as the Clayton Act, shall not be applicable "in respect of any contract, combination, or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce, to which a labor organization is a party, if one of the purposes of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, distribution, or competition, or impose restrictions or conditions upon the purchase, sale, or use of any material, machines, or equipment."

That language is designed to correct the interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia and Clayton acts made by the Supreme Court in the Hutchinson case, and a number of other cases brought by former Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, when he attempted to break up monopolistic practices on the part of labor unions, sometimes acting on their own, sometimes in conspiracy with employers. They were engaging in all kinds of price fixing. They were attempting to determine, on their own responsibility, what products should be used in industry, what kind of machines, and what products the public should be entitled to buy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator says the purpose of this portion of the amendment is to correct a decision of the United States Supreme Court. What he means is that it is intended to overrule or set aside the holding of the United States Supreme Court that the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act do not apply to labor organizations, and to permit the application of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act to the acts set out in the words of the amendment.

Mr. BALL. The Senator can phrase it in any way he desires; whether it is "to correct" or "overrule," it means the same thing. There is no reason why those acts should not be applicable.

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to describe the evils of the secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike. The Senate should be familiar with them by now. As I said before, farm producers and small businesses and their employees are the main victims of secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and organizational boycotts. It is not the large companies, such as General Motors and General Electric, although they were caught in the monopolistic boycott of the IBEW in New York City, that are the main victims of secondary boycotts and organizational boycotts. It is the small businessmen, usually those with only 50 or 100 employees, who do not have the resources to enable them to last out the 2 to 6 weeks' delay which would intervene before they could possibly get relief under the committee bill. It is such persons and their rights that we are trying to protect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill provides that a secondary boycott is an unfair labor practice. That will be determined by the Board, which itself may invoke injunctive relief to stop one that is threatened, or an existing secondary boycott. The amendment of the able Senator would permit an individual himself to seek an injunction in an effort to stop a secondary boycott. That, in essence, is the difference between the bill and the amendment?

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct. Under the committee bill a regional office of the NLRB can go into court and get an injunction, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is wiped out completely. Under our amendment the individual who is injured does not have to detour through the National Labor Relations Board; he can go directly into court and get temporary relief. I might say that if the amendment shall be agreed to it will be in order to move to strike out the unfair practice provision in the committee bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the great majority of Senators are agreed that secondary boycotts, organizational boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes are wrong, and that they should be stopped. But, somehow or other, the idea has persisted that even though we are absolutely opposed to this kind of racketeering practices, we still must detour through the regional office of the National Labor Relations Board a party injured by such practices before he can go into court and obtain relief, and then he cannot go into court unless the National Labor Relations Board says he may do so. That seems to me extreme New Deal doctrine. I think it is far removed from what I have considered to be the liberal approach to these problems, which, as I said before, is to define in the law the rights, responsibilities and duties of parties, and permit an injured party to go directly into court to protect his rights.

I cannot understand the seeming lack of confidence in the courts to pass on issues so clear as these and to protect the rights of the people. I do not know why we have to screen these cases through some bureaucrat before the court can get a chance to pass on them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the present law, what protection has a farmer, when a boycott interferes with the transportation of his products, which possibly are highly perishable?

Mr. BALL. He has none, unless there is a State law which would protect him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. He has none under the present Federal law?

Mr. BALL. He has not. We passed the Hobbs Act last year, but so far there has been no prosecution under it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That did not go far enough.

Mr. BALL. No; it did not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The pending amendment would give such a farmer opportunity for immediate relief by appealing to the court himself?

Mr. BALL. It would give him a chance to go directly into court, and if he could show that the act of which he was complaining was a violation of the law, he could get immediate relief.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But under the bill as it is now, without the Senator's amendment, he would be compelled to resort to a regional office of the Labor Board in an effort to get relief?

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the meantime the perishable food would rot, and it would be lost to the country and to the farmer.

Mr. BALL. He would be detoured through the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. BALL. How much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 8 minutes remaining at his disposal.

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that all the unfair labor practices covered by the bill, whether against management or labor, are processed through the Board?

Mr. BALL. Yes; of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should the Senator desire to provide a different method of procedure in the disposition of cases involving jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts?

Mr. BALL. I want to control this kind of racketeering in violation of the law, and stop it. I do not know why we should go through the administrative law approach in order to stop something that is clearly racketeering, and which we all agree we want to stop. I do not know why we should have to go through that kind of rigmarole to accomplish the result.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator be willing to permit a union to go into court to seek redress in the case of an unfair labor practice on the part of management?

Mr. BALL. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot follow the Senator. What is the difference insofar as obtaining relief is concerned?

Mr. BALL. There is a great difference. We are defining something that is unlawful. It is a racket. Unfair practices on the part of employers deal with the reasons or the motives why they discharge or refuse to hire somebody. That is not a question of fact as in the case I am discussing.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can see no difference. The penalties are the same in case of violations of the injunction by the offender. Whether a violation of the act on the part of management or a union is made unlawful or an unfair labor practice, a question of fact is always involved. The injured party seeks redress and if he is able to obtain relief through a Board attorney or through the Board itself should make no difference. As I pointed out on several occasions the Board is compelled to give priority as to all cases involving jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. In the case of jurisdictional strikes the Board is authorized to appoint special arbitrators so that all cases can be handled with speed. I have no doubt but that the Board will set up special machinery to handle all such cases in order that justice can be meted out with the least possible delay. My belief is the fact that we make jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts unfair labor practices will act as a deterrent and few violations will come to the attention of the Board.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like a little time on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from New York is favoring the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio, but is opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. In that case, I am sure the time can be satisfactorily adjusted. Did the Senator from New York have in mind any particular length of time he would like to speak?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York will try to finish within 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to have an understanding that the Senator from Florida yields 7 minutes to the Senator from New York and that the Senator from Minnesota yields 3 minutes, for the reason I cannot in this instance be either wholly with the Senator from Florida or wholly with the Senator from Minnesota. I am probably more strongly opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I find that I have remaining 4 minutes only, and I think I should conserve that time.

Mr. IVES. Then, if I may, I ask the Senator from Florida to yield me 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York appreciates the courtesy shown him by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I want to point out a few salient things in connection with this particular proposal. In the first place, I am opposed to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota for two very simple reasons: First, his proposal revives the injunction upon the request of an employer. I grant it is limited to a particular type of case, but, nevertheless, insofar as the principle itself is concerned, there is definitely a violation of the principle of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I want to point out to the Senators that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which has been referred to so frequently, was passed and signed under the administration of President Hoover, and I think the Senate would do well to keep that in mind. I deplore a condition which in any way, shape, or manner will revive the flagrant abuses which brought about the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I think the pending amendment opens the door; it is the entering wedge.

Second, in his very effective statement outlining the contents of the bill, at the beginning of its consideration by the Senate, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Ohio, indicated that the unfair-labor-practice procedure provided by the bill would be sufficient without the injunctive procedure proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

In the first place, a priority is given this particular type of case. If I know anything about the workings of the National Labor Relations Board, I am absolutely convinced the Board will have to set up additional machinery to take care of cases of this particular kind. I am further convinced that the Board will do so, and that the priority referred to will insure almost immediate consideration of cases of the kind prescribed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I cannot yield, because I am so limited in time. I should like to do so, but I cannot.

Furthermore, as the matter develops, the same thing would be found true in practically every part of the country. It has been pointed out that possibly the unfair-labor-practice procedure might not be so effective as the direct injunction obtained by the employer. To some extent, perhaps, it would not be. Perhaps there would not be the immediate action obtainable by injunction, but by and large, the entire suggested procedure is intended to deal with the National Labor Relations Act. The provisions with respect to jurisdictional disputes and with respect to secondary boycotts, which are met by a statutory denial, deal fundamentally with the National Labor Relations Act. In effect, such boycotts and strikes would constitute violations of that act, if indeed they would not actually violate other laws. The remedy should be found in procedures under the National Labor Relations Act. So I say that if there should be a slight delay—and I do not think there would be, once the system is established—but if there should be a slight delay, the right approach is through the provisions of the committee bill without opening the door to abuses which formerly existed and which resulted in the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I have stated my second reason for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Third, I am opposed to it, because Senators will have before them either a substitute for the amendment or a direct amendment—I do not know which it will be. Incidentally, that is why I should have obtained the 3 minutes from the other side, because I cannot go along with what I believe to be the position of the Senator from Florida on this particular phase. As I understand, a substitute amendment will be offered, to authorize the bringing of actions for damages in the Federal courts, under certain conditions as I have indicated. I know of no reason in the world why actions for damages should not be permitted in the Federal court. That is perfectly legitimate. I know of no reason in the world why one suffering from such abuses or violations should not have the right to recover damages, not only in the Federal court, but in any court.

I want to point out to the Senator from Nebraska, and any other Senators who may have made the point, that in my judgment the right to recovery as proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will take care of the situation about which the Senator from Nebraska inquired. Once it is established that recovery may be had for damages in the Federal courts, it will go a long way toward stopping the jurisdictional dispute and secondary boycott.

I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Florida, but I shall not use all the time he granted me. For the three reasons I have stated I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. If the procedure provided in the bill should not take care of the situation I should like to add a fourth reason. I deny that it will not take care of it, but if it should not, then the joint committee established by the bill, will be following the matter, as it will be following other questions which have been considered in the debate, and if, in another year, the proposed procedure should be found inadequate, the joint committee could and should come forward with proposals which would satisfactorily take care of conditions that may exist at that time.

For all these reasons I submit that there can be no justification for the adoption of such amendment as the one proposed by the Senator from Minnesota; but I want it definitely understood that I am wholeheartedly supporting the proposal to be made by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The substitute proposal offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is subject to many of the same objections as I shall make to the original amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. While the substitute proposal eliminates injunctive relief at the instance of the United States attorney or private parties, it nevertheless makes every person who participates in a strike for one of the outlawed objectives liable to damage suits. In other words, the proposal of the Senator from Ohio would open wide the doors of the Federal courts to damage suits against any person who engaged in a strike or attempted to persuade other employees to engage in a strike for one of the prohibited objectives.

The proposal very definitely would take us back at least 40 years and we would again have the spectacle of mass suits against employees, similar to the infamous Danbury Hatters case. Senators will recall that in that case some 150 members of the union were sued by their employer and the Supreme Court of the United States sustained a judgment against them in the neighborhood of a quarter million dollars. As a matter of fact the proposal would make it substantially easier to maintain a damage suit than was the case under the Sherman Act as interpreted by the Danbury Hatters case and the Apex Hosiery case. In the Apex case the Court stated that in the earlier cases arising under the Sherman Act the activities had been "directed at control of the market" and had resulted in "a suppression of competition in the market." But under the substitute proposal all that need be shown in order to maintain a damage suit is that the party plaintiff has been "injured in his business or property."

It also should be pointed out that the substitute proposal is inconsistent with the present provision in the bill allowing

a union to be sued for breach of contract. Section 301 of the bill permits suits against labor organizations only, whereas the substitute proposal allows damage suits against "any person." Also, section 301 limits recovery to the assets of the union. The substitute allows the attachment of employees' bank accounts and all their property.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. On request by the Senator from New York and others who raised the point, I am amending the proposal, by striking out the word "person," in the second line, and inserting in lieu thereof "labor organization," so the action will be open only against labor organizations promoting this type of strike.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say, Mr. President, that I am very glad the Senator from Ohio is agreeing, at least, to remove my first objection to the amendment. I shall not press the argument on that point, other than to say that had it remained as it was submitted to the Senate, we should have been back to the Danbury Hatters' case of 40 years ago. I think, however, it illustrates the great mistake in our proceeding, during the closing days of debate, to amend the bill presented by the committee, by suggesting such hastily drafted amendments as are now being presented to the Senate. I think the bill should be taken as it came from the committee, without additional amendments.

I do want to make the additional argument against the Taft substitute, that it makes it possible for two different district courts and the NLRB to be dealing simultaneously with the same subject matter. The Board would be conducting a hearing looking to a cease-and-desist order. At the same time, the Board would be required, as provided in the committee bill, on which I shall comment in a moment, to seek injunctive relief, which means that there would be two actions going on at the same time, or that there might be. While I acquiesced in this latter provision when it was added to the bill, I may say that I did so rather reluctantly. That is an example, however, of my willingness to enter into reasonable compromise in committee. I did so believing that the best procedure would have been to make it discretionary, rather than mandatory, for the Board to seek injunctions.

Finally, under this proposal, we have a third agency—probably a different Federal court—deciding whether a damage action lies. Such dispersion of authority, in my judgment, is very bad legislative policy.

Mr. President, in view of the question raised by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] a short time ago, I want to emphasize that under the committee bill discretion is left with the Federal court, after notice has been filed, to go into a hearing on any request for injunctive relief. I want to call the Senate's attention to page 33 of the bill, line 7, as follows:

(l) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4 (A), (B), and (C) of section 8 (b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred. If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, he shall, on behalf of the Board, petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter.

Now note the procedure, Mr. President:

Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That no temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration of such period.

In other words, Mr. President, in the committee bill we have given to the courts certain discretionary power in issuing injunctions, but, as pointed out by the Senator from Michigan, however, we have limited that power by adequate procedural safeguards.

I want to say that I think one of the results of the Taft substitute, contrary to the approval of it by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], will be the use of litigation, the use of lawsuits, the effort to break up unions by constantly bringing them into court on one charge or another, whether foundation in fact lies for the charges. It does not make any difference, so far as the union treasury is concerned, Mr. President, whether the charges are truthful or whether they are false.

Furthermore, let us recall again the fact that as of today, under our State laws, those who are harmed by unions have the right to go into court and sue if they can bring proof that they have been damaged by the action of unions or of a union.

What we are trying to do here, it seems to me, is to superimpose upon a very sound administrative law structure devised to bring about the settlement of labor disputes the old technique of damage suits in order to harass and weaken a union. I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I certainly disagree with his views that in this field we ought to set aside our whole body of administrative law. Administrative law has been built up over the years in this country, Mr. President, to deal exactly with certain specified, specialized fields of the activity, such as transportation, labor relations, and some agricultural problems. Why then is an attack made on administrative law as it deals with labor unions? I will tell the Senate why. Because antiunion employers know that one of the best ways to break a union is to keep its treasury depleted by way of court action. I submit, Mr. President, that one of the results of the amendment will be to foster that type of anti-union activity.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but time does not permit.

Many of the amendments I have opposed, Mr. President, including this one, are based upon a view of labor relations which causes me to believe that the amendments overlook the realities of labor relations. In discussing the amendment with respect to industry-wide bargaining the other day, I pointed out that the amendment was based upon the wholly erroneous premise that local unions had no voice in choosing or control over their agents—the officers of the international union. In discussing the amendments relating to health and welfare funds, I again pointed out that, contrary to the view of the sponsors of the amendment, trade-union members do exercise considerable control over their officers and have means of holding them accountable for their actions. A similar unfortunate approach to labor-relations problems is implicit in the proposal here made; namely, that employees enjoy striking, are ready to do so at any time, and suffer no penalties or deterrents in the event they go on strike. Only such a view is consistent with the outlawing of the strike for recognition.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the very potent deterrents to striking which now exist, or the error of those who believe that the only cause for strikes lies in the desire for power on the part of a small group of trade-union leaders. I am sure those who voted for the Smith-Connally Act were surprised, as I was not, to find that employees voting in a Government-conducted election upon a question loaded against striking during wartime, nevertheless, voted by overwhelming majorities in favor of such strikes. At the present time an employee who goes on strike, contrary to many assertions made by the proponents of these amendments, is not automatically reassured that he will get his job back, but takes the hazard that he may never be restored to employment.

I want to add, Mr. President, that I think one of the primary effects of the Ball amendment will be that it will destroy the right to strike for recognition purposes. In addition, the employee faces the obvious loss of his salary or wages for an indefinite period and sometimes loss of status in the enterprise which has been employing him. I ask what provocations would induce the Members of this body voluntarily to cut off their source of income for an indefinite period, with the possibility that they might never get their jobs back? It must be self-evident that only wrongs rankling deep in the hearts of workers can induce them to take a step so vital to their welfare. That they do so voluntarily in so many cases is an unhappy commentary on the status of our industrial relations, but I am confident that the answer is to be found not in for-

bidding even this safety valve to outraged feelings, but in basic improvements in our management-labor relations.

While, as indicated by my support of the committee bill, I feel that there are instances where we should and can properly place some restraint upon use of this power, I feel strongly that the strike for recognition is not one of them. It frequently happens that, when a union has just begun its organizing efforts, an employer undertakes retaliatory action. The discharge of one or two of the most active union members is a sharp warning to others who have joined the union that they will be the next to go and any courageous person, justifiably incensed by this invasion of the rights of the group by the employer, might well feel it necessary to take steps in self-defense particularly by way of withdrawing the economic power of those who remain in order to meet the challenge laid down by the employer. To deny this weapon is to force men to wait in abject fashion for such further attacks as the employer may care to make upon their most fundamental rights.

But, say the sponsors of this measure, under the National Labor Relations Act these men now have an alternative in that they may receive protection from the Board. It is well that they do and the steady falling off in the last 10 years of strikes for recognition indicates that in a vast majority of cases employees do resort to the processes of the Board rather than engaging in strike action. But the remedy provided by the National Labor Relations Act is slow and time-consuming, running in litigated cases to a period of about 3 years. The hazards of the law are always there and even a meritorious claim may fail for lack of proof or on a technicality. It is a particularly unhappy answer when the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board are inadequate to enable it even to begin to do its job. Insofar as the remedy is effective, employees will of course use it as an alternative to striking; and every self-interest will encourage them to do so. Further, the National Labor Relations Act by no means covers all provocative action by an employer which may induce employees to engage in a strike for recognition. There may be grievous infractions of other Federal or State laws, there may be a deliberate incitement to such strikes by the employer through an "agent provocateur" or other means. To deny employees under these circumstances their right of self-help is to award a bonus to those employers who engage in the most outrageous antisocial conduct. While I do not welcome strikes for recognition—or, indeed, any type of strike—I have not the slightest question that this is an instrument which should properly be left in the hands of employees where the circumstances are so outrageous as to induce them to resort to it.

The next change from the committee bill is the insertion of the language contained in section (b) of the amendment which allows the district attorneys to bring suits for injunctions in the district courts for any violation of this subsection. The procedure of the committee bill is set forth in section 10 (j), (k), and (l) of the committee bill which, in my judgment, fully meets the problem of enforcing these provisions. Under section 10 (j) of the committee bill the National Labor Relations Board may in its discretion apply for a temporary restraining order where unfair labor practices have been committed, including, of course, the unfair labor practices which we are here discussing. Section 10 (k) authorizes the Board to appoint arbitrators in jurisdictional disputes whose decision is to be final. Section 10 (l) requires that with respect to secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes the regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board shall petition for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to the case.

It has been my consistent endeavor while this legislation has been under discussion to vest determination of labor problems so far as it is humanly possible to do so in a single organization that is expert in labor problems. I assume that if the debates on this bill have served no other purpose they have demonstrated to all Members of the Senate the complexity and difficulty of this field. Labor problems are complex; as complex, indeed, as our entire social structure, since the great mass of our people are workers. It is a field which has been growing even more complex as our society has come to depend more and more upon the output of large industrial enterprises. Nor will these problems be simplified if the legislation which we have here proposed becomes law. Close day-to-day contact with these problems is necessary if able persons are to keep themselves even reasonably informed.

I am confident, despite the high regard in which I hold the district judges of the United States, that they have neither the background, the desire, or the time, to become experts in these matters. It is one thing to grant to the district courts, upon application of the Board, an interim power to maintain the status quo pending resolution of the problem by the body which we have selected as the expert body to handle such problems. It is quite a different thing to do what this bill proposes, namely, to throw these matters for final decision into the laps of the approximately 250 district judges of the United States, some few of whom may have some knowledge of the field, but all of whom can certainly not pretend to be experts. I feel that it is placing upon them an unfair burden to ask that they gain the necessary experience which the amendment would require them to have.

It is unhappily true, even though frequently unjustified, that many labor organizations and workers, because of unfortunate experiences before passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, hold the Federal courts in great mistrust. I believe that many of those unfortunate decisions which made the Norris-LaGuardia Act so necessary arose precisely out of the ignorance of the Federal courts concerning labor matters. I do not believe we will enhance either the reputation of the Federal courts, or the respect of our people for the Federal courts, or the cause of industrial peace, by placing these matters in the hands of our district courts for solution. And everything I have said may be applied with equal vigor to the district attorneys who would be called upon to bring such action.

The provisions of the committee bill should not make it necessary for me to indicate that I am heartily in sympathy with discouraging jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. I submit that the committee does contain adequate machinery appropriate to that end. But all our debate has been centered on the search for sound solutions to existing problems; I cannot be convinced that it is sound legislation to disperse the authority over these problems, to draw into the orbit of their handling, a host of district attorneys and Federal judges without competence in the field or, by splitting up authority among all the district attorneys and district judges of the land, to make impossible the development of a uniform body of precedent and decisions, harmoniously integrated with each other over the entire economy.

Section (c) of the proposed amendment is, in my judgment, also unwise. This allows suits for damages to be brought in the Federal courts for violations of the section to recover damages and costs of the suit. Since the Clayton Act is also repealed as to this type of violation under section (d) of the amendment, this would mean that a trade-union engaging in these practices could be enjoined, could be sued for damages in the Federal courts, and would be liable criminally under the Sherman Act for treble damages. Nothing in the way of such remedies is proposed for unfair labor practices when committed by employers, and I suggest that if we are to give something more than lip service to the ideal of equality which we have set for ourselves, that we should be careful, as the committee bill has been, to make certain that the remedies available against employers and labor organizations are precisely equal. The manifest injustice of such additional penalties in the case of employee unfair labor practices alone would forever serve to damn any legislation here adopted as discriminatory class legislation.

It has happened in the past—frequently before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act—that employers entered into arrangements by which they agreed to blacklist union employees in an entire industry—or to supply insurance funds to enable employers to enter into lock-outs against organizations, or to supply funds for spying on labor organizations. No one will deny that such practices cause substantial harm and damage to the interests of trade-unions throughout the country and to the individuals composing them. Such practices may well continue clandestinely in various parts of the country, and to the extent that they may be revived they represent a serious danger to trade-unions. Yet the sponsors of this amendment have not suggested that such practices by employers, if again revived, should be subject to the penalties here proposed to be applied against trade-unions.

Section (d) further removes the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act from "any contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of commerce, to which a labor organization is a party, if one of the purposes of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, distribution, or competition, or impose restrictions or conditions upon the purchase, sale, or use of any material, machines, or equipment."

After all, our objective, Mr. President, ought to be to prevent labor abuses, and not proceed here today, by hastily considered amendments under the great limitation of time under which we are laboring, to give to the Federal courts power which I submit in practice is going to result in a return to many of the old abuses of the injunctive powers of the courts that led in the first instance to the adoption of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Adoption of the amendment certainly would lead to a great deal of litigation to determine how much power in fact has been returned to the courts.

As I have stated, the provisions of the committee bill should not make it necessary for me to indicate that I am heartily in sympathy with discouraging jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. I proposed the provisions of the committee bill which seek to make those practices unfair labor practices. I think that is as far as we should go in this session of Congress. Let us implement and effectuate those sections of the committee bill. Let us try them for a year and then determine whether I am right or wrong when I say that with those sections in operation we shall not need any additional Federal legislation to check jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

Next I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the small phrase contained in the amendment—"If one of the purposes" is to fix prices, and so forth. For years, even prior to passage of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the courts had developed the doctrine of primary purpose. In the first of the Coronado Coal cases (259 U. S. 344 and 268 U. S. 295) the Court pointed out that the Sherman Act was not violated because union activities restricted production.

In the second Coronado case in 1925 Chief Justice Taft said:

> The mere reduction in the supply of an article to be shipped in interstate commerce by the illegal or tortious prevention of its manufacture or production is ordinarily an indirect and remote obstruction to that commerce. But when the intent of those unlawfully preventing the manufacture or production is shown to be to restrain or control the supply entering and moving in interstate commerce, or the price of it in interstate markets, their action is a direct violation of the Antitrust Act (citing cases). We think there was substantial evidence at the second trial in this case tending to show that the purpose of the destruction of the mines was to stop the production of nonunion coal and prevent its shipment to markets of other States than Arkansas, where it would by competition tend to reduce the price of the commodity and affect injuriously the maintenance of wages for union labor in competing mines.

This language followed the opinion of Mr. Chief Justice Taft in *United Leather Workers International Union* v. *Herkert & Meisel Trunk Co.* (265 U. S. 457), where Chief Justice Taft said:

> The sole question here is whether a strike against manufacturers by their employees, intended by the strikers to prevent, through illegal picketing and intimidation, continued manufacture, and having such effect, was a conspiracy to restrain interstate commerce under the Antitrust Act because such products when made were, to the knowledge of the strikers, to be shipped in interstate commerce to fill orders given and accepted by would-be purchasers in other States, in the absence of evidence that the strikers interfered or attempted to interfere with the free transport and delivery of the product when manufactured from the factories to their destination in other States, or with their sale in those States.
>
> We think that this question has already been answered in the negative by this Court (citing the first Coronado case).

The Court then reviewed various authorities and continued:

> None of these cases * * * can properly be said to support the argument that mere intentional cutting down of manufacture of production is a direct restraint of commerce in the product intended to be shipped when ready * * *.

And in conclusion:

> We concur with the dissenting judge in the circuit court of appeals when, in speaking of the conclusion of the majority, he said:
>
> "The natural, logical, and inevitable result will be that every strike in any industry or even in any single factory will be within the Sherman Act and subject to Federal jurisdiction provided any appreciable amount of its product enters into interstate commerce."

In the *Apex Hosiery Case* (310 U. S. 469), decided in 1940, the Court recognized the distinction between primary intent and objectives and the secondary intent present in every strike to limit or restrict production. If it is enough to look to the secondary intent to stop production then, as the Supreme Court has consistently pointed out, every strike would be illegal. But since the provision of the amendment here is to make a strike illegal "one of the purposes" of which is to restrict production, then every strike automatically becomes illegal. As Mr. Justice Stone, speaking for the Court in the Apex Hosiery case said:

> Concededly the purpose of the strikers and their principal objective was to compel petitioner to yield to their demands for a union shop, but it is a matter of common knowledge and experience that the stoppage of a large manufacturing plant, which the strikers did intend, whose product is distributed generally to consumers throughout the country, would prevent its shipments in interstate commerce.

After discussing the various cases under the Sherman Act, Chief Justice Stone concluded:

> Underlying and implicit in all of them is recognition that the Sherman Act was not enacted to police interstate transportation, or to afford a remedy for wrongs, which are actionable under State law, and result from combinations and conspiracies which fall short, both in their purpose and effect, of any form of market control of a commodity, such as to monopolize the supply, control its price, or discriminate between its would-be purchasers. These elements of restraint of trade are wholly lacking here. We only hold now, as we have previously held in both labor and nonlabor cases, that such restraints are not within the Sherman Act unless they are intended to have, or in fact have, the effect on the market on which the court relied to establish violation in the second Coronado case.
>
> If, without such effect on the market, we were to hold that a local factory strike, stopping production and shipment of its product interstate, violates the Sherman law, practically every strike in modern industry would be brought within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, under the Sherman Act, to remedy local law violations. The act was plainly not intended to reach such a result, its language does not require it, and the course of our decision precludes it.

Further, the Supreme Court in 1911 in the Standard Oil case developed the doctrine that in order to show a violation of the Sherman Act it was necessary to show that there was an unreasonable restraint upon interstate commerce. This test, too, would be abolished in the case of labor organizations alone if the pending measure were to become law. The language of this section would revive the case of *Duplex* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443) and the *Bedford Cut Stone Case* (274 U. S. 37). In those cases workers attempted to protect their own living standards by refusing to work upon goods made by nonunion labor; the outcry against those cases was among other abuses responsible for the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. An examination of history and an accurate appraisal of the background of public reaction in the labor field, should persuade us to avoid again facing the outcry which attended those unfortunate cases.

This portion of the amendment is genuinely playing with fire. Its literal effect would be to make all strikes illegal. It will be noted that the amendment, for instance, contains no clause protecting workers who strike because machinery is dangerous; it becomes illegal to impose restrictions or conditions upon the purchase, sale, or use of any material, machines, or equipment. Hence any strike by workers against the use of dangerous machinery would subject them to an immediate injunction, severe suits in the Federal courts, and imposition of treble damages under the Sherman Act.

The language of this section is so broad, its possibilities so infinite, its impact upon well-settled doctrines so far-reaching, that I shall not make the effort to expand what seem to me to be its dangerous implications. I am confident that only years of litigation, turmoil, and strife could ever adequately explore its sinister possibilities. Suffice it to say that of all the proposals which have been made on the floor of the Senate, this seems to be most clearly a provision which is not thought through, designed to interfere with vast areas of legitimate union activity as well as with a small area of indefensible union practice. It is utterly clear on the face of the amendment that its effect must be in very

large measure to wipe out the Norris-LaGuardia Act, to repeal entirely the Clayton Act, and to put us well back to the state of the common law in England in the late 1700's, when any combination of workers was a conspiracy. The bill uses the language of "combination" and "conspiracy" and thereby wakes echoes of the common law now more than a century and a half forgotten.

For reasons which escape me, section 303 (a) (4) of the amendment changes the language of the committee bill which reads "for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to members of a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to members of some other labor organization." The amendment omits the words "members of" where they appear for reasons which are entirely unclear to me. I suggest that the language in the committee print is clear and definite and thus should not be changed without some valid reason.

I submit that on the basis of the decisions of Chief Justice Taft the Ball amendment will take us back to the situation which was brought out in the Coronado cases and the Herkert & Meisel case. In other words, the amendment seeks to move us back, in my judgment, a great many years in labor relations, back to the era of labor injunctions and oppressive court action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes additional to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by repeating that the substitute amendment would also throw the question of labor relations once more back into the courts, with all the litigation which would flow from it. If anyone thinks that that would bring labor harmony, he is not aware, in my judgment, of the lengths to which labor will go to see to it that not again will there be shackled upon the free workers of the United States all the abuses of the injunctive process which would rise again either under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or that of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I can state very briefly my reasons for opposing the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

I am entirely in accord with his statement that there can be no defense for secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes; but this question arose in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I look upon it as a matter of procedure. We decided, after debating the question, that instead of opening these cases to direct attack by employers aggrieved, it was wiser to consider them as unfair labor practices, and put them under the National Labor Relations Board. I feel that as we have broadened the scope of the National Labor Relations Board and the scope of the Wagner Act to include unfair labor practices by labor organizations as well as by employers, our logical procedure in dealing with these questions is through the Board, placing the responsibility on the Board to deal with such cases, whether on the one side or the other.

But beyond that, all through the discussion before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I took the position—and never swerved from it—that we should not open up the Norris-LaGuardia Act to the use of injunctions by private employers or private individuals aggrieved. It is my judgment that the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be open only for injunctions in behalf of the Government, in the limited classes of cases provided in our bill.

As the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] so ably stated a few minutes ago, we would be making a very serious mistake to open the Norris-LaGuardia Act beyond that point, and therefore I oppose the suggestion in the Ball amendment that that be allowed to be done.

We have taken care of the question of time. I admit that these cases may not be handled as quickly through the procedure of the National Labor Relations Board, but I think we should experiment with that procedure. If we find that it does not work effectively enough, after trial and error, we can determine what is necessary to be done to cure the defect. I feel that we should try what we have sought to write into the bill as a complete revision of the Wagner Act, with unfair labor practices on both sides, and the primary responsibility with the National Labor Relations Board to protect both parties.

That is a brief statement of my position on this question. Let me add that I am entirely in favor of the so-called Taft substitute, whether it is offered as a substitute or as a separate amendment, because I see no reason why injured persons should not go into court to seek damages for wrongs in the event wrongs are done. My primary objection is to the use of the injunction in such cases.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether he knows of any reason, or principle, why a person who claims to have been injured by a jurisdictional strike or secondary boycott should not be permitted to go into court, employ his own lawyer, and control his own litigation, rather than have it sent to the National Labor Relations Board to determine whether his rights shall be presented to the court in an injunction proceeding.

Mr. SMITH. It is only because I feel that we are experimenting with procedure in these questions in an effort to improve the relations between management and labor, and not to raise new barriers through the feeling brought about by lawsuits. I do not believe that the way to deal with this problem in the first instance is by seeking injunctions. I believe that the problem should be handled by the Board, which is distinctly charged with the responsibility of being a judicial board to take care of problems on both sides of the controversy. I think we are justified in experimenting with that procedure before we go back to all the old legal remedies, including especially the injunctive remedy, which caused so much trouble in the early labor cases.

I admit that secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are indefensible; but questions will arise with respect to which discretion may be needed, and I believe that the Board can serve a very useful function, even in cases of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator, notwithstanding the point of trial and error to which he referred, know of any reason on principle why a person who claims to suffer an irreparable injury should not be entitled to control his own litigation, conduct his own suit, and hire his own lawyer?

Mr. SMITH. My only answer to the distinguished Senator is that in injunctive cases I am leaning over backward to try to improve the relations between labor and management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I offered a substitute for the Ball amendment. It is mimeographed and on the desks of the Senators. I now withdraw the substitute. I find that under the circumstances Members on both sides of the proposition are liable to vote against the substitute in the first instance if it is offered as a substitute. If the Ball amendment fails of adoption, I shall offer my substitute as a separate and direct amendment to the bill.

I now withdraw the substitute. When I offer it, I shall make one change. The word "person" in line 2 will be changed to read "labor organization," so that suits in secondary boycotts may be brought only against labor organizations and not against individuals, which might have been the effect, as stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

My views on the subject of the Ball amendment are stated in the supplemental views found on page 4 of the majority report. I do not change those views. However, in the progress of the consideration of a bill the Senator in charge of it should judge the temper of the Senate and the action which should be taken. I found that opposition to restoring the injunctive process even in cases of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes seemed to be so strong, and I am so anxious to retain provisions covering the right of direct action in suits brought for damages in cases of that kind, that I have determined that I shall vote against the Ball amendment and then offer the substitute, which provides for direct suits in cases of secondary boycott. I think that will be a powerful deterrent. While the injunctive process through the National Labor Relations Board is not so direct, it is an injunctive process of a kind; but without

the right to sue for damages, there is no recourse for a man who is injured by a secondary boycott. I was appealed to last week while I was in Connecticut by a man who had lost $100,000 because the sign-hangers union refused to hang his signs, and they practically put him out of business completely.

It seems to me that the right to sue for damages is a very vital thing to retain. As I sense the sentiment of the Senate, I believe it is in favor of that, although perhaps not for the injunctive procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that some of the Senators who the Senator apprehends would vote against the Ball amendment would vote against the substitute amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] within the last few days and have tried to reach a compromise of some kind, and having reached a compromise I intend to act in accordance with it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator stated that he had not changed his views as set forth in the supplemental statement of certain Senators as set forth in the report. I ask the Senator, in order that the record may show it, whether the statement to which he still adheres includes the sentence set forth in the conclusion on page 56 of the report, which I read:

> We see no reason why any one of these four amendments—

And I interpolate that the Ball amendment is one of them—

> should be regarded as punitive or restrictive of the legitimate rights of labor unions. They do not go beyond the general principles accepted in the committee bill, but they do fill up gaps which we feel are serious.

Does the Senator still adhere to that statement?

Mr. TAFT. I agree with everything that is stated in that report. As the Senator in charge of the bill I believe that the welfare of the entire bill will be benefited by the compromise into which I have entered, so far as I myself am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota deals with matters of procedure, with the problem of how the prohibition against certain types of labor activity is to be enforced. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio also deals with a matter of procedure.

The bill as reported by the committee already outlaws the activities in question by making them unfair labor practices, and even enables the National Labor Relations Board to obtain an immediate injunction while it is conducting a hearing on the issue. We are led to believe that the only question that now remains is whether we should add to these sanctions the suit for damages contemplated by the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, or the damage suit, injunction, and antitrust prosecution contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

I shall return presently to the question of whether all or any of these enlargements on the sanctions already contained in the bill are warranted or desirable; but I believe we must put first things first, and I therefore wish at this point to direct my remarks to the fact that, regardless of the sanctions employed, the language of these amendments and of their counterpart in section 8 (b) (4) of the bill strikes without discrimination at legitimate efforts of labor unions to employ peaceful economic action in promoting their lawful interests.

Let us look at the language in question. It would be unlawful for any labor organization "to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment" if the objective of the strike, or refusal to handle, was one of four objectives enumerated. The first of these objectives, we are told, is the so-called secondary boycott. Let us examine this language. A strike or refusal to handle, or the encouraging of others to strike or to refuse to handle, is made unlawful if it is conducted "for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person."

Mr. President, I believe that all of my colleagues on the committee, and all others who have given serious thought to the problems of labor relations, will agree that there are few issues that are more complicated and more illusive than those connected with secondary boycotts. Here we have a term which is almost incapable of any precise definition, but which is one of those very dangerous loaded phrases which can be tossed around indiscriminately to stir the emotions and cloud the brain. In support of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota we are told in the committee report that "there appears to be virtually no disagreement as to the complete injustice of secondary boycotts." I, for one, refuse to do my thinking on the basis of loaded phrases and slogans. If I am going to pass judgment on secondary boycotts, I want to know what they are in concrete and understandable terms, in terms that have some meaning in the light of the economic realities involved.

And so I look once again to the language of this provision which is designed to outlaw this so-called secondary boycott, and I find, in substance, a prohibition against any strike or any refusal to handle or any effort to encourage others to do likewise which is designed to persuade one employer to cease dealing with another employer.

At this point, Mr. President, the question we must, of course, ask ourselves is this: What is there about a strike or refusal to handle which has the objective of persuading one employer not to deal with another that is evil, and as a result of which this practice must be banned in its entirety? Surely it cannot be the fact that in such conduct parties who are not directly concerned in the labor dispute are adversely affected. At the outset of this debate the Senator from Ohio, and chairman of the Labor Committee, stated that in a free economy we must recognize freedom to strike "in spite of the inconvenience, and in some cases perhaps danger, to the people of the United States which may result from the exercise of such right." There is no doubt that in an economy such as ours, in which specialization and interdependence are the keynotes, virtually any strike of any significance adversely affects the interests of third parties, many of whom are wholly innocent, and frequently wholly incapable of influencing the settlement of the dispute. But we are willing to suffer such injustices because we realize, or at least enough of us realize, that in a free country the wage earner must be free to work or not to work, for whom he will, and that curtailing that freedom involves a greater injustice than permitting it, and trusting to his sense of reasonableness, and to the controlling influence of public opinion to curb its abuse.

Certainly, therefore, the evil of the workers' striking or refusing to handle in order to bring pressure upon some employer to cease dealing with another cannot be said to lie in the fact that innocent third parties are affected, unless we are willing to place a similar restriction on any strike which has a like effect.

The fact is, Mr. President, that there are justified and unjustified boycotts, just as there are justified and unjustified strikes, but the true test cannot be whether or not third parties are affected. The true test must be the objective sought to be accomplished. In the ban on strikes or refusals to handle with a view to persuading one employer to cease dealing with another we do not have any reference whatsoever to the underlying objective of the economic action. The ban is placed indiscriminately on a particular form of economic action regardless of what the objective may be.

Throughout this debate we have had our attention focused on boycotts used in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes; but it is well to remember that the labor boycott began as an effort by labor unions to protect hard-won union wage standards and working conditions from the depressing influence of the sweat-shop

conditions in many nonunion businesses. Many boycotts even today are purely defensive and are carried on for that purpose. As such they have a beneficial influence on society because they support better wages and better working and living conditions for everyone.

Consider, for example, the facts in one of the early boycott cases, *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443) to which the Senator from Florida directed our attention several days ago. There were four manufacturers of printing presses; three of them operated a union shop, the fourth did not, and paid lower wages and required longer hours. The three union manufacturers, unable to meet the competition of the nonunion producer, threatened to refuse to continue the union shop unless the nonunion producer likewise adopted it. The union of printing press workers called upon workers installing, delivering, and repairing presses to refuse to handle the presses of the nonunion producer.

Are we prepared to call such activity unjustified? Yet it would be clearly unlawful under the bill and amendment we are now considering. In the words of Mr. Justice Brandeis:

> When centralization in the control of business brought its corresponding centralization in the organization of workingmen, new facts had to be appraised. A single employer might, as in this case, threaten the standing of the whole organization and the standards of all of its members; and when he did so the union, in order to protect itself, would naturally refuse to work on his materials wherever found. When such a situation was first presented to the courts judges concluded that the intervention of the purchaser of the materials established an insulation through which the direct relationship of the employer and the workingmen did not penetrate; and the strike against the materials was considered a strike against the purchaser by unaffected third parties * * * But other courts, with better appreciation of the facts of industry, recognized the unity of interest throughout the union, and that, in refusing to work on materials which threatened it, the union was only refusing to aid in destroying itself.

This bill, and the amendments we are now considering, would reverse the trend to which Mr. Brandeis referred. It would be unlawful for union labor in one craft to refuse to handle products made by nonunion labor even in the same or related craft. It would be unlawful for union labor to strike in order to compel their employer to cease dealing with a nonunion employer. It would be unlawful for the union workers to refuse to work next to nonunion workers of another employer engaged in a common project. In each of these situations the efforts of the unionized workers are primarily directed at protecting their own organizations, and their wage and hour standards against the destructive competition of nonunion labor.

I have said that the criterion with which to distinguish between justifiable and unjustifiable boycotts should be the objectives of the action. I have cited examples in which I believe the objectives are legitimate, but which would be struck down under this bill and the amendments we are considering. I would be the last to condemn legislation specifically limited to boycotts used in furtherance of objectives which are not legitimate; and that was stated very specifically in the minority views filed by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Florida, and myself. We stated there, and we now state again, that we would support legislation to prevent boycotts when used to further jurisdictional strikes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act, and I am certain that if thorough investigation by a commission or joint committee disclosed that the boycott was being used in any substantial fashion to further other objectives which are as clearly illegitimate, we would support extending the ban to cover those situations. But we cannot in good conscience support a measure which outlaws the secondary boycott without reference to the objectives pursued, and thereby attacks activities which in the distilled wisdom of many of our courts and many outstanding authorities in the field of labor relations have come to be recognized as socially beneficial, morally just, and legally right.

I have been endeavoring to demonstrate to the Senate that, entirely apart from the question of the nature of the sanctions imposed, the amendments now under consideration, and their counterpart in the unfair labor practice section of the bill, are, at least so far as the boycott situation is concerned, drafted without regard to valid distinctions between wholly acceptable and wholly unacceptable situations that may arise. I wish to say a word, however, with reference to the extension of sanctions, which is the direct function of the two amendments.

The suit for damages contemplated in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is, I believe, open to attack, first of all, on the ground that it would further compound the difficulties which would be created by section 301 of the bill. For reasons which I believe are adequately set forth in pages 13 and 14 of the minority views, it would be most unwise to depart from the present amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship jurisdictional requirements in our Federal courts. The dockets of these courts are already crowded beyond reason, and the institution of a new era of litigation involving boycotts and jurisdictional disputes would merely add to the existing difficulties.

In a more fundamental sense, this amendment would introduce an element of gross inequality in the enforcement of the unfair labor practices. It would make available to employers a remedy—private suit in the Federal courts—which is nowhere available for employees who may be injured as a result of the commission of an unfair labor practice by employers—and this in a bill which, we are advised, is designed to equalize the position of employers and employees.

The amendment introduced by the Senator from Minnesota gives rise to these same problems, plus many more. Much has already been said, and much more could be said, about the grave dangers involved in restoring the use of the labor injunction. Mr. President, the injunction can be beneficial as the means of preventing unions from committing unlawful acts; but, as a device for forcing people to work, it is an insidious device to deny to free Americans their constitutional rights against involuntary servitude. I do not believe that Senators want to make themselves parties to any action which would again commit the United States Government to a course of denying Americans their rights as freemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of the 6 minutes remaining, 4 minutes are under the control of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and 2 minutes are under the control of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like particularly to call the attention of the southern Senators to an editorial which appeared in the International Teamster, the official magazine of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, in the June 1946 issue. In the editorial, Mr. Tobin states that the cotton bloc in Congress has supplied the Republicans with sufficient votes to pass antilabor legislation, and therefore he calls upon the members of the international teamsters' union and all other organized labor to boycott cotton production and thereby defeat the southern delegation in Congress; and he states that because of the activities of southern Senators in behalf of labor legislation, legislation to curb his ruthless power, he urges a secondary boycott; by means of which the economy of the South would be destroyed and the Senators from the South would be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO CRACK THE COTTON BLOC

The cotton bloc in Congress is responsible for most of our domestic troubles. It is composed of the reactionary southern Democrats who team up with the equally reactionary northern Republicans to destroy the living standards of the American people.

Naturally the Republicans must bear the bulk of the blame because they are more numerous. But without the cotton Senators, and Congressmen, they would be only a noisy, dangerous minority.

The cotton bloc supplies the votes the Republicans need to kill legislation promoting full employment, higher wages, social security, and public health.

It also supplies the votes the Republicans need to pass legislation restricting labor, removing price control, and reducing taxes for large corporations. Such legislation reduces living standards by reducing the purchasing power of the workers' wages.

The cotton bloc is interested chiefly in higher prices for cotton, even though that means higher prices for shirts, dresses, underwear, socks, and other articles of wearing apparel.

When Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles restricted speculation in cotton, the southern Congressmen attacked him and the whole price-control program in retaliation. They are demanding inflation in cotton, even if it means inflation in everything.

The public can go naked while warehouses bulge with cotton being hoarded for higher prices, for all the cotton bloc cares.

The southerners in Congress, interested primarily in perpetuating the plantation slave economy of the South, think that the public is helpless.

But it is not. It can strike back with devastating force. How? By simply boycotting cotton goods.

You can buy rayon underwear; rayon, nylon, silk, or wool socks and shirts. You can reject articles made of cotton, even insisting on automobile tires made with rayon instead of cotton thread. Such tires wear longer and are safer.

If the public becomes cotton-conscious and refuses to buy anything made of cotton, the price of cotton will tumble and the power of the cotton bloc in Congress will be broken. Many of them may be defeated for reelection because of the penalty their arrogance brought upon the South.

Labor can do this job by mobilizing its economic strength and diverting its buying power to cotton substitutes with which the market will soon be loaded.

Patronize your friends, is the key to the success of the union label. And there is no union label on the cotton Congressmen. They are apostles of the open shop.

You can beat them if you make the simple resolution and tell it to your friends:

Don't buy cotton!

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and a telegram from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, both of which state their conviction that both the pending bill and the Taft proposal, which now has been withdrawn, would be inadequate to protect effectively farm producers against the secondary boycott and "hot cargo" tactics which have been used against them, and they urge support of the pending amendment.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1947.

Hon. J. H. BALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BALL: The Taft substitute for the Ball antiboycott, antimonopoly amendment, offered yesterday, is thoroughly unsatisfactory. It will create great disappointment and cause resentment among the dairy and other farmers of your State.

Elimination of subsection (d) of the Ball amendment dealing with labor unions comprised jointly of wage workers and self-employed persons such as country haulers and farmers and controlling the marketing and pricing of commodities is a severe blow to farmers who in many parts of the country are distressed and oppressed by these practices.

The House of Representatives passed a very adequate provision dealing with secondary boycotts and monopolistic practices of labor unions. The Ball amendment meets this problem courageously; the Taft substitute dodges the issues.

The Taft substitute should be defeated. The Ball amendment should be passed.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

MAY 9, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH H. BALL,
Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Substitute amendment offered by Senator TAFT is very inadequate to protect farmers against secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and monopolistic practices of labor unions, which have heavily penalized farmers and public generally. Farmers are expecting Congress to enact effective legislation to protect them against these abuses, which violate basic rights of public. Substitute amendment contains no protection against monopolistic practices and its boycott provisions will be ineffective, especially with respect to perishable food commodities, unless parties are given right to secure court injunction restraining boycotts which otherwise will cause losses of perishable food. Respectfully urge that Senate protect farmers by approving Ball-Byrd-Donnell-George amendment.

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm
Bureau Federation.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it has been alleged that the amendment is a hastily considered or ill-considered piece of legislation. That is not so. A provision similar to this amendment was in the Case bill, which was passed by both Houses of Congress at the last session. It was in Senate bill 55, which was introduced in January; and it was considered fully in the committee. It was voted out of the bill, in the committee, by a vote of 7 to 6.

Mr. President, the issue in connection with the pending amendment is very simple. The committee bill provides for injunctive relief against secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, but it provides that the citizen who is injured, whose rights are transgressed by a union which has engaged in those racketeering practices, must first obtain the permission of the regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board before he can go into court to protect his rights, and then only the attorney or the Board goes into court; the injured citizen does not control his own action.

Mr. President, I think the American people in the last election voted against that kind of bureaucratic authority over the rights of citizens; and I think any person who is injured by such racketeering practices should have the right to go directly into court and obtain relief.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I heartily join the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the announcement that they are opposing the pending amendment because they feel that it goes too far.

The amendment, if adopted, would accomplish two things: First, it provides that citizens who allege injury may secure injunctions against boycotts. Such a provision would be an amendment to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The bill itself provides that it shall be mandatory upon the regional attorney or the regional representative of the National Labor Relations Board, if a complaint is filed with him, to seek an injunction. So, today, under the provisions of the bill it is mandatory for an agent of the Board to seek an injunction against a boycott. The Senator from Minnesota by his amendment would extend that further, to allow that dangerous right to be exercised by a private citizen.

The second point is that the amendment is designed, as the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, to overrule or correct, as he stated, the decision of the United States Supreme Court that the antitrust laws of the United States are not intended to be applied to labor unions. The Senator from Minnesota is trying to reverse or set aside that decision of the Supreme Court and to make the antitrust laws applicable to labor unions. I do not believe the Senate wishes to make those two radical departures from either the present law or the present decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has control of all the time remaining between now and 1 o'clock, which is approximately one minute and a half.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to make the parliamentary situation clear. Am I correct in stating that the proposed substitute of the Senator from Ohio has now been withdrawn, and that the vote at 1 o'clock will be on the Ball amendment as offered yesterday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. Inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has withdrawn his amendment in the nature of a substitute, the question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Is the so-called Ball amendment the amendment which is printed and on our desks this morning, and which was submitted yesterday by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. REED. That amendment, as printed and lying on our desks, is the amendment upon which we are to vote, is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. In order to make sure that I understand the Chair's statement, I should like to inquire if it is the understanding of the Chair that if the amendment now pending, which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], is defeated, the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. TAFT] then will offer his substitute amendment, or the one which he has called a substitute amendment, immediately following?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that if the Ball amendment is rejected, the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator can offer any amendment to the bill which he may desire to offer to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to offer the amendment as an amendment to the bill, if the Ball amendment is rejected. It will not be necessary to offer it otherwise, because in that event the bill will contain the provision.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. MORSE and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting they would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If present, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—28

Ball	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Hickenlooper	Stewart
Bushfield	Kem	Tydings
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Capper	McKellar	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Moore	Wilson
Eastland	O'Daniel	
George	Reed	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hill	Murray
Baldwin	Hoey	Myers
Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Brewster	Ives	Overton
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lodge	Sparkman
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Downey	McCarran	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McMahon	Umstead
Flanders	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Malone	Wagner
Green	Maybank	Watkins
Hatch	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Morse	

NOT VOTING—5

Capehart	O'Mahoney	White
Jenner	Tobey	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL on behalf of himself and other Senators was rejected.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1253. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to extend terminal leave benefits to the survivors of members of the armed forces who died while on active duty between September 8, 1939, and September 1, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1254. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1255. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by requiring that veterans entitled to benefits thereunder have served honorably in the armed forces on full-time active duty with pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Andrew Mathewes;

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of William Karundeng; and

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of Johannes R. Andu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1259, relating to searches of the premises of persons arrested by officers and agents of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILSON (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1260. A bill to provide for the settlement and payment to certain motor carriers of claims against the United States for damages resulting from Federal possession, control, and operation in time of war of the carriers' transportation systems and properties; to provide for just compensation to such carriers for the use of such transportation systems and properties during such possession, control, and operation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McGRATH introduced Senate bill 1261, to provide emergency relief for American citizens captured on American sovereign territory by the armed forces of Japan, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1262. A bill to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names, for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. VANDENBERG (for himself, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 111, approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution creating a joint committee to formulate plans for withdrawal of Federal restrictions over Indians in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE RIGHT OF FREEDOM FROM SEARCH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to searches of the premises of persons arrested by officers and agents of the United States. I request that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1259) relating to searches of the premises of persons arrested by officers and agents of the United States, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on

the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) no officer or agent of the United States having authority to arrest a person charged with a crime or offense against the laws of the United States shall, by reason of such authority, have any right to search the dwelling, place of business, or other premises of such person.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall prohibit the seizure by such officer or agent of any property found (1) within the dwelling, place of business, or other premises of such person, and (2) within plain view of such officer or agent at the time and place of such arrest or while going to or coming from such place, if such officer or agent has reasonable grounds to believe (A) that the property so seized was stolen or embezzled in violation of any law of the United States or was used as the means of committing the crime for which such arrest is made, or (B) that custody or possession thereof is unlawful under any law of the United States; or prohibit the search by any such officer or agent of any individual lawfully arrested or the seizure of any property found on the person of such individual.

SEC. 2. No evidence obtained by any officer or agent of the United States in violation of the provisions of this act shall be admissible in any criminal prosecution in a court of the United States.

SEC. 3. Any officer or agent of the United States who makes a search in violation of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $1,000 or by imprisonment for not to exceed 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to supersede or modify any law of the United States relating to the issuance or execution of search warrants or to affect in any way the admissibility of evidence obtained pursuant to any search warrant.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just introduced by me, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington News. The editorial is entitled "Right of Freedom From Search," and I wish to read the first paragraph of it:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Mr. President, that is the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I wish to have the editorial printed in full, and to have printed following it the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of the Supreme Court of the United States, which was handed down on May 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial and dissenting opinion were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT OF FREEDOM FROM SEARCH

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized." (Fourth amendment to the Constitution.)

The Supreme Court, to our way of thinking, stuck its foot through that particular part of the Bill of Rights in its Harris case decision this week. It was another of those 5-to-4 divisions, concerning which there probably will be much hell to pay until the High Court reverses itself.

Harris, a small-bore crook in Oklahoma City, was arrested on a charge of trying to defraud an oil company by a check forgery. FBI agents had an arrest warrant, but no search warrant. Nevertheless, they took custody of the man in his apartment and proceeded to search the premises. For 5 hours they ransacked the place. They were looking for a couple of canceled checks for evidence.

They didn't find what they sought, but they did find in the bottom of a dresser drawer an envelope containing a number of draft cards and registration forms, possession of which is illegal under the Selective Service Act. It was for this latter crime that Harris was tried, convicted, and sentenced. The case was carried to the Supreme Court on the question of whether the fourth amendment had been violated.

Chief Justice Vinson, for the majority, ruled that the search was not "unreasonable," since it was confined to the premises where the arrest occurred. And that the evidence was valid, since it was discovered in the course of that search, although it related to a crime at the time unsuspected by the arresting officers.

The four minority Justices denounced that end-justifies-the-means line of reasoning—and we think what they said makes sense. We haven't space here to repeat their eloquent and vehement language.

The gist of their dissents was that the arresting officers, if they had good reason to believe incriminating evidence was hidden in the man's apartment, could have gone before a judge and obtained a search warrant "particularly describing the place to be searched, and * * * things to be seized." Not circumscribed by such due process, any arresting officer might feel free to ransack from cellar to garret any home, or to rifle all the desks and safes and files of any office, wherever an arrest is made—even though the arrest be for a misdemeanor. And the arresting officer would be largely free to choose the premises to be searched, among all the places where the accused person might be found.

As an old police reporter, we see readily that this would make it pretty easy for a politically run police department to arrest one of the mayor's opponents on a minor charge, then go through his effects to try to pin something on him.

If that should happen to a respectable citizen, instead of a penny-ante criminal like Harris, we are sure that the majority Justices—Vinson, Burton, Reed, Black, and Douglas—would hold the search "unreasonable." But before any such other test case reaches them, much damage is likely to be done.

The minority Justices—Jackson, Rutledge, Murphy, and Frankfurter—probably don't love the Fourth Amendment Act more than the majority does. But they seem to have a better understanding of how cops act on a raid.

The most moderate of the dissents was that of Mr. Justice Jackson, from which we quote:

"In view of the long history of abuse of search and seizure which led to the fourth amendment, I do not think it was intended to leave open an easy way to circumvent the protection it extended to the privacy of individual life. In view of the readiness of zealots to ride roughshod over claims of privacy for any ends that impress them as socially desirable, we should not make inroads on the rights protected by this amendment * * *

"Of course, this, like each of our constitutional guaranties, often may afford a shelter for criminals. But the forefathers thought this was not too great a price to pay for that decent privacy of home, papers, and effects which is indispensable to individual dignity and self-respect. They may have overvalued privacy, but I am not disposed to set their commands at naught."

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 34—OCTOBER TERM, 1946.—GEORGE HARRIS, PETITIONER *v.* THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MAY 5, 1947—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

(Mr. Justice Frankfurter, with whom Mr. Justice Murphy and Mr. Justice Rutledge concur, dissenting.)

Because I deem the implications of the Court's decision to have serious threats to basic liberties, I consider it important to underscore my concern over the outcome of this case. In *Davis* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 582) the Court narrowed the protection of the Fourth Amendment[1] by extending the conception of "public records" for purposes of search without warrant.[2] The Court now goes far beyond prior decisions in another direction—it permits rummaging throughout a house without a search warrant on the ostensible ground of looking for the instruments of a crime for which an arrest, but only an arrest, has been authorized. If only the fate of the Davises and the Harrises were involved, one might be brutally indifferent to the ways by which they get their deserts. But it is precisely because the appeal to the Fourth Amendment is so often made by dubious characters that its infringements call for alert and strenuous resistance. Freedom of speech, of the press, of religion, easily summon powerful support against encroachment. The prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure is normally invoked by those accused of crime, and criminals have few friends. The implications of such encroachment, however, reach far beyond the thief or the black-marketeer. I cannot give legal sanction to what was done in this case without accepting the implications of such a decision for the future, implications which portend serious threats against precious aspects of our traditional freedom.

If I begin with some general observations, it is not because I am unmindful of Mr. Justice Holmes' caution that "General propositions do not decide concrete cases." *Lochner* v. *New York* (198 U. S. 45, 76). Whether they do or not often depends on the strength of the conviction with which such "general propositions" are held. A principle may be accepted "in principle," but the impact of an immediate situation may lead to deviation from the principle. Or, while accepted "in principle," a competing principle may seem

[1] "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

[2] While this case presents a situation not involved in the Davis case, or in *Zap* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 624) so that the Court's conclusion cannot rest on those cases, it is appropriate to note that neither of those cases carries the authority of a majority of the Court. Aside from the fact that a constitutional adjudication of recent vintage and by a divided Court may always be reconsidered, I am loath to believe that these decisions by less than a majority of the Court are the last word on issues of such far-reaching importance to constitutional liberties.

more important. Both these considerations have doubtless influenced the application of the search and seizure provisions of the Bill of Rights. Thus, one's views regarding circumstances like those here presented ultimately depend upon one's understanding of the history and the function of the fourth amendment. A decision may turn on whether one gives that amendment a place second to none in the Bill of Rights, or considers it on the whole a kind of nuisance, a serious impediment in the war against crime.

The provenance of the fourth amendment bears on its scope. It will be recalled that James Otis made his epochal argument against general warrants in 1761.[3] Otis' defense of privacy was enshrined in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 in the following terms:

"XIV. Every subject has a right to be secure from all unreasonable searches and seizures of his person, his houses, his papers, and all his possessions. All warrants, therefore, are contrary to this right if the cause or foundation of them be not previously supported by oath or affirmation, and if the order in the warrant to a civil officer to make search in suspected places, or to arrest one or more suspected persons, or to seize their property be not accompanied with a special designation of the persons or objects of search, arrest, or seizure; and no warrant ought to be issued but in cases and with the formalities prescribed by the laws."

In the meantime Virginia, in her first constitution (1776), incorporated a provision on the subject narrower in scope:

"SEC. 10. That general warrants, whereby an officer or messenger may be commanded to search suspected places without evidence of a fact committed, or to seize any person or persons not named, or whose offence is not particularly described and supported by evidence, are grievous and oppressive, and ought not to be granted."

When Madison came to deal with safeguards against searches and seizures in the United States Constitution he did not draw on the Virginia model but based his proposal on the Massachusetts form. This is clear proof that Congress meant to give wide, and not limited, scope to this protection against police intrusion.

Historically we are dealing with a provision of the Constitution which sought to guard against an abuse that more than any one single factor gave rise to American independence. John Adams surely is a competent witness on the causes of the American Revolution. And he it was who said of Otis' argument against search by the police, not unlike the one before us, "American independence was then and there born" (10 Adams, Works, 247). That which lay behind immunity from police intrusion without a search warrant was expressed by Mr. Justice Brandeis when he said that the makers of our Constitution "conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men. To protect that right every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment."

To be sure, that was said by him in a dissenting opinion in which he, with Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Stone, applied the prohibition of the fourth amendment to wiretapping without statutory authority. *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U. S. 438, 478. But with only an occasional deviation, a series of decisions of this Court has construed the fourth amendment "liberally to safeguard the right of privacy." *United States* v. *Lefkowitz*, 285 U. S. 452, 464. (See an analysis of the cases in the appendix to this opinion.) Thus, the Federal rule established in *Weeks* v. *United States*, 232 U. S. 383, as against the rule prevailing in many States, renders evidence obtained through an improper search inadmissible, no matter how relevant. See *People* v. *Defore*, 242 N. Y. 13, and Chafee, the Progress of the Law, 1919–22, 35 Harv. L. Rev. 673, 694 et seq. And long before the Weeks case, *Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U. S. 616, gave legal effect to the broad historic policy underlying the fourth amendment.[4] The *Boyd* opinion has been the guide to the interpretation of the fourth amendment to which the Court has most frequently recurred.

It is significant that the constitution of every State contains a clause like that of the fourth amendment and often in its precise wording. Nor are these constitutional provisions historic survivals. New York was alone in not having a safeguard against unreasonable search and seizure in its constitution. In that State the privilege of privacy was safeguarded by a statute. It tells volumes that in 1938, New York, not content with statutory protection, put the safeguard into its constitution.[5] If one thing on this subject can be said with confidence, it is that the protection afforded by the fourth amendment against search and seizure by the police, except under the closest judicial safeguards, is not an outworn bit of eighteenth century romantic rationalism, but an indispensable need for a democratic society.

The fourth amendment we have seen derives from the similar provision in the first Massachusetts Constitution We may therefore look to the construction which the early Massachusetts court placed upon the progenitor of the fourth amendment:

"With the fresh recollection of those stirring discussions (respecting writs of assistance), and of the revolution which followed them, the article in the Bill of Rights, respecting searches and seizures, was framed and adopted. This article does not prohibit all searches and seizures of a man's person, his papers, and possessions, but such only as are 'unreasonable,' and the foundation of which is 'not previously supported by oath or affirmation.' The legislature were not deprived of the power to authorize search warrants for probable causes, supported by oath or affirmation, and for the punishment or suppression of any violation of law" (*Commonwealth* v. *Dana* (2 Met. (Mass.) 329, 336)).

The plain import of this is that searches are "unreasonable" unless authorized by a warrant, and a warrant hedged about by adequate safeguards. "Unreasonable" is not to be determined with reference to a particular search and seizure considered in isolation. The "reason" by which search and seizure is to be tested is the "reason" that was written out of historic experience into the fourth amendment. This means that, with minor and severely confined exceptions, inferentially a part of the amendment, every search and seizure is unreasonable when made without a magistrate's authority expressed through a validly issued warrant.

It is noteworthy that Congress has consistently and carefully respected the privacy protected by the fourth amendment. Because they realized that the dangers of police abuse were persisting dangers, the fathers put the fourth amendment into the Constitution. Because these dangers are inherent in the temptations and the tendencies of the police, Congress has always been chary in allowing the use of search warrants. When it has authorized them it has circumscribed their use with particularity. In scores upon score of acts, Congress authorized search by warrant only for particular situations and in extremely restricted ways. Despite repeated importunities by Attorneys General of the United States, Congress long refused to make search by warrant generally available as a resource in aid of criminal prosecution. It did not do so until the First World War, and even then it did not do so except under conditions carefully circumscribed.

The whole history of legislation dealing with search and seizure shows how warily Congress has walked precisely because of the fourth amendment. A search of the entire premises for instruments of crime merely as an incident to a warrant of arrest has never been authorized by Congress. Nor has Congress ever authorized such search without a warrant even for stolen or contraband goods. On the contrary, it is precisely for the search of such goods that specific legislative authorization was given by Congress. Warrants even for such search required great particularity and could be issued only on adequate grounds. (For a table of congressional legislation, with indication as to its scope, see

---

[3] For reports of Otis' famous argument, see 2 Adams' Works, pp. 523–525; Tudor, Life of James Otis, ch. VI; Quincy's Massachusetts Reports, pp. 471 et seq. (see also pp. 51–55); American History Leaflets, No. 33. And see the tribute of John Adams to Otis, Samuel Adams, and Hancock in 8 Old South Leaflets, p. 57 (No. 179). "The seizure of the papers of Algernon Sidney, which were made use of as the means of convicting him of treason, and of those of Wilkes about the time that the controversy between Great Britain and the American Colonies was assuming threatening proportions, was probably the immediate occasion for this constitutional provision. See *Leach* v. *Money* (Burr, 1742; S. C., 1 W. Bl. 555, 19 State Trials 1001), and Broom, Constitutional Law, 525; *Entick* v. *Carrington* (2 Wils. 275; S. C., 19 State Trials 1030), and Broom, Constitutional Law, 558; May, Constitutional History, ch. 10; Trial of Algernon Sidney (9 State Trials 817)." Cooley, Principles of Constitutional Law (1st ed.) 212 note 2.

[4] Compare the answers to certified questions by this Court in *Gouled* v. *United States* (255 U. S. 298), with the forecast made by a student of the subject of known partiality in favor of civil liberties. Fraenkel, Concerning Searches and Seizures, 34 Harv. L. Rev. 361, 385–387. As pointed out by Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., in each instance where the Gouled case differs from Mr. Fraenkel's forecast, "the court gave increased force to the constitutional guarantee." Chafee, The Progress of the Law, 1919–22, 35 Harv. L. Rev. 673, 699.

[5] It is not without interest to note the first appearance of provisions dealing with search and seizure in State constitutions: Alabama, I, 9 (1819); Arizona, II, 8 (1911); Arkansas, II, 9 (1836); California, I, 19 (1849); Colorado, II, 7 (1876); Connecticut, I, 8 (1818); Delaware, I, 6 (1792); Florida, I, 7 (1838); Georgia, I, 18 (1865); Idaho, I, 17 (1889); Illinois, VIII, 7 (1818); Indiana, I, 8 (1816); Iowa, I, 8 (1846); Kansas, I, 14 (1855); Kentucky, XII, 9 (1792); Louisiana, VII, art. 108 (1864); Maine, I, 5 (1819); Maryland, Declaration of Rights, XXIII (1776); Massachusetts, I, art. XIV (1780); Michigan, I, 8 (1835); Minnesota, I, 10 (1857); Mississippi, I, 9 (1817); Missouri, XIII, 13 (1820); Montana, III, 7 (1889); Nebraska, I, 7 (1875); Nevada, I, 18 (1864); New Hampshire, I, XIX (1784); New Jersey, I, 6 (1844); New Mexico, II, 10 (1910); North Carolina, Declaration of Rights, XI (1776); North Dakota, I, 18 (1889); Ohio, VIII, 5 (1802); Oklahoma, II, 30, (1907); Oregon, I, 9 (1857); Pennsylvania, Declaration of Rights, X (1776); Rhode Island, I, 6 (1842); South Carolina, I, 22 (1868); South Dakota, VI, 11 (1889); Tennessee, XI, 7 (1796); Texas, Declaration of Rights, 5 (1836), I, 7 (1845); Utah, I, 14 (1895); Vermont, I, XI (1777); Virginia, Bill of Rights, 10 (1776); Washington, I, 7 (1889); West Virginia, II, 3 (1861–63); Wisconsin, I, 11 (1848); Wyoming, I, 4 (1889).

the appendix to the dissenting opinion in the *Davis case*, 328 U. S. at 616.)

This is the historic background against which the undisputed facts of this case must be projected. For me, the background is respect for that provision of the Bill of Rights which is central to enjoyment of the other guarantees of the Bill of Rights. How can there be freedom of thought or freedom of speech or freedom of religion if the police can without warrant, search your house and mine from garret to cellar merely because they are executing a warrant of arrest? How can men feel free if all their papers may be searched, as an incident to the arrest of someone in the house, on the chance that something may turn up, or, rather, be turned up? Yesterday the justifying document was an illicit ration book, tomorrow it may be some suspect piece of literature.

The court's reasoning, as I understand it, may be briefly stated. The entry into Harris' apartment was lawful because the agents had a warrant of arrest. The ensuing search was lawful because, as an incident of a lawful arrest, the police may search the premises on which the arrest took place, since everything in the apartment was in the "possession" of the accused and subject to his control. It was lawful, therefore, for the agents to rummage the apartment in search for "instruments of the crime." Since the search was lawful, anything illicit discovered in the course of the search was lawfully seized. In any event, the seizure was lawful because the documents found were property of the United States, and their possession was a continuing crime against the United States.

Much is made of the fact that the entry into the house was lawful. But we are not confined to issues of trespass. The protection of the fourth amendment extends to improper searches and seizures, quite apart from the legality of an entry. The amendment asserts the "right of the people to be secure" not only "in their persons, houses," but also in their "papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures." It is also assumed that because the search was allegedly for instruments of the crime for which Harris was arrested it was ipso facto justified as an incident of the arrest.

It would hardly be suggested that such a search could be made without warrant if Harris had been arrested on the street. How, then, is rummaging a man's closets and drawers more incidental to the arrest because the police chose to arrest him at home? For some purposes, to be sure, a man's house and its contents are deemed to be in his "possession" or "control" even when he is miles away. Because this is a mode of legal reasoning relevant to disputes over property, the usual phrase for such nonphysical control is "constructive possession." But this mode of thought and these concepts are irrelevant to the application of the fourth amendment and hostile to respect for the liberties which it protects. Due regard for the policy of the fourth amendment precludes indulgence in the fiction that the recesses of a man's house are like the pockets of the clothes he wears at the time of his arrest.

To find authority for ransacking a home merely from authority for the arrest of a person is to give a novel and ominous rendering to a momentous chapter in the history of Anglo-American freedom. An Englishman's home, though a hovel, is his castle, precisely because the law secures freedom from fear of intrusion by the police except under carefully safeguarded authorization by a magistrate. To derive from the common law right to search the person as an incident of his arrest the right of indiscriminate search of all his belongings, is to disregard the fact that the Constitution protects both unauthorized arrest and unauthorized search. Authority to arrest does not dispense with the requirement of authority to search.

But even if the search was reasonable, it does not follow that the seizure was lawful. If the agents had obtained a warrant to look for the cancelled checks they would not be entitled to seize other items discovered in the process *Marron* v. *United States* (275 U. S. 192, 196).[6] Harris would have been able to reclaim them by motion to suppress evidence. Such is the policy of the fourth amendment, recognized by Congress and reformulated in the New Rules of Criminal Procedure adopted only last year. (See rule 41 (e) superseding the act of June 15, 1917, 40 Stat. 228, 229.) The Court's decision achieves the novel and startling result of making the scope of search without warrant broader than an authorized search.

These principles are well established. While a few of the lower courts have uncritically and unwarrantedly extended the very limited search without warrant of a person upon his lawful arrest, such extension is hostile to the policy of the amendment and is not warranted by the precedents of this Court.

"It is important to keep clear the distinction between prohibited searches on the one hand and improper seizures on the other. See Mr. Justice Miller, in *Boyd* v. *United States* (116 U. S. 616, 638, 641). Thus, it is unconstitutional to seize a person's private papers, though the search in which they were recovered was perfectly proper. *E. g., Gouled* v. *United States* (255 U. S. 298). It is unconstitutional to make an improper search even for articles that are appropriately subject to seizure, *e. g., Amos* v. *United States* (255 U. S. 313); *Byars* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 28); *Taylor* v. *United States* (286 U. S. 1). And a search may be improper because of the object it seeks to uncover, *e. g., Weeks* v. *United States* (232 U. S. 383, 393-394), or because its scope extends beyond the constitutional bounds, *e. g., Agnello* v. *United States* (269 U. S. 20).

"The course of decisions here has observed these important distinctions. The Court has not been indulgent toward inroads upon the amendment. Only rarely have its dicta appeared to give undue scope to the right of search on arrest, and *Marron* v. *United States, supra* (275 U. S. 192), is the only decision in which the dicta were reflected in the result. That case has been a source of confusion to the lower courts. Thus, the circuit court of appeals for the second circuit felt that the Marron case required it to give a more restricted view to the prohibitions of the fourth amendment than that court had expounded in *United States* v. *Kirschenblatt* (16 F. 2d 202), see *Go-Bart Co.* v. *United States, sub nom., United States* v. *Gowen* (40 F. 2d 593), only to find itself reversed here, *Go-Bart Co.* v. *United States, supra* (282 U. S. 344), partly on the authority of the Kirschenblatt decision which, after the Marron case, it thought it must disown. The uncritical application of the right of search on arrest in the Marron case has surely been displaced by *Go-Bart Co.* v. *United States, supra*, and even more drastically by *United States* v. *Lefkowitz, supra* (285 U. S. 452), unless one is to infer that an earlier case qualifies later decisions although these later decisions have explicitly confined the earlier case." *Davis* v. *United States* (328 U. S. at 612-613) (dissenting opinion).

It is urged that even if the search was not justified, once it was made and the illicit documents discovered, they could be seized because their possession was a "continuing offense" committed "in the very presence of the agents." Apparently, then, a search undertaken illegally may retrospectively, by a legal figment, gain legality from what happened 4 hours later. This is to defeat the prohibition against lawless search and seizure by the application of an inverted notion of trespass ab initio. Here an unconstitutional trespass ad initio retrospectively acquires legality. Thus, the decision finds satisfaction of the constitutional requirement by circular reasoning. Search requires authority; authority to search is gained by what may be found during search without authority. By this reasoning every illegal search and seizure may be validated if the police find evidence of crime. The result can hardly be to discourage police violation of the constitutional protection.

If the search is illegal when begun, as it clearly was in this case if past decisions mean anything, it cannot retrospectively gain legality. If the search was illegal, the resulting seizure in the course of the search is illegal. It is no answer to say that possession of a document may itself be a crime. There is no suggestion here that the search was based on even a suspicion that Harris was in possession of illicit documents. The search was justified and is justified only in connection with the offense for which there was a warrant of arrest. But unless we are going to throw to the winds the latest unanimous decisions of this Court on the allowable range of search without warrant incidental to lawful arrest. *Go-Bart* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 344), and *United States* v. *Lefkowitz*, (285 U. S. 452), this was an unlawful search which rendered unavailable as evidence everything seized in the course of it. That the agents might have obtained a warrant to make the search only emphasizes the illegality of their conduct. In the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, speaking for the Court, the precious constitutional rights "against unlawful search and seizure are to be protected even if the same result might have been achieved in a lawful way." (*Silverthorne Lumber Co.* v. *United States* (251 U. S. 385, 392).) Nor does the fact that the goods seized are contraband make valid an otherwise unlawful search and seizure. (*Agnello* v. *United States*, (269 U. S. 20).) Indeed it was for contraband goods that search warrants, carefully hedged about, were first authorized by Congress.

The only exceptions to the safeguard of a warrant issued by a magistrate are those which the common law recognized as inherent limitations of the policy which found expression in the fourth amendment—where circumstances preclude the obtaining of a warrant (as in the case of movable vehicles), and where the warrant for the arrest of a person carries with it authority to seize all that is on the person, or is in such open and immediate physical relation to him as to be, in a fair sense, a projection of his person. That is the teaching of both the Go-Bart and the Lefkowitz cases, which effectually retract whatever may have been the loose consideration of the problem in *Marron* v. *United States* (275 U. S. 192). Thus, the Go-Bart case emphasized that the things seized in the Marron case were "visible and accessible and in the offender's immediate custody" (282 U. S. 344, 358). By "immediate custody" was not meant that figurative possession which for some legal purposes puts one in "possession" of everything in a house. The sentence following that just quoted excludes precisely the kind of thing that was done here. "There was no threat of force or general search or rummaging of the place." Ibid.

In our case, five agents came to arrest Harris on a charge of violating the postal

[6] "The requirement that warrants shall particularly describe the things to be seized makes general searches under them impossible and prevents the seizure of one thing under a warrant describing another. As to what is to be taken, nothing is left to the discretion of the officer executing the warrant."

laws and the National Stolen Property Act. Though the arrest was consummated in the living room, the agents were told to make a thorough search of the entire apartment. In the bedroom they lifted the carpets, stripped the bed linen, turned over the mattress. They combed the contents of the linen closet and even looked into Harris' shoes. The selective service cards, the items whose seizure is here in controversy, were discovered only after agents tore open a sealed envelope labeled "personal papers" which they had found under some clothes in a drawer of a small bureau in the bedroom. If there was no rummaging of the place in this case it would be difficult to imagine what rummaging of the place means.

Again, in the Lefkowitz case, the Marron case was carefully defined and limited:

"There, prohibition officers lawfully on the premises searching for liquor described in a search warrant arrested the bartender for crime openly being committed in their presence. He was maintaining a nuisance in violation of the act. The offense involved the element of continuity, the purchase of liquor from time to time, its sale as a regular thing for consumption upon the pfemises, and other transactions including the keeping of accounts. The ledger and bills being in plain view were picked up by the officers as an incident of the arrest. No search for them was made" (285 U. S. at 465).

Surely no comparable situation is now here. There was no search warrant, no crime was openly being committed in the presence of the officers, the seized documents were not in plain view or picked up by the officers as an incident of the arrest. Here a thorough search was made, and made without warrant.

To say that the Go-Bart and the Lefkowitz cases—both of them unanimous decisions of the Court—are authority for the conduct of the arresting agents in this case is to find that situations decisively different are the same.

It greatly underrates the quality of the American people and of the civilized standards to which they can be summoned to suggest that we must conduct our criminal justice on a lower level than does England, and that our police must be given a head which British courts deny theirs. A striking and characteristic example of the solicitous care of English courts concerning the liberty of the subject may be found in the recent judgments in *Christie* v. *Leachinsky*. In that case the House of Lords unanimously ruled that if a policeman arrests without warrant, although entertaining a reasonable suspicion of felony which would justify arrest, but does not inform the person of the nature of the charge, the police are liable for false imprisonment for such arrest. These judgments bear mightily upon the central problem of this case, namely, the appropriate balancing, in the words of Lord Simonds, of "the liberty of the subject and the convenience of the police" (*Christie* v. *Leachinsky* ([1947], 1 All E. R. 567, 576)).[7]

The English attitude was clearly evinced also in the famous Savidge case. "Both the original incident and its sequel illustrate the sensitiveness of English opinion to even a suggestion of oppression by the police." (Fourth Reports of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (Lawlessness in Law Enforcement), p. 261.) For "the high standards of conduct exacted by Englishmen of the police" (id. at 259) see the debates in the House of Commons (220 Hans. Deb. (Commons), cols. 5 and 805 et seq. (July 20, 1928)), and the Report of the Tribunal of Inquiry on the Savidge case (Cmd. 3147 (1928)). There are those who say that we cannot have such high standards of criminal justice because the general standards of English life insure greater obedience to law and better law enforcement. I reject this notion, and not the least because I think it is more accurate to say that the administration of criminal justice is more effective in England because law enforcement is there pursued on a more civilized level.

Of course, this may mean that it might be more difficult to obtain evidence of an offense unexpectedly uncovered in a lawless search. It may even mean that some offenses may go unwhipped of the law. If so, that is part of the cost for the greater gains of the fourth amendment. The whole point about the fourth amendment is that "Its protection extends to offenders as well as to the law abiding," because of its important bearing in maintaining a free society and avoiding the dangers of a police state (*United States* v. *Lefkowitz*, supra, at 464). But the impediments of the fourth amendment to effective law enforcement are grossly exaggerated. The hindrances that are conjured up are counsels of despair which disregard the experience of effective law enforcement in jurisdictions where the police are held to strict accountability and are forbidden conduct like that here disclosed.

Stooping to questionable methods neither enhances that respect for law which is the most potent element in law enforcement, nor, in the long run, do such methods promote successful prosecution. In this country police testimony is often rejected by juries precisely because of a widely entertained belief that illegal methods are used to secure testimony. Thus, dubious police methods defeat the very ends of justice by which such methods are justified. No such cloud rests on police testimony in England. Respect for law by law officers promotes respect generally, just as lawlessness by law officers sets a contagious and competitive example to others. See IV Reports of the National Commission on Law Enforcement and Observance (Lawlessness in Law Enforcement) passim, especially pages 190–192. Moreover, by compelling police officers to abstain from improper methods for securing evidence, pressure is exerted upon them to bring the resources of intelligence and imagination into play in the detection and prosecution of crime.

No doubt the fourth amendment limits the freedom of the police in bringing criminals to justice. But to allow them the freedom which the fourth amendment was designed to curb was deemed too costly by the founders. As Mr. Justice Holmes said in the Olmstead case, "we must consider the two objects of desire, both of which we cannot have, and make up our minds which to choose" (277 U. S. at 470). Of course arresting officers generally feel irked by what to them are technical legal restrictions. But they must not be allowed to be unmindful of the fact that such restrictions are essential safeguards of a free people. To sanction conduct such as this case reveals is to encourage police intrusions upon privacy, without legal warrant, in situations that go even beyond the facts of the present case. If it be said that an attempt to extend the present case may be curbed in subsequent litigation, it is important to remember that police conduct is not often subjected to judicial scrutiny. Day by day mischief may be done and precedents built up in practice long before the judiciary has an opportunity to intervene. It is for this reason—the dangerous tendency of allowing encroachments on the rights of privacy—that this Court in the Boyd case gave to the fourth amendment its wide protective scope.

It is vital, no doubt, that criminals should be detected, and that all relevant evidence should be secured and used. On the other hand, it cannot be said too often that what is involved far transcends the fate of some sordid offender. Nothing less is involved than that which makes for an atmosphere of freedom as against a feeling of fear and repression for society as a whole. The dangers are not fanciful. We too readily forget them. Recollection may be refreshed as to the happenings after the First World War by the Report Upon the Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice, which aroused the public concern of Chief Justice Hughes[8] (then at the bar), and by the little book entitled "The Deportations Delirium of Nineteen-Twenty" by Louis F. Post, who spoke with the authoritative knowledge of an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

More than 20 years ago, before democracy was subjected to its recent stress and strain, Judge Learned Hand, in a decision approved by this Court in the Lefkowitz case, expressed views that seem to me decisive of this case:

"After arresting a man in his house, to rummage at will among his papers in search of whatever will convict him, appears to us to be indistinguishable from what might be done under a general warrant; indeed, the warrant would give more protection, for presumably it must be issued by a magistrate. True, by hypothesis the power would not exist, if the supposed offender were not found on the premises; but it is small consolation to know that one's papers are safe only so long as one is not at home. Such constitutional limitations arise from grievances, real or fancied, which their makers have suffered, and should go pari passu with the supposed evil. They withstand the winds of logic by the depth and toughness of their roots in the past. Nor should we forget that what seems fair enough against a squalid huckster of bad liquor may take on a very different face, if used by a government determined to suppress political opposition under the guise of sedition" (*United States* v. *Kirschenblatt* (16 F. 2d 202, 203)).

---

[7] The extent to which such subordination of the police to law finds support in informed English opinion is reflected by the comments of the Solicitors' Journal. After noting that, in the view of Lord Simon, "Any other general rule would be contrary to our conception of individual liberty, though it might be tolerated in the time of the Lettres de Cachet in the eighteenth century in France or under the Gestapo," the Journal observes: "The importance of the reaffirmation of this principle cannot be exaggerated. The powers of private persons to arrest where a felony has been committed and there is reasonable ground for thinking that the person detained has committed it are important now that crimes of violence are more numerous, and the statutory powers of arrest without warrant under, for example, the Malicious Damage Act, 1861, the Larceny Act, 1916, the Curtis Act of 1876, and many other acts, are more used than is generally appreciated. Of no less importance in such times as these is the assertion of our individual liberties to counteract any tendency which may appear for police powers to be exceeded" (91 Solicitors' Journal, 184–185 (Apr. 12, 1947)).

[8] Address, Harvard Law School Centennial, June 21, 1920, Some Observations on Legal Education and Democratic Progress, page 23: "We cannot afford to ignore the indications that, perhaps to an extent unparalleled in our history, the essentials of liberty are being diregarded. Very recently information has been laid by responsible citizens at the bar of public opinion of violations of personal rights which savor of the worst practices of tyranny." For a contemporaneous judicial account of searches and seizures in violation of the fourth amendment in connection with the Communist raids of January 2, 1920, see Judge George W. Anderson's opinion in *Colyer* v. *Skeffington* (265 F. 17).

APPENDIX

Analysis of decisions involving searches and seizures, from Weeks v. United States (232 U. S. 383) up to Davis v. United States, (328 U. S. 582)[1]

1. Name of case	2. Charge on arrest	3. Authority for arrest	4. Articles seized	5. Articles seized under warrant	6. Articles seized incident to lawful arrest	7. Articles seized incident to authorized search for other articles	8. Decision
Weeks v. *United States*, 232 U. S. 383 (1914).	Use of mails to distribute lottery tickets.	Arrested without a warrant and not during commission of crime.	Personal papers and lottery tickets, taken from defendant's home.	None	None	None	District court had improperly admitted in evidence some of articles seized; conviction reversed.
Schenk v. *United States*, 249 U. S. 47 (1919).	Conspiracy to violate Espionage Act of 1917.	Indictment	Leaflets counseling draft evasion.	Leaflets counseling draft evasion. Warrant was directed to search of Socialist headquarters from which leaflets were mailed by defendant.	do	do	Evidence properly admitted by trial court for use against defendant.
Silverthorne Lumber Co. v. *United States*, 251 U. S. 385 (1920).	Contempt of court for failure to produce books and documents required by subpoena. (One of defendants was a corporation.) Order was based on evidence secured as indicated in columns 3-7.	No arrest	Books and papers seized under color of invalid subpoena.	None	do	do	Order directing production of evidence, which was based on knowledge secured in violation of Fourth Amendment, was error, and conviction for failure to obey order reversed. (White, C. J., and Pitney, J., dissenting.)
Gouled v. *United States*, 255 U. S. 298 (1921).	Conspiracy and use of mails to defraud United States.	Indictment	4 documents taken from defendant's office.	3 of the papers. (The other was taken by stealth from the office by a government agent.)	do	do	On certification, held that papers were inadmissible. Search warrant may issue only when interest of public or complainant in the article is primary, or when its possession is unlawful; it may not issue merely to secure evidence.
Ames v. *United States*, 255 U. S. 313 (1921).	Removal of whiskey without payment of tax; sale of whiskey on which no tax had been paid.	do	Whiskey in question, as result of search without a warrant in defendant's absence. (Officers admitted by defendant's wife.)	None	do	do	Evidence improperly admitted; conviction reversed.
Burdeau v. *McDowell*, 256 U. S. 465 (1921).	Civil suit for return of property in hands of Assistant to Attorney General.	No arrest	Plaintiff's books and papers had been stolen from plaintiff's possession by a party unrelated to the Federal Government.	do	do	do	District court had held that retention of paper for use as evidence was in violation of Fourth and Fifth Amendments; this Court reversed. (Brandeis and Holmes, JJ., dissenting.)
Essgee Co. v. *United States*, 262 U. S. 151 (1923).	Violation of import laws. (Corporate and individual defendants; only latter, of course, were arrested.)	Warrants	Corporate papers and books.	Corporate papers and books produced under subpoena.	do	do	District court admitted evidence against both corporate and individual defendants. This Court affirmed.
Carroll v. *United States*, 267 U. S. 132 (1925).	Transportation of alcoholic beverages.	Arrested during commission of crime.	Alcoholic beverages.	None	Whiskey uncovered during search of car in which it was being transported at time of arrest.	do	Evidence was properly admitted; conviction affirmed (McReynolds and Sutherland, JJ., dissenting.)
Steele v. *United States*, 267 U. S. 498, 505 (1925) (two cases).	1. Action for return of seized liquor.	1. No arrest	1. Liquor	1. Liquor. (Warrant was directed to address not specifically stated to be that of building searched.)	1. None	1. None	1. Evidence properly secured and need not be returned.
	2. Possession of liquor in violation of Prohibition Act.	2. Information	2. Liquor	2. Liquor. (Warrant was directed to prohibition officer. Question of reasonable cause for its issuance was not left to jury.) Alcoholic wines.	2. None	2. None	2. Evidence properly secured and properly admitted by district court; judgment affirmed.
Dumbra v. *United States*, 268 U. S. 435 (1925).	Motion to quash search warrant.	No arrest	Alcoholic wines	Alcoholic wines	None	None	Warrant properly issued on reasonable ground; refusal of district court to quash search warrant affirmed.
Agnello v. *United States*, 269 U. S. 20 (1925).	Possession and sale of cocaine without registration or payment of tax.	Arrested during commission of crime.	Can of cocaine seized at home of one of defendants while he was being arrested several blocks away.	None	do	do	Evidence improperly admitted; conviction, affirmed by the C. C. A., here reversed.

[1] For cases related but not immediately pertinent, see *Olmstead* v. *United States*, 277 U. S. 438; *Goldman* v. *United States*, 316 U. S. 129; *United States* v. *White*, 322 U. S. 694; *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U. S. 186.

Analysis of decisions involving searches and seizures, from Weeks v. United States (232 U. S. 383), up to Davis v. United States (328 U. S. 582)—Continued

1. Name o case	2. Charge on arrest	3. Authority for arrest	4. Articles seized	5. Articles seized under warrant	6. Articles seized incident to lawful arrest	7. Articles seized incident to authorized search for other articles	8. Decision
Byars v. *United States*, 273 U. S. 28 (1927).	Possession of counterfeit alcoholic beverage stamps.	Indictment	Counterfeit alcoholic beverage stamps.	No Federal warrant issued. But warrant was issued by State judge to State officers to search for liquor. Federal officer accompanied them on search and uncovered stamps.	None	Counterfeit alcoholic beverage stamps. (See column 5.)	Conviction in district court, affirmed in the C. C. A., here reversed, because evidence was improperly admitted.
McGuire v. *United States*, 273 U. S. 95 (1927).	Possession o. intoxicating liquor.	Information	Intoxicating liquor.	Intoxicating liquor. (Most o. liquor thus seized was immediately destroyed, with only samples retained for evidence.)	do	None	On certificate from C. C. A. after conviction, held that evidence was properly admitted. Butler, J., concurring in result.
United States v. *Lee*, 274 U. S. 559 (1927).	Conspiracy to violate Prohibition Act.	Arrested while engaging in crime.	71 cases of grain alcohol. Cases were seized on American vessel more than 12 miles from shore.	None	71 cases of grain alcohol.	do	Defendant's conviction, reversed by the C. C. A. on grounds of illegal search, sustained by this Court.
Segurola v. *United States*, 275 U. S. 106 (1927).	Transportation of intoxicating liquor.	Arrested during commission of crime.	Intoxicating liquor.	None	The liquor	do	Conviction, affirmed by C. C. A., affirmed by this Court.
United States v. *Berkeness*, 275 U. S. 149 (1927).	Civil suit to abate nuisance.	No arrest	Liquor	Liquor. Warrant was invalid for failure of allegation of sale on the premises as basis for its issue.	None	do	District court judgment excluding evidence, affirmed by C. C. A., affirmed by this Court.
Marron v. *United States*, 275 U. S. 192 (1927).	Violation of Prohibition Act.	Indictment. (Crime committed in presence of arresting officers. Articles seized, as described in columns 4–7, were taken at time of arrest.)	Intoxicating liquor, ledger, and papers. (Ledger was in closet in back of bar which contained some of the liquor; papers (bills) were on table near cash register.)	The intoxicating liquor.	Ledger and bills. Court held that, while seizure was not authorized by the warrant, ledger and bills were properly seized as within the "immediate possession and control" of offender.	See explanation in 282 U. S. at 358, that the articles "were visible and accessible" and that there was no "rummaging of the place." And see 285 U. S. at 465.	Evidence properly admitted; conviction sustained by C. C. A., affirmed here.
Gambino v. *United States*, 275 U. S. 310 (1927).	Transportation of intoxicating liquor.	Crime committed in presence of arresting officers (state police).	Intoxicating liquor.	None	Liquor seized as result of search of car in which defendants were when arrested. But Court found no probable cause for arrest.	None	Evidence improperly admitted; conviction, affirmed by the C. C. A., reversed here.
Go-Bart Co. v. *United States*, 282 U. S. 344 (1931).	Possession, transportation, sale, etc., of intoxicating liquor.	Invalid warrant	Office papers and records secured by use of keys taken from defendants at time of their arrest, and on false statement that they had a warrant for the papers.	do	None. (See column 3.)	do	Evidence must be returned to defendants; judgments of district court and the C. C. A. reversed.
United States v. *Lefkowitz*, 285 U. S. 452 (1932).	Conspiracy to violate Prohibition Act, including use of premises for sale and solicitation of orders.	Warrant of U. S. Commissioner.	Variety o. papers taken from desks, cabinets, and wastebasket. Among these papers were lists of names and addresses, stationery, bills directed to customers, letters of solicitation, etc.	do	None. (Papers in wastebasket were, of course, in open view.)	do	District court denied motions for return of papers; C. C. A. reversed, and this Court affirmed judgment of C. C. A.
Taylor v. *United States*, 286 U. S. 1 (1932).	Illegal possession of intoxicating liquor.	Arrest made on basis of evidence uncovered during search.	122 cases of liquor. Agents investigated and noticed odor of alcohol coming from garage. Defendant had been under suspicion. Agents broke into garage and uncovered cache of liquor. Defendant was arrested when he came to garage during search.	do	None	do	Evidence of seized liquor improperly admitted; conviction and C. C. A. affirmance reversed.

Analysis of decisions involving searches and seizures, from Weeks v. United States (232 U. S. 383), up to Davis v. United States (328 U. S. 582)—Continued

1. Name of case	2. Charge on arrest	3. Authority for arrest	4. Articles seized	5. Articles seized under warrant	6. Articles seized incident to lawful arrest	7. Articles seized incident to authorized search for other articles	8. Decision
Grau v. United States, 287 U. S. 124 (1932).	Unlawful manufacture and possession of liquor.	Indictment	Still, its appurtenances, and 350 gallons of whiskey.	Still, its appurtenances, and 350 gallons of whiskey. But warrant issued on mere allegations that defendant had been seen hauling cans often used for liquor, and bringing cane sugar onto premises; that full cans were removed from premises; and that odors of fumes of cooking mash were noticeable. There was no allegation of any sale on premises.	None	None	Evidence of seized goods improperly admitted; conviction in trial court and affirmance of C. C. A. reversed. (Stone and Cardozo, JJ., dissenting.)
Sgro v. United States, 287 U. S. 206 (1932).	Possession and sale of intoxicating liquor.	Information	Intoxicating liquor.	Intoxicating liquor. But warrant was invalid. When first issued, it was not executed within 10 days; reissued without new evidence or affidavits.	do	do	Evidence of seized liquor improperly admitted; conviction and its affirmance by C. C. A. reversed. (McReynolds, J., concurring in special opinion; Stone and Cardozo, JJ., dissenting.)
Nathanson v. United States, 290 U. S. 41 (1933).	Importation of liquor without payment of import duties.	Information, filed after seizure.	do	Intoxicating liquor. But warrant issued by state judge at request of customs agent on mere allegation of belief by customs agent that defendant had violated the law.	do	do	Evidence of seized liquor improperly admitted; conviction and affirmance by C. C. A. reversed.
Scher v. United States, 305 U. S. 251 (1938).	Possession and transportation of distilled alcohol on which tax had not been paid.	Arrest during commission of crime.	Distilled alcohol on which tax had not been paid.	None	Liquor seized during search of car which officers had followed into garage adjoining defendant's house.	do	Evidence properly admitted conviction and judgment of C. C. A. affirmed.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR CERTAIN AMERICAN CITIZENS CAPTURED BY ARMED FORCES OF JAPAN

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide emergency relief for American citizens captured on American sovereign territory by the armed forces of Japan. I request that the remarks which I had intended to make in connection with the introduction of the bill, but which I shall not make at this time, in deference to the matter now before the Senate, be printed in the RECORD in the form of a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island will be printed in the RECORD in the form of a statement.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1261) to provide emergency relief for American citizens captured on American sovereign territory by the armed forces of Japan, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGRATH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the remarks of Mr. McGRATH, in the form of a statement, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR J. HOWARD McGRATH, MAY 9, 1947, PRESENTING BILL TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS CAPTURED ON AMERICAN SOVEREIGN TERRITORY BY THE ARMED FORCES OF JAPAN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced I regard as fulfilling a most urgent and moral obligation of our Government growing out of the late war.

The bill incorporates the principles of legislation which are sought by the American Internees Committee, a nonprofit organization of American civilian citizens, who were the victims of atrocities committed upon their person by the Japanese when their armies invaded American soil. There are about 7,000 United States citizens who were interned by the armed forces of Japan for more than 3 years. Most, if not all of these, suffered in addition to torture and ignominy permanent injuries to their health and in many cases complete destruction of their material possessions, all as a result of their confinement.

In some instances, entire families of American citizens were imprisoned by the Japanese and when they were released from imprisonment, they found their homes, including their household goods and personal effects, completely destroyed. Many possessed only the clothes upon their back when they were liberated. They were without funds and, when repatriated, found themselves in destitute circumstances.

During their detention about 600 civilian American citizens died as a result of maltreatment, and our Government has not made any provisions to compensate their next of kin or dependents.

Many American citizens suffered losses during the war period by reason of acts for which the German and Japanese Governments are responsible, and their claims must be satisfied. No tribunal has been created to hear and to determine the claims and enter awards for the losses for which those Governments are responsible since the outbreak of the war December 1941, more than 6 years ago. American claimants are forced to await action by Congress which is required for the consideration and payment of their claims.

UNITED STATES POSSESSES RIGHT TO USE ENEMY PROPERTY TO PAY CLAIMS

Property of enemy governments and their nationals in the United States as of March 17, 1947, vested in the Alien Property Custodian approximates $300,000,000, of which about $215,000,000 was formerly owned by nationals of Germany and $56,000,000 by nationals of Japan. In addition, $66,000,000, of which $11,000,000 is in the form of cash, is presently in the German special deposit account set up in 1928 in the Treasury, representing a transfer of German property to the Treasury by the Alien Property Custodian pursuant to the provisions of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928.

Under the Potsdam declaration the United States possesses the right to retain this property to satisfy the claims of American citizens against Germany and Japan. The United States has already taken out of Germany a substantial amount of German prop-

erty in accordance with the reparations provisions of that declaration for its own use.

Some provisions must be made by Congress for the payment of reparations justly due American claimants. The proposed legislation recognizes the close relationship between the problems which must be solved together. It is impossible to provide for the immediate payment of all the American claimants by recourse to enemy property vested in the Alien Property Custodian. There is not enough of it to satisfy all claims. However, provision can be made for immediate part payment of some urgent meritorious claims of American civilian citizens who while located upon American sovereign territory invaded by the Japanese suffered loss and damage which the United States has not thus far made any provision to compensate and who are in destitute circumstances.

NOT WARNED TO EVACUATE FOR POLITICAL REASONS

American civilian citizens located within the Philippine Islands December 7, 1941, are the victims of Japanese aggression. According to Acting Secretary of State Grew, they "could not with due regard to the national interest be advised to leave for the mainland * * * because it is obvious that for political reasons they could not be warned * * * and having been captured on American soil are entitled to protection and assistance."

United States High Commissioner Sayre was in the Philippines at the time of the Japanese attack and has stated the reason for not giving notice to American civilians to leave was due to "advice from Washington not to do so * * * Washington felt that with due regard to the national interest it would be inadvisable to issue such notice * * * I urge that Congress take such action as is appropriate for the relief of those Americans still in distress as a result of their injuries and losses suffered in the Philippines."

AWARDED CAMPAIGN RIBBONS

Upon the liberation of American civilians after 37 months of internment by the armed forces of Japan in the Philippines, they were awarded by the War Department the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Ribbon and were cited because of their "fortitude and courage which contributed materially to the success of the Philippine Campaign." The War Department has advised these recipients of the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Ribbon that they "shared in the activities of our armed forces." The Philippine Commonwealth awarded the Philippine Defense Ribbon and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon to them in recognition of their services in defending and liberating the Philippines. It is respectfully submitted that this group of Americans possess a semimilitary status.

CAPTURED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES, CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF UNITED STATES, AND EMPLOYEES OF WAR CONTRACTORS COMPENSATED

Congress has enacted about 200 laws for the benefit of the members of our armed forces including reimbursement for loss of pay and allowances while a prisoner of war and providing payments to dependents of prisoners. Provision has been made to compensate them for personal property damaged, lost, destroyed, captured, or abandoned in the service.

Congress has provided benefits for the injury, death, and enemy detention of civilian employees of the United States, including employees of contractors with the United States, and members of the crews of vessels of the American merchant marine service, and compensation for loss of personal property. As recently as July, 1946, Congress passed an act increasing the compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States, and in so doing House Report No. 2510, Seventy-ninth Congress, said in part:

"The maximum amount payable under the workmen's compensation law was considered inadequate to carry out the policy of Congress to take care of the captured employees and their dependents and, in order that the employees of Government contractors should receive approximately the same extent of relief as Congress had previously provided for civilian employees of the Government by act approved December 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 626), amended such act of December 2, 1942.

"Such amendment had the effect of providing for the detained employees 100 percent payment of the rate of pay of civilian employees of the United States.

"An employee of the United States under the amendment of December 23, 1923, is entitled to 100 percent of his wages."

The above-mentioned laws were passed as relief measures for civilian employees of the United States and for the employees of contractors performing work for the United States outside of the continental United States and for the families of such employees in cases of injury, death or detention brought about by action of the enemy, and "to carry out the policy of Congress to take care of captured employees, and their dependents."

DUTY OF GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT PERSON OF ALL ITS CITIZENS

It is the duty of the Government to protect the person of its citizens and extend the same measure of relief to all of its citizens similarly situated as fully and as readily as it has any particular groups of citizens, i. e., armed forces, civilian employees of the United States, and employees of Army-Navy contractors.

The purpose of my present bill is to see that all American civilian citizens who were captured be placed upon an equal basis with employees of the Government and of Army and Navy contractors, and be accorded equal benefits in the matter of compensation for detention by the enemy.

The proposed legislation creates a fund in the Treasury Department to pay the claims of certain civilians who were detained by the Japanese. This is done through the transfer of Japanese and German property by the Alien Property Custodian to the Treasury which is to be held as security for reimbursement of an appropriation out of the Treasury in the amount of $35,000,000.

An emergency payment for relief purposes in the amount of $5,000 is provided for certain beneficiaries.

The claims of veterans are to be adjudicated by the War and Navy Departments and the claims of civilians by the State Department.

BILL EFFECTUATES REPARATION POLICIES

The general purpose of the bill is to have Congress carry into effect the policies of the Departments of State, and Treasury, and the Alien Property Custodian that the vested property of Japanese seized pursuant to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act be used by the United States for its purposes, and that no provision should be made for any return or compensation by the United States to the former owners.

Secretary of State Byrnes, during his tenure of office, wrote Senator McCARRAN:

"The Department is in basic agreement that the property in the United States of Germany and Japan should be made available to meet American claims on account of losses resulting from the war; it appears to the Department that considerable attention should be given to the categories of claims which may be paid from such properties or their proceeds, and to the priority to be given to various types of claims.

"Claims * * * resulting from personal injuries * * * stand high on the list of allowable claims."

A letter from Acting Secretary of Treasury Gardner to Senator McCARRAN states:

"Compensation to private claimants, we believe, should be based only on the ground that such claimants have suffered losses which it would be unjust to require them to bear in addition to their general obligations as citizens. Accordingly, it is the view of this Department that the merits of each class of claim should be judged separately and any class found worthy of redress should be carefully defined by Congress. For example, Americans who were maltreated or have suffered physical injury as interned civilians would appear to be clearly entitled to compensation in dollars."

Seymour J. Rubin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Security Policy, Department of State, testified in opposition to S. 1322, Seventy-ninth Congress, but said that the Department's opposition did not "relate in any way to legislation which might be enacted for the relief of persons who have suffered personal injury or loss of personal property in areas occupied by the enemy."

The bill enunciates a policy that Japanese property is subject to the satisfaction of claims of American citizens, who while located upon American territory under the American flag suffered damages to their person and property as a result of Japanese invasion of part of the United States.

REHABILITATION DESIRED

Repatriated Americans are entitled to be rehabilitated by their Government and desire to make their contribution to the economic life of their own country. Any narrow conception of what compensation these American citizens should receive results in Japan escaping financial responsibility to whatever extent adequate and just compensation is withheld from them.

The claims which are to be paid under the bill are those of American civilian citizens of the United States who are the victims of the Japanese in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Philippine Islands, and Wake occupied American soil where they suffered:

1. Deprivation of liberty, arrest, imprisonment, and internment.
2. Evacuation from their homes.
3. Maltreatment, cruelty, and violence during capture.
4. Impairment of earning capacity during internment and since liberation.

Provision is made to compensate the dependents of those Americans who died as a result of war crimes.

AMERICANS IN PHILIPPINES NOT WARNED TO LEAVE

Acting Secretary of State Grew, on August 4, 1945, made this statement which was released to the press on that date:

"American residents in the Philippine Islands, a territory under United States sovereignty, were not publicly warned to leave before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In view of the steps taken by the War and Navy Departments to evacuate from the Philippines all of their nonessential personnel, including families of officers and enlisted men, the United States nationals who remained in the Philippine Islands were presumably aware of the danger that threatened.

"However, they could not, with due regard to the national interest, be advised to leave for the mainland. Therefore those United States nationals who fell into the hands of the Japanese in the Philippines may well believe that, not having been apprised of the imminent danger, they are entitled to more consideration than United States nationals who remained in foreign countries in the Far East or in Europe despite repeated advice from their Government and its officials to return to the United States while commercial transportation facilities were available.

"American citizens from Wake, and Guam as well as from the Philippine Islands might be given preferential treatment in relation

to those from other areas: (a) because it is obvious that for political reasons they could not be warned officially to return to the United States, as were citizens in Europe and Asia: (b) because these citizens in the Philippine Islands, Wake, and Guam, not having official warning to depart and having been captured on American soil, are entitled to protection and assistance."

In connection with the unconditional surrender of Japan it accepted the Potsdam declaration which results in making Japanese assets in the United States available for payment of our reparation claims.

See written statements of claimants giving graphic accounts of their experiences during internment.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATE ON POSTAL-SAVINGS DEPOSITS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum. I request that the amendments be printed and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments were received, referred to the Committe on Civil Service, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the first page, line 5, after "Sec. 7.", insert "(a)."

On page 2, line 2, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 2, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"(b) Whenever, in the judgment of the board of trustees, current interest rates on obligations of the United States justify a change in the interest rate on postal-savings deposits established by subsection (a), the board of trustees by unanimous vote may increase or decrease the rate of interest payable on such deposits, by multiples of one-fourth of 1 percent per annum, to not more than 2 percent per annum and to not less than 1 percent per annum. Any such increase or decrease in interest rate shall take effect on the 1st day of January or the 1st day of July, as the board of trustees may determine, after public notice of not less than 3 months."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to submit several reports from the Committee on Foreign Relations and make a brief statement with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably, by a full vote of 13 to nothing, the following executive documents:

Executive F. Treaty of peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947;

Executive G. Treaty of peace with Rumania, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947;

Executive H. Treaty of peace with Bulgaria, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947; and

Executive I. Treaty of peace with Hungary, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

There will be a full presentation of our reasons for this action when the treaties are taken up for Senate action. I wish, at the moment, to make only this brief observation.

There are many clauses in these treaties which we all would wish might be written otherwise. But the United States is only one of the four so-called major powers involved, and only 1 of 21 nations in the peace conference from which the treaties stem. It is the considered view of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Foreign Relations Committee that the treaties represent the best available result; that nothing but dangerous uncertainty and confusion would flow from rejection or postponement; and that this report sustains the best available and the best relative hope for peace and stability. Again, we believe this is the better "calculated risk."

We have the greatest sympathy with those among our citizens who have asked for delay or rejection. Italian-American groups have been particularly earnest in these appeals. But we have reached the conclusion that it is best for peace, best for America, and best for the new, democratic Italy that the treaties should be promptly ratified. I ask Senators carefully to read the committee record which soon will be available. It will demonstrate the great efforts which the Government of the United States made to write a treaty that would fairly recognize Italy's right to consideration as an ultimate cobelligerent. It will demonstrate the great contribution which the Government of the United States was able to make to this end. It will unequivocally demonstrate our firm friendship for the new forces of democracy in Italy. This friendship, I dare to prophesy, may be a source of profound encouragement for the future.

This is not the time or place to present the total story. I simply am making this preliminary appeal for careful and considered judgments in the light of all the facts as they shall be disclosed.

We here deal with only the perimeter of European peace. It is inexpressibly regrettable that we do not also have in hand the other treaties, with Austria and Germany, for which we continue to strive with every resource at our command. It is wholly logical to argue a relationship between these problems. But to make one contingent upon the other might be to multiply the hazards and the confusions which would further jeopardize both.

I express the personal view that we have no sound alternative except to start where we can in this process of salvaging peace from World War II; and that if the ultimate pattern of the total European peace finally recommends different treatment for Italy, or any of these other countries, in the interests of the general welfare or friendly relations among nations or in sustaining the purposes and principles of the United Nations, the forum of the General Assembly of the United Nations will be available for this purpose under article 14 of the Charter.

Mr. President, I do not wish to debate the subject of the treaties today. But knowing how deeply this subject comes to the heart of both the Senate and the country, I have wanted to make this preliminary observation as I report from the Foreign Relations Committee and as I ask my colleagues and my fellow citizens to review all the record in reaching a conclusion on this problem which so intimately relates itself to destiny for us, for the world, and for peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be received and the treaties will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, a joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, and so forth. I request that a statement by me, together with an explanatory memorandum, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Michigan; and, without objection, the statement and explanatory memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr. VANDENBERG were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

The resolution to authorize the St. Lawrence project, which several of my colleagues and I have introduced today, is materially

different from similar legislation that has been before Congress in recent years. All previous proposals have been primarily in the nature of public works, like our domestic rivers and harbors projects, to be paid for principally out of the National Treasury. This resolution proposes to make the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a whole self-supporting and self-liquidating, both in its power and in its navigaton phase. This policy is in line with the general desire of Congress and the country to balance the national budget and place the development of natural resources on a self-sustaining basis.

There are many precedents in other international waterways projects for charging tolls in reasonable amounts in order to defray the cost of construction and operation. In fact, most international projects of this nature, such as the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Manchester ship canal, and the Kiel Canal, have had tolls for the purpose of meeting their costs. Since the St. Lawrence seaway is an international project of commensurate magnitude, to be used by the vessels of all nationalities the principle of charging tolls to defray its expenses is in line with this established traditon.

In proposing this legislation I am mindful of the recommendations of Secretary of State George Marshall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Maritime Commission that this project is an important contribution to national security and preparedness for any national emergency. In the cooperative working relationship which it establishes with our cherished neighbor, Canada, it exemplifies a continental solidarity which will not fail to have a favorable effect abroad.

The proposal to charge tolls on the St. Lawrence seaway does not apply to the present navigation facilities within the Great Lakes system. Specifically, it does not apply to the local domestic Great Lakes traffic of Canada and the United States that utilizes the Soo Locks and the Welland Canal. It will not apply, also, to the 14-fcot Canadian Canals on the St. Lawrence River. Trade and navigation that has adjusted itself to these navigation facilities will remain unaffected. Only the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River authorized by this resolution will be affected by the proposition to charge tolls.

It is provided, also, that bulk cargoes, agricultural, mineral and industrial raw materials, will have special consideration and may have lower rates than other products, to the end that the relative advantages of the St. Lawrence seaway to different types of traffic will be maintained insofar as practicable. There is a practical reason for this since ships carrying bulk cargoes are generally loaded to a greater proportion of their capacity than ships carrying a variety of other products. It should be the aim of the two countries to equalize the benefits of the seaway to the producers and consumers of different types of cargo. There is a maximum limit of 1.25 on total charges for any type of cargo.

The resolution calls for the negotiation of a new agreement between Canada and the United States to determine the rates of charges and other pertinent details. This new agreement, to be negotiated during the period of construction, is subject to approval by the Congress.

I regret that the Foreign Relations Committee cannot proceed with early consideration of the proposal. We shall do the best we can; but we have a long series of other treaties and other foreign policy measures which have imperative priority and which have long been waiting their turn. I have a new and positive degree of hope and confidence, however, that in this new form the St. Lawrence project can command congressional approval and that, at long last, we are on the way to success before this Eightieth Congress adjourns next year.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM ON JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Section 1: This section has the effect of authorizing the President to construct the United States' share of the St. Lawrence project, which in the present case means principally the International Rapids section, and the dredging of connecting channels in the Great Lakes, as provided by the Canadian-American agreement of March 19, 1941, upon the following conditions:

A. The Canadian Parliament also approves the said agreement.

B. In approving the agreement, the Canadian Government agrees to the elimination of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX of the Canadian-American Agreement.

C. The Canadian Government agrees to the principle of self-liquidation of the deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River authorized by the joint resolution.

The articles deleted from the agreement as a condition of approval by the Congress deal with the following subjects:

Article VII extended perpetual navigation rights to the two countries in boundary waters and connecting channels and canals where those navigation rights are now terminable with the life of existing treaties.

Article VIII, paragraph (c), established a procedure of arbitration in case of damages resulting in either country in consequence of unilateral diversion of water from the Great Lakes by the other country. This was specifically applicable to the so-called Chicago Diversion, and is permanently deleted from the agreement.

Article IX amended the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, increasing the amount of diversion of water allowed to each country at Niagara River.

Articles VII and IX were eliminated to meet the view that they required the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, because they were considered to be matters properly dealt with by means of treaties.

With the elimination of articles VII, VIII (c) and IX from the agreement, the effect of the remaining provisions of the agreement is to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided last year could be accomplished by majority vote of both houses of Congress.

Section 2: Authorizes the President to negotiate the necessary treaty arrangements to achieve the purposes of articles VII and IX delegated from the agreement by section I of joint resolution.

Section 3 (a): This section authorizes and directs the President to negotiate a new agreement, during the period of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, to define and establish the necessary toll charges to make the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River self-liquidating. The negotiation of this new agreement will not delay the construction of the project. On the contrary, the Canadian-American agreement will come into full force by the provisions of article XI of that agreement when the Congress and the Parliament of Canada approve said agreement, with the exceptions of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX, and the additional proviso that before the agreement comes into force according to article XI of the agreement, the Canadian Government gives satisfactory assurance that they agree to the principle of self-liquidation.

Certain policies are to be followed in the negotiations of these details with Canada. These policies are (a) the total charges will be fair and will give encouragement to increased utilization of the navigation facilities; (b) the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials would be recognized and they may carry differential (lower) rates as compared with other types of cargo; (c) that the maximum charge on any type of cargo shall not exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo and may be lower; (d) that tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River, excluding the 14-foot canals on the Canadian side now in existence, and excluding navigation within the Great Lakes system, the Soo Locks and connecting channels, from toll charges.

Section 3 (b) gives discretionary authority to the President to appoint a St. Lawrence Advisory Commission, which, in cooperation with representatives of Canada and after public hearings, may make recommendations to the two Governments on the administrative, technical, and economic aspects of a toll system.

The resultant agreement on the basis of such studies will be subject to the approval of the United States Congress and the Parliament of Canada.

Section 4: This section authorizes the expenditure of the necessary funds for the accomplishment of the purposes and the undertakings approved by this joint resolution, but prohibits the change in the amount of such authorization by exchanges of notes between the executive agencies of the United States and Canada.

Section 5: Authorizes the President to negotiate an agreement with the government of the State of New York for the transfer of the power facilities to an appropriate State agency under a formula agreed to by New York State and the United States Corps of Engineers, which provides in essence that the State of New York will pay all of the costs of the powerhouse and equipment, plus one-half of the United States' share of the joint costs for navigation and power at the International Rapids section. It is also provided that this arrangement with the State of New York will protect the interests of the United States and of other States, which has particular reference, as a practical matter, to the New England States. Furthermore, this agreement will also be subject to approval by the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of New York.

A BULWARK OF DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Lees Press Clinic, at Natural Bridge, Va., on May 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARTIN TO PENNSYLVANIA MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST WAR VETERANS

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Senator MARTIN on May 9, 1947, to a delegation of Pennsylvania members of the Communist War Veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO WENDELL BERGE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to Wendell Berge, retiring Assistant Attorney General, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Self-Liquidating Seaway," from the Pioneer Press of St. Paul, Minn., of May 5, 1947, and an editorial entitled "A Toll Canal?" from the Vindicator of Youngstown,

Ohio, of May 4, 1947, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WAY OUT OF INFLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Way Out of Inflation," delivered by Senator MURRAY, May 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning next Monday, I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for several weeks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 54, after line 4, to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment, except for one change, is the same one I offered yesterday as a substitute for the Ball amendment, and subsequently withdrew. The change is on line 2 of the mimeographed sheet which is on the desks of most of the Senators, where the word "person" is stricken out and the words "labor organization" inserted.

This is similar to the Ball amendment, dealing with the jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. It eliminates the injunctive process, the suspension of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which I found was creating so much difficulty and opposition to the Ball amendment. It retains simply a right of suit for damages against any labor organization which undertakes a secondary boycott or a jurisdictional strike.

I think it a most effective remedy. Under the bill there is a kind of injunctive remedy through the National Labor Relations Board, but there is no possibility of a suit for damages. I have heretofore cited the typical case of a secondary boycott, wherein the small businessman is practically put out of business because he is required to recognize, we will say, an AFL union, and a CIO union will not handle his goods. There are a number of cases of that kind in the record. Further, I think the threat of a suit for damages is a tremendous deterrent to the institution of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. I may say that, so far as I know, no defense of this kind of strike was made throughout the testimony. There was a suggestion that there was some kind of "good" secondary boycott, but no one was ever able to point to it and to say what it was. I think, since the sentiment of the Senate is against the injunctive process, I see no reason why suits of this sort should not be permitted to be filed. After all, it is only to restore to people who lose something because of boycotts and jurisdictional strikes the money which they have lost. I do not think suits will often be brought, because I believe the possibility of a suit will be a sufficient deterrent to prevent unions undertaking this kind of racketeering activity.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment does not in any wise affect the injunctive process provided for in the pending bill, but simply provides an additional remedy by way of suits for damages.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. We considered making it a procedure through the National Labor Relations Board also, but it is not felt, I think, by any of those on the other side of these questions that the Labor Board is an effective tribunal for the purpose of trying to assess damages in such a case. I do not think anyone felt that that particular function should be in the Board. So, if such remedy is to be provided at all, if there is to be any recourse for financial losses caused by unions, it must be by direct suit, as proposed by the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had assumed that the Ball amendment and the Taft amendment had both, in defining the boycott or the jurisdictional strike, employed substantially the same language as is used in section 8 of the bill, where those things are made an unfair labor practice. It just dawned on me that the Senator has made it unlawful—not an unfair labor practice, but he has made it unlawful to engage in a boycott or in a jurisdictional strike. That is found in section 303 (a) of the Senator's amendment:

It shall be unlawful, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

For the enumerated purposes set out in the amendment. Was it the desire of the Senator from Ohio to make those acts unlawful?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I may say that the definition is exactly the same as the definition we had of an unfair labor practice. The effect of making it unlawful is simply that a suit for damages can be brought for that kind of thing. There is no criminal penalty of any sort.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is the point I am making. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to refer to a memorandum which I put in the RECORD last year, in which I called attention to the conspiracy statute, which is on the statute books of the country, providing that, if two or more people band together, or if they conspire one with another, to do an unlawful act, that is a criminal offense. I shall presently obtain the memorandum from the office of the Legislative Counsel, and I should like to call it to the attention of the Senator. But I also call attention to the fact that the Senator's amendment has been modified to make it applicable to labor organizations, not to a "person," as it was when first submitted.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see how the conspiracy statute could apply.

Mr. PEPPER. It would always be a working together of many people to do what the Senator defines as an "unlawful act." I maintain that they would be subject to criminal prosecution under the Federal conspiracy statute. I think I can sustain the contention with cases. I have the memorandum here.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely incorrect. There is no intention whatever to subject persons to a charge of conspiracy or to subject them to any criminal penalty for such strikes, by the use of the words "labor organization." Furthermore, a labor organization is

just like a corporation; a corporation is not itself a conspiracy, nor is a labor organization a conspiracy. So that even on the Senator's assumption, unless there were two or three labor organizations conspiring together there could not be any possible application of the amendment to the law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me finish this particular inquiry to which we were addressing ourselves.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I yield further to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a labor organization is not a corporation. It is an unincorporated association. It is made up of many individual persons, and therefore the conspiracy statute would apply, because if several persons work together to accomplish an unlawful purpose, that is a conspiracy within the definition of the Federal statutes, and the provisions of the United States Code.

Mr. TAFT. I may say to the Senator on that point that under the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act a labor union is not a conspiracy, and cannot be a conspiracy simply by reason of the existence of a number of members of the labor organization.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the individuals who engage in this concerted activity which would be outlawed will be working together—I shall have the language of the statute before me presently and will call it to the Senator's attention—they will be working together to accomplish what the Senator makes not an unfair labor practice but an unlawful act. That will be the action of the American Congress in castigating an action as being unlawful, not merely as being an unfair labor practice.

Mr. TAFT. If something is castigated as being an unfair labor practice it might as well be castigated as being an unlawful act.

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, the courts——

Mr. TAFT. So far as the conspiracy statute is concerned, I do not think it applies.

Mr. PEPPER. The courts of the country are set up to administer punishment for unlawful acts, not for unfair labor practices, unless they are specifically criminal in their nature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read the section, all that is attempted to be done by the amendment is to provide jurisdiction in the Federal courts in suits for damages in case damages might be proved by reason of certain conduct. I do not understand that the amendment creates any unlawful act, so far as the act being criminal is concerned. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. There is no criminal penalty whatever proposed in the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore all the amendment would do, if adopted, would be to create a cause of action for damages, which could be heard before a jury in a Federal court. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I shall now read the provision of the Clayton Act as follows:

> Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence of labor organizations—
>
> And so forth.
>
> Nor shall such organizations—
>
> The labor organizations—
>
> Nor shall such organizations or the members thereof be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws.

That only covers the antitrust laws, but there is another statute, either the Norris-LaGuardia Act or the Clayton Act, which covers generally the idea that members of a labor organization, acting as an organization, are not violating any conspiracy statute of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if his amendment is in line with the recommendation made in the President's message to the Congress opposing secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes? Does the amendment implement the President's message?

Mr. TAFT. I do not have the President's message before me. The President spoke of his desire to outlaw jurisdictional strikes and certain types of secondary boycotts. I think he used the word "outlaw," which would seem to me that he thought they should be made unlawful. I shall obtain a copy of the President's message and find out exactly what he said. As I recall, however, the President did use the word "outlaw." I think the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not examined the Criminal Code, but I recall that there is a provision to the effect that when no specific penalty is assessed against an act which is elsewhere declared unlawful a penalty may be applied as if it were made a penalized act, if the act itself, when committed, was similar to one with respect to which there is a penalty. Has the Senator looked up that statute to see whether, notwithstanding there is no specific penalty in his amendment, one might be applied under the general basic clause of the Criminal Code?

Mr. TAFT. I have looked up that matter before, and there is no such general clause, as I understand. The only question is respecting the conspiracy statute which the Senator from Florida has brought up.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, what we are considering would be unlawful in the sense only that it would create a civil liability for damages. It is not unlawful in the sense that there would be any criminal liability?

Mr. TAFT. It is unlawful. There may be other results arising from it, but there would not be a criminal penalty in my opinion, because there is no criminal penalty prescribed in the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the use of the word "unlawful" is clearly unfortunate. There is no necessity for making an action unlawful in order to make the person liable in civil damages. What it amounts to is a mere trespass, and nothing else, and it is clearly unfortunate to use the word "unlawful."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the able Senator from New Mexico hit the nail on the head when he said that it merely makes the person committing the act liable in civil damages. I think it is unfortunate to say that it is unlawful, because the word "unlawful" indicates criminality. There is nothing in the measure which would make such action criminal. We have no Federal criminal common law. It is true that the definition of a conspiracy at common law was a combination of two or more persons to do an unlawful act, or to do a lawful act unlawfully. But we have no such common law in the Federal law. Therefore it is wrong to say, in my opinion, that this is an illegal or unlawful act. The amendment merely creates a right of action for a trespass or for damages, and I am glad the Senator from New Mexico raised the point he did.

Mr. TAFT. If it makes any difference to anyone we will handle the matter by inserting after the word "unlawful" the words "for the purposes of this section."

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. And then the only thing under this section is the suit for damages. That would be the quickest way to handle the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. This subject arose when we had the Case bill before the Senate during the last session of Congress, and there was some discussion between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and me as to whether or not there was any criminal significance to the use of the word "unlawful" as it appeared in that measure. I thought it was a question of significance, and others thought it was not. I applied to the legislative counsel's office for an opinion, and I shall read two or three paragraphs of the opinion submitted to me by the legislative counsel:

> Memorandum for Senator PEPPER:
>
> This memorandum is in reply to your request for my opinion as to whether a prosecution under the conspiracy statute (sec. 37 of the Criminal Code) would lie with respect to a violation of section 4 (b) of H. R. 6578 (the President's temporary labor bill).
>
> Section 4 (b) of H. R. 6578 reads as follows:
>
> "(b) On and after the finally effective date of any such proclamation, continuation of a strike, lock-out, slow-down, or any other

interruption at any such plant, mine, or facility shall be unlawful."

Mr. President, there was no penalty provided in the statute. It was simply made unlawful, but no criminal penalty provided thereafter in the bill.

The memorandum continues:

Section 37 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 88) provides:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

This is the conclusion of the legislative counsel.

In conclusion, it may be stated generally that the conspiracy statute (sec. 37 of the Criminal Code) covers to all intents and purposes the situation you had in mind when you stated that there was a general criminal statute to punish persons for continuing a strike made unlawful by section 4 (b). While the conspiracy statute applies only to two or more persons acting in concert, a continuation of a strike, slow-down, or other stoppage of work referred to in said section 4 (b) will of necessity be concerted action on the part of a labor union and its members and will subject its officers and members to a criminal prosecution for conspiracy.

That memorandum was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 2, 1946, and appears on page 10732 of the RECORD, if Senators care to see the entire memorandum.

Mr. TAFT. However, when this amendment deals with labor organizations and the only unlawfulness is for a labor organization to do something, in my opinion the labor organization is not a conspirator, and the conspiracy statute does not apply to it unless two or more labor organizations are involved. I believe that the simplest way to take care of the matter is to insert in line 2 on page 1, after the words "it shall be unlawful", the words "for the purposes of this section only." I have no intention of subjecting them to criminal liability. I now modify the amendment by inserting in line 2 on page 1, after the words "it shall be unlawful", the words "for the purposes of this section only."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not want to leave the Senator under a misapprehension. I am not in favor of the damage suit part of the amendment. I do not see anything to be gained by declaring such an act to be unlawful in any respect. If the Senator wishes to give the commission of some acts legal significance and make them the subject of a suit for damages, he can do so without running the risk of becoming involved with the question of criminal prosecution by leaving out the declaration of unlawfulness altogether and either calling it an unfair labor practice, as we do in the body of the bill, or simply say that the commission of such acts shall be the basis for suits in the Federal courts.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that what I do when I say that it shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section? Does not that cover the case? It is not unlawful for any other purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, an act does not have to be unlawful to be the basis of a civil suit. If all the Senator is seeking to accomplish is to lay the predicate for a civil suit, I see no reason why he has to use the language of criminality.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is necessary, but I do not see what harm it does, if we make it clear that it applies only to this section. There is no criminal penalty in the section.

I now have before me the President's message. He refers first to jurisdictional strikes. He says:

I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

The second unjustified practice is the secondary boycott when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.

The third item relates to breach of contract.

So the President himself has stated, in a general way, that this type of action is unjustifiable. I would have no great objection to making it a criminal offense. But certainly that is not this proposal. As modified, the amendment would simply provide that "it shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section"; and this section is for the purpose of providing the remedy of a civil suit for damages.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to propose an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to address myself to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, but I defer to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, to the pending amendment I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont wish to offer the amendment now?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. If the Senator from Florida, with the consent of the Chair, will grant me a couple of minutes I will say that the amendment which I am offering to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is to meet and partially correct one of the worst evils existing in the industrial strife in recent years. We have had reports for many years of cases involving farmers who have worked through the year raising a crop and have taken it to market, only to run into a secondary boycott or a jurisdictional strike in existence at the place at which they were supposed to deliver the crop. Consequently they have lost it. I do not believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio would afford much protection to the average farmer. He might lose a load of produce worth $500 and would have the privilege of suing to recover damages, but he would not have a moral certainty of recovering $500. It would be eaten up in lawyers' and court fees. What the farmer wants is to be able to deliver his produce to market and not be turned back when he gets to the city terminal with it.

For that reason I offer an amendment which, I admit, is class legislation. It provides for something that I do not like, but it does provide that if when the farmer reaches market he runs into a jurisdictional strike which prevents his unloading his season's crop he may appeal to the courts for an injunction permitting him to unload that which he has brought to market. I admit that I do not like to do it; I do not like injunctions; but we have searched everywhere to find a remedy for a condition which has victimized the innocent and deserving people who raise produce.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is adopted, I think it ought to afford some real protection to the farmer so far as it is possible to afford such protection by legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator is proposing to restore the injunctive process in certain special cases. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; in the case of perishable farm produce, such as fruit, vegetables, and dairy products; nothing else.

I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the Senator from Ohio by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) as follows:

SEC. 303. (c) Whenever any violation of subsection (a) causes or threatens to cause destruction, spoilage, or deterioration of any perishable agricultural commodity (including but not limited to any meat, fruit, vegetable, or dairy product), the district courts of the United States have jurisdiction, in proceedings instituted by any person suffering or threatened with loss or damage by reason of such destruction, spoilage, or deterioration, to prevent and restrain violations of such subsection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is yielding the floor. I think the Senator from Florida had it, anyway.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not recall exactly the terms of it, but last year we passed the Hobbs bill, the so-called antiracketeering bill, which gave jurisdiction to the Federal court to act with respect to interruptions of and interference with people delivering their goods, in the way I think the Senator from Vermont has in mind. I was wondering if, since the Federal court has jurisdiction of that kind of an affair and the local authorities have jurisdiction to prevent such an act in the course of the administration of the ordinary criminal law, the Senator feels it is necessary to add the further restoration of the injunctive process which his amendment contemplates.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Vermont recalls, the Hobbs bill made it a felony to interfere with anyone traveling along the highway to market.

Mr. PEPPER. It was intended to reach the situation which the Senator from Vermont apparently has in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. It was thought that it would cure the condition. However, it has developed that the Hobbs bill was

not worth the paper upon which it was written, so far as affording any protection to the farmer was concerned, because the farmer is not molested in taking his crop to the market, but when he arrives there may find that the commission man has an agreement for a closed shop, and the farmer cannot unload his produce, and therefore is turned back. Therefore he is in the same position as he was before.

The Senator from Vermont regrets very much that he has to propose anything of this nature. Frankly, I do not know whether it will work. It is very difficult to correct by legislation any of these evils. It is very difficult to write legislation which some "slick" lawyer cannot get around. But it seems to me that if we are attempting to give protection to other persons we should try in some way to afford protection to the producer. I know that a great many large corporations producing perishable foods are well able to look out for themselves, but I also know that the ones I have in mind are not producers of that kind. My amendment is to protect small producers who probably do not produce over a thousand dollars' worth in a year, and they cannot afford to lose it. If they lose it they cannot afford to go to the court to recover damages. I do not know whether this amendment would help them; it is simply an effort to do something to remedy the situation.

Mr PEPPER. I am sure we are all sympathetic toward what the Senator from Vermont has in mind. I am glad he has made it clear that he is not attempting to restrain interference, in the sense of violence, in connection with the delivery of farm produce to market. What he is trying to enjoin is the stopping of work or asking others to stop work in connection with what they believe to be a legitimate objective relating to their own welfare. The Senator's amendment seems to me to have the vice which the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota had, except that it is limited to cases in which the commodity involved is a farm commodity and is not applied to the situation generally.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment? I think there is an important point to be brought out here.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course, I believe that the abuse the Senator from Vermont has in mind should be corrected. But let me ask a question. In addition to fruit or dairy products or other farm products which will spoil if they cannot be unloaded promptly, how about the manufacturing plants which have raw materials which do not come from a farm, but are in process or ready to go in process, and will be ruined unless they are promptly processed? Unless the operations of the plant continue, those materials will be destroyed, thus causing losses to the extent of thousands upon thousands of dollars. Such operations constitute another segment of our American life, aside from the farmer. How about a jurisdictional strike which stops that process, but as to which a citizen cannot obtain the injunctive relief which the Senator from Vermont seeks to make available to the farmer?

Before the Senator answers, let me say that I am very much in favor of what the Senator from Vermont has requested, and that is why I voted for the Ball amendment. I think injunctive relief should be available whenever someone unlawfully or illegally or without provocation interferes with the carrying on of legitimate activities, and I think that such injunctive relief should be available prior to the institution of a suit for the protection of property and property rights.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, to permit me to answer the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I believe that nonperishables are taken care of in the bill, through the provision that the National Labor Relations Board shall have the right to apply for an injunction. But in the case of perishables, it is almost essential that relief be obtained immediately. A matter of hours, not a matter of days, is involved.

Mr. HAWKES. But the Senator from Vermont has not answered the point raised by me. I happen to be familiar with certain processes in certain factories which must proceed without delay; and if they do not do so, thousands upon thousands of dollars' worth of material is ruined. The situation in regard to such plants is the same as the situation in the case of perishable fruits. The relief that is afforded by the bill is available both to the farmer and the manufacturer, but it is not available by means of the injunctive process. The Ball amendment, for which I just voted, would have given such relief to all without discrimination.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe we would be justified in giving the relief to the small producers who need the help of the Congress. I realize the truth of what the Senator from New Jersey has said, but I do not care to open up the whole question of injunctions.

My proposal is simply a desperate effort to help remedy one of the worst evils facing the people of the United States insofar as union activities are concerned. I think the unions themselves should have cleaned up the matter long ago, so as not to force the Congress to make legislative provision of the sort I have suggested. However, that has not been done. The Hobbs Act, as I have said, turned out to be worth no more than the Petrillo Act, which seems to be worth nothing at all.

Although I do not like to have the Congress take the step I have proposed, I think it is justified. I think we are justified in offering some relief or trying to obtain some relief for these small agricultural producers, many of whom sometimes pool their crops and send them to the market together, simply because they cannot even afford a truck of their own, in which to send their own crop to market.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will further yield to me, let me say that I wish the Senator from Vermont to realize that I am not talking about big business. The Senator from Vermont said he wished to protect the little people. I can take the Senator to dozens of tiny manufacturing establishments which are living from hand to mouth, with their very existence in the balance; they are trying to make a success, and they are affected by conditions which we have been discussing.

I should like to say that during the past several weeks many labor leaders and representatives of labor organizations have called to see me, but I have not heard a single labor leader say that in his own mind and heart he believed a jurisdictional strike was justified. Every one of them to whom I have talked has said very definitely that some way should be found to control and stop jurisdictional strikes. That shows that almost the entire country recognizes the evil of such procedures.

I think the labor organizations would like to handle the jurisdictional strike situation themselves, by having some kind of a czar. But they have had czars, without materially affecting the situation complained of. That is the reason why we are trying to provide a remedy in the interest of all the American people.

Mr. President, there is no ill-feeling about this matter. If the great economy of the United States is to move forward and do the things which must be done in order to make it possible for our Nation to carry out successfully all the plans we have for activities in the domestic field as well as those to which we are committed in the foreign field, we must make sure that no group in America has the power to stop our economic and industrial machine from working.

Mr. PEPPER. As I have said, all of us are exceptionally sympathetic to the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from Vermont. All of us regard it as despicable to make any man suffer loss, especially the farmers of the country who are bringing perishable products to the market. On the other hand, if the farmers associate themselves together and determine not to bring their products to the market on a certain day, I do not know of any injunction which could be issued against them on behalf of a canning plant or a manufacturer who might sustain some loss from their action in that respect.

I believe that some way should be worked out to prevent interference with the action of farmers in disposing of their products. We have a local law which makes certain acts criminal, and now the Congress is enacting Federal legislation to make certain actions criminal.

But in the present instance, I fear that the Senator from Vermont wishes to do what the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] would have done, namely, to put into the hands of private parties the power to have injunctions issued against the exercise of the rights which they feel strongly about, such as the rights of people to talk with other citizens in a peaceful way about maintaining decent wage standards in a given community.

Mr. President, to give an individual, even though he be a farmer, with all

the merit he has, the power to use the private injunction in connection with this act, in addition to the power which the main bill gives by mandatorily requiring the regional attorney of the National Labor Relations Board to take such action, would be in line with the kind of practice and the sort of danger which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators condemned on the floor of the Senate with respect to the Ball amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator from Vermont is attempting to do is what the Committee on Labor attempted to do when it had the Case bill before it approximately a year ago. The Senator from Florida may recall that at that time I offered an amendment which would have covered perishable farm products only, and it was accepted by the committee. But on the floor of the Senate that amendment was eliminated from the bill. I felt at that time that because of the food shortage and for other reasons, the President would sign the bill if it went no further than that amendment. But, as I have said, when the bill reached the floor, the Senate decided to toughen it, just as some Senators are attempting to do now in the case of the pending bill.

The consequence at that time was that the Case bill was vetoed, the veto was subsequently sustained; and the result was that no legislation of that sort was placed on the statute books.

That is what I fear will happen in respect to the pending measure. I fear that if the Senate goes beyond reasonable limits, the President will be thoroughly justified in vetoing the bill, and will veto it, and the Congress will be justified in sustaining such a veto, and will sustain it.

The amendment I have suggested is merely another attempt to do what we tried to do last year. Our effort was not successful last year, and perhaps it will not be successful this year.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, of course the Senator from Vermont is aware of the fact that the situation at which he aims his amendment is not ignored by the main bill, for in the main bill it is provided that the regional attorney or representative of the National Labor Relations Board, upon the filing of a complaint that such a practice is being engaged in, is mandatorily required to seek relief in the courts by way of temporary injunction, without notice. So the matter is not left without remedy in the main bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that the amendment now being offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont—and of course I am in agreement with it, because of the principle involved—in degree is exactly what was offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. PEPPER. It seems to me so.

Mr. WHERRY. It is simply narrowed to the question of perishable goods.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The principle is the same. I submit to the Senator from Florida, in connection with the statement he made that we would all like to obtain legislation on the particular question, that what the Senator from Vermont is attempting to do could have been accomplished by the Ball amendment. That is why I voted for the Ball amendment, and I submit to the Senator from Florida whether it is not true that those who could have taken care of themselves with the Ball amendment on the books would have been hurt either way. It was the ideal legislation to give the relief the distinguished Senator from Vermont is asking for in the amendment. How could legislation be drafted to give the aid the Senator from Vermont is seeking now, in words simpler or less objectionable than those contained in the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say for the Senator from Florida that I do not accept the basic premise of the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Vermont, that it is necessary to have injunctive relief in any case. In fact, I oppose injunctive relief; in fact, I even oppose making the act we are considering the basis of a suit at law, as the Senator from Ohio suggests, because I think American citizens who are dissatisfied with wage conditions in a community, with the recognition of organizations of workers in a given area, have a right, as citizens, to go to another group of men and ask their cooperation in a common aim, a common objective. That is what is outlawed by the bill itself, and it is proposed to be made the subject of civil suit by the Senator from Ohio, and now the basis of an injunction by the Senator from Vermont.

I think farmers are also interested in certain basic rights of American citizens. They have a right to go to fellow farmers in a community and say, "Let us not patronize A because he is unfair to farmers." They have a perfect right to pass him by and go down the street and patronize merchant B. I think workers have the same right.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the farmer going to do who has to deliver milk in a metropolitan center, when he is stopped at the city limits and his truck is upset and he loses his milk? What relief has he?

Mr. PEPPER. If someone upsets his truck and spills his milk?

Mr. WHERRY. What is his relief—a suit for civil damages?

Mr. PEPPER. No; that is a criminal offense under local law, and under the Hobbs law, and whoever did it could be indicted, or made the subject of an information filed in a local court, or in a Federal court, and could be put in jail, if the jury found him guilty, or he might be put in the penitentiary.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that answer. That is exactly what the small man has to do, and the Senator well knows that in Florida the farmer who has had that experience is put to the test of employing a lawyer, going to court, and paying the expenses. If he gets no recovery, he loses. Why not give him the injunctive relief, as provided in the Ball amendment, and not compel him to go through a civil court in order to get relief in the way of damages?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I think it is the general opinion that resort to the injunction in the settlement of labor disputes is dangerous practice. The Norris-LaGuardia Act condemned it, and if we liberalize that prohibition at all, it could be narrowed in the most severe way.

In the second place, while all of us respect the farmer, recognize his incomparable value to the country, and his special rights and interests, yet it is certainly not good public policy to say that the farmer can have legal damages which other people similarly injured cannot enjoy. That is not impartial administration of the law.

The Ball amendment would have given the right to use the injunction to the manufacturer who is hurt, to the businessman who is hurt, or to the farmer who is hurt. The Senate rejected that amendment. The Senator from Ohio said the Senate should reject it. Now the Senator from Vermont wants to give this remedy to the farmer but not give it to the manufacturer and to others who might sustain similar injuries.

As sympathetic as I am with what the Senator from Vermont is trying to accomplish, I believe that the right of criminal prosecution of the wrongdoer in the local courts and in the Federal courts—making it an unfair labor practice in the bill itself, making it the duty to a representative of the National Labor Relations Board to bring temporary injunctive action without notice—was reasonable.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, what the distinguished Senator is saying is that the only relief the farmer has under the present statutes, or even under the Taft amendment, would be to go to the National Labor Relations Board and there depend upon their decision as to whether injunctive relief would lie.

Mr. PEPPER. No; Mr. President, he does not have to go to the Board under section 10 (l). He has to bring a complaint to the notice of the regional attorney.

Mr. WHERRY. Which means going to the Board, and he does not know whether the Board will be in my home town or Omaha or Fremont, Nebr. It might be in Kansas City, Mo., and there is a man with a load of milk which he cannot even get into Omaha, who has no relief except in the way of civil damages, which he has to prove in court.

The distinguished Senator knows, as well as I do, that the small farmer or the small businessman does not have the legal representation. He does not have the contacts. I know the distinguished Senator is not worrying about those who are perfectly able to take care of themselves. That is why the amendment does not hurt them any. But it is the small operators, the small businessman, the farmers, and those who have perishable goods, who should have some sort of relief other than money damages which

they may obtain at the end of a lawsuit in some court. It is true that a form of injunctive relief may be had upon the determination of some Government lawyer, but the Senator will agree with me that that process involves delay. It takes time, and by the time relief would come, I submit to the Senator, it would not be of benefit to the producers of farm products, who would obtain relief under the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PEPPER. I have no disposition to oppose with any acrimony or severity the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. I merely thought it was bad policy to pick out one class of our citizens, meritorious as they are, and deny relief to other people. But if the Senator feels that way about it, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the RECORD to show that I agree with the Senator that it is class legislation, and that the principle involved in the amendment is identical with the principle of the Ball amendment. I voted for the Ball amendment. Those who can take care of themselves, and have the money, the big manufacturers and the big unions, can get along. It is the small people, like the farmers, who come in between cross-fires and need relief, who should be considered. I voted for the Ball amendment because it did establish a general principle. It did not include class legislation, but it did give relief to those I have been discussing, who need protection against the big operator, whether it be manufacturer or labor.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not sure but that the local citizen the Senator from Nebraska describes would have the right of injunctive relief in a local court. We are simply giving the right in the Federal court, but he still has local machinery of which he may avail himself to prevent irreparable damage, if he can make a showing. It seems to me this would bring the matter into Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that there are remedies in every State, but we are passing a Federal law, to give injunctive relief.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator would probably find the circuit judge closer than the Federal judge in most States, and I suggest a man would have a complete and adequate remedy in the local courts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is perfectly clear that the Senator from Vermont has proposed class legislation, and if we are to open up the bill in regard to giving protection in the type of cases to which he refers, then we might just as well go back to the Ball amendment and adopt the Ball amendment, and do away with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. If we adopt this amendment we should say directly that what we want to do now is to throw all these matters into the Federal courts, with all the problems created by having them handled in the Federal courts as they were prior to the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

The second point I want to make, and I think it a very important one—one to which I think the farmers should give heed—is that if the bill only could be enacted as it came from the committee, salutary precedents will be established very shortly after it is put into operation to the end of checking these union practices which do such injustice to the farmers. What is going to happen, as the committee bill is administered, if we succeed in making it the law of the land, is that the National Labor Relations Board will make it clear to unions, in the course of a very few months, that the type of practices to which the Senator from Vermont is objecting will not be tolerated. Any union that is found to be a party, directly or indirectly, to such practices, is going to find itself subject to the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. It is going to be made very clear that that sort of union conduct of which the Senator from Vermont complains will not be tolerated. If the union then proceeds to defy the National Relations Board, under our bill the Board will be required to go into the Federal courts to see to it that the union or its officials are brought to account for such conduct.

It is said that our bill does not have teeth. If a few union leaders were to be held in contempt for defiance of court decrees enforcing the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, or for violation of injunctions, they will know just what teeth there are in the bill.

I think the thing that is being overlooked now in the attempt to get the Senate to pass class legislation, is that what is needed of course is to get a pattern of precedents laid down under the committee bill, which I am sure the National Labor Relations Board will lay down very quickly. Once they are established, I think farmers are going to find that, without regard to class legislation, a measure has been passed providing a procedure that will give them the remedies they need. I can think of a good many other employers or of a good many other industries that would like to have the type of special legislation that is now proposed by the Senator from Vermont for the benefit of producers of perishable goods. The goods may not be so perishable as farm products but the producers of them suffer loss in so-called "hot cargo" cases, too. Let us take for example the lumber industry. It is confronted with a great many "hot cargo" cases, but special legislation over and above the committee bill is not needed to meet the problem. I want to make the point that under the procedure provided for in the bill, the so-called "hot cargo" cases are very well handled. The same applies to other cases in which certain unions resort to the type of tactics to which the Senator from Vermont refers, and which I deplore as much as does the Senator. It was because of my opposition to those tactics that I proposed in the committee the procedure that is found in the committee bill on secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes.

If the Senator will indulge me, may I say further that I think all the discussion, the amendments that are now proposed, and the corrections that have been made here on the floor of the Senate to the pending amendment, show that here is a problem that ought to be referred for further study to the committee proposed in another section of the committee bill. I think the pending Taft amendment is a perfect example of hastily devised legislation. I think the problem involved in it ought to go back to committee. I think we ought to take the committee bill and stop muddying the water, so to speak, by adding more and more amendments to it.

I want to ask the Senator from Florida a question as to the possibility of additional legal difficulties developing because of the amendment, even as presently written. The Senator from Ohio has added, following the word "unlawful," certain language. I do not have the amendment before me.

Mr. TAFT. After the word "unlawful," there were inserted the words "for the purposes of this section only."

Mr. MORSE. The legal question I want to direct to the Senator from Florida is this: Does he think that by the use of the word "unlawful"—whether it is "for the purposes of this section only," or anything else—there is restored to the individual citizen the right to seek injunctive relief? Since the amendment does not go on to provide that, there is no intention on the part of the proponents of the amendment to prevent employers from seeking injunctions in secondary boycott cases, I am inclined to believe that a very good legal argument can be made—and it will certainly have to be litigated to final Supreme Court decision, it seems to me—that by the very use of the word "unlawful" in the amendment, unless it be further restricted, there is automatically restored to the employer injunctive relief. In other words, the Taft amendment indirectly repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act insofar as the conduct of unions covered by the amendment is concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have already stated that I think the word "unlawful" is adapted to the criminal law, not to the civil law.

Mr. MORSE. I am not referring to the point dealing with conspiracy.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that. It is an improper use of language in this section. The Senator from Oregon may be correct in his view that it will have the effect, or will probably have the effect of restoring to the individual the right to injunctive process, which was not true of the Ball amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I put this hypothetical point to the Senator from Florida. Let us assume a statute says that certain conduct shall be unlawful. It appears that a union is going to engage in that type of conduct, and is threatening to interfere with the shipment of my goods to market; in other words the union is threatening to commit acts that have been declared unlawful in the statute. Do I not have the right then to go into court and ask to have that conduct enjoined then and there on the ground that the statute, without in any way restricting my remedy to injunctive relief,

says that such conduct shall be unlawful. In other words, will not employers be able to go directly into court and receive injunctions under this amendment? If so then I wonder why the author of the amendment does not make that remedy perfectly clear in the amendment. I am sure many Senators would not vote for the amendment if they knew that there is a great legal probability that it will circumvent the Norris-LaGuardia Act in a very material respect.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt of the injunctive power to restrain the commission of an unlawful act. One who might show damage from the unlawful act it seems to me might well be heard and might well have a case in the local courts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to point out that there is no law against courts issuing injunctions. We are using a rather general term here. Of course, a court may always issue an injunction in connection with a lawsuit except as limited by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That is the whole question. I really question whether the amendment of the Senator from Vermont accomplishes anything, because all it does is to give jurisdiction to the United States district court to enjoin the acts which result in the destruction of perishable goods. They already have jurisdiction so far as that is concerned, it seems to me; but they have jurisdiction subject to the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

The real question at issue, when it comes to injunctions is, Do we suspend the Norris-LaGuardia Act or not? Under the Ball amendment, the Norris-LaGuardia Act would have been suspended. That is the whole question, as I see it. That is the reason I yielded my position, because the feeling, the sentiment against suspending the Norris-LaGuardia Act was so strong. But the question of whether courts have jurisdiction may be answered by saying they have jurisdiction still under the Norris-LaGuardia Act. They can issue injunctions in any labor dispute, but they have to comply with very strict provisions. I really do not think when the Senator from Vermont offers an amendment to give jurisdiction, without any reference to the Norris-LaGuardia Act that he is in any way changing the legal situation of those who are injured under those circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont wishes to say that the purpose of his amendment must be clear. It is his expectation that the bill will go to a committee of conference, and the Senator from Ohio will be a member of that committee. So long as the purpose of my amendment is absolutely clear, whether the terminology is correct or not, the Senator from Vermont is convinced that the Senator from Ohio and other Senators will be able to find the proper wording to make the amendment effective.

As I previously stated, if anyone can find any other way of correcting this evil which labor unions themselves must have been aware of, I would welcome such a suggestion.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated that if the Senate committee bill could be passed and become law—and I think it could become law if the Senate would be willing to accept it as it came from the committee and would adhere to such decision in conference—that probably it would work out as the Senator stated. It has become apparent here that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is offered for the purpose of affording protection to a great many people, but I do not believe his amendment does protect the producer of perishable farm products, as it ought to. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is to be adopted I want some protection for the farmer to be adopted with it. That is the reason I offered my amendment to his amendment. If anyone can guarantee that the bill as it came from the Senate committee can become law I think that would probably be as just a law as we could work out, and, as the Senator from Oregon has said, through interpretations and so on and so forth, whatever the lawyers call them, it could be made into the most effective and just labor law that any country in the world has ever had.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me just one or two minutes?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I shall be glad to; if the Senator will allow me to make one observation first.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. The most effective way to prevent injury of the sort contemplated by the Senator from Vermont is for the workers on the farm and the workers in the factories to recognize that each has a common interest with the other; that they are all working toward the common good, and that they will respect each other's legitimate interests and objectives.

Mr. President, none of the laws we pass is going to be a substitute for the necessity of the worker and the farmer recognizing the common interest they have and working together for the individual as well as the public good.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I agree absolutely with what the Senator from Florida has said. The Senator from Florida knows as well as I know that millions and millions of dollars are spent annually to keep workers and farmers from realizing their interdependency.

Mr. PEPPER. The effort is made to separate them.

Mr. AIKEN. And until we have the realization on the part of both of their common interest, we are going to have each one striving for advantage for himself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I want to discuss his amendment very briefly from the standpoint of legislative intent, because I am very much of the opinion that because of the language to which I have referred, we are going to find in the future some interesting litigation over it. Therefore, I want to point out certain facts, and it will take me only a few minutes, I will say to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I rose anyway to address myself to the principal amendment, the Taft amendment, and I will take my seat until the discussion on the Aiken amendment to the Taft amendment has been completed. Then I wish to address myelf to the Taft amendment first.

Mr. MORSE. What I was pointing out, Mr. President, was that I think we need to take note of the fact that we are dealing with an amendment which in the first sentence provides:

> It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or to encourage—

Then the amendment proceeds to set out the terms in great detail, as we do in the committee bill. In fact as I read it, it is identical, as far as the definitive terms are concerned, with the committee bill on secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. It provides:

> It shall be unlawful for any labor organization to engage in—

And if any labor organization engages in any of those practices, then the purpose of the amendment is to give to the employer or anyone damaged by such conduct the right to sue for civil damages.

My legal contention is that if it makes certain conduct unlawful, then the individual employer does not have to wait until the damage accrues, but that there is inherent within his rights under the legal concept "unlawful," once we make it unlawful in this sense, the right to go into court and then and there secure an injunction. If that argument should be sustained by a court—and I am satisfied, Mr. President, that it is a sufficiently strong legal argument so as to make it necessary in the final analysis for a Supreme Court determination—the effect will be indirectly as to the type of conduct covered by the amendment, to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

So in my judgment it would not only be giving to the employer in this case the right to bring suit for civil damages, but if the employer sees the danger of those damages developing because of threatened conduct on the part of the labor organization to do any of the things provided for within this measure, he certainly ought to have the right, unless there is further restrictive language placed in the amendment, to go into a court and say "Stop this oncoming irreparable damage which I see pointed in my direction." Hence I think there are two things I should like to have cleared up.

First, I should like to know whether or not it is the intention and the contemplation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to accomplish the purpose by the amendment of giving the employer such a remedy, because I think it is important to get that into the RECORD now for future court interpretation as to congressional intent.

My second point is that irrespective of what intent we may express here this afternoon, it still remains within the province of the court to determine whether a citizen under this section has

the right to secure injunctive relief unless we specifically, in language definite and certain, provide in the amendment that such a right shall not be given to him, but that the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall prevail. That is not so stated in the amendment. In the absence of such words of limitation I think such an injunctive right will accrue.

The last word I want to say is again in reference to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I think we ought to wait to see how the procedure of the committee bill will work out in regard to checking the abuses of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. That is why, Mr. President, I repeat, I think the amendment ought to go back to committee. It should not be passed upon by the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Murray
Baldwin	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wagner
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as modified.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on the pending amendment.

From an examination of section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, I am of the opinion, after reading that section and reading the amendment, that the amendment cannot accomplish anything. Section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is not repealed or modified in any way. To add this amendment would not accomplish anything. For that reason I shall be compelled to vote against it in its present form.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the author of the proposed amendment if the effect of it is not limited to farm produce only?

Mr. AIKEN. It is limited to perishable farm produce. The producers of other products have recourse to the National Labor Relations Board. But the Senator from Maryland knows that if a farmer on the Eastern Shore of Maryland starts out for New York with a truckload of strawberries and runs into a jurisdictional strike, he cannot come back to Washington and go before the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. For the reasons I am about to indicate I am opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. My purpose in rising was to suggest a question of fundamental right. If the Senator's approach to this problem is fair in the case of farmers, why would it not be fair likewise in the case of a furniture manufacturer who is taking a load of furniture from his plant to the city, or in the case of a lumber manufacturer who is taking a load of lumber from his mill to the city? In my State men in both categories have been held up. In my opinion, if what is sought to be reached by the amendment offered by the Senator involves a matter of fundamental right, it seems to me that we are getting into the field of class legislation if we say, "You shall not do this, provided there is involved such and such produce, but you may do it if it involves any other kind of produce." My point is that we should approach this matter on the basis of what is right and what is wrong.

If it is right for a farmer to take his produce from the Eastern Shore of Maryland or from the Senator's State to New York City without being interrupted by anyone, then it is equally right, if this is a free country, that a manufacturer of any other product should have the privilege of delivering his goods to a customer who has entered into an honest arrangement to buy those goods. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not limit his amendment, or, if it be limited, I hope the limitation will be voted down. We ought to guarantee to everyone in this country who abides by the law the chance to sell the goods he produces without the interference of anyone. If we do not do that there is no use passing the Greek-Turkish loans or anything else. We might as well go all the way overboard.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to not limiting the amendment, the Senator from Vermont called attention to the fact that the Senate voted down the Ball amendment which provided for injunction applicable to everyone. There is a great deal of difference between a load of strawberries and a load of furniture.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; there is not.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; there is.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I am delivering furniture to the Senator from Vermont and taking it along the public highway, no man in this Republic has a right to stop me and interfere with its delivery.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not speaking about taking it along the public highway. My amendment does not refer to taking it along the public highway. That matter was supposed to have been taken care of by the Hobbs bill which was passed last year. Here is the situation. When the farmers on the Eastern Shore grow a crop of strawberries, the berries become ripe when nature determines. They cannot be left in the field for perhaps a week. They must be loaded on trucks and taken to the city, where they must be unloaded and disposed of within 3 or 4 or 5 hours.

Mr. TYDINGS. I realize all that. That is an argument of expediency; it is not an argument of principle. It has not a shred of principle in it. The Senator simply says, "We are going to take care of one class of persons, and it will not apply to other persons because they have produced something which does not perish; they can afford to go to court and hire a lawyer and go to great expense in order to use the public highway."

If there is one thing in America that ought to be protected by this bill it is the right of a man to deliver the fruits of his own labor or business to the customer who wants to buy them, without the interference of anyone else on earth, so long as he abides by the law of his country.

It is a reflection on the governors and mayors of our 48 States that they have not sufficient courage to enforce the laws of their States. That is the reason we are dealing here with what should be dealt with on the local level. We should not have to consider this matter. I am astounded at the situation. I have a letter in my pocket—I shall not read it at this time—which touches on this very subject. The writer of it appeals to me to give him some assistance because the mayor of a certain town in the West has not sufficient courage to enforce the ordinances and laws of a great State.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; and the Senator from Vermont has often wondered why people from all the States in the Union come to the Congress to ask the Federal Government at Washington to do things which they ought to be doing or asking their own State legislatures to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. And we are trying to do as little of it here as we can do and get by. Instead of meeting this problem with courage, face to face, we are trying to give a little relief to a certain class.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think the Federal Government should go into every town, city, and State and do the work properly belonging to the civil governments of the States?

Mr. TYDINGS. We should not pass laws which take local matters into the congressional purview. That is what we have been doing for the past 20 years, particularly. We have been taking over the local functions of the counties, the cities, and the States of America. Now we are in the mess which we ourselves

created, and we do not have sufficient courage to meet the results of our own handiwork. It is nothing else in the world than a lack of courage. There is not a man here who does not know in his heart that no one in this world has a right to stop me in the delivery of goods which I produce, so long as I abide by the laws of the several cities, counties, and States of America, and the national laws. We meet the question timidly instead of head-on. If we want to pass a labor bill, as my friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said the other day, if the only way to get labor legislation is to elect a Republican administration, here is the place to start. If we are not going to start on the delivery of goods, let us cease all this bunk, because it is merely a sham and a pretense.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is to protect people who do not seem to be adequately protected anywhere else in the bill or in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, the producer of perishable crops which will spoil within a few hours if they are not permitted to be unloaded at the terminal market.

Mr. TYDINGS. It does not make any difference whether the crops are perishable or imperishable. The principle is that a man has a right to take his goods down a public highway and deliver them to a customer in an honest, open, and aboveboard manner without the interference of any other person. Years ago the pirates of Tripoli attacked our ships when they were in the Mediterranean Sea. We fought a war with Tripoli so that the Tripolitan pirates would not interrupt the flow of American goods to an honest customer. Now in the United States Senate we are confronted with a case of piracy on the public highway. That is all it is. It is condoned by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that I thoroughly subscribe to everything he has said.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say further to the Senator from Maryland that there are too many people in Congress and elsewhere listening to the voices of individuals who come to their offices. They forget that there are 20 or 30 or 40 workingmen back home for every one who puts pressure on us, and those back home ought to be unshackled and given back their right to proceed in the ordinary way to make a living. I think we should remember that the pressure put on by people who make a lot of noise does not represent the voice of the people who are endeavoring to make their living in the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to my friend from New Jersey—and I thank him for his support—that there may be some men in America who think it is good politics to vote for the amendment offered by the able Senator from Vermont. I should like to point out that perhaps someday some gentleman may make an issue of this situation and if the truth is told about it, he will not be satisfied with those who are on the other side.

I believe that the masses of the people of this country can see very little distinction between interrupting commerce on the public highway and going into a man's factory and mutilating his property or interfering with the production of anything he may be making inside the factory. It is tweedledee and tweedledum.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I simply wish to state the opinion which I have formed as a result of talking to many of the working people of the United States, when I have had a chance to talk to them at times when they have felt free to express their honest opinion. What they want is to be unshackled, and they expect us to do the job.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say that if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is left out of the bill, nothing in the bill will hurt labor. No laboring man will have any right taken away from him by the bill. No one will be hurt by collective bargaining. There is nothing in the bill that will hurt a laboring man. I do not care who says that the bill will hurt the laboring man; such a statement is not susceptible of proof.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is not old enough to remember the position which many persons first took in regard to the Interstate Commerce Commission Act. I do not remember when it was enacted—in 1887, I believe—but I remember that for many years afterwards there was much talk to the effect that it would wreck the railroads. However, today the railroads could not get along without it.

If I did not feel that the pending labor bill, which we are about to pass, is in the definite interest of every working man and woman in the United States—not necessarily in the interest of the labor leaders, but in the interest of the working people—I would not vote for it, because I want the Congress to protect the real interests of the honest working people of our country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey. Nothing in the bill interferes with honest collective bargaining or takes anything away from a workingman in America.

Mr. President, the interception of traffic on a highway is a crime. No one in the world has a right to do that in the United States. The governors of the 48 States and the mayors of the cities and towns and the county commissioners of the counties should see that traffic is not intercepted. But they will not do it, and now the question is before us; and it looks as if we in the Congress will not take care of it if we can find a half-way method of getting around it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Maryland as vigorously as I can on his extremely sound discussion of the fundamental principles which should move this body into taking action in regard to human relations and industrial relations. The Senator from Maryland has gone further than that, and has announced the basic principles upon which our economic and social system should exist. Let me say to the Senator that if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont comes to a vote, I shall support it, because I supported the principle of the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Had I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, I could not in conscience support the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, because, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, it is class legislation; and I say frankly that if it is adopted, I think it will do an injustice to other persons who should be accorded the privilege the amendment provides.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to say further to the Senator from Maryland that I think he will admit that the State of Iowa, which in part I represent, is at least as interested in agriculture and the well-being of the farmer as is any other State or section of the United States or, in fact, of the world. So, certainly I can state that I am in favor of whatever is for the best interests of the farmer.

But there is also the principle, which the Senator from Maryland has so aptly and thoroughly stated, that what is good for the farmer of my State is equally as necessary for the businessman and the processor and every other American citizen who is engaged in economic pursuits.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Maryland has pointed out that in much of the debate the Senate has too often—and that is my judgment, too—treated its approach to certain problems on the basis of expediency and local pressure, and has disregarded and brushed aside the fundamentals which have to be preserved in the United States if our Nation is in the future to be a country of free enterprise and genius, as it has been in the past.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, are not we in a ridiculous situation? Here we are, the Senate of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world, and a component part of the Congress of a country that is the most powerful on the face of the earth; and we are about to say that if a man starts from point A, to go to point B with a load of strawberries, nobody in the world shall interfere with him from the time he puts his strawberries on his truck until he delivers them to point B; but if he puts two chairs and a second-hand sewing machine on his truck and attempts to leave point A to go to point B, then the law does not apply; he may be interrupted and stopped. That is the position taken by Members of this body, where the great, giant intellects of America are assembled for the welfare of 140,000,000 American people.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. First I yield to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia, and thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, being the first Senator to whom the Senator from Maryland has yielded, I wish to state that I heartily approve of what the able Senator from Maryland has said about the action of the Congress of the United States in entering upon matters with which the States and counties and local authorities are concerned. I wish to add my approval to what he has said to the effect that the local authorities are not doing the job they should do.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. We cannot stress that point too much, because it is time for us to tell the people back home that all things cannot be done in Washington, that the criminal laws must be enforced at the local level. There was never a truer statement than the one the able Senator from Maryland has made with respect to the enforcement of criminal law at the local level.

If I thought this amendment would accomplish anything I would vote for it. But I do not believe it would accomplish a thing, because it would not change section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Therefore, it would be idle to adopt the amendment.

We know that often it is idle to adopt an amendment, even though it would accomplish a desirable objective, because it is impossible to get the executive branch of the Government to enforce it after it is adopted and becomes a part of the law. But, in the present instance, I can not add my voice or vote in favor of an amendment which, if adopted, would not even constitute a provision of law which the executive branch of the Government could enforce or take action upon.

Mr. President, as I have stated, I desire to approve heartily what the able Senator from Maryland has said in relation to this matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I yield now to the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Disregarding the amendment of the Senator from Vermont for the moment, and referring to the principle which has been so ably discussed by the Senator from Maryland, namely, interference with commerce on the highways, the transportation of any article, whether it be perishable or durable, whether it be agricultural products or the products of factories, for my information, I address to the Senator from Maryland a question in regard to what is known as the Hobbs bill, Public Law 486, which was passed by the Congress and signed by the President, and is now upon the statute books. I read the following short provision:

> Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

Mr. President, in regard to the matter of action by the Congress in respect to commerce moving from one State to another or between two points in the same State but, in that process, passing through another State, it seems to me that under the law now on the statute books, the Congress already has taken adequate action and has fixed a severe punishment, namely, a heavy fine or confinement in the penitentiary, to be applied to anyone who interferes with the transportation of goods along a highway. Some may say that applies only to robbery or extortion. The two terms are explicitly defined in the statute, and I wish to read those definitions:

> The term "robbery" means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

That is robbery, as defined by the statute. The term "extortion" is defined in extenso:

> The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

So that there is a law upon the statute books today with respect to the conveyance of goods, whether they be perishable, whether they be the products of agriculture, whether they come from the factories, of whatever nature or kind they may be, to protect anyone from interfering with their transportation.

What is "interference"? "Interference" means that a man is stopped against his consent, by threat, or even by anything that threatens injury not only to his person but to his property. That is covered by the law today. So I would say to the able Senator from Maryland that it seems to me, indeed, that our present statutes cover the case of the protection of property in the haulage of commerce between States.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator would allow me to interject there, if the Senate should adopt the pending amendment, this being a later law than the one he has just expounded, it would seem to show that that law did not mean what we said it should mean.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Exactly so.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would seem to show that we meant that it should apply only to perishable goods, because of the premise of the Senator from West Virginia is sound, there would be no need for the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say at this point, that seems to be the correct conclusion. The only difference, if we go back to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, is that he offers the relief of injunction in the case of perishable goods. I say that today there is upon the criminal statute books provisions for punishment—if punishment is a deterrent, and we have always believed it to be so—we have on our statute books the deterrent of punishment for interference with the transportation of any article.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who rose a moment ago.

Mr. TAFT. I was going to make the point made by the Senator from West Virginia, but to suggest that we are dealing here not with direct violence; we are dealing with the checking of deliveries through secondary boycotts or jurisdictional strikes. We have already covered the case of the highway. The trouble is that the man drives up to the delivery point, and because the teamsters' union says he does not have a teamster's card, then the union in the plant, the unloaders, or longshoremen, or whatever they may be, will not unload his truck. That is what we are trying to reach in this case. We are dealing only with the one narrow phase of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. That is all I wanted to point out to the Senator. The violence question is covered by the Hobbs Act.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from West Virginia was referring to the Hobbs Anti-racketeering Act, which was amended by the special statute passed last year. I had that checked up. It prohibits only extortion, robbery, or threats of force or violence which interfere. The Department of Justice to date has received 107 complaints of alleged violations. All of them were checked. Of the 107, 24 cases were referred to United States attorneys for possible prosecution. In 14 of the 24, the district attorneys refused prosecution on the ground that they did not have a case. In the other 10 cases, a decision has not yet been made. I may say that under the Hobbs Act it is necessary to prove force or violence or threats, and unfortunately that is not the way the shipments are stopped. It is by means of a secondary boycott, through economic pressure. The farmer simply is told, "O. K. If you do not go along with this, your stuff will not be unloaded when it finally gets to market."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield next to the Senator from New Jersey, who arose some time ago.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wonder if the Senator would yield to me for a comment on this particular point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish the Senator from West Virginia would let me yield to the Senator from New Jersey, because he himself wants to reply. There are many Senators seeking the floor, and the Senator from Maryland is doing the best he can to give every Senator a chance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I merely desire to say, as one of those who voted against the Ball amendment, that I am heartily in accord with what the Senator from Maryland has been saying. There is absolutely no distinction in principle, and I am not trying to distinguish between one case and the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I should now like to conclude with a summation.

Mr. SMITH. May I finish my thought?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. I intend to vote against the Aiken amendment, because in addressing myself to the Ball amendment this morning, I tried to point out that I think we provided the procedure for taking care of the cases covered in the amendment. In my opinion, the responsibility is definitely on the National Labor Relations Board to take care of the very outstanding cases that are being put into their hands now. I think they can afford relief promptly, if they are organized to do it, and they should be properly organized, or they will fail in discharging the responsibility we are placing on them. I think there is no distinction between the case raised by the Senator from Vermont and any other case. As the Senator from Maryland says, the principle is exactly the same.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make just one point. As I understand the comment by the Senator from Vermont, the object is to cover perishable farm products. Suppose a farmer is carrying a load of corn, a load of oats, wheat, or cotton, and he cannot get them handled; the same principle is involved. Local authorities have been condemned for not meeting their responsibilities, and because they have not, the problem is now in the lap of Congress. If we fail, as the local authorities have failed and thus make it necessary for the issue to come before us, are not the American people fully justified in condemning the Congress as severely as Senators today are condemning the local authorities for not having the courage to pass a law that will meet the situation?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think I need answer the Senator's interrogation, because the logic answers itself.

In closing, I want to reiterate this one point: If there is any merit at all in adopting the pending amendment, it ought to be adopted without any qualification whatever. If it is sound that perishable goods shall not be interrupted while being transported on the highway, it is equally sound that other goods ought not to be interrupted in their transit on the highway. Simply putting perishable goods in a class by themselves, I say without any reflection on anyone here—for I do not intend any reflection—seems to me to be an expedient way of being on both sides of the same question. The issue presented to us is whether or not a thing is wrong; and if it is wrong, whether or not the remedy should apply to all phases of that wrong. We cannot segregate it. In my judgment, we ought to act one way or the other. We ought not to straddle.

I am indebted to the Senator from Arkansas for his illustration, because the farmer may think that his corn, his wheat, his oats, his cattle, his cotton, his soybeans, his flax, and all the other things which are transported along the highway, are implicit in the suggestion of perishable goods as covered in the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. The truth is that the farmer is not protected under the amendment. The truth of the matter is that only a few farmers are protected under this amendment; and if it is right to protect those few, we ought to protect them all, and all others who have goods to deliver.

Finally, there is not one single, solitary thing in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, without the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, that hurts labor one bit; I care not who says it does. There is not a right taken away from labor we all have not already had taken away from us as individuals. Labor loses nothing, and gains much in order, peace, and a thriving country, if we can have the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, not weakened by the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. Although I would rather have the amendment as so amended than no amendment at all, I should rather have the group covered in the amendment to the amendment lifted out of the conflict of the wrongs and interference we have discussed than nothing at all. I am going to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, and then, if his amendment shall be voted down, vote for the Taft amendment in its original form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Langer	Russell
Byrd	McCarthy	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McKellar	Wherry
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Williams
Ecton	Murray	Wilson
Fulbright	O'Conor	Young

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Hayden	Moore
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Myers
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Downey	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Umstead
Gurney	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Hatch	Malone	Wagner
Hawkes	Millikin	Watkins

NOT VOTING—5

Barkley	O'Mahoney	White
Chavez	Tobey	

So Mr. AIKEN'S amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. TAFT was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The questions recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for about 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to know whether debate on the Taft amendment is closed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; debate is not closed on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about the pending amendment. Senators will recall that the bill itself provides that there may be suits by or against labor unions in the Federal courts for breach of collective-bargaining agreements. The bill also provides that boycotts, as defined in the bill, and jurisdictional strikes, are unfair labor practices, and it makes it obligatory in case of a complaint being made that an unfair labor practice of this character has been committed, that the regional attorney or regional representative of the National Labor Relations Board shall apply to the courts for a temporary restraining order.

In addition to that, the Senator from Ohio proposes to make the basis of a substantive suit at law for damages what the bill in its principal capacity describes as an unfair labor practice. Whereas the bill seems to me to provide merely a procedural remedy in a Federal court, the Taft amendment proposes to confer a substantive right for a suit for damages in a Federal court, because it says:

> Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof—

And so on. In the next place, Mr. President, it confers jurisdiction on the Federal courts without regard to diversity of citizenship required in other Federal cases. In other words, if the injury is 15 cents, the amendment confers rights upon a party to bring suit in a Federal court, regardless of the fact that there may not be diversity of citizenship. That encourages litigation. It gives jurisdiction to the Federal courts, which violates all the rules we have at the present time relative to that jurisdiction. It tends to foment litigation and to get away from the adjustment of these disputes by procedures before the National Labor Relations Board or by arbitration agreements, or by machinery set up in the collective-bargaining contracts.

Mr. President, I therefore believe that the amendment is detrimental to the public interest and should not be adopted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD some remarks prepared by me on certain phases of the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The statement prepared by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MAGNUSON IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENTS OUTLAWING UNION SECURITY CLAUSES AND PROHIBITING INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

I think most Members of the Congress are in accord that some legislative action in the field of labor-management relations is necessary to reduce industrial strife in the Nation. Wide divergence of opinion exists among us, however, as to the specific methods by which this objective can be achieved.

It is asserted that congressional action should be aimed at two major targets: First, protection of the rights of the individual worker as guaranteed in the Wagner Act and in the Constitution itself; and second, reduction of strikes and boycotts to protect the public interest.

As a Member of the United States Senate I feel a deep obligation to all the citizens of my State and of the country—citizens including both workers and employers—to analyze the proposals which are before us, to focus upon them all the pertinent facts at my command, and to vote upon these proposals in the light of the convictions developed by this process. Every Senator has, and I am sure feels, that same obligation.

I want to discuss now the first of the two major targets I mentioned, namely, protection of the rights of the individual worker as guaranteed in the Wagner Act and in the Constitution itself. There has been extended discussion both in and out of Congress concerning the need for protecting the worker's rights from infringement by the employer and from infringement by his union. The consensus of opinion in the Senate committee apparently was that the individual worker is adequately protected against infringement by the employer under the National Labor Relations Act. I judge this both from a perusal of the testimony presented to the committee and from the fact that there are no new proposals in the bill reported by the committee dealing with this phase of the subject. Most of the discussion and all of the pertinent proposals are allegedly aimed at protecting the rights of the individual worker from infringement by his own organization, from infringement by his union. I want to take a few minutes of the Senate's time to summarize my thinking on this question.

As I see it, there are two inseparable rights which the worker has, in a free society, in relation to the necessity of earning a living. The first is, the right to a job for which he is qualified and on which he is willing to work; the second is the right to receive from that job a wage that will permit him to provide a deecnt standard of living for himself and his family. If we're sincerely interested in protecting the rights of the worker, both rights must be protected—the right to a job and the right to a decent living wage on that job.

In the final analysis, the ability of the worker to obtain a job, for which he is qualified and on which he is willing to work, rests upon the number of jobs available in the particular industry he has chosen as a desirable occupation. The number of jobs available in any one industry, in turn, depends upon the importance of that industry in our national economy and upon the current health of our national economy. In 1932, with or without organized labor, there were approximately 10,000,000 people unable to exercise their right to a job, irrespective of their qualifications and their willingness to work. In those dark drys the best carpenter in a community was unable to exercise his right to a job, because employers had no job available. The only time all workers qualified and willing to work are able to exercise their right to a job is when the Nation is enjoying full employment and full prosperity, and even then it is not possible for every worker to obtain the particular job he would like. This is brought about by imbalances which obtain as between the number of workers needed in a particular plant, office, or industry, and the number of workers who might desire a position in that particular plant, office, or industry. The President recognized this when he urged the Congress to consider such constructive measures as extension of social security, a full employment program, higher minimum wages, etc.

The proponents of the legislation which we now have under consideration assert that outlawing the closed shop, restricting organized workers in their efforts to write union-security provisions into their contracts, are designed to protect the right of the individual worker to obtain a job. Let's assume for a moment that in industry X there is a closed shop, and that currently the industry has all of the workers it requires. The individual worker who desires a job in that industry would be unable to exercise his so-called right whether there was a closed shop or not.

The only difference I can see is that if I am a worker seeking a job in that industry and there is a closed shop, I go to the employment office and am told that I should go to the union hall and join the union. The union leadership, which certainly knows the job status in that particular industry, tells me that the union membership is closed, tells me in effect there is no job available. If there were no closed shop in the industry the employment office would give me the answer, but the end result, so far as I as an individual worker am concerned, is the same. The demand for labor in that particular industry is simply not sufficient to provide a job for every individual who might wish to enter it. I reached the conclusion, therefore, that it is not a closed shop or a union shop or a maintenance of membership shop that denies me the right to work in industry X. It is, rather, the lack of jobs available in the industry which dictates the answer. In the final analysis, therefore, Congress can't protect the right of the individual worker to a job for which he is qualified and willing to work by outlawing the closed shop, the union shop, or any other union security provision. Congress can protect this right only through legislation which contributes constructively to full employment and general prosperity in the Nation.

A moment ago I said that if we're sincerely interested in protecting the rights of the individual worker, we must protect his right to a job, and his right to a decent wage on that job—and further, that the two are inseparable. Now, I want to discuss the second of these rights and examine the effects of this bill and proposed amendments upon the ability of the individual worker to achieve it.

The level of wages that can be obtained by the individual worker in free enterprise in this country, again, depends partially upon the economic health of industry in the Nation, but it also depends to a very significant degree upon his bargaining position. The individual worker, by himself, in our highly industrialized economy, does not enjoy a high degree of bargaining power. Standing alone he is relatively impotent in any individual effort to achieve a higher wage for himself in bargaining with his employer. It is only through the collective action made possible by unionization that the individual worker in industry has been able to achieve any significant increase in his standard of living.

I don't mean to intimate for one moment that the employers of this Nation are insensitive to the welfare of those they employ, but I do believe that, human nature being what it is, laudable drive on the part of the employer to reduce his costs—one of which is wages—and thereby increase his profits, is stronger in the majority of cases than the desire to lift the standard of living of his employees. By associating themselves for mutual aid and protection, employees, through collective bargaining, have been able to compensate partially for this incentive on the part of the free enterprisers of the country to lower costs by lowering or holding the line on wages.

The bargaining position of employees who have associated themselves for mutual benefit depends partially upon their own number and partially upon the leadership they select. In other words, their bargaining position depends upon their own economic strength, or to put it in the language of the press or the man on the street, the strength of their union. The closed shop, the union shop, and other forms of union security give the individual worker greater bargaining strength, because they strengthen the organization of which he is a member. To my mind, it follows, therefore, that those proposals now before us aimed at reducing the strength of the worker's organization will not assist him in protecting his right to reasonable wages, better working conditions, etc. On the contrary, they will have the effect of weakening his ability to exercise that right.

Too, there is a collateral effect which cannot be overlooked. The accumulative effort of workers bargaining collectively to raise their wages, which means to raise their purchasing power, assists in creating mass markets for the goods and services industry produces. Upon such mass markets depends industry's ability to provide more jobs, to permit more workers to exercise the first right I mentioned, namely, the right to a job for which the man is qualified and willing to work.

Based on what I have said, I have reached two conclusions: First, that those proposals now before us, alleged by their proponents as being necessary to protect the individual worker from infringement upon his rights by unions, actually destroy the very rights they are purportedly designed to protect, and second, that the proponents either have failed to think their proposals through to a logical conclusion or are interested not so much in protecting the worker from his own union as in shearing him of his bargaining strength by reducing the power of his labor organization.

I therefore find myself opposed to those amendments which outlaw union-security clauses and drastically limit the scope of industry bargaining.

I would be inclined to take a different position on this union-security issue were it not for the fact that the bill contains other provisions which protect the individual from coercive and capricious action by his labor organization. Before the union can bargain for a closed shop or a union shop or a maintenance of membership clause, a majority of the workers in the plant or office must authorize their representative to bargain with management for it. There must be an election on the issue by secret ballot. The authorization to bargain with management for a union-security clause may be withdrawn by a majority of the employees. In addition, the leadership of the union itself is made responsible to the will of the majority by providing for a secret ballot and supervised elections in questions of representation.

I wish to discuss briefly the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, which drastically restricts the scope of collective bargaining. I am opposed to this amendment because it places industry itself in a strait-jacket. Some industries and some unions would prefer to bargain on an area-wide, region-wide, or industry-wide basis. This proposal imposes a formula upon collective bargaining without regard to the past experience of the enterprises and industries affected. I have in my hand a letter which will illustrate this point. The letter was written to me jointly by the

Flour, Feed, and Cereal Employers' Association and the American Federation of Grain Processors in the Pacific Northwest, importuning me to vote against proposals to prohibit industry-wide bargaining. Remember this is management talking through its association and labor through its regional committee. I read from the letter:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 23, 1947.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This letter is being written as a joint communication of the Flour, Feed and Cereal Employers' Association, composed of flour and cereal manufacturing plants whose total capacity equals approximately 80 percent of the flour and cereal capacity in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and the American Federation of Grain Processors and its affiliated local unions located within the States of Washington, Oregon and Idaho. The employees of the plants which are members of the Flour, Feed and Cereal Employers' Association are members of local unions affiliated with the American Federation of Grain Processors. The capacity of individual plants represented by the Employers' Association ranges from very small plants having a daily capacity of 400 hundredweight to large plants having a daily capacity of 12,000 hundredweight.

Since 1942 labor negotiations between the local unions and the members of the Association have been carried on on an area-wide basis. These negotiations have resulted in the establishment of fair wages and conditions of employment and have been conducive to industrial peace. We, therefore, are deeply concerned over the possibility that section 9 (f) (1) of H. R. 3020, Eightieth Congress, first session, which section contains prohibition against so-called industry-wide bargaining, may be enacted into law. In our opinion the enactment of this section would not be conducive to industrial peace in the flour and cereal manufacturing industry in the Pacific Northwest. On the contrary, based upon our past experience, it is believed that the enactment of this section will be a backward step and would in a large measure, nullify the progress heretofore made within this industry in respect to collective bargaining.

Because we feel so strongly on the matter, we take the liberty of outlining to you in some detail the history of labor negotiations within this industry.

The flour milling plants of the Pacific Northwest were organized by the unions from 1933 to 1935. From the period of initial organization through 1941 labor negotiations were carried on by the local unions and the management of individual plants. Negotiations at individual plant levels proved to be wholly inefficient and the relationship between the management of the plants and their employees was, on the whole, unstable. This instability was caused, in our opinion, by two primary factors:

1. Individual representatives of local unions attempted to outdo representatives of other locals to gain the favor of their individual members. This resulted in a rivalry between local unions and the making of unequal demands against individual plants which were in competition with each other.

2. From the industry point of view, each mill attempted to obtain union contracts more favorable to it than those obtained by its competitors.

As a result of these factors antagonism between the management of individual plants and the representatives of the local unions tended to become intensified, resulting in insecurity and mutual suspicion and distrust.

This situation resulted in labor disputes of such magnitude that in 1941 virtually every flour and cereal manufacturing plant in the Pacific Northwest was closed for a period of approximately 3 weeks. The precise issue causing the closing of the mills was not entirely clear. It was claimed by the unions that the employees were locked out. The management of the mills, however, contended with equal vigor that they were closed by strike. Despite the fact that the unions and management did not agree upon the immediate cause of the closure, both sides agreed that the dispute was brought about because of the mechanism of bargaining separately at plant levels.

This likewise was the conclusion of a joint commission of the United States Department of Labor and the Office of Production Management, which was convened to settle the dispute because of its magnitude and the urgent need of flour at the time After hearing the arguments of both the unions and management, the Commission made specific recommendations which resulted in the reopening of all plants. But the Commission went further than to settle the immediate dispute. It concluded that the States of Washington and Oregon constituted a single economic unit as far as flour and cereal manufacturing industry was concerned. With this fact in mind, and being cognizant of the suspicion and distrust caused by separate bargaining at plant levels, the Commission recommended that future negotiations be conducted by joint committees of employers and unions on an area-wide basis. The recommendations stated:

"Each side shall set up a wage negotiating committee representative of the industry as a whole in the States of Oregon and Washington, and these two committees shall jointly meet for the purpose of reaching a wage agreement."

The recommendation of the joint commission was accepted by both the unions and the employers on an experimental basis. Negotiations for 1942 and subsequent years have been carried on successfully on an area-wide basis in complete harmony. Indeed, since 1942 no labor dispute has occurred between the flour milling plants and the unions participating in the joint area negotiations, and none is anticipated in the future. In fact, area-wide bargaining, which was first tried on an experimental basis only, is now accepted with enthusiasm by both the management and the unions.

Area-wide bargaining in the milling industry in the Pacific Northwes' has now advanced to the point where there is a single contract covering all major plants within the area. The area contract permits the execution of supplemental agreements between individual plants and local unions covering local plant problems, and a supplemental agreement is in effect at each plant. The contracting parties to the area agreement are the Flour, Feed, and Cereal Employers' Association, acting for and on behalf of itself and its members, and the Northwest Council of Grain Processors, acting for and on behalf of itself and all local unions within the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho which are affiliated with the American Federation of Grain Processors. Negotiations are actually carried on by committees representing both the contracting parties. The committee for the employers' association is composed of individuals representing each member, and the committee representing the northwest council is composed of representatives of each local union within the area. The negotiating committees, as such, have no power to enter into an agreement, but they do make recommendations to their respective organizations which are usually ratified and approved by them. However, before the contract is actually entered into it must be approved by a majority of the employers and by a majority of the membership of the local unions.

We point out in this connection that once the contract is approved and ratified by a majority of the membership of the local unions and by a majority of the members of the employers' association, both parties may enter into a binding agreement. It is not necessary for the unions to obtain the consent of their national or international offices. Thus the procedures used within this industry with respect to area-wide bargaining are extremely democratic. Area-wide bargaining, as carried on within this industry in this area, is wholly free from dictatorship, either on the part of management or on the part of the union. Accordingly, we believe that the usual arguments advanced against industry-wide bargaining are wholly inapplicable to the area-wide bargaining as practiced within the milling industry in the Pacific Northwest.

One of the unique features evolved by the industry, after 12 years experience, is the procedure used in settling grievances. Attempt is made to settle grievances at plant levels. Where this is impossible either side may immediately appeal to an area grievance committee composed of three members representing the unions and three members representing management. Provision is made for final decision by majority vote and for the appointment of an arbitrator if the vote is equally divided. Since this procedure has been perfected a large number of grievances have been presented to the committee. We think it is significant that it has not only been unnecessary to use an arbitrator but every grievance has been settled by a unanimous vote. This, we think, tends to solidify harmonious relations and is proof that labor relations when conducted upon a broad area basis can be constructive and, if properly safeguarded by democratic procedures, definitely in the public interest.

Our experience has been that too often where labor negotiations are conducted on an individual plant basis they are influenced by conflicting personalities and, accordingly, are destructive rather than constructive in regard to promoting industrial peace. On the other hand, it has been our experience that where negotiations are conducted on an area wide basis personalities and relatively minor problems fade into insignificance and the negotiations are conducted upon the basis of constructive principles. In our opinion area-wide bargaining eliminates inequality of bargaining and results in collective bargaining upon the basis of equality. It places heavy responsibilities on both the management and Union committees because of the number of workers and the magnitude of the interests involved. It has been our experience that this heavy responsibility has acted as a challenge to both sides, which has resulted in patience, respect, mutual understanding and statesmanship. These factors have combined to eliminate mutual mistrust and substitute, in place thereof, mutual trust, which in itself is a long step toward industrial peace. We think it is a fair statement of fact that both the unions and management are confident that if area-wide negotiations are continued and further perfected along the lines as presently practiced, the milling industry within the Pacific Northwest will continue to operate for many years to come without even the thought of closing any plant on account of labor disputes.

We have read with interest the statement appearing on pages 8 and 9 of the House committee report regarding industry-wide bargaining. We have also read the arguments of organizations opposed to industry-wide bargaining. Nowhere have we found any argument which contends that area-wide

bargaining as practiced in the Pacific Northwest is against the public interest. In our opinion the arguments in support of section 9 (f) (1) go no further than to say that industry-wide bargaining, as practiced in some industries, contains certain abuses. But this section goes further than to outlaw alleged abuses; it, in effect, declares area-wide bargaining, regardless of how practiced, to be illegal, per se. It is our sincere belief that the section as written is much too broad. We feel that Congress should give definite consideration to the advantages of area-wide bargaining as practiced by the milling industry in the Pacific Northwest. It is our considered opinion that section 9 (f) (1), if enacted into law, will, in a large measure, wipe out the constructive steps heretofore taken within the milling industry to achieve industrial peace; it will place the industry in the unstable condition which existed prior to 1941. It is, therefore, our sincere request that you will take all possible steps against passage of this section as now written.

Yours very truly,

FLOUR, FEED AND CEREAL EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION,
W. J. LAWRENCE,
Executive Secretary.
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GRAIN PROCESSORS,
TED M. HOPKINS,
Regional Vice President.

No doubt there are many firms and employers' associations whose experience with area-wide or industry-wide bargaining would corroborate the experience set forth, so lucidly, in the letter I have just read.

Some problems can be handled more effectively by an administrative agency than by legislation. The question of industry-wide bargaining is such a problem. My own view is, that determination of the size and scope of the bargaining unit should be left in the hands of the National Labor Relations Board, as provided in the bill itself. The pattern of business and industrial operations in this Nation is highly complex. No simple formula can be written which will meet the day-to-day problems of industry in its bargaining with labor. Flexibility is mandatory in these negotiations—flexibility can be achieved through an administrative agency. It cannot be achieved by legislative action which leaves no leeway whatsoever for the exercise of administrative judgment.

There is one additional thought I should like to inject into this discussion. The development of labor organizations in this country has been an evolutionary process. This process was accelerated by passage of the Wagner Act. During the years since the Wagner Act became law this Nation has fought its way to victory through the greatest depression and war in the history of the world. As a Nation we have emerged from these world upheavals with the highest level of income, the greatest productive capacity, and the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people in the history of the world. All groups in the economy, including organized labor, contributed to this achievement.

Now, it is argued, labor has become too strong; labor has become too powerful. We must restore balance between the bargaining power of labor and the bargaining power of management. And it is proposed that we do this by writing into law, according to statements made on this floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee, some 20 separate provisions, all designed to chisel from under labor a part of the very foundation upon which the bargaining strength of its individual members must rest.

It is further asserted by proponents of this course of action that all these steps must be taken now—this week, this session—if we are to avert national calamity, national disaster. And this in face of the fact that the Nation today enjoys the best economic health in its long and glorious history—under a system of labor-management relations, may I remind you, which all these proposals are designed to correct.

Patience and moderation are great virtues. May I remind our Republican friends that Congress will be in session again next year. What is the emergency that demands that all of these 20 steps be taken now—today, this week, this session—at the risk of creating greater industrial strife, and greater imbalances between the bargaining position of labor and management, than we seek to correct.

I sincerely hope the majority of Senators will recognize that just as labor-management relations in this country have developed through the evolutionary process, so too, legislation governing those relations must develop by the same process. I doubt very much that the economy of this Nation will collapse, if we reject a part or even all of the 20 new provisions contained in this bill and related amendments.

In conclusion, I am opposed to the seven amendments which have been proposed to this bill and to those sections of the bill which drastically reduce the individual worker's ability to exercise his right to a job at wages which will sustain himself and his family on an American standard of living.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not want to delay a vote on the pending amendment for any great length of time, but I intend to make my record against the amendment, because I think it is very important that attention be called in the closing minutes of the debate to what I think are two very serious legal weaknesses in the amendment. I think it is a great mistake for the Senate of the United States to adopt an amendment which contains what I consider to be very serious legal weaknesses. Earlier this afternoon I commented upon the first point I wish to make. I want to reiterate what I said. I want to point out that it is my judgment that the use of the word "unlawful" in the amendment, followed by a definition of the conduct that is to be declared unlawful, that conduct consisting of various types of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes, will reestablish the right of the individual to seek an injunction to prevent the damage flowing from the conduct declared to be unlawful under the amendment, because there is nothing in the amendment by way of words of limitation that makes clear any intention that such a result shall not flow from the amendment. Thus the amendment repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act as to the conduct covered by the amendment.

It is my position, Mr. President, that it is going to require a United States Supreme Court decision to determine the legal point I am raising. I say that if we provide in this amendment that certain conduct on the part of labor organizations shall be unlawful, and we permit individuals to bring suit to collect damage for injuries suffered from such conduct, they also thereby have the right to go into a Federal court and obtain an injunction as individuals prior to suffering that damage when they can show the court that such damage will flow from the conduct declared to be unlawful under the amendment, unless an injunction is issued to prevent its happening. If that is the interpretation that is made of the amendment by the courts—and I submit that it is more than probable; in fact, I think it is a better legal argument to argue that such a right becomes available to the individual under the amendment than to argue to the contrary—then we are restoring as to these secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike cases the right of the individual employer to obtain an injunction just as the Senator from Minnesota contemplated in his amendment which was defeated earlier this afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wanted to point out that there exists a right of injunction today. There is a right of injunction against mass picketing; there is a right of injunction in other labor disputes. The only question is whether it is subject to the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which imposes a dozen different qualifications.

So far as the pending amendment is concerned, if it in any way indirectly authorizes an injunction, it would still be subject to all the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The question here is not one of injunction. The Norris-LaGuardia Act does not say that no one shall obtain an injunction in labor disputes. It says no one shall obtain an injunction unless he complies with the terms of that act. The reason I was not willing to vote for the Ball amendment was that it sets aside the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Whatever may be the fact as to what relief courts will give in civil suits for damages or otherwise, obviously, the amendment still remains subject to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. So I do not see the point of the Senator's objection to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I wish it were as obvious as the Senator from Ohio tries to make it appear to be by assertion, but the fact is that, as of now, secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes do not result in injunctions under the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. They do result in injunctions. Two or three injunctions have ben issued when persons have been able to comply with the terms of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, whenever violence is involved.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, whenever violence is involved, yes, but we do not have an amendment here which so defines the conduct that is to be made unlawful. It does not require violence in secondary boycotts and the jurisdictional disputes as a basis for the unlawful conduct prohibited by the amendment. The cases cited by the Senator from Ohio are not in point insofar as the effects of his amendment are concerned.

What the Senator is saying is that it shall be unlawful to participate in jurisdictional disputes or secondary boycotts when the result is to do damage to whoever suffers from cases of secondary boycott or jurisdictional disputes.

Mr. TAFT. And for the purpose of this section only.

Mr. MORSE. For the purpose of this section only.

Mr. TAFT. The purpose is to enable the bringing of civil suits for damages.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me that there is implicit in the Senator's position the argument which the junior Senator from Oregon is making, namely, that once such conduct is declared to be unlawful and so defined in the amendment, ipso facto, the individual employer then has the right to obtain an injunction to prevent the damage from accruing, in regard to which he is given the right to sue for damages which otherwise might be suffered.

Mr. TAFT. I should say, if at all, only subject to all the proper restrictive provisions in the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. MORSE. I am pointing out that, in my judgment, the Senator automatically removes those restrictions when he says that "for the purposes of this section," this conduct shall be unlawful, and that in regard to such conduct the individual may sue for damages. If he can sue for damages, he certainly is entitled to protection by way of injunctive relief before the damage accrues.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say in reply to the Senator or anyone else who makes the same argument, that that is not the intention of the author of the amendment. It is not his belief as to the effect of it. It is not the advice of counsel to the committee. Under those circumstances, I do not believe that any court would construe the amendment along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that statement from the Senator from Ohio. I sought it earlier in the afternoon. I am glad to have it now. Since I made my argument earlier in the afternoon, I, too, have received advice from high counsel in the Government. After discussing the legal problem with me, they reached exactly the same conclusion I have reached in regard to the legal effect of declaring such conduct unlawful. They agree that what will happen as a result of the inclusion of the language "unlawful" in the amendment is that as to the conduct covered by the amendment we would give the right to the individual employer to injunctive relief, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act would not apply.

The second legal objection which I wish to raise to the amendment goes to part (b) of the amendment. There is some very interesting language there to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate:

> Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof.

The word to which I invite attention is the word "whoever." Take a look at the breadth of that language—

> Whoever shall be injured in his business or property—

Whoever shall suffer any injury shall have the right to sue therefor. It is difficult for me to understand how such broad language can be used in an amendment such as this, when we bear in mind the legal consequences of the language. In a moment I wish to talk in terms of a few hypothetical cases.

First, let me point out that under the Sherman Act, when the Supreme Court came to pass upon the meaning of the phrase "restraint of trade," it did not rule that any interference with trade resulted in restraint of trade. It did not take the position that any injury shown would result in a finding that the conduct of the party charged with acting in restraint of trade constituted restraint of trade. To the contrary, in the cases which I cited in my speech this morning, the Coronado cases, and particularly in the leather case, the decisions of Mr. Justice Taft, but even more particularly—and I wish to dwell on it for a moment—the decision of Mr. Justice Stone in the Apex Hosiery case shows that under the Sherman Act and under the Clayton Act, when the court was dealing with the question of treble damages, it limited to very narrow confines the conduct which could be interpreted as restraint of trade.

In the *Apex Hosiery case* (310 U. S. 469), decided in 1940, the court recognized the distinction between primary intent and objectives and the secondary inevitable intent present in every strike to limit or restrict production. If it is enough to look to the secondary intent to stop production, then, as the Supreme Court has consistently pointed out, every strike would be illegal.

Mark the language of Mr. Chief Justice Stone in the Apex Hosiery case. He said:

> Concededly the purpose of the strikers and their principal objective was to compel petitioners to yield to their demands for a union shop, but it is a matter of common knowledge and experience that the stoppage of a large manufacturing plant, which the strikers did intend, whose product is distributed generally to consumers throughout the country, would prevent its shipments in interstate commerce.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Underlying and implicit in all of them is recognition that the Sherman Act was not enacted to police interstate transportation, or to afford a remedy for wrongs, which are actionable under State law, and result from obstructions and conspiracies which fall short, both in their purpose and effect, of any form of market control of a commodity—

In other words, he was suggesting one test as to whether or not it was a restraint of trade—the test of whether the objective was to concentrate a control of the market—

> such as to "monopolize the supply, control its price, or discriminate between its would-be purchasers." These elements of restraint of trade are wholly lacking here: We only hold now, as we have previously held in both labor and nonlabor cases, that such restraints are not within the Sherman Act unless they are intended to have, or in fact have, the effect on the market on which the courts relied to establish violation in the second Coronado case.
>
> If, without such effect on the market, we were to hold that a local factory strike, stopping production and shipment of its product interstate, violates the Sherman law, practically every strike in modern industry would be brought within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

I cite these decisions in order to make this application of them: When the court was dealing with violations under the Sherman Act it limited the application to so-called primary injury, not secondary. But in this amendment we have language which says:

> Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof.

See what that language encompasses. Let us take a hypothetical case or two. Suppose that A operates a print shop. B is a union working for A. C is another union working for another employer. C carries on a secondary boycott against A's plant. As a result of that secondary boycott a thousand drug stores do not receive delivery of a certain issue of a popular magazine. Under the terms of this amendment, they bring a thousand lawsuits against the union, charging that they have suffered, let us assume for hypothetical purposes, a loss of $200 per store in profits from the sale of the magazines. That is one example in which it seems to me that under the language of the amendment we go into what amounts to a secondary injury rather than a primary injury. But I see nothing in this language which would stop the bringing of a multiplicity of suits against a union which lost its head and engaged in a boycott for a certain period.

Of course, as I said this morning, the result of this device is to litigate a union right out of existence if it makes a mistake. I say, furthermore, that the so-called punishment that would flow from this amendment in such cases is an unconscionable punishment. It is too harsh and will lead to labor strife, not labor peace.

I think this amendment ought to be sent back to committee and have its language worked over so that we shall not bring into the law a statute which will involve such a sweeping punishment upon the unions of the country when they make the type of mistake that some will undoubtedly make—because unions are composed of human beings.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that I seriously question whether he can find another statute that has such sweeping power as is given in this bill to bring suits when there are secondary injuries and not primary injuries. It is not limited to the so-called direct injury suffered by the employer who has relationships with a particular trade-union organization. It covers 140,000,000 American people, any one of whom, under this language, if he can show that he suffered any injury whatsoever from a secondary boycott or from a jurisdictional dispute, can come in with an action against the union and flood our courts with a multitude of litigation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asks for a parallel, and I can give him one. Under the Sherman Act the same question of boycott damage is subject to a suit for damages and attorneys' fees. In this case we simply provide for the amount

of the actual damages. But the parallel is exactly the same, only under the Sherman Act, if a group of businessmen put a small concern out of business, they are subject to a suit for damages. If a labor union does the same thing, why should it not be subject to a suit for damages?

Mr. MORSE. I say, with all respect, that if the Senator will read the opinion of his distinguished father in the Coronado case he could not reach that conclusion; and if he would read the decision of Justice Stone in the Apex case he could not reach that conclusion. They made it very plain that they were limiting liability to so-called primary injuries, and that the restraint of trade referred to under the statute had to be a restraint that affected the market. The Senator has not included in his amendment language which is restrictive or which is parallel to the narrow and restrictive interpretations of the Supreme Court under the Sherman and Clayton Acts. I want the RECORD to show that this afternoon, because I think the Senate, if it passes this amendment, will be passing an amendment without having a full appreciation of the legal consequences of the amendment. Thus, in conclusion, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment because of the undesirable legal consequences which will flow from its adoption.

I now turn my attention for a few minutes to an entirely different matter.

I have in my hand a copy of the May 1947 issue of the Republican News, which is supposed to be the official organ of the National Republican Committee. I note on one page that there is a full-page discussion under the heading "The rights of labor," and in large type at the bottom of the page "That's what the people ordered last November!" Then there is this interesting paragraph:

> All of the rights listed above are guaranteed by the bill (H. R. 3020) passed by the House of Representatives pursuant to Republican promises during the 1946 campaign. The bill also insures free collective bargaining: protects the interests of the public and of management; and is designed to prevent recurrence of the production-paralyzing epidemic of industrial disputes stimulated by the intrusion of politics into labor-management relations.

It purports to set out the main provisions of the Hartley bill.

I think it is a fair interpretation to say that there is an attempt made by the editors of the Republican News to create the impression that the Hartley bill is the official Republican labor policy.

I think there is the further implication—the only inference that can be placed upon the article—that the provisions of the Hartley bill are what the Republican Party promised the voters last November. I want to record a categorical denial of any such inference or implication or representation, Mr. President. There are some Republicans who presented such a point of view and other Republicans who presented other points of view on labor in the last campaign. I think it is unfortunate that such an impression is given by the Republican News that this statement of labor principles represents the Republican labor program. Some of the votes in the Senate in recent days would certainly cause some doubts as to that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator spoke in quite a number of States in the primaries and before the last general election, did he not?

Mr. MORSE. I think I spoke in approximately 15 States.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator make any such statement as that in speaking to the farmers?

Mr. MORSE. In speaking to the farmers I said that so far as I was concerned I would endeavor to make Republican policy, to the extend that I had any influence in the party, favor the type of labor program to be found in title I of the bill which came out of committee and which consists chiefly of my proposal for amendments to the Wagner Act.

Mr. LANGER. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that promises such as he has referred to were never made by any Republican speaker in North Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. I was very careful to make no promises for the Republican Party, because I do not believe that individual Republican speakers should be going around the country stating what the Republican policy is on any issue. I think we ought to evolve Republican policy on the floor of the United States Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives, and then go before the Republican voters of the country and ask them if they want to endorse that as the policy at election time by their ballots. It will be interesting also, when we get through with this labor legislation in this session, to see what the voters think of it in 1948.

The last comment I want to make on this matter is that I hold in my hand, also, Mr. President, another little sheet called the NAM News, of April 26, 1947, in which, under the heading "The worker's bill of rights, by Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.," I find verbatim the same language that I find in the Republican News article under the heading "The rights of labor." I am sure it is unnecessary for me to draw any inferences.

I ask to have both articles incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Republican News for May 1947]

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR

1. The right to join with his fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union that they want, not the union that is forced upon them.

2. The right to get a job without joining any union.

3. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job.

4. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union.

5. The right, with his fellow employees, to make demands of their own and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union without dictation by national and international officers and representatives and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers.

6. The right to keep on working and getting his pay in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

7. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

8. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination.

9. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear, in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for.

10. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers.

11. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses.

12. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want.

13. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for (1) not paying dues; (2) disclosing confidential information of the union; (3) violating the union's contract; (4) being a Communist or fellow traveler; (5) being convicted of a felony, that is, of a serious crime; (6) engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union.

14. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union doesn't like.

15. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer.

16. The right, without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes.

17. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested.

18. The right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights.

All of the rights listed above are guaranteed by the bill (H. R. 3020) passed by the House of Representatives pursuant to Republican promises during the 1946 campaign. The bill also insures free collective bargaining: protects the interests of the public and of management; and is designed to prevent recurrence of the production-paralyzing epidemic of industrial disputes stimulated by the intrusion of politics into labor-management relations.

That's what the people ordered last November.

[From the NAM News of April 26, 1947]

THE WORKER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.)

Our bill of rights gives to each worker:

1. The right to join with his fellow workers to select a collective-bargaining agent of their own choosing; that is to say, one that is not forced on them.

2. The right to get a job without joining any union.

3. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election, the votes in which are openly counted, on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job.

4. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union.

5. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own, and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union, without dictation by national and international officers and representatives, and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers.

6. The right to keep on working and getting his pay without sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

7. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

8. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers, and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or the union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination.

9. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear in free and fair elections, on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for.

10. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers.

11. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses.

12. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance, welfare, or relief that he does not want.

13. The right to receive his pay in his pay envelope, without the employer and the union spending it for him, checking it off for union dues or for other purposes.

14. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for (1) not paying dues, (2) disclosing confidential information of the union, (3) violating the union's contract, (4) being a Communist or fellow traveler, (5) being convicted of a felony, (6) engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union.

15. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like.

16. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer.

17. The right without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes.

18. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested.

19. The right to a union free of Communist domination and control, and one that is devoted to honest trade unionism and not class warfare and turmoil.

20. Every right to strike for any legitimate object that he has had under our laws for the last hundred years.

21. And finally, the right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54 after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, for the purposes of this section only, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services in the course of their employment—

(1) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person;

(2) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) for the purpose of forcing or requiring any employer to assign to a particular labor organization work tasks assigned by an employer to some other labor organization unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work tasks. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If present, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea." On this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is unavoidably detained, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—65

Baldwin	George	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Brewster	Hawkes	Reed
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Bushfield	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Stewart
Cain	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Lodge	Thye
Capper	Lucas	Tydings
Cooper	McCarthy	Umstead
Cordon	McClellan	Vandenberg
Donnell	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Martin	Wiley
Ecton	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Moore	Young
Fulbright	O'Conor	

NAYS—26

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Barkley	Kilgore	Myers
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Downey	McCarran	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Magnuson	Wagner
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—4

Chavez Tobey White
O'Mahoney

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Various Members of the Senate have made inquiry in reference to the announcement made yesterday by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that it would be the intention to have the Senate remain in session tonight until all amendments are disposed of. I repeat that announcement at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether his announcement is to be interpreted as meaning that if all amendments are not disposed of during the early portion of the night, the Senate will be expected to continue in session all night.

Mr. WHERRY. I say to my distinguished colleague and friend that we shall be reasonable in regard to the matter. We expect to request the Senate to remain in session during the night as long as that can be done with comfort; but if some amendments are not disposed of after a reasonable time, no doubt a recess will be taken.

However, the intention is to have the Senate continue to consider the amendments until they are disposed of, and we hope it will be possible to do that without having a night session.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the amendments are disposed of before night, there will not be a night session; but if the amendments are not disposed of before night, there will be a night session?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that I see no reason why the amendments cannot be disposed of before 6 or 7 o'clock, if all Senators will get down to business and will do nothing but consider and discuss the amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that there are some Senators, of whom I am one, who wish to discuss the bill itself in general, without reference to any particular amendment. Of course, it is not necessary to do that before the amendments are disposed of, and personally I have no desire to interfere with the disposition of the amendments in order to make a general speech on the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if all Senators who wish to make general speeches on the bill will adopt the attitude just expressed by the Senator from Kentucky, I think it will be possible to dispose of all amendments promptly today, and then to have the bill open for debate on Monday and Tuesday for as long as any Senator may wish to discuss the bill itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio how many amendments remain to be acted upon.

Mr. TAFT. There are approximately five or six. One or two of them will not be controversial at all. Perhaps several will require a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether it is desired to have the Senate vote on the bill itself tonight.

Mr. TAFT. No; no effort will be made to have the Senate do that. There will be no vote on the bill tonight, so far as we are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it is the intention to have the amendments voted on tonight; is it?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; we hope to have the Senate vote on the amendments tonight.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate bill 1126, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 23, after the word "agreement", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding this act or any other statute of the United States, an employer shall be required to accept and establish a union shop if three-fourths of the employees of such employer have voted for the establishment of a union shop which for the purposes of this act is defined as a shop where employees, as a condition of continued employment, are required to join within 30 days following the beginning of employment the labor organization designated as the representative for collective bargaining of the employees as provided in section 9 (a) and authorized to enter into such an agreement in the most recent election held as provided in section 9 (e)."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an opinion on the constitutionality of the amendment which I have just offered.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT TO PROVIDE FOR A UNION SHOP

Any amendment of the National Labor Relations Act, like the act itself, must be sustained, if at all, on the basis of the congressional power under article I, section 8, clause 3, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. See *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* ((1937) 301 U. S. 1); *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1938) 305 U. S. 197). The Supreme Court has said repeatedly that this power is "complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution." *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* ((1824) 9 Wheat. 1); *Currin* v. *Wallace* ((1939) 306 U. S. 1); *U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100). The congressional authority to protect interstate commerce thus is extremely broad. *Bowie* v. *Gonzalez* (C. C. A. 1, 1941; 117 F. (2d) 11). Congress may follow its own conception of public policy in imposing restrictions on commerce (*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra), and the choice of means is within its discretion so long as there is no exercise of arbitrary power (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra). It may aim at particular difficulties thought imperative (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, supra; *Florida Fruit & Produce, Inc.* v. *U. S.* (C. C. A. 5, 1941; 117 F. (2d) 506)), and the wisdom or policy of the choice is not one for the courts to question (*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra; *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, supra.) Where some specific situation or area of conduct is deemed to have an injurious effect on labor relations and hence obstruct and interfere with the free flow of commerce, the congressional power may be exerted to correct the matter, and it is not necessary to show that such corrective measure will solve all problems giving rise to labor difficulties (*Overnight Motor Transportation Co., Inc.* v. *Missel* ((1942) 316 U. S. 572)). Accordingly, if Congress determined that the imposition of union shops, where the proposed elections so decide, would serve to improve labor relations and remove grounds of dissatisfaction among employees, that determination should be given decisive weight by the courts.

The proposed amendment does not interfere with the employer's free right to contract for employment with whom he pleases. Nor does it directly compel him to enter into any collective-bargaining agreement with the representative of the union shop. See *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* ((1937) 301 U. S. 1). Insofar as it may compel him later to discharge those who become members of the union but who do not fulfill their union obligations, his freedom of contract is not unconstitutionally impaired. The liberty of contract guaranteed by the Constitution under the fifth amendment is not an absolute one, but is a freedom from arbitrary restraint rather than an immunity from reasonable regulation imposed in the interests of society. *Carleton Screw Products Co.* v. *Fleming* (C. C. A. 8th, 1942; 126 F. (2d) 537; certiorari denied, 317 U. S. 634). "Congress may constitutionally deny the liberty of contract to the extent of * * * regulating every contract which is reasonably calculated to affect injuriously the public interests * * * Congress may constitutionally regulate the making or performance of contracts where reasonably necessary to effect the purposes for which the National Government was created, such as the regulation of interstate commerce." *Carleton Screw Products Co.* v. *Fleming*, supra. The theory of the amendment is that free opportunity for negotiation with accredited representatives of employees, in situations where the employees themselves have evinced a desire to maintain uniform and full membership in the representative union, is likely to promote industrial peace and bring about the adjustments and agreements which the act otherwise does not directly compel. See *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, supra.

On the same basis, there seems to be no ground for contention that the proposed amendment in any other aspect constitutes a violation of due process of law under the fifth amendment. See *U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, supra. With respect to the argument that the amendment denies the employer the equal protection of the laws, it can be answered that the fifth amendment directly imposes no such requirement on the Federal Government—as the fourteenth amendment does upon the States (*Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra; *Florida Fruit & Produce, Inc.*, v. *U. S.*, supra; *Carleton Screw Products Co.* v. *Fleming*, supra); and in any event all that is required is that no person or class shall be denied the same protection of the law enjoyed by other persons or classes in like circumstances *Carleton Screw Products Co.* v. *Fleming*, supra. The proposed amendment treats all employers on the same basis, and the fact that some employers may be compelled by election to acquiesce in a union shop where others may not, is not decisive.

In *Currin* v. *Wallace*, supra, the constitutionality of the Tobacco Inspection Act of August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 731; 7 U. S. C. 511a-511q), was in question. This act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to establish tobacco standards and designate those auction markets where tobacco bought and sold moved in interstate commerce, and provided that no tobacco should be bought or sold therein until inspected and certified by an authorized representative of the Secretary. It was specified, however, that the Secretary could not designate such a market unless

two-thirds of the growers, voting at a prescribed referendum, favored it. Since this meant that some markets would be regulated and others would not, the constitutionality of the act was challenged. The Court rejected this contention, saying:

"We have repeatedly said that the power given to Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is 'complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution' (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1, 196). To hold that Congress in establishing its regulation is restricted to the making of uniform rules would be to impose a limitation which the Constitution does not prescribe. There is no requirement of uniformity in connection with the commerce power (art. I, sec. 8, par. 3) such as there is with respect to the power to lay duties, imposts, and excises (art. I, sec. 8, par. 1) (*Clark Distilling Co.* v. *Western Maryland R. Co.*, 242 U. S. 311, 327). Undoubtedly the exercise of the commerce power is subject to the fifth amendment (*Monongahela Navigation Co.* v. *United States*, 148 U. S. 312, 336; *United States* v. *Cress*, 243 U. S. 316, 326; *Louisville Bank* v. *Radford*, 295 U. S. 555, 589); but that amendment, unlike the fourteenth, has no equal-protection clause (*LaBelle Iron Works* v. *United States*, 256 U. S. 377, 392; *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, 301 U. S. 548, 584).

"If it be assumed that there might be discrimination of such an injurious character as to bring into operation the due process clause of the fifth amendment, that is a different matter from a contention that mere lack of uniformity in the exercise of the commerce power renders the action of Congress invalid For that contention we find no warrant. It is of the essence of the plenary power conferred that Congress may exercise its discretion in the use of the power. Congress may choose the commodities and places to which the regulation shall apply. Congress may consider and weigh relative situations and needs. Congress is not restricted by any technical requirement but may make limited applications and resort to tests so that it may have the benefit of experience in deciding upon the continuance or extension of a policy which under the Constitution it is free to adopt. As to such choices, the question is one of wisdom and not of power."

The fact that the proposed amendment may result in the regulation of intrastate activities is not fatal. (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Fairblatt* (1939), 306 U. S. 601; *U. S.* v. *Darby* (1941) 312 U. S. 100). And see discussion in *U. S.* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Ass'n* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533); *Polish Nat. Alliance of the U. S. of North America* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1944) 322 U. S. 643). Nor is it material that various States may have enacted statutes regulating the union shop, for the exercise of State power in this respect cannot affect or limit the constitutional power of the Federal Government. (*Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (1938), 305 U. S. 197; *U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra).

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill as now written outlaws the closed shop; that is, it makes it illegal for an employer or the employees to agree to, or operate under, a closed-shop agreement. My amendment is intended to amend that part of the bill which provides for a union shop in lieu of the closed shop. Under this amendment, it is provided that an employer shall be required to accept a union shop if three-fourths of the employees of such employer, entitled to vote in an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board through a secret ballot, vote for such union shop. The legislation presently provides that to establish a union as a bargaining unit a majority of the employees entitled to vote must cast their vote for such union under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board, and then, and only then, they may negotiate with the employer through collective bargaining for a union shop.

In a union shop, as contrasted with a closed shop, the employer is entitled to hire anyone he chooses, whether he be a member of a union or not. For the purposes of this act, a "union shop" is defined as a shop where employees, as a condition of continued employment, are required to join within 30 days following the beginning of such employment the labor organization designated as the representative for collective bargaining of the employees, as provided in section 9 (a). As provided in the bill, the union may not prevent such employment, nor can it ask an employer to discharge such employee for any reason other than nonpayment of dues.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What effect would the Senator's amendment have in States having constitutional provisions prohibiting the closed shop?

Mr. MALONE. That, I suppose, would be settled through the courts the same as any other conflict in State and Federal jurisdiction. Under the pending bill, after the union shop is decided upon by a majority vote of the employees, an employer might prolong indefinitely the process of collective bargaining, during which time he could employ nonunion workers as jobs became available and, in that manner, the union could gradually be broken and made ineffective.

I am ready to vote for legislation which will regulate employees in the same way that employers are regulated. I shall not vote to destroy either one of them. That is my reason for offering the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have read with interest the amendment as offered, which in effect provides that if three-fourths of the employees vote——

Mr. MALONE. It has been changed to three-fourths.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been changed, I understand, to three-fourths of the employees. It provides that if three-fourths of the employees vote to have a union shop, it shall thereafter and thereupon be compulsory to have a union shop. It is provided that the closed shop shall be outlawed completely. It cannot be made even the subject of negotiation.

It seems to me that in view of that, it is entirely fair that if three-fourths of those who work at a place desire a union shop—and we have recognized the union shop as valid, as a good thing in labor-management relations—that they should have it. Another thing that appeals to me is that we are removing an issue that may create great contention, if we should give to the men, by a three-fourths vote, a right to the union shop.

We speak of the pending legislation as having a prime purpose of ending disputes between workers and employers. One of the most definite and certain ways of doing that, in defining the rights of both sides, is to fix definitely what each may do. That, of course, removes the issue from dispute between the two sides.

Therefore, I want to say to the able Senator from Nevada that I intend to support his amendment. I think it fair, and I think it will remove from the stage of contention one great issue that might arise.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the effort of this amendment is to force upon an employer a union shop, if three-fourths of the men want a union shop. We based our entire proceeding in the committee on the theory of free collective bargaining. That is to say, the whole theory of the Wagner Act, and every other provision we have had, is that the difficulties in labor shall be settled by free collective bargaining between employer and employees, free to bargain as they choose, within definite limitations.

In this case it is proposed to force on an employer a union shop when he does not want a union shop. I myself think the effort is not only unwise, but unconstitutional. I have an opinion from one of the special counsel of the committee, Mr. Gerard D. Reilly, who himself was a member of the National Labor Relations Board for some time, and for a long time was Solicitor of the Department of Labor, stating in his opinion that the proposal is unconstitutional. A contract cannot be forced on the employer which he does not want to make.

In any event, Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada represents one extreme. The Senator from Minnesota has proposed an amendment which absolutely outlaws the union shop altogether as being against public policy. The committee in effect is in the middle. We have taken the position that if such an agreement is reached, and if the men really want it—the only purpose of the vote is to be sure that the men really do want it, because it is something which affects their individual rights to a tremendous extent—if the men really want it and show that they want it by voting in an election, and the employer also wants it, or is willing to grant it, then there may be a union shop. But it seems to me that a legislative body seriously considering the complete outlawing of the union shop would be stepping completely to the opposite side of the whole position by suddenly saying that if a certain number of the men wanted it the employer must grant a union shop. So, Mr. President, I very much hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, the opinion by Gerard D. Reilly that the proposed amendment is unconstitutional.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1947.

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator TAFT.
From: Gerard D. Reilly.
Re constitutionality of Malone amendment.

I have examined Senator MALONE'S proposed amendment to section 8 (a) (3) of the committee bill, S. 1126. It would amend not only the committee bill but the present section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act by compelling an employer to agree to compulsory membership of all the employees in the bargaining unit if a majority of such employees voted for such an arrangement. In other words, it differs both from existing law and S. 1126 in that it no longer leaves the subject of compulsory union membership to collective bargaining but would make such a requirement mandatory upon the happening of a certain event, namely, the election under section 9 (e).

In my opinion, such an amendment is repugnant to the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

In reaching this conclusion I did not find any authorities precisely in point, for apparently neither Congress nor any State has passed legislation of that character. The probable attitude of the Supreme Court, however, is indicated by two decisions. In the *Jones & Laughlin case* (301 U. S. 1) the validity of the National Labor Relations Act was assailed not only under the commerce clause but also under the due-process clause. In its brief the company, in support of its argument that there was an unlawful interference with the right of the compsny to manage its own business, urged the following view upon the Court:

"The power which it delegates to a majority of the employees to bind the minority is arbitrary and unfair and will necessarily lead to the suffocation of minorities and to the closed shop, forcing the employer to herd his employees into an organization which is not of their own choice. This will in turn seriously disturb the discipline and morale of the respondents and employees with obvious injury to them and to the respondents" (301 U. S. 1, at 21).

To this argument Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for the majority of the Court, replied:

"The act does not compel agreements between employers and employees. It does not compel any agreement whatever. It does not prevent the employer from refusing to make a collective contract and hiring individuals on whatever terms the employer may by unilateral action determine * * *. The theory of the act is that free opportunity for negotiation with accredited representatives of employees is likely to promote industrial peace and may bring about the adjustments and agreements which the act in itself does not attempt to compel" (301 U. S. 1, at 45).

The implication of this opinion of the Chief Justice is clear, namely, that if the act had compelled an employer to conform to certain standards, to which he did not wish to agree, it would have been contrary to the due-process clause.

Of course it may be argued that certain statutes do require an employer to agree to certain substantive shop conditions such as a 40-hour week or a minimum wage. But it must be remembered that these statutes operate only on the narrow ground that they bear a direct relationship to the health and welfare of the employees. It would be virtually impossible to demonstrate to a court that a worker's membership or nonmembership in a union bore some relationship to the promotion of health and morale.

The amendment might also be unconstitutional as infringing the rights of employees to earn a livelihood without having to conform to a discriminatory law.

In *Truax v. Raiche* (239 U. S. 33) the Supreme Court held that a State statute requiring employers to see to it that not less than 80 percent of their working force was composed of citizens was held repugnant to the rights given by the fourteenth amendment. In action brought by an alien employee to restrain his employer from discharging him under this statute, the Court said:

"It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essential of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment to secure" (239 U. S. 33, at 41).

The argument was also made in that case that a statute requiring an employer to give preference to citizens as against aliens was not unconstitutional, since an employer was free to agree if he saw fit to employ only citizens.

A similar argument might be raised in support of the proposed amendment, since the Wagner Act now permits an employer to agree to hire only union men if he sees fit. But this argument carried no weight with the Court. Mr. Justice Hughes said:

"The fact that the employment is at the will of the parties does not make it one at the will of others. The employee has manifest interest in the freedom of the employer to exercise his judgment without illegal interference or compulsions."

Some support for the proposed amendment might be found in the fact that certain statutes which do limit an employer's discretion in some respect, for example, statutes outlawing the "yellow dog" contract, statutes like the Wagner Act which forbid an employer to discriminate in hire or tenure on the ground of union membership, and statutes forbidding racial or religious discrimination, have either been sustained or are widely regarded as being valid. It is not believed that these statutes are any real analogy of the proposed amendment, since what it proposes is not a restraint upon discrimination but rather a mandate to discriminate against a certain class, namely, such minority employees as do not wish to join the union. It is true that the committee bill proposes to prevent an employer from requiring union membership unless a majority of its employees so vote. If the committee bill also proposed that where a majority of the employees voted against the union shop it would become mandatory upon an employer to discharge all the union men in the bargaining unit, there would be a parallel to the proposed amendment. For the reasons I have stated, however, I am inclined to think that either type of proposal would be unconstitutional.

In considering this question I studied Mr. Oglebay's memorandum—which I am aware reaches a conclusion at variance with mine. It should be noted, however, that most of the authorities which he cites deal with the power of Congress under the commerce clause to regulate labor relations in industries affecting commerce. I do not question the existence of the commerce power but emphasize the fact that the exercise of this power is subject to the due process clause of the fifth amendment. Mr. Oglebay is correct in stating that this amendment, unlike the fourteenth amendment, does not contain an equal protection clause, but as the court stated in one of the very cases which he quoted at length (*Currin v. Wallace* (306 U. S 1)):

"If it be assumed that there might be discrimination of such unjust character as to bring into operation of the due process clause of the fifth amendment that is a different matter from a contention that mere lack of uniformity in the exercise of the commerce power renders the action of Congress invalid."

One of the other principal authorities upon which Mr. Oglebay relies, the Jones and Laughlin case, supra, affords no support for what he states (see p. 2 of Oglebay's memorandum) is the theory of the amendment, namely, "that free opportunity for negotiation with accredited representatives of employees not citizens where the employees themselves have evinced a desire to maintain uniform and full membership in the representative union, is likely to promote industrial peace and to bring about the adjustments and agreements which the act otherwise does not directly compel." It is true that some of this language was taken from the court's opinion in that case, but since the very purpose of this amendment is to deny "free opportunity for negotiation" and to make the union shop mandatory the decision is an authority for the very converse of the proposition for which it is cited.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Two opinions have been submitted for the record on this subject. I read briefly from the one I submitted for the record. It says:

The proposed amendment does not interfere with the employer's free right to contract for employment with whom he pleases. Nor does it directly compel him to enter into any collective-bargaining agreement with the representative of the union shop.

Then a number of decisions are cited in support of the statement.

There is a grave difference of opinion with respect to this subject. The bill, however, takes care of that situation. I read on page 59 of the bill as follows:

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 503. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to any other persons or circumstances than those to which it is held shall not be affected thereby.

Therefore I think we need not spend time in debating the question when there can be no serious harm done in either case.

I would say that it is my personal opinion, speaking as one Senator out of 95, as the Senate is at present constituted, that the proposal to outlaw the union shop has never been seriously considered by a majority of this body. Some serious difference of opinion may develop as to whether there is a chance to outlaw the closed shop when the final vote comes. By outlawing the closed shop, we would close the avenues of bargaining concerning something which the unions and the employers have always had, and which has never been questioned. Whatever we do, we should not close the door entirely, nor should we place the power in the hands of either one side or the other definitely to close that door and "break" the other party to any proposed agreements.

So I say that the present practice, in my opinion, should be modified. The bill provides that it is an unfair labor practice not to bargain collectively, but

it has been proved that two parties can bargain collectively for some time without reaching any agreement. And if an agreement is not reached by reason of the reluctance of either party, then the union means nothing, that is, to the union itself. It is provided by the bill in the case of the union shop, the employer may employ anyone he sees fit, regardless of whether he is a union member or not. To this I subscribe, if properly safeguarded, for the reason that there has been severe criticism throughout the Nation that unions have prevented the employment of qualified men. Adoption of my amendment would solve that problem and answer that great criticism. Unions know they have been criticized for such action. But by such employees becoming members within a stated time after such employment, the union is preserved and the bargaining power is also preserved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want to call attention to one remark made by the late President of the United States, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said that in his opinion the United States Government would never compel a man to join a union in order to work. He made that remark in reference to the captive coal mines, and it seems to me that what he said was sound. What is now proposed is that the Government of the United States shall say to the individual, "If you want to work when three-fourths of the employees of the factory want a union shop, you must join the union." It seems to me that goes further in the way of compulsion on the employee than anything we have ever done in the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has brought out a very interesting point. I do not want to compel anyone to join a union against his own wishes, but the very bill which the Senator sponsors, which was reported from the committee, provides that upon a majority vote—not a two-thirds vote, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, but upon a majority vote of the workers—there shall be a union shop. If the terms of the bill itself provide that a union shop shall be established upon the basis of a majority vote, so that the employees must be members of the union, how can an amendment be criticized which provides that a union shop shall be established upon a three-fourths vote?

Mr. TAFT. Of course in the one case it is by agreement between the employer that he wants to employ only union men, and the union. But the pending bill does not force the union shop in any case. The point the late President Roosevelt made was exactly the point I am making. He said that while the individual industries may work out a closed shop arrangement, and that will be effective, in his opinion the United States Government should never force a closed shop on any industry and any union which does not want it. So that the whole question is whether we are going to abandon collective bargaining altogether and step in ourselves and say that under certain circumstances there must be a closed shop in a particular industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to know what in the Senator's judgment would be the effect of the amendment on the State statutes forbidding the closed shop?

Mr. TAFT. Unless some special provision was made I think it would nullify State statutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada, as I understand, does not use the term "closed shop."

Mr. TAFT. I used the term inadvertently. Of course the ordinary closed shop in the United States is a union shop, not a closed shop. There are not a great many closed shops. There are a great many union shops, and they are usually referred to as "closed shops," in a loose way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Ohio himself very ably, earlier in the debate, drew a distinction between a closed shop and a union shop. I am glad to hear the Senator from Ohio say that he inadvertently used the term "closed shop." The bill itself declares that a closed shop is against public policy and that a contract cannot even be made for a closed shop.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is not interfered with by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. His amendment simply provides, and I think it is entirely sound, that if three-fourths of the employees desire a union shop—and a union shop is recognized upon a majority vote in the bill as it is now written—that they shall have it. If I may say it again, by providing for such a decision by the employees we will remove one of the greatest causes of contention between the employer and the employees. Such a provision will not interfere with collective bargaining. Once the men vote to have their union shop, they proceed then with collective bargaining upon another issue. It seems to me that if we are to have peaceful relations the most definite way is to define the rights of both sides and to remove from contention most of the issues which may arise.

As I previously stated, the amendment of the able Senator from Nevada appeals to me as one which would remove a great contention in collective bargaining between the employer and the employees; and it would not do a wrong to the employer when it permits the employees, through a three-fourths vote, to say, "We want a union shop."

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the adoption of this amendment would nullify every provision in the bill with respect to the union shop, and our effort to limit the abuses of the union shop. In my opinion, the effect of this amendment would be ultimately to force a union shop on every industry in the United States. Those interested in the union shop could propagandize and wait until finally they got three-fourths of the votes. Even though the other fourth were most violently opposed to it, there would be a union shop permanently. Once a union shop is established it is practically permanent. I would far rather say nothing about the union shop in the entire bill than to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. I think it would completely nullify everything we have done with reference to the union shop.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has very ably explained his position. However, I take issue with him when he says that if this amendment were adopted it would mean a closed shop, in the accepted definition of the closed shop.

Mr. TAFT. I have inadvertently used the expression "closed shop." Every time I have used it I should have said "union shop."

Mr. MALONE. We are making it unlawful for the employer to agree with the employees on a closed shop.

Diverting at this point, if the Senator will permit me further to comment, many employers, especially in the newspaper business, like the closed shop. Many editors in my State like the closed shop, because when they ask for a certain type of worker they can obtain a qualified worker without any further conversation.

I will not object to the outlawing of the closed shop if provision is made for the preservation of the collective-bargaining power through the union shop.

The point on which I heartily disagree with the Senator from Ohio is this: When we leave the question open for bargaining—and naturally there is no reason for leaving it open unless it is thought that some employers would not want it—I do not know the employees in the Senator's State, but in my area they will still get the union shop, even though we shall again have strikes, picket lines, rioting, and everything else we have gone through in the past 10 or 15 years. Men will quit their jobs and walk out when refused the union shop under this legislation and they will ultimately get the union shop. So long as we know that they will ultimately get it, as the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has so ably said, why not eliminate that particular bone of contention and concentrate on things which we think are necessary subject for collective bargaining, namely, wages, working conditions, and other important matters?

Mr. TAFT. If we adopt the Senator's philosophy, we might as well say, "If they want a certain wage, let them have it." The Senator goes so far as to say, "If it is a subject of possible dispute let the Government settle it by compulsory arbitration or in some other way." The amendment is absolutely contrary to the whole theory of the bill. The bill is based upon free agreement between the employer and the employee. The moment we depart from that theory and say, "Here is something which the Govern-

ment is going to decide, and if the Government decides it you must accept its decision whether you wish to do so or not," we destroy the whole philosophy of collective bargaining, and the theory of the bill, and of the Wagner Act, which preceded it.

Mr. MALONE. If we go far enough to say to free people in America, including both employees and employers, "If you want a closed shop you cannot have it," I agree with the Senator that we should go one step further and provide a fair opportunity for a fair substitute in which necessary protection and collective bargaining power can be provided and preserved.

I point out to the able Senator that what he is doing is simply trading the closed shop for an opportunity to bargain for something which, from the employees' standpoint, never could be a satisfactory substitute. But I am willing to vote for it if a proper substitute through the union shop can be provided, because I think it will remove the criticism that qualified workers have in the past been prevented from obtaining jobs. But under the present legislation we simply provide that the employer may hire anyone he wishes to hire and could continuously feed nonunion employees into a plant and gradually get rid of union employees, such as when a union man quit his job, or there was reason for letting him go, the new employee would not need to join the union. In a very short time there would be no union. So I repeat what I said when I offered the amendment, that I will vote for any just regulation of unions and corporations alike, but I will not vote to destroy either.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the amendment, if adopted, have the effect of removing the union-shop question from the realm of collective bargaining if three-fourths of the employees of an industry or business voted for a union shop?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it would have that effect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would take it out of the realm of collective bargaining?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, by this amendment we would be saying that if three-fourths of the employees vote for a union shop, the employer would no longer have anything to say about it. We would force him to accept the decision.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator from Arkansas repeat the last statement he made?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas merely stated the effect of the amendment. Under those circumstances the employer must accept the union-shop agreement, and the Congress of the United States would compel him to do so.

Mr. MALONE. That is the provision. We have prohibited any agreement with respect to a closed shop. While the employer would be entitled to hire anyone under the union shop whether he was a union member or not, the union would be preserved by reason of the employee joining the union within a stated time. Further, it is provided in the bill that the only ground on which the union can demand the discharge of an employee is that he has been expelled from the union for nonpayment of dues.

I should like to point out that in any election under the NLRB it would be pretty difficult to get the votes of 75 percent of the employees eligible to vote. We all realize that if we had to elect a President of the United States by a majority of the people who have reached the voting age, there would rarely be such a majority. Perhaps only three-fourths of those eligible to register take the trouble to register, and less than three-fourths of those registered take the trouble to vote. Many of the workers employed at a plant would never vote. We are trying to preserve a bargaining unit. We are substituting one form of bargaining unit under this amendment, the union shop, for another common form, the closed shop; which is made illegal under the present bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it the interpretation of the Senator from Nevada that every employee is included when he says "the employees of the employer"? Does that mean three-fourths of the employees voting at an election, or does it mean three-fourths of all the employees?

Mr. MALONE. Three-fourths of all the employees eligible to vote, not just the majority attending a meeting or the majority of those voting.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment says three-fourths of the employees of any employer, which might be interpreted either one way or the other.

Mr. MALONE. It means all the employees eligible to vote, which is defined as all of the employees in that particular business or industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the amendment were adopted it would have to be rather extensively revised. The union shop is not defined. No one knows what it is. We did not use the term in the bill. Moreover, we would probably have to say three-fourths of the employees covered by the appropriate bargaining unit, rather than the employees of a single employer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It seems to me, as a practical matter, that if three-fourths of the employees of a plant want a union shop they will either get a union shop or there will be a serious dispute and labor clash. Why not provide, if three-fourths of them want it, that they may have a union shop, and remove the issue completely between employer and employees? That is the feature of the amendment which appeals to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which has been lying on the desks of the Members of the Senate, and I ask to have it stated and considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 22, after the comma, it is proposed to insert "and simultaneously therewith notifies any State or Territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or Territory where the dispute occurred,".

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I merely want to point out to the Senate that that language should be inserted because it was inadvertently omitted when the bill was being prepared. It is perfectly obvious that it was the intent and purpose to connect the language suggested with the section of the bill which provides that employers or employees shall serve notice 60 days before the expiration of a contract if there is going to be any change; and such notice has to be served upon the National Mediation Service proposed to be established under the bill.

My amendment provides, as will be noted, that in connection with sending notice or sending any information on the subject, the same information or notice must be sent to the appropriate State agency. There are, I think, 37 States in the United States at the present time which have agencies of this kind, mediation services of one kind or another. This is done purely in order to protect the State agencies and in order not to bypass them by action of the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment is entirely satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 6, after the word "than", it is proposed to insert the following: "(1) being a member of the Communist Party or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods, or (2)."

And on page 14, line 13, after the word "than", it is proposed to insert the following: "(1) being a member of the Communist Party or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States

Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods, or (2)."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, has the amendment been printed?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it has not.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read the second time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will restate the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if I may briefly explain it, it may not be necessary to have it read again.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. This amendment was urged by a delegation of labor leaders, men who are interested in the rank and file of labor. They pointed out that the bill as presently written takes from union labor organizations a right which they now have, and one which I believe we did not intend to take from them under the bill as presently written. If a labor organization operating in a union shop expels a member for Communist activities or for being an active member of the Communist Party, and if then the leaders of the union desire to go to the management and say, "Will you discharge this man?" this bill would make it impossible for the union to make such a request, although the man had been expelled from the union because of his subversive and communistic tendencies.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not any employer fire a man if he was a Communist? Why do we have to force the employer to do it? The labor union fires a man because he is a Communist. All this language says is that the labor union shall not go to the employer and compel him to fire that man. If they call attention to the fact that he is a Communist, would not the employer fire him anyway? Can we not rely on the employers to get rid of Communists without saying that they shall not be coerced by labor unions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us see if the Senator and I agree on what the bill presently provides.

The amendment provides that a labor leader may go to management and say, "We have expelled this man because he is an active member of the Communist Party and has strong subversive tendencies." The labor leader can ask management to discharge that member of the Communist Party. Management does not have to discharge him, but in effect it says that the amendment provides that labor leaders may go to management and say, "We expelled this man from the union because he is a member of the Communist Party, and we suggest that you discharge him." The mere fact that they go to management and point out why they expelled the man from the union would be an unfair labor practice. I cannot conceive why the bill should so provide. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if he so understands that provision of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator states the provision of the bill correctly. The only questions I raise are two. In the first place, is it necessary to compel employers to fire Communists? Can we not trust the employers to do it without writing into the bill a specific clause requiring them to do it? In the second place, we think it is difficult, if not almost impossible, to find out whether a man is a member of the Communist Party. When we refer to him as one who is actively or consistently supporting or promoting or teaching the doctrines of the Communist Party, or the overthrow of the United States Government by force, the difficulty of proving the case is so great that it seems to me in the last analysis we are better off to let unions fire people because they are Communists, or they think they are, and to let employers do so, without having the proposed law take a hand in the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator speaks of the difficulty of identifying members of the Communist Party. This morning a delegation of Communists called upon two Members of Congress from Wisconsin, Representative KERSTEN and Representative BROPHY, and in a conference with newspapermen they openly stated that if and when we have any trouble or engage in a war with Russia they will be on Russia's side. Let me say that if I were a labor leader or head of a union and those men were in my union I would try to expel them. The bill would prevent me from going to management and saying: We have two men who are disloyal to this country. We do not think they have any right to work on the job. Will you not fire them?

Mr. TAFT. What difference would that make?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. My suggested amendment will not force management to discharge them. It merely says that if the labor leader wants to go to management and ask that they be discharged he is not violating the law by making the request.

Mr. TAFT. I do not feel very strongly on the subject. There is a provision in the House bill that no union shall even be recognized by the National Labor Relations Board if any officer of it is a member of the Communist Party or actively engaged in working for it. That is certainly a matter of substance. I think if a union fires a man because he is a Communist the employer is probably going to fire him anyway, without the necessity of changing the law regarding the matter. I do not greatly object to the amendment or oppose its adoption. It would not make much difference to me, one way or the other. But I think it is unnecessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Ohio that perhaps management would discharge a man who had been expelled from a union because of communistic activities. But yesterday a delegation of honest, sincere labor leaders called on me, and they were very much disturbed about this matter. They felt that the bill as presently written would make it more difficult for them to clean up their unions and get rid of the Communist elements.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said about having a delegation of labor leaders visit him and ask for legislation which would enable them to clean house. For myself, I wish to say that I believe it is true that most labor unions want to get rid of the communistic elements and of Communist domination; but under existing law they find it most difficult to do so. For that reason, as the Senator from Ohio has said, the House bill contains a provision prohibiting the certification for bargaining purposes of unions whose officers are Communists or are engaged in Communist activities.

Let me say that I wish to offer that section of the House bill as an amendment to this bill, because I believe that the rank and file of American labor are truly American—Americans first and Americans all the way. I believe that while we are enacting legislation on this subject we should give our moral support, with legal sanction back of it, to prohibiting Communists from taking over labor unions, and I believe we should do so by prohibiting the certification for bargaining purposes of labor unions which are dominated by Communists. Such action on our part will give encouragement to the rank and file of labor organizations in America to fight that insidious influence, which is not only dangerous to labor organizations, but is dangerous to the security of our Nation as a whole.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask the Senator a question, but I desire to preface it by saying that I am not quite clear what the Senator's definition of "Communism" is. For instance, in my State there is a Communist Party. I have never run for an election without having a Communist Party opponent. The Communist Party in my State does not receive many votes, but that party takes part in the elections, and it is a legal party and it has a right to have its name on the ballot.

Under the amendment, I assume that a man running for election on the Communist ticket would be classed as a member of the Communist Party. Such persons register as Communists; and under the provisions of this amendment, I assume that a member of that political party would be classed as a Communist. There are probably 2,000 or 3,000 of them who vote in the State of Washington, out of a million votes which are cast in any election there.

I wish to ask the the Senator whether such a man would be covered by the provisions of the amendment; or does the Senator mean that it would only apply to those who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or those who are disloyal to our Government?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would include the 2,000 or 3,000 members of the Communist Party in the Senator's State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would it include them, regardless of whether the party was legal?

Mr. McCARTHY. What does the Senator mean by "legal"? Does he refer to the fact that the party can have its name on the ballot?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a legal party in the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the Communist Party is ever legal. It may be legal to have the name "Communist" on a ballot.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me state that they say they are American Communists.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is well known that the Communist Party consists of two important elements. There is an element which is above ground, which openly adopts the name "Communist Party." Then there is an underground organization, sometimes a group of 5 men or a group of 3 men, who have the specific job of learning how to engage in sabotage and espionage in case of war. They engage in underground operations. The men who openly adopt the name "Communist Party" are the administrative nerve center. My thought is that regardless of whether a man belongs to the above-ground organization, which is the less dangerous branch of it, or whether he belongs to the underground organization, which is much more difficult to identify, he still should have no part in a union.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator in principle; but in this matter we get into a difficult constitutional question. If a man who is a resident of a State in which the Communist Party is registered for voting purposes registers as a Communist or files for election to office as a Communist, will that be sufficient to bar him, under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of a bar. The amendment will not force management to discharge him; it will not force a union to expel him from union membership. My amendment merely maintains the status quo, so far as that is concerned. Today a labor leader can go to management and say, "I have 3 or 4 Communists in this union. We are expelling them, and we would like to have you discharge those men."

As the bill now stands, that could not be done without violating the law, if the bill should be enacted into law. Senators understand that today management is not forced to discharge such men, and under my amendment management would not be forced to discharge them. My amendment would merely permit a union leader to go to management and ask management to discharge such men.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that. My point is that in stating by law under what circumstances a man shall be classified as a Communist, it is necessary to go further than to refer to the fact that he has registered in an election as a Communist, which he can legally do in many States.

Under the Senator's amendment, would it be necessary to prove that a man belonged to an organization which had some disloyal tendencies, so far as our Government is concerned; or would it be sufficient to show that he had filed on the Communist ticket in an election?

Mr. McCARTHY. If he registers as a member of the Communist Party, that will be sufficient proof.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a legal question, and it has been raised before now. The fact remains that in some places there are Communist Party members. There is a crew of them downtown in Washington, D. C.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and a delegation of them called on a Member of the Senate today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the amendment, would it be sufficient to show that a man was a member of an American political party using the name "Communist"?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about my amendment, let me say that it is not intended to force any union to expel from membership a member of the Communist Party, unless it sees fit to do so. Neither will my amendment force an employer to discharge such a person.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I am sorry to say he is misstating the effect of the amendment. If there is a closed shop and if the union expels a member on the ground that he is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, the union can compel the employer to discharge that employee. That can be done today.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I was more concerned with the provision on page 14 in regard to what shall be an unfair labor practice. However, the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to read the provision which the amendment would insert, on page 13, in line 6, to which the Senator has referred. The amendment reads as follows:

> Being a member of the Communist Party—

That is all that will have to be shown.

As the Senator from Washington has said, in a great many States the Communist Party is a legal party.

This amendment provides:

> Being a member of the Communist Party, or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods.

I submit, Mr. President, that under the wording of the amendment, the mere fact that a citizen joined that party in the State of Washington, or in any other State where there is a legal Communist Party, as he would have a legal right to do in those States, would subject him to being discriminated against, in violation of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit that any man who joins the Communist Party, knowing that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of our Government by force, is guilty of treason the minute he joins the party, regardless of whether or not the State allows the Communist Party to be on the ballot.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator added, "if they advocate the overthrow of the Government by force." That was the definition of communism. But I do not know about the people to whom I have been referring. They say they do not do that. They say they are a legal American party. The Senator and I, of course, know what is behind it; nevertheless, as the Senator from North Dakota points out, this is a serious constitutional question, on which the courts have ruled many times.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do the Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Wisconsin agree that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of our Government by force? There is no doubt of that, is there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could not say that about the people to whom I have been referring. They say they are not. I do not know. They claim they are not. The group about whom I have been talking say they are not. I have my own personal opinion about the matter. Nevertheless, as the Senator from North Dakota points out, they say, "We are the American Communist Party. We do not believe in the overthrow of the American Government."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Wisconsin. I think all Members of the Senate would like to do what we can to put up the bars in the way of communism, but I suggest to the Senator that as his amendment is worded, it probably will not always hit the target he has in mind. For example, the wording of the amendment is "being a member of the Communist Party." Of course, it probably would be possible to establish whether a man were or were not a member of the Communist Party. The amendment then proceeds, "or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party." When we get down to the determination of what someone says, as to whether a man is promoting the policies of the Communist Party, we often run into a twilight zone, and the examination might turn into a witch hunt.

For example, I imagine that the Communist Party believes in some parts of the Declaration of Independence—for instance, that "all men are created equal." There are many things in the Communist doctrine, not all of them, but there may be many in its printed doctrine, which are also American doctrine. There are many things in the Communist doctrine which are absolutely abhorrent to our idea of democracy. But the point is that if we bar a man from holding office because he is promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, without defining what those teachings and policies are, we are getting into a zone where, in my opinion, the execution of

what the Senator has in mind, which is a desirable objective, might not be possible.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest, before I conclude, that if the Senator would simply bar Communists, if he would leave out the witch-hunting idea, which sometimes is pursued, and quite often causes abuses which I know he does not have in mind—if he would bar Communists only, persons known to be Communists, persons who can be proved to be Communists, I think he would strengthen his amendment. When he goes over into the field of what are the teachings which promote the Communist doctrine, almost every educator in America will differ as to just what those teachings are and are not, and he will be in a field which will bring on a great deal of turmoil. I make that suggestion. The Senator has thought more about the matter than have I, but that is the way I react to the suggestion at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendment would grant the labor unions nothing which today they do not have.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. A labor union in a union shop, a closed shop, can expel members for being members of the Communist Party, and if they are expelled, management must discharge them.

We are not talking about giving the labor unions something in addition, we are not talking about any additional bar. All we are saying is that we will not restrict the labor unions in this one field more than they have been restricted in the past.

Let me suggest some language to the Senator from Maryland and see if he has any objection to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would expel a man if he were a Communist, but I would not expel a man who is said to be teaching something that is communistic, because it might subject to criticism in the minds of serious people one who might be a good American, a good Democrat, or a good Republican.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the Senator object to this language, referring to the fourth line from the last, "being a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods"?

Mr. TYDINGS. Taking out the part about supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of communism, which is a wide field in determining what is communism and what is not?

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, if the amendment read "being a Communist"——

Mr. TYDINGS. "Being a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the Senator leave that in?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would leave that in, and stop about there.

Mr. McCARTHY. So that it would read, "being a member of the Communist Party," and strike out "or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party," and proceed "or being a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States Government."

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me call the Senator's attention to a suppositious situation. Suppose I am a foreman in a plant and do not like one of the workmen, and let us suppose for the moment I am not as fair as I should be. One of the easiest things I could do would be to accuse that fellow of being a Communist, and say that he had made certain statements at some time. There is a twilight zone. The man might not be a Communist at all, but he would be laid open to persecution, human nature being what it is. But if it is provided he can be expelled if he is a Communist, and it can be shown he is a member of the Communist Party—which in most cases could be pretty conclusively presumed—the amendment would be strengthened in its simplicity. When it is widened, the Senator takes in a field of possible abuses which I know he does not wish to enter.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would this meet the Senator's approval, "being a member of the Communist Party, or being a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods"? That would avoid allowing the Communist Party to change its name.

Mr. TYDINGS. I certainly think that would improve the amendment; and perhaps if it were adopted, it could be worked over in conference by the able Senator from Ohio and others who will be conferees. But as I see it now, it would be improved greatly if the amendment were confined to the points the Senator just mentioned.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be changed to read as follows, after "(1)", namely, "being a member of the Communist Party, or being a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods, or (2)." That can be changed, so far as inserting it on pages 13 and 14 is concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether a man might not be a member of the Communist Party in the State of Washington and have an entirely different program from that of the Communist Party in, say, the State of Wisconsin, if there is one in that State? In other words, it is like the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. In the State of Washington the Democratic Party meets and adopts a program and planks which may be entirely different in that State from what they are in the State of New York, for example. In North Dakota we might have a set of principles in the Republican Party entirely different from those in the State of Ohio.

I remember that in the Republican Convention held in the city of Cleveland the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, the late Robert M. La Follette, Sr., rose and read his 32 planks. He was called an anarchist, he was called everything, except Communist, that name being unknown at that time. The only State that joined the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin at that time was the State of North Dakota. I might add that, out of those 32 planks, 31 since that time have been adopted by the Republican National Committee at different national conventions. So I think the Senator is treading on very dangerous ground.

Mr. McCARTHY. I point out to the Senator that the Communist Party cannot be considered in the same way that the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are considered. It is not a political party; it is a way of life; it is a religion.

I want it kept in mind that I am not seeking to place any additional ban on the Communist Party through this amendment. It is not proposed to take away from a labor union the right which it has today to expel from a union shop members of the Communist Party. Today, if they expel a man for being a member of the Communist Party, he is discharged. That situation should not be upset.

I recently received a delegation of labor leaders, fine men, who are deeply concerned with not having the Communist Party take over their labor union, as several of the unions in my State have been taken over by Communists. They tell me that if the pending bill is passed in its present form, without this amendment, the labor unions will be hampered and hamstrung, and it will be impossible for leaders to clean up the unions. I believe that is true.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will yield further, I think the best way to illustrate what I say about a political party in one State having a different platform from the same party in another State is by referring to letter I have been receiving. I have received at least many scores of letters saying that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is a Socialist, because he is advocating the housing bill with the assistance of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am sorry I do not have those letters with me. I have at least 75 or 100 of them, coming to me from the State of North Dakota, which I shall be glad to show to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from North Dakota thinks the Senator from Ohio is not a Socialist?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am afraid our distinguished and able friend from Ohio is going to be elected by unanimous consent as President of the United States, because I have heard him called a reactionary, and now I hear him called a Communist, or a Socialist. Certainly if he gets all those parties for him, he will have an enormous vote. I do not think the Senator from North Dakota ought to give him quite all the votes; he ought to leave a few for us Democrats.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Ohio succeeds in obtaining passage of the housing bill, I will say to the Senator the chances are that he will get a tre-

mendously large liberal vote. At least, I hope so. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I agree with his objective, but I believe it would be much better if he were to define Communists as those who believe in communism, or the overthrow of government by force or illegal means, instead of using the expression "a member of the Communist Party," which is difficult to define. As a matter of fact, there may be a great many well-meaning people who are members of the so-called American Communist Party, which is legal in many States, who are not necessarily Communists. As a matter of fact, I do not think a real Communist would go to a polling place and ask for a Communist ballot.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may interrupt the Senator, I am afraid we do not agree exactly on what constitutes the Communist Party. In the first place, there can be no question that the Communist Party in the United States is getting its orders from Moscow, by way of Paris. There is no question that the Communist Party in this country consists of two important elements, the most dangerous of which is the underground element. Many of those men go to Moscow today, to attend schools of sabotage and espionage. Secondly, the overground organization, which is referred to by the Senator as legal, is the administrative nerve center of the underground organization.

I feel that the honest labor unions of this country that want to eliminate men of that type from their organizations should not be restricted. If the amendment is not adopted it will mean that we are imposing an additional restriction on labor that will serve to protect the Communist Party. I do not want to take more of the time of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am thinking about the difficulty of writing definitions. The Senator and I may hold certain opinions. Party platforms are required to be published in my State. With respect to the American Communist Party, the one that is supposedly legal, and that is American only in the sense that it is located geographically within America, its platform does not advocate any of the principles which are thought of as constituting Russian communism. Many of its adherents may be true Communists, but that is a matter calling for proof.

Mr. McCARTHY. We need not prove it. There is today a Communist convention in Washington. This morning at 10 o'clock a delegation of those Communists called upon two Members of Congress from Wisconsin, and stated publicly that if there were a war with Russia they would side with Russia, they would not side with America. They are attending a Communist meeting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With men of that type, of course, proof could be obtained easily.

Mr. McCARTHY. When one joins the Communist Party, he subscribes to that line of thought.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that the Senator ought to advocate a bill outlawing the Communist Party in America.

Mr. McCARTHY. All I am advocating is that no additional restraints be placed upon honest labor unions, which today have the right to clean up their labor organizations by throwing out Communists. I know whereof I speak, because in my own State there are labor organizations that have been taken over. A Communist minority has taken over a complete labor organization, and has served as a tremendously disrupting force. If this amendment is not adopted, we are in effect saying to the honest labor leaders, "We are going to hamstring you and restrict you in cleaning up your labor organization."

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Senator's amendment is permissive rather than mandatory?

Mr. McCARTHY. All the amendment does is to preserve the status quo.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield; but first let me say that we have about four or five amendments either to adopt or reject, and I do not want to take up more of the time of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I was merely going to say that if one advocates the overthrow of our Government by force, or if one puts the aims and desires of another country ahead of those of the United States, while living here as a citizen, as I understand the law, such a person is guilty of treason; and I submit that throwing him out of a labor union is hardly a fit punishment for the crime. Is it not a fact that we have laws which inflict very severe punishment upon one who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force, or who owes allegiance to a foreign country instead of the country of which he claims to be a citizen?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator completely overlooks the purpose of my amendment. Before the bill is passed, a labor union can expel Communists from the labor organization; and in a union shop those men will also be discharged by the employer. All that is intended by the amendment is that after the labor bill is passed, the same situation shall exist. If the labor bill is passed without my amendment, it will unquestionably be much more difficult for labor leaders to clean up their labor unions; and some of them want to do that, I can assure Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know about that, but what prompted me to rise was the statement that persons were advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force. It seems to me that expulsion from a labor union is hardly fit punishment in such a case.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator on that.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BALL. I should like the floor in my own right.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. I share the extreme dislike of the Senator from Wisconsin for the Communist Party and for all Communists. I do not think any Senator dislikes them, or hates them, I may say, any more than I do. They are out to wreck the American system, although again I say it may be impossible to prove it against them. But the whole philosophy of the pending bill, and particularly of the provisions dealing with the union shop, is to protect the individual's right to work.

The only basis on which he can be expelled from the union and thereby lose his job, his employer being compelled to fire him, is that he refuses to pay initiation fees and regular dues, or engages in unionism at the wrong time. I might add, Mr. President, that under the committee bill a union is perfectly free to expel any Communist or Communist sympathizer, or any Republican or Democrat. The union retains complete control over its own membership and the standards of the union; but it cannot compel an employer to discharge anybody, or deprive him of his right to earn a living, on any grounds other than nonpayment of dues.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is also true, is it not, that not only can the union expel him from the union because he is a Communist, but the employee having been expelled from the union, the employer is perfectly free to fire him from the job?

Mr. BALL. That is absolutely correct. The employer is perfectly free, if he thinks the individual has a disruptive influence in the shop, to fire him, and I assume a great many employers would. Unfortunately, we have a few employers who themselves are fellow travelers, and I think they would not.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Minnesota is making a very important point which needs to be emphasized, that the union can throw an individual out, and once the union throws him out the employer can throw him out.

Mr. BALL. That is true. Mr. President, I shall always support the complete control by the union of its own membership. I think that is fundamental. I agree that the only way to handle Communist infiltration in a union is to kick the Communists out, but I do not think the Government of this country should go one step further and say that when an individual is thrown out of the union on that ground, he no longer has the right to earn a living in that particular job. That seems to me to be adopting exactly the same kind of ruthless tactics in liquidating opposition that the Communists use wherever they secure control, as for example, in Yugoslavia and Poland. Even in some of the union shops which the Communists control here in the United States, they expel from the union anyone who disagrees with their particular philosophy, and cause him to be fired by the employer. In Yugoslavia, from reports I have heard, the Communists constitute a small minority of the people, but they have complete control of the economy of the country, and if one wants to live and eat he must go along with the Communists.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a free society can effectively fight communism and totalitarianism by adopting totalitarian tactics; in other words, that the end justifies the means. I think we are making a fundamental mistake and violating the basic philosophy of the bill if we should adopt the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Forgetting for the time being the amendment which I propose on page 13, and turning to page 14, the Senator and I will both agree that up till the time the bill is passed a labor leader can go to an employer and say, "John Jones is a Communist. If we expel him from the union we would like to have you discharge him." Regardless of whether it is a union shop or not, as of today that situation exists. Am I correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Can the Senator see any reason whatsoever for making it an unfair labor practice for a labor leader to go to the employer and say "John Jones is a Communist. I would like to have you discharge him"? I am referring only to page 14.

Mr. BALL. I do not know how that amendment can be placed in the bill without in effect violating the principle which underlies the provision of the bill which it amends. There is nothing in the provision to prevent the union from informing the employer that, "We have expelled So and So because he is a Communist or because he has advocated communistic doctrine. We leave it up to the employer then to do what he wants to." But if we permit a union to persuade, or attempt to persuade—and in union parlance, persuasion sometimes becomes pretty strong——

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume we will both agree that, referring to page 14, if a union leader went to an employer and said, "We have expelled John Jones because he is a Communist and advocates the overthrow of this Government by force," if we stop right there some court, under the provision outlined on page 14, may say, "You are trying to influence the employer."

Mr. BALL. Oh, no; the language is "to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee." If they would simply say, "We have expelled Mr. X from the union because we are convinced that he is a Communist or a 'fellow traveler'," I do not think that would by any stretch of the imagination or law be construed as a violation of the subsection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that as of today the union has a right to try and clean its ranks of Communists and has a right to go to the employer and ask the employer to discharge a man who is a Communist, I cannot conceive of any reason why we should in this bill place a restriction upon the unions. Why should we not at least say to them, "You can do tomorrow what you are doing today"? I refer to page 13 of the bill.

Mr. BALL. We are stopping the unions in this bill from doing many things they do today. They can, and have, expelled members from unions for speaking up in meetings, for opposing the leadership, for working too hard, for refusing to pay a political assessment, for refusing to buy lottery tickets—an incident of the latter kind occurring in Missouri recently. We are stopping them from doing all that. If we are going to preserve the individual's right to work, subject only to the requirement that where a union shop prevails he must pay dues to the union, we cannot broaden the language without injuring the rights of the individual.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is a question in my mind which I think the Senator from Minnesota has partly answered. Simply put, it is this: Is it going to be any harder under the bill for a union to clean house of communism than it is now?

Mr. BALL. Not a bit.

Mr. FLANDERS. That, I think, is what we want to know.

Mr. BALL. The union retains complete control of its membership.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the Senator meant to say that. As of today the union leader can go to management and say, "Will you discharge this man who is a member of the Communist Party?" If we adopt my amendment he will be able, if the bill becomes law, to do tomorrow what he can do as of today in a union or a closed shop.

Mr. BALL. That is not the question the Senator from Vermont asked. The Senator from Vermont asked if the union would not be, under the committee bill, completely free to expel Communists from the union and clean house? The union would be completely free to do so.

Mr. FLANDERS. I might say further that I think the employer could take a strong hint.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator's philosophy, but let me ask a question. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin were adopted, would there be danger that it might be the means whereby union leaders, who wish to rid themselves of certain members would allege the ground that they were Communists, when in reality there were other grounds upon which they desired to remove them?

Mr. BALL. I think there is always that danger, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky. The number of Communists who will admit that they are Communists is relatively small, and in most cases the union proceeds on evidence that they go along the party line. As a matter of fact, it is a recognized technique of the real Communist sometimes to accuse an honest liberal or a member of a fighting opposition of being a Communist and get rid of him in that way. That has been done even in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has proposed another amendment dealing with this issue which I think stands upon entirely different ground, because he proposes that the NLRB shall not certify any union which has as officers known Communists. That is an entirely different sort of case, because the National Labor Relations Act in itself, by policy of government, confers on unions certain rights, and obviously in that case there is sounder justification for saying that the leadership of the unions should not be such as completely to contradict the whole philosophy and policy of the Government. I think there is a much sounder basis for taking that kind of action than in giving the union under this provision the power to deprive of the right to earn a living anyone whom they choose to call a Communist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], as modified. The modified amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 6, after the word "than" it is proposed to insert the following: "(1) Being a member of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods, or (2)."

On page 14, line 13, after the word "than", to insert the following: "(1) Being a member of the Communist Party, or advocating or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods, or (2)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, beginning with the colon in line 7, it is proposed to strike out down through and including the period in line 14 on page 13, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On page 14, beginning with the word "on" in line 13, it is proposed to strike out down through and including the word "raised" in line 19.

On page 22, beginning with line 7, it is proposed to strike out down through and including line 7 on page 23.

On page 23, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)."

On page 24, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I expect to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment. I shall not take much time to explain it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes to explain the amendment which I have offered. It strikes out completely the provision beginning in line 7 on page 12, going down through line 13 on page 14, and legalizes contracts making membership in unions a condition of employment. Without that proviso, under the terms of the Wagner Act itself, it was an unfair practice for employers to prohibit any kind of a contract making membership in unions a condition of employment. The rest of the amendment simply strikes out, after the word "terminated", in line 13, page 14, the remainder of subsection (2), so that it would be an unfair practice for a union to persuade or attempt to persuade an employer to discriminate against an employee to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated.

The other part of it strikes out, on page 22, subsection (e) of section 9, which is the subsection providing for NLRB-conducted elections to determine whether the union is to be authorized to negotiate for a union shop or maintenance of membership.

Incidentally, Mr. President, those elections generally cost from 50 cents to $1 a voter, and under this section every union that now has a union shop provision—and there are about 7,000,000 employees covered by them—will have to get an election authorization to negotiate a new contract containing those terms. I should estimate that the cost of conducting those elections will probably run into several million dollars.

I agree that the committee bill eliminates the closed shop completely and takes care of the worst abuses of the union shop in maintenance of membership, in that it prevents a union from taking away a man's job and the right to work by expelling him from the union on any grounds other than failure to pay his dues.

Most of the abuses of the closed shop with which we are all familiar have been in cases where members have been expelled because of their political ideas, because they were opposed to the leadership, or in some cases, because they had the temerity to work too hard on their job, and for other reasons of that kind. The unions not only expelled them but required the employers to fire them, and they thereby had lost their right, which I think is a pretty fundamental right, in a free society to earn a living for themselves and their families.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with the passage of the Wagner Act which prohibits employers from discriminating against union members the only sound and valid reason for this undemocratic and unliberal requirement is that in order to work and earn a living in his chosen occupation, if there happens to be a union-shop contract, the individual must, regardless of his own convictions, join the union and pay dues to it. It seems that the only valid excuse for that was the antiunion tactics of employers in America a few decades ago. I say that the reason for that disappeared when the National Labor Relations Act was passed, because employers now are prohibited from discriminating, just as we have outlawed the yellow-dog contract by which an employer sought to make nonmembership in a union a condition of employment. We should now, in order to protect the freedom and the rights of the individual, take the same step and outlaw contracts which make membership in a union a condition of employment. Unions in the United States enjoy a number of special privileges and immunities under the law, on the theory that they are voluntary associations of workingmen.

Mr. President, what is voluntary about compulsory membership? On what kind of a democratic principle, as we understand it, will we give the right to a bare majority of employees in a given bargaining unit to negotiate a contract with the employer which will force 49 percent of the employees in that unit, against their will, into an organization? It seems to me that the bill, as it stands, takes the position that all the unions and union leaders in this country are interested in is collecting dues from members. I think there are probably quite a few union leaders who are primarily interested in how many dues they can collect, but I think that is not true of the best and soundest leadership in the labor movement in America. I believe they are interested primarily in serving the working people of this country and are doing a good job with the compulsory membership which has been provided by law in some 13 or 14 States by the State legislatures. The labor movement in this country will be much better off if leaders appeal to the membership by the democratic method of persuasion and argument and debate and not by the shabby bread-and-butter compulsion method by saying "Your job depends on this."

Mr. President, it seems to me under the language of the committee bill, that it would be possible for a union to suspend their voting privileges as a disciplinary measure as to over half of the employees of a given unit, and yet force them to continue to pay dues. I do not see anything in the committee bill as it stands that would prevent that kind of a practice. I do not think many unions would do it. But I am afraid there are a few that would jump at the chance to retain control of the funds, with only a small percentage of the union membership permitted to have full voting rights and to control their policy.

In conclusion let me say that the right to work and earn a living is not one of the rights enumerated in the Constitution. I think the founding fathers did not specifically mention it, because they knew that that right is so fundamental to any kind of political freedom or civic rights that it did not really need to be spelled out in the Constitution. I think that whenever we abridge or compromise that right we are departing from fundamental American principles. We are adopting to a degree the totalitarian philosophy that a particular little group is entitled to and should have the right and privilege of dictating the terms and conditions under which all others should operate. That essentially is the philosophy behind the closed shop and the union shop today. It is often a militant minority which decides the policies of the union. When the union wants the legal right to dictate to all the rest of the employees the terms and conditions under which they shall work they levy a tax, in effect, upon their earnings, which, in my opinion, is a sovereign right which should be reserved only to government.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment, as I understand, proposes completely to abolish the union shop. I recognize the strength of the argument made in that behalf by the Senator from Minnesota. We considered the arguments very carefully in the committee and I myself came to the conclusion that since there had been for such a long time so many union shops in the United States, since in many trades it was entirely customary and had worked satisfactorily, I at least was not willing to go to the extent of abolishing the possibility of a union-shop contract. It seemed to me that we should meet the problem of dealing with the abuses which had appeared. That is what the committee bill does.

Incidentally, it abolishes the closed shop, insofar as that means that only members of the union can be employed. That is the hiring-hall proposition. But the bill permits the union shop, which is the customary form of employment in the United States. If a majority of the employees are in favor of the union shop, the bill will permit the union shop; but the bill requires a majority of the employees to vote that they are in favor of having a union shop, so that it will be

definitely known that they are in favor of it, rather than that the union leaders are simply asking for it, so as to have more power over the members of the union and over all the employees.

In the bill we say that the employee must join the union within 30 days after he is employed.

We say that if at that time the union will not admit the employee as a member of the union, on the same terms and conditions as those on which any other member of the union is admitted to it nevertheless the employer can continue to employ that man. That provision takes care of arbitrary rules on the part of unions. It takes care of cases similar to one in New York in which 10 men were fired because the union made a rule that it would not permit anyone to continue in membership unless he was the son of a man already working in that plant and a member of that union.

There are also many abuses in connection with the firing of men. We further provide in the bill that if a man is fired by the union for some reason other than nonpayment of dues, the employer does not have to discharge him. The abuse at which that provision is aimed is the usual type of abuse, and is the only type of abuse testified to. We have taken care of that in the committee bill.

We had testimony regarding the case of a union member who saw a shop steward knock down a foreman; and the union member was subpenaed to testify in court in the assault case. He testified truthfully that he saw the shop steward take the offensive and knock down the foreman. Thereupon, the union said that such testimony was contrary to good union practice, even though the union member had been subpenaed and was under oath to testify to the truth; and the union discharged him from union membership, and the employer had to discharge him, under the existing closed-shop contract.

In a case of that sort, the committee bill provides that the employer does not have to fire the employee. The union can discharge him from union membership if it wishes to do so, but the employer does not have to discharge him from employment.

My own philosophy is that we have to decree either an open shop or an open union. The committee decreed an open union. I believe that will permit the continuation of existing relationships, and will not violently tear apart a great many long-existing relationships and make trouble in the labor movement; and yet at the same time it will meet the abuses which exist.

So I think it would be a mistake to go to the extreme of absolutely outlawing a contract which provides for a union shop, requiring all employees to join the union, if that arrangement meets with the approval of the employer and meets with the approval of a majority of the employees and is embodied in a written contract.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have some clarification regarding the bill. As I understand the bill which has been reported by the committee, if a majority of the employees want to have a union shop, and vote accordingly, then their bargaining representatives have a right to bargain for a union shop; but it will not be compulsory on the employer, will it, to agree to have a union shop merely because a majority of the employees vote for a union shop?

Mr. TAFT. No; it will be subject to free collective bargaining.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The matter will be left open to bargaining?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] which was rejected earlier this afternoon, would have made it compulsory for the employer to accept the union shop in such cases.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a distinction which I wish to have clearly made. The amendment which was rejected would have made the union shop compulsory on the employer if three-fourths of the employees had voted to have a union shop; but I understand that as the bill now stands, the matter will be left open to free collective bargaining.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask a question of the Senator. Under the bill as it is now written, an agreement providing that an employer would not employ anyone who was not already a member of the union would be invalid, would it not?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I think the most direct case of that sort is to be found in the maritime industry on the Pacific coast. The testimony was that a provision similar to the one the Senator from Missouri has referred to led to a condition on the ships engaged in the Alaskan run, where there was no discipline whatever; a man might be discharged for action contrary to good discipline, but in a few days he might be back in the hiring hall, and then the shipping line might be compelled to employ him again. Of course, under such an arrangement a man could not even get a job unless the union admitted him to union membership. The bill will make such a contract illegal.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask another question. If it is improper and invalid to say to an employer that he cannot agree that he will employ only persons who already are members of a union, is there any difference in principle between that situation and one in which the employer makes an agreement that he will not employ anyone who does not join a union within 30 days after he commences employment?

Mr. TAFT. Probably there is no difference in constitutional principle, but there is a great difference in economic principle. In the first place, if an employer can only employ union members, there is no freedom of labor; under those conditions a man cannot get a job unless he is a member of the union.

Under our provision in the committee bill, the closed shop is abolished, and a man can get a job with an employer and can continue in that job if, in effect, he joins the union and pays the union dues. In such case there is a fluidity of labor which is very important in the United States. Otherwise, the unions would be frozen tight shut, and apprenticeship could be restricted to such an extent that thereafter no one could join a union without the consent of the union. That would make it impossible for newcomers to obtain employment, because the employer could employ only those who were union members.

It also seems clear that, under the provisions of the committee bill, a man who is looking for work will be much more able to obtain employment and much less subject to the orders of the union than he would be if we permitted an absolute closed-shop agreement.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not true that if it is deemed unduly restrictive for an employer to agree that he will not employ a man unless the man is already a member of the union it is equally restrictive upon the rights of the employee to provide that the employer can make an agreement by which he will not employ a man unless the man joins an organization which perhaps he may not wish to join?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I can go any further than to say that so far as the so-called legal principle of constitutional right is concerned, there is no distinction between the two cases, but as a practical matter the one system has led to very serious abuses and the other system has not led to such serious abuses. In this bill we are trying to be strictly practical and to meet the actual problems which have arisen, and not to go into the broader fields of the rights of particular persons.

Mr. DONNELL. However, it seems to me that from the standpoint of the individual employee, it is just as harmful to say that he cannot get a job unless he agrees that he will join a union within 30 days after he gets the job, as it is to say that he cannot get the job unless he already belongs to a union. I see no difference in principle, except in one instance the man will have 30 days more in which to join the union.

Mr. TAFT. The great difference is that in the first instance a man can get a job without joining the union or asking favors of the union, and once he has the job he can continue in it for 30 days, and during that time the employer will have an opportunity to ascertain whether he is a capable employee. The fact that the employee will have to pay dues to the union seems to me to be much less important. The important thing is that the man will have the job. That indicates the difference between the two situations.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not regard the payment of dues as the important point, at all. It seems to me that the important point is that in the situation which will exist under the bill as it now stands, a man will not be able to hold a job, under a contract of the sort we have discussed, unless within 30 days after he takes the job he joins a union, although he may not wish to join it at all. It seems to me that in that case the same restriction is placed upon the rights of the individual as in the case of an em-

ployer who is prevented from hiring the man in the first place unless he is already a member of the union.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while I think of it, I should like to say that the rule adopted by the committee is substantially the rule now in effect in Canada. Apparently by a decision of the justices of the Supreme Court of Canada in an arbitration case, the present rule in Canada is that there can be a closed shop or a union shop, and the union does not have to admit an employee who applies for union membership, but the employee must, nevertheless, pay dues, even though he does not join the union.

If he pays the dues without joining the union, he has the right to be employed. That, in effect, is a kind of a tax, if you please, for union support, if the union is the recognized bargaining agent for all the men, but there is no constitutional way by which we can do that in the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator from Ohio yield for one question?

Mr. TAFT. I may say that the argument made for the union shop, and against abolishing the closed shop, is that if there is not a closed shop those not in the union will get a free ride, that the union does the work, gets the wages raised, then the man who does not pay dues rides along freely without any expense to himself. Under the Canadian rule, and under the rule of the committee, we pretty well take care of that argument. There is not much argument left.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of setting forth my own views and endeavoring to clear up the question of the union shop and the closed shop. Insofar as the senior Senator from Missouri was referring to it, the main objection, and the only objection I have to the closed shop, is that if the employer were to find someone with considerable aptitude for the particular line of business in which the employer is engaged, he could not hire him without first going to the union, have the union accept the man, and then put him on the roll.

I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that under the present provision in the bill the employer can hire any man from any walk of life, but after he has been in the plant 30 days he must become a qualified member of the union in order to remain on the pay roll.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the word "must" is the word which I think is decisive. It means that there is no longer a freedom of choice on the part of the employee. The provision that there may be a contract by which an employer will contract that he will not engage anyone unless the individual joins a union within 30 days after the engagement, is subject, in my judgment, to exactly the same logical objection as is the provision in the contract that he will not hire a man unless he first belongs to a union.

It is true that the employer has a greater ability to hire under the union-shop arrangement than under the closed-shop arrangement, but so far as the standpoint of th employee himself is concerned, he is confronted in the one case by a situation in which he cannot get a job unless he first belongs to a union, and that is prohibited under the bill; yet he is confronted, under the bill as it exists with the provision that he cannot retain a job after he once gets it unless he joins an organization within 30 days. He may not want to join the organization, he may not subscribe to its principles, he may not subscribe to its methods, but the word "must," which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has used, applies nevertheless with respect to him. It is compulsion in both cases; first, compulsion on the employee that he must first belong to the union before he can be employed; it is compulsion, in the second instance, in that he must join the organization within 30 days.

It seems to me that from the standpoint of liberty, so far as the individual is concerned, each one of these involves a compulsion which is wrongful to the theory of the free right of contract.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Missouri that there is involved not merely the word "must," on which he has so eloquently animadverted, there is also involved the word "can." Under the union shop, as distinguished from the closed shop, a man "can" get into the union, to which extent his freedom is enlarged.

Mr. DONNELL. To the extent that he must get into the union, his freedom is still restricted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have not taken up much time, and I intend to say a few words now even if Senators are calling for a vote.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is, in my opinion, absolutely correct when he states that the freedoms of the individual are interfered with when it is made necessary for a workman to join a union 30 days after he is employed—perhaps not to the same extent as telling him he cannot have a job unless he belongs to a union, but the difference is purely a matter of degree. My understanding of the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the meaning of individual freedom corresponds with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Missouri. There is no more inherent or sacred right in this world than the right to work when and where one chooses to work, when and where one can find employment that is satisfactory to him, whether he chooses to belong to a union or does not so choose. To my mind, that is fundamental.

I am aware that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] will be rejected. I do not think we have grown up yet; the amendment will be defeated because we do not understand what we are doing, and the labor leaders are not telling us what the American workingman wants.

I should like to say that there are too many people in Congress and elsewhere listening to the voices of individuals who come to their offices. They forget that there are 20 or 30 or 40 workingmen back home for every one who puts pressure on us, and those back home ought to be unshackled and given back their right to proceed in the ordinary way to make a living. I think we should remember that the pressure put on by people who make a lot of noise does not represent the voice of the people who are endeavoring to make their living in the United States.

I predict that in less than 10 years making themselves heard in the offices millions of working people will be of Senators and Representatives. They will not be slow to make it known that they do not want anyone to force them into a union or force them out of a union, or have the right to dominate their lives in connection with working and earning a living.

I know it is not too popular, at the moment, to stand up and tell the truth, but some of the ablest labor leaders in the world state they do not believe in the closed shop; that they do not believe in forcing a man to stay in a union and pay dues. They even go so far as to say that they do not believe the labor unions can amount to what every decent American wants them to be until the time comes when every man in a union has the right to refuse to pay dues and still remain in his employment, if he does not like the leadership and the course of the leadership. That is the only means the workingmen have of getting rid of rotten labor leaders, namely, the power to resign without losing their jobs and their right to make a living.

A few years ago—I should say about 7 or 8 years ago—there came to this country the president of the Railway Clerks Union of England. If I remember correctly, his name was Brown. His union had a membership of 90,000, which is a union of considerable size for England. He made a speech in Philadelphia in which he said he was very strongly opposed to the closed shop because, in his opinion, it destroyed the rights of the individual members of the organization to better conditions and improve the quality of leadership. He said, "Unless the members of my union have the power to resign without losing their jobs, they cannot effectively protest against my poor leadership." He further said, "I believe the future welfare of the working people lies in having good, intelligent, law-abiding leadership."

About 6 years ago, I was told by Mr. Alexander Whitney himself, that a large group of railway employees met in convention in Cleveland about 1916 and a resolution was presented to the convention which in simple terms provided that no one should be permitted to work on a railroad unless he became a member of one of the railroad brotherhoods. The president of the organization was present, and before there was a chance for adoption of the resolution he stepped to the front of the platform and said, "I ask the gentleman who has made the motion to withdraw it, because I consider it inimical to the best interests of the men working on the railroads. The American people do not want the closed shop.

They do not want anything forced on anyone. I ask that the motion be withdrawn, or, in the event of its not being withdrawn, I ask for its defeat, because, in my opinion, our great objective in the railroad brotherhoods should be to make our unions so good, and make them deliver so much of value to the membership, that we will not have to force men to join, but they will join because they want to become members and receive the benefits."

I am merely repeating to the Senators what Alexander Whitney, who is well known to them and to me, a man I have known for a number of years, told me himself. He is old enough to have been at the convention, and he recited what happened. The resolution providing that no one could work on a railroad unless he belonged to one of the unions was withdrawn.

Mr. President, in my opinion the practical problem has not been touched upon at all. If any Senator thinks for one minute that in a union plant a man can have his employer keep him at work after he has been expelled from the union, he is sadly mistaken. Such an employee goes home at night, and he may return in the morning, but he is worried every minute while in his home. Some in the union will find a way to force him by fear to resign.

I have received hundreds of letters on this subject. I received a letter from the wife of a man who worked in my plant for 27 years, and this is what she said:

DEAR MR. HAWKES: I hope you won't hold it against my husband, John, because he has joined the labor union.

I will not mention the name of the union, because I do not wish to discriminate.

He has joined it because he is working on the midnight shift at your plant, and they have been putting pressure on him here at the house, and making threats that if he did not join the union his face would not look the same in a few days as it does now. My daughter and I cannot sleep, because he has to walk a mile along the Passaic River Road on the way home, and we can never sleep until he gets home. So we are the ones who have asked him to join this union, and he has only done so because of that condition.

MR. President, that illustrates the situation that exists in the United States, and it is going to continue, to the detriment of all the millions of fine working men and women in the United States. And do not forget that there are millions of working men and women who want the right to organize, and are entitled to it; who want the right to bargain collectively; who want to have decent, living wages, to which they are entitled; and who want the right to strike lawfully. I do not say that most of them want the right to shut down public utilities and other activities which are vital to the welfare and the health and the lives of the people, but in some unions certain leaders do want even that right. The workers want to be relieved of dictatorship in the ranks of the labor leadership, and they do not want dictatorship in the United States Government.

I repeat, I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has expressed some very wonderful words of wisdom.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall undoubtedly vote for the bill on final passage. There should be understanding enough and courage enough to cause men to be willing to vote for principles even though it might mean they would not be returned to office. Such courage in the people's representatives is needed to cure the ills of the country. "Jim" Farley, former head of the Democratic Party, made a wonderful statement at a luncheon in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate about 2 years ago. There were 28 Democrats and 2 Republicans present. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I were the only Republicans in attendance. Mr. Farley said:

You Senators have been voting politically for a number of years, but the great fundamental principles of the United States of America are now at stake, and we have got to preserve them, we have got to be courageous if we are going to save them, and keep the United States a great, successful Nation of freemen.

He said further:

Gentlemen, you have got to begin voting differently from now on, even if it means that some of you do not come back to the United States Senate.

Those are words upon which every Senator in this chamber can well afford to reflect.

Mr. President, I love this country so much more than I love my seat here in the Senate that I am going to stand for what I believe to be right so long as I am a Member of the United States Senate.

Again I compliment the Senator from Missouri; he is positively right. This great America cannot go on unless all Americans are made free to work when and where they can find work, and where they choose to work, whether they elect to belong or not to belong to a union and pay dues or any special form of tribute.

Anyone who believes that the feeling against the closed shop is confined to those who are outside the ranks of the working class is greatly mistaken, I can assure the Senators. A gentleman I know recently spoke to 1,281 workers, most of whom belonged to a certain union. He spoke of the closed shop and the question of the workers being able to resign or not being able to resign from the union. After he spoke on that subject, the entire 1,281 workers rose to their feet and cheered and whistled for a full minute.

So, Mr. President, the resistance to the closed shop and the destruction of individual freedom in connection with the right to work is not confined to Senators or industrial leaders or the so-called people in the upper brackets.

Remember the little chart I sent to every Member of Congress, which showed that in the year 1943, $390,000,000 were taken out of the pockets of the working people of the United States and went into the coffers of the labor unions. That is all right if the money is used legitimately for the benefit of the members, but it was more than twice as much as all the money collected by all the business organizations in the United States, every chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and all the business organizations that are continually brought into the discussions upon this floor. That is why those in the Senate galleries, every time a conservative amendment was voted down, broke into applause in violation of the rules of the Senate. Think of the labor unions sending 20 bus loads of representatives from the little State of New Jersey to put pressure behind their contentions concerning the pending legislation, keeping their representatives here in Washington 3 days, and paying their bills. We figured what it must have cost to do that, and estimated the cost at over $25,000. And that was from just one State.

If we are sincere, if we love this country, and want to save it, let us decide that we are going to vote to sustain the inherent, sacred right of every man and woman in America to work and earn a living, and not to have to doff his hat and get on his knees and beg some union labor leader for a right that belongs to him. If this great Congress does not make it safe for every man and woman in the country to go down the street from his home to his place of work, to go into the factory, and while at work feel assured that nothing harmful to him will be done in the factory, and that he will not be working day after day under fear, intimidation, and threat; if we do not make it safe for him to go home along the streets of this great country of ours without any fear; if we do not make it safe for him to be in his home, and insure the safety of every member of his family while he and they are out in the evening—if we do not do that, Senators, very soon we shall have to say good-by to the great free-enterprise system of America, which is the foundation of our free life and all that makes the American system of free men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak very long against the closed shop, because I have spoken long and loud on this subject before in the Senate Chamber. I was against the closed shop when I came here in August 1941. I found very little support here at that time, but the support has been gaining in numbers and volume, and especially, since the 5th day of last November. I doubt whether there is enough support in the Senate at the present time to pass legislation that will outlaw the labor-leader racketeer and return our Government to the United States Congress instead of the labor-leader racketeers, who operate on orders from Moscow. When Senators are talking about the closed shop, they are talking about the very heart and soul of the control of our American form of government, because it is the closed shop which siphons off from the taxpayers and the honest laboring people of the country, hundreds of millions of dollars. This is done for the specific purpose of

defeating the reelection of any Member of Congress who opposes the labor-leader racketeers, and for the political purposes of using this money that is gained by virtue of the closed shop to elect to the Senate and to the House of Representatives men who will do the bidding of the labor-leader racketeers.

As I have often said before, I am a friend of the laboring man. I was born in poverty. My parents were both hard-working people. I have performed much hard manual labor myself. My sympathies are with the laboring people.

Mr. President, when Senators talk about "labor" in connection with the pending legislation, they are not talking about the laboring people; they are talking about a racket, a racket that has built up the labor-leader racketeers of the country until they are more powerful than our Government itself.

I am opposed to the labor-leader racketeer. I am opposed to the closed shop. I believe in collective bargaining. I believe in unions. We have a great many unions whose members are absolutely sound. But the labor unions that are causing the trouble in this country are not the class of which I just spoke. The labor unions that are causing the trouble are the big monopolistic labor unions that are dominated by Communists on orders from Moscow. If Senators do not believe it, let us get into war with Russia, and see how quickly the factories of this country will close down. The Moscow liberals closed our factories down in the recent war and kept them closed until the day Hitler sent his mighty war machine against his pal Joey and thus placed Russia on the side of the Allies.

It was not until then did our Moscow liberals and our big labor bosses cease their sabotaging. It was then they began to scream for full production and a no-strike program.

In the meantime our boys were drilling with wooden guns, and this very Capitol was guarded by dummy wooden cannons. When the American worker was given a chance, he began to produce and he never stopped producing until he had built the greatest war machine the world has ever seen. Unshackle our honest workers and they will break the back of world-planned scarcity in short order.

I do not want to impugn the motives of any Senator on the floor. I have explicit confidence in every Senator, but I want to say that the impression is abroad in the land that the only reason we have supported the National Labor Relations Act and turned everything over to the labor racketeers is because of the fear on the part of certain Senators that they would be defeated for reelection, unless they gave all-out support to the big labor bosses. Certain very good Senators who formerly sat here are not in the Senate any longer, because they were defeated by the tools of Communist labor leader racketeers, who are operating on the vast sums of money, the millions of dollars, that they have extracted from the pockets of the poor working people. The situation is a political one. I heard one of the ablest Senators who ever graced this body, at least in my opinion he was one of the ablest Senators since I have been a Member of this body, the late Honorable Josiah Bailey, who on the floor of the Senate said that Congress had violated the Constitution of the United States which places upon it the power to lay and collect taxes. That power is vested in the Congress by the Constitution. According to the late Honorable Josiah W. Bailey Congress transferred that power to lay and collect taxes from the Congress of the United States to the labor leader racketeers. That power was vested in the labor racketeering leaders by permitting them to say that no man could work unless he had a permit card issued to him by them or their henchmen. Furthermore he had to pay any price the racketeers wanted to charge him for that permit card. That applied not only to private industry, but to Government jobs as well. This great Government of ours made it impossible for a free born American citizen, the father of boys fighting overseas for their country and needing war materials, to go into a Government-operated and owned plant and secure a job in which he could help build the trucks, the guns, the munitions, those boys needed in the war without paying tribute to labor czars. As a result of that transferrence of powers to the labor racketeers many of our boys died, and the blood of those boys is upon the heads of the Members of Congress of the United States.

That, Mr. President, is how far Congress has gone in transferring power to lay and collect taxes to a group of citizens in this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say in connection with the Senator's reference to the abrogation in favor of labor organizations of the right to collect taxes, which I think he has very aptly put, he might extend his observation a little further and say that we have abrogated to a certain degree the right to assess fines, forfeitures, and penalties which have ordinarily and consistently in this country been the province of organized government, and today, through labor organizations, without trial, without proof, but usually upon either a whim or order, members of certain organizations can be assessed fines under penalty of expulsion, and such fines can be arbitrarily assessed by whimsical action taken by certain leaders. So we have not only abrogated to a certain extent the right to collect taxes, but we have passed on the right to assess fines and forfeitures.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the able Senator from Iowa for that observation. I am glad to have such observation from attorneys in this body, men who have studied the law and know what it means. Their words have much weight, as did the words which were spoken by that great statesman, the late Senator Bailey, of North Carolina.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to make a brief statement, because I am sure the Senator from Texas does not want to leave the thought that because a man does his duty in voting on this subject he will be defeated at the polls. Perhaps some Members of Congress were defeated at the polls at the last election for that reason. But I am certain that the Senator from Texas will agree with me that there is no need for a Member of Congress being defeated at the polls simply because he does his duty as he sees it in voting for what he believes is to the best interest of the working people of the United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said. I prefaced my remarks by the statement that I did not wish to impugn the motives of any Member of this body. But I do say that the unions themselves have advertised over the length and breadth of this Nation that they will defeat certain Senators solely because the Senators have voted against labor leader racketeers.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to bring out my point. I know the Senator made the statement he has just referred to. The point I want to bring out is that if we do our duty and the people of the United States do their duty, and in doing that duty in connection with labor legislation we are never animated by bitterness or hatred or desire to injure anyone, but only to benefit the working people of the United States—if we get that message over, there are 20 votes back home for every 1 that may be controlled by labor leaders who threaten us—if we get our message over and do our duty. Does the Senator agree with the statement that the labor leaders' threats will be idle threats?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I agree with that statement. Even if that were not true, I still believe it is the duty of every Senator to vote his convictions on the floor of the Senate, regardless of what the outcome may be at the next election.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator, but it is a fine thing to know that we do not have to destroy ourselves by voting our convictions. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. I think the vast majority of the people of the United States believe in the form of our American free government. Does anyone wish to say that under our American form of free government every American citizen should be deprived by law of his right to accept a job if it is offered to him at a satisfactory wage? That is what has been done however. American citizens have been prevented from accepting work at a lawful vocation which is offered to them, at a salary which they want to accept. But no, they cannot do it, because Congress has enacted legislation which bars free American citizens from exercising their freedom, from using their God-given right to work. I think this august body, the greatest legislative body

on the face of the earth, has fallen below its usual high standard when its Members sit here and argue and debate day after day concerning the rights of the labor unions, the rights of industry, and forget altogether the rights of the individual citizen, forget altogether the man who is doing the work. Members of the Senate simply talk and argue and try to fix the terms of the bill so it will be acceptable to the labor leader racketeers and to industry, but forget about the man in the overalls, forget about the man who has to earn a living for himself and his family. We permit the union to charge the worker anything the big labor bosses want to charge him, and he must pay it, or get out of the union and not be allowed to work. I am against such a condition. I think we should get around to the point after a while when we give some consideration to the rights and freedom of the American citizens, and not look to these bloc votes of this organized racket.

Mr. President, I have kept bills, similar to the one we are now discussing, before the Senate ever since I have been a Member. I had an amendment which I sent to the desk, and which I intended to bring up. I do not know whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] covers exactly what is contained in my amendment, but after listening to what the Senator from Minnesota has had to say I think his amendment is a very beneficial one, and I intend to vote for it. I shall vote for it.

During the war when we debated about abolishing the closed shop many persons said to me, "Lay off of that thing. Do not try to abolish the closed shop during the war, because the union racketeers are bigger than the Government, and they will cause a great deal of trouble if an attempt is made to abolish the closed shop. Wait until the war is over." Well, the war has been over now for 2 years. Why should we wait longer? An amendment is before us. Why not vote for the amendment and add it to the bill? Give the American people a little touch of freedom. Give them something to be proud of. Vote for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. SPARKMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is unavoidably detained. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably absent on business of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is absent on public business, would vote "nay" on this question if present.

I announce also that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—21

Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Kem	Stewart
Butler	McClellan	Wherry
Donnell	McKellar	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Williams
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

NAYS—57

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Baldwin	Hill	Martin
Barkley	Hoey	Maybank
Brewster	Holland	Millikin
Brooks	Ives	Morse
Cain	Jenner	Murray
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Connally	Kilgore	Pepper
Cooper	Knowland	Revercomb
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Downey	Lodge	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lucas	Smith
Ecton	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Umstead
Green	McMahon	Watkins
Hatch	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Bushfield	Reed	Tydings
Byrd	Robertson, Va	Vandenberg
Capper	Sparkman	Wagner
Ellender	Thomas, Okla.	White
George	Thomas, Utah	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BALL on behalf of himself and Mr. BYRD was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit for the consideration of the Senate a suggested unanimous-consent agreement upon the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The clerk will read the suggested unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, May 12, 1947, at the hour of 6 p. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that it be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended; that the third reading of the bill as amended be considered as ordered; and that a vote be immediately taken thereafter on the final passage of the said House bill as amended.

Ordered further, That of the time for debate on said day, the proponents of the bill shall be allowed 2½ hours and the opponents 4½ hours, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, and the Senator from Utah, Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the membership of the Senate to consider this unanimous-consent request which is on the final passage of the bill. It provides that a vote shall be taken at 6 o'clock on Monday evening, it being understood that the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock in the morning, and that the time shall be divided so that the proponents of the bill will have 2½ hours and the opponents of the bill will have 4½ hours. I believe that that would take care of the speeches of those who expect to make speeches, so far as time is concerned.

I feel confident that we will pass on all the amendments this evening and may have a third reading of the bill tonight, and then recess until Monday, to meet at 11 o'clock, a. m., and, under the proposed agreement, a vote should be taken at 6 o'clock Monday evening on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky is absent. It would be agreeable with him, I am sure, and so far as I am concerned, it is agreeable to me. I have no objection to the unanimous-consent arrangement.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say that while the distinguished minority leader did not authorize me to speak for him, I asked him today if he would accept the unanimous-consent agreement and he said he would.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understand, the Senator from Kentucky desires some time on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The arrangement is that the opponents shall have 4½ hours, and their time is to be in charge of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am quite satisfied that there will be no difficulty in arranging whatever time the distinguished Senator from Kentucky would like to have in presenting his arguments for or against the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the distinguished Senator any objection to fixing the time for the vote at or before 6 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to do that, but we are trying to make sure that the opponents shall have sufficient time to make speeches against the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should have to object to such an arrangement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The acting majority leader has been gracious and considerate, as he has been all through the debate, and it is with the greatest reluctance that I must object. I am sure I also speak for other Senators who are unable to agree to a vote on Monday. To the fixing of any time thereafter we have no objection whatever. If it can be worked out for Tuesday or any other time other than Monday, so far as I am concerned, it will be satisfactory. Some other Senators who are vitally interested will have no objection.

The Senator will recognize that the bill has been an uncertain quantity up until the end of the day. A good many Senators have not known how they would vote on the final passage, because they did not know what kind of a bill it would be. But by the end of today—and I believe the Senator will agree that we have not delayed action on the amendments—we will know what kind of a bill we shall have to vote on, on its final passage.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his observations. I feel that ample time should be given for debate on the bill. I thought 2½ hours for the proponents and 4½ hours for the opponents would be enough inducement to the distinguished Senator to agree to the unanimous-consent arrangement.

Mr. PEPPER. I am exceedingly sorry that I am not able to agree to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Florida feels that he cannot accept the unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 6 o'clock on Monday.

I have also prepared another unanimous-consent agreement. I hope the Senate will not think that I am a mule trader. I know the Senate would like to get to a vote if possible. The only thing to do is to sound it out and see what is the sentiment of the Senate. There is no criticism of anyone intended.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the next unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WHERRY. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent request agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that it be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended; that the third reading of the bill as amended be considered as ordered, and that a vote be immediately taken thereafter on the final passage of the said House bill as amended.

Ordered further, That the time intervening on said day between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 2 p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the date next Tuesday?

Mr. WHERRY. Tuesday, the 13th.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any objection to stating whether the Senator has another proposal to submit?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will ask me that a little later, I shall be glad to answer him.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senate will agree to vote. It has been delayed long enough.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the proposal now is to vote at 2 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Is that standard time or daylight-saving time?

Mr. WHERRY. We will vote at 2 o'clock according to the clock here.

Mr. OVERTON. Can the Senator advise the Senate whether that clock is going to be changed to daylight time?

Mr. WHERRY. I personally voted as did the Senator from Louisiana. I hope the time will be 2 o'clock, "God's time," as I think the Senator said. Whether the time will be advanced or not I am not sure, but the time will be according to the clock when 2 o'clock arrives.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Would this agreement bar the presenting of further amendments between now and that time? I have in mind offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I think I shall have it ready to be filed on Monday. I can file it tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the proposed agreement provides for a vote on the final passage of the bill, and if we take a recess from tonight until Monday, we shall have Monday and Tuesday in which to take action.

I suppose a Senator can make a motion at any time until the final passage of the bill; but under the proposed agreement, when we vote at 2 o'clock, we shall vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me, Mr. President, that such a limitation of time would prevent a proper presentation of the substitute. It seems to me we should have a little more time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Montana has concluded his remarks.

Mr. MURRAY. I was saying that I think the proposed time limit would prevent a proper presentation of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. It seems to me we should have more time in which to present it.

Mr. President, this bill has been materially changed on the floor of the Senate. If the bill had been brought in from the committee and had been voted on as it was reported by the committee, it could have been passed long ago. But many very important and serious amendments have been added to the bill while it has been under discussion on the floor of the Senate. So the bill now before us is entirely different from the bill which was reported by the committee. It seems to me we should have time to present a substitute and have it properly explained and debated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I had hoped that tonight it would be possible for the Senate to take final action on all the amendments and to have the third reading of the bill, so as to bar the offering of further amendments.

Am I to understand that at this late date, after 2 weeks of debate, the Senator from Montana proposes to offer a complete substitute for this bill—a substitute which no other Senator has yet seen?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is not such a surprise as all that because we have discussed it in the committee, and the important thing to do is to have the Senate pass a bill which can be enacted, not a bill which will fail of final enactment.

It seems to me that the Senator from Ohio understands very well the position which was taken by the minority members of the committee who signed the minority views. If the passage of some bill on the subject is desired, we are in favor of a bill which will be sound and which will do some good instead of a bill which will raise resentment and bitterness and will destroy in large degree the labor relations which have been established in this country.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute will carry out all the recommendations of the President, and, in addition, will provide other amendments to the National Labor Relations Act—amendments which I think will be helpful and will clarify some of the problems connected with the criticisms which have been made.

Mr. TAFT. It has been perfectly possible to prepare such a substitute at any time during the last 3 weeks. The Senator from Montana signed the minority views opposing the committee bill. It would make no difference what amendments were adopted to the committee bill; a substitute could have been proposed at any time, embodying the recommendations the Senator now has in mind.

I cannot fail to regard the offering of a substitute at this late date as anything other than a dilatory motion to delay action on the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think that is an unfair statement. The Senator from Ohio knows that we have been engaged on the bill every day during several weeks, and our time has been fully occupied with discussions of the bill and the amendments which have been presented from time to time to the bill. I think the Senator will concede that it would have been utterly impossible for

us to write an entirely new bill during the time when we have been required to be on the floor of the Senate for the discussion of the bill reported by the committee and the amendments which have been offered. The bill now goes entirely beyond what the President has recommended; and I think the substitute would be entirely sound.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if that course is pursued, I think I would be justified in moving to lay the substitute on the table as soon as the Senator finishes presenting it. Whether I shall do that, I do not know; but the procedure the Senator has proposed is the most extraordinary procedure I have ever seen proposed in the Senate of the United States in connection with the discussion or handling of a bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before that is done, I wish to have a decision reached in regard to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to express the hope that the Senator from Ohio will not follow the course he has just announced; namely, to move to lay on the table the substitute, and not to give any Senator an opportunity to discuss it or consider it. Throughout the entire course of this debate, Mr. President, the amendments which have been offered and have been discussed have come from the other side of the aisle; and so far as I know, no Senator on this side of the aisle has questioned the right of any Senator on that side to propose any motion or any amendment or any substitute which he desired to propose.

Mr. President, I regard it as rather bad taste at this time, when a Democratic Senator rises and has the temerity to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, to threaten to make a motion to lay the substitute on the table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that 3 days ago, and also yesterday, we announced our hope that it would be possible to conclude action on all the amendments tonight. No objection was made, and we have proceeded all day on the theory that the Senate would proceed with the amendments tonight and would stay in session until action on the amendments was finished. No suggestion was made that there would be offered for the bill a complete substitute which would open up the consideration of every point in regard to the labor legislation discussion which has already been before the Senate. Those are the circumstances under which I made the statement. Incidentally, I did not announce a course; I said I thought I would be justified in doing that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield once more to me, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that I have not been in the confidence of my colleagues who are proposing the substitute. I had no information from them that they desired or intended to propose the substitute. Like the Senator from Ohio, I was completely in the dark, except I happened to read the newspapers, and for the past several days the press of the country has carried the statement that a substitute proposal would be made. Therefore I do not think it is a matter of any great or overwhelming surprise to anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago I more or less concurred in what the able Senator from Nebraska said with respect to an early vote upon the pending labor bill. I, too, knew nothing about the substitute which is proposed to be offered by the able Senator from Montana. But if a substitute is to be offered, certainly it should be given every opportunity for debate on the floor of the Senate. As the Senator has said, after all, the Senate has been debating this bill for several weeks, and the amendments which have been considered, of course, have been offered to the bill as reported by the committee. Until all action on amendments to that bill is completed and until the Senate knows where it stands with respect to the amendments which already have been offered, it would be utterly impossible for any Senator to offer a substitute bill.

Therefore, I think the Senator from Ohio does not take the proper attitude when he says that the moment that an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill is offered and the moment that the Senator from Montana concludes his remarks upon that amendment in the nature of a substitute, he, the Senator from Ohio, will move that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be laid on the table. I do not believe that would be cricket, as we understand it in the Senate of the United States.

If that attitude were adopted, Mr. President, I would not agree to any unanimous-consent agreement, even though I suggested a moment ago that I would agree; because, after all, this is a rather serious matter, and many Senators have their own views and their own attitudes with regard to these questions. If the Senator from Montana desires to offer a substitute bill, he should have the right to offer it, and it should be debated on the floor of the Senate, without any question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Ohio committed an inadvertence when he stated that the Senator from Montana had joined with the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Florida in saying that he opposed the whole bill and everything that pertains to the subject of the bill, because he surely could not have overlooked what was said by authority of their written minority views, which was filed in the Senate about the time the majority report was filed, in which those three Senators stated they favored everything recommended by President Truman to the Congress in his message. In addition to that, on pages 40 and 41 there were enumerated 6 or 8 or 10 various provisions of the bill under the heading "Chapter V. Acceptable provisions of the bill," which those Senators said they would accept, and they commended the majority for including them in the majority bill.

It has been a matter of consideration here for days as to whether there should be separate amendments offered to objectionable parts of the bill, or whether there should be presented a concise and succinct substitute embodying an affirmative approach to the problem. I do not know of one Senator on this side of the aisle who has offered a single amendment to the bill. The whole time has been consumed on amendments offered by Senators on the majority side, and by members of the majority in the committee. Day after day amendments have been debated. There are Senators on this floor who have changed their minds, I have understood, since the bill has been under consideration, and have determined to vote against the bill because they saw amendments adopted to the original bill reported by the committee which made them determine to oppose the bill as it was then presented to the Senate.

Finally, because the Senator from Montana and a number of other Senators on this side of the aisle have finally decided that it would be best to present a milder bill than the one now before the Senate, a bill they thought might secure the approval of the President and of the country, and result in some legislation being adopted, they should not be castigated as being engaged in dilatory tactics. I am sure the Senator from Ohio did not really mean to say that those Senators in their minority views had affirmed their opposition to everything that pertained to legislation on the subject of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I meant to say exactly what I said.

Mr. PEPPER. Then the Senator was wrong.

Mr. TAFT. The Senators filed minority views which, in effect, opposed everything in the bill. As a matter of courtesy to the Senate, if Senators intended to present a substitute bill, they should have presented it and had it printed so that we would have had some opportunity to vote on it today, inasmuch as Senators knew we were going to try to finish the amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he does not realize that it would be impossible for us to determine what substitute bill could be offered until after the amendments which have been under consideration the last several days had been accepted or rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I cannot see what possible bearing the question of whether the amendments were adopted or not has on the preparation of a substitute bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one of the finest things I will always remember about the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARK-

LEY], who was the majority leader for many years after I came to the Senate, was that he could always pour oil on the troubled waters, and come up smiling when he failed to accomplish what he wanted done.

I think that we will not press the unanimous-consent request further this evening. We are taking up valuable time we might spend on the consideration of the amendments. So, Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request not having been granted, we will proceed with the amendments as they are brought up.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has indicated that he is about to leave the floor, and I wish to ask him a question. Is it the purpose of the Senator to have a session tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose is not to have a session tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I would have asked for a session tomorrow, but the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the minority leader, has left the city to make a speech at Bowdoin College, in Maine at the request of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the majority leader, and requested that we not have a session tomorrow or have any votes, while he was away.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that we now proceed in as orderly a manner as possible, every Senator remaining in the Chamber, to take up the amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, at the end of line 20, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no language or provision of this section is intended to nor shall it be construed or administered so as to abridge or interfere with the right of either employers or employees to freedom of speech as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to attempt to say what I think every Member of Congress should truly mean, and that is no contravention of the Constitution. This amendment deals with one of the fundamentals of liberty, that is, freedom of speech.

In the bill that has passed the House, as well as in the Senate committee bill, the one pending before us, an effort has been made more or less to limit and define what restrictions shall be placed on freedom of expression as between employers and employees, what speech should be regarded as an unfair labor practice. The House bill provides that it will not be an unfair labor practice to express "any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, if it does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal."

In other words, under the terms of the House text, unless the written or spoken words, by its terms, carry a threat of force or economic reprisal, then it would not constitute an unfair labor practice.

Under the Senate committe bill it is provided that—

> The Board shall not base any finding of unfair-labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit.

I am concerned about that language, Mr. President. I would like to see it strengthened. The language of the present law, the National Labor Relations Act, has been so distorted by court decisions and by administrative decisions that freedom of speech has definitely been abridged and denied to many of our citizens.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was wondering how this amendment would change the law. The highest law of the land, namely, the Constitution, is being cited in this amendment. If the same court is to construe this law which has been construing the Constitution, how can any change be effective?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, we may never get any change, but I would like in this bill, to emphasize the fact that it is not the intent of Congress and of the Senate by this legislation to in any way abridge freedom of speech, and that in my judgment has been the result and the consequence of court decision and administrative decision in the past with respect to the present law. I call attention to the fact that the present law was not so restrictive as are the provisions that I have referred to in the two measures.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan. We had in one of the committee prints language similar to that proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, but it was decided, as I recall unanimously, that it was unnecessary; because, of course, it would be impossible to enact any law that could possibly be sustained, if it involved a violation of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States. But so far as I am concerned—and I think it will be found that other members of the committee share this view—I am perfectly willing to accept this amendment, if the Senator from Arkansas wishes to have it inserted in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the statement by the Senator from Oregon, and I will say to him that I do not wish to delete any language of the bill as it stands at present, but I would like to have this provision incorporated in the new law. Whether the court knows it or not, whether administrative officers will know it or not, every other citizen with common understanding and who can read the language will know that it was not the intent of Congress to deprive any citizen, either employer or employee, of a right guaranteed under the Constitution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I will gladly yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should be very glad, so far as I am concerned, to accept the proposal of the Senator. There will need to be negotiation and conference on the two provisions of the House and Senate bills, anyway. I think the Senator's suggestion is deserving of every consideration. If the Senator is willing, I think we might vote on the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wondered if the Senator from Arkansas might feel that while the language he proposes in the amendment may be in the Constitution and may have been declared by the founders, it is possible it may have been overlooked from time to time by the Supreme Court, and he would just like to punch up their memory?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. Permit me to say that I think this will reinforce the other language that is now in either the House or Senate bills, and it ought to have, at least, both a moral and legal persuasion and influence on the courts and on the administrative officers to not strain the construction of the language so as to permit administration by rule, by order, or by decision, or otherwise, that would actually infringe upon the liberty of speech guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator upon his vigor in restating some of the fundamentals of American freedom and American personal liberty. I will say that I fear from time to time, in my own mind, that they are too often forgotten in the rush and press of kaleidoscopic things.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that often the courts and administrative officers undertake to declare the intent of Congress with respect to legislation, and I am trying to say now by this amendment that it is not the intent of Congress to infringe on the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution, and that we do not want this section either interpreted or administered so as to do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest a vote on the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should be perfectly willing, Mr. President. I was merely emphasizing my views with respect to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 25, between lines 9 and 10, to insert the following:

(h) No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its national or international officers, or one or more of the officers of the organization designated on the ballot taken under subsection (c), is or ever has been a member of the Communist Party or by reason of active and consistent promotion or support of the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party can reasonably be regarded as being a member of or affiliated with such party, or believes in, or is or ever has been a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall not consume much time with respect to this amendment, which is lifted from a section of the House bill. The House bill, as passed some days ago.

Mr. President, I think, as I said earlier this afternoon, that most of American labor, a great majority of union membership, are definitely fine American citizens, whose patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to country can no more be questioned than can that of any Member of this body. But, Mr. President, often, as Senators heard the plea made here this afternoon by the Senator from Wisconsin, a small minority of Communists are able to infiltrate into these organizations, and by the processes under which they operate they are able to rise, and they have risen, in some unions to official positions. Therefore, those who are really Communists are not loyal to our country. If they rise to positions of power as officers in labor organizations, then, with the law that we enact, investing certain powers in labor organizations, such as the power of collective bargaining, and other powers and rights that we have legislated and invested in them, we are simply placing the power and authority and the sanction of law behind men who are in those positions, giving them authority to bargain collectively, to deal with management of industry, and thus wield a greater influence in the economic and political life of the Nation. We are simply giving authority to people who are not loyal to our Government, who will use that power as Communists have demonstrated in the past they will use it, for the purpose of subversive work and for undermining the very fundamentals upon which this Government rests.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to perface my remarks by saying that no one is more opposed to communism than I am, but I want to ask some questions, for I am wondering how this kind of provision could be effectively enforced. I have always belived that when Congress passes a law it should be susceptible of effective enforcement. As I read the amendment, if a man had ever been a Communist he never could become an officer of a union, even though he had purged himself and had decided he had been wrong when he became a Communist. He could never become an officer of a union even though he had become a loyal American citizen.

My next point is that if he were a Communist, or had the attributes the amendment mentions, and could not hold office in a union, how would such a law be enforced? Would the Board be compelled to determine whether or not each officer of a union was or was not a Communist?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the Board would be compelled to make a determination respecting each one, but where the issue was raised, where there was a challenge, then I think it would be the duty of the Board to make a determination.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would such a matter be brought before the Board? What would be the procedure to bring the question before the Board? I find nothing in the amendment respecting how the question should be brought before the Board.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Board could inquire into the matter upon its own volition. I do not think it would be necessary for the Board to inquire into the case of every officer, of course, but it would be like barring a Communist from working for the Government; when it was discovered that an individual was a Communist, of course, he could be discharged. The Board is going to inquire into many issues which will be presented to it, such as many questions coming up respecting elections, respecting the proper collective bargaining agency, and other pertinent matters arising from administration of the law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator's position respecting employment of Communists by the Government. I am opposed to them being employed by government. The only difficulty is that we have never enforced the rule against Communists. We have not put them out. We ought to start in government first. The amendment, however, goes a little further than that. It does not say that the man cannot hold the position. It says:

No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its national or international officers, or one or more of the officers of the organization designated on the ballot taken under subsection (c), is or ever has been a member of the Communist Party or by reason of active and consistent promotion or support of the policies and doctrine of the Communist Party—

And so forth. In other words, the Board could not certify any labor organization if one of its officers was a Communist. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose, however, the certification were made. The certification then would be bad, would be void, if it turned out later that one of the officers was a Communist at the time the union was certified. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. I think it ought to be bad. That is what we are trying to provide, that it shall be bad. That is why I want to prohibit it, because it is bad.

Mr. President, if we mean to keep our country truly American, I do not believe we should tolerate conditions with respect to communism which now exist. We ought not to expect a union to clean house of communism in its ranks when the Government itself by law recognizes Communist-dominated organizations, unions whose officers are Communists, and permit them to be certified as collective-bargaining agents.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if some way could be conceived legally whereby a court determination could be had, whereby the right of trial were granted, the right to make a defense, and a court determination then be had whether an individual charged with being a Communist was in fact a Communist, or came within the designation set forth in the words of the amendments, then I say such would be a proper remedy. After he had been found guilty of being a Communist then a judgment could be entered prohibiting such an individual being an officer of a labor union and if he became such an officer, the union could be forbidden to act. But should we go so far as to say that a man who had ever had communistic tendencies, or who ever had been a Communist, should never be able to redeem himself and become a good American citizen. I think that in America even the worst Communist ought to have the right to become an American citizen if he will eliminate from his heart and soul his Communist beliefs and activities. The trouble with the amendment is that such things are not provided for.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's views. In the House committee, the provision was offered as a committee amendment to the House bill. After it was offered as a committee amendment the words "or ever has been" were added to it by amendment. Those words appear in two places in the amendment. There was considerable debate respecting the amendment to the amendment adding the words "or ever has been," when it was offered in the House. I find from the record that the vote in the House, on a division in the Committee of the Whole, was 153 for the amendment and 10 against. That overwhelming vote does not mean that the provision is sound or wise or that it does not go too far. I simply mention how the House of Representatives felt about it.

I agree with the Senator from Michigan. I dislike to condemn a man irrevocably if he has honestly repented. I would be very skeptical, however, in any case where a man had been a member of the Communist Party and a known Communist, and had followed that course very long, if he undertook to tell me later he had reformed. I do not say he could not reform. I do not say I never would have faith in him. But I would want more proof than simply his profession of reformation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator. I would be very suspicious that such an individual had reformed. Still

I should like to hold out for him the hope that he could redeem himself and become a worthy citizen, even though he had been an unworthy one. I feel that we should not pass a bill which would not hold out such a hope. We ought to hold out some hope that if an individual did change he could become a worthy citizen and perform all the duties of a worthy citizen.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I modify the amendment I have offered, in line 5, on page 1, by striking out the words "or ever has been," and on page 2, line 2, by striking out the words "or ever has been."

On page 1, line 7, after the word "policies" I should like to strike out the word "teachings" and the comma.

Mr. President, with these modifications I feel that the amendment ought to be adopted. I realize that if it is not adopted the conferees, of course, could finally incorporate it in the bill. With the modifications I have now made in the amendment as it passed in the House bill, if the amendment is now agreed to there will be a provision in the law prohibiting the National Labor Relations Board from certifying as a bargaining agency any union or organization headed by a Communist. If the bill finally becomes law, this provision will be a part of the law. I believe that it ought to be a part of the law. I believe that the great majority of laboring men and women of this country, if they could be here tonight and express themselves, would want the aid of the Congress in helping them to rid their organizations of Communistic influence, an influence which often they are unable to cope with or fight against effectively under the laws as they now are.

I should like very much to see this amendment agreed to as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas desire to have his amendment read as modified?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

(h) No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its national or international officers, or one or more of the officers of the organization designated on the ballot taken under subsection (c), is a member of the Communist Party or by reason of active and consistent promotion or support of the policies and doctrines of the Communist Party can reasonably be regarded as being a member of or affiliated with such party, or believes in, or is a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Morse
Baldwin	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	
Hatch	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], as modified. [Putting the question.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (relating to employment of veterans, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 608. No veteran (discharged or released from the armed forces under honorable conditions) shall be denied employment because of membership or nonmembership in or affiliation or nonaffiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude from employment any veterans who are members or nonmembers of a labor union or veterans who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union; nor shall any veteran against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment. The rights of any veteran under this section may be enforced, upon his petition, by mandatory injunction or other suitable process by the district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) for the district in which the alleged violation or threatened violation of such rights occurred, or in which the veteran resides, and for such purpose process of the court may be served at any place in the United States."

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have received many letters from veterans in my State complaining that when they apply for jobs they are not given a job nor an opportunity to earn a living without first paying a fee to some labor union. Some of these letters indicate that the veterans thought that while they were fighting for the freedom of American citizens they were defending freedom and liberty for themselves and their families, but now they think that inasmuch as they cannot even get a job by which to earn a living for their families, without paying tribute to someone else, they did not win the war.

This amendment simply relieves all honorably discharged veterans from having to pay for the privilege of getting a job.

I do not intend to take any more time of the Senate to explain this amendment, because it is as simple as it can be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I desire to ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see how we can possibly write a special closed-shop provision for veterans. I take it that is what the amendment would do. It seems to me we have dealt fully with the closed shop in the debate on the bill itself and in the debate on the Ball amendment and on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. I do not believe we should adopt the amendment now proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is too late to request the yeas and nays; a division has been had.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I now offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. —. It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

SEC. —. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term

"labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. —. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. —. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, this amendment is what is known in Texas as the antiviolence bill. We enacted it in Texas just before I came to the Senate, while I was Governor of Texas; and I brought the bill with me when I came here, and introduced it on the first day I was in the Senate. I have kept it before the Senate ever since, and have had the Senate vote on it at various times since then. It simply makes it a felony for anyone—either an employee, an employer, an outsider, or anyone else—to use force or violence or to threaten to use force or violence.

We have indicated that we would like to eliminate force and violence throughout the world, thus it appears to me that we might begin by eliminating it here at home.

Therefore, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that in the first part of the amendment which was adopted we take care of the unfair labor practice covered by this amendment. We do so by providing that it shall be an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce or attempt to coerce or use threats of force against any member who desires to work.

Mr. President, the wording of this amendment seems to me rather broad:

It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

I do not believe any draftsman of criminal law or any person who was charged with the enforcement of criminal law would use such broad language.

Furthermore, I do not understand the effect of such a provision. As I understand the present situation, the penalty has been removed. So it seems to me the amendment would do no more than provide that such action would be an unfair labor practice which would be very much along the lines of what we worked out carefully in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas for himself and the Senator from Mississippi. [Putting the question.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 15, after the word "employer", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and/or shall take a secret ballot of the voting stockholders of each such employer (or if any such employer is an unincorporated association or partnership, of the members of such association or partnership) on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by the employees of such employer or their representatives."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President under sections 206 to 210 of the bill, the Attorney General, the various district courts, the Federal Mediation Service, the President of the United States, and the Congress would all be participating in the handling of labor disputes.

I believe that the handling of labor disputes should be concentrated in a single agency. Diffusion of responsibility would confuse the handling of these important matters, and would complicate, confuse, and delay settlement.

I sincerely question the wisdom of injecting the Attorney General, a prosecuting attorney, into a labor dispute. I feel that this action in itself would irritate existing labor-management relations, and would prove to be harmful rather than helpful in the peaceful solution of the controversy.

Section 209 (b), which provides for the secret ballot to be taken by the National Labor Relations Board to determine whether the employees wish to accept the final offer of settlement made by the employer, is, to me, particularly objectionable. It carries the suggestion or implication that in all cases the employees, or those who represent the employees, are the adamant parties and always in the wrong. In all justice and in all fairness, if the National Labor Relations Board is to be required to present a proposition to the employees, I feel that the Board should be required to present the union's proposal to the shareholders of a company or a corporation.

The United States Conciliation Service, experienced in the field of labor-management relations, has on numerous occasions been confronted with the situation where a union proposal, rejected by a representative of the corporation or perhaps an attorney from the outside representing the corporation, might have very well been declared acceptable by the shareholders of the company or corporation, had the union's proposal been presented in the true light for their consideration and acceptance. This amendment is for the purpose of correcting the basic defect in section 209 (b).

In other words, Mr. President, the amendment simply requires that inasmuch as they are asked to take a vote of the entire membership of the union, to ascertain whether they will accept the last offer of the employer, they shall be asked to contact all the shareholders, to ascertain whether they are willing to accept the last offer of the union. I think that would only be fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed to the pending bill on behalf of myself, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read by the clerk?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President; but I should like to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. MURRAY for himself and other Senators was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I—MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES AFFECTING COMMERCE

SEC. 101. It is the policy of the United States that—

(a) sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation and of the best interests of employers and employees can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of conference and collective bargaining between employers and the representatives of their employees;

(b) the settlement of issues between employers and employees through collective bargaining may be advanced by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through conferences and collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes; and

(c) certain controversies which arise between parties to collective-bargaining agreements may be avoided or minimized by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for furnishing assistance to employers and the representatives of their employees in formulating for inclusio within such agreements provision for adequate notice of any proposed changes in the terms of such agreements, for the final adjustment of grievances or questions regarding the application or interpretation of such agreements, and other provisions designed to prevent the subsequent arising of such controversies.

SEC. 102. (a) It shall be the duty of the United States Conciliation Service established pursuant to section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913 (hereinafter referred to as the "Conciliation Service"), in order to carry out the above policy and prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, to assist parties to labor disputes in industries affecting commerce to settle such disputes through conciliation and mediation.

(b) The Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, proffer the services of the Conciliation Service in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon his own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute, whenever in his judgment such dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption to commerce. The Director and the Service are directed to avoid attempting to mediate disputes which would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce if State or other conciliation services are available to the parties. Whenever the Secretary of Labor does proffer its services in any such dispute, it shall be the duty of the Conciliation Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Conciliation Service is not able to bring the parties to agreement by mediation or conciliation within a reasonable time, it shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration: *Provided*, That the failure or refusal of either party to agree to arbitration shall not be deemed to be a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act. Upon the request of the parties to the dispute the Conciliation Service shall cooperate with the parties in formulating an agreement for the arbitration of the dispute, in selecting an arbitrator or arbitrators, and in making such other arrangements and in taking such other action as may be necessary to provide for the arbitration of the dispute. When any labor dispute in an industry affecting commerce is submitted to arbitration pursuant to the suggestion of the Conciliation Service under this subsection, the Conciliation Service, at the request of the parties to the arbitration proceeding, shall pay so much of the compensation of the arbitrator or arbitrators and of the cost of reporting and preparing the transcript of the proceedings as does not exceed $500 in the aggregate in any one case. Any member of the Conciliation Service and any officer or employee of the Conciliation Service designated by the Conciliation Service is authorized to take acknowledgments of agreements to arbitrate.

(d) The Conciliation Service is authorized to furnish to employers, employees, and other public and private agencies, information concerning the practicability and desirability of establishing suitable agencies and methods to aid in the settlement of labor disputes by mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other peaceful means, whether or not such disputes are in industries affecting commerce; and the Conciliation Service is further authorized, upon request, to furnish assistance in establishing and administering such agencies and methods and in the conciliation and mediation and arbitration of such disputes, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section with respect to payment of the costs of arbitration by the Conciliation Service.

SEC. 103. (a) Disputes in any industry affecting commerce between an employee or group of employees or their representatives, and an employer or employers or their representatives, growing out of the interpretation or application of any collective-bargaining agreement concerning rates of pay, hours, or conditions of employment, including cases pending and unadjusted on the date of approval of this act, shall be determined in accordance with the procedure provided in such agreement for the disposition of such disputes. Where there is no agreement concerning procedure with respect to such disputes or where the agreement does not provide for final and binding arbitration of such disputes, and the parties fail to reach an adjustment in accordance with the procedure provided for in the agreement, any such dispute may be referred by petition of the parties or either party to the Director of the United States Conciliation Service.

(b) The Director of the United States Conciliation Service, or his authorized representative, shall thereupon offer, with the consent of the parties, to attempt to conciliate the dispute. If either party refuses to accept such offer, or if after acceptance conciliation shall be unsuccessful, the Director, or his authorized representative, shall make available to the parties a roster of arbitrators from which the parties shall designate one or more, but not more than three, arbitrators to arbitrate the dispute. In the event the parties are unable to agree upon a selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators from such roster the Director shall designate an arbitrator or arbitrators who shall arbitrate the dispute.

(c) In any case arising under this act in which an agreement between the parties provides for final and binding arbitration by one or more arbitrators and the parties, or the arbitrators appointed by the parties, are unable to agree upon the designation of one or more arbitrators, the Director of the United States Conciliation Service shall, upon the request of either party, designate an arbitrator or arbitrators, as the case may be, to arbitrate the dispute.

(d) In any case in which an arbitrator is designated by the Director of the United States Conciliation Service, the parties shall be given a hearing upon not less than 5 days' notice, at which they shall be accorded full opportunity to be heard and to present their case in person, by counsel, or by such other representative as they may respectively elect.

(e) All testimony before any arbitrator designated by the Director of the United States Conciliation Service shall be given under oath or affirmation, and any arbitrator thus designated shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses and receive evidence, and to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and other data as may be deemed material to the dispute. Such attendance of witnesses and production of evidence may be required from any place in the United States, or Territory or possession thereof, and the arbitrator may, for that purpose, request the clerk of the district court of the United States for the district wherein said arbitration is being conducted to issue any necessary subpenas, and, upon such request, the said clerk or his duly authorized deputy shall be, and hereby is, authorized, and it shall be his duty to issue any such subpena. In the event of the failure of any such person to comply with any such subpena, or in the event of the contumacy of any witness appearing before such arbitrator, the said arbitrator may invoke the aid of the United States courts to compel witnesses to attend and testify and to produce such books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents to the same extent and under the same conditions and penalties as provided for in the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto. Any witness appearing before such arbitrator or arbitrators shall receive the same fees and mileage as witnesses in the United States court, to be paid by the party securing the subpena.

(f) The arbitrator or arbitrators shall furnish a certified copy of the award to the parties to the dispute and shall transmit the original and two copies thereof to the Secretary of Labor to be included in the file required to be maintained pursuant to section 401 (a) of this act.

(g) Any difference arising between the parties as to the meaning or application of the provisions of the award made by the arbitrator, or arbitrators, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be referred for a ruling to the arbitrator or arbitrators who rendered the award; and such ruling when certified in the same manner, and transmitted in the same fashion as provided in subsection (f) of this section, shall be a part of and have the same force and effect as the original award.

(h) The award shall be final and conclusive on the parties as to the merits and facts of the dispute submitted to arbitration, unless within 10 days after the award is made a petition to impeach the award, on the grounds hereinafter set forth, shall be filed with the clerk of the district court of the United States in the district wherein the dispute arose. A party desiring to enforce such award after such 10-day period has expired may file with the clerk of such district court a certified copy of the award and the court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to enforce the award in the same manner as a judgment entered in such court.

(i) Petitions for the impeachment of any award so filed shall be entertained by the court only on one or more of the following grounds:

(1) An arbitrator rendering the award was guilty of fraud or corruption; or (2) a party to the arbitration practiced fraud or corruption, which fraud or corruption affected the result of the arbitration: *Provided, however*, That no petition on the ground that an award is invalid for uncertainty shall be entertained, and in such case the proper remedy shall be the resubmission of the award to the arbitrator or arbitrators for interpretation: *Provided further*, That each such award, when contested as herein provided, shall be construed liberally, with a view to favoring its validity, and no award shall be set aside for trivial irregularity or clerical error, going only to form and not to substance.

(j) At the expiration of 10 days from the decision of the district court upon the petition filed as aforesaid, final judgment shall be entered by the court in accordance with said decision, unless during said 10 days either party shall appeal therefrom to the circuit court of appeals of the United States or the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. In such case only such portion of the record shall be transmitted to the appellate court as is necessary to the proper understanding and consideration of the questions of law presented by said petition and to be decided.

(k) The determination of the appellate court upon the questions submitted to it pursuant to subsection (j) of this section shall be final, and when certified by the clerk thereof to the district court from whose decision the petition was filed, judgment pursuant thereto shall thereupon be entered by said district court.

(l) If the petitioner's contentions are sustained, judgment shall be entered setting aside the award in whole or, if the parties so agree, in part; but in such case the parties may agree upon a judgment to be entered disposing of the subject matter in controversy, which judgment when entered shall have the same force and effect as judgment entered upon an award.

(m) In any case in which an arbitration is had pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the cost of arbitration shall be borne by the party against whom the award is made, or where the award is not made against any party, in such manner as the arbitrator shall determine, subject to the provisions

of section 103 (c) of this title with respect to payment of such costs by the Conciliation Service.

SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor, through the Conciliation Service, is authorized to propose to the parties to any labor dispute which threatens a substantial interruption of operations in an industry basic to the national economy that an impartial emergency board of inquiry be appointed to investigate and report to the Secretary of Labor its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to the dispute, and to appoint such a board where the parties have agreed thereto or, in his discretion, when the parties so request. Any emergency board appointed pursuant to this section shall submit its report and recommendations, if any, to the Secretary within 30 days after the appointment of the board, except that this time may be extended by agreement of the parties with the approval of the Secretary. The Secretary shall publish the report and recommendations of any board so appointed.

SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a committee to be known as the Labor-Management Advisory Committee (hereinafter called the "Committee"), composed of not less than two nor more than five representatives of labor, and a like number of representatives of management, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Labor from lists of nominees submitted to him by national labor and management associations. Members of the Committee shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 a day for each day actually spent on the business of the Committee, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, in accordance with applicable provisions of law. The Director of the Conciliation Service shall serve as Chairman of the Committee.

(b) A vacancy in the Committee shall not impair the authority of the remaining members to perform the functions of the Committee and two-thirds of the Committee shall at all times constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(c) The Committee may, from time to time, adopt, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(d) The Committee shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Chairman upon reasonable notice to the members thereof, and in addition at such times and places as may be designated in appropriate regulations prescribed by the Committee, but in any event not less often than once a month.

(e) The Committee shall make an annual report to Congress, through the Secretary of Labor, of its activities and the state of industrial relations in the United States.

SEC. 106. The functions of the Committee shall be—

(a) to advise with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Conciliation Service upon major questions of policy and administration affecting the work of the Service;

(b) to prepare and maintain rosters of leading representatives of labor and management, who may be called upon from time to time by the Director of the Conciliation Service to serve on tripartite panels in individual cases;

(c) to conduct regional, area, State, local, or industry-wide conferences with leading representatives of management and labor, Federal, State, and local officials or interested civic groups and organizations, for the purpose of promoting voluntary collective bargaining and encouraging management and labor to develop methods and procedures to facilitate the settlement of disputes between them;

(d) to keep itself currently informed as to the state of industrial relations throughout the United States.

SEC. 107. The Secretary of Labor shall appoint such regional, State, local, or other labor-management advisory committees as may be necessary or appropriate in the administration of this act. The membership of such committees shall consist of equal numbers of labor and management representatives, chosen by the Secretary from lists of nominees submitted by the National Committee, and a public member, who shall be chairman, appointed by the Secretary. Members of such regional, State, local, or other committees shall serve without compensation, but shall receive necessary travel and subsistence expenses or per diem allowance in lieu thereof at a rate not exceeding $50 per day when actually engaged in the work of such committees. Such committees shall have authority to adopt, amend, or rescind such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the regulations of the National Committee, as may be necessary to the performance of their functions.

SEC. 108. Nothing contained in this title shall be applicable to any employer or employee subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

SEC. 109. When used in this title—

(a) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country;

(b) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor dispute would burden or obstruct, or tend to burden or obstruct, commerce or the free flow of commerce;

(c) The term "labor dispute" includes any disagreement, or any dispute, concerning terms, tenure, or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the contestants or disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee;

(d) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization;

(e) The term "employee" shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, and except as otherwise specifically provided in this act shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, within the meaning of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse.

(f) The term "representative" includes any individual or labor organization;

(g) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work;

(h) The term "person" includes any employer, employee, employee representative, or labor organization.

TITLE II—AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449) is amended as follows:

SEC. 201. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers."

(b) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for the purposes of section 9 (b) hereof, the term 'employer' shall not include a group of employers except where such employers have associated themselves together for the purposes of collective bargaining."

(c) Subsection (3) of section 2 is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "or any employee subject to the Railway Labor Act."

(d) Section 2 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection "(12)" to read as follows:

"(12) The term 'supervisor' means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment."

SEC. 202. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 8 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Board shall not base any finding of unfair labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefits."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 8 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or from adopting nondiscriminatory rules forbidding union activity by employees on company time and property which interferes with the business of the employer."

(c) Paragraph (4) of such subsection is amended by inserting before the word "testimony" the words "statements or."

(d) Subsection (5) of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: "*Provided*, That it shall be a defense in any proceeding based on any charge that an employer has refused to bargain collectively with a representative of supervisory employees that such representative is a labor organization which (a) represents nonsupervisory as well as supervisory employees, or (b) is affiliated with or subject to the control of a labor organization representing nonsupervisory employees."

(e) Section 8 is further amended by inserting after the section number the letter (a), and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) It shall be an unfair-labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

"(1) to restrain or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining;

"(2) to expel any employee from membership in any labor organization holding a contract with his employer which requires membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment, because such employee has engaged in activity on behalf of another labor organization at a time when a question concerning representation may appropriately be raised; or to persuade or

attempt to persuade his employer to discriminate against such employee;

"(3) whenever the Board, pursuant to section 9 (c), of this act, has certified any person or labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in the act as an unfair labor practice) as representative of employees, by strike, boycott, or other concerted activity or threat thereof, to induce or require or attempt to induce or require the employer of such employees to recognize or bargain collectively with any person or labor organization other than such certified representative in violation of his duty under the act to bargain exclusively with such certified representative."

SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 9 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and to adjust such grievances without the intervention of the bargaining representative, if after notification such representative does not indicate a desire to participate in such adjustment."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any party in interest, including an employer, may request such an investigation. The Board shall not proceed on the request of an employer unless it appears (1) that one or more persons or labor organizations have made a claim to be recognized as the representative within the meaning of subsection (a), and (2) where a labor organization has been recognized by contract as the exclusive bargaining representative, that there is a bona fide doubt that such labor organization is the representative within the meaning of subsection (a) and the request is filed with the Board at least 30 days prior to the expiration of such contract."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and inserting the following: "except that where the Board, upon objection by the employer involved in any representation proceeding to the certification of a labor organization as bargaining representative of supervisory employees, and after investigation, finds that such organization (a) represents nonsupervisory as well as supervisory employees, or (b) is affiliated with or subject to the control of a labor organization representing nonsupervisory employees, the Board shall not certify such organization as bargaining representative of the supervisory employees of such employer."

SEC 204. (a) Subsection (a) of section 10 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Board is empowered, by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory, to concede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases arising in industries not basic to the national economy even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce."

(b) Section 10 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (j) to read as follows:

"(j) An order of the Board shall become final within 60 days after issuance, unless a petition to review such order has been sooner filed in an appropriate circuit court of appeals, but the Board may thereafter modify or set aside its order as provided in subsection (d) of this section, or may, in its discretion, extend the time within which such order shall become final."

TITLE III—UNJUSTIFIABLE SECONDARY BOYCOTTS AND JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

SEC. 301. Work stoppages caused by jurisdictional disputes concerning the allotment of work tasks, and secondary boycotts having as their objectives the furtherance of jurisdictional disputes, cause burdens and obstructions to commerce which are not justified by the purposes and ends which such actions are designed to promote. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the burdens and obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce caused by secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes and by work stoppages caused by jurisdictional disputes concerning the allotment of work tasks.

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(a) The terms "person," "employer," "employee," "labor organization," "commerce," "affecting commerce," and "National Labor Relations Board" shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449), as amended.

(b) The term "secondary boycott" means a concerted refusal of employees of one employer to produce, manufacture, transport, distribute, or otherwise work on the articles, materials, goods, or commodities manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer.

(c) The term "jurisdictional dispute" means—

(1) a dispute between two or more labor organizations (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, as an unfair labor practice) concerning the representation of employees for the purpose of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment; or

(2) a dispute between two or more labor organizations (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, as an unfair labor practice) as to the right to perform particular work tasks for particular employers.

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to induce employees to engage in a secondary boycott to further a jurisdictional dispute affecting commerce.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization involved in a jurisdictional dispute as defined in section 302 (c) (2) of this title, affecting commerce, to attempt, by means of a concerted refusal to produce, manufacture, process, distribute, or otherwise work on the goods, articles, or commodities manufactured, produced, or distributed by the employer involved in such dispute, to require such employer to allot such work tasks to it.

SEC. 304. (a) Violation of the provisions of this title shall be deemed to be an unfair labor practice within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. The National Labor Relations Board shall have exclusive jurisdiction in accordance with and subject to the provisions of subsections (b) through (l) of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act and subsection (a) of this section, to prevent any persons from engaging in any such unfair labor practice affecting commerce.

(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has violated the provisions of section 303 (b) of this title, the National Labor Relations Board is authorized and directed to hear and determine the dispute out of which such unfair labor practice is alleged to have arisen or to appoint an arbitrator to hear and determine such dispute, unless, within 30 days after notice that such charge has been filed, the parties to the dispute submit to the Board satisfactory evidence that they have adjusted, or agreed upon methods for the voluntary adjustment of, the dispute. At any time after the expiration of such 30 days and prior to the issuance of a final order or award, if the Board finds that it is in the public interest, the parties may voluntarily adjust or agree upon methods for adjustment of the dispute. Upon voluntary adjustment in accordance with these provisions, or upon compliance by the parties with the decision of the Board, or the award of the arbitrator, the charge shall be dismissed. The award of the arbitrator shall be deemed a final order of the Board, within the meaning of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 305. Nothing in this title shall be construed so as to (1) interfere with, impede, or diminish in any way the right to strike except as otherwise herein specifically provided; (2) require an individual to render labor or service without his consent; or (3) interfere with the right of employees to engage in secondary boycotts for purposes other than those specified in section 303 of this title.

TITLE IV—PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS, LABOR UNIONS, AND EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) For the guidance and information of interested representatives of employers, employees, and the general public, employers engaged in any industry affecting commerce who are parties to collective labor agreements shall file with the Secretary of Labor no later than 30 days after the execution of such documents, (1) copies of all such collective-bargaining agreements, (2) copies of arbitration awards in labor disputes to which such employers have been parties, and (3) all agreements to which such employers are parties, reached as a result of mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. The Secretary of Labor shall maintain a file of such agreements and awards, and such file shall be open to inspection under appropriate conditions prescribed by him.

(b) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor shall be equipped and is authorized to furnish upon request of the United States Conciliation Service or employers, employees, or their representatives, any information developed from the file of collective-bargaining agreements or awards submitted to the Secretary of Labor, and such additional generalized data and factual information as may aid in the settlement of any labor dispute: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall require the Bureau of Labor Statistics to furnish any specific data or factual information submitted to the Bureau in confidence.

SEC. 402. (a) Section 54 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 28 as amended by 58 Stat. 21; 26 U. S. C., sec. 54), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Every labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce and every organization or association of employers in any such industry shall file together with the return required to be filed pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, a separate statement, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, showing—

"(1) the name of such organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"(2) the names, titles, compensation, and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the year as to which such statement is filed exceeded $5,000;

"(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) hereof were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such organization;

"(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing in such organization;

"(6) in the case of a labor organization, the names and addresses of all employers with whom such organization has collective-bargaining agreements in effect at any time during the period covered by such statement; and

"(7) in the case of an employers' association, the names and addresses of all labor organizations with which any of its members has collective-bargaining agreements at any time during the period covered by such statement."

(b) Violation of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $100. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enforce these provisions.

(c) Statements filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be available for public inspection at such times and places and under such reasonable conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

TITLE V—CREATION OF TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE CAUSES OF LABOR DISPUTES

SEC. 501. There is hereby created a Temporary Labor Relations Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of (1) six Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; (2) six Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) eight members, representing the public, management, and labor, to be appointed by the President of the United States. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not impair its powers to exercise its functions and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of original appointments. Members of the Commission appointed by the President shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the Commission, together with their necessary travel and other expenses, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof.

SEC. 502. (a) The Commission shall make a thorough study and investigation into the underlying causes of disputes between labor and management, including union and employer policies and practices, economic and other factors, methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process, Government policies, present and proposed legislation affecting such disputes, and the measures by which such disputes may be minimized or eliminated in order to safeguard the public interest, including, particularly, voluntary and cooperative measures between labor and management which can be promoted or facilitated by the Federal Government. In making such study and investigation the Commission shall place particular emphasis upon the special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in essential industries affecting the public interest with a view to recommending a method to settle or prevent such strikes without endangering our general democratic freedoms.

(b) The Commission shall also study and investigate the desirability of further legislation concerning the health and safety of employees engaged in industries that are essentially hazardous, with a view to the prevention of accidents and the improvement of health and sanitary conditions connected with such industries.

(c) The Commission shall also study and investigate the feasibility of the establishment of a uniform voluntary system of welfare funds for the benefit of ill, disabled, or age employees and their families, with a view to the enactment of legislation to assist in the promotion and encouragement of such a program.

(d) The Commission shall confer and consult with responsible leaders of both organized labor and industry and shall seek, as far as compatible with their own judgment, to recommend legislation that will eliminate all reasonable objections of either labor or industry.

SEC. 503. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions. The Commission may make such expenditures as may be necessary for performing its functions.

(b) The Commission may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of other agencies or departments of the Government, and may cooperate with and utilize the services of other public and private agencies.

SEC. 504. For the purpose of this act the Commission, or any member of the Commission designated by it, shall be entitled to exercise the same powers and rights as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 831); and the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend and testify or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, or other records and documents before the Commission.

SEC. 505. (a) On or before January 5, 1948, the Commission shall submit to the President, for transmission by him to the Congress, a preliminary report, together with such recommendations for legislation and such other recommendations as the Commission deems appropriate; and shall submit such further reports, and recommendations from time to time, to the President, for transmission by him to the Congress, as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) Upon the submission of its final report to the President, which shall be on or before April 15, 1948, the Commission shall cease to exist and its records and property shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 506. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. Notwithstanding the provisions of any State or Federal law, no Federal district court shall dismiss or otherwise refuse to entertain any action based on a complaint of breach of a collective-bargaining agreement solely by reason of the fact that one of the parties thereto is an unincorporated labor organization incapable under applicable State law of suing or being sued in its common name where all other conditions prescribed by law for establishing the jurisdiction of such court over the parties and the action have been satisfied.

SEC. 602. Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with, impede, or diminish the right to strike except as specifically provided herein, or the right of individuals to quit work, or to require any individual to render service or labor without his consent.

SEC. 603. Nothing contained in this act shall be applicable to any employer or employees subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

SEC. 604. If any provision of this act, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 605. This bill may be cited as the Federal Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator to proceed this evening with his explanation of the proposed substitute?

Mr. MURRAY. I intend to give an explanation of the proposed substitute.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment so that I may continue the observation that was made earlier in the day, and with all good intent, about the threat, if I may so call it, or the promise, of the Senator from Ohio to move to lay on the table the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana. Earlier in the day I expressed my opposition to such a motion, and voiced the hope that the Senator from Ohio would not pursue his thought.

Mr. President, I wish to make the suggestion that the strength of the United States Senate throughout the years has been based on the fact that Senators did have the right to speak freely and as long as they chose on any particular subject. Never has any rule, such as is commonly referred to as a gag rule, been applied in the Senate of the United States, regardless of which party was in power.

Since the present session began several motions to table have been made on legislative proposals. In recent years the motion to table has been used on motions to reconsider until it has practically destroyed the efficacy of the motion to reconsider, although the rule which gives any Senator, provided he has voted in the affirmative, 2 days' time to move to reconsider, was made for the purpose of assuring that right, lest a mistake had occurred in what had been done, or an error of some kind had been made. But the practice now of moving to table motions to reconsider has practically destroyed and nullified the motion to reconsider.

Mr. President, I rise now only to express the hope that no party in power, regardless of which one it is, will so far forget the rights of the minority as to use the power of moving to table for the purpose of cutting off legitimate and honest debate, for let that happen—and I am speaking a warning, not in regard to the present situation, but for all time to come—let any party adopt that practice, as it has already been followed too much in this session, and the right of free and unlimited debate will be destroyed in the only body in all the world today that entertains that right.

I am prompted by the very seriousness of the occasion and the gravity of the suggestion to make this statement, and to express the hope that no Senator will use the power of moving to table for the purpose of gagging the minority, and cutting off legitimate and honest debate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, repeatedly during the course of debate upon

Senate bill 1126 my colleagues and I have pointedly and, I believe, validly, criticized the value of the pending bill as a means of preventing labor-management conflicts and attaining equal justice for the American worker and the American employer. We have taken the well-considered position that this bill will weaken or wreck the sound principles of labor law established gradually during many years of constructive experience. We have predicted accurately, I think, that many of its features will breed confusion and conflict. They would disrupt established and equitable customs and practices of labor and management. They would impose totally unwarranted barriers to the fruitful growth of fair, effective and, above all, free and peaceful collective bargaining, at a most critical time in our national history, when unrestricted production is essential to continuing prosperity.

Mr. President, I wish to state that it has never been our position that all the provisions of S. 1126 are unsound or unwise. Many of them are sound and constructive. Others, with very slight modifications, could likewise constitute a useful contribution to our national laws on industrial relations. Some, in our opinion, actually do not go far enough. And it is our belief that these exceptionally valuable recommendations should not be ignored merely because they are overwhelmingly outbalanced by the destructive features of the measure. Rather than that tragic, yet very likely result, they should be combined with a sound and effective labor program for the Congress and for the Federal Government. To this end, my distinguished colleagues and I are presenting in this substitute the details of such a constructive program in place of the present provisions of the pending bill. I do not claim that this substitute is a cure-all. I doubt that any such thing exists. It is, however, an effective program based on existing studies requiring immediate action, and at the same time provides for a temporary commission to find the complete legislative answer to all the problems we are considering.

Briefly, the pending bill is composed of three principal titles relating to mediation of disputes, to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, and to what may be termed "unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes." Three additional titles would cover miscellaneous matters which can be explained most effectively by a description of their contents.

TITLE I—MEDIATION

Title I relates to mediation machinery for the settlement of labor disputes affecting interstate commerce. Instead of establishing a new independent Federal mediation service for mediation of labor disputes, as provided by S. 1126, the substitute would reaffirm and strengthen the United States Conciliation Service as it now functions under the Secretary of Labor. This would avoid the administratively impossible separation of functions which is proposed by the present bill.

In this regard I wish to make clear that, aside from special cases relating to national health or safety, the proposed Federal Mediation Service which would be created by S. 1126 would have no new or additional powers in addition to those now carried out by the Conciliation Service. Not only do we believe that better administration will result from keeping all mediation and conciliation activities under one head—with cabinet rank—but, in addition it is our conviction that the pending bill fails to give this branch of Government sufficient powers.

ATTACK ON CONCILIATION SERVICE UNWARRANTED

The only argument I have heard for an independent Conciliation Service was based upon the statutory function of the Secretary of Labor to promote the welfare of wage earners. The gist of the complaint was that the Secretary could not impartially intervene in an industrial dispute where his sole statutory function is to protect the interests of labor. This is not only inaccurate as a matter of fact, but it completely ignores the statutory source of the Secretary's mediation powers.

Since 1913 the Secretary of Labor has been empowered to act as a mediator in industrial disputes, not in the interests of wage earners, but—and I quote from the statute—"in the interest of industrial peace." If the Secretary were to intercede in favor of one side as against the other it would be the antithesis of mediation. It would be anything but conciliation. And it certainly could not be in the interest of industrial peace. In fact, it would undoubtedly stimulate rather than solve the conflict. It would be a clear breach of the duty imposed upon him by law.

At no time have I heard it charged that the Secretary of Labor has failed to carry out his statutory duties as an impartial mediator. To the contrary, all the evidence points to the eminent success with which this obligation has been carried out with fairness to all parties concerned in the public interest, and for the high purpose of reducing the burdens which industrial disputes impose upon the American people.

We must remember that the war gave a tremendous impetus to the growth of labor organizations in plants and industries where none existed before. During most of the war period labor and management in these industries were dealing with each other under strict Government controls. Wage increases were severely restricted, and any serious disputes were resolved by Government order after a full hearing. Free collective bargaining became a thing of the past for all unions and all employers. Indeed, collective bargaining was virtually unknown in the newly organized plants where the first lessons were learned under rigorous governmental supervision.

After the defeat of Japan, management and labor were on their own for the first time in more than 3 years. No agency of Government could tell them what to do. They had to learn how to use this new-found or rediscovered freedom to bargain with each other, and the immediate result was a rash of strikes producing an undeniable obstacle to orderly conversion from war to peace with continued national prosperity.

Faced with a problem of serious proportions the Secretary of Labor reorganized and strengthened his Conciliation Service. In doing this he actively sought the support and advice of all groups representing management and labor. Largely as the result of this advice and with the enthusiastic cooperation of industry, there has been created a smoothly functioning program within the Department of Labor today. More than 13,000 disputes have been settled by this new organization in the past year. In more than 90 percent of the cases in which mediation was accepted before a strike occurred, the Service settled the matter without a work stoppage. These accomplishments were achieved in spite of the strong demand for cost of living wage increases and in spite of unfamiliarity with the experience of collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I believe that this is a remarkable record. I am convinced that we would be acting contrary to the wishes of management and labor and contrary to the public interest if we were to destroy this organization now. We would be committing a colossal blunder to meddle legislatively with this smoothly functioning Service of the executive branch of our Government. It appears to me to be the height of common sense in this case to leave well enough alone.

Mr. President, that seems to be the opinion of the press of the country generally. I have two editorials, one from the Washington Star of Friday, April 25, discussing this matter along the lines that I have been speaking, and another editorial from the Washington Post of April 26, also discussing the same subject, and approving the provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two editorials may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the two editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

NO NEED FOR INDEPENDENT MEDIATION SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY. Yet the pending bill would create a new cleavage within the executive branch between agencies which deal actively in industrial relations. In addition to the Department of Labor, the National Mediation Board, the National Labor Relations Board and, in some respects, the Federal Security Agency, we would have under this bill another new agency, the Federal Mediation Service, with independent right to take uncoordinated action in what is perhaps the most vital aspect of this broad problem. In effect we would be ordering the President to consult with an officer of secondary rank instead of his duly chosen Cabinet adviser on questions of industrial peace.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to seek a solution of our problems by the arbitrary creation of new agencies. Every precept of good government has

painfully taught us the pitfalls which await such a step. We would again be splitting authority and responsibility between unrelated agencies, creating confusion and misunderstanding, endorsing the privilege of each officer to proceed without consultation in pursuit of his own policies and ultimately placing an unjustified and unnecessary burden of detail and decision upon the Chief Executive.

CONCILIATION SERVICE STRENGTHENED

Because we cannot subscribe to this unwise and disruptive action, the substitute bill continues the United States Conciliation Service as it now stands. In so doing we support the constructive suggestion of the President set forth in his state of the Union message of January 6, 1947, and we deplore the present failure of the bill to recognize this recommendation which was so wisely made.

VALUABLE MEDIATION FEATURES OF S. 1126 RETAINED

At the same time, however, we frankly recognize the advantages of S. 1126 in spelling out with greater statutory detail the duties and functions of the Conciliation Service and emphasizing the desirability of voluntary resort to the services of this agency on the part of employers and employees. We also endorse and incorporate in the substitute bill those provisions of S. 1126 which would ease the problem of arbitration by permitting payment of the first $500 in costs from the public treasury. And, as an alternative equivalent to creating a new national labor-management panel, which would have identical powers with the existing labor-management advisory committee of the Conciliation Service, we propose to achieve the same result by giving official statutory status to that committee, thereby continuing the existing successful pattern. We would, however, strengthen its powers over those of the panel by permitting it to offer advice upon its own motion instead of waiting for a request of the Director.

ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES ARISING FROM EXISTING AGREEMENTS

All of these proposals of S. 1126 we accept with grateful acknowledgment of their worth-while contribution. But in respect to arbitration of existing agreements we do not believe that the present bill goes far enough. As the bill now stands it would not provide any additional machinery for the peaceful solution of disputes concerning the interpretation of existing agreements. I think that this was an important oversight upon the part of the committee. I fail to see any substantial reason why the public should suffer from the inability of the parties to agree as to the meaning or application of contract clauses which they have voluntarily adopted. This was recognized by the President in his state of the Union message, which urged that means be found whereby such unsettled disputes may be referred by either party to final and binding arbitration.

The substitute bill therefore provides by section 103 that in disputes over the interpretation of existing agreements in industries affecting interstate commerce, the parties must resort to arbitration if the dispute be not settled by mediation. Of course this established procedure would not apply—nor would it be necessary—where the contract provides for arbitration. In all other cases, however, the Director of the Conciliation Service would be required to make available a roster of arbitrators from which the parties must choose at least one but not more than three. The Director would make the choice upon failure of the parties to agree, and, in the case where arbitrators cannot be chosen pursuant to an arbitration agreement, the Director would have a similar duty to make the designation.

The section provides effective procedures for deciding each case. Hearings must be held, testimony must be taken under oath, subpena powers enforceable in the Federal courts are conferred upon the arbitrators, and the decision would be final and binding upon the parties, subject to challenge within 10 days in the Federal courts, solely on the grounds of fraud or corruption.

I submit, Mr. President, that this proposal is an effective contribution to the labor law of this country. It will obliterate the so-called wild-cat strike by fair procedures holding unions and employers to the obligations and responsibilities which they have assumed in solemnly agreeing to carry out their contracts. It will protect the innocent public from the incalculable damage, delays, and inconveniences which such unnecessary stoppages may cause. We recommend this proposal for earnest consideration. We are convinced of its basic justice warranting enactment into law.

TREATMENT OF DISPUTES NOT SETTLED BY MEDIATION

We must reject, however, the provisions of S. 1126, section 203 (c), which would require the submission of any labor dispute to the President upon the failure of the parties to accept arbitration suggested by the Director of the Mediation Service. The Director of the Conciliation Service makes a frequent practice of suggesting arbitration in appropriate cases today. Frequently these suggestions are turned down by the parties, and continued negotiatior results in satisfactory settlements. Sometimes arbitration is suggested at several points during negotiations, and ultimately it may be accepted. If the Director knew that the refusal of his suggestion would automatically result in sending the case to the President, I am sure that he would be loath to make any such suggestion except in the most serious cases warranting attention by the highest officers of the Government. The resort to arbitration—a desirable objective—would actually be discouraged. And, in this regard, we cannot ignore the tendency of parties to seek the highest tribunal at the outset by refusing to submit their case to a logical and orderly process of determination.

If the Director of the Conciliation Service—or of the Mediation Service—were to continue his present practices relating to arbitration, the President would undoubtedly be swamped by so many cases that he would be forced to refer them to some other body for consideration. Logically this body would be the Department of Labor, or the Secretary of Labor, or some fact-finding board established by the President for each case. Thus the dispute would be returned to a staff level without any practical accomplishment.

Related to the problem of referring disputes to the President is that of providing for governmental action in so-called emergency situations where a strike may involve the national health or safety. S. 1126, sections 206–210, would provide an elaborate procedure for handling such disputes: First, boards of inquiry must be appointed; second, the Attorney General may obtain an injunction in the Federal courts; third, the mediation service would continue to seek a settlement; fourth, a continued failure to reach an agreement would again result in further boards of inquiry; fifth, the National Labor Relations Board must conduct a strike vote; sixth, the Attorney General must move to discharge the injunction; seventh, a report must be made to the President; eighth, the President must transmit the report and his recommendations to the Congress for appropriate action.

Thus we have eight separate required steps in this kind of a dispute, involving action by the Mediation Service, boards of inquiry, the Attorney General, the Federal courts, the National Labor Relations Board, President, and the Congress. Aside from any other consideration, I cannot imagine a more cumbersome or confusing program for governmental action. I cannot escape the conclusion that all labor disputes should be handled by one central agency.

I realize that the problem presented when a national emergency is involved is a most serious and complicated one. I cannot forget, however, that the certainty of an injunction against a strike will induce the employer to prolong the dispute without fear of economic loss and that the Government would abandon impartiality to throw its weight upon the employer's side of the bargaining table. There may be a solution to such a strike, but I am convinced that the majority has not found it, and I do not believe that we can confidently proceed with any proposal on this subject now in the absence of a more complete investigation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the substitute measure which the Senator from Montana is proposing contain any provision whatever to regulate Nation-wide strikes?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Of course it strengthens the existing Mediation and Conciliation Service, but it merely retains it as it is now in the Department of Labor. The pending bill proposes to set up the Service as a separate, independent agency.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that, but what does the substitute measure which

the Senator is sponsoring do with these extraordinary cases where the health and safety of the whole Nation is involved? Does it have any provisions respecting such cases?

Mr. MURRAY. It provides the various procedures which have been in effect right along, and makes it possible for the President to step in when a very critical situation develops, when the strike will threaten the national health and welfare, as the President has done in the past.

Mr. HATCH. Does the substitute measure give the President any power in any such instances?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; the same power that he now has.

Mr. HATCH. But no new power?

Mr. MURRAY. No new power.

Mr. HATCH. Nothing is added whatever to the President's power by the Senator's substitute measure?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I think no new power is necessary. We have been faced with a very serious situation because of the ending of the war and the difficult conditions which have developed as the result of the rise in prices, which have tended to engender labor disputes. But I am satisfied that this difficult period will soon pass away and that normal conditions will again return. I do not see the need for enacting legislation which may be too far-reaching and which, in the end, may do more damage than good.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not mean to discuss the merits of any proposal whatsoever. I was trying to find out what the Senator's substitute measure contained. If he now will be good enough to answer, I should like to ask a further question. For instance, when the Smith-Connally Act expires and the power contained under that act no longer exists, is there anything in the Senator's substitute measure which attempts to take the place of the act which expires or to supply the deficiency?

Mr. MURRAY. I expect to come to that point later in my remarks. We are talking now merely of the Conciliation Service, and the main feature of my substitute measure is to leave that Conciliation Service where it is now, and where the best-informed individuals, those who have given study to the subject of labor relations, feel it ought to be.

Mr. HATCH. But the Senator does intend to discuss later the matter I mentioned?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I will not interrupt the Senator further at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, turning to the other devices which would be required in these emergency disputes, I can see little advantage in strike votes or in mandatory and repeated action by boards of inquiry. Our experience under the Smith-Connally Act has shown the futility of the strike vote as a means of securing settlement. I do not believe there was a single instance when those votes prevented a strike during the war. Even if the votes are limited to cases affecting national health and safety—terms largely left to the discretionary interpretation of the Attorney General—the administrative burden might again cripple the National Labor Relations Board as it actually has done in the past. I must remind the Senate that this would occur at a time when the Board would be vested with additional important functions. We might again be forced to cut out the strike vote by the unsatisfactory method of limiting appropriations as was done by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Boards of inquiry, or special fact-finding boards, certainly have a place in the settlement of disputes regardless of whether the national health or safety would be affected. The exact point at which they become useful varies, however, with the particular case. Certainly they are valueless in the early stages of a dispute when they may completely block negotiation. Whether or not two separate inquiries are necessary again will depend on the particular case. The use of the boards is important mainly to seek a reasonable ground for agreement and reliably to inform public opinion of the issues and the equities for the purpose of inducing a fair and speedy settlement. It is a question for expert judgment as to when these stages are reached. Most assuredly these boards are unnecessary for the purpose of keeping a public official informed so that he may properly exercise his functions in regard to the dispute. Indeed, I question seriously whether so cumbersome a method of obtaining information would ever be relied upon as a practical matter. Other equally reliable and immediately effective methods are too readily available for this purpose. We have therefore concluded that the appointment of these boards should be discretionary in the appointing officer and not mandatory as provided by S. 1126.

Since we can agree neither with the device of reporting to the President when arbitration has been rejected nor with the required procedures of S. 1126 for handling emergency disputes, we propose that the most effective present step is to authorize the Secretary of Labor to create temporary emergency boards of inquiry whenever he believes a report will aid in a settlement. Any further steps which may appear necessary in emergencies can be left appropriately for the consideration of the temporary labor commission proposed in title IV of the substitute bill.

TITLE II. AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Title II of the substitute bill gives consideration to amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. Our purpose is the same as that professed for the amendments proposed by Senate bill 1126, that is, to strengthen the existing provisions in the light of more than 10 years of experience in their administration and to "equalize" the effect of the act by proscribing unfair labor practices for labor organizations as well as employers. In the substitute bill we have provided for a true equalization, however, whereas S. 1126 would harmfully weight the act against labor. Nonetheless we have found agreement with many helpful features of the reported amendments and we have put them in the bill. At the same time we have discarded those features which we feel are punitive or excessively severe.

PROHIBITION OF INVOLUNTARY INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

We have adopted, for instance, an amendment to the definition of employer contained in section 2 of the act, so as to include a group of employers only where they have associated themselves for collective bargaining. This is substantially the same as S. 1126 and would prevent the Board from forcing an unwilling employer to bargain through an association.

We are unalterably opposed, however, to prohibiting industry-wide collective bargaining as proposed by the Hartley bill passed in the House. We also gladly aided in defeating the amendment suggested by the senior Senator from Minnesota. These provisions would in effect prevent both employers and unions from voluntarily using their combined knowledge and skill to secure necessary stabilization of wage conditions except on a local scale within strictly limited areas. Now it seems to me that industry-wide bargaining does not produce strikes but rather that strikes usually result from a break-down in the bargaining process regardless of the area concerned. We cannot, therefore, attain industrial peace by limiting the bargaining unit in this fashion. Indeed we may increase unrest by exposing employers to individual campaigns by unions thereby forcing adherence to what may be unfair demands while the competitors of the employer continue to produce at lower labor costs.

A corresponding harmful effect would be to deprive unions of their power to protect themselves from the competition of low-wage areas and low-wage employers. Moreover, the prohibition would hopelessly complicate the wage structure and the bargaining tasks in companies with many plants in scattered localities. And it must be remembered that we would be forcing the renegotiation of contracts now providing a successful charter of operations in many industries for millions of workers—splitting asunder the uniform standards achieved over a long period through this very useful process. We cannot, therefore, permit such a useless attack upon what appears to be a beneficial system both for employers and employees.

SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

We must also disagree with provisions of S. 1126 which would exclude supervisory employees from the Labor Relations Act. We must willingly acknowledge in the light of the decisions of the Board and of the courts that bargaining by organizations of supervisory employees presents a delicate question for expert treatment and solution. We cannot submit to the proposal of S. 1126 to place completely independent organizations of supervisors outside the law. These workers have the same right to organize as other wage earners. They should be given a similar protection in the exercise of these rights. At the same time, they must be held to the same degree of responsibility in dealing with employers.

I can see no virtue in singling out these workers and herding them into a ghetto

where they become fair game for every recriminatory device developed by nonunion-minded employers during a century of industrial strife. And it would be equally unthinkable to deny employers protection from otherwise lawless forages which may understandably occur in the course of the inevitable struggle of these groups for economic security and self-protection. We therefore propose to deprive supervisory employees of their status under the act only where the circumstances present a real possibility of collusion with organizations of nonsupervisory employees. For this purpose we have denied such organizations the protection of the act where they also represent rank-and-file workers or where they are affiliated with or controlled by organizations of such workers.

EMPLOYER'S RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH AND OTHER FEATURES PERFECTING PRESENT PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

On the other hand, we wholeheartedly endorse the excellent protection afforded by S. 1126 to the right of employers to freedom of speech in matters of employee relations so long as the circumstances do not present elements of coercion. In fact, section 202 (a) of the substitute bill follows verbatim the language which has been used for this purpose in the reported bill.

We also concur in so much of the proposed amendment contained in section 9 (c) (1) which would permit employers to request certification of bargaining representatives whenever an unrecognized union claims the right to represent employees—or whenever the employer is confronted by competing unions both seeking the right to represent the same employees. We regard as ill-advised, however, the further step of permitting the employer to challenge the representation of certified unions at any time. We take this position on the grounds that this may well impair the stability of collective-bargaining relations and provoke damaging delays in the bargaining process productive of industrial strife. Accordingly section 203 (b) of the substitute bill guarantees to employers the right to ask for certification in the two instances which I have mentioned and leaves to appropriate rules or regulations of the Board the question of recertification of organizations already certified, provided that there is a bona fide doubt as to representation and the request is made at least 30 days before the contract expires. These restrictions will prevent unfairness and at the same time will permit a reasonable stability in employer-employee relations.

To correct a present deficiency of the statute in its protection of employees, we have undertaken by section 202 (c) of the substitute bill to make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate against an employee because he files statements with the Board. This problem is not at present covered, and I believe that the justice of this provision carries such obvious appeal that there can be no controversy in the mind of any reasonable man concerning its acceptability.

In further protection of the rights of employees and to insulate employers from possible charges of unfair bargaining practices, we have by section 203 clarified the right of individuals or groups to settle and adjust grievances under section 9 (a) of the act whenever the bargaining agent, although given the opportunity to participate, nonetheless does not indicate a desire to take part in the adjustment. This is in substantial agreement with similar amendments proposed by S. 1126 which present desirable grievance procedures for these special classes of cases.

Another provision of the substitute bill not found in S. 1126 but reflecting the present procedures of the Board and insuring their continued application, is an amendment to section 8 of the act to protect the legality of nondiscriminatory plant regulations of union activity on company time and property. This will permanently protect the employer in his undoubted prerogative to dispose of his employee's time during working hours.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES BY UNIONS AND THEIR OFFICIALS

Before discussing the major remaining amendments dealing with unfair labor practices by unions and their officials, I wish to point out at this time that in our opinion the act, as it would be amended by the changes which I have already discussed, will impose fair and adequate duties upon employers for the protection of employees. We therefore do not seek further to change the obligations of employers—nor do we seek to deprive employees of the privileges which these obligations undoubtedly confer.

On the other hand, S. 1126 would weaken and restrict by repeated amendment the provisions of section 8 which prescribe unfair labor practices of the employer. It would deprive employees of hard-won legislative gains and would actually result in greater inequalities under the semblance of putting both parties upon an equal statutory plane. These provisions are punitive and disruptive in character and I wish again to express our opposition to them.

We cannot support, for instance, the blanket prohibition of closed-shop contracts. These agreements now cover many hundreds of thousands of workers in industries, many of which are famous for their stable industrial relations, such as the glass, textile, and garment industries. Nor can we accede to rigorous limitation of union security agreements to a rigid type of union shop pattern as proposed by S. 1126. The necessity for supervising elections in these cases throw upon the Board a serious and totally unnecessary administrative burden. The provision making employers the sole judge of whether the employee has been rejected by the union for unjustifiable reasons, thereby entitling him to remain employed even when he is no longer a union member will undoubtedly encourage vicious antiunion activities within a plant supposedly stabilized by a union-shop contract.

Then there is also the related provision of section 9 (c) (2) of the amendments proposed by S. 1126 which would effectively weaken the duty of employers to refrain from dominating unions under section 8. This provision would require the Board to place upon ballots for election of representatives independent unions which have been ordered disestablished because they have been found to have been company dominated. This would be mandatory even though a cease-and-desist order had been issued the day before the election. In my opinion nothing would do more to revive the company union or to place the employer legitimately on both sides of the bargaining table without fear of committing an unfair labor practice under section 8.

Regarding unfair labor practices by unions or their agents, we find no disagreement with provisions prohibiting coercion of employers in their choice of collective bargaining representatives, and we agree that the phrase "interfering with" as deleted on motion of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] from S. 1126 would harmfully prevent the legitimate efforts of unions to attain or preserve effective bargaining on a company-wide or industry-wide basis. Since we are opposed to restrictions upon the bargaining area we have also deleted these words from a similar restraint proposed by section 202 (e) of the substitute bill.

We are not opposed to prohibiting the expulsion of the employee from the union or prohibiting the union from persuading the employer to discriminate against the union member where, under a closed-shop contract, he nonetheless aids competing unions in the plant. Here the union would otherwise be assured of perpetual tenure under a security agreement. There is no need, however, for protecting employees from coercion where the security agreement does not exist. The usual legal remedies—both criminal and civil—in our opinion provide adequate relief for unwarranted interference by unions under all other circumstances. We would therefore restrict the impact of the amendments contained in section 8 (b) (2), as proposed by S. 1126, to instances where the security agreement is in effect between the parties.

The requirement of S. 1126 that unions bargain collectively is an unnecessary feature which has not been adopted by the substitute bill. It is a well-known historical fact that strife and disintegration have not resulted from the refusal of unions to bargain. In fact, their very existence is dependent upon the bargaining process. Management, on the other hand, secure in reliance upon unquestioned economic superiority, has time and again sought to impose its own terms or to crush the union by refusing to bargain. The provision, moreover, would carry the implication that unions may not resort to the use of economic force but instead must settle all differences by negotiations in which the threat of strike would have no part. This is emphasized by the redefinition of collective bargaining under section 8 (d), as added by S. 1126 to include an obligation to refrain from striking for a period of 60 days after notice, subject to loss of the status of employee under the act. As we have stated repeatedly in the past—regarding the Case bill and other labor measures before the Congress—this is an unfair punitive device. The

employee would be made an economic pariah deprived of his means of livelihood whereas the employer would be met solely by a cease-and-desist order for a similar infraction. We have concluded that the union would enter any negotiations under an irreparable disadvantage imposed by a duty to bargain collectively and we therefore cannot agree to this provision of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call in order that we may propose another unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Morse
Baldwin	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	
Hatch	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after conferring with a number of Senators who are in charge of the bill for the proponents, as well as Senators in charge for the opponents, and also Senators interested in amendments, I submit for the consideration of the Senate a proposed unanimous consent agreement for a vote upon the amendments and final passage of the bill. I send the proposed order to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may thereafter be proposed, either of a perfecting nature or as a substitute, to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; thereafter no further debate on the bill shall be in order.

Ordered further That on the calendar day of Friday, May 16, 1947, at the hour of 11 a. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1126 as amended; that the third reading of the House bill as amended be considered as ordered; and that a vote be immediately taken upon the final passage of the said bill as amended.

Ordered further, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, immediately after Senate bill 1126 has been ordered to be read a third time, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me explain the proposed order. On Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at 2 p. m., it is proposed to vote on all amendments to the bill or substitutes for the bill. Debate will be concluded at 2 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday the 13th, and there will be a vote with no further debate.

Then it is proposed that we proceed with other business.

The last part of the order is to take up the European relief loan and any other business which may be transacted between Tuesday at 2 o'clock p. m. and Friday, May 16, at 11 o'clock a. m. At 11 o'clock on Friday we proposed to proceed to vote upon the final passage of the bill, without further delay.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it proposed to go from 2 o'clock on Tuesday until 11 o'clock on Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. Because that is the only time there is any prospect of obtaining a vote upon final passage of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, other provisions of S. 1126 relating to matters of administration of the National Labor Relations Act similarly have very unfortunate implications. The language of section 10 of the act, making the Board's remedy exclusive, has been inexplicably deleted without apparent cause. The 6 months' statute of limitations placed by section 10 (b) upon unfair labor practice complaints gives unjust assistance to employers or unions which commit those types of practices which are easily concealed and difficult to detect. The language of section 10 (j) permitting the Board to obtain temporary injunctive relief upon issuance of complaint has never been necessary and may bring undue pressure upon the Board to seek premature resort to the courts. The mandatory requirement of section 10 (l) of resort to court injunction prior to hearing in every case where complaint is filed charging unfair boycotts or jurisdictional disputes is a poorly concealed effort to bypass the Board and to evade the very purposes for which the Norris-LaGuardia Act was established. None of these provisions can be called sound or constructive and they have no part in an orderly revision of our present legal structure. The substitute bill does, however, accept and embody by section 204 the sound suggestion of S. 1126 permitting the Board, by agreement, to relinquish jurisdiction over minor cases to appropriate State agencies having effective jurisdiction over the subject matter. This clause will avoid troublesome conflicts which have arisen in the past.

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS AND JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

The repeated failure of the sponsors of S. 1126 to recognize the distinction between legitimate and unjustified boycotts or between jurisdictional disputes and traditionally recognized use of economic force to organize a competing plant, constitutes one of the most serious objections to this bill. We have constantly taken the position that a refusal to handle nonunion goods produced within a reasonable area of economic competition is a legitimate union activity. We have been completely unable to perceive the unexplainable position of the majority that the union employees in one plant cannot boycott nonunion goods from another plant for the purpose of securing collective-bargaining recognition even where the nonunion employer is guilty of unfair-labor practices. As stated by the President "the appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining." I am therefore perfectly willing to concede that strikes or boycotts are completely unjustified where their purpose is to secure recognition of a union other than the certified collective-bargaining representatives, thereby inducing an unfair-labor practice, or where they arise from disputes between competing unions over a division of work tasks in the plant of a particular employer.

These union activities inflict incalculable harm upon the fair-dealing, law-abiding union employer and I believe they should be subject to cease and desist orders of the Board and of the courts upon application of the Board. The substitute bill would therefore confine the broad provisions of S. 1126. By title III it would prescribe unfair labor practices only in these two instances of untenable activity, and, regarding jurisdictional disputes, would permit exclusive Board action only where the Board fails to find that the parties have failed peacefully to adjust their differences.

I do not say categorically that there cannot be other circumstances in which it may be desirable to regulate strikes or boycotts. It is very possible that a full investigation may disclose other necessary legislation in this regard, and the deliberations of a temporary commission investigating this field may reveal such a necessity. I do not propose at this time, however, to go beyond the area within which we have certain knowledge of abuse. Above all I cannot countenance any effort to open the doors of the Federal courts to wholesale injunction against these activities in the face of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and to the crippling imposition of antitrust laws upon the direct economic action by organized workers in protection of their common right to earn a living.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS AND LABOR ORGANIZATION MISCELLANEOUS

We can find no general fault with those provisions of S. 1126 which would require the Secretary of Labor to keep on file and make public collective-bargaining agreements and to make available nonconfidential data collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Accordingly, we have included these provisions within title IV of the substitute bill.

Companion provisions of S. 1126 which require unions to file certain information subject to public inspection are equally acceptable. Most of this information is now either filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the tax laws or constitutes matter of general public knowledge made available by the unions themselves. The substitute bill would, however, cause this information to be filed with and made public by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in order to avoid duplication of effort and the tremendously increased costs of maintaining these files, which would otherwise be imposed upon the Department of Labor.

We of the minority do not see the wisdom of permitting suits in the Federal courts concerning the violation of collective-bargaining agreements regardless of the amount involved or of the constitutional requirement of diversity of citizenship. It is clear that the Federal courts are already open to these suits where the present Federal requirements are met, and we object to burdening them with a host of petty litigation not heretofore countenanced in any way. The State courts are adequate for the purposes of these petty suits. We have nonetheless found that there is a present inability of Federal courts to permit union assets to be reached easily in the few States where the application of State procedural laws prevent suits against unincorporated associations. For this reason section 601 would grant jurisdiction in otherwise justiciable contract actions where suit is brought by or against a union in its common name.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I regard the program contained in this substitute bill as the soundest and most effective method of reforming our national laws on labor relations. It avoids such harsh and unrealistic measures as those restricting the normal development of welfare funds. It permits the voluntary use of industry-wide bargaining and resort to legitimate boycotts in furtherance of sound union objectives. It would strengthen the excellent mediation machinery of the Federal Government without imposing experimentally novel and administratively grotesque structures and devices to the utter confusion of management, labor, and the Government itself. This act possesses all the teeth that any law of this kind needs in order to achieve the industrial peace which has appeared so important to us in our discussion of this subject.

Moreover, this substitute is consistent with the recommendations of President Truman in his state of the Union message delivered to us last January. It is sure to receive a ready acceptance at the White House, whereas the present bill—already severe—is being laden with damaging amendments, and will have to run the gantlet of a conference on a much more stringent House measure which would warrant an immediate veto.

I repeat, Mr. President, this substitute is not a complete answer to every labor problem, but it is the best answer this Senate can give at the present time. Some problems, seemingly pressing or insoluble, will undoubtedly work themselves out in the absence of legislation. Others may eventually require wise consideration and control by appropriate laws. I do not believe, however, that we can devise an adequate remedy at any time to every national ache and pain. Nonetheless, I feel that it is the duty of the Congress to investigate every symptom and to lay bare every fact which may reveal the cause and cure of industrial disputes.

I therefore urge that we seriously consider the creation of a Temporary Joint Commission To Investigate Causes of Labor Disputes, to be created in accordance with the recommendations of the President, as provided under title V of the substitute bill, and to be composed of 12 members equally appointed from both Houses of Congress and of 8 representatives of management, labor, and the public, to be appointed by the President. This Commission would have full subpena powers to aid in its duties. It would be directed to make a preliminary report at the next session of Congress, on January 5, 1948; and it would have to submit a final report not later than April 15, 1948, presenting the results of its findings and its recommendations for further legislation.

In that way—and only in that way—shall we be fulfilling our obligations to the American people, with due regard for the rights and interests of all.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Star of April 25, 1947]

CONCILIATION SERVICE

One provision of the House and the Senate labor bills which deserves more careful consideration than it seems to have received is that which takes the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor and sets it up as an independent agency.

The reasons for this move are obscure. One theory seems to be that since the Department of Labor is charged with the duty of representing labor, a subordinate agency of the Department cannot function fairly in a mediatory role. Another argument is that the present set-up brings the Government into labor disputes in a partisan role.

Actually, however, no evidence has been produced to show that the Conciliation Service has functioned either as a prolabor or as a political agency. On the contrary, there is much testimony on the record from spokesmen for management and labor that the Service as currently constituted has functioned impartially and effectively. One of the few recommendations upon which the President's labor-management conference of 1946 could agree called for "reorganization of the United States Conciliation Service to the end that it will be established as an effective and completely impartial agency within the Department." The reorganization of the Service within the Department has taken place, its effectiveness is attested by the settlement of more than 13,000 disputes last year, and there is no complaint of partiality. So why take it out of the Labor Department?

Another proposed change which deserves more scrutiny is the provision for a 60-day waiting period before a labor contract can be abrogated. At best, the usefulness of this is dubious, and many experienced negotiators believe that it actually makes more difficult the adjustment of disputes. In any event, it is a point which should get more attention during the Senate debate than it has received in committee.

A final point, but an important one, has to do with funds for this agency. The Conciliation Service has been doing a good job. But Congress now is considering a reduction in its funds and a complete revamping of its organizational structure. With the prospects for future industrial harmony being none too good, the legislators would be well advised to look a little more carefully before they take this leap.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Washington Post of April 26, 1947]

SENATE LABOR BILL

As debate on the Taft bill got under way in the Senate yesterday, its superiority over the labor reform bill passed by the House was generally conceded. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was less impetuous than was the House. It brought in a bill dealing with a great many phases of labor-management relations, but it didn't try to sweep into one measure every suggestion that had been made to it. The comparative modesty of the bill is further illustrated by its provision for a joint committee on labor-management relations to conduct a thorough study of this momentous subject.

In short, the Senate recognizes that it is better to correct the most glaring defects in the present law and take another look at the problem next year when the results of the first wave of reforms can be more effectively appraised.

This seems to us to reflect much better judgment than was evident in the all-out impetuous gesture of the House. There is no occasion for cracking down. There is an occasion for enactment of reasonable and just legislation that will curb the grave abuse of power by many labor groups in recent years. We hope that the Senate will act with determination, but also with wisdom and a mature sense of restraint. That, in our view, is the essence of the democratic method.

Unquestionably the Senate bill could be improved in many respects. It seems to us a mistake to lift the Conciliation Service, whatever it may be called, out of the Department of Labor. Work toward the settlement of industrial disputes is perhaps the foremost function of the Department. If Congress continues to chip off segments of the Department, it will no longer have a raison d'etre. Nor does the bill go as far as we think it should in strengthening the important conciliation function. The conciliators ought to have a chance to settle disputes affecting interstate commerce before and not after strikes are called. We should much prefer the Committee for Economic Development's plan of postponing strikes for a brief period while the conciliators are at work. Nevertheless, this section of the bill is on the credit side, except that it tends to splinter the Labor Department.

Some notable advantages may be seen in the Senate plan to reorganize the National Labor Relations Board. The Taft bill would give the NLRB seven members instead of three, making possible two panels consisting of three or more members to speed up the disposition of cases. Even more important is the listing of unfair labor practices on the part of unions. This should have been done, of course, when the act was originally passed. One of the reasons why sentiment for labor reform now tends to run to extremes is the long-standing bias of the law in its special regard for the rights of some and total disregard for the rights of others.

Without assuming to approve this entire section of a technical bill, we applaud the determination of both Houses of Congress to restore this balance.

Something must also be done to give the Government power to deal with strikes that imperil the national safety or welfare. We do not think, however, that the Senate Committee has done much better than the House in handling this delicate problem. It would permit such strikes to be halted by injunction upon request of the Attorney General after he has had an investigation made by a board of inquiry. An injunction might remain in effect 60 days and the Board in that period could subject the parties to the pressures of publicity. An election would finally be held, if no settlement were otherwise effected, in which the employees would be asked if they wished to accept the last offer of their employers. Then the injunction would be discharged and the President would report the whole proceedings to Congress. Surely the Senate can do better than this in creating a protective device that will save our economy from paralysis and at the same time be fair to employees and employers alike. We hope that the Senate will subject the bill to the same rigid scrutiny that it gave the Greek-aid bill, with the single purpose of effecting improvements without weakening any of the safeguards now recognized as being essential to make collective bargaining work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana has given a rather comprehensive and clear explanation of the provisions of the substitute and of the distinctions between it and the bill reported by the committee.

The substitute was sent to the desk only a short time ago. Of course, Senators have had no opportunity to examine it or to attend in large numbers to hear the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

Therefore, I wonder whether it would be inappropriate to suggest the reasonableness of having the matter go over until the Senate resumes its session at 11 o'clock on Monday, at which time debate on the substitute or upon the committee bill may be resumed. I should like to address the Senate at that time upon the subject.

I wish to repeat what I said a while ago, that I personally think the debate upon the substitute and the bill should run certainly through Monday. At any time after Monday, beginning with the session on Tuesday, I personally shall be ready to vote on the substitute or on any amendments or upon the question of the final passage of the bill. I think it not unwise or unreasonable that the Senate debate at least through Monday, or have the privilege of debate at least through Monday, the substitute or any other possible amendments to the bill itself. Neither the proponents nor the opponents of the main bill have had any appreciable time to address themselves to the bill as a whole or to the substitute as a whole, which in an affirmative way present alternative approaches to the problem.

So, Mr. President, at this time of the night I see no necessity for detaining the Senate, when Senators have not had an opportunity to read the substitute or to hear the explanation which has been made of it. So I wonder whether the acting majority leader will be disposed to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday. If so, and if it is consistent with the pleasure of the majority leader and of the Senate, I should like to address myself to the substitute and to the bill, beginning with the session on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure in my own mind that the suggestion made by the able Senator from Florida is fair. I think the substitute should be debated, and I think we should look it over.

In view of the request which has been made and in view of the inability to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the time for voting, if agreeable to the Senate I should like now to suggest that the Senate take a recess until Monday at 11 a. m.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that I hope the Senate will take a recess at this time, and that the substitute will be printed.

I had not expected to speak on this subject; but in view of the form into which I think this proposed labor legislation is shaping itself, I shall desire to speak after the Senator from Florida and other Senators who may wish to speak are heard from, because I do not think it worth while for the Senate to pass a labor bill which will mean absolutely nothing to the American people.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. AIKEN introduced Senate bill 1263, for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1264. A bill to extend the time within which alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces may be admitted into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 1, COLCHESTER, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Prudential Committee of Fire District No. 1, of the town of Colchester, Vt., I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill. I request that an explanatory statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Vermont will be presented in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1263) for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt., introduced by Mr. AIKEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

In 1941 the fire district was in the process of building a new sewer line as a WPA project. At the same time the Army was seeking new sewerage facilities necessitated by the expansion of Fort Ethan Allen, which borders upon the fire district. The Army and the fire district entered into an agreement whereby the Army was to take over and complete the sewer line for the district in consideration of the district's allowing the Army to tap onto and use the sewer. In this agreement the Army reserved the right to repair and did in fact repair one break in 1943.

In the latter part of the same year other breaks occurred which the Army would not repair. The district subsequently made the repairs, at a cost of $10,562.07. For this expenditure the district was reimbursed by the Congress by Private Law 473, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 13, 1944.

Again in 1946 breaks occurred in the sewer which were repaired by the district. The total cost was $30,190.16 and it is the purpose of this bill to reimburse the district for this sum.

The Army has heretofore admitted that these numerous breaks were caused by the failure to use proper construction methods originally.

I have consulted with the Office of the Legislative Counsel and they have informed me that, in their opinion, this bill is not banned by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, inasmuch as this claim arises from the contract between the Army and the fire district and therefore is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 12, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, as we tread the aisles of life, make us one with our fellow men—one in faith, one in sacrifice, and one in endurance. As Thou dost teach us the larger meaning of human life, make us humbly glad to live in these challenging times; may we not shun, but glory, in the pain which provides the elements of victory, thus making the wrath of man to praise Thee.

Do Thou bless our Speaker and the Congress. In these hours of honest striving, enable them to fulfill their highest aims, that contentment may abound with industry and that all may be brought within the circle of peace and happy hearthstones. O fashion all lives, from the humblest to the chiefest, putting virtue above success and devotion to our Lord above every other loyalty. Use us in enriching the lives of others and by our ministry bring them to the heights. In the name of Him who said to all men: "Our Father." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the

House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News.

GREEK-TURKISH AID

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, right after President Truman delivered his message to the Congress, asking aid for both Turkey and Greece, I realized that this would be the most important and far-reaching problem we in the Congress would be asked to decide this session. For this reason I immediately brought this matter to the attention of my constituents through my next news letter. In that letter I tried to give an unbiased opinion and asked for comments from those who had studied the problem. The letters that followed that request were very encouraging. I was pleased to learn that many of my people had already given serious thought to this drastic change in our foreign policy. The majority of my constituents favored our giving aid, but a large percentage felt that the United Nations should not be bypassed.

As the debate on this bill continues, many feel that the United Nations, imperfect as it is, must be given the opportunity to determine what is the best procedure. From the beginning I have supported the United Nations organization, hoping that this representative group would become so strong and effective we might forever be assured of everlasting peace. Millions all over the world, I am sure, have that same hope. Let us not be ready to throw the United Nations out of the window until we have given it a real test and a fair trial. However, if it is proved during the debate that action is imperative and that the United Nations cannot at this time take care of this proposition, I feel I shall vote for the bill because I believe its passage is essential for our national security. As a nation, we cannot afford to sit back and rest on our laurels. This is a world problem, and as the leading nation in this world, we have our responsibilities. We, as a nation, have talked of preserving liberty, of promoting democracy and freedom. History has proved that we cannot sit back and accomplish these things. Personally, I do not believe the passage of this bill means war. Quite to the contrary, I believe it expresses the willingness on the part of our great country to fight totalitarianism, and this fact will stamp out the threats calculated to destroy liberty.

HAS UNCLE SAM FORGOTTEN OUR OLD FOLKS?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering opening the Public Treasury to send $400,000,000 overseas, much of which, according to plan, is to be used for developing the resources, economy, and for relief of the peoples of foreign lands, some of whom did not join with us in the recent war. The United States since the war's end has made available for world aid $21,058,422,818, as follows:

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
World Fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain, Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,422,818

Would it not be good judgment while considering this huge expenditure for the Congress to grant some relief to the old folks here in America as well? There are in excess of 10,000,000 American citizens over the age of 60 years, many of them in want and distress, yet the Congress has denied their appeals down through the years for some relief. Many of them receive a stipend of old-age assistance of less than $10 per month and the average is a little more than $25 a month, while living costs are mounting skyward. I urge consideration of H. R. 16 now while these funds are still available to give some ray of hope to our old folks at home. Let us bring the bill out on the floor for a debate and passage.

GREEK-TURKISH AID

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district want to stop communism and want to give reasonable aid to the peoples of Europe. I have not participated in the debate of H. R. 2616, known as the loan to Greece and Turkey, as I felt certain others here were more qualified to speak on the subject. So for 3 days I have sat and listened, and have come to the definite conclusion that this undertaking, which would give $400,000,000, including an unknown amount of military aid to Turkey and Greece, is the first step in a program which would eventually become world-wide in scope. Further, I am convinced that this administration is again starting on an over-all plan to extend aid, both financial and military, to Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, China, Korea, Iraq, Arabia, Iran, and possibly some other countries, including Russia. We are again starting to use American dollars and soldiers to settle the political and domestic quarrels of a foreign nation, which is contrary to American tradition.

In my opinion this contemplated program will cost ten to fifteen billion dollars, and might possibly lead to war. I recall what Mr. Churchill, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, said before the Second World War, and I quote: "Give us the implements and we will do the job."

Certainly this program is open to criticism. Government officials are not taking the people into their confidence. Why does our State Department not tell the true and full picture of where this program might lead? The people will have to contribute every dollar, and if the worst should come—if war should develop as a result of the clash of ideologies—the people would have to do the fighting, the suffering, and the dying.

Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress has an obligation to support his conscience and his own convictions, and some of us, at least, have a deep conviction that this bill, H. R. 2616, the loan to Greece and Turkey, is going to lead us right down the road to bread lines, bankruptcy, or to war all over the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

OUR NEW FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, the message of President Truman to Congress on March 12, 1947, promulgated a new American foreign policy, in proposing to extend financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey, and to asume new political responsibilities in the Mediterranean area.

This new step imposes upon us, as American citizens, a grave responsibility and because of our special interest and knowledge of the conditions in the Near East, I would like to present certain important facts for the serious consideration of our Government, and point out the far-reaching implications of the proposed new foreign policy in the Near East.

We saved the world from Hitlerism at a cost of $300,000,000,000 plus the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives of our American youth. Now we are asked to save the world from communism at a cost that can neither be estimated nor predicated. This first request of $400,000,000 is only the beginning. It means that President Truman's new foreign policy will also mean that Uncle Sam ac-

cepts the role of world policeman; that from now on he will have to furnish the military might required to stop trouble wherever and whenever it arises in any corner of the world. It will mean that he has taken over the responsibilities and obligations that we had hoped a strong United Nations organization would assume and carry.

During the last days of World War II conflict we had appeased Russia and permitted her to disseminate propaganda throughout eastern Europe, Greece, and Italy, thus dominating the greater part of that section of the world. Her power was felt in Italy and aided materially through UNRRA, startling the world with its 2,250,000 votes in the last election.

Let us not forget that this work was carried on in Italy before the very eyes of our military government, the very entrances to their offices were placarded with "Vote Communista." No attempt was made then, nor since, in behalf of Italy, to ward off this communistic trend. Why now the cry to save Greece and Turkey? Is it to save England's face or the oil fields of Iran and Iraq for the rich promoters? How much easier it would have been to help Italy after she became a cobelligerent, with her problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation, rather than now by the cry, "Help Greece and Turkey to save Italy."

The proposed Italian peace treaty, which is before the Senate today, is a drastic one and should not be ratified. If ratified in its present form, Italy will be rendered helpless before her Communist dominated neighbor Yugoslavia, whose dictator, Tito, is a Charlie McCarthy of Stalin.

Thus the provisions of the Italian peace treaty, that the United States has agreed to, go absolutely contrary to President Truman's announced foreign policy in connection with aid to Greece and Turkey. On the one hand we strengthen Stalin's hands by weakening Italy, and on the other hand we propose to strengthen Greece and Turkey in order to block Tito and Stalin. Does this make sense? Can Uncle Sam ride with the hounds and run with the hare at one and the same time?

Communism cannot be fought with bullets. To defeat communism you must prevent hunger and starvation. You must feed them, shelter them, and clothe them. Have we done this for the people of Italy? If we had the votes in their last election would have been 2,250 instead of 2,250,000 Communist votes.

If America is sincere in fighting communism, why then did she, through the action of her representatives to the United Nations, vote not to recognize Franco? Why does she still give aid to the communistic forces in the Far East?

I believe America can enhance her prestige and win the admiration and respect of the people everywhere only by championing the cause of justice and decency.

Wake up, America. Watch your step. You might be sowing the seeds of World War III.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 53]

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Preston
Battle	Hand	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Bland	Hart	Sabath
Bonner	Hartley	St. George
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Camp	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Jensen	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Kennedy	Somers
Cox	Keogh	Stanley
Crosser	McDowell	Taylor
Curtis	McGarvey	Thomas, N. J.
D'Alesandro	Macy	Thomason
Davis, Tenn.	Maloney	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Dingell	Meade, Ky.	Wilson, Ind.
Dirksen	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Fellows	Mitchell	Wood
Fisher	Morrison	Worley
Fuller	Norrell	Zimmerman
Gifford	O'Hara	
Gossett	Owens	
Grant, Ind.	Ploeser	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, many Members have asked me about the program in respect to the consideration of this bill and final action thereon. So, I have asked for this minute in order to announce for the information of the Members that the consideration of the bill will continue through the day. If it is not finally concluded this evening, consideration will continue on tomorrow. However, it is hoped that there will be sufficient and ample time for discussion of all matters in connection with the bill and amendments during the day so that action can be concluded this evening.

CONGRESS WILL HONOR THEM

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, that the ideals of American youth are still secure and sound foundation material upon which the future of the American Government may rest with confidence was demonstrated here Tuesday when Dick Smith, Virginia Marakle, Ruth Pigott, and Virginia Lanham, four Western High School students of Washington stopped their ears against the godless ideology of communism that was being preached to them in a lecture and got up and marched out of the school building as a fitting rebuke to the speaker, a Mrs. Lewis, the Russian-born wife of a former American envoy.

The spirit of Paul Revere was exemplified, and their patriotic action will arouse millions of Americans throughout our land to the dangerous inroads communism is making into our schools and colleges. Here is a story the press and the motion-picture industry of the Nation should spread before all the people. It will help to clean the Communist cells and rat nests out of our institutions of learning.

Congress, the representatives of the people, will honor these four fine young people in a fitting ceremony Tuesday afternon at 5 o'clock in the Ways and Means Committee room. It is said that Speaker MARTIN and other congressional leaders will eulogize their actions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "In the Nation," by Arthur Krock.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Tablet.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper items.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a copy of a letter from a constituent to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address Our Stake in Greece, delivered by Mr. Paul A. Porter before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two telegrams from officials of the city of Shreveport.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the agricultural program.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram he received from, and a telegram he sent to, the North Adams Chamber of Commerce.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there were pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and an amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Page 2, line 11, after the words "in an advisory capacity only", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and add the following: "*Provided, however*, That not more than 100 such personnel are to be utilized in either country at one time under the terms of this act without further authorization from Congress."

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD to the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Strike out the figure "100" and insert the figure "200."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third day that the House has spent in the consideration of this legislation. If we go over to tomorrow, many of our Members would be forced to be away. I sincerely hope, and I believe it is the hope of us all, that we can get through this bill today with plenty of time for all the discussion of the bill that is necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever come before the Congress. If, in order to get a vote on this bill today, they are going to try to rush it through, the Nation will suffer irreparable damage I think you should continue this for a week or a month if necessary. I do not think you ought to try to close it today. It ought to continue until the American people know what is happening.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this is very important legislation, but I believe that the intelligence is so high in this body that we ought to be able to solve the problem in 4 days. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to go on until the end of time.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MERROW. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want the people of my district and the people of the country to know that I am vigorously supporting this legislation without crippling amendments because of its political, strategic, and, if you please, especially because of its military aspects.

I wonder what we are afraid of. The security of the United States is at stake. There are no longer any frontiers. Our interests are global. What has happened during the past few years? Mr. Stalin and his associates have expanded as rapidly as possible. They have spread communism wherever and whenever possible. They have organized Communist Parties in every country where it is possible to organize them, including our own. They have not kept their solemn agreements, including Potsdam, Yalta, and the Atlantic Charter. They have not lived up to the spirit of the United Nations.

Furthermore, in reference to Greece, Moscow-controlled Communists are ready to take over. In connection with Turkey, Russia has demanded bases on the Dardanelles. From the activities of Russia it is apparent that the Soviet Union is on the road to world domination.

I would like to know how much longer this country is going to be insulted by those who are in control of the Soviet Government before we are willing to take firm action. How much longer do both sides of our face have to be slapped before we are willing to take a stand?

Mr RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Would not this amendment or either of them be an appeasement of Russia and tie the hands of our administration?

Mr. MERROW. Exactly. I am glad the gentleman has made this observation. We tried appeasement through the 1930's. We tried to appease Hitler, and we failed. Since the end of World War II we have been trying to appease Soviet Russia, and we have completely failed. In addition, the Russians have deadlocked every conference, and now they hope that we will become weary with exhaustion and finally begin to make compromises on principles.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The outside limit of this amendment is 200 men. Russia has more spies than that in this country now.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly. She has the largest land army in the world. I wonder if it is not possible for us to learn from the all too recent bitter lesson of history. When Mr. Hitler invaded the Rhineland, many said it was no concern of ours. We were not willing to do anything about it. We insisted that we would keep out of European difficulties. I say, if we had had the Truman doctrine then, a doctrine which I hope will become the American doctrine, we probably would have avoided World War II. This is recent history. Within the last few years we have seen history repeating itself.

We are attempting to limit the number of military men we are to send to Greece and Turkey. Whatever number is necessary to send in order to stop the Russian march to world domination ought to be sent. We ought to take an immediate stand.

The alternative to action in the Mediterranean area is too horrible and too awful to contemplate. If Turkey falls, as has been said again and again, then the eastern Mediterranean will go and finally the Mediterranean will become a Soviet lake. All of Europe will be under the control of Russia. This will mean trouble and we will not have the time for preparation we had in World War II. There will be no England or France to give us time to get ready. One of the best things we can do in this country is to establish and keep a strong Army and a strong Navy. Yesterday I was glad to hear someone make a plea for a strong air force. I have often said we should maintain air supremacy at all costs. I believe that firm and resolute action now will save millions of American lives in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order to answer the gentleman's questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree absolutely with the gentleman's statement with reference to appeasement. However, would it not be much more forthright for us to ask for mobilization of our forces now?

Mr. MERROW. That may be; and if you are willing to do that, why should you oppose this bill and advocate crippling amendments?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I assume the gentleman would also favor the proposition of stopping any shipment of essential materials to Russia or any country dominated by Russia?

Mr. MERROW. Well, the gentleman may be talking about the recent lend-lease agreement, which is another subject. We entered into solemn agreements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly, the gentleman has stated that Russia has broken every agreement she has made with our country.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And still the gentleman wants us to go through with the other agreement.

Mr. MERROW. I did not state that I wished to go through with the agreements. I think they should be carefully considered and if it is necessary to stop communism, we should stop shipments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we are to try to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, why do we not go out to the Uline Arena where there are 400 of them right now in our own city?

Mr. MERROW. All right. I am willing to stop communism in the United States, but that is no argument against action to halt the march of Russia to world domination. If Europe falls and the Mediterranean and oil of the Persian Gulf is cut off, the United States is in peril.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The substance of your remarks, as I understand them, is you think that war with Russia is inevitable. If you believe that, why do you not ask for a declaration of war?

Mr. MERROW. I do not think it is inevitable, but I think the passage of this measure will undoubtedly prevent war with Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are starting it now.

Mr. MERROW. If Russia thinks this is a declaration of war, then let her make the most of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. That is what you want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, toward the close of debate yesterday, according to page 4820 of the RECORD, there are 14 of us who, I thought, were going to be given time to speak on this amendment. I just mention that, because I hope we will not be shut off in this move to hurry this bill through. Are those 14 men still to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. However, the Chair will state that no request was submitted. The request was withdrawn.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry on the matter of procedure?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly will.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee stated this morning that he hoped we would finish this bill today. He also said he would like to have an opportunity for those who have not yet been heard to be heard; yet the first move when we started the debate was for a member of the committee to ask for two additional minutes. Now another member of the committee is recognized. I am very glad to hear him, but I am wondering if Members other than members of the committee are going to be heard. I will ask the chairman of the committee to answer my question.

Mr. EATON. That, I think, rests on the initiative of the Members themselves who want to be heard. I decline to accept responsibility for parceling out the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But under the rule, the Chairman perforce must recognize members of the committee first.

Mr. EATON. The chairman of the committee did not make the rules and declines to accept responsibility for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but he does have some restriction, I suppose, over the members of the committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, how much of my time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute of the gentleman's time has been consumed.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, unless some other Members of the House are going to be recognized other than members of the committee, I will have to object to future requests of this nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his time for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for the balance of his 5 minutes and for two additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope to nail down these two amendments that have been submitted to tie the hands of the American Government and to keep our representatives from exercising good administrative sense either now or in the future under the future circumstances as they arise.

Why do I say I am against these amendments? Because they say to the world—and they are sponsored by very fine members of our Foreign Affairs Committee—that they tie the hands of America. Why not include in the amendments a similar provision that would bind Joe Stalin's hands? If they would modify the amendments and say that they are going to bind Joseph Stalin just as they are going to bind the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of State and the President, then I, too, would be for the amendments.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It seems to me like an invitation to Joe Stalin to come and get us. In effect it says: "Come and get us. We are over here helpless, innocuous, inane; come and get us."

Mr. FULTON. That is a very fine statement, Judge.

It was the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], who said on yesterday:

> It seems to me that this amendment is just one more illustration of the thought a great many people have, that if we only tie our own hands we are safe.

Maybe we had better be talking about someone else's hands rather than trying to emasculate our own foreign policy.

I am against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and against the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], for another reason: The numbers 100 and 200 suggested by each of these men in their respective amendments have no relationship to actuality, they have no relationship to any reason. They are numbers just taken out of the air because they said: "Well, Secretary Patterson estimated 10 to 40." The gentleman from South Dakota said "I will double it," and then the gentleman from Minnesota came along and said: "I will double Mr. MUNDT's figure." Now, if you are just going to reach around and pick figures out of the air you are going to tie the handcuffs on yourselves without knowing their size.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman read the language on page 4 of the committee report, in the paragraph headed "Kind of military assistance proposed." The committee made this official statement to the Congress and the world:

> Testimony of Government witnesses indicates that the military mission to Greece would probably not exceed 40, and the naval mission would probably be less. In the case of Turkey it is expected that the missions would not be larger.

Is that picked out of thin air?

Mr. FULTON. All right; then why did the gentleman say "200"? Why did not the gentleman stay closer to 40?

Mr. JUDD. I was allowing for emergencies that might arise. I do not, as I said yesterday, want to limit in the slightest degree the United States. But the Congress which has the responsibility under the Constitution for declaring war ought to make clear to the country in the bill itself what the limitations are that the Congress of the United States is placing on the military of the United States in line with what the committee states in its official report is its understanding of those limitations.

Mr. FULTON. The trouble with the gentleman's estimate is that he is only taking into consideration little emergencies. He is not taking the big ones into consideration.

If we will notice the reason for putting these amendments in, and if we will look at them the way the gentlemen themselves look at them we may get an idea. For instance, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said in committee:

> I think it would be very comforting to the American public to have this limit.

The gentleman has forgotten that it will be comforting to Joe Stalin and a lot of people over there too.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says:

> I think we could pick up a great many votes here in the House of Representatives if we were all assured and voted for these amendments.

I disagree with the gentleman from Minnesota on that and will not change

this bill to pick up votes. We take it the way it is or leave it. We have to look the problem straight in the face and not avoid it by amendment. We better meet the issue and not try to hang a little sweetmeat on the bill to attract votes. I am not here to attract votes.

It has been brought out by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that the Secretary said one thing. However, the Secretary came back to an executive session and said he had made a mistake. The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], a member of our committee, very ably brought that out when he said yesterday that the Secretary stated in the second hearing it would be most unwise to tie the hands of his Department and the Navy Department in reference to this point.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] said she is for these amendments because the purpose of the proposal, as she sees it, is not troops but it is economy.

People do want to economize. May I say that if you are trying to guess far ahead on economy in the future in a world such as we have today, you better try to do some real guessing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I shall not burden you again by my suggestions in regard to this bill, and I think I shall not, but it lies deeply in my heart the thing that we are considering at this time, and I felt impelled to say what I have said and now feel impelled to speak again. The difference between you and me is simply this: I am not alarmed like you who are supporting this bill are. Christianity has been a religion in this world for about 2,000 years, yet less than half of the people of the world have accepted it. No philosophy, whether true or untrue, is going to sweep this world like you say it will. Communism is not going to make the inroads that you say it will.

I respect your sincerity; I know you are honest, honorable, and upright men and women; I know you are capable men and women; I know you want to do the right thing; but, in my judgment, you are doing the wrong thing. My judgment is that you are filled with fear and hysteria that has been superinduced by publicity to the point where you have lost your heads and you are going to do an unseemly thing because of all this propaganda. Now, that is my judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experiences in my own life that have taught me some things.

For instance, I was a kid 18 years old and I enlisted as a soldier in the First World War. I fought in half a dozen of the bloodiest battles ever fought in that World War. They told us most every day in the newspapers that the Germans were cutting the arms off of Belgian children, crucifying Canadian soldiers, pitching up children and catching them on their bayonets. I got over there and found that none of that was true.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of this Committee, I call your attention to the fact that when people become alarmed, when they become scared, when they become so zealous about a situation, they always overstate the case, and the case here is being overstated, I tell you. Logic teaches me that communism cannot defeat democracy. If we will just sit steady in the boat and serve our people well in this great country of ours, if we will give them the service they are entitled to, we will stop communism in its tracks. It cannot get anywhere in the world.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that he has no fear of Russian expansion in this area. If so, if there is no desire on the part of Russia to move into this area, what difference will it make how many people we have over there? Whom will we harm? Whom will we offend? If Russia has no expansionist desires, how are you going to offend anybody by sending these people over there?

Mr. MORRIS. I did not say that Russia has no expansionist desires. Of course they have expansionist desires. But my point is, they cannot expand like you say they can. We will resist them. The people of the other nations will resist them and the world will resist them.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman means that the 200 will resist them and that the 200 will be adequate to inspire those people to stand up against the largest army in the world? Or had we not better tell those people we are going to back them up? Is not that what this is for? We are telling them we are backing them up with all we have.

Mr. MORRIS. Give me time to answer the question, if you please. I want to retain in the power of this Congress the right to declare war, and if we send them over there, with unlimited power, and do not reserve the constitutional right to declare war, we do not know what kind of an incident is going to happen, and they could send an army over there and we would be helpless, and we may be catapulted into a war, with the hatred that so many seem to have in their hearts, with the desire that we seem to have, and I am sorry to say, my friends, but the desire we seem to have, as is exemplified here every day, is to practically run the world. That is the program we are getting into. I know our purpose is noble; of course it is. I know we are going in for a noble purpose, but we went into the First World War with a noble purpose. We were going over there to make the world safe for democracy. We were going over there to fight a war to end all wars, and I fought as hard as anybody could fight, and it is worse now than it was then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are today considering what kind of assistance we propose to give to two countries that have asked us for help in stemming the tide of influences that is being brought to bear upon them by outside forces. We heard in the committee many things of deep interest, with which many of us were already conversant. Most of us were in agreement with the administration, that it is imperative for us to do something for these countries.

As the bill is written, what we propose is not military action. We do not propose under this bill to replace the garrison troops the British have. We have been asked for assistance in training; we propose to give assistance in training. The fact that the Secretary of War, in the beginning, said that under 50 men were all that would be needed and that he later on apparently told the committee that it would be unwise to make such a limitation seems to me to present us with a very real problem.

For myself, I should like to see this House amend this bill in some fashion to make it very clear that what we propose to send over there is a training mission and not combat troops. From my own personal knowledge of the situation, I feel that any show of armed troops at this time would very likely bring upon the world something which neither Russia nor the United States anticipates or wants. I should be exceedingly reluctant to believe that we do not have the courage to make it very clear that we do not propose that kind of action. If there ever was a moment in history that needs restraint, it is this moment. I would urge upon this House the need for great wisdom and great restraint in the action it takes at this time.

Naturally, there are going to be many interests that are going to try to bring pressure upon the War Department and the Navy Department to send troops to guard whatever is done there. I am very reluctant to have us permit ourselves the temptation of armed forces. I should like to see a very clear definition of what it is that we propose to do. It is very apparent from the discussion on the floor that the Members are not clear as to the intent and purpose in this bill, and certainly, if the Members are confused, we cannot expect the people to be clear in their minds as to what we really expect to do. For myself, I do not see this as the moment or the occasion for military troops, and I should prefer to see some such statement in the text. I do see it very much the occasion for specialists of every sort and kind, including the military, that there may be a rebirth of hope in the hearts of all the sorely-tried, freedom-loving people of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree with the very able remarks just made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. Certainly under the language of the bill, it is very clear that what she so ably stated is the intention of the Congress and of our Government.

I again read the language in the bill, and I think it is the strongest language the committee could put in other than

something along the lines of either one of the two pending amendments, which I think it would be unwise to adopt. The bill says, "By detailing a limited number of members of the military services." "Limited" is a word of restriction. It is further restricted by saying that those sent over there can act only in an advisory capacity, and "advisory" certainly is a restrictive condition or stipulation.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my very sincere and conscientious friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], and as I listened to him the thought came to my mind that we are living in a very practical world. His remarks and utterances might well be followed if this were not a rapidly changing world and if conditions were not so disturbed as they are today and if a powerful nation were not challenging the civilization and way of life that the people of other nations believe in. His remarks carry me to a dream world. I share his hopes, but I cannot come to the same conclusions as he does in view of the world conditions as they exist today.

My only interest, like the interest of every other Member of the House, is the national interest of the United States. I say it is in our national interest not to let this wave envelop country after country until it envelops all of Europe. If it ever reaches that point, it will overrun all of Asia and thus actually reach our shores.

My friend from Oklahoma disregards the fact that that advancing wave does not permit the people to exercise their free will in the selection of their government, that small groups are supported directly or indirectly, who then obtain control of the government by any means possible. When control is taken over then the decent elements who resist are either driven underground or are liquidated by the means and processes that are followed by the totalitarian ruler of today.

There is a spirit behind it—a spirit of aggression and viciousness. I picked up the newspapers of only this morning. What do we find as evidence of that spirit? We find an attack on the report of former Governor Stassen by Isvestia, by the Soviet press. That constitutes an attack on the American press. The purpose of that is not to spread propaganda in the United States because it would not have any effect except to increase our resentment. The purpose of that is to spread propaganda in other countries that are watching what is taking place between Moscow and Washington, and who are reacting to our failure to do something. The purpose of it is to spread propaganda throughout the world.

What else do we find? We also find Major General Draper in a speech today charging that the Soviet State Corporation now holds a total of between 30 percent and 40 percent of German industry in the Russian-occupied zone. That brings up the very question of the Austrian peace and why it failed. The Russians wanted to sap Austria's economic strength and thus prevent Austria from becoming a free and independent nation. They were willing to give them freedom in name only, but they would not give them the means to maintain that freedom. That is why it was a failure. They have also sapped the juice out of the lemon of the Russian zone in Germany and now they want to go into the American and British zones and sap the juice out of the lemon in those two zones. But they are not going to do it. They want to communize all of Germany. That is what is happening. But it is not happening through or by the free will of the people.

They charged us recently with having our agents in Turkey in civilian dress. The same charge was also made against the British. Isvestia made that charge. What about their agents in the United States who are American citizens? What about their agents in other countries who are citizens of that country, working in Italy and all of the other nations where people are in distress, and where a small organized group can work more effectively than they can in our country?

I picked up the New York Times only this morning and I find that Gromyko asked the United Nations to reopen the Greek case. On what ground? In a letter he made clear that he was asking to open the Greek controversy because of the decision of the Council and its investigating committee to keep a subsidiary inquiry board in the area to maintain watch on border flare-ups. That is the objection he makes and which appears in this morning's newspapers. He is going to try to reopen the Greek case, as far as the mission of inquiry is concerned, and to protest against the subcommittee continuing inquiry.

That is what we are up against—the state of aggression and a challenging spirit of a vicious nature. We have to appreciate that fact in the consideration of this bill.

I hope that this amendment and other amendments that will be offered will be defeated and the excellent bill of the committee will come out of the committee and be passed by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on Monday when I spoke at the time the rule was under consideration, I called attention to what was bound to happen to our economy in the event this legislation was adopted. Now the cat is out of the bag.

I want to call your attention to an article that appears in this morning's paper, an address by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, at Cleveland, Miss., last night. He gives you a preview of what is going to happen. I want to read for the RECORD an article which appears in today's paper, the Washington Post:

> To carry out an effective policy of relief and reconstruction implementing the Truman doctrine first promulgated in the plan to assist Greece and Turkey, he declared that there must be an extension of Government control over domestic sale, transportation, and export of such commodities as wheat, coal, and steel.

Yet Members of this House have stood on this floor and demanded that prices come down. The President himself is appealing to the businessmen over this Nation to reduce prices. Again we have further evidence of New Deal inconsistency. How long can the country take this kind of leadership?

I continue, and I refer to point 5 set out in this accompanying article:

> In order to carry out an economical and effective policy of relief and reconstruction, the United States is going to need the extension by Congress of certain executive powers over the domestic sale, transportation, and exportation of certain commodities over which Presidential war powers control is due to expire June 30.

"It is wheat and coal and steel that are urgently required to stave off economic collapse, not just dollar credits," Acheson said.

Now, mark you well this statement:

> Power to assign priorities on transportation is needed, including legislation to insure "efficient use of all shipping."

And he goes on to point out the necessity for continued control over our economy. We talk about veterans' housing, we talk about eliminating these restrictions which today are tying up our economy, yet the Secretary of State comes out with this plea for continued controls. I believe his foot slipped or else the release of his article was badly timed. He thought this bill was going to be passed yesterday, and hence he could come out and make this statement today.

The fat is now in the fire, Mr. Chairman, and so far as the economic impact of this legislation is concerned, you hogtie the American economy from now on by passing this legislation. We should have seen that very situation long ago. There are tremendous implications in this matter.

We do not have to be partisan at all; we can approach this matter from the standpoint of America. Is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything wrong in protecting our people under this legislation. Indeed not.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman. I just want to ask the gentleman a brief question. If the Acheson program which the gentleman has read, is necessary to win the peace, which, unfortunately, has been slipping through our fingers ever since the war ended, will it not be worth while?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My God! We have not won the peace in 2 years. Yesterday was the second anniversary of VE-day, and we are still struggling for peace and getting nowhere. Now we are going to extend our activities to other parts of the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire not more than 15 minutes ago said that if this policy led to war that Joe Stalin could make the most of it. How can we expect to win the peace by making war? Is that a sound

position? That is what he is talking about.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. This policy has been sold to America, sold by a bunch of dictators in a bureaucratic State Department. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] named it rightly when he named it a military bill. That is exactly what it is, and that is exactly what we are talking about here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We should thank the Under Secretary for his honest and forthright statement last night. Now certainly we know what is going to happen, and this 2 years after VE-day when we are praying for peace. What a commentary on our efforts in behalf of those who served in this last war! We are today, Mr. Chairman, about to take a step to declare war; and, secondly, you are going to take a step to tie up our economy from now on under Government controls from which we can never, never recover, because the program calls for a worldwide OPA, and under this bill we are going to set one up in Greece.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. And in those 2 years this Congress had piddled away $18,000,000,000 trying to buy the peace. Now we are going to buy with $400,000,000 that which could not be bought with $18,000,000,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. What is holding up the peace? Russia, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. At least we were guilty in part, because we made it possible for Russia to get to the position which she now occupies. She would not have attained it had it not been for American aid; so we are a party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, throughout this debate one of the keynotes of the isolationist argument in opposition to the pending bill has been that if the United States wants to check the spread of communism throughout the world the place to begin is here at home.

In reply, I want to say that the only sure way to make the American democracy safe against threats of encroachment by totalitarian ideologies is to produce a social order which will provide greater benefits for all of our people than can be offered by any other form of government.

Today other nations which call themselves democracies are attempting to substitute mass social security for individual liberty, and are boasting that their governments take better care of all the people than we do in America. The only danger to the American way of life today, Mr. Chairman, lies in the remote possibility that the protagonists of these alien dictatorships may succeed in persuading the rank and file of the American people that this boasted superiority is real. To me, such an eventuality is inconceivable.

But, Mr. Chairman, modern American liberals must demand an adequate system of social security as a permanent bulwark for our individual liberties, and must fight ceaselessly to achieve this goal. Upon the success of this program the fate of the American democracy may well depend.

I assert that no government is a real democracy which denies civil liberties and suppresses individual freedom by a sovereign dictatorship. I have been deeply concerned many times, Mr. Chairman, by utterances here on the floor of Congress which sought to restrict civil liberties in America, but these were merely the expressions of individuals with a warped conception of the American way of life. The Constitution is the supreme law of our land, and the Bill of Rights in that Constitution is the greatest charter of democracy which this world has ever known.

Patrick Henry dramatized the American concept of democracy in a single phrase: "Give me liberty or give me death."

The problems which confront this troubled world today in its efforts to devise a stable plan for peace in Europe are not new. Indeed, almost identical problems with respect to Greece, Russia, and Turkey were perplexing American statesmen more than a century ago, as evidenced in the state papers of John Quincy Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Marquis de Lafayette.

The thing of greatest importance which is new in world affairs today is the historic change in American foreign policy. Twice in the last three decades the soil of Europe has been drenched with American blood. After the First World War, despite the decisive part our armed forces had played in the defeat of Germany, the Congress of the United States refused to join the League of Nations, which had been created by President Wilson. At that time a majority of the American people, including the present speaker, supported our congressional leaders in adhering to the policy of George Washington and declining to participate in "entangling foreign alliances."

Rendered internationally impotent by the abstention of America, the League of Nations degenerated into a mere debating society, whose futile efforts to preserve world peace soon became the objects of open scorn by the military dictators who sprang into power in the bankrupt areas of Europe. A famous American Senator, now dead, told me of a conversation he had with Mussolini soon after the Fascist leader seized control of the Government of Italy.

"What do you think of the League of Nations?" the Senator inquired.

Mussolini's reply was a roar of laughter.

The German and Italian dictators, emboldened by their belief that America would never interfere with their ambitions, proceeded with their program of world conquest. They enlisted the support of Japan. Great Britain attempted a policy of appeasement. The result was World War II and finally Pearl Harbor.

Then the die was cast with respect to our foreign policy in the future. The American people determined with invincible unanimity that never again would this Nation refuse responsibility for maintaining the peace of the world.

We invaded Africa and Europe. Italy collapsed. Germany was completely crushed. Japan surrendered.

But for the intervention of our armed forces, the outcome of the war would have been totally different. Russia would inevitably have been subjugated by the Axis attack. England could not long have survived. All of continental Europe would have remained under Nazi domination. Japan would have completed her conquest of Asia, Australia, and the islands of the Pacific, including the Philippines.

And today this country and the entire Western Hemisphere would be in imminent danger of attack by the mad enemies of democracy if, indeed, the attack were not already under way.

Having twice conquered the greatest threats in all history to the democratic way of life, America is now irrevocably committed to the maintenance of peace throughout the world by whatever means are necessary. Failure in this commitment is unthinkable. It would be a betrayal of our countless hero dead who gave up their lives on battlefields in all parts of the earth in the sacred belief that they were making peace possible for future generations of mankind everywhere.

It is well that those heroic dead cannot envision the tragic situation which exists around the so-called peace tables of today. America has tried to keep faith with them. America has taken the lead in organizing the United Nations, and has pledged its tremendous financial, economic, and military resources in an effort to make that organization an effective instrument of peace. America has not sought to acquire any conquered lands for commercial or political exploitation. On the contrary, immediately after the end of the war America restored the Philippines to complete independence. Our only territorial acquisitions when the final peace treaties are signed will be minor islands in the Pacific which are virtually valueless except for our future national defense.

But American efforts to establish a permanent and stable peace have been constantly obstructed by certain of our allies in the late war who, but for our military aid and financial and economic support, would now be enslaved by the Nazi tyrants. Despite the fact that we rescued them from certain national destruction, these erstwhile allies have maintained an attitude of hostility toward us in all of the peace negotiations. They have openly resented our assumption of any responsibility for the reconstruction of Europe—a responsibility which we cannot and will not relinquish. Their policy appears to be basically anti-American.

They have striven deliberately to make it impossible for us to cooperate with them, except on their own terms—terms which, in many instances, the American conscience cannot accept.

They ignore the fact that while the war was in progress they eagerly subscribed to our declaration that we were all engaged in a common fight to make

the world safe for democracy. Now that the war is over—won for them by our arms and our blood and our material aid—they repudiate our democracy and set themselves up as the sole arbiters of real democratic government.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I confess that there are various aspects of the pending proposal which I regard with deep misgivings. The United Nations represents the first great attempt in all history—an American attempt—to establish a world democracy. We must be ever mindful of the fact that not all of the nations which are embraced in this new federation are themselves democratic, and we must endeavor in every proper way to treat their opinions on world problems with deference and respect. We have a right to insist that they treat our opinions in the same manner.

I deplore the fact that our leaders of State did not see fit at first to submit the question of aid to Greece and Turkey to the United Nations. Their explanation is twofold, that the United Nations is not yet able to finance such an undertaking, and that the proposal would be foredoomed to a veto because its frank purpose is to check Communist aggression in the Middle East.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the paramount problem in the United Nations and in the whole scheme of foreign affairs today is to establish a practical working relationship between the United States and Russia. We should employ every honorable means to achieve this objective. Our diplomatic representatives say this cannot be accomplished by a policy of supine appeasement on our part, and in this position they are supported by the tragic lessons of recent history and by the overwhelming preponderance of American public opinion. But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the United Nations will be preserved and strengthened by American leadership in a mutual effort on the part of all the member states to understand and respect each other's aims and aspirations.

Perhaps the greatest deterrent to such mutual understanding and respect is the traditional secrecy of statecraft. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, we cannot hold ourselves blameless. The American people today are uncertain and perplexed as to the ultimate results of this unprecedented participation in the affairs of Europe. Confessedly, this is true even among the Members of Congress. We have been given little factual information about what we are called upon to do. The urgent admonitions of our State Department have been largely arbitrary in their form and essence. We have been told simply that the program before us is indispensable and of the highest order of urgency. An equally terse assurance that the adoption of this program will reduce the likelihood of war in the future completes the sum and substance of the information now available to us.

Enemies of the program charge that its real object is to guarantee military protection to private American oil interests in Saudi Arabia. Although it is true that oil reserves in America have been reduced to an extent which is dangerous to our national defense, measured by the requirements of the recent war, this would not seem to be a plausible reason for such a departure from our historic foreign policy. The development of atomic energy for economic and industrial uses, which cannot long be delayed, may soon relegate oil to a position of secondary importance among our national needs.

I shall vote for this measure because I know that the peace of the world depends upon strong leadership by the United States of America, and that the only way our leadership can be made strong is to back it up with the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people. Our people know that the policies of isolationism and appeasement were tragic failures after the first World War. Today they are determined to chart a new course for this Nation in the affairs of the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. It is my opinion, based on reliable information, that H. R. 2616 is the most sordid bill that has come before the House of Representatives since I have been a Member of this distinguished body. The proposal in this bill, when the real purpose of it is considered, is an insult to the people of Greece, a country that has contributed so much to civilization. Greece had a glorious history many centuries before our country was discovered. The greatest asset Greece has today is the spirit of her people, a spirit so heroic that any nation in these modern times might well and profitably emulate. You who plan to vote $400,000,000 under the pretense that it will save Greece from communism will neither add to her strength nor save her independence. It will not strengthen the character of Greece to make her a ward of the United States. Greece with her centuries of rich and noble traditions and her contribution to civilization can far better rely upon these to save her than to relinquish such a rich heritage to become the victim of a sordid commercial transaction masquerading under a proposed loan to save Greece from communism. Have the Communists been removed from our Government, from the United States, from South America? How long have they flourished here, had schools of communism, children's camps under the very nose of those who urge that our military be sent to Greece to prevent the growth of this Godless cult there? The presence of hundreds of Communists in the gallery of the House of Representatives of the United States of America during the debate on the Greek question presented a burlesque show instead of an effort to get rid of communism.

I say without fear of successful contradiction that it will be the spirit of Greece that will save her and make her independent.

This is not a relief bill for the starving in Greece. It is a gift of $400,000,000 sponsored by those who wish to provide dollars to foreign countries to enable them to buy our exports. It means that our taxpayers are to furnish money to foreign governments or their agencies with which to purchase our products. I am sure that the people in every country on the globe will be quite willing to buy our exports just so long as our taxpayers furnish the money through gifts, loans, and credits with which to do so. The foreign black-market operators will be the chief beneficiaries of all future loans, gifts, and credits made available to them by the taxpayers of the United States.

I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who has not been urged by his constituents to cut the expenditures of Government and to thus make tax relief possible.

The Appropriations Committee has been working night and day to meet the demand of the citizens for the elimination of waste and extravagance in Government; also as a consequence a substantial reduction in the Federal budget. Yet, in the face of this effort to lift the burden of taxation by cutting expenditures of a swollen bureaucracy, the Congress yields to the demand of a few powerful exporters for a continuation of the program of having our taxpayers provide foreign nations with gifts, loans, and credits to buy the goods and service of these exporters.

It may be that 140,000,000 persons in the United States wish to take on the burden of furnishing money to the rest of the world to maintain them and their standing armies, but I doubt if such will be the mature judgment of our citizens when they know all the facts.

Congress has been asked to save, but can it do so if through propaganda the public is whipped into a lather of frenzy in favor of pouring countless billions of dollars of our money into the hands of foreign nations? I again quote from the National City Bank letter of April 1947:

The accompanying table summarizes American governmental credits authorized and utilized, showing that more than $5,500,000,000 was still unused December 31, 1946:

Status of United States credits

[In millions of dollars]

	Credits authorized	Utilized by December 1946	Unutilized as of December 1946
Export-Import Bank credits	$2,300	$1,100	$1,200
Surplus property credits	1,100	800	300
Lend-lease "pipe line" credits	1,400	1,200	200
Ship-sales credits	200		
Loan to Great Britain	3,750	600	[1] 3,150
Philippine credits:			
Individual war damage claims	[2] 400		
Restoration of public property	[2] 125		
RFC loan	75		
Total	9,350	3,700	5,650

[1] Another $300,000,000 has been withdrawn since.
[2] Authorized but not appropriated.

Source: Export-Import Bank (third semi-annual report), Survey of Current Business, January 1947 and Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 1, 1947.

If we want to weaken and destroy communism, why ship steel and other

war supplies to Russia, and also feel obligated to furnish more lend-lease to her? This type of appeasement was the main tenet of the Roosevelt program in dealing with Japan. The tragedy of Pearl Harbor was the answer to the unwise policy of arming a potential enemy as well as the result of building up exports in an effort to justify the free-trade-agreement policy of the New Deal.

In the monthly letter on economic conditions sent out by the National Bank of New York under date of April 1947, reference is made to the outlook on exports:

OUTLOOK FOR EXPORTS

The President's message to Congress March 12, making a declaration of foreign policy which is epochal in its importance and urging expenditures of $400,000,000 over the next 15 months to aid Greece and Turkey, has intensified interest in the export prospect and in the influence of exports on the domestic situation. The heart of the President's statement is in the following sentence: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The possible implications of this policy are so broad that they cannot be assessed in advance of events, and any effort to translate them into a schedule of foreign loans or expenditures would be widely speculative. The one thing certain is that they indicate expansion of loans and gifts beyond the limits earlier intended.

Also within a few weeks we have had the President's request for the appropriation of $350,000,000 to finance relief in certain countries, and Mr. Hoover's report on relief requirements in Germany and Austria. All these in conjunction have raised expectations as to the volume of exports and the resulting inflationary pressure on prices. At the same time, however, reports of tightening import controls and diminishing dollar resources in many countries have prompted questions of the opposite kind, creating doubts as to whether the unprecedented foreign demand for American goods can continue.

The outlook for exports concerns everyone. Directly and indirectly, exports last year were a very large factor in the business of this country. Foreign demand for industrial products intensified the pressure on our industries. Exports of farm products, which exceeded $3,000,000,000, were a great influence, lifting farm prices and farm income, and prosperity in the farming sections was one of the supports of domestic trade. Everyone should know that without the dollars accumulated by foreign countries during the war and the loans and gifts made since the end of the war our export surplus in 1946 could not have been financed. When credits contract and dollar balances are drawn down the export balance will have to shrink, and our foreign sales will be limited more nearly to what foreign customers can pay for out of sales to us.

It must not be forgotten that our national debt is still reported as $259,000,000,000 when it is in fact more than six hundred billions. The words of Benjamin Disraeli, the great Prime Minister of England, when he sought to caution his fellow colleagues and his countrymen of impending danger, are applicable at this time in our history:

It may be vain now in the midnight of their intoxication to tell them there will be an awakening of bitterness.

It may be idle now in the springtime of their economic frenzy to warn them that there will be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive; then when their spirit is inflected by misfortune they will recur to those principles which made England great.

Those who never lose an opportunity to pay lip service to Thomas Jefferson, ignore the wise policy in dealing with our international relations. Let me quote:

We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our Government is founded, that everyone may govern itself according to whatever forms it pleases, and change those forms at its own will; and that it may transact its business with foreign nations through whatever organ it thinks proper, whether king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or anything else it may choose. The will of the nation is the only thing essential to be regarded.

The arrogance of those who assume infallibility in foreign affairs even to the extent of proposing to set up the type of government which they feel will be best for a foreign country, such as Greece with her glorious contribution to civilization is a brazen affront to a noble race. The pseudo experts on foreign affairs, under the leadership of Harold Laski, if unrestrained will eventually bring down the hatred of every sovereign nation against the United States. The New York Times, July 28, 1945, quotes Harold Laski as saying: "The period of nonintervention is over." A great American statesman, John Bassett Moore, writing on the subject of nonintervention as the cornerstone of our national policy said this:

This term was used inclusively in a two-fold sense. It expressed, in the first place, nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations. In this sense, while betokening the revolutionary origin of the Government * * * it was also intended reciprocity to concede to other nations the right to determine their form of government and otherwise to manage their domestic concerns, each for itself and in its own way. In the second place, it embraced nonparticipation in the political arrangements between other governments, and above all, strict absention from any part in the political arrangements of Europe.

As recent as November 27, 1943, pages 384–388 of the Department of State Bulletin, appears this statement by Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle:

Nor have we any intention to scrap the well-settled policy of nonintervention in the affairs of other states. The policy of nonintervention in other people's affairs is and must be the first principle of sound doctrine. Unless this is the settled practice of nations, there may be no principles of sovereign equality among peace-loving states and probably no permanent peace at all.

I remind my colleagues that in the face of this it is proposed under this bill to intervene in the domestic affairs of Greece and also to intervene with our military.

Now the scene in our foreign relations has shifted. President Truman in his message to Congress March 12, 1947, said:

I believe that it is must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting subjection by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It is no wonder that the National City Bank of New York, in its letter of April 1947 in referring to the $400,000,000 for Greece and the President's message commented that it "has intensified interest in the export prospects and the influence of exports in the domestic situation."

Just how long the taxpayers of this country will wish to forego the solution of their home problems to finance exports is a question. It is a policy which if continued will bring disaster both here and abroad. The international financial commitments during the next 15 months will, if no more commitments are made, total $7,443,100,000. This sum ought to be spelled out lest its significance as a tax load on our citizens be underestimated: it means seven billion, four hundred forty-three million, one hundred thousand dollars. It all resolves itself to this: that inasmuch as the foreign countries cannot pay us in goods and services exported to them, our taxpayers pay our exporters for the goods and services for the benefit of the foreign people. Our exporters profit and so do the foreign black-market operators, all at the expense of our taxpayers. This shell game will go on until the people of the United States become aware of the danger of such financial folly and stop it; or suffer and permit the program to continue until the inevitable financial crash results. I for one refuse to be a party to this scheme of financing the whole world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to question the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] or that of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. But if everything they say is true, then these amendments should be voted down.

Why should we take this step, why should we pass this bill, and then tie the hands of the administration? Have you forgotten Pearl Harbor? Do you know what brought about that disgraceful and humiliating disaster at Pearl Harbor? It was the appeasement of Japan which enabled the Japs to come 5,000 miles across the Pacific Ocean and administer the greatest humiliation that this country has ever known.

I was in Hawaii in 1937. I protested then against the weakness of our Air Force at that time. I said then that Hawaii was unprotected because of the weakness of our Air Force. The head of the Air Forces came to me and said, "I could put my arms around you. You are the one man who has told the truth about our Air Forces here."

If we are going into this program these two amendments should both be defeated. Communism is making war on the United States now. Every Communist in America is, wittingly or unwittingly, an agent of a foreign power. They are striving to undermine and destroy this Government.

Last night the head of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, came to Washington, after just coming back from

Moscow, and compared Harry Truman, the President of the United States, with Adolf Hitler. We had representatives of the Committee on Un-American Activities there, and, of course the FBI had agents there to find out what was going on.

They tell these young men that communism is a glorious movement toward democracy. There is no more democracy—and I am quoting the words of a former Ambassador to Russia—there is no more democracy in a Communist country than there is in the penitentiary of Mississippi, Ohio, New Jersey, or any other State.

These young men are being deceived. I see they call themselves and are advertised as "the Communist war veterans."

They are being deceived and misled by the most dangerous influence, the most dangerous element, that ever undertook to undermine and destroy the American way of life and to wreck the Government of the United States. God grant that they may see the error of their ways.

Do not forget that Benedict Arnold was a great hero at Saratoga. He was a hero in Canada. But he later turned against his country and became one of the most hated traitors the world has ever known.

Has it ever occurred to you that Alcibiades and Socrates fought side by side through a Grecian war against a foreign power? I believe they were messmates in the Grecian Army.

But after the war was over Alcibiades is said to have stopped up his ears and fled from the presence of Socrates for fear that he would grow old listening to his eloquence. He joined the enemies of Greece and caused the downfall of his country.

There is no such thing as a Communist American. They are enemies of the United States. They are out to undermine and destroy this Government. They are out to undermine and destroy the American way of life. Their program has for its purpose the destruction of Christianity in every country under the shining sun. If we adopt these amendments, we say to Russia, "We will further appease you by binding ourselves not to send more than a certain number of men, or planes no matter what you may do to us."

What the witness before the committee recommended were mere suggestions, not limitations. As I understand it, they did not ask that a limitation be written into the bill.

I cannot understand how any man, whether he is for this bill or opposed to it—and I recognize the honesty of men who disagree with me—I cannot see how any man who is opposed to this legislation can vote for either one of these amendments, because I think it would be encouragement for Russia to keep on sending her spies to this country and her agents attacking Americans as they did in Yugoslavia.

We have had the best minds we could get before the Committee on Un-American Activities. We had the best witnesses we could find, and we had our investigators on the trail of those Russian spies who were finally caught and exposed by the Canadian Government. What were they doing? Pretending to be friendly to the United States while our representatives were giving way to them, they were working to undermine and destroy this country. I am one Member who would vote today to send every Communist Ambassador or Minister, out of the United States and say to them, "Unless you are willing to go back and give your people an opportunity to express themselves in an honest election, to select their own government, you need not come back here, a wolf in sheep's clothing."

Every single one of them, every single minister or Ambassador who represents a Communist country in America is virtually a spy in our midst. So, if we are going to pass this bill, let us not tie the hands of the Administration with these paralyzing amendments.

I agree that we must clean house at home—clean house and fumigate in every department of this Government. I am not saying anything to you that I will not say to Harry Truman, the President of the United States. We are at the crossroads of civilization. We are at the crossroads, if you please, of history. I do not know whether this is the proper movement or not, but I do know that unless America begins to assert herself and stop appeasing criminal Communists who are trying to destroy America and everything for which America stands, your children and mine will pay the penalty.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Would the gentleman clarify for the members of this Committee the word in section 3 of this bill, "limited", as applied to the number of members of the military services of the United States? What does that mean?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, it means what it has always meant. That is the same word that you and I studied back in the fifth grade.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I ask the gentleman this question: How can it mean what it always has meant when it actually means "unlimited"?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman wants to turn it upside down, he can make it mean what he pleases. But my understanding is that these amendments would place a limit that would entirely hamper the President in protecting this country in case of attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that there is a very confused situation here. I hope that we can clarify it by offering a substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota by unanimous consent has withdrawn his amendment to the amendment. The Clerk will report the substitute offered for the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORAND. Can two substitutes be pending at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN. No; but in this case we have only one amendment pending, that offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. The amendment to the amendment has been withdrawn and a substitute for the amendment has been offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 2, line 11, after the word "only" and before the semicolon, insert a comma and the words: "And not to include armed organized military units to serve as occupational or combat troops."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and clear. Objections have been raised to placing a limitation on the number of military personnel to be sent to Greece and Turkey under this act.

This amendment changes the quantitative limitation to a qualitative limitation. It really is not an additional limitation, it is rather a clarification of the limitation already in the bill, which now provides that we may send military personnel in an advisory capacity only. To make sure exactly what is meant, my substitute amendment merely states, "And not to include armed organized military units to serve as occupational or combat troops."

It does not exclude Army engineers, it does not exclude technicians, or Sanitary Corps; all it excludes is armed organized American military units. They may not be sent to serve as occupational or combat troops.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am in hearty accord with the purposes of the gentleman's substitute. I am perfectly willing to accept it because it achieves the objectives that we had in mind, and it writes into the legislation the intent of the committee report.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. EATON. I wish to say that I am very happy to have this solution offered. I am wondering if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the other Members on his side of the aisle are in accord with it?

Mr. JUDD. I may say that this does not really alter the bill. It merely clarifies the obvious confusion that exists in the minds of a great many. I cannot see how it weakens the bill. It merely makes official what it is we intend to do.

Mr. BLOOM. Under the circumstances, as far as I am concerned, I will have no objection.

Mr. EATON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I think we can vote on this and get rid of it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close at this time.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from New Jersey has moved that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to know, an amendment having been offered, if we are going to be denied the right to talk about it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The situation is within the control of the Committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is this not in violation with the agreement that was made last night with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That, of course, is not a parliamentary inquiry. The situation is within the control of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The country should know that the gag is in operation in this House.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for exactly the same thing that these gentlemen have been fighting for. If they want it withdrawn and want to talk about it I will withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may withdraw his motion.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether or not this substitute is one of those sweetmeats that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] was talking about?

Mr. EATON. I am not an authority on sweetmeats.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] read a quotation the other day from one of Daniel Webster's speeches. I should also like to read a quotation from Daniel Webster on January 26, 1830, when he said:

> When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence and before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

Mr. Chairman, that advice could very well be followed by the committee. We should take all the time necessary to debate this bill and all amendments thereto because it will be the most important bill this Congress will consider.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] quoted from the Washington Post a statement in which Dean Acheson said:

> There must be an extension of government over domestic sale, transportation and export of such commodities as wheat, coal, and steel.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. It was the Republican Party that went to the people of this country last fall and said they were going to end regimentation and were elected on that basis, was it not?

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for that contribution, and I was just leading up to that point. I have a clipping from the New York Times of April 27, 1946, wherein Dean Acheson is reported as follows:

> FEDERAL SEIZURE OF NEEDED GRAIN URGED BY ACHESON—ACTING SECRETARY SAYS MORE DRASTIC ACTION IS CALLED FOR TO MEET COMMITMENTS ABROAD—FOOD RATIONING FAVORED—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT ENDS LOANS ON CORN IN MOVE TO FREE 2,457,000 BUSHELS
>
> WASHINGTON, April 26.—Much more drastic action is necessary if the Government is to get wheat off the farm and on its way to the famine areas of the world, Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, asserted today.
>
> Emphasizing that he was expressing his personal views, Mr. Acheson told a news conference that the Government should go out and take the wheat and flour it needed to meet foreign commitments.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, if you pass this bill you are going back on the campaign slogan on which you were elected, "Haven't you had enough." This bill if passed will do more to bring back regimentation and rationing quicker than anything you could do. If you pass this bill, it will be a means of starting a flood of propaganda to pass excessive appropriations for the Army and the Navy thereby wrecking our chances to cut the budget substantially and reduce the heavy burden of taxes for the people. If you pass this bill, I am fearful this so-called military mission that will go into Greece and Turkey will create an incident. Did you ever stop to think that we never go to war until an incident is created? Every country fights a defensive war. It was the sinking of the *Maine* that created the incident that led us into the Spanish-American War. The sinking of the *Lusitania* had a great deal to do with leading us into World War I and the incident at Pearl Harbor led us immediately into World War II, and as soon as this military mission authorized by this bill creates an incident in Greece or Turkey, we are in World War III.

I think the majority of the Members of this Committee are for straightforward-above-the-table dealing. This bill is a subterfuge that might well take us into World War III. Should an incident occur, the tension of the people of our country would demand that we declare war.

Yes; this has far-reaching implications, and we should ponder well before we make our final vote on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as he does so often, the gentleman from Mississippi again today gave us a statement condemning communism. I too condemn communism. He spoke in favor of Christianity. I try to be a Christian. I do not believe that the gentleman can find anyone in this House who favors communism. I do not believe that he can find anyone who has not at least the desire, whatever may be his practice, to be a Christian. So, I ask, what of it and what do we propose to do about it?

In what is here said, neither the ability, the fairness, nor the patriotism of anyone is questioned. This Government, as I understand—was founded upon the principles that the individual had a right to worship in the manner in which he desired and that the people should have the right to be free and independent, to choose their own form of government.

Accepting those principles, where do we get with this bill? It is a bill to do what? The debate has shown that it is a bill to fight communism by, if necessary, waging war. I know I will be criticized when I ask: What business is it of ours if the people of Russia want to be Communists? I ask you in all fairness, what business is it of ours?

I do not like communism; I would like to see it ended; but if we are consistent, if we are logical, if we are willing to concede to other peoples the same right which we claim for ourselves to follow this or that theory of government, this or that form of religion, how can we send either our boys or our money to tell the people of Russia, of Turkey, Greece, or any other country, as long as they remain over there and do not endanger our safety, that communism or any other form of religion or political policy shall not be carried by missionaries or by the sword into some other country?

Are we consistent? We do not fight communism in South America; we have not fought it here at home. For 12 years I have been in this House, lived here in Washington, and I recall that the administration in power had Communists sleeping in the White House, gave them jobs in the Government, and by this means and that, by grants of

power and by grants of money, Communists were encouraged in this country and praised when they smeared good Americans. So why is it that all at once—now—all at once we turn our backs on the principle that every people shall be free to choose their own religion and their own form of government, and we say that by the sword, by war, we are going to spread Christianity. The Crusaders tried that, as the gentleman mentioned just the other day, and they did not succeed. That is not what is back of this bill, is it? Oh, no. This is a so-called bipartisan bill which will mean an act of war.

What about the Monroe Doctrine? Ever since the days of President Monroe we have said to the whole wide world that because our national security and welfare depended upon it, no nation should interfere with the government of the people of any country in the Western Hemisphere.

Now what do we say? We say we are going to stick our nose into the affairs of every country abroad, that we are going to stop communism and we are going to stop Russia at the Turkish and the Greek borders, at their frontiers. Suppose Russia said to us she was going to stop our influence in Mexico and in South America, what would we say? We would say, "Get out." We would say, "We must defend ourselves." We would declare war.

Later I will quote from the testimony of the Secretary of War before the Committee on Expenditures given the other day, which shows that the remedy for this country, that the safety of this country, depends only on making ourselves strong and then attending to our own business. His testimony shows that isolationism, if you like to call it that—I prefer to be called an isolationist or a nationalist, rather than a bipartisan or an internationalist, even though that brings the false charge of disloyalty—will keep us out of war and permit other nations, if they are so determined, to fight it out among themselves.

Believing that my first duty is to my country—I think that when we take on the burden of policing the whole world we are taking on just too big a job, and that, instead of doing something to preserve our country, we are writing the causes of its ruin in the pages of history.

Listen to the following questions to and the answers of Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson. At a hearing of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was considering H. R. 2319, which provides for the unification of the armed forces, held on the 29th of April, the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. There is one more question. You say in this statement:

"The maintenance of the future peace of the world will depend on the attitude and policies of the United States in world affairs, and also upon the measure of strength which the United States continues in the future to maintain in order to lend vitality to those policies."

Is there anything more to be added to that?

Secretary PATTERSON. Those are my convictions.

The CHAIRMAN. Just how do you arrive at the conclusion that the peace of the world depends on what we do?

Secretary PATTERSON. Well, I believe that this country is one of the leading powers, if not the leading power, in the world today, that our influence in the direction of peace, if it is backed up by the power to enforce peace, can be decisive.

The CHAIRMAN. What you mean is, if we become powerful enough, we are acting as master policemen and no one else will dare start a war?

Secretary PATTERSON. I think that if we have adequate military strength, no nation will dare attack us or will commence a major war anywhere. I believe that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is to say, we become boss policemen.

Secretary PATTERSON. Our powers have never been exercised in any offensive way. I think the whole world knows that the intentions of the United States are peaceful and not aggressive, and we are not trying to build empires or embark on a course of imperialism.

The CHAIRMAN. I was not talking about that, about our intentions, at all. What I was suggesting was that what you were saying was that if we become powerful enough so that the other nations, or no other nation would dare start a war, that not only would they not venture to attack us but as between themselves they would not start a fight because we would stand in the background ready, as Teddy said, with a big stick. That is what you are saying is it not?

Secretary PATTERSON. Practically so. I think it has been well proved in the last 30 years that a major war anywhere in the world results finally in a world war, involving all of the civilized world.

The CHAIRMAN. And while we started neither one and perhaps had nothing to do with the starting of either one, in both we came in, to end it?

Secretary PATTERSON. We were drawn in, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, drawn in then; and our power, the United States power, decided it?

Secretary PATTERSON. Yes, sir; althought we had nothing to do with the causes, directly at any rate, we were drawn, and our power proved decisive.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to repeat what was said before, your thought is now that if we will go ahead and arm and become strong enough, then, not only will they let us alone because of our size and strength, but they will not venture to fight among themselves if we let it be known that we are going to step in and quiet the quarrel?

Secretary PATTERSON. Your first conclusion, that they will not attack us, I think to be inescapable.

If the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, knows what he is talking about, and I assume he does, where is the need for this bill?

From his testimony, it seems to be the opinion of the Secretary—and I agree with that thought—that, if this country uses its resources to build up our armed services, no nation, no group of nations, will have the hardihood to attack us. Nor is it probable that any other nation will make war on another nation if it be of the opinion that, if its quarrel is unjust, the United States might step into the picture and settle the issue.

In any event it is clear that the way to stay out of war is to quit interfering in the affairs of other nations, backing up the wars started by other nations.

Instead of always becoming involved in controversies between other nations which do not directly concern us, why not once at least exhibit confidence in our own strength, in our own ability to protect ourselves?

For years, we have been deceived and proceeded on the delusion that our national existence and safety depended upon the British navy. That idea has been exploded. It has been demonstrated that the British Government depends for its security upon the United States.

All we need to do, according to the Secretary of War, to preserve the peace of the world is to continue to be, as Churchill said we were, the strongest Nation in all the world.

I am in favor of that program, but from there on out I disagree with the internationalists; I disagree with the Secretary of War. My contention is that, instead of acting as the boss policeman of the world, going hither and yon and attempting to knock together the heads of other nations in order to make them agree on a policy which we think advisable, if they are determined to fight among themselves, if world powers are to continue through the years as they have down through the centuries to fight over which nation is to control the Dardanelles, then let those nations fight it out. It is now evident that, had we let Hitler and Stalin exhaust each other, there would now be less need for assistance from us.

In what may be here said neither the ability, the good intentions, the patriotism, nor the consistency of any individual is questioned.

Ever since the days of President Monroe we have insisted that we would not tolerate any interference with or coercion of the policy of any nation in the Western Hemisphere by any nation in the Old World.

A sound reason for that policy was that we did not want and would not permit in the Western Hemisphere the existence of any power which might threaten our own security and future welfare.

That doctrine was founded upon the principle that self-preservation is the first concern of every individual and of every nation.

Our Government is founded upon the principle that every people have the inherent right to choose their own form of government, their own form of religion, worship as they may choose.

Logic, fairness, and consistency compel the conclusion that, asserting those rights for ourselves in this hemisphere, it is presumptuous for us to deny a like right to any nation across the seas.

We have long boasted that we are not an imperialistic nation; that we desire no territory; that we have no thought of aggression. If that be true, then the only excuse, the only reason, if you prefer, for our present action of attempting to confine Russia and communism within circumscribed limits is that unless we follow such course, our own national security is endangered.

It is here emphatically asserted that neither at the moment nor in the immediate future is our national security endangered. The propaganda asserting that it is and that the present move to send financial and military aid to Greece

and Turkey is one dictated by the necessity of preventing future aggression is a fraud.

The United States of America today is in no danger from any foreign power. Our danger—and it is a very real one—is that we have turned our backs upon the policies and the practices which made us what we are.

It is conceded that we are today, in every sense of the word, the most powerful nation in all the world. The very fact that the proponents of this measure call upon us to aid stricken nations is proof of our military and our productive power.

The fact that Russia was compelled, when Hitler invaded her, to call upon us for, and was only saved through, our help is evidence of her inability to wage war against us.

The fact—and it is a fact—that those who are behind this move favored contributing, and we as a Nation have contributed, billions of dollars and millions of tons of supplies to Russia is further evidence that she is in no position to successfully assail us.

Grant that her desire is world conquest; she lacks the ability to do that job and fools indeed must we be if we continue, if that be our conviction, to supply her with the means necessary to accomplish that purpose.

Every sane individual knows that we cannot, either through our dollars or our armed forces, establish Christianity throughout the world. The Crusaders tried that centuries ago. Is anyone so foolish as to think that, through another war or a dozen wars, we can destroy the Mohammedan faith, the religion of India, or the communism of Russia?

If it be the thought of the proponents of this measure that either through the expenditure of dollars or by the sword we should tell the people of middle Europe or of any other country what political theory, what form of religion, they should adopt, then we are denying to them the benefit of the principles established when our forefathers founded our Republic.

Communism, however detestable it may be, is but the whipping boy in the present situation.

We have made no worth-while effort to fight communism in South America. Here at home, in the Capital City, communism has been sheltered and nurtured and made to grow. Communism and the apostles of communism have been on the Federal pay roll and time and again over the last 10 years have received public encouragement from the administration in power.

We made no complaint, as was pointed out so eloquently and so logically by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], to stop communism in Finland or in half a dozen other countries.

The truth of the matter is that the present move is but a part of the plan to preserve the British Empire, to keep open its lifeline to the east. And, may I add, a part of a political policy to maintain in power internationalists and those who pride themselves first upon being bipartisan in foreign affairs; who have finally, through their own conceit, arrived at the conclusion that it is well—at least for them—to be bipartisan in domestic affairs.

If bipartisanship, either at home or abroad, is sound national policy, why two parties? Why Republicans?

For 14 years, the people, led astray and softened, first by excessive prosperity and easy living, then confronted by the necessity of facing a few years of hard work and thrift, have deluded themselves with the idea that they could get something—perhaps all they wanted—for nothing; that they could take from those who had and distribute to those who did not have.

Then last November came the awakening, when the people said in no unmistakable manner that they had had enough.

But, ever since January 1, they have been getting more of the same.

Two distinguished politicians and statesmen, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Dewey, and the gentleman from New York and Indiana, Mr. Willkie, thought they could ride into office by promising just a little bigger and better give-away policy. They shouted "me too." Today, their cry is being adopted by others.

Here in Congress, day after day and week after week, in domestic affairs, we have been told that we must go along because the bureaucrats or the President had inaugurated the policy.

In foreign affairs, we have been told and are being told that because some individual, either the former President or the present President or some member of the State Department, has made certain commitments, has pledged us to certain obligations, which none had the right to make or to give, the Congress and the individual Members of the Congress will be disloyal if they do not follow through. Emphatically do I deny the validity of any such argument.

The former President did not have, nor has the present President, the power or the authority to dictate the policy of our country either here or abroad.

True, the President is given certain authority with reference to foreign policy, but he is powerless to implement that policy, to make it effective, without money, and upon Congress is placed the responsibility of making or withholding appropriations.

The President has no right, in formulating foreign policy, to involve us in war, and if he makes promises or does things which of necessity lead to that end, he is acting without authority, for the Constitution also provides that Congress and only Congress, can declare war, make appropriations for war.

If this Congress has reached the conclusion that it must follow and uphold every thought of the Chief Executive, of the Secretary of State, or, if you please, of a bipartisan group of internationalists in the other body, then the House might just as well adjourn, or perhaps resign, go home, and save the taxpayers' money.

No individual in this House would start on a journey without counting his resources, determining his ability to get to his destination. Yet nowhere in this debate, so far as I have been able to learn, has anyone ever offered an inventory showing what our resources, either in money, material, or men, may be. No one, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] so ably pointed out in debating this rule, has told us where we were going, how far we were going, what we were to spend, or the purpose of this expedition.

To me it means, unless Russia is bluffed and backs down, a third world war.

It may be, as the distinguished international Republican statesman in the other body said when the organization of the United Nations was being discussed, that it is a "great adventure."

Yes, our foreign policy is a great adventure and a most uncertain one. And it may be a disastrous one. It is certain that it calls for an unreasonable expenditure of our national resources.

On another occasion, the same distinguished Member of the other body said that lend-lease was a great speculation.

Since when should the national resources of a nation, the lives of its youth, be placed on the gambler's table, even though that table be an international one?

This debate has demonstrated that the bill before us is not a measure designed to promote peace.

From its proponents at first came the forced reluctant admission that its terms were so stated as to permit military aid. As the debate has gone on, the bill's supporters have been forced by the logic of the argument to admit that it is a war measure.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] frankly stated that the bill was a war measure; that it was designed to give military aid to Greece and to Turkey and, as we all know, that is an act of war and will so be understood by Russia.

If Russia is in a position to pick up the challenge, this bill means war. The gentleman from Georgia repeated his statement that that is what it meant and stated that he supported it.

Why not be honest with our people? Why not, if this House desires to commit us to a policy which is an invitation to war, to give the administration authority to commit an act of war, why not, I repeat, have the courage to so declare? Why attempt to avoid the condemnation which an open declaration of war would bring down upon us from the American people by the passage of this bill?

I have said nothing about our ability to take on the burden of maintaining peace throughout the world by the use of armed forces. I have said nothing about our ability to pay the veterans of the third world war and their dependents the benefits to which they will be entitled at the end of that war.

I have said nothing about the impairment of our national resources through the waging of a third world war, for I realize that the internationalists, the bipartisan politicians, have control of the agencies of propaganda; that they are determined to continue the New Deal program of wasting, and of spending, of regimentation, of dictatorial government, and that any argument directed toward common sense measures, toward first considering and acting for the welfare of our own country, would be futile.

The politicians, the internationalists, the war mongers, those who profit from war, are once more in the saddle, and all that we can do is to protest and to cast our votes in the interests of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have only 2 minutes and I take this time simply to assure those who might have come in since the agreement was reached so you will know that we have worked out, after about 24 hours, may I say, a satisfactory solution to this problem which, it seems to me, brings the bill definitely back to its original objective. Let us keep that clearly in mind. Some very extravagant statements are being made in this debate. We are not declaring war on anybody; we are not sending an invasion force to Europe to line up along the borders of Russia with pistols and bayonets; we are simply trying to aid Greece and to aid Turkey to reestablish themselves, to maintain their economy, and we are doing it through a military and economic aid of an advisory and constructive nature.

This amendment, the point the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I have been working on yesterday and again today, makes additionally clear what the bill has as its original objective; that is, it does not send occupational troops, does not send organized, armed troops over there, but limits it to an advisory capacity as the bill proposes now on line 11 of page 2 and as the Secretary of War stated it is going to be and as the Secretary of State and the President have insisted. The Judd substitute gets it back to the point where perhaps more of you can support it in good conscience and let the people back home know what the bill is, because there is always a chance that in the heat of debate folks are going to get the wrong impression about a bill of this type. Perhaps this substitute amendment is unnecessary repetition of the limitations already in the bill, especially because the clearcut statements by committee members today and yesterday nailing down the real purposes and scope of this bill. In all events I now agree it is an improvement over my earlier suggestion to set up a numerical limitation.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman agree with the statement that we are going in there at their own suggestion and invitation and that we are not voluntarily going in?

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly correct. The suggestion comes from them; from Greece and from Turkey.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman recall any testimony before the committee, either in open or executive sessions, to the effect that there was an intention to go in on a military basis or any basis other than an advisory one?

Mr. MUNDT. None whatsoever. We should keep that clearly in mind. That is already in the bill; the Judd proposal would again reiterate it. We are making it clear to Russia, as we are making it clear to the people of America, that we are not sending occupational forces over there, and we increase our stature with other nations of the world when they know that we are proceeding in a traditional American manner to uphold the hands of free men in another area of the world.

There is nothing new in American history about that sort of thing. We are doing it because we recognize that the menace of communism is at their door and that it is heading in our direction. The Russians are going to look at the size of the vote by which we affirm this Presidential program to discontinue appeasement of Russia. The thing that they will look at is not the numbers of the men that we have in Greece or Turkey but they will consider what they know so well—our vast industrial capacity; the attitude of the free men of America; our vast reservoir of good will and friendship among free peoples the world over; our fleet and our Army; our atom bomb and our machine tools.

We do not have to worry that we are going in any way to injure the strength of our voice against communism by adopting the amendment which the committee has accepted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am unable to embrace the doctrine that God is not averse to deceit when committed in a holy cause. If the pending resolution is not military in character, then it is a cheat and a swindle. It is, of course, military; and, because of that fact, I favor its adoption; and because of that fact, no restraint should be laid upon those who will administer it.

It ought to be easy for this House to realize that a storm is upon the sea. The old ship of state is in peril, and we who man it should fight both wind and tide that now concurrently run against us.

Speak of it as you may, the pending amendment is an appeasement of the forces that we wish to restrain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 59, noes 99.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. JUDD and Mr. COX to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee: On page 2, line 5, after the word "paragraph", insert "*Provided*, That in the assignment of civilian personnel to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act, preference shall be given to ex-service men and women."

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the ex-service men and women in America. Many of them have inquired what we propose to do in their behalf in this bill.

This amendment does not in any way interfere with the proper administration of this gift to Turkey and Greece; it simply gives a priority or preference to veterans.

I speak as one not unfamiliar with the hardships and bloodshed of war. We have heard a lot today and in days gone by from men who have had the courage to sit across mahogany tables and plan wars. But now is the opportunity for Members of this Congress to do something for the service men and women who have actually fought these wars.

I have met a number of nurses who having served in World War II would like to have the opportunity to further their service, if it is to be on the battlefields of Greece and Turkey. I met a number of Waves and Wacs who gave their time and effort in order that some able-bodied soldier might go to the field of battle. I met and talked to a number of GI's and ex-servicemen, both officers and enlisted personnel, who came home to find that their job was gone, that the world has truly moved on and now they have no employment. There are many well qualified ex-service men and women in my congressional district who are unemployed. They would like to have an opportunity to go over and serve their country in this way. We promised these men and women we would do something for them. Our Congress made that promise.

I do not think there is any serious opposition to an amendment of this kind. I have talked to a number of Members on both sides of the aisle and they seem to think it is a good proposition.

Mr. Chairman, before we go too far into this matter, may I say that this is a sad hour indeed. The cloak of secrecy has been placed around this whole thing. All of the issues have not been aired and brought to light. The internationalists have sold the American people a bill of goods.

Why do you not tell the people that this is a military bill and that you are proposing to plunge this country into war? Why do you not tell the people all of the facts? Personally, I do not like to vote for something unless I know what I am voting for. Why have we in times gone by spent days and days in hearing testimony, bringing in great volumes of it and presenting it to this Congress? Now, we are being requested to make the most important decision, admittedly so by the proponents, that this Congress has ever been asked to make. Within a few hours or a few

committee hearings you bring it in here and ask us to pass upon the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the learning and ability of all these gentlemen, but I do say that as the days come and go if we vote for this we will see controls again, we will see the shackles of economic slavery placed upon the people of our country again, we will see the very same thing happen that we tried to undo.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about lowering the price of commodities and we talk about doing something with reference to the high cost of living. The facts are, and the Committee on Agriculture will tell you, this country is not self-supporting from an agricultural standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the Greek and Turkey gift because I am convinced that it is not in our national interest. We are in no position to undertake to finance every nation in Europe, Asia, and China, and that is exactly what this policy will lead to. We have been importing agricultural products to supply our own tables, and it would occur to me that it is now time to begin to look after our own people. We cannot afford to continue to ship large quantities of food and commodities across the seas. Such a policy will make us poor and at the mercy of strong powers that might arise. Millions of people are now feeling the direct affects of the high cost of living. We cannot have a lowering in the cost of living and at the same time continue to export both food and commodities to all parts of the world.

I fear that our action here today will lead down the road to a third world war. We are projecting ourselves into the complicated political affairs and internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. We are taking sides with a faction of the population in these respective nations. Some claim that we are only sending a military mission of some 100 or 200 men to administer the food and supplies provided for by this so-called assistance to Greece and Turkey bill. Four hundred million dollars is a lot of money, but that amount of money cannot stop communistic aggression in Greece or Turkey. In order properly to make Greece and Turkey our first line of defense it would require probably billions of dollars to build the necessary military installations, including air strips, pill boxes, improvement of docks, exporting of the necessary mechanized equipment, the installation of communication centers, the supplying of food, the equipping of a number of divisions of trained men that would actually be necessary properly to fortify Greece and Turkey. I think what we are doing here today is a serious matter, and I sincerely trust that we have not taken a step that may well lead to the repetition of past experiences. I am afraid that another world war would destroy liberty at home and abroad. In my humble judgment, the matter of assistance to Greece and Turkey should have been handled by the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to give the veterans a preference of employment in an isolated case where we are going to undertake a particular project in two countries. I do not believe that the American veterans of this last war or any other war in which this country has engaged want any further privileges over the average citizen in this country. We veterans have been well taken care of by the American Congress and the American people and are grateful. That is the first point.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it not true that under our general law now the veterans get preference without this special provision in this legislation?

Mr. FULTON. That was my second point. Under the general law already existing, under civil service, the veterans are adequately taken care of, and I do not believe that we should start the practice of hanging this veterans' preference on every bill that comes up here.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman has suggested that the veterans were well satisfied and being well taken care of. If the gentleman will just travel around over the country—and I assume the gentleman is a veteran—and look around a little and listen to the men talk, he may change that opinion. Further, what is wrong with placing a provision in here that will give the boys that fought for freedom along with you, and fought for all of us, and fought for our country this privilege? Why not give them an opportunity? Why not nail it down by this amendment so that they can be taken care of? What is wrong with that?

Mr. FULTON. I disagree. I had yielded at length to the successor of my good friend, Carroll Reece, and I feel I cannot yield any longer.

I might say that the veterans who are returning want to be citizens first and veterans second, and that we do not want always to be asking for special privileges. We feel when we have been given protection under a general act, and when we have been given very generous treatment by this Congress, that there can be little complaint.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one else is seeking recognition, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "furnish", insert "nonmilitary."

On page 1, line 7, after the semicolon, insert "and."

On page 2, line 8, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 2, line 9, strike out all down to the end of section 1.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to eliminate from this bill all of its military provisions. For years in America the Beautiful, as long as I can remember, we have been singing in our churches, "In the Cross of Christ I glory towering o'er the wrecks of time." One thing is sure, this legislation will increase the wreckage, but if this legislation is Christian doctrine then I do not know what the Christion Church stands for or represents. I can imagine how our people will feel seeing Uncle Sam arm in arm with Greek and Turkish monarchists marching down the pike and singing, "Onward, Christian Soldiers."

Mr. Chairman, wholesale hypocrisy has been practiced on the American people by the administration in the presenting of this bill for an international military alliance in the name of relief. Most of the newspapers, many of the radio commentators, and all of the State Department bureaucrats have used the word "relief." This, as I believe every person in the House recognizes, and as the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has stated, is a complete, deliberate act of wholesale misrepresentation. It is a scandal on the morality and the political ethics of the Truman administration that it should have engaged in this monstrous misrepresentation concerning the nature of the present bill before us. The sham, the pretense, the tears, the public vulgarity accompanying this monstrosity reflects on the intent of the administration.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps some Member of the House feels that these are strong words. Some Members of the House who oppose this bill have been accused of demagogy by exactly those people who in a complete spirit of Machiavellian demagogy have attempted to sell this insane military alliance to the American people under the pretext that it was giving food to the hungry and clothes to the naked.

Mr. Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, in speaking to a group of Members of the House a couple of months ago, stated that $60,000,000 would adequately take care of all of the relief needs of Greece in the next year. Herbert Hoover was sent abroad by President Truman to determine the relief needs. This was his answer.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in the House deeply appreciate the heroic sacrifices of the Greek people in the last war. If any people in the world deserve generosity and gratitude from America, it is the Greek people. They need food, they need clothes, they need economic help. I, for one, am more than ready to extend such help. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order that the genuine desires of the American people to assist the Greek peo-

ple shall not become a pawn in the hands of power-mad State Department bureaucrats, I am offering this amendment which, when it strikes from this bill all of its military aspects, will make of the present bill a genuine, bona fide, 100-percent relief bill—pure and simple.

Turkey needs no relief. It is fat, and is fat on the traitorous war profits which it squeezed from us and from its dealings with Hitler Germany. It needs no relief and no proponent of this measure has ever dared to suggest that it needs relief.

Mr. Chairman, the British for 2 years have organized, financed, and waged a merciless civil war against the great majority of the Greek people. They have taken American money to pay for their civil war, and they have used our supplies and UNRRA relief in the past to bolster up their criminal attack on the democratic rights and liberties of the Greek patriots now fighting in the mountains of Greece.

Food for the rich aristocracy of Athens and bullets for the machine guns with which to attack the democratic peasantry of Greece is not my idea of a relief bill. Long ago, in 1776, we separated ourselves from the ruthless policies of British imperialism. It would be the height of folly for us to employ on a world scale their ruthless tactics of civil war against the poor and relief for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, the House should repudiate the monstrous misrepresentation generated by our State Department. It should repudiate the arrogant hypocrisy under which this proposal has been offered to the American people. We should make this bill a genuine relief measure. We should strike from this bill every element regarding the military. I urge that the House in all good conscience and good faith adopt the amendment which I am offering to eliminate all the military features from this bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we are making some progress now. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is early in the day and I think we ought to have a little more time to speak on this bill.

I plead with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs not to press his request.

Mr. EATON. The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], suggests that I ask that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so merely to ask the chairman this question.

I trust this is not evidence of an inclination to cut off debate because that is the thing we have been pleading for. What if it is going to take another day?

Mr. EATON. The gentleman's trust is well placed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am apparently one of the insane Machiavellians that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has referred to in smearing all those who feel that this bill should pass.

You remember Bert Williams' song, "You don't need to know how much you know in order to know how little you know."

I have been to Greece and Turkey. I have recently talked to the elected representatives of 23 countries in Cairo. I realize that I do not know all about this. I have talked off the record with our ambassadors to Greece and Turkey and our military men here and in those countries. I realize I do not know all about this problem. But I know a great deal more about this and the threat to our own security which is involved than does my colleague who criticizes with wild and reckless generalities those who support this measure.

The pending amendment would take out the military advice and the military equipment which is proposed in this bill to give these two countries a chance to defend themselves against Soviet attacks. This amendment would make this a nice economic bill so that these countries could build themselves into richer prizes for Soviet aggression. This amendment makes this into a Henry Wallace bill. Wallace is the individual who is so anxious to furnish economic help over there but no military help of any kind so that these two countries may become richer and juicier Soviet prizes. I do not think the House wants to adopt the Henry Wallace program by adopting this amendment.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, ever since this proposal for this sort of aid to Greece and Turkey was brought to our attention by the President, I have been alarmed and worried by its implications. I have sought the advice of the people of the district I represent and the generous response has been gratifyingly thorough and thoughtful. I have, of course, studied the committee report and the debate.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in which we find ourselves in our consideration of this bill reminds me of the situation which confronted an early settler in the central part of New York State. He was a prosperous settler, the most prosperous in the entire area. Within his stockade, which lay in the center of his cultivated fields, he maintained a fine supply of arms and ammunition. It was a limited supply because all supplies were limited, but it was, nevertheless, sufficiently adequate to deter the savage Iroquois Indians from making a direct attack upon his settlement. This did not prevent the Iroquois, however, from commencing to threaten and harass the friendly and less warlike Mohicans who lived in the settlement's near vicinity. The settler knew that if these friendly Indians were destroyed, his danger at the hands of the Iroquois would be greater. He did not have enough guns and ammunition to arm all the friendly Mohicans but he reached the conclusion that it would be worth while to make a show of arming a few of them to demonstrate to the Iroquois that he meant business. His aim was to protect both his friends and himself. He also reached the conclusion that if this show of force failed, he would not leave himself defenseless by making panic distribution of the great bulk of his arms and ammunition. Instead, if and when an all-out attack by the Iroquois compelled him to retire into his stockade, he would still be strong and ready with food and guns and bullets and gunpowder.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill to aid Greece and Turkey. Beyond that, however, and for my part, I will oppose spreading our resources and our arms and our ammunition with such a free hand and in so many directions that we will be unable to withstand the Iroquois if and when they attack.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio which, if adopted, deprives the bill of all military significance and makes it purely a relief measure.

This amendment lays bare the real issue involved in this bill which has been largely evaded during the 3-day debate. Why should we camouflage and sugarcoat the decision which is before us? Let us face it squarely. This bill is a measure for military defense of the United States, and all for which the United States stands in the world today. That is why I am for it.

One by one the outposts of freedom have been engulfed by the onrushing tide of a world power which recognizes nothing but force and which intends to dominate the entire world. If Greece and Turkey, keys to the Near East, are so engulfed, the loss of Europe, Asia, and Africa is inevitable. The President of the United States in joint convention, has solemnly informed us that we, and we alone, can stem this tide. He has informed the Congress that a crumbling and bankrupt British Empire is no longer able to act, and that the United Nations organization, torn with dissension and restricted in its powers by its own charter, cannot meet this situation. His statement in this respect in corroborated by Warren Austin, delegate to the United Nations, and by Senator VANDENBERG who has inserted safeguards in the measure now before us to make sure that we shall not violate our obligation to that organization. The President has formally declared our policy to us and to the

world and calls upon Congress to support him. How can we do otherwise?

We have the bitter lessons of two wars to guide us. We failed to act when Hitler invaded the Rhineland, when the Nazis overpowered Czechoslovakia, and when Japan entered China. As a result, we expended thousands of lives and billions of dollars to gain beachheads in north Africa, Normandy, and on the islands of the Pacific. Shall we weakly surrender all that we have gained at such tremendous cost?

The vote which we cast today is more important than any that will be cast in this or perhaps any other session of Congress. The eyes of the world are upon this Chamber. The enemies of freedom, both foreign and domestic, are watching us. To be sure, if we embark upon the course that this bill provides we may ultimately face war, but if we reject that course we shall certainly face war or lose our liberties. Every school child knows the words of the great Virginian who made the first speech in our history against appeasement:

> What is it that the gentlemen wish? • • • Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God!

We, as a nation, cannot escape our manifest destiny which is to defend freedom at home and abroad. A vote against this bill is a vote for that policy of isolationism and appeasement which has twice led us down the road to war.

I repeat that this bill, while it properly carries relief to the sufferers of Greece, is fundamentally a measure for the military defense of this country. I shall vote for it.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, our Uncle Sam has gone delinquent. He is in his second childhood. He has deserted beautiful Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters. He has become an international philanderer. He is chasing red, pink, green, and off-colored skirts all over the world. He is squandering the wealth that Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters have created.

The time has come that we appoint a guardian to protect him from his folly, and prevent him from squandering the substance of our Nation—from giving away to gold diggers that which belongs to Miss Columbia and her sons and daughters—that which belongs to unborn generations.

I know of no better guardian than a Republican candidate for President in 1948, who believes in America first, last and all the time, with justice to all nations, whether they be the so-called 52 peace-loving nations—should be aggressors—or our vanquished foes. One who believes in the Stars and Stripes rather than in a mongrel flag. A candidate who knows enough to know that the One Worlders have been deflated. A candidate that has not, and will not, hob-nob with the former pal of Hitler, Joe Stalin.

I am sorry that such a candidate—such a guardian—is not yet in sight. I also know that 80 percent of the American people are getting sick and tired of our Uncle's behavior, and demand such a candidate. They know that our Uncle is the easy prey of the global gold diggers—that he is denuding our Nation. They know that he is leading us into another undeclared war.

I, too, realize that this is a momentous decision. But it need not be, if we remember that our first duty is to our own Nation. It is an easy decision, unless we knock-kneedly follow a few misguided, silver-topped octogenarians in both chambers of this Capitol.

The Republican Party was kept out of the White House for 16 years because it had no positive program—because its candidates were "me-too" followers of the One Worlders—globetrotters. The Democrats met a disastrous rebuke last November 5 because they too blindly followed blind leaders.

The time has come for both parties to again adopt the policy of our forefathers, and avoid globetrotting and foreign entanglements. The time has come for my Democratic friends to adopt the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson. The time has come for my Republican friends to adopt the doctrines of Abraham Lincoln. When that day comes, it will be a glorious day for the United States of America.

As I listened the other day to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], I was impressed with his dreadful earnestness, and astonished at his fallacious argument. It was the same old story—arm other nations, and they will protect us—will save us from war. How does the gentleman know on which side the Greeks or Turks will be in the next conflict? Does he not know that an armament race always has, and always will end in war?

Since when have we become so cowardly that we have to arm other nations to do our fighting—Hessians. I deny that that is essential, or for the best interest of our Nation or for the peace of the world. It means war.

Whenever the day comes that love for our country and patriotism falls so low, that this kind of chicanery is necessary, then the Republic that you and I have cherished and loved—the Republic that the world has looked to as a model of justice and decency to all nations—will be dead. Then, we will have surrendered all that is sacred and good to the human race.

Let us no longer be blind followers of deceptive slogans. We were deceived and led into World War I by false slogans. Then it was, "He kept us out of war," "Too proud to fight," "America first," and then "Benevolent belligerency," "A little group of willful men," "War to end all wars," and, "Make the world safe for democracy." Time has proven the dishonesty of all those slogans.

In World War II it was "Raise the arms embargo and save our boys," "Give us the tools and we will do the fighting—lend-lease," "The four freedoms," and then "I say again and again and again your sons will not be sent to foreign battlefields." Time has proven these slogans false. There are no four freedoms and our boys did the fighting.

Whatever difficulties we face today are of our own making. We went to bed with the former pal of Hitler and we are reaping the reward. Our Presidents and leaders were outgeneraled at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. In place of looking for more entanglements the time has come for Congress to repudiate Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, and all the other commitments that are not in keeping with decency and honesty among the nations.

History repeats itself. So does war. So do slogans. We are now being deceived into World War III. Now we are told that we—less than 7 percent of the world's population and owing twice as much as the rest of the world together—must become a permanent, international Santa Claus. We are told that we must not only feed the world but that we must arm and set nation against nation. That we must arm Greece and Turkey and set them against Hitler's former pal, more recently our pal.

In his special message to Congress the President short-circuited the UN—the angel of peace that concealed the truth and sanctioned the liquidation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, part of Poland, and part of Finland by the former pal of Hitler. The President insists that we accept reneging British commitments and assume guardianship of Greece, Turkey, and other nations. He says we must do this in order to head off communism—to save Britain from Russia.

In his armament race, in his power politics, the President is following the unfortunate footsteps of the former President. He is entering an undeclared war. All this could have been avoided if at Potsdam he had repudiated Yalta and taken a firm stand by telling Stalin to get back into his own country where he belongs and stay there.

Again, at about the time that the President asked for the $400,000,000 to arm Greece and Turkey against communism, our Government was turning over 650 artillery shell pressers and other implements of war to Russia as reparations. These were from the part of Germany that we occupy. The German war plants were dismantled and shipped to Russia. With one hand we arm Russia and with the other we are asked to equip the Greeks and Turks to combat her. The time has come to wake up. There is danger ahead.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers during the last few days have told us of the celebration throughout

Soviet Russia of "Soviet Radio Day." The Soviet radio throughout Russia and in broadcasts to other countries has been telling the world that the Soviet radio is "objective because it has nothing to hide" and has been assailing the American radio as a part of the "reactionary press." The Soviet radio has even attacked the Voice of America and I would like to read a part of a broadcast which the Russians sent over the air in four languages in Europe.

This broadcast is the second recognition the Russians have officially given to the Voice of the United States of America which has been broadcasting the news of the United States to the Soviet Union. Ilya Ehrenberg, the noted Soviet propagandist, previously has told us that the Voice of America is being heard in Soviet Russia. This new broadcast confirms the fact that many Russians are hearing the Voice of America and that apparently Russia is worried that they will hear more truth than they receive from Soviet newspapers and over the Soviet radio.

Here is what this Russian radio broadcast said:

When the famous Russian savant Alexander Popov discovered the method to transmit sound over a distance, he had visions of enriching humanity by the most perfect means of communication, expanding the viewpoints of the people who were afforded the possibility to transmit their thoughts and feelings from one end of the earth to the other with the speed of light. However, every one of humanity's great accomplishments can be twisted, and the world mass now repeatedly witnessed this. The German radio was in the hands of Goebbels for a few years, and there began the demoralization of the German people, a source of misinformation, a propagandist for war, murder, and robbery, and of race theories hostile to humanity.

To hear the same motives in a more democratized version, one has but to tune in on the New York wave lengths. There we hear propaganda for the need to create American * * *. Throughout the world we hear imperialistic plans for the conquest of strategic positions in the Near East and the Levant; hysterical appeals for a crusade against communism, against socialism, and labor unions; in general, against any progressive democratic movement, slanderous fabrications about countries of the new democracy, etc., etc.

Some people accuse the Soviet people that they are too sensitive about such reports. But the fact is that in * * * our Socialist country there is no room for the dissemination of slander and falsification. This arouses aversion on our part simply because we are decent. The Soviet information is objective because it has nothing to hide. With us there are no monopolist groups which pay good salaries for falsifications.

Facts in themselves are objective, but there is not one radio station nor newspaper in the world which in reporting these facts does not express a certain standpoint. The point is, Whose standpoint? Soviet radios throughout the world express the true and sincere opinion of the entire Soviet * * * of the powerful and peace-loving people that is prepared to collaborate with all to create a democratic peace. But in countries where everything is figured in dollars, where the radio is a source of income to the instigators of a new * * * there the radio is not the expression of the people, but that of those 60 or 100 or 200 families who control the radio stations.

This broadcast is only one of many recent Soviet broadcasts in a campaign of false and malicious information about the United States over the air waves of the world.

Since March 12, when President Truman proposed the $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, the Soviet radio has been systematically attacking what they call the "atom" and "dollar" diplomacy of "imperialist capitalists" to take over Turkey and Greece.

This campaign reached its climax during the past week when the Soviet radio began broadcasting the attack of their newspaper Izvestia on Secretary Marshall's speech on the Moscow Conference. On Soviet Radio Day this attack was broadcast in 19 transmissions in 12 languages throughout Europe and the Near East—the greatest concentrated attack the Soviet radio has ever made on a statement of the President or the Secretary of State of the United States. The Soviet broadcasts went to Greece, Turkey, and the Arabic countries which the Voice of America does not now reach. It is highly important that we make every effort to tell the American story in this highly important region.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill, commonly known as the loan to Greece and Turkey, has been in the most part earnest and sincere and of a very high order. The debate has reflected the fact that the membership is much concerned about what is the proper course to take. This is in all sincerity a very important bill because it calls for a complete departure in governmental policy. I want to emphasize this statement that this is a complete departure in governmental policy and further that it is tremendously important. It is appallingly important. I hope that whatever action the House takes on this proposed legislation will ultimately prove to be for the best interest of our country and future generations.

Much has been said on the floor of this House and through the press suggesting that this question is much the same as the question which confronted our country when we enunciated the Monroe Doctrine. I fail to see any similarity between this problem and the problems which confronted us in President Monroe's time. In fact the situation seems to be diametrically different. At that time we were laying the foundations of America. We said then, in effect, that any attempt by an European nation to gain dominion in America would be considered by us as an unfriendly act and would be opposed to the limit of our resources. In other words, we were then protecting ourselves. We were, in effect, removing ourselves away from all European aggression. We purposely assumed a defensive attitude. I think that any attempt at this time to establish a so-called Truman doctrine and claim for it the merits of the Monroe Doctrine is simply an effort to enhance the political stature of Mr. Truman. The course sought to be established by this bill is in every respect a course toward imperialism. It is a course that promises to lead us into foreign entanglements and not away from them.

Many of the Members who have spoken on this floor in advocacy of this legislation have frankly admitted that we are starting on a new course. We are not following a course of defending America for the protection of Americans but we are following a course which its advocates say is one that takes liberty to the peoples of other countries and other continents. This may be true but as yet I am not convinced that it is the right course. Personally, I think that this proposed course is of such tremendous importance that we should give it more consideration than has been given to it. When we enter upon this course we will find ourselves moving inevitably toward a one world. I think that the leaders of our country are not justified in moving so aggressively on this course. The people of the country have not been thoroughly advised with reference to the tremendous changes which this course is bound to bring us from a national and an international standpoint.

Personally, I do not think that the time has come when this great country of ours should throw itself into any movement that has for its ultimate purpose a one-world government. The fact that there is so much honest uncertainty in the minds of so many Members of Congress is proof to me that we are today embarking upon a course, the end of which we cannot safely foresee. The situation to my mind is not so imminent as to demand this action at this time.

The President in the speech he made at Waco, Tex., on March 6, took unto himself much more authority and power than rightfully belong to the Presidency. The President has no right to commit our people to a course which carries with it such momentous consequences. I should like to ask where, under our theory of government, does the President have a right to commit the American people to this course of action. In his speech at Waco, he said:

At this particular time, the whole world is concentrating much of its thought and energy on attaining the objectives of peace and freedom. These objectives are bound up completely with a third objective—reestablishment of world trade. In fact the three—peace, freedom, and world trade—are inseparable.

I agree with the President when he says that the whole world is anxious for peace and freedom. But I do not agree that peace and freedom and world trade are inseparable. In fact I claim that in all the history of our country freedom has been the cardinal purpose of our country and that we cherished this purpose as fervently and even more fervently in war than in peace. Freedom is one thing and peace is another and world trade is quite another. They are all desirable but not inseparable. We would be justified to go to war for freedom's sake but not for the sake of world trade.

When the President says, "Our foreign relations, political and economic, are indivisible, we cannot say that we are willing to cooperate in the one field and are unwilling to cooperate in the other," he

takes unto himself more authority than belongs to the office of the Presidency. In fact he attempts to commit our great Nation to a policy upon which our people have never publicly spoken. We have fought wars in defense of our political relationships but not in defense of our trade relationships. Furthermore, if our people have ever spoken on this subject, their voice has been recorded exactly opposite to the position which the President takes. We have always maintained that as far as our relationships with foreign countries are concerned, our political relationship is one thing and our economic relationship is something else. He attempts to sound forth a new policy which is not a recognized American policy.

The American emissaries at the Economic Conference in Geneva which is now in session are encountering stubborn obstacles in their efforts to foist this program upon the world. The opposition which they are encountering is a natural opposition. They are in Geneva representing a Nation in which a free economy has always been maintained and in which private industry and freedom of action have been the dominating and controlling forces. They are now attempting to deal and bargain with representatives of some nations whose economy is now largely state-controlled and with some nations that are controlled by communistic dictatorships. In other words, the representatives of the countries with whom we are dealing can speak with the authority of a dictator and can make trades without regard to the people of their respective countries while our representatives must consult with the people whom they represent. Our representatives represent a free people while many of the other representatives speak for the state or the dictator who is above the people.

The attempt of the President to speak for America is nothing more or less than an attempt on the part of the New Deal leadership to continue the practices of President Roosevelt as he went about the world committing our country to courses of action without having consulted the people or their elected representatives. When it was so plain that the most unsophisticated of our people knew that we would have trouble with Russia after the war why did not President Roosevelt in some of his many secret conferences anticipate what is happening today and guard against it? I have always maintained that the countries whose peoples were of the same racial extractions and of the same religious philosophies and the same political philosophies as ours should have joined together in the fluxing processes of the last war. They should have been encouraged to stand together against the communistic and pagan and anti-Christian and anti-human freedom countries of eastern Europe.

Likewise, the President in his message to Congress on March 12 assumed to commit our country to courses of action which the American people have not approved. As I have already stated, the President has no inherent right to commit our country to courses of action unless the same have been well recognized courses and unless the people have accepted them or unless the country is in imminent danger.

I quote from the President's message:

> I therefore ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. In requesting these funds, I have taken into consideration the maximum amount of relief assistance which would be furnished to Greece out of the $350,000,000 which I recently requested that the Congress authorize for the prevention of starvation and suffering in countries devastated by the war.
>
> In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction, and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished. I recommend that authority also be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel.
>
> Finally, I ask that the Congress provide authority which will permit the speediest and most effective use, in terms of needed commodities, supplies, and equipment, of such funds as may be authorized.
>
> If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

In this message the President says:

> In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilians and military personnel to Greece and Turkey.

I maintain that the President went entirely too far in attempting to commit our country to a new course which is entirely contrary to the foreign philosophy that we have heretofore followed. Never before in the history of our country has a President attempted to embark our country on a course of military aggrandizement or military imperialism. When we pass this legislation, we are doing it at the behest of the President and in an attempt to follow the course which I maintain that he has improperly charted for us. If this bill is passed as it is, as many Members who have already spoken on this matter have said, it is just the beginning. The President in the remarks that I have already quoted makes the solemn announcement as follows:

> If further funds or further authority should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress.

My colleagues, this action that we are about to take is the first step in the third world war. The President's language can mean nothing else. This appropriation of $400,000,000 is a military appropriation, and nothing else.

I maintain that the country is not ready for a declaration of war, and I shall not vote for a measure which is virtually a declaration of war. I maintain that the situation is not so imminent as to require this action.

I am sorry that our State Department does not have the confidence of the American people. I only wish it did have. That it does not have is due to its failure to be forthright in its dealing with the people. If we had a strong Department of State in which the American people had confidence and if we had an Executive who was recognized as a leader of thought in his own right, and if these two great departments of the Government, after the approval of the military and naval authorities of the Government, would bring us the information that any foreign country was surely and certainly planning military opposition that would threaten the rights and safety of our great country, I would then, as I have done in the last several years, vote to support them in such a program. But since the situation is entirely different, I feel it my duty not to cast a vote that from all indications will lead us into war.

In this connection, and in all seriousness, let me ask, Why is it that the United Nations organization has not been called upon to lend its good offices in an effort to compose and resolve these differences? Of all the nations in the world that should recognize the United Nations, it is the United States of America. We were more responsible for its establishment than any other country and we pay more for its maintenance than any other country. No one of those who have spoken that I have heard has claimed that the United Nations could not have jurisdiction in this case. It may be that it is not a case to come within the jurisdiction of the United Nations, but surely when the United Nations was set up it was contemplated that that organization would have such jurisdiction as would permit it to consider whatever issues this problem raises. But so long as there are Communists holding high places in our Government, and so long as persons in high places in the Government such as was the case in the Roosevelt administration, who knowingly associate and collaborate with well-known communistic persons and groups, I do not feel like taking steps that will surely involve us in war. Let us put our house in order first. Then let us encourage those peoples who subscribe to our political and social philosophies and then let us make ourselves strong in a military and naval way and while we are doing this let us call upon the United Nations organization to protect Greece and Turkey from the insidious encroachments of Soviet Russia through her infiltrations of communism and other sinister philosophies and practices which upset the internal peace and prosperity of Greece and Turkey. When and if all these efforts fail we can then appeal to the arbitrament of war.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks concerning the Greek-Turkish loan, as recommended to Congress by the President, it seems to me there can be one open door to the course of action to be taken. The program is being discussed throughout the length and breadth of our land and in foreign countries as well. It becomes now the immediate problem of the Members of Congress, after thorough investigation, discussion, and debate, to decide which policy this country will follow. No Member or group of men can foresee the far-reaching effects and ultimate outcome the action will have.

There are in this country a great number of intelligent Americans representing every walk of economic and political life, who have a firm belief in democracy and in its survival. We, in the United States, live under the oldest written Constitution in the world. We have a tradition of freedom. Despite occasional irrationalities, the dislike of servility and regimentation is deeply ingrained in the American character. To exercise free speech, free choice, free government, is one of America's chief contributions to the world. This tradition of freedom constitutes a backbone that refuses to crumble before authority The strength of this democracy of freedom is that the United States must remain firm and true to its purpose. The true American feels that what is best in his own democracy will be best for men in all other countries seeking like ideals. There is nothing we want for ourselves that we do not want, ultimately, for the rest of the world.

We know the philosophy of Russia and the policy that follows the infiltration of ideologies into smaller countries, with the ultimate objective to incorporate through revolt and revolution or by conquest. This policy was followed by Hitler during his leadership in Germany.

Now, as we are faced with these nations which have suffered the ravages of war and are now in a state of unrest and fear of being pressed into submission by an aggressor nation, it seems to me, that America must take a firm stand in its foreign policy and discontinue the policy of appeasement. Appeasement leads only to more appeasement until we should soon find our backs to the wall and our leadership as a Nation completely wrested from us. The consequences are not hard to imagine.

To accept a do-nothing policy puts democracy under a handicap. We cannot continue a great democracy by giving ourselves up as individuals to selfishness and physical comfort and be blind to the desperate need of others. The very foundation of the American ideal of a better and richer life for all is that others, in varying degrees, may share it.

There are two alternatives for our action toward Greece and Turkey. One is lending aid, thereby furnishing the help needed to retain their freedom. The other, to serve notice to them that we are not concerned with their problem, thus leaving them in their vain struggle against aggression.

Let us stop and ask ourselves this question: "Is peace the supreme end of foreign policy or is the survival of nations in independence and security a greater end than peace?" Through the creation of the United Nations organization we have hope that these problems will eventually be settled, but we are all aware that at this period in its development and progress, it is still unable to cope with this responsibility. Therefore, I do not concede that we are bypassing the United Nations. The Greek-Turkish loan is a direct appeal to the United States.

Although included in this are funds for military aid, I do not feel that this action will lead to war, but will lend more to bringing about a lasting peace, in that these smaller nations will be put in a better position financially and morally to oppose the pressure being brought upon them.

No great power can be indifferent to any of the other great powers. It must take a position in regard to all of them. There are two great powers left in the world. America is at the crossroads as to whether we accept or reject the world leadership in the ideals of our democracy of freedom. If we accept it, we must take a firm and positive stand on foreign policy, the object being not only to provide security against war but also to organize a peace which will prevent war. We want a foreign policy so strong and so dependable that there is no way of challenging it.

To preserve civilization, we must be ready to give the world more than we get. The nation or the individual who looks for the tangible returns and quick profits will be the very one who will come back empty handed. We must have faith in God and confidence in those nations who accept our aid, that freedom, security, and peace may be achieved.

Consequently, it is my personal conviction that I must support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

On the issue before us, I take my position beside Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the outstanding patriot from Virginia. Possibly the forces back of the pending bill know that it would take us into war, and intend that it should. In that case, we may be sure the necessary incident to start the conflagration will appear in due time.

On the other hand, it may be that those responsible for bringing this measure before Congress are not deliberately maneuvering the United States into war but believe the action they are asking Congress to take will somehow spare the United States from another holocaust. If this be the case, the United States would be placing itself in the precarious position of possibly losing what power it possesses to prevent war. The Greeks and Turks might provide incidents of their own, in which event they—not we—would make the great decision. Is the United States placing its destiny in the hands of the Greeks and Turks?

What will the Turks get out of the war, if this eventuates, and what will be the spoils of Greece? Is anyone so naive as to believe they would deign to farm out their homelands to be used as a war base without some promise of territorial expansion? Was there not once a far-flung and powerful Ottoman Empire? Are we to presume that this fact does not still linger in the minds of the Turks?

First, the United States used of its resources to enthrone Hitler in power. Then at a fearful financial, material, and moral cost we knocked him off his high pedestal, but put something just as bad and possibly worse in his place. Now the Congress is being importuned and inveigled to inaugurate a scheme to shear Hitler's successor of his power.

Having accomplished that—more likely than not at an additional terrific cost of blood and physical and moral resources—and possibly the enthronement of the Turk in power, will the United States then be obliged to continue the cycle of destroying and reestablishing empires by abolishing our latest creation? Where will it all end? God alone knows.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me I should like to say something about an incident that very much affected me this morning. Over in my office about an hour ago a group of Communists called upon me, and I imagine other gentlemen have had the same experience in the last day or so. They wanted very much to know how I was going to vote on this Greece-Turkey bill. They were very much against it, of course. I told them to their teeth that I was going to vote for it. I further asked these gentlemen, and I had to put the question six or seven times before I got a straight answer, in the event of a conflict of interests between the Government of the United States and the Government of Russia, which Government would they, as the Communist Party of the United States, support. Their final answer was that they would support the Government of Russia against the United States.

That is the American Communist Party for you. Mr. Lenin, on numerous occasions, and Mr. Stalin, following him, frequently have stated the world-wide ambitions of communism. Let us make no mistake about their purposes. They have exemplified those purposes by the countries surrounding Russia today.

Gentlemen who oppose this measure state that they do so because of the economy of America and that they do not wish to deplete the resources of the United States. Let me ask those gentlemen: Are they willing to let Russia expand over the rest of the world? Are they willing to adopt a head-in-the-sand policy and permit Russia to take over the trade routes of the world? If Russia does that, what will be the result? There will result a competition between the United States and the Russian-dominated world wherein Russia, having a slave economy with ten to fifteen or perhaps more million people in slave camps working for the Russian economy, will compete with the United States. Where, then, will our economy end up? It will end up competing with the totalitarian world. Those gentlemen who talk of economy and protecting the economy of the United States—are they willing to let Russia take over the economy of the world? If that is the situation, then we

will have to become somewhat totalitarian ourselves to compete with slave labor and the average of $1.08 an hour that American labor now earns will be reduced by at least half as a result of competing with 15,000,000 slaves.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would strike all military aid from this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no greater mistake than the attempt to strike all military aid from this bill which calls for assistance to Greece and Turkey. Actually, as we all know, this legislation cannot be justified merely as relief for these two countries. The American people are entitled to know that we entertain no illusions that the assistance we are to render is other than basically military and strategic in character. However strong may be the need for civilian and economic help to indomitable Greece, it has been clearly demonstrated that Turkey neither needs nor expects anything but a bolstering of her out-of-date military machine. In the case of Greece, we will surely lose the chief fruit of our investment if we do not couple such economic help as we are prepared to give with advice in reorganizing and strengthening her army and by furnishing arms and munitions. Military aid is thus the heart of the entire program for both countries.

I think our experience in practicing sweet gentleness and forbearance that led up to two wars ought to demonstrate the futility of temporizing with dictators. An estimable gentleman by the name of Chamberlain found that being polite is not always the most effective way to deal with bullies.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we also found that being polite to the Japanese in Hawaii did not pay.

Mr. GOFF. I thank the gentleman.

We will be adopting a halfway measure if we strike the military-aid provision out of this bill. When you are dealing with bears you have to speak in growls, the only language that a bear can understand.

It seems to me the fundamental issue before us is whether we are prepared to stop this program of infiltration and aggression. We ought to make this action strong enough for Stalin to understand that we are prepared to go the limit in preventing Greece and Turkey from being taken over as have been the whole list of smaller countries on the borders of Russia. I was not impressed the other day with the argument that because we had stood by and permitted the gobbling up of Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other countries that we should not now protect Greece and Turkey. Whatever mistakes may have been made in yielding to Stalin at Yalta and Teheran, I thought Secretary Byrnes, fortified by bipartisan support at home, had stopped backing away and announced there would be no further compromise on the principles for which we had poured out American lives and treasure. We have done a lot of talking about freedom for small nations and their right to self-determination. Now is the time to show the world we meant what we said. What the Russians respect most is a firm stand and a strong hand. These will come nearer to prevention of war with them than any policy of appeasement. We did not free Europe from the Nazis just to let the Communists move in. That would be throwing away the sacrifices we have already made.

We should have had our understanding with Russia, without any compromise of principles, when her back was against the wall, and when she called on us for help. Any concession or show of weakness on our part now will permit her to grow in strength and make the inevitable show-down all the more difficult for us when finally it comes.

After serving in two wars, I have had my fill, but surely we must realize that temporizing is not the way to stop aggressors. The people of Russia are entitled to have any type of government they want, but they must not force it on us or on the rest of the world. I, too, have looked over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Stalin should understand that we are not agreeing to withhold anything if he persists in his present course, and that is the reason I voted against the amendment on atomic weapons submitted by the gentlewoman from California. I do not propose that we repeat the mistake of Britain which sent Chamberlain over to stop Hitler with an umbrella.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that everybody's mind has been made up and the debate means nothing; that each one has made up his mind. I do not concur. I will state frankly that I am grateful for the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We who do not concur in their conclusions nevertheless respect their sincerity and industry. I want to commend especially the work of Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. VORYS, of our own State of Ohio.

During the 4-day debate my opinion is that the outstanding address has been made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. He is a member of the opposite party and I have never met the honorable gentleman. However, he gave a message which we must heed when in substance he said: "Let us avoid hysteria. By all means let there be no speeches for applause and, at the time of voting, let us know that emotionalism shall not have the right-of-way." Let me state frankly that self-will shall not guide my vote.

If Dr JUDD's amendment had been agreed to, I would have supported the bill. If the present amendment or any amendment is offered and carried which will remove us from being an aggressive power-politics nation which could change this greatest of all peaceful nations into a nation asking for war, I could support this measure. I could support it if it meant that our tractors in Greece which are now rusting would be put to work, that there would be a chance for a better world and not an opportunity for hysteria to lead us into war mindedness and war madness.

War is not imminent, neither is peace imminent. Through hysteria, we are now building up a straw man at which to shoot, thus allowing "patriotism to become the refuge of a scoundrel." I do not mean that the person so shouting is purposely a scoundrel but when hysteria instead of sound reasoning guides power propaganda talk, he involuntarily becomes one unintentionally. I shall have an open mind but there have been no facts presented to show the need which has been expressed through emotionalism.

There was a time when people called others vulgar or profane names. Now, we politely call everyone with whom we do not agree, a Communist, a Fascist, a Nazi, an isolationist, an internationalist, a New Dealer, a conservative Republican, or a reactionary Democrat. These words are also the product of hysteria. There is not a gentleman in either of the great parties on the floor of this House whom I do not respect and whom I would brand with any of these names. I do not always respect the judgment of some, but I would not charge these names to any one on the floor of the House.

The history of communism we know and we know of its start in Russia. We know of the start of fascism in Italy and of nazism in Germany. All were created when the people surrendered their freedom to their government for things and by so surrendering they not only lost their freedom but failed to obtain things. We breed communism, fascism, and nazism when we surrender the sovereignty of the individual to the control of government authority. A great many think those who vote for this measure are isolationists, isolating a group of countries against another asking for war. I do not impugn their motives. There are others who maintain everyone who loves the United States of America is an isolationist. Neither do I concur in this view. We only become isolationists in mind when we refuse to recognize the viewpoint of another. Isolationism is mental. Even though counterfeit ghost-writers are able to attach these slanderous names to persons, let us not personalize any of these names to the colleague with whose views we do not agree.

My appeal is, let us be sane. Let us not be self-willed in this hour of decision. Let us listen to the "still, small voice" instead of that self-will and be guided by the "still, small voice" in this critical hour.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER:

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and Turkey."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "or Turkey."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 18, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "or of Turkey."

On page 3, line 13, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, does that means that the committee will have the last 5 minutes or is that in addition to 5 minutes for the committee?

Mr EATON. The committee does not want any time on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, President Truman has asked us to form a military alliance with a nation whose record in the art of international double-cross is without parallel in the annals of history. This nation, for a thousand years, has persecuted Christians and Jews. It is without free elections, it denies freedom of the press, it is ruled by a ruthless military dictatorship. There is no argument, Mr. Chairman, of any kind—political, economic, or ethical—which does not argue against the inclusion of Turkey within this proposed bill.

Mr. Chairman, would any Member of the House invite a thief into his home to protect his property? Is there anybody who would hire a bandit to protect his wealth? Is there anybody who would pay a military dictator in order to guarantee his civil rights and his civil liberties? Is there anybody in the House who can conscientiously point to any ground whatsoever for putting our national security into the hands of the present Turkish Government? How in God's name can American national security be entrusted to a government which on the record has broken every single international commitment it ever made?

Mr. Chairman, in 1926 Turkey and several other powers signed the Montreux Convention, under which armed control of the Dardanelles was returned to Turkey. Mr. Chairman, do the Members of the House know that Winston Churchill denounced in the bitterest possible terms in the House of Commons the open, flagrant violation of the Montreux Convention by the Turkish Government during the last war? Do the Members know that Anthony Eden, Foreign Minister of Britain, likewise denounced the violation of this convention? Do all of us know that the United States Government, Russia, and Britain are committed to review and revise the Montreux Convention governing the Dardanelles? Mr. Chairman, if all of us know these simple facts which are a matter of record, why does our State Department propose to guarantee continued Turkish military control of the Dardanelles? They go further, Mr. Chairman. In this bill, what in effect they propose is an enduring and continuing military alliance with Turkey. And where, Mr. Chairman, does this military alliance end? In this bill, we are asked to pay a first installment on a mercenary army. Will we be asked next year for another one hundred and fifty or two-hundred and fifty millions of dollars for Turkish armaments in the years 1949, 1950, 1951? This policy, Mr. Chairman, of hiring mercenary armies was employed against the American people in 1776 by the British, and now we propose to repeat on a world scale the age-old errors of British imperialism—measures whose immorality and whose utter viciousness I cannot adequately describe.

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of the world has a policy of hiring foreign mercenaries in any way contributed to the national security of a country. Let us put that on the record, Mr. Chairman. Can any Member of the House cite an instance in the history of the world in which the national security of a country was properly and adequately maintained by the hiring of mercenary troops of another foreign nation? Washington and Jefferson and Madison knew and understood the immorality and colossal stupidity of such insane policies.

Never in American history, Mr. Chairman, have we proposed to establish our national security on the basis of foreign mercenary armies and an international system of mercenary alliances. This policy has been conceived in corruption and disguised in the robes of hypocrisy. It is a fatal policy—it is a policy of war and world power politics. It is a policy which no American voter has ever cast his vote for. The American people oppose it. The House of Representatives, in all good conscience and good faith, should agree to the amendment which I herewith introduce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, to adopt the pending amendment would, of course, be equivalent to adopting the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio offered yesterday when he moved to strike out the enacting clause. To strike out aid to Turkey would be but to invite immediate action on the part of the Soviet Union and to place Greece in an utterly untenable position, and it would simply place us in a position where we would be certainly involved in war. If you want to guarantee involvement of this country in foreign wars you can do it no more effectively than to adopt this amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio says: "Turn over the Dardanelles, turn over the most strategic point in all the eastern part of the world to the Soviet Union." I say turn over because they have demanded it. They have already sent their demands to Turkey and said: "We must put our armies in your territory and take control of the Dardanelles."

If America says to the world that we are not interested, then the Turks must give in. What else can they do? What would you do if you were in their position? Turkey is a country of about 18,000,000 people with more than 800,000 now under arms and they have been under arms for years. That constitutes a burden that no civilized people can long endure. Of course, Russia knows that. She therefore proposes to keep Turkey under arms until such time as Turkey's economy has collapsed by the weight of the burden of this great armament, then Russia will move in and take what it wants unless we show clearly that we will resist with all our resources.

This amendment is a direct invitation to Russia to invade Turkey. How long could Greece last if the Dardanelles fall? Those of you who have not thought this thing out, look at the map. With a Russian army on the Bosphorus and on the Dardanelles, and a Russian navy coming through these passages into the Aegean Sea, how long do you think that Greece could stand?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has flown over the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles only 3 weeks ago and has talked with our own military attaché. I suggest that the gentleman knows what he is talking about.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim that I am an expert. Maybe I stayed 1 day too long to be an expert and 1 day too short to write a book, but we did see the physical aspects of some of these problems and we did have the opportunity to talk with the American militar, attaché in Turkey as well as with many of the officials of Turkey. We talked also to newspapermen, we talked to American educators, we talked to all we could find. I am convinced if there is one place on this earth that is anticommunistic it is Turkey today. If there is any nation in the world that will resist Russian aggression it is Turkey. If there is one place where the Communists have made no inroads it is Turkey and not the United States. Turkey presents a more solid opposition to Russian aggressor than we do right here. We have our apologists for Russia, some of them sitting around here today. We have them in every part of this country. But not so in Turkey. The Turks have lived next door to Russia for generations and have been the victims of Russian aggression in the past. I am thoroughly convinced that those people in Turkey, if given any assurance that the United States will back them up with the needed supplies and with an air force, will fight to the death and resist Russian or any other aggression.

With the kind of army that Turkey has and with the spirit that Turkey has, I am convinced, as are our military men, that Turkey can withstand any pressure that is put on her; that Turkey can and will keep an invasion from coming in through these mountains in the northeast and that they can keep an invasion from coming in across those fortifications north and west of Istanbul, some of which we actually saw. They simply must have the assurance that we are with them. To tell Turkey that we would not

help her would be but to make any effective Turkish resistance impossible, and to make Russian invasion a certainty. Surely no American on this floor fails to realize that, whether this bill is passed or not, a Russian invasion of Turkey means war for the United States. The only way to avoid war is to prevent such an invasion. That is what this bill tries to prevent. It tries to prevent it first by showing the Turkish people that if they resist aggression, they will not fight alone or in vain, and second, by convincing the Russian rulers that an attack on Turkey means war with the United States. Those of us who support this bill believe that by making the fact of serious consequences perfectly plain in advance, we will probably prevent any overt act.

This amendment does none of the things we want. It leaves us committed in Greece, but invites Russia to outflank Greece. It says in effect that we will fight but not until we have been placed in a much less favorable position than the one we now occupy. It says that rather than defend Greece while we have the aid of a powerful Turkish Army fighting for their own homes, that we must wait until Turkey is overrun and then we must try to defend Greece after all reasonable defense is past.

My friends, if we are going to kill this bill and turn the world over to the Soviet Union, let us do it frankly in the open. Do not try to do by indirection what we refused to do directly only yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this act, and any necessary expenses related thereto, to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established by it for the purpose.

(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this act, such payments when made shall be credited to accounts for such countries established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) (1) Payment in advance by the government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 3, after the comma, strike out the balance of the line down to and including the comma on line 4.

Page 3, line 10, strike out "by it."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "accounts for such countries established for the purpose" and insert, "such countries in accounts established for the purpose."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr CRAWFORD: On page 4, line 22, after the period, add a new section:

"SEC. 3a. There is hereby created the Foreign Funds Control Commission, which shall be an independent agency of Government directly responsible to the Congress.

"The Commission shall consist of three members—a Director, the Comptroller General, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

"The Director shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term of 5 years and shall serve until his successor has qualified. The Director's salary shall be $15,000 annually. He shall be a natural-born citizen of the United States. He shall have had a broad experience in the administration of Government funds and without previous prominent affiliation with any major political party.

"The Commission is hereby directed to administer all funds hereafter granted by the Treasury of the United States or previous grants if directed by the Congress to foreign countries, their nationals and agencies of whatever kind or nature.

"The work of the Commission shall be organized under no less than three general divisions (1) the executive under the supervision of the Director, (2) audit and accounting under the supervision of the Comptroller General, and (3) investigation under the supervision of the Intelligence Branch of the Treasury.

"The Director is hereby authorized to engage such personnel, to acquire such office equipment, accounting records, printed matter, and office supplies as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"The Director shall have the assistance of other Government departments such as the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines and Mining, Bureau of Fisheries, State, War, Navy, and Treasury on matters generally coming within the scope of the respective department's functions and to the end that the best expert advice obtainable may be at the service of the Commission in administering the funds so granted; and it shall be the duty of the said agencies to cooperate in every practical manner possible.

"The main office of the Commission shall be located in Washington, D. C. Field offices shall be established and operated in whatever country is given a grant and shall be maintained in operation in that country for whatever time may be required to properly administer the funds so granted.

"The Commission shall submit quarterly reports of its administration to the Congress which shall be published for the general information of the taxpayers and bond buyers of the United States."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, the legislation the gentleman proposes is very important and very fundamental legislation, but it ought to come before the committee in a special bill. I make the point of order that it is not germane to the present bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not. This is in the interest of the taxpayers and the bond buyers of the United States. It is to protect their funds. If the committee does not care to consider the amendment, I have nothing else to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to create a Foreign Funds Control Commission, to be an independent agency of the Government and to have control not merely over the funds proposed to be authorized by the pending legislation but over funds that might be made available under other legislation. Consequently the Chair sustains the point of order and rules that the amendment is not germane.

Are there further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act not to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; and (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 12, strike out "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 15, after the semicolon insert "and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this act."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 20, after the semicolon insert the following: "and (f) nor shall any of the loans, credits, or grants be used for the payment, allowance, and maintenance of any army foreign to that country."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, it has been a real education during the last 3 days to see how this bill is being handled in the House. I thought yesterday when the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered his very valuable amendment that it would be adopted, but the reception it received was very much the opposite. I thought today when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr MUNDT] offered their amendments that because of their validity and worth-whileness they would be accepted by the House, but they likewise received very little support.

I do not know how much support this amendment will get. I am not going to take the full time allotted to me under the rules of debate because I think the amendment explains itself quite clearly.

You will note in the preceding part of the section before this amendment goes in that it states as follows:

As a further condition precedent to the receipt of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid under paragraph (1) of section 1 the government requesting such aid shall agree not to use any part of the proceeds thereof for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government.

That is the committee amendment, and I think it is very worth while. But I would like to see added to it the amendment which is now before the House and which reads as follows:

nor shall any of the loans, credits, or grants be used for the payment, allowance, or maintenance of any army foreign to that country.

In explanation, we have been told that the British brigade would have to leave Greece because Britain could not maintain the cost of continuing that force there. I do not want to see American funds used for further maintenance of the British brigade in Greece, and, furthermore, I do not want to see the funds which will be allocated under this act used for bringing in a mercenary army. Furthermore, I do not want to see the funds which will very likely be appropriated under this authorization used to transfer or maintain any mercenary armies which are on the loose at the present time. I refer specifically in that regard to the Polish legions under General Anders, which at the present time have no country of their own to which to turn and which have been used in various capacities in various instances prior to this date. I think that explains the amendment sufficiently.

I hope the House will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment is one of those attempts to build a wall piecemeal all around a big area. If we try to put a universal negative in here by little specific instances, we will never get through handling this bill.

Of course, we are not going to have our administrators over there throwing the money down sewers. We are not going to have them putting the money in other countries than Greece and Turkey or their agencies, so you do not need such amendments, if you credit our representatives with sane common sense. Our administrators are there to help Greece and Turkey. They are not there to help any other power or maintain or pay for the army of that power.

It has been mentioned in the debate about the number of British troops in Greece. As one from the Foreign Affairs Committee who has some knowledge of the matter, I would like to explain shortly the situation with reference to the troops in Greece, and also the situation with respect to outside troops in Turkey.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], on page 4819 of the RECORD, said this:

I say in answer to that that the British say their troops are over there solely in an advisory capacity, yet they have 10,000 of them there. I suppose they are advising the people to maintain law and order.

Actually what has happened in the case of Britain in Greece is this, they do have on security duty about 10,000 troops, which is one brigade. We ourselves have one division of troops for the city of Trieste. We are going to have an American contingent of 5,000 troops composed of the Blue Devil Brigade of the Eighty-eighth Division under Maj. Gen. Bryant S. Moore, who are to be there on a long-time basis when the treaties are ratified with the former belligerent countries of Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. The ratifications of these various treaties of the Four Powers, the United States, Britain, Russia, and France, are now under consideration by the United States Senate.

The treaty provisions propose and bind the signatories, that within 90 days after the ratification of those treaties by the Four Powers the United States, Britain, and Russia will all simultaneously withdraw those troops which they have in these four countries. The treaties do not apply to Greece, because Greece is not one of these treaty countries.

The situation in Greece has been handled by Britain in this fashion: Britain by statement of internal policy has said to the world that they would remove those troops from Greece at the time that Russia moves her troops out of Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. She has done that as a unilateral action ahead of time, as a voluntary action to show Russia that she will come out of the nontreaty country, Greece, at the same time that Russia moves her troops out of the treaty countries. I think that is a fair and a sane action to take; and, as you know, it was done voluntarily.

The British brigade went to Greece in 1944 at the time of the ELAS insurrection, when everyone admits it was necessary to restore public order, on the liberation of Greece. Then it was necessary because the German troops had departed and that left a vacuum so that somebody from the Allied side had to assist the people of Greece to fill it. Under the arrangement made by Roosevelt at Yalta the British were the ones to maintain order in the lower end of the Balkan Peninsula, Greece. So it was entirely in accord with the foreign policy of both Britain and the United States to have those troops there.

Britain has already put those troops at this present minute on a retirement basis and is waiting to remove them. They have no active duties in the present leftist trouble at the present time.

On the other hand, Britain has an economic civilian mission there and a police civilian mission. The economic mission has been doing just about the same thing that we intend to do in aiding Greece toward stabilizing its finances. The police mission is recruited from metropolitan police from the city of London. London bobbies are now assisting in keeping order. In Greece in addition to these, the British have a military advisory mission; and that is the sort of thing that we intend to do on the military side here. The British at present cannot afford to go further and alone keep the military mission there in an advisory capacity when they cannot furnish aid on the many projects necessary to help Greece rise to the level of the society of our democracies. We must not forget the British are our friends and have assumed to this date a heavy obligation in Greece to help her back on her feet, so she can stand as a friendly partner in the democratic world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana to the committee amendment: On

page 5, line 24, after section 3 insert "And (h) shall agree to undertake within 6 months and after the enactment thereof a bona fide effort through taxation to support its own national reconstruction, rehabilitation, and economy; and such Government shall further undertake within such period to graduate the rates of any taxes imposed by such Government upon the income of its nationals in such a manner as to insure that the appropriate burden of taxation is borne by those taxpayers with the greatest ability to pay. The quarterly report required by section 7 shall also include a statement of the progress of such Government in effectuating the provisions of this paragraph."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized. The unanimous-consent agreement entered into heretofore was that all time on the amendment pending and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The time has already expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair sure that request was to amendments to the amendment or just a particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It was to the amendment pending and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 minutes to explain his amendment and that there be allotted 5 minutes in reply.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I indulge the hope that this may not be considered a precedent and in order to materialize that hope I may say that I must object to any similar unanimous consent request hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to the committee for allowing me this time. I am somewhat shocked at the speed at which we are trying to get through with section 3 after we had spent so much time on section 1 of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is not my amendment. It was the amendment offered by Senator LODGE in the other body in committee but not reported out. It was also considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was voted down. However, I feel it is an excellent amendment, because it will give the Greeks and the Turks a chance to revamp their tax structure and to assume some share of responsibility in their own rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does the gentleman recall this amendment was thoroughly discussed in the committee and voted down?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman is absolutely correct and I have already made that statement to the Committee here. However, I feel that we should not go into Greece and Turkey with this $400,000,000 and expect these governments to do nothing in return. We know from what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] told us yesterday about the tax and income situation as far as the Greek shipping interests are concerned and how little they pay to maintain their own government, and we all know from recent reports and correspondence as well as stories which appeared in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, and even in some Washington papers, that the people having the money in these countries are not the ones who are paying the taxes toward their country's development.

I feel that we should make it mandatory in some way through some sort of agreement so that the Greeks and Turks will be able to do their part in rehabilitating and reconstructing their own country. I do not feel that we should assume the entire burden. I feel they should help themselves as much as they can.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman recall that Senator LODGE when he was advised this might embarrass the United States Government and also make it look as if we were taking too much of a part in the internal affairs of a foreign country voluntarily withdrew the amendment and did not submit it?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right. I believe I mentioned that in the course of my remarks. However, I think that this is a good amendment; that we should help these people to help themselves, and that we should not, if at all possible, bear the entire burden.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that there is no income tax in Greece at the present time?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. There is no income tax, at least as far as the people who can well afford to pay it are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Members have complained that this legislation constitutes an intervention into the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. While I do not agree that the legislation as now written is an intervention into the internal affairs of the nations involved, I do insist that this amendment will have just that effect. This is an attempt actually to write the tax laws of Greece here on the floor of this House of the United States Congress. Certainly nothing could be more clearly an act of intervention. The amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman who is now speaking was recently in Turkey and Greece, and the gentleman and I were members of the same delegation which visited those countries. Did we not find that the greatest effort which was being made to thwart our efforts was over the Russian radio, which was beaming its propaganda into Turkey every day, in an effort to build up sentiment against the United States by telling those people that America was undertaking to run their government and to conduct their domestic affairs. That is exactly the Russian line of propaganda, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. POAGE. And if we write this provision into this bill we will be writing into legislation just what Russia has been telling them over the radio everyday.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I would like to point out for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas that Great Britain and Greece have entered into such an agreement, and if Great Britain and Greece can do it, I do not see why we cannot.

Mr. COOLEY. If the matter can be settled by agreement and without legislation, there would appear to be no necessity for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. One of the main criticisms of this legislation which I have heard is that it would be an intervention in the affairs of Greece and Turkey. Certainly, should this amendment be passed, as I understand it, the Congress will cause itself to be guilty of passing legislation which would be intervening into the internal affairs of those countries.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman's statement. The opponents of this bill seem to oppose it merely because they regard it as an intervention. As I have said, the bill as written is not an intervention into the internal affairs of either Greece or Turkey, but this amendment would very definitely constitute an intervention. Certainly we will not attempt to direct the affairs of either Greece or Turkey by the enactment of law here in the United States Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman deny that in a certain sense we are intervening in the affairs of Greece and Turkey at this time, if this bill goes through?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do deny it. During the conference which we held in both Greece and Turkey, Senator BARKLEY and other members of our delegation sought to ascertain whether or not there was any apprehension on the part of the people of Greece or Turkey concerning the motives and purposes of the American Government, in connec-

tion with the contemplated loans. The answer to each question propounded by members of our delegation was invariably to the effect that the people of Greece and Turkey were familiar with American history; that they knew that there was nothing in the history of our country which would justify the belief that we were about to embark upon a program of imperialism, or that we would attempt in any way to dominate or to direct the internal affairs of either Greece or Turkey, and each of the persons with whom we conferred agreed that they were perfectly willing to accept such regulation, supervision, and advice in the administration of these loans as our Government desired to make or deemed necessary.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that much of the opposition to this bill yesterday was based on the theory that the Greek Government was a totalitarian government? The gentleman who is speaking was in Greece. Did he not see with his own eyes positive evidence that that very Government was more tolerant with those who hold other opinion than some of the opponents of this bill who want to enforce their own ideas of government on other people regardless of the wishes those people freely expressed at the ballot box? Here is a newspaper we bought on the streets of Athens, a Communist newspaper, with a picture on the front page. The picture is the only thing I can read, but I recognize it is a picture of Marshal Stalin. Those who could read the article told me it was pure Russian propaganda from start to finish. We bought it on the streets of Athens. It was circulating perfectly freely. And, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the Greek Government allows freedom of action, freedom of speech, right now? At the same time the very people who most loudly protest against us trying to help put the Greek people on their feet offer as an excuse the alleged fact that the Greek Government is a dictatorship. I think democracy involves allowing other people the same right to decide for themselves how they will run their own affairs. I think that from that angle the Greek Government is doing a better job of democracy than some of our own self-styled liberals. In what part of the U. S. S. R. or in what Russian-controlled country could you find the kind of freedom and liberty for minority views that you and I saw in Greece?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. I do not believe this paper could be published in that country if it had a totalitarian government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the eloquent gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Does the gentleman not know that the committee report itself on page 2 states that we are going to tell them what kind of taxes to levy and what kind of imports and exports they shall have?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree with that statement at all.

May I say in conclusion that the Greek Government has been in power for only a few short months. The report referred to yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was only filed in the month of March 1947, and that contemplates a long-range program for the country of Greece.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 17, strike out "financial."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: To close section 3 on page 5, line 24, insert the following additional clause:

"(g) that the Greek Government declare a general amnesty for political prisoners, and within 1 year after assistance by the United States has been made available, the Greek Government will cause to be held a free election, the conduct and results of which shall be supervised by a commission appointed for the purpose, by the General Assembly of the United Nations; or, if the President advises the Congress that the United Nations is unwilling or unable to appoint such commission, then under the supervision of an American commission, composed of five members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, we propose to extend aid to Greece, and I heartily approve of that.

We must be very sure that this aid will produce democratic and sound economic results.

Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into Greece since the end of the war by Great Britain and the United States, Greece is still in a state of political chaos and economic desperation.

Official British, American, and United Nations reports clearly point to the reasons for this failure; namely, the incompetence, corruption, and oppression which exists in the present Greek Government.

Terror exists in Greece today—economic and political terror. Terrorism from the extreme right is as oppressive as terrorism from the extreme left.

Arthur Krock, in his column of April 1, 1947, in the New York Times, endorses completely the following statement made to him by an observer in Greece:

In one 3-day period, after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professionals—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the Government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation.

This observer concluded with the statement that as much as he detests communism, he would "go to the mountains" if he were a citizen of Greece.

Current reports made by observers now in Greece bolster this testimony. Members of the House will find them in the RECORD.

Great Britain failed in her efforts to aid Greece.

We must not fail.

In our opposition to communism, we must not make the mistake of backing the remnants of corrupt and decaying systems. This is the sure formula for failure. This is the sure formula that will breed communism. Failure to succeed in Greece will seriously undermine the challenging foreign policy which we are undertaking.

There is only one way to succeed. We must make it clear to the oppressed people of Greece that we are in profound sympathy with their legitimate aspiration for economic reform and social rehabilitation and that we propose to see that United States aid is used to create channels for the free political expression of those aspirations.

Stephen K. Bailey, who was the Chief of Balkan Intelligence for the OSS, has this to say:

Anyone who views communism in the Balkans as the result of simple Russian machinations is overlooking the centuries of poverty and aristocratic corruption which have characterized those countries. * * *

A peaceful resolution of the impasse in Greece depends upon two things: Convincing Russia that any military expansion will be met by force; using every means at our disposal to hasten long-overdue economic and social reforms. * * *

* * * We must search out those political leaders who until now have been crushed between the millstones of reaction and communism and give them power.

It was said yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that when we defend liberty for others we defend our own liberty. I agree fully, with all my heart and mind, if the liberty we defend for others is the same liberty we cherish for ourselves; and I am ready to defend that liberty abroad as well as at home, not just with $400,000,000, which guarantees nothing but a beginning, but with billions of dollars.

That is evidently not the sentiment of this Congress, or it would have passed the International Children's Fund before this and it would not have gutted the relief bill, the crippling of which will invite communism in Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Poland.

If we are going to be instrumental in the development of a democratic world it is going to cost us something in terms of hard cash and generous treatment to the impoverished and miserable people of this earth.

My amendment is in line with statements made by the Secretary of State

and evidence presented before our committee.

I offer an amendment which requires as a condition precedent to giving aid to Greece that the Greek Government declare a general amnesty for political prisoners and agree to hold a free election within 1 year after assistance has first been made available. Such a procedure must appeal to the people of the United States as well as to the people of Greece since it embodies fully the democratic process which it is the stated purpose of this bill to defend. Whatever may have been urged against the former King of Greece, it is indubitably clear that the present King, without a trace of Greek blood in his veins, married to a German princess, notorious for her Nazi activities and sympathies during the war, may well be thoroughly unpopular and unacceptable to the Greek people.

The record of the present King is such that even the British Foreign Office, we are reliably informed, has grave misgivings about his fitness to serve as the ruler of Greece in such critical times.

A free election by the Greek people would, of course, not directly resolve the issue as to the continuation of the monarchy or the future of King Paul. On the other hand, it would enable the Greek people to elect representatives who would presumably fully express prevailing political convictions. If these representatives should in turn, decide that the welfare of their country demands constitutional reforms, they would be empowered to take the necessary steps. You will agree, I am sure, that this is the way we want to see things done and that if it is our sincere desire to bring about and support a democratic government in Greece, we must shape our own assistance so as to contribute most effectively to that end.

To assure a thoroughly free election, my amendment directs the President to request the United Nations to appoint a commission to supervise the election. Since I recognize that for various reasons the United Nations may be unable, or possibly unwilling, to undertake the commitment, the President is directed, if such be the case, to inform the Congress of the fact and to appoint a five-man American commission to supervise the election.

In order further to assure Congressional participation in this course of action, my amendment proposes that if an American commission is appointed, it be subject to confirmation by the Senate. I have allowed for a leeway period preceding the election of 1 year after assistance is first made available to Greece on the ground that in that period relief operations will have reduced tension among the Greek people, restored a measure of calm and thereby contributed to an atmosphere in which a truly free election may be held. Furthermore, during that same period of time the United Nations will have the opportunity to decide whether it chooses to assume the responsibility of appointing a supervisory commission.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to bob up so frequently, but it seems to me that this is a tremendously important amendment, and I feel that it should be opposed and defeated. The author of the amendment, unfortunately, did not discuss the first part of it, which in itself is quite important. The effect of the first part of the amendment is to declare an amnesty for political prisoners. Does that mean that the author of the amendment would like to open up the jails of Greece and turn out the criminals and guerrillas, so that they can overthrow the government? Apparently this is clearly the purpose of the amendment.

Shall we by this amendment attempt to direct Greece to hold another election? I wonder if the author of the amendment and those who will support it would be willing for Congress to pass laws directing Yugoslavia and all of the other countries which are puppets of Soviet Russia, and in which elections been held to hold other elections, to be supervised as contemplated by the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, I feel that elections in Yugoslavia and in other countries which have been overrun by communism should hold new, free and unfettered elections, but I certainly question the wisdom of an act of Congress directing that such elections be held. This is an unreasonable proposition and I certainly hope that it will not be seriously considered by this Committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I recently talked in Cairo to Greek Republicans who opposed the monarchy, and they said they hoped that an election would not be held too soon, because if an election were held too soon the danger would be that the only choice would be between a monarchy and communism, whereas if sufficient time elapsed, there could be then a real choice between a republic, which they supported, and a monarchy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] does he feel that 1 year is a reasonable length of time?

Mr. VORYS. I think Greece knows more about that than we do.

Mr. COOLEY. We have general elections in this country every 4 years and we seem to get along all right. When another election will be held in Greece, perhaps, is not so important, but the importance of this proposition is shall the American Congress direct or require, either directly or indirectly, the holding of an election in the far-away country of Greece, in which country we are told that more than 85 percent of the people even now approve the Government in existence there. Maybe the great powers should have supervised elections in other countries, and had they done so I venture to say that the situation in many of the countries of Europe would be quite different from what it is today.

I insist that this amendment should be defeated, and by an overwhelming vote, to the end that Greece and Turkey and all other countries of the world will clearly and definitely know that America does not intend to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations, or attempt to dominate or direct the domestic affairs of other nations by remote control. We either believe in this bill or we do not believe in it. We are either for it or against it. We either want to follow Truman and Marshall and Vandenberg, and all of the other leaders of America, including our distinguished representative to the United Nations Organization, Senator Austin, or we want to follow the primrose path of weakness, which leads to conflict and bloodshed.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, several days ago I stated on this floor—and I repeat now—that if we allowed political expediency to determine our vote on this measure we would all vote against it.

This morning five Communist veterans from my district called upon me and they asked my why I, as one who in the past had to some extent believed in the principles of Henry Wallace, could possibly support the Truman doctrine. I told them I could support the Truman doctrine because I had been given the great privilege of traveling through many of these countries that have been mentioned. I had the opportunity of being in Moscow, and, following that, in eastern and central countries—Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Turkey, and Greece. I was not wined and dined at the cocktail bars of the diplomats, but I talked to the average people—to the little people. Everywhere I went I found that in every country they were fearful of Russia and fearful of the future. I told those veterans that was one of the reasons I would vote for the Truman doctrine. I told them I would vote for it because I believed we were going to insure freedom to our part of the world—to this country—where I can walk out of the door and stand on the steps of the Capitol of the United States and say whatever I choose to say about the President of the United States, about the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of State, or anyone else.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That aggregation of so-called Communist veterans was simply a mission from Moscow.

Mr. HUBER. Well, I do not know what the mission was, but I know that they asked me as vets of this war if I knew what they had been fighting for. I said it was not only those who fought in World War II; it was those who fought in World War I, the Spanish-American War, the Civil War, and the Revolutionary War, to preserve the heritage that has been won for us at so great a cost. I did not have the privilege of serving in this war but I have stood by the graves of those who died, and have a true appreciation for the sacrifice they made. There is a great obligation on us.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. It occurred to me to suggest also that that misison from Moscow, to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred, came here and had their communistic convention, or whatever it was that met yesterday, with the ridiculous idea that they could influence the House of Representatives of the United States in its vote on this measure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Last night the principal speech was made by the leading Communist, William Z. Foster, who just got back from Moscow.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I may as well. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman find any significance in the fact that the young Members of this House who bear the scars of World War II upon their bodies are generally for this bill?

Mr. HUBER. I believe the overwhelming number of veterans who have served in all the wars in which this country has engaged are and should be overwhelmingly in support of this bill.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Along the same line brought out by the gentleman from Georgia—and he has focused attention to a point I was going to make, one which I think the membership of this House can well consider—the vast majority of men who know war more recently than a great number of the Members of this House are for this bill because they feel that we do have to take a stand and they know that when you are speaking to a power which knows only the language of force you have got to answer with force yourself.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I merely wish to suggest that perhaps the gentleman from Alabama was not quite right after all when he said that the Communists had the ridiculous idea that they could influence votes in this House by holding their convention here. I believe that by their opposition to this bill they have induced a lot of Members to support it who now realize where the strength of the opposition comes from.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for an additional 5 minutes if he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has not yet expired.

Mr. JARMAN. I still ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBER. I appreciate the interest shown in my remarks.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would suggest that the gentleman spend his additional 5 minutes in explaining why these questions cannot be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. HUBER. I may say to the gentleman from California that if he will explain why Russia cannot handle similar matters through the United Nations then I will be satisfied. This thing is not one-sided.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure everybody in the House fully realizes and deeply regrets that so many of the countries of the world, especially those devastated by the war, are disrupted and distraught, and their governments are in bad condition; no one pretends that the Greek Government is as good or as democratic as we wish; but is this not our situation, that the choice in Greece is not between the present Greek Government and something better, it is between the present Greek Government and something infinitely worse?

Which will be better for the Greeks, for us to help the government chosen by themselves maintain the nation's independence, while helping it to work toward more democracy and more efficiency and less corruption or, on the other hand, to abandon Greece to the control of a foreign power which has never yet given any people under its heel any chance whatsoever to develop democracy? Is not that our real choice, between the present Greek Government and something worse, not between the present government and something better?

Mr. HUBER. There is much truth in what the gentleman says. But we must not condemn all the young ex-soldiers who came down with this group. They are looking for a better way of life. Do not condemn them too hastily. If they could be assured of security in the future it would go a long way in changing their outlook toward our great form of government which guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or the right of the people peacefully to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question I asked the gentleman from Ohio was evaded and to some extent turned back to me; and, of course, I am not going to try to use my 5 minutes to show how this could be taken up through procedures which are set forth in the United Nations Charter. I know the Members of this House are familiar with them, and I believe many of them seriously considering this matter realize that such a problem could be handled through the procedures and methods set up in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman agree with me that everything could be done by the President under the United Nations Charter if he but would? In other words, we would not need any congressional action if he would but do it that way.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. He has the power to ask Mr. Austin to initiate the matter either through the Security Council or the General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to recommit this bill, in case I am recognized by the Chairman of the Committee, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment, and I want to take this time to read the amendment briefly and to explain briefly what it means:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"SECTION 1. It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States through the appropriate representative of the United States shall initiate in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations proposals designed to ensure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey, and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum not exceeding $100,000,000 for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation of the Greek economy. The President may expend funds appropriated pursuant to this provision through existing agencies of the Federal Government and through transfer of such amounts as he deems appropriate to the Government of Greece and the Secretary General of the United Nations for expenditure by them. Such funds shall be expended for the purchase and other provision of supplies for the civilian economy of Greece, including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services, but no part of such money shall be used for the provision of military supplies or services."

Very briefly, I first ask to recommit the present bill. Second, it instructs the President to initiate through the appropriate representative of the United States, in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations, proposals designed to insure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and middle eastern areas which are endangering the peace.

As the Members of this body know, the Palestine question is now in the hands of the United Nations. To a certain extent a portion of the Greek situation is in the hands of the Balkan Commission. There is nothing involving Turkey at the present time, as far as the United Nations is concerned. But the

Dardanelles is a problem which will remain regardless of whether this bill passes or not. When the $100,000,000 which goes to Turkey is expended, the problem of the Dardanelles, and the problem of the distribution of oil in Iran and Syria and other places will still remain and, Mr. Chairman, we will have to appropriate other hundreds of millions of dollars because the problems will still be there. That is why I say you cannot solve the problem of Greece and Turkey without solving the related problems which are contiguous and related thereto.

Third. An appropriation of $100,000,000 is made to Greece immediately for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation in Greece. I supported the $350,000,000 relief bill, and I opposed the Jonkman amendment that cut that amount because I felt at that time it cut down too much the need for relief in Greece.

The expenditure of this fund is for the civilian economy, and the reason I set the figure at $100,000,000 is because the Food and Agricultural Organization which was embodied and created by the United Nations recommended $100,000,000. That is why I set it at that amount. This cuts down the amount of this bill from $400,000,000 to $100,000,000 to comply with the FAO recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it prohibits an expenditure for military purposes and it provides that at the President's discretion such part of this fund as necessary may be transferred to the Greek Government or the Secretary-General of the United Nations for supervision in the expenditure of money in Greece.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that when this motion to recommit is offered we will have enough support on the motion to show that we still have some faith in the United Nations and that we are not completely ignoring the existence of such body

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Gladly.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close with this address.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are pending on this section for which unanimous consent has been asked to close debate upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that there are no amendments pending on the desk on this section.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when the President of the United States on March 12 delivered his now historic message on aid to Greece and Turkey the occasion marked a significant turning point in America's foreign policy. In the words of the President:

> One of the principal objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the wars with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will and their way of life upon other nations. * * *
>
> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Stated another way, the President of the United States, in the name of the people of the United States, on that day before the Congress abandoned, once and for all, the ineffectual and costly isolationist policy of the past—a policy which directly contributed to the devastating wars that the world has witnessed within this generation.

The issue in Greece and Turkey is identical with the one which prevailed when Japan marched into Manchuria, when Italy took Ethiopia, and when Hitler violated all of the treaties of his government, and by force, by threats of force, and by his Nazi fifth columns, conquered much of Europe without firing a shot.

The issue may be put by way of a simple question. Shall we face up to our responsibilities throughout this one world or shall we adopt a 1947 variety of appeasement and isolationism which must sooner or later bring about a Third World War that so many are already calling inevitable?

If we follow a course of appeasement, if we decide that what happens in the rest of the world is of no concern to us, then the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, just as the madman in Berlin of 1939, will decide that the western democracies are weak, and can be conquered by the same techniques of propaganda and boring from within as employed by Hitler. If, on the other hand, we meet our responsibilities and let the world understand that we will not shrink from them, the freemen everywhere will be encouraged and the voice of our great and powerful Nation, spoken in behalf of democracy and freedom will be heard in every corner of the world and the march toward communistic totalitarianism will be halted.

The need is urgent. The time is short. Greece and Turkey are vital. They command the Near East, Africa, and Asia. If they fall to the Russian fifth column from within, then before long, all of the world outside our hemisphere may be within the orbit of the iron curtain. If their position is held, most of western Europe will be saved, and constructive measures, such as the establishment of a United States of Europe, will make possible the economic rehabilitation of that continent. Such action should assure the continuation of world peace by convincing Moscow that our policy is one of justice, backed by all the strength and might of this great Nation.

Those who argue that we are bypassing the United Nations are either begging the question or opposing our policy by indirection because they know that we are confronted with acute internal situations in Greece and Turkey which cannot be handled at this time by the United Nations. They are also deliberately ignoring the fact that Russia has a veto power in that assembly which she would not hesitate to use.

America now faces the same challenge that it faced in 1914 and in the 1930's. If it follows the course of coming to the aid of stricken peoples and abandons isolationism and appeasement, the tragic and bloody history of 1917 and 1941 will not be repeated. If it follows the opposite course, a third blood bath may soon be upon us.

Let us be frank about this matter.

Are we willing for the iron curtain to be extended to the shores of the Atlantic, through all of the continent of Europe, through the Near East, and possibly throughout Asia and Africa?

Have we forgotten the bloody, dismal struggle which so recently engulfed mankind? Do hundreds of thousands of young Americans lie in hallowed ground and other thousands suffer in hospitals and institutions so that we might substitute Red dictatorship for black dictatorship? Shall we repeat in Greece and in Turkey and in western Europe the solemn tragedy of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Albania Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, and Yugoslavia; or shall we use the moral power of this Nation for the cause of freedom? Freedom is an ancient word. It first gained its magnificence in the land of the Hellenes. To many of us who have lived under the blessed sun of the United States, it may seem like an academic word; but in those bleak nations behind the iron curtain, it is still the most glorious word in the minds of men. And yet, the issue involved here is just that simple. It is whether freedom survives on this earth, or whether some strange ideology, which proclaims freedom but practices tyranny, which talks about the rights of man but foists a brutal, soulless system of collectivism upon the minds and hearts of men, and which employs cruelties heretofore unknown to mankind shall prevail. For my own part, it is my firm belief that there can be no compromise with communism. That is the issue. If we compromise now, if we throw Greece and the nations of Europe into the waiting, willing arms of Red fascism, then we will face a third world war more horrible and more devastating than the one that this world has so recently experienced. If we fail in this duty, then we may as well withdraw our armies of occupation from Europe. We may as well remain away from the conference tables and prepare for the holocaust.

I read with interest Mr. Stalin's interview with Mr. Stassen. He talked about cooperation and said that our countries could live together in peace. I fervently

hope that they can. But certainly Mr. Stalin would be more impressive if his deeds spoke out rather than his words.

The philosophy to which he subscribes, denies the validity of covenants, the validity of morals, the validity of religion. How then can western civilization trust his assertions? He talks about freedom, when in his nation and in the nations that are dominated by communism there are more slaves than have ever existed in the entire recorded history of this world.

To compromise with communism is to compromise with an essential evil. It is no more possible than to compromise with cancer or tuberculosis.

The debate, however, has pointed up the need for something more than a negative policy in Europe. While we must oppose Russian expansion and while we must fight communism on every front, we also must put forward a positive program of democracy. The objections voiced to the extension of aid to Greece and Turkey have come from many thoughtful Americans who are justly worried about our precarious fiscal structure and who realize that dollars alone will not solve the problems of Europe.

These thoughtful Americans are properly concerned over our tremendous national debt. They show where we have already spent billions in England and France and throughout the world, and communism marches on. There must be some other way. Otherwise we will bankrupt America.

There is an alternative that has stirred the minds of men for many centuries. It is to be found in a federated western Europe A resolution "that the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations" is now pending in this body and in the Senate. That resolution has received support from the overwhelming majority of Americans, representing all political groups, from the press, and in public forums. Recently a group of 81 of the Nation's outstanding leaders in business, finance, religion and education, and journalism endorsed the plan as the answer to the recurrent problem of Europe. It is not a new plan. It has been supported for many years by great statesmen of Europe. Today its principal champions are Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Smuts, John Foster Dulles, Walter Lippmann, Prime Minister Attlee, and many others. George Washington once wrote to General Lafayette:

> We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere on earth, and one day, taking its pattern from the United States of America, there will be founded the United States of Europe.

The great French writer, Victor Hugo, prophesied:

> The day will come when these two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic—when they will exchange their goods, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, to civilize the globe, to fertilize deserts, to improve creation under the eyes of the Creator, and to assure the greatest benefit for all by combining these forces: the brotherhood of man and the might of God.

That day is at hand.

The Greek loan must be made, because as I have pointed out, we cannot compromise further. But at best it is serving only as an oxygen tent for the patient. Similar loans have been made to France, England, and to the Netherlands, and the condition of our ex-enemies does not need recounting at this time.

Greece is vital, but western Europe is even more vital, and now is the time, with Europe prostrate, for the ancient ideal of federation to bear fruit. As one writer has said, "What was once an ideal is now a necessity."

In the words of Winston Churchill:

> And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the small states have, indeed, made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, careworn, and bewildered human beings gaze on the ruins of their cities and scan the dark horizon for the approach of some new peril, tyranny, or terror.
>
> They may still return. There is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted by the great majority of people in the many lands, would as if by a miracle, transform the whole scene and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is today.
>
> What is this sovereign remedy?
>
> We must build a kind of United States of Europe.

America cannot bring about the United States of Europe, but by the adoption of the resolution now before the Congress the forces at work everywhere in western Europe will be immeasurably strengthened and those who hesitate now because of the opposition to Soviet Russia will be given the courage and the support to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate on this measure for 3 days. I have opposed every amendment which has been offered to the committee bill. I shall continue to oppose amendments. I shall oppose the amendment which the gentleman from California contemplates offering.

The committee has done a masterful job in framing this legislation and the issues have been clearly presented to this body. Everyone here fully understands that. As the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and our great minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] pointed out on day before yesterday, the comparison existing between 1914 and 1939–41 is too serious to overlook, and all thoughtful Americans realize that we must no longer adopt a policy of appeasement.

I listened with interest this morning while one gentleman said, "Of what concern is it to us what happens in eastern Europe or what happens in Russia?" My mind went back to my first term here in this Congress in 1941 when we were debating lend-lease, and I heard those same words, and those same gentlemen making the identical assertions. After Hitler had conquered most of Europe, and when the British Isles were holding out all alone, those same gentlemen stood in the well of the House and said, "What concern is it to us what Hitler does in Europe?". Then, all of a sudden bombs fell on Pearl Harbor and it was of direct concern to every American. That is the same challenge that we face today, and we had better not make any mistake about it.

But, I want to take this time to point out what I believe is possibly an alternative to the direction we are headed. Many years ago the statesmen of Europe recognized the fact that as long as Europe was disunited, as long as we had countless little nationalities and countless little nations in Europe, we were bound to have these interminable wars and interminable struggles. Recognizing this recurrent situation, some months ago, in conjunction with some of my colleagues in the Senate, I introduced a resolution in this House favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations. I am certain that many Members of the House have noted the overwhelming approval with which that resolution has been met by the press, in public forums, in educational, and in civic circles of this country. I am happy to say that that movement now has a tremendous momentum, and today the Moscow Conference having failed and our effort of cooperation with Russia having completely failed, we must have an alternative.

I say to the Members of the House, if they will give serious consideration and serious thought to the age-old ideal of a united western Europe, together in trade, together in commerce, and together in government, the 200,000,000 people of western Europe will be the answer to this problem, and I believe we will have some hope for peace on this earth; but as long as we maintain all of these separate entities, as long as we try to create artificial barriers in Europe, they are bound to overflow into our own Nation and we are bound to go into another and a more bloody world war.

I ask you to read when you have time the words of Winston Churchill, of John Foster Dulles, of Prime Minister Attlee, and the expressions of 81 prominent Americans which recently appeared in the press, representing every shade of political opinion in the United States, recommending and endorsing the Federation of Europe. If you will read those expressions, and if you will study them, we as Americans may find an alternative to the grave and chaotic problem of Europe.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

On page 6, line 1, strike out all of subsection (a) of section 4.

And on line 8 strike out the letter "(b)" indicating a subsection and on line 9 substitute the figure "200,000,000" for "400,000,000," and after the period on line 10 strike out all of the following sentence, and substitute a new sentence as follows: "Out of the funds provided herein the President is authorized to supply such financial assistance as may be requested by the United Nations to further the objectives of this legislation, but in no event shall it exceed $5,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the nature of the amendment I have offered, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, this not to include the 10 minutes already allotted to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I make this suggestion at the request of the majority leader.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would it not be better to hear what the gentleman says concerning his amendment, so that we can see if any Member wants to discuss it?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object at this time?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, you will note if you have a copy of the bill before you that I am striking out all of subsection (a) because it is a request to advance $100,000,000 without going before the Committee on Appropriations.

I see no reason why there is need for such quick action. I believe that the Department of State should justify the need for that sum of money before the Committee on Appropriations. There is nothing in the record, as I recall it, wherein there was a showing of such need. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are going to pass this legislation, let us be businesslike about it. Certainly, there is no justification for this provision to be in the bill.

I go on to the next part of my amendment, cutting down the amount from $400,000,000 to $200,000,000. I am wondering if Members of the House realize that so far as the record is concerned, Turkey, which is covered by this bill, has never made a request to this Government for any money. If I am wrong, I want the members of the Committee to tell me so. $125,000,000 is provided in this bill for Turkey. I trust that the members of the Committee who want to ask questions will wait until I complete my statement.

So far as I can find, all we have concerning aid to Turkey is the statement in the report on page 3, as follows:

The situation in Turkey differs substantially, but she has found it necessary during recent months to apply to the United States for financial aid.

That is the statement made by the committee. What does Mr. Acheson say? The only testimony is this:

Today the Turkish economy is no longer able to carry the full load required for its national defense.

But in the statement on the same page Mr. Acheson does not say that there was a request for aid, and if he did I submit that that would be a self-serving declaration and a statement in support of his own position.

The report is very clear, however, so far as the Greek Government is concerned. On March 3 the Greek Government actually asked for this assistance. I could not find in these heavy secret documents that we have, 6 or 8 inches thick, anything to show that the Turkish Government has asked for this aid. As a matter of fact, they did not ask it or need it. Turkey wants arms and not money.

I say there should be before this House something in writing to show that the Turkish Government wants this money. I submit the record does not indicate that, and if it does then I have missed it and I will stand corrected if the evidence can be produced.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have it right here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman will wait until I complete my statement.

Mr. JARMAN. You ask for it and then you do not want it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In the latter part of this amendment I provide that the President would be authorized to advance out of this authorization $5,000,000 to assist in carrying out the objectives of this legislation. If there is Russian aggression, let us find it out. Let us find out through the United Nations organization. We have heard a great deal about isolationism. I wonder, in all this by-passing of the United Nations, who are the isolationists.

I want to call attention to a matter which I think is highly important because I believe it indicates that even as far as Greece is concerned, they can go to the International Bank and get this money. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, page 4719, to an address delivered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON]:

A reading of section C of part 4 of the charter of the International Bank proves conclusively that this United Nations agency can be used to help the people of Greece. It says, and I quote, "If a member suffers from an acute exchange stringency, so that the service of any loan contracted by that member or guaranteed by it or by one of its agencies cannot be provided in the stipulated manner, the member concerned may apply to the bank for a relaxation of the conditions of payment." This certainly applies to Greece today as it seems to me.

The very first chapter of the bank's charter is even more specific in its application to Greece today. It says under section B the resource shall be used "for the purpose of facilitating the restoration and reconstruction of the economy of members whose metropolitan territories have suffered great devastation from enemy occupation or hostilities. The bank, in determining the conditions and terms of loans made to such members, shall pay special regard to lightening the financial burden and expediting the completion of such restoration and reconstruction."

There you have it. It is all laid out. The International Bank can take charge of this matter, so why should we in all our largesse volunteer to hand out this money which our taxpayers are striving so hard to pay each year? We as Republicans, under the program outlined, have promised tax reduction and debt reduction and all that goes with it. Under no circumstances can we be justified in making not a loan but a gift of more than $200,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Dean Acheson delivered an address last evening in place of the President, and he advocates rehabilitating the whole world. After we have bled ourselves white, who will there be to give us a blood transfusion?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The question answers itself, it seems to me. Of course, we will face economic ruin and we are on the verge of it today.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I simply ask the gentleman to yield to produce the evidence he asked for a moment ago. I believe the gentleman made the statement that if there was any evidence that Turkey had requested this assistance, he would like some member of the committee to produce it. It is found on page 13, where I inquired of Under Secretary Acheson, as follows:

In other words, as I understand it, everything proposed to be done in this bill has been definitely requested by the countries concerned?

Secretary ACHESON. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is that the best evidence the gentleman offers? It is a self-serving declaration. I say it is not the best evidence.

Mr. JARMAN. That may not be the best evidence but it is most excellent evidence.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not for me.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman asked for it and when he gets it he does not want it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You know as a lawyer that is not the best evidence. Produce a copy of a letter from the Turkish Government. That is what I am asking for. There is a copy of the Greek request in the confidential report prepared for the committee by the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman wishes further evidence——

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am asking you to produce it and you cannot.

Mr. JARMAN. The difference is I have confidence in the President and other officials of my country whereas the gentleman does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the unanimous-consent request suggested by the majority leader, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ascertain how many seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees five Members indicating they desire time.

Mr. EATON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the following Members who indicated a desire to be heard: Messrs. MACKINNON, VORYS, CHENOWETH, MILLER of Connecticut, and JARMAN.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may the committee members be heard last?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will be recognized last.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday one of the illustrious Members of this House said that when you hear one person you have heard one-half of the story. That is not true on this issue, for when you have heard one person on this issue you have heard only one-third of the story. You have three views on this issue.

One group believes that the national interest of the United States is involved and they support the bill. There are two groups in opposition. First, the isolationists oppose it. Secondly, in opposition you have that group whose foreign policy has been such that they have not actively opposed the foreign policy of the Soviet Government and they have opposed the foreign policy of the United States. It is very easy to pick that group out. You know what their position was on lend-lease. They were demanding that Russia get more lend-lease. You know what their position was on the second front. For several years they demanded an immediate second front in Europe regardless of the inability of our country to prosecute effective military operations.

THE PARTY LINE

The party line that they have now developed on this particular bill is they say that they oppose military aid, favor relief to starving children, and then they say, "Besides, the United States cannot afford to give this relief in any amount." That argument is completely dishonest, because in one breath they say, "I favor partial relief," and in the next breath they say "I favor no relief." That is the party line argument on this bill today. To merely state it is sufficient. Its inconsistency is its own answer.

IDEAS VERSUS FORCE

One of the arguments that has been made, that seems to have some force with a number of people, is that you cannot stop ideas by force. Their inference is that communism is an idea and hence it cannot be stopped by force.

But I say communism has no force as an idea. Communism has never been accepted by any country of the world except by force. Does any person—and I will yield the floor to anyone who has an answer on this one—can any person in this House tell us today of any nation in recorded history that ever voluntarily accepted communism? No person rises to suggest that there ever was such a nation—and I agree that there never was. Communism has never been voluntarily accepted by any country. It needs force to impose it and it needs force to continue it.

There is no question that when you run into force you have to make your position clear, and that is what this bill does. We are opposing communism.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

In closing I want to say that I regard this program as unfinished business arising out of our involvement in the war. It is nothing more than we did after the last war. We stayed until conditions were stabilized. For the same purpose today we are in Germany, we are in Austria, and we are in Italy. In those countries we are presently seeking to bring stability to their economy. They were our enemies a short time back. Should we not also seek to maintain a stable government for our friends who ask our aid? They were our allies in the war and are our friends now. I submit that they are entitled to our help now as much as our former enemies.

THE GREEK ELECTION

Some criticize the Greek Government. You can criticize almost any foreign government—in comparison with ours. But the Greek Government was elected by the Greek people in what our observers state was a free election. The statistics show that of 1,900,000 eligible voters, 87 percent voted and 68.3 percent favored the present Government. This leaves 31.7 percent opposed. In other words the vote was 2 to 1 for the present Government.

That is a more substantial popular majority than any President of the United States ever received in recorded history. No person can truthfully say that the Government in Greece does not have the popular support of the Greek people.

USE THE UNITED NATIONS

Some say we should use the United Nations. I agree with that proposal and the bill contains ample provisions for the use of the United Nations if that body wishes to assume jurisdiction, but we have already seen the power of the veto in Russia's hand to delay effective action on this very issue.

RUSSIAN VETO

Russia vetoed the initial attempt to investigate the Greek border dispute. Subsequently the investigation was only authorized when Russia refrained from voting. Do we want to permit the Soviet to use such dilatory tactics? That is their game. Everyone knows it. The veto power gives them the authority to delay action—and they use it. This issue in Greece and Turkey involves internal stability. Thus it is not a proper case for the United Nations. It does not involve international issues with respect to those countries. By the very charter of the United Nations they have no jurisdiction. Our delegate from the United States has pointed out that this bill does not bypass the UN. I agree with that analysis of the problem.

THE ISSUE

The issue in this bill is clear. Are we going to appease Russia; are we going to jump through the hoop at the Soviet wish? We only intervened in Europe in World War II after the most constant demands from Russia. They demanded arms, munitions, and a second front. We finally opened the second front and the war was soon over. Now the Soviet line is to say, "Get out now, leave Europe to us." To this demand I say we did not intervene in Europe to permit Communists, Fascists, or other groups alien to their own country, to have free reign to aggressively overrun the remnants of European civilization. By our position as victors we owe a duty to the world to restore stable governments before we pull out. Let us all support this bill to do that for Greece and Turkey—our allies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate in the closing hours of this debate that has been going on for four days that some Members' patriotism so runs away with them that they have to charge those who honestly and conscientiously oppose this bill as following what is referred to as the "party line." I am not at all disturbed about anybody questioning my Americanism or my patriotism. I do want to ask one question and I hope before the debate closes someone on the committee or in the House will answer it for me.

I listened this morning to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] speak of the wave of communism sweeping over Turkey and over Greece, then across the Mediterranean over Italy and over France, and so on, possibly over the Atlantic to the United States. I concede that it is certainly a threat and that all this world is threatened with the spread of communism. Assuming all that to be true, will some member of this committee explain to me why, to deal with such an important problem, in view of our participation in the United Nations and our promise to the American people, we were going to deal in association with the other nations of the world, that we

should embark on this lone-wolf program on our own.

Some may say that other nations cannot contribute their share in money toward this effort to stop the spread of communism into Turkey and Greece. If they cannot appropriate $100,000,000 or $400,000,000, if they would appropriate a quarter of a million dollars to this program and associate themselves with this Government, I would feel much happier about it and I could then support this whole program. But I do not want to see the United States Government embark on this program with no assurance, certainly no assurance has been given us throughout this debate, that the program has the support, at least the moral support, of other nations associated with us in the United Nations. If they cannot furnish financial support they certainly can make known their support in other ways. I wish that somebody could show me how we can do this job so much better alone than with the help and cooperation of other nations.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it not true, sir, that when we approve this action we are taking, it means that any other nation may take any action it sees fit so long as it says it is carrying out the purposes of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We are formulating our own program and carrying it on alone, so far as I am able to find out.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I want to remind the gentleman what the United Nations representative of the United States, Senator Austin said:

> In my opinion, the United States program of aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I heard that statement read and I may say it does not answer my question. I have not said anything about bypassing the United Nations. I am asking why other nations that are in the United Nations cannot cooperate in this program. I heard the statement read by the chairman of the committee yesterday and I have great respect for Senator Austin.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In all fairness, the House should be reminded also of what the Secretary-General of the United Nations said on this subject.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes. I go back to my question which was: "Why do the proponents of this bill think that the United States acting alone can do the job better than it could be done in cooperation with other nations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment, as I understood him a moment ago, stated that Turkey had not applied for this assistance and challenged anyone to prove otherwise. I thought I did so by quoting the Under Secretary of State of the United States, who at the time was Acting Secretary of State. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, just as I do not know what General Marshall's politics is; but he is the Under Secretary of State of the United States and, for my part, I am willing to take his word on a matter with the responsibility for which he is charged and on a matter about which he naturally knows more than could any Member of this body. Furthermore, he is an exceptionally able official to whom I heard one of our best Members refer during this debate as the man who had the most alert and most brilliant mind with which he has come in contact.

However, I find, after my colloquy with the gentleman—for whom I have a very high regard, but who I think should be more careful with his challenges and his statements—that the President of the United States in his message made the same statement, and I say to you, my colleagues, I care not who the President of the United States be, whether he be Democrat or Republican, I am willing to take his word on a matter such as this, and I quote from the President's message:

> Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity.

Now, for my part, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I am perfectly willing to believe those two officials of this Government and not be pin prickey and issue challenges about whether they are telling the truth or not.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, an able member of our committee.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin said he searched the committee report and looked through it carefully and could not find it. He must have missed page 1, because there Mr. Acheson says that at various times during recent months the Turkish Government has applied to the United States for financial aid. And, there is no quibbling about that.

Mr. JARMAN. Indeed, there is not. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I read to the gentleman the Under Secretary's reply to my question, in which he reiterated that fact.

Now I gladly yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to again ask both of you gentlemen, who are lawyers, if you would accept that as proof in a court of law?

Mr. JARMAN. Absolutely. I would accept the statement of my President and my Under Secretary of State as proof.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That sounds fine, but that still is not proof. That is a self-serving declaration.

Mr. JARMAN. Are we in a court of law here?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You might be.

Mr. JARMAN. Is this a court of law?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is anything that you make it.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes, and we have established it without reference to the precedents of the courts, too. We do not have to go to courts to get precedents. We have them of our own.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The challenge is still open to produce the proof. Turkey has never asked for this loan, in my opinion.

Mr. JARMAN. I repeat, I have confidence in my President, whether he be a Democrat or not, and should the gentleman on the other side ever be so fortunate as to have a President I would have confidence in him, whoever he be.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is the gentleman's privilege.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, having challenged both of us as lawyers, has gotten himself a little outside in saying that opinion evidence is admissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

(Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think on this issue of whether or not Turkey made a request we should read the President's message delivered at the joint session of Congress. With respect to Greece he specifically states that Greece has asked for this assistance. You do not find any language as strong as that with respect to Turkey in the President's message.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. I wish to commend him for the splendid and brilliant leadership he has exercised in handling the opposition to this legislation.

It appears that Turkey has asked for no assistance. I understand that Turkey has no financial crisis like Greece. Unless the purpose of this bill is entirely military, I cannot conceive how any Member of this House can vote to send money to Turkey.

We are told, however, we should support this bill because it has the approval of the President and the Secretary of State. Our leaders have made some tragic mistakes. They have formulated policies which even the proponents of this bill admit have been unwise and unsound. Surely we must make an important decision like this for ourselves.

Largely because of pursuing wrong policies this country became involved in World War II, which cost the lives of 300,000 American boys. The debate today reminds me very much of the discussion of the lend-lease bill in 1941, which was represented as a peace meas-

ure. We soon discovered it was a step toward war. We won the war, but now we are again disillusioned; after defeating our enemies we are now told there is a new threat to our security. This measure is a subterfuge and a bald-faced deception. The title implies this is a bill which authorizes aid to Greece and Turkey. You know, and I know, it is purely a military move. Yet we are being told we must continue to follow leaders whose blundering policies have precipitated the situation in which we find ourselves today. Our first responsibility is to the people we represent. It is my opinion the overwhelming sentiment of this country is opposed to this legislation in its present form.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. This is the same leadership that in the last 2 years has spent $18,000,000,000 to promote communism, and is financing communism.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely right. We are still shipping supplies and materials to Russia. It is impossible to reconcile these conflicting positions. I have never understood the influence which has enabled communistic Russia to obtain unlimited amounts of equipment and machinery from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, let us look for a moment at this bill. It states that it provides for assistance to Greece and Turkey. However, I think the mask has now been drawn aside. The intent of the bill is clear. You have seen the amendments, limiting the military personnel to 100, or 200, voted down. Those sponsoring this bill vigorously opposed any military limitations.

It is proposed to send members of our military forces, but we are assured they will act in an advisory capacity only. I submit there is no precedent for such a step and that it now appears obvious from admissions made on the floor by those in charge of the bill that our military operations will not be restricted to advice only. A motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Forces would be very proper.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me an article written by Mr. Palmer Hoyt, Jr., Denver Post correspondent, who made a recent tour of Greece. He urges us to help Greece rebuild, and not to fight a war. I wish to read a few lines of this report on Greece, as the observations made by Mr. Hoyt are very pertinent to the bill we have before us. He says:

> The United States can compete successfully with communism in Europe. It can compete successfully with communism elsewhere, too, but in order to do this the Government must adopt a positive policy of aid to countries whose economy has been threatened by the war or its aftermaths.
>
> The Greek-Turkish aid bill is a case in point. Right now it is important that these countries receive financial aid. Greece, especially, has need of food and clothing for its people. It needs money to rebuild a shattered economy.
>
> But the Greek-Turkish aid bill is being talked about, in Athens and America, in terms of military supplies and money to support the army in its fight against what the rightist Greek Government at least, calls a Communist threat.
>
> It is true that communism threatens Greece. Nevertheless, the point of attack should not be through the Greek Army, fighting Communist and non-Communist guerrillas in the hills. If the American grant is to be successful the attack must come through the country's economy.
>
> When the army uses funds to wage war, a lot more houses and roads and people are destroyed. The survivors find conditions difficult. Then they are easy prey to totalitarianism—Communist or otherwise.

I agree with Mr. Hoyt, and I submit we are making the wrong approach to this whole matter. We want to rebuild Greece, and not destroy her. As Mr. Smith has pointed out, the International Bank has been set up to aid countries like Greece. I feel certain satisfactory arrangements could be made to obtain the credit she needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, further commenting on whether Turkey requested aid, in the questionnaire found on page 366 of the hearings appears this statement from the State Department:

> In order to prevent a deterioration of the Turkish economic situation, which might weaken the country and compromise its position, Turkey has requested American financial assistance which the President proposes that we grant.

Under Secretary Acheson, at the very start of the hearings, said—see page 1:

> At various times during recent months the Turkish Government has applied to the United States for financial aid.

Apparently the opposition feels that if a country asks a whole lot of times that does not count as a request, but if a country asks once that counts as a request.

I am one of those who opposed the way the evidence was brought before us on the relief bill a few weeks ago. We were not told what the money was to be spent for and where. Possibly as a result of the protest that many of us made the secret document furnished the first day of the hearings on this bill was thrown open, and detailed information has been given in the hearings as to how they propose to use this money, not only for military purposes, but to rehabilitate the economy of Greece.

The military part is $100,000,000 for Turkey, only part of which is to be for arms and ammunition, and $150,000,000 for Greece, only a third of which is to be for arms and ammunition. The other $150,000,000, and you can see the details on page 3 of the report, is composed of $20,000,000 for agriculture, $50,000,000 for reconstruction—and the items are noted—and $80,000,000 for consumer goods.

I have here a 1,000-drachma note that I got in Greece. I may say that I got it legally. At that time there were 5,000 drachmas to the dollar at the legal rate of exchange. Here is a 10,000-drachma bill. The 10,000 drachma bill is worth 2 bucks legally, $1.25 on the black market. The 1,000 drachma one is worth 20 cents legally, 12½ cents on the black market. The exchange varies so rapidly over there in the skyrocketing inflation that is going on that it is hard to keep track of your money.

It cost me 8,000 drachmas to buy 6 post cards and the Embassy driver got 375,000 drachmas a month. One of the things that must be done to stabilize Greece is with reference to their exchange. That is a part of this bill.

Another part is provisions for physical rehabilitation of their economy.

Another part of it is to furnish Greece military assistance, advice, and supplies, so that Greece can drive the Communist-supported guerrillas out and maintain her integrity.

This is a very ambitious program. It is going to be difficult to accomplish. It has its risks, not only possible military risks, but the risk that the economic program may fail. We increase the risks by cutting the program heavily at the start.

This is only an authorization bill, and the appropriations will be checked carefully by our appropriations committee. I suggest it would not be wise to cut this authorization now and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 49, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin: On page 6, after line 13, add a new subsection (4) (c):
>
> "That forthwith and immediately upon the taking effect of this act the Government of the United States and all agencies thereof shall cease and desist from sending any materials, granting any credits, paying any moneys or anything of value whatsoever, either under lease-lend commitments or otherwise, to the government or governments of any country or countries that in the opinion of the President of the United States are threatening, or during the life of this act do threaten, directly or indirectly, the integrity or sovereignty of Greece and Turkey."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment sets forth a policy which many of us are strongly in favor of, I am sorry to say I must raise a point of order that it is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman I believe this amendment is germane. I think it is highly necessary that we indicate in this very act wherein we propose to assist Greece and Turkey in resisting aggression, that we also indicate very clearly by the same token that we do not wish to send anything over there to any countries that are threatening or endangering the very countries we are attempting to assist. I think it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair invites the gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment proposes that the Government shall cease and desist from sending any materials, granting any credits, paying any moneys or anything of value whatsoever either under lease-lend commitments or otherwise, to the government or governments of any country or countries, and so forth. In that respect it would in effect place limitations upon existing law and go far beyond the scope of this bill and is neither germane to the bill nor to the section to which it is offered.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is limited to those countries that threaten Greece or Turkey. It does not pertain to the entire lend-lease program It is only to those countries that threaten the integrity of Greece or Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has taken note of that but believes that that in no wise counteracts the point which the Chair has made.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this bill has constantly revolved around the subject of communism. The specter of aggression by the U. S. S. R. is the one great fear-impelling shadow that has overwhelmed this Congress in a wave of hysteria. The implication of isolationism or pro-Russia has been cast upon the opponents of the Truman doctrine. I refuse to accept the implication of being isolationist or pro-Russian.

I am fighting today for what I believe to be the best interest of the American people. I am fighting today for the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. What is the basic principle? It is found in article I:

> To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Notice the phrase "to take effective collective measures for the removal of threats to the peace and for suppression of acts of aggression." Collective, not individual. Multilateral, not unilateral. Upon this great principle the League of Nations was formed. Because this principle was not followed the League disintegrated when Japan started aggressive action on Manchuria.

We have another chance to make an international organization work for international peace. An improved organization whose procedures and methods were improved over those of the League. Again it is based on "collective" investigation, consideration, and action against aggression.

The United States took a leading part in the formation of the United Nations. It is our own making. We are its strength. Our faith and confidence in it is its lifeblood.

We have been told that the United Nations is too weak to handle the Greek-Turkey case. We have been told that it is impotent.

It was not too weak when the sovereignty of Iran was violated by the actual presence of Russian soldiers. The Security Council acted and the Russian Army withdrew from Iran.

It was not too weak when the Lebanon-Syria crisis occurred. The Security Council acted and the British and French soldiers obeyed its edict.

In the complaint against Indonesia by the Ukrainian Republic, the Council considered the charges but they voted against investigation. In the case of the Poland complaint that Spain was a threat to the peace, Russia exercised her veto. The Security Council thereupon formally returned the complaint to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, after due consideration, unanimously decided to drop the matter.

Let me point out here that the veto by the parties directly concerned is permitted upon certain serious charges which involve the use or threat to use military personnel. However, in the case of appeals for investigation, the parties involved do not have the right to use the veto.

Why then do we not follow the four precedents of multilateral consideration within the framework of the United Nations?

Is it because we are afraid of the decision United Nations might reach?

Is it because we are embarked on a course of unilateral, military, imperialism which is in contradiction to the principles of the Charter?

Has the virus of world empire entered the veins of our democracy?

Are we ready to junk the United Nations by denying it the chance to grow with its responsibilities? These questions must be answered in the light of moral and spiritual values, or we stand convicted of violating our pledges to the United Nations principles.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. Are there any amendments pending to section 4?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. EATON. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 6, line 21, insert at the end of the section the following:
>
> "The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:
>
> "(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;
>
> "(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;
>
> "(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and
>
> "(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 7, line 14, after paragraph 4 insert:
>
> "5. If the President finds that the government of any country receiving assistance hereunder is not representative of a majority of the people of such country or is not taking the governmental and economic measures essential to the reconstruction of such country."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to qualify this amendment on the technical phases first. It consists of two parts. It states first that the President shall withdraw assistance to any country if he finds that the government in that country does not represent a majority of the people in it. And I draw the attention of the members of the committee to the first proviso of the Vandenberg amendment, which says that if requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey respectively representing a majority of the people of either such nation, the President is directed to withdraw assistance from any such country. So that we have written right into the bill the necessity that the President shall make that kind of a finding before he responds to any request to withdraw assistance to any such nation. All I say is that the President withdraw even if he is not asked to withdraw, if he finds that the government of the country assisted does not represent a majority of the people of that country.

The second part of my amendment requires that the government of any nation assisted is itself taking every governmental and economic measure necessary for its own reconstruction. In other words, it is doing everything possible to help itself. I call the attention of members of the committee to the fact that this particular provision was written into the relief bill by us in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The situation,

therefore, is as follows: When the money devoted to Greece's relief, which will be fifty or sixty million dollars, is used up, our own administrators over there will be no longer bound by the provisions which we have in the relief bill unless we write that into this bill, too.

Why have I proposed this amendment? I am a member of the committee and I do not want to delay the debate, but I feel in good conscience, and bespeaking the minds of Members of this House who are in the middle of the road—not those on the extreme right or those on the extreme left—just the sober people who are worried about the implications of this legislation, that this amendment is essential. Why?

We have to remember two things about it: One thing that worries us who are of the middle-of-the-road point of view is that this legislation should not be a signal to any extremist to the effect we are going to have a political witch hunt in this country, or a wave of reaction imperiling civil liberties in the United States. I think too much of our own devotion to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution to place the greatest stress on that, and I for one will be eternally vigilant on this floor to fight as I have fought for the civil rights of all, regardless of whether I may disagree with them. Therefore I feel it is enough to make that point at this time. But the second point does hinge a lot on this amendment. We must notify these people overseas, these people in Greece, that it is not our intention to shore up governments which leave a great deal to be desired as the Government of Greece itself does, and our own President said so and the witnessess have said so. We have got to let those people in Greece know that it is not our intention to support a reactionary government and shore it up, that we are not telling them they have to take this government or else they will not get this money. We have to let them know that they have freedom of action and that the only government we intend to deal with is one that represents a majority of the Greek people. That is not telling them how to run their internal affairs or anything else. That is just plain, decent being an American.

Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize this further fact: Let us get away from the idea that this program is antianybody, that it tends to stop anybody. All we are trying to do is fill a vacuum. There is a vacuum in the world. It is the vacuum of despair, it is the vacuum of an unreconstructed, devastated world. Into that vacuum may pour an extremist philosophy, the philosophy of communism. All we say is that we will fill that vacuum and that we want to let the decent judgment of the majority of the people of every country determine how they are to live and be governed. That is all my amendment seeks.

After I was in Greece in December 1946 I came back here and reported to this House that the guerrilla fighters were not a lot of long-haired people running around fighting for communism; but that they were a decent people, desperate over the political and economic situation of Greece; that there had not been less extremism and punishment of the common people in Greece from the "Chite" bands of the right than there had been from extremists on the left.

This is an amendment of common decency. It seeks only to give these peoplement the right of self-determination and that we in the United States shall back the demands of a majority of the people with our own faith in the love of freedom and justice of the Greek people.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire whether this amendment was offered in committee or not?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the gentleman makes that inquiry. In the committee I offered an amendment which was generally along the lines of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] about elections and democratic government, but I could not work out the language which would give a certain leeway that hers did not have. The particular thought in this amendment was not offered to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York permits the President to discontinue the proposed aid in the event he finds that the Government of Greece is not representative of the people.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to confirm the gentleman's impression.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case it is an unnecessary amendment because the President already has been given that discretionary power in the bill as it is. In the enacting clause of the bill you will find these words:

> The President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their Governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make the point which I made previously, and reiterate it, that this is assurance to the Greek people that we are not giving this relief or assistance only if they keep this government. This is serving notice on them that in case it represents a majority of them, whether it is this one or another one, we will help them and that the important feature is in getting that message across from the people of the United States as represented by this Congress to the people of Greece.

Mr. RICHARDS. In reply to the gentleman I will say that a great deal of assurance has been given the Greek people in the other provisions of this bill, and I think it would be unwise to clutter up the bill further with his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The main object of this bill is to protect the people of the United States, at any rate.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire as to the exact parliamentary situation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The parliamentary situation is that a committee amendment is pending to which the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment on his own behalf.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I support it for two reasons. In the first place, as the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out, there is now language in the bill which at least hints at the fact that this legislation is supposed to do the thing that the Javits amendment spells out specifically, and that is to give the President the authority to discontinue this relief if he finds that the Government in Greece or Turkey is not representative of the majority of the people. The Javits amendment simply expands that hint to a mandate.

It is our desire in this legislation not alone to stop communism and military aggression at the borders of Russia, but to help create conditions which will be resistant to the growth of communism from the standpoint of the infiltrating methods of the agents sent out from Moscow. If conditions are unjust and if conditions are unfair we find a fertile field then for the growth of communism. This kind of an amendment in the first place, therefore, gives assurance to the people of Greece, many of whom believe in a republican system of government such as we have over here, rather than in either a monarchy or a communistic dictatorship; it gives them assurance that the intention of the Congress and America is to see that our advice and our counsel and our aid is directed to the end that gradually and steadily there will be better recognition of human rights in Greece and Turkey.

In the second place, I like his amendment because it does in a rational and reasonable way the thing which the Smith amendment proposed to do in a very abrupt manner. I voted against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to reduce this from $400,000,000 to $200,000,000, because we have no evidence whatsoever to indicate that $200,000,000 will do the job. On the other hand, this proposes that the President can withdraw this aid should he find that the governments of either country are failing to take the necessary economic and commercial steps to underwrite their own economy. It is along the same line in that connection as the Mansfield amendment. It is encouragement for them to develop a just and equitable tax system. It is encouragement for them to assume more and more the burden of their own economy and their own government. It is an indication that we do not expect to continue indefinitely and forever a program of financing and supporting these foreign governments which now find themselves up against a dire emergency. And it encourages both Greece and Turkey to broaden the base

of popular support for and participation in their governments.

So, it seems to me that this amendment is constructive. Certainly it is not a crippling amendment. This amendment will indicate, in the first place, that we are urging those countries to work toward the American concept of government and freedom and, in the second place, we are serving notice that they must take steps on their own volition to improve their internal conditions and to maintain their own security, because while we are stepping into this breach as an emergency, we are not underwriting these countries as a program to go on ad infinitum.

If this legislation is to help promote peace and stability in the world it must be followed rapidly with the development of some such sort of comprehensive, consistent, clear-cut, constructive program of relationships between the United States and Russia as the one I outlined as objectives in my talk the opening day of this debate. This legislation can hold the line for a time but it cannot solve the prodigious problems which now perplex and bedevil the world. By the same token, if this legislation is to achieve the maximum dividends for Greece and Turkey it should be so administered as to make both countries self-supporting as soon as possible and so as to enable them to move steadily and smoothly in the direction of governmental set-ups which are more and more to be found in the hands of an increasingly large number of people in both countries. The Javits amendment in my opinion will help achieve this result and I have worked with him at some length on his proposal.

Just as it is the hope of Congress that the whole problem confronting Greece and Turkey may gradually be turned over to the United Nations for administration and assistance so, too, it is our hope that in both countries their respective governments may become more and more representative of all the people and that they will increasingly protect and defend the human rights and the individual liberties of all their people.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to ask the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment a question. I may misunderstand his amendment, but, as I understand it, if, after the United States of America put in, say, 90 percent of this money, the President came to the conclusion that the existing government did not represent at that time a majority of the Greek people, would we just walk out and leave everything we put in there in the hands of a government which did not represent the majority of the people?

Mr. JAVITS. We are giving the President that amount of discretion, and we assume that he is keeping check on it and will keep check on it constantly as we go along, while the 90 percent is going in and before the additional 10 percent goes in, as the gentleman states.

Mr. MATHEWS. That is exactly the situation I have put up to the gentleman. If after the 90 percent is in the President determines that the government does not represent the majority of the people, and we should do what the gentleman sets forth in his amendment, then we leave the 90 percent that we put in in the hands of a government which does not then represent the majority of the people.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out to the gentleman that that is just the problem this amendment is designed to meet.

Mr. MATHEWS. It seems to me that is just the problem it creates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 6 the President is directed to withdraw if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable. You may have put in 99.74 percent of the $400,000,000, but the Council or somebody else can then say, "It is undesirable; step out." If you ever had a screwball proposition submitted to you in your life, this is the perfection of one.

Mr. MATHEWS. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. It has been said on this floor that this policy is absolutely necessary to the security of this country. We have gone around the United Nations for that purpose. Are we now going to say that regardless of the essential necessity for that policy for our security we will abandon it the minute the United Nations tells us to?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. How are you going to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear? No matter how you amend this bill it still is the United States reinforcing the Truman doctrine, which is the permanent global policy of interfering everywhere in the world.

Mr. MATHEWS. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that he left out one very important sentence in the paragraph he read, that is, that we cannot save our faces by using the Russian policy of "I veto."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to make it very plain that the statement of the gentleman from Michigan has no application whatever to my amendment. It refers to the committee amendment, which will come up later. My amendment does not deal with the text which the gentleman from Michigan read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 6, noes 104.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the committee amendment:

On page 7, strike out all of the language after the figure "(2)" down to and including the semicolon and substitute the following:

"(a) As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question of Communist aggression to the United Nations organization;

"(b) If the President finds that the United Nations has failed to act within 60 days after the enactment hereof, he is directed to carry out the provisions of this bill."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order because there is no reference in this bill to Communist aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it seems ridiculous to me, although I may be caught in a parliamentary situation, that we have legislation based upon the request of the President of the United States, who says this aid to Greece and Turkey is necessary because of Communist aggression, and that my amendment which goes to that situation should be ruled out of order. My amendment goes to the point of asking that this matter, if there is such a thing as Communist aggression afoot, be referred to the United Nations, the organization set up to accomplish the very thing that the President complains of. I will have to confess, so far as the wording of the bill is concerned, there is perhaps no reference to it. I would like, however, to ask unanimous consent to strike out from my amendment under subsection (a) the words "Communist aggression" so that it would read

As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question to the United Nations organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to modify his amendment by striking out the words "Communist aggression."

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama care to withdraw the point of order?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to the amendment:

On page 7, strike out all of the language after the figure "2" down to and including the semicolon and substitute the following:

"(a) As a condition precedent to the rendering of any assistance pursuant to this act, the President is directed to refer the question to the United Nations organization.

"(b) If the President finds that the United Nations has failed to act within 60 days from the enactment hereof, he is directed to carry out the provisions of this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE UNDRESSED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to hours of debate on this bill.

We do not need more words. What we need is light.

And I have it. Here is a fresh piece of evidence, the first new light on the question in many hours.

It is a book called The Struggle for the World, by one of the intellectual stepfathers of the Truman doctrine.

You must read it. It will curl your hair. This volume is a dead give-away. It tells us what the real Truman doctrine is, and where it will lead us.

It is a veritable Mein Kampf.

When you have read it carefully, you will be horrified about the picture it gives us of the Truman doctrine in its final and expected form, even though the President may not realize it.

It says that the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world, and should therefore plan to conquer the world. It says we have the atom bomb, and should therefore send it crashing on the cities of the world to assert our claim for world empire and world domination.

It says, and many of the Members of this House are familiar with the sound of these words, that we cannot escape war with Russia.

Here are no pious phrases pandering to the humanitarian sentiments of the American public. No tears about aid for poor little Greece and Turkey. Here is the outline, in all its naked horrors.

Now you may interrupt at this point that the book was not written by Harry Truman. But it was written by a New York professor, one of those intellectuals whom we have seen so much of since 1933.

The author of this book, James Burnham, it is true, is not a member of the President's official family. But he is hailed as one of the prophets of Trumanism.

On a recent evening he spoke over a network of 262 stations of the American Broadcasting Company in defense of this doctrine. His publishers, in paid advertisements in the New York Times, claim that this book has been most influential in establishing our foreign policy.

Step by step the moves on the road to empire which he recommends in this book are being taken by the administration. And even if he does not have a room in the White House, his public and radio sponsorship of the Greek-Turkish bill has never been disavowed by the administration for which, to all intents and purposes, he speaks.

Now, let us get on with the analysis. Here is your new Truman doctrine. Here is the poison at its source.

The essence of Burnham's book is: The line is drawn. And you have your choice. You can help the Russians build their empire. Or you can build an American Empire. Either way. There is no other out. And either way, it is war. Which side are you fighting on?

What a fallacious pair of alternatives. What a trumped-up choice.

Secretary Marshall recently said that even though the situation is not encouraging he still believes we can reach an agreement with Stalin. I do not know, but that is what Marshall said.

But to get back to the evidence, Mr. Burnham says we must force England and the dominions into our grasp. India will be kept in chains. Spain will be freed from the forces now dominating its Government. China will be propped up, bailed out, and bottle-fed.

And get this: "The strategic plan must be, it would seem, to strike an immediate, paralyzing blow with atomic weapons at the Caucasian oil fields, Moscow, and a dozen or more of the chief Soviet and Soviet-controlled cities and industrial concentrations." That is on page 243 of this book.

Think of that. The very blueprints for an aggressive war of the type we just paid 250,000 lives to curb. But this time it is us. And this time, instead of the Wehrmacht, we have the atom bomb.

May God have mercy on us!

And here is more on page 177—four direct quotes:

"1. It would have to be recognized that peace is not and cannot be the objective of foreign policy.

"2. What tag ends still remain of the doctrine of 'the equality of nations' would have to be discarded. The United States would have to be prepared to make an open bid for world political leadership.

"3. Similarly, the doctrine of 'nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations'—already little more than a verbal shell—would have to be discarded altogether.

"4. The United States would have to accept the need for world-wide propaganda as an arm of policy that cannot be dispensed with in the modern world."

Gentlemen, it is not just rhetoric, when I speak in shocked awe of the possibilities outlined in this book.

It is rather an expression of fear at what is happening to us. Are we too being corrupted by our power? Has God been too good to us?

Will we abuse the trust and bountiful blessings He has given us, and turn ourselves into a warrior Nation?

Does America want to become the dreaded scourge of the peoples of the world?

Who is it that does not scan the sky now for our bombers? Or who is it that does not quail at the thoughts of our rockets?

Gentlemen, the Truman doctrine evidenced in the Greek-Turkish aid bill is an immoral proposition, advanced chiefly on the assumption that we can get away with it.

It is unworthy of us, and the high position which destiny has handed us.

If we will, we can be friends and leaders of the world. If we would, then we must disown this Truman policy lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment in substance turn this matter over to the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It does, and it remains in the hands of the United Nations for a period of 60 days. If there is no action by that organization the President is authorized to proceed under this legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it gives the United Nations an opportunity to act before we spend the money?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And before we become so deeply involved?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Before we open the door. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Instead of going ahead with all of these plans and then giving the United Nations a chance to throw us out if it desires to do so?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. You say the United Nations should act. By that term, if the United Nations should start to do something within the 60 days and they do not finally conclude their deliberations, they can continue and continue and continue, because it is not final action you are looking at. It is merely that they can start action.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My answer to that is that we will assume those who have charge of such matters will not allow such a situation to arise. They are prudent men.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this attitude of hurry and rush is evident. I know the Preakness race is on tomorrow but I am sure there is time tomorrow to get to that.

There has been in my mind for a long time a question as to just what kind of an organization we have set up in the United Nations. I am sure that as you read your mail and you read the daily press you know that the mothers and fathers of this country are concerned about whether or not we are going to bypass the United Nations, because when you vote down this amendment, or any amendment whereby you refuse to recognize the United Nations, you might just as well build on John D. Rockefeller's

estate in New York a mausoleum to the memory of the United Nations. Nothing more nor less. I am amazed at those in this body today who have had something to do with bringing this baby into existence and see them repudiate their previous action. We see today only a lip service to the United Nations.

I think it is begging the question when you say it is foolish to take this matter to the United Nations because it cannot act. Sixty days is not a long time. It is true that the President on March 12 said that there was a terrific crisis existing, but nothing much has happened, has there? So, I say it seems to me that we can well afford to stop, look, and listen at this point and give the United Nations a vote of confidence, because if you do not, tonight over the radio and the telegraph will go to all parts of the world the statement that the United States has backed out of the United Nations.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, may we have some decision on the time to be consumed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall have to object unless the chairman of the committee revises his request.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request until we can get a little clearer picture of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back the balance of his time.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield back the balance of my time; I gave the privilege of using my time to the gentleman from Mississippi, because if I yield back the balance of my time I would not have any left for myself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as one who has long advocated an abandonment of the policy of appeasing Russia, and who has given much serious deliberation and study to this question of stopping that aggressor by providing assistance to Greece and Turkey in their effort to combat communism, I must cast my vote for this bill.

The issue confronting the Congress and the country is, in my judgment, most momentous and far reaching in its implications. There have been few, if any, of more transcending importance before the people of the United States since the unfortunate fratricidal strife known as the Civil War. And yet it is a very simple issue, for there are few intelligent people in the world today who would still attempt to deny that the Soviet Russian Government, under the domination of Generalissimo Stalin and his little band of advisers, constituting the Politburo, is a totalitarian and despotic government, bent upon territorial and idealistic world expansion. Moreover, it must be apparent to students of current world affairs that the little, but strategic countries of Greece and Turkey are the immediate objective of that policy. The immediate question, therefore, is whether these small countries shall be added to the list of such countries as Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, who have been taken within the communistic orbit over their impotent protest.

In the fall of 1945, as chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, it was my privilege, together with a half dozen of my 17 colleagues comprising that committee, to make a 2-month, on-the-spot study of the economic and political conditions in 13 European countries. We then interviewed the rulers and the outstanding national figures in all of those countries, including Generalissimo Stalin himself. It was the firm and unanimous conviction of our committee, after a completion of that study, that there is no substantial difference in either the Russian system, as it exists today under Stalin, and the German system, as it existed immediately prior to World War II under Hitler. The individual had about as much freedom under one as he has under the other.

The Allies, under the then leadership of Great Britain, had a glorious opportunity to stop Hitler, when in wanton disregard of existing treaties by a process of infiltration and intrigue, he violated the sacred rights of other countries, but instead, the democracies under that leadership tried the policy of appeasement. And under the Chamberlain umbrella policy, Hitler then began his mad march, subjugating and enveloping country after country.

History has a way of repeating itself. Today in a world situation not dissimilar to that, President Truman, with the able counsel and backing of that great soldier and statesman, Gen. George C. Marshall, our Secretary of State, together with the advice and assistance of such able statesmen and real Americans as VANDENBERG, of Michigan; CONNALLY, of Texas; and EATON, of New Jersey, has embarked upon a firm policy of cessation of appeasement; stopping the aggressor; and preventing the further spread of communism. The first step in this program is this $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey.

Since I am sure that we are all agreed that something must be done to stop the aggressor lest we have a repetition of that gory strife known as World War II, what alternative is advanced? What do the opponents of the President's plan have to offer? Do they propose to continue the policy of Russian appeasement so strenuously advocated by Mr. Henry Wallace? Or, in the alternative, do they propose that we should sit idly by and permit the Russian policy of waging a war of nerves, of obstruction and infiltration, until it is too late?

The only alternative so far advanced has been that this whole matter should be referred to the United Nations. Can anyone seriously contend that such a policy could be effective? Is it not perfectly apparent to all that Russia would exercise her right of veto and the Greek-Turkish assistance would be hopelessly shelved even as every other serious proposal made by the United States, Great Britain, or France has been obstructed and barred from realization? To advocate the referring of this matter to the United Nations is simply equivalent to saying that one is against the necessary assistance to these two small countries to prevent their being taken into the Russian sphere.

The civilized world today, as a result of the recent global strife, is in a state of moral, economic, and political unrest. The Soviet Government of Russia is capitalizing on that situation. Russia wants war no more than we want war. She is not prepared for war. Her rulers are taking advantage of the weakened condition of England and France and of our known and fervent desire for peace to expand and grab everything she can short of war.

Mr. Chairman, no one dislikes the idea of adding to our already staggering national debt by foreign loans more than I do. As a matter of fact, for the past year and a half I have insisted that our own economy be given first consideration. Only last week in this House I voted against the $350,000,000 foreign-relief bill. But, like you and other representatives of the people here today, I am confronted with a duty to perform. We are all agreed that we cannot afford to retreat. We cannot have another Munich. The Commander in Chief, who speaks for our foreign policy, has told the world that this was the way to stop the dictator, Stalin, and the further spread of communism. If we turn him down here today, it will mean that Russia will take that as her license to continue her onward move, even as Hitler took the retreat at Munich as his license to proceed. So, as much as I dislike the idea of this foreign loan, I feel in duty bound to vote for it. In other words, I feel that any other policy would be unfair to the millions of our young veterans who risked their all to win the war. What is the risk of the loss of a few million dollars more invested in the objective of winning the peace when we spent countless billions to win the war? What will we have gained by the expenditure of these billions of dollars of American resources and the loss of so many precious lives in that war if we now permit the setting up of another dictator in the place of the one we destroyed?

Mr. Chairman, just a few months after the Battle of the Bulge, and while I was on the mission to which I earlier referred, I visited an American cemetery in a clearing of a forest on the outskirts of Luxemburg. There I witnessed a

scene that has been intensely imprinted upon my mind. Hundreds of German prisoners of war were being utilized to set in order a large cemetery in which were buried several thousand of our gallant American soldiers who sacrificed their lives in that battle to stop the last German drive. They were busily setting up thousands of tiny white crosses to mark the last resting place of these heroic boys. As we approach the final argument on this legislation I feel that I must keep the faith with them. I have no other alternative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I doubt if anyone in this House has worked harder through the years for an effective world organization to establish and maintain peace than I have. Although from a stanchly Republican family, I cast the first vote of my life for the Democratic Party in 1920—for Cox, and the only vote I ever cast for Franklin D. Roosevelt—because I thought the most important issue then was the League of Nations.

After 19 years as a surgeon I gave up the security and deep satisfactions of my profession to enter public life because it did not make sense to spend one's life bringing children into the world, nursing them through all sorts of difficult illnesses, bringing them to clean eager manhood, and then sending them out to be killed. Nothing we accomplish domestically can endure if we have a war every 25 years.

I became convinced that the only way to keep the United States out of war is to make sure there is no war for her to get into; that the only major war we can keep out of in this shrunken world is the war that isn't.

I could see no way to prevent world wars except by getting some sort of world organization which would be able to work out just and reasonably satisfactory settlements of disputes between nations before situations deteriorate to the place where men see no other way out than by going to war. It must be able to deal with wars as with fires, put them out before they get going in such a way that our own house is endangered and we cannot in self-defense stay out.

All my adult life I have worked harder for such a world organization than for any other single cause. I think I can claim to be interested in the United Nations.

When the United Nations Charter was adopted I was unhappy about some of its provisions, especially the veto, and said so. In a speech on a Nation-wide broadcast, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 29, 1945, almost 2 years ago, when the San Francisco conference had just ended, I urged that we enter the organization because it seemed to me "Our choice is not between this and something better, but between this and nothing, which is worse." I further said:

> While I do not believe the Charter is as bad as some people would have you think, I also do not believe it is as good as some others portray it to be in their concern to make sure our country will participate this time. I deplore that over-enthusiasm, because it will almost certainly lead to over-disillusionment, producing three isolationists where only one grew before.

I warned repeatedly against overselling the United Nations in its present form.

I think the confusion and dismay we are in today is largely the result of that over-selling. The American people believed all they were told by the propagandists and naturally came to think that the United Nations in its present form was set up to handle situations like the internal disorders in Greece and so they come and say, "Turn it over to the United Nations. Let it do its stuff."

They do not realize the tragic fact that the UN is not set up to deal with this kind of an internal situation. It was authorized to deal with troubles between nations, but not to deal with troubles within a nation. In fact it is specifically forbidden in its own Charter to deal with a situation such as exists in Greece. Article II, paragraph 7, says:

> Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter * * *.

It was set up to deal with old-fashioned military aggression from outside a nation. Many indulged in the wishful thinking that after we disposed of Hitler and Japan, there would be no more aggressors. And then its first big test comes on aggression by one of its own Big Five, working by infiltration from within another member nation. The organization was not set up to deal with such aggression from within. To ask the United Nations to take over the problem of restoring internal order and peace in Greece so reconstruction can begin there is to ask it to violate its own Charter.

Secondly, everyone knows it does not have as yet the tools with which to do the job, the money, or the men.

Thirdly, action by it against the Communist insurrectionists in Greece would be blocked by the Russian veto even if the organization had the authority in its Charter, and the tools.

What happens to a bird which is pulled out of the nest and called upon to fly before it has feathers? And especially if one wing is tied down, as the UN is by the Russian veto.

I regretted the veto arrangement because it was a monkey wrench carefully placed in the UN machinery in such a way that it could block the turning of a single wheel, beyond discussion, if one of the Big Five so desired.

I said in June 1945:

> This Charter with all its inadequacies does provide machinery by which I think the nations can settle peaceably the conflicts that exist now and those that will inevitably arise. It is workable if there is the will and good will to make it work.

Mr. Chairman, the record proves that all the major nations, save one, do have the will and good will to make it work, but that the one nation does not.

President Truman at San Francisco rightly said the Charter was only a first step. But Russia has insisted on blocking the necessary next steps. Let us not have our people fooled any longer. Let us frankly recognize that as long as one Big Five nation does not have the will or even the willingness to let the machinery work, then the machinery, no matter how good it looks, is useless for such a crisis as we face today—until the monkey wrench is removed.

We all remember vividly the last time that the former President of the United States, President Roosevelt, spoke from this floor. He was just back from Yalta. He told us frankly he did not like some of the compromises he had agreed to. But he said they seemed necessary in order to achieve two most important objectives. One was the assurance that Poland would have the chance to become "strong, independent, and prosperous"; the other was that Russia would come along into the United Nations. He apparently assumed that if she came in she would come in for the same reasons we did—to help solve world problems. History proves how tragically he was betrayed or out-traded on both counts.

Perhaps you remember the magazine articles written about the Teheran Conference by Ernest Lindley and Forest Davis, with President Roosevelt's blessing. They described his so-called grand design—getting Russia into the United Nations. Yielding to her on matters of principle, pledges, and territory—for example, Poland's—was considered justifiable as a temporary expedient, if it succeeded in getting Russia to join up. Well, she joined up, but not to help develop a workable organization—rather to make sure that it did not work. That, in my judgment, is the climactic tragedy of President Roosevelt's life—the tragedy of Europe's life, the tragedy of the world's hope that it would get a United Nations that could deal with situations like that within Greece. It ought to have been able to, but the plain fact is that it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I serve notice on the House now I will object from here on unless time is extended so that we will have a chance to debate. That means all requests

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. M.. Chairman, futher reserving the right to object, I am wondering whether, as soon as the gentleman concludes, a motion will be made to limit debate. If so, then I think some of the rest of us ought to be given a little time, too.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctantly forced to object to yielding additional time even to a member of my committee.

Mr. JUDD. If you want the United Nations to succeed, as I do, then do not pass the pending amendment and torpedo it by asking it, in violation of its own Charter, to take full responsibility

for something it simply cannot accomplish in its present form. Rather, let us do soberly and well the job before us while helping develop and strengthen the United Nations until, please God, it can be improved so as to make it capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law for relations between nations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Evidently it is his desire that we rush in, as a Nation, where angels fear to tread.

I would be impressed with the argument the gentleman has made about the United Nations being weak, and unable to do anything in support of the very purposes for which that organization was created, to wit, to preserve the peace of the world and to protect the territorial and political integrity of the smaller nations of the world, were it not for the fact that just a little over a year ago in a very similar situation, when Russia actually had troops within Iran, one of the countries you will be sending money to within the next 6 months—remember my prediction. The Iranian Government appealed to the United Nations and that organization so marshalled the forces of world opinion that Russia was compelled to withdraw her troops.

I say again, how much better it would be if we keep the pledges, if we would live up to the solemn covenants we made at San Francisco and move to meet this Greek-Turkish problem as a member of the United Nations. I know and you know that we would pay most of the cost and furnish most of the men, we would give the great part of the support to the United Nations for its efforts to preserve peace, but we would at least be operating under the cloak and authority of the United Nations, and would show, by our action, that we actually believe in the things we have preached—sincere cooperation with the other nations of the world.

Yes; I have heard a great deal of talk on this floor in the last few days about isolationists and internationalists. I will tell you who are the isolationists in this House today. They are those men and women who are, by their support of this legislation, about to destroy the United Nations. Oh, you talk about covering up. Remember that you are going to destroy the United Nations and its usefulness when you bypass it, and that is exactly what you are doing by this bill.

I was a nationalist, if you want to call me that. I believe that we should have made an honest try to stay out of the last war. I did everything within my power to keep America at honorable peace with the rest of the world. Then, after the war was over I was sold the idea, by some of these men who talked about peace measures prior to the last war, that we had to cooperate on an international basis, and that we had to support the United Nations. To my astonishment, when this legislation is presented to the House these very same gentlemen are running right out on the very same promise and pledge they were able to get me to make, and in support of which I cast my vote for the Fulbright resolution, and for every bit of enabling legislation to make the United Nations work.

I think history will tell us who are the internationalists, who are the ones who want to cooperate with the rest of the world against aggression and to preserve the peace, and who are actually now the isolationists. These isolationists are now saying to all civilization, "We will not cooperate with the United Nations. We will not cooperate with the other nations of the world. Instead, we are demanding that America go it alone. We do not want the help of any other nation."

Undoubtedly those who are now the isolationists have the votes to pass this bill, but remember, by the passage of this enactment you are driving a dagger into the very heart of the United Nations. You are destroying the very organization which has been, and is, the one great hope of the world for peace.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Committee may not be misled, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that there are no Russian troops either in Greece or in Turkey, as was the case in Iran. I cannot refrain either from expressing greater confidence in the membership of this body than that evidently entertained by the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke. If I understood him correctly, he said that the isolationists are those who wish to destroy the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from challenging the statement that there is any Member of this body who wishes to destroy the United Nations. I simply do not believe that. My confidence in them is such that I cannot bring myself to agree with that.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that if we give the United Nations something that it cannot do we will probably destroy the United Nations?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is not only eminently correct but that is probably the best, the surest, and most positive way to destroy it.

Mr. COX. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In spite of the statement made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, it is impossible for me to believe that he favors our imposing a limitation upon our right to exercise the law of self-defense when the safety of the Nation is imperiled to make it contingent upon the consent of some international power.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it that we are here now trying to take the initiative as a nation individually, single-handed, and alone, without going out to these countries that you have tried to band together, such as the Par American Union, for example, or some other foreign nation, and ask their aid and assistance to join with us now to do the job you are trying to do. No; we want to do it alone; we want America to go over there and take charge of Europe. I say when you do that you will wreck our country.

Mr. JARMAN. May I answer the gentleman's question by inquiring whether he was in favor of the extension of UNRRA the last time it was voted on?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Was not the essence of the Iranian situation this: The issue there was between two countries—Russia and Iran. The United Nations had jurisdiction. It could operate, and it did.

Now, we are dealing with a situation not between two countries, but within one country, Greece, which is a totally different situation. The United Nations does not have similar jurisdiction.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is correct, and he will also recall that the Russian troops were already in Iran.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. May I say a further word? President Roosevelt put all our chips on the gamble that if he could get Russia to come along into the United Nations, she would join for the same reason we joined, namely to help solve world problems. Now, it is tragically clear that she came in not to get solutions to problems but to block solutions. We face the hard realization that her purpose in joining was not to make the United Nations work but to do everything possible to keep it from working. To ask it now, stymied as it is from within, to take over this problem would be to sound its death knell.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman, who is one of the ablest Members of the House, is eminently correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished friend that I fear the apologies for this action today will be heard for a long, long time.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman mean his action?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; I mean the action of those who will bypass the United Nations by voting down this amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who has not had enough time to speak.

Mr. MORRIS. I know it is a little distasteful for a new Member to speak, but I think we should speak what is in our hearts.

Mr. JARMAN. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. MORRIS. I am going to ask a question. You referred to the fact that I had spoken. I spoke from my heart and for my country, sir; the best I knew how.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, the House, in my opinion, is considering the most important matter that will face the Eightieth Congress. This, I believe, is the most important decision that ever confronted me.

The sudden and alarming deterioration of the affairs of the world at large and in Europe particularly requires us in the interest of national safety, and in the cause of world peace, to review the entire international situation in order to clarify our position and determine the best use we can make of our great, but not unlimited, resources.

We must assume our responsibilities which this deterioration has forced upon us. We must carefully define those responsibilities and decide for what purpose they are being undertaken. We must determine where we can do the most good and how we can protect and enhance those principles for which we recently fought. God grant us sustained determination and guidance to use our talents well. May our actions help solve the greatest objective of mankind—peace—not by force but with freedom, remembering always that the more virtue we have the fewer treaties we shall need.

The President has definitely committed our Nation to all-out diplomatic action. In other words, the honor and prestige of our Nation is at stake. It will take all our wisdom and skill to fill this new role, into which we are virtually being forced, in the great American tradition.

The formation of a sound and efficient military policy which will provide effective support of our foreign policy and at the same time promote efficient and reasonable economy is indeed a difficult task.

In the debate this week we heard cries of imperialism. I am proud of the record of our great country. We have never been the aggressor but have always been the protector. A year and a half ago we had incomparably the greatest military machine that the world had ever seen—in the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea. If we had a single ounce of imperialism in our souls, a single design on Russia, we could have imposed our will on her, or on anyone else, for that matter. What we did with our great military forces is a matter of history.

Then we hear again that we could afford to disarm because we have the atomic bomb. Let us look again at our record. We told Russia that we would give her all the atomic secrets, conditioned only that any use she made of atomic energy must be under the control and full inspection of a real International Commission. This, to my mind, was the most outstanding, the most far-reaching proposal any strong, sovereign, victorious nation ever made in all history.

Russia can have the atomic bomb under exactly the same conditions as we ourselves have it. We have done everything we could, and perhaps more than we should, to try to show our friendship and good will toward Russia. To our great disappointment, our relations have grown steadily worse.

This is not a contest for supremacy, but a contest between two different ideologies. The eyes of the entire world are upon us. We are not only determining whether the people of the world shall have a chance to go the way of freedom but are determining whether we ourselves are to be a safe, solvent, and free people.

Millions and millions of men and women who love freedom will fight and die for it, if they have hope. We can give them that hope and can inspire them to hold fast to their religious beliefs.

In supporting this measure I have relied upon the protection of a divine providence that our sacred honor and our beliefs shall not perish from the earth, and that we shall be instrumental in establishing unity and human freedom throughout the world.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, for 4 days I have listened very carefully to the debate upon the President's proposal to expend $400,000,000 and give military and naval advice to Greece and Turkey in an effort to preserve their independence of Russia. We are embarking upon a new and dangerous foreign policy of intervention in behalf of weak nations and the preservation of their liberties.

When the President first came before the joint session of Congress on March 12, and asked that Congress make this most important decision since the declaration of war, there came to me the thought, "Just how far shall we go? Shall we commit ourselves to the stupendous task of stopping the expansion of communistic Russia throughout Europe?"

Every day since then I have studied this problem from every possible angle. Many of us here, I know, have prayed for knowledge to do what is right in this hour of decision.

I personally have been much disturbed since VE-day 2 years ago over the domination by Russia of a dozen small nations formerly independent and now satellite states of Stalin. There seems to be very little hope that Finland and Poland will again be free or that these dozen nations will ever emerge from behind that iron curtain of darkness, despair, and communism where freedom of speech and of worship is not permitted.

The debate here for 4 days has convinced me that the United Nations organization is not able to assure Greece and Turkey their continued freedom from the ever grasping claws of the Russian Bear, intent upon aggression. I am also convinced that this debate has proven that the United States is the only power capable of stopping Communist Russia in its creeping expansion throughout Europe. The conclusion has been forced upon me reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, that it is our duty, whether we like to face it or not, to stop further encroachment by Russia upon weaker nations.

As has been stated here often, if Greece and Turkey go communistic, it will be but a matter of time before that blight will fall upon Italy, Switzerland, and France. What then can we expect to happen to honest little Finland's neighbors, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, not to speak of Great Britain. It seems to me there is but one answer and that leads us to the question, Can we afford to let this happen? My answer is "No," not even if it costs us billions of dollars to prevent it.

Yes; frankly, it may be that intervention in Greece and Turkey will lead to war. Just as frankly, we do know that, if we do not intervene and do not help the small nations of Europe keep out of the clutches of Russia, war is sure to come, 5 years from now perhaps, 10 years, who knows when.

I hope and pray that the passage of this legislation, coupled with a hard-fisted nonappeasement foreign policy, will prevent World War III. It is with that hope and prayer that I am today voting, as are most of you, for this bill. God alone knows whether we are doing right or wrong.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate for 3 days, and to say the least, it is a bit confusing and full of contradictions. Many issues have been brought into the discussion that do not properly belong and certainly have no bearing on appropriating $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations. The position is taken in the bill that we have a responsibility to maintain peace and we believe that our own country will suffer whenever totalitarian regimes are imposed on free people. With this position I am in complete agreement. I intend to vote for the bill and against any crippling amendments. First, because the President of the United States in his message to Congress made clear to me that this aid is necessary to implement the position we have taken to establish freedom throughout the world. Second, because the President has been supported in his request by the Secretary of State, by a former President of the United States, by our top men in the United Nations, and by many commissions and individuals who have made an objective study of the question. They are the people who are in position to know much more than we are, and I am satisfied that in following their considered judgment and reports I am on safe ground. And last, but by no means least, if I needed to be persuaded, I would find much comfort in the fact that most of the opposition to this bill is furnished by Members who before 1941 opposed every effort we attempted to prepare for a war that everybody should have known was inevitable if we were to remain a free people. Not until we were attacked by Japan did they realize that the United States was next on Mr. Hitler's list of countries to be conquered. It was a small group in the Congress during those frightening days that really had the courage to do the right thing. We succeeded then and we shall succeed today because real Americans usually see straight, even though we may have many differences of opinion. Let us by our big vote here today prove that America can be depended upon when the choice is, as

between great strength and courage, to do the right thing or appeasement which could easily lead to destruction.

It took billions of dollars to win the war, much time and a tremendous amount of sorrow and suffering. We cannot change these facts. Let us be realistic.

It will take many more billions and probably much more suffering before a just and lasting peace is secured; but we cannot falter now, we must go on. With the help of God and an informed courageous people we shall reach the greater goal, and that goal is a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my replies to the few letters I have received both for and against this Greek-Turkey aid, loan or gift bill, I have answered by saying, "This is the sort of a decision which tries one's very soul," without committing myself one way or another, for the very good reason that up to until yesterday I had not fully made up my mind as to how I should vote on this bill with all its far-reaching implications.

I have now come to the very definite conclusion that if this bill, as now written, finally becomes law it will not give relief to the suffering people for which it is intended, nor will it tend to frighten the Communists out of Greece and Turkey, or any other country, but to the contrary by sending military personnel to Greece and Turkey, it will, in my studied opinion, cause internal revolution there, which will really put us to the acid test of full military intervention, and possibly start World War III, or else be obliged to back out with our faces red, and be the laughing stock to the rest of the world, especially in the eyes of Stalin and the Communists both over there and right here within our own shores.

The administration in power has given aid and comfort to the Communists both here and abroad for many years just to garner their support and votes, and are still doing it, as is evidenced by the fact that our Attorney General still gives only lip service to the law which requires him to rid from Government employ any person belonging to any organization which advocates the destruction of the American form of government by force and violence, as is the purpose of the Communists. And if we are obliged to back out of Greece and Turkey, the Communists here will gloat and be even bolder and become more powerful.

I say, we in America had best clean our own house of the destructive forces within our own shores before we attempt to force them out of other countries far across the sea. And in my humble opinion we will fail miserably if we make this weak attempt to drive the Communists out of Greece and Turkey.

In addition to the danger I have so far pointed out, I again want to remind you, my colleagues of this House of Representatives, that there is a limit to our ability to pay and pay and pay. And if we pass this bill in addition to all the other gifts, loans, and so forth, we will be called upon to make to the other countries now forming in line with their hands out to Uncle Sam, if this bill is made law, to say nothing about the thirty to forty billions of dollars required to pay the running expenses of our own Government, how in heaven's name can we avoid national bankruptcy when we look squarely at the whole picture? Surely such a condition will soon confront us unless we stop this spending spree now.

In one of Lenin's last speeches, he said:

> We will force America to spend herself into bankruptcy then we will take her over.

Mr. Chairman, if we permit this spending spree to go on much longer, then just as surely as we live, Lenin's prediction will come true. God forbid that we should be so stupid. What will the good people of the world profit, even if we do succeed in driving Communists out of Greece and Turkey, if at the same time we extinguish the only lamp of liberty in the world, America?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is pending, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], imposing, if adopted, a condition precedent to this bill going into operation, I hope, will be defeated, as has been other amendments. The adoption of this amendment would for all practical purposes defeat the bill that we have under consideration. It has been pointed out by myself, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and other Members, that this bill does not bypass the United Nations. I was amazed at the argument made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the effect that he now is an internationalist. The gentleman pleads guilty now to being an internationalist. But based upon the evidence that I know in relation to him, and insofar as I can arrive at a judgment on this evidence and his confession, I think the confession of guilt is under legislative duress, and because of that, if I were sitting as a judge, I would rule it out as inadmissible and find the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] not guilty of being an internationalist.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, there is only one question that concerns me on all legislation of this kind, as well as the legislation which preceded Pearl Harbor and during the war—that is, what course of action at a particular time is for the national interest of my own country? I recognize that Members may have honest disagreement on this question. So far as I am concerned, Greece will be taken over by the Communists of that country unless we take affirmative action, and, after being taken over, the Government of Greece, like other countries that we are aware of, will become a satellite of the Soviet Union. I am satisfied that if we sit idly by and do nothing in our own national interest Italy will be the next country. We know that France is already fighting with its back to the wall. I am satisfied that if Italy goes, or if France goes, the Mediterranean goes with it. That will mean all of Europe. That also means that international communism or Red fascism will envelop all of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I take the position that such will not be for the national interest of the United States. What are we going to do—sit idly by, adopt the negative attitude, and see country after country taken over by default? Russia does not have to act. Russia has it groups working in every country. They are backed by the spirit and indirectly by the forces of Soviet Russia. They operate upon discontent, through fear, through any means—lawful or unlawful—or a combination of both—to attain their ends. They have their representatives and agents in each country to get control of the government of a country and then, once having control, use repressive and vicious measures upon the decent elements of such countries, and, if necessary, to liquidate them.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. What Russia is doing, as the gentleman said, cannot, according to the United Nations Charter, be brought to the attention of the United Nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Russia says, "We are not doing it as a nation," and, theoretically, from a legalistic point of view, they are correct, but from the practical angle everyone on the floor of this House knows what is going on.

Let me ask this question: Suppose we do nothing, what do you think will happen to Greece? Is it likely within the near future that they will be taken over by the Communists within Greece, assisted by Yugoslavia, Albania, and back of it the Balkans that are now under the control of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union itself?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that happens, will that be in the national interest of the United States, is the next question? All right. Suppose Greece goes. Does any Member in this body think that Italy, already under pressure, and the only nation outside the iron curtain that is compelled to have a coalition government today, with Communist members in its cabinet, can survive? If Italy goes, will that be for the national interest of the United States?

Now, I respect the views of those who disagree with my reasoning, but that is the way my mind operates. If we do nothing, it is only a matter of time when Greece will go, and I say as an American that will not be for the national interest of my country. Then a month or 2 or 3 months from now, pressure on Italy will become intensified, and if Italy goes, I say as an American that this will not be for the national interest of my country,

and it is on that ground that I take my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is in order to again quote Shakespeare who in one of his plays, one of his characters, the King, in speaking of the conditions of the Government in Denmark, observed that, "The people muddied, thick and unwholesome in their thoughts and whispers."

I think you can take the debate on this bill, and analyze it studiously and carefully and come to the conclusion that the American people are muddied in their thinking, and especially the Congress of the United States is muddied in its thinking. We have the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations, the United Nations organization, Bretton Woods, all of the side agreements which have been mentioned numerous times in this debate, the British loan agreement, and the International Trade Organization in which we set forth the aims and objectives of the people of the United States in cooperation with other nations and with respect to international relations. We certainly put faith in the United Nations organization, and yet this very day we have from the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, the five-point program to implement the so-called Truman doctrine, which, as set forth in this debate, shows that it cuts directly across the face of these other international agreements to which I have referred. And in Dean Acheson's statement he points out that, "We must take whatever action is possible immediately," irrespective of what the United Nations organization may desire to do or what it has the power to do.

I am familiar with the debate which occurred in the other body with respect to subparagraph 2 on page 7 of this bill, and if the argument presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is accepted for argumentative purposes or otherwise, if the United Nations organization is not in position to assume responsibility on this issue, then will some member of the committee in his own time tell us why on earth the language, lines 1 to 7 on page 7, is in this bill? Why do we propose to turn over the destiny of the United Nations as affected by the communistic doctrine and philosophy and aggression and approach when we say in the language of this bill that the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein if the Security Council or the General Assembly finds that this aid is undesirable in these two countries?

In that language you give the United Nations the power to stop your program. That is exactly what you do. If the United Nations has no power to act, as stated under the Smith amendment, what is this language doing in the bill? Our people on this floor have a right to be confused with respect to this debate and this presentation, and the people out through the country have a right to be confused.

Here during the first 3 months of this year we exported on the basis of an average annual performance nearly $15,000,000,000 worth of goods from this country. It outclasses anything we ever did in peacetime other than during the period we were shoving lend-lease goods out to the world. Yet one of the five points listed by Dean Acheson is:

1. Vast increase in American exports to narrow the financial gap between—

Between what?—

what the world needs and what it can pay for.

One of the five points is to shove the substance of this country out to the four corners of the earth. It squares absolutely with Lenin's proposal to whittle us down. Whatever the American people want they may have, but I shall not support this bill because I do not believe it is what the people want. Their secondary reaction to this proposal when its full force and effect falls upon them will be most interesting.

If the United Nations is to have the say as to what we shall do, it should be said before we spend the $400,000,000 and further involve ourselves.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very illuminating discussion here. I should like to raise the question now as to closing this debate. I wonder how many there are who want to speak. I had the very unpleasant duty of objecting when a very eminent and able member of my committee wanted to add to his 5 minutes, because I wanted everybody to have a fair show. I should like to say about three sentences myself on this subject before we get through. How many now want to further illuminate us on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counts 14 Members on their feet. Does the gentleman care to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. EATON. I will take my seat with an earnest plea for mercy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does not the gentleman try to get an agreement as to a time to close all debate on the bill, say a quarter past 5, and let those who are standing be recognized in that time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment supported by the gentleman from Wisconsin and would like to reason with the Committee briefly about some of the fundamental decisions we are about to make on the final roll call vote.

Like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] I feel the time has come to focus our attention not only on what we propose to do in this legislation but on the conditions which would prevail throughout the world should we fail to act favorably on this legislation at this time. We dare not overlook the fearful alternatives which we now confront.

Ever since the war America has been suffering from the lack of a consistent and comprehensive foreign policy and program. Perhaps that was an inevitable consequence growing out of the great conflict, but more probably it is the direct result of the Roosevelt era of appeasing communism. But in all events we find ourselves, on the one hand, spending billions of dollars and maintaining vast armies abroad for the purpose of averting war, for the purpose of stopping the forces of dictatorship from arising in Europe. For the past 2 years, at the same time that we have been doing that, we have been appeasing abysmally another great dictatorial force—the Communist forces of Moscow.

Since March 12, for the first time we are beginning to fashion a consistent foreign policy, comprehensive and clear-cut and understandable, whereby while we do maintain armies abroad and spend billions of dollars in Japan, Korea, Austria, and Germany to hold down the forces which we defeated—the forces of dictatorship—we also propose now to stop similar dictatorial forces from aggressing further down toward the Mediterranean into Greece and Turkey. We now at long last propose to prevent Stalin from doing that which we have prevented Hitler from achieving. So for the first time in many years we are acting consistently.

I submit that those who oppose this legislation today should present something as consistent as the program offered by those of us who favor this legislation, even though we favor it reluctantly and as the least evil of the alarming alternatives which have been forced upon us all.

We present a program from our committee now based on consistency to resist these forces of evil wherever they raise their heads and to set up barriers against them. If you do not think we should do that, if you talk in terms of economy or terms of isolationism or terms of anything else which require you now to oppose this legislation, to be consistent then you should submit legislation or proposals to the Congress and your countrymen asking us to withdraw our Army from Germany and Austria; to withdraw our army of occupation from Japan and withdraw our army of occupation from Korea because why should we keep hundreds of thousands of men there and spend billions of dollars if we are going to permit the floodwaters of the Red torrent of Russian dictatorship to sweep down through Greece and Turkey, Iran and Iraq, Italy and Europe and then eventually down through South America to our own American shores?

I think that we all have the responsibility of being consistent in this action. I submit this situation to you. Not one Member of Congress that I know of has arisen to protest against the fact that we have 5,000 American soldiers now in

Trieste for the specific and identical purpose that we are now proposing to extend $400,000,000 of aid to Turkey and Greece.

The only conceivable reason our money, men, and materials are in Trieste is to keep the Russian Communists out. There is no other reason. Nobody protests that. But what good will it do to keep the Russian forces out of Trieste if we are going to hang the welcome sign up by defeating the proposal now before us and let them come into Italy and Turkey and Greece.

You should be consistent in any position you now assume. If you believe America should withdraw entirely to its shores, that we should pull back our armies of occupation that we should to put up the white flag of surrender to the red flag of communism all over the world, well, at least a program of consistency can be built along that line. Personally, I cannot support such a complete surrender of everything for which World War II was fought. However I cannot follow the line of reasoning of those who say it is within the realm of consistency to spend money and materials and send occupying armies of men in some of the countries of the world to stop the forces of aggression, and then refuse to give any aid whatsoever at a place where every military leader in America tells us the danger is greatest at the present time. So I urge you to defeat this amendment and to support the legislation. We owe it to our armies of occupation abroad either to back them up or bring them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Following out the program of consistency that was so eminently described by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I would like to talk a little myself about consistency. Picture the position in which we find ourselves throughout the world today and before the people of America and the people the world over. Here we are, arguing over a $400,000,000 appropriation authorization to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. In other words, by this act we are virtually telling the Greeks and Turks what they shall do with their problem of Communism. While we as Members of Congress are arguing and trying to tell Greece and Turkey what they should do with communism, right in the very House that we are debating that issue we have in the galleries from 100 to 200 Communists, right in the United States of America, listening to us. Last night they had a convention of 500 Communists in the city of Washington, talking on how they are going to take over Washington, D. C., when they have their first mayorality election. Here we sanction and we approve of the activities of the Communists in our shores. Now we are going to spend $400,000,000 to tell the Greeks and Turks what to do with their Communists. We are going to ask them to outlaw the Communist Party; to imprison and disarm and to shoot every Communist that exists in Greece and in Turkey. We are going to ask them to do what, as Members of Congress, we do not have the courage to do right in the United States.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. The Communists oppose this bill and you oppose the bill. Now, you are not a Communist.

Mr. O'KONSKI. No; and I am not a Stassenite, either.

Mr. MACKINNON. You cannot both be right, can you?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I will say this to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]: He and I have voted in opposite directions for the last hundred votes that have been cast. This is the first time we are together; but those who are accusing me of voting with him at this time have nothing to say about the 100 times that they voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in the past. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is right once, for the first time out of a hundred, and I am going to follow him.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. And they do not make any point of the fact that you are voting along with HARRY BYRD? They make no point of that at all? They try to conceal that fact.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, I vote my own vote. I do not care how anybody else votes. Anyway, we are going to tell the Greeks and the Turks how to treat the Communists when we have them running free right here within our own country and doing absolutely nothing about it. What we do not have the courage to do we are going to ask the Greeks and the Turks to do. Is that consistency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know you are anti Communist. The very thing you mention about this meeting in Washington last night has me bothered, as it has you.

The gentleman from Wisconsin well knows that if this group that met here last night were doing here what they are doing in Greece, if they were armed guerrilla bands trying to overthrow this Government, there could be but one result. The gentleman does not doubt for 1 minute what action this Congress would take. In other words, we are faced with just a little different situation here in trying to handle this problem in this country than is the Government in Greece. The problem in Greece is that the guerrillas are actually trying by force of arms to overthrow the Government.

I say to the gentleman that if these hundred Communists in the gallery, 150 or 300 who may have been here today, were actively engaged in trying to overthrow the Government, he knows what the answer would be. The two situations are not the same.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, having mentioned his name.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wanted to say that I am overwhelmed by this attention. The gentleman says sometimes there are a hundred with me or a hundred against me; and at last the gentleman is with me. I do not know what is going on any more.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from New York is right for the first time in a hundred votes and I am going along with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

At the outset let me state that I am ready to vote relief funds for the distressed people of Greece and for the unfortunate people of other lands. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the question here involved.

Without a question of a doubt, history will record that the proposal here today is the most significant event in our foreign policy since the Declaration of Independence. It may exceed—it may well transcend—in importance our declaration of war in 1917 and in 1941. In each of those wars we had allies. But here today we are out on our own. If we delve through the fog and mist of the uncertainies of today, it seems to me that we can find a yardstick that will dictate our proper course of action.

The British Empire endeavored to maintain peace for over a century. Today it stands exhausted at home. Segments of that once great Empire are breaking away. It seems to me that before we embark on a course of unilateral action, we should know just where we are going. If we go into Greece and into Turkey today then, most certainly, we shall be obliged to go into Korea, into India and into many other countries throughout the world. Russia will see to that. The decision in that regard will be Russia's and not our own.

Let us see what the world situation is. Only three countries are on a balanced budget—Canada and this country in the Western Hemisphere and South Africa. Inflation is the most important single curse affecting the vast majority of nations. Of course we must alleviate human suffering, but we also owe a duty to this country to see that when we help an impoverished world we do not endanger the financial security of the United States. The gentleman from Ohio spoke of the radical inflation in Greece, but I am fearful that the action here today will increase the possibility of radical inflation here in America. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that before we undertake this responsibility we should endeavor to obtain the cooperation of all peace-loving peoples of the world not presently within Soviet domination.

We can use the power and force of the United Nations to mobilize the people of the world against aggression and at the same time we can insist that they join us in a fight against inflation and by that action we can achieve a measure of financial stability throughout the world.

The United Nations already has a commission operating in Greece. The ques-

tion of assistance to Greece and Turkey should come before the United Nations pursuant to the direct mandate of its charter. Some people contend the United Nations is not strong enough to assume this responsibility. But if that be true, let us take the steps to make it strong. If this issue is submitted to the United Nations, then we will force a showdown with Russia in that body. As for me, I believe that Russia will back down when confronted with the combined opposition of the people of the world outside the confines of its own and its satellite states.

The people of America want us to take such steps as will make the United Nations stronger and stronger and not to impair its standing in the world. I submit, Mr. Chairman, if the United Nations assumes jurisdiction of this question and resolves it in the proper way, then and then only will we be on the road to world peace. If this amendment is not adopted, I shall be constrained to vote against this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee amendment and the Smith amendment to the committee amendment do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 135, noes 21.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 65, noes 137.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I had to object to one of the members of the committee requesting additional time, and I hated terribly to do it. I object.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, to whom I have listened now for four solid days, with the other members of his committee.

Mr. Chairman, I perhaps will not be able to say in the 5 minutes what I would like to say, but I want to make my position perfectly clear on this bill. I do wish that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who formerly was the majority leader, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and a lot of these people who are talking so glibly today, had been making the some kind of speeches 4, 5, 6, and 7 years ago that they are making today. Why, it was heresy to even use the word "communism" in the well of this House just a few years ago when the great appeaser was in the White House appeasing Communist Russia. We all know what brought about this position that faces us today. I predicted it in a speech which I was pleased to make on the floor of this House on the 30th of January 1941. Let me quote therefrom:

What are the war aims of the democracies in the present struggle? It is said by Lord Halifax that the British aims are to win the war and to crush Hitler. It is said by others that this is a war between conflicting ideologies, totalitarianism on the one hand and human liberty protected by democratic institutions of government on the other.

If that is true, I ask you in all seriousness what difference is there between Hitler and Stalin?

I asked that question in 1941. I asked you then, "Who would rule in the world in the event Hitler was crushed? Under what sovereignties will these people live?" And I got no answer. You said, "We are going to keep out of war; we are going to live at peace." I voted as my conscience dictated at that time for the thing that I thought would keep this country out of war. I have no apologies to make. I was designated as an isolationist because I took the same course that prior to the election of 1940 the President of the United States took, and which both parties wrote in their platforms. But the advice which I gave at that time and which others gave, went unheeded. When we took the course that we did take, the foreign policy of this Nation then was determined. I supported it with every vote from that time on.

Now we are faced with another situation, and we are not told what is going to eventuate. But what should be my position now? Can we turn back? No. The President has announced the foreign policy of the United States and has done so in these most critical times. What should I do as an American? With American troops scattered all over the world, in Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan, Korea, and other places, and with the forces of Stalin facing us in every place, shall we withdraw? Shall we turn tail? My colleagues, it is too late. What is the alternative? The opposition have failed utterly to present any alternative except to refer the matter to the United Nations. This is a hopeless gesture at this time, with Russia holding the veto power.

What can I do as an American? Must I only carp and criticize? We are involved all over the world, whether we like it or whether we do not.

Time will not permit the discussion of the things which I have considered prayerfully at home, alone, that impel me now to take the position that I must reluctantly take. I can see no other course. The alternative is too terrible to contemplate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the chairman give me some more time now?

Mr. EATON. The chairman has no power to give time, but I will withdraw my objection, because I think this is a speech that really means something.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BREHM. Must not the gentleman from New Jersey ask unanimous consent to withdraw his former objection?

The CHAIRMAN. That matter is not before the Committee. What is before the Committee is the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I very deeply appreciate the magnanimity of the chairman of the committee, who objected to my request for five additional minutes until he found out that I was speaking in favor of his bill. I think the unfairness in the distribution and allocation of time that has prevailed in the discussion of this bill is now perfectly clear and perfectly plain. However, that shall not change my vote on this bill, because I must vote as a Member of Congress and as an American as I see it in the interest of my country. To me it would be unthinkable now, in view of what has transpired in the Senate, and in the address of the President to this Congress, to send the word out to the world, "The people of the United States are not united, they are divided, and we have at last succeeded in dividing them," the very thing that Mr. Stalin would like to see done.

Now, may I ask you to see this. They say that the Stalinites want to bankrupt this Nation. They say that the spending of this money is a step in that direction. Is it? I note that the Reds are all for killing this bill. The "pinks" are all against this bill. If they were going to bankrupt the Nation by that means, I should think they would all be for it. I may interject here that many splendid Members of Congress intend to vote against it. They are honest and courageous and I do not challenge their attitudes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has arrived at his decision on this very serious problem by almost exactly the same rather tortured mental processes that I went through as a member of the committee in hearing the testimony and in arriving at the same conclusion. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me on this, that we face the alternative that, if we vote this legislation down, this country and this world face the very definite probability that the Russians, chained as they are, and moving in fast

in periods of stress and unrest, will step into Greece and Turkey and we will be confronted with fait accompli.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that in my opinion the Russians can go into Greece and Turkey any time they want to. What is there to stop them? We were told by the President that this thing was of such vital importance that we had to act by the 31st of March. I could almost see the Russians going down with their divisions from the Balkan area into Greece at that time.

Let me tell you that they are over there just as they are here and just as they are in Italy. They are there with their ideas and ideals, and you cannot stop that by building a wall of bullets or guns, regardless of what anybody says.

Let me tell you of what I am advised. I am advised that Italy is all ready to go communistic and all they are waiting for is for us to hand them $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 as a loan before they announce it. I understand that France is all ready to go communistic, and all they are waiting for is a $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 gift from us.

Let us not be foolish about this situation. But, still, with all that knowledge, I am going to vote for this bill because I, as one Member of Congress, went out throughout this Nation and condemned the administration because of its appeasement of Russia. I demanded that it announce a foreign policy. The administration has done so, and I hope to God they carry it out. Let us send word to Stalin that we do not intend to appease any longer.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman appeared before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives and delivered a message wherein he recommended the legislation we are now considering, to wit: House bill 2616. He concluded with these words:

> This is a serious course upon which we embark.
>
> I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious.

The President realized that by the request he was advocating not merely assistance to the people of Greece so that they might have the necessities of life and be saved from starvation, but that he was also advocating relief of a military character and that we were in reality bolstering with American arms and personnel the military strength of Greece and Turkey.

A member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which reported out this legislation for consideration by the House, recognized the military character of the same when he moved before the Rules Committee to transfer the matter to the Armed Services Committee for its attention.

The majority of our people do not object to the granting of relief, as such, to the people of Greece. Only the other day we passed House Joint Resolution 153 appropriating $200,000,000 for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war and Greece has been allocated $50,000,000 thereof. The Greek Army, described by the President as small and ill-equipped, has absorbed about $44,000,000 worth of equipment, some of it second-hand lend-lease. UNRRA's contributions, totaling approximately $360,000,000, have been poured into Greece and we paid 73 percent of that amount. Greece has also been extended a loan credit of $25,000,000. I understand that Britain has spent $150,000,000 on the Greek Army and has canceled $160,000,000 owed her for maintaining 16,000 British troops there and for other purposes. All this has been done in the past for Greece and yet, like China, she seems to be economically worse off than when we started.

Since the President's message on March 12, I have received many letters from constituents at home in which they express alarm over the bypassing of the United Nations and claim that by this action we reduce that great organization to the role of a glorified debating society. Many were persons who only a short time ago had worked so enthusiastically for the adoption of the United Nations and nad come to the conclusion that in it lay the hope for future world peace. I am frank to say that I have given the question of the legality of unilateral action by the United States very serious consideration. My research led me to the conclusion that by adoption of the United Nations Charter, all nations recognized that the maintenance of international peace and security was the responsibility of the United Nations collectively; that no nation should act unilaterally; that the Security Council had exclusive jurisdiction with respect to this matter and, as a matter of fact, is actually exercising the same at the present time.

It is stated by the President in his message, however, that the action contemplated gives effect to the principle of the Charter of the United Nations and does not bypass it or violate any of its provisions. Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, two statesmen who played a very important role in the formation of the United Nations also have gone on record to the same effect.

The Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States representative at the seat of the United Nations in the Security Council itself, in his address to the delegation on March 28, 1947, in explaining the action requested, also stated that the proposed program of assistance would in fact be a most essential act in giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that it is directly related to the act of the United States in creating a commission of investigation in Greece. On May 8, Mr. Austin addressed a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was read in the House in which he reiterated that this action does not bypass the United Nations; on the contrary, it would be a most essential act in support of it and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

The Honorable Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, also discounts the claim that the United Nations is being bypassed and indicates that it is not equipped to handle this matter, and that the action taken is in conjunction with that body. He said in part:

> The situation of Greece and Turkey confronts us with only two alternatives. We can either grant aid to those countries or we can deny that aid. There is no possibility of putting the responsibility for extending the aid for Greece and Turkey as asked from the United States on some other nation or upon the United States. This becomes clear when we consider the specific problems that confront Greece today. Greece has charged before the Security Council that armed bands operate within her territory are partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, and that these bands are moving back and forth across the borders. Greece has asked the United Nations for help in dealing with this situation and the Security Council has appointed a commission which is at the present moment investigating the Greek charges on the spot. It is expected that this commission will begin writing this report early in April and that report should be ready shortly thereafter. We hope and believe the United Nations action in this matter will result in the cessation of disturbances along Greece's northern borders. Such a result would be a most vital contribution to the situation in Greece and make possible the task of stabilization and rehabilitation. It would not be a substitute for the assistance which Greece has asked from the United States. More is needed to deal with internal disorder and economic break-down.
>
> The second problem confronting the Greek Government is the need for supplies and funds to enable it to cope with its internal difficulties, namely, the restoration of order in the country and the averting of economic collapse. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the British Government have been helping Greece with these particular problems, and the present crisis has arisen because those two supports must be withdrawn.
>
> To whom was Greece to turn? The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which recently sent a mission to Greece, recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the United States and the United Kingdom to extend aid to it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal, until expanding exports, international development loans and expanding production should enable Greece to balance its international accounts.
>
> If Greece had applied to the United Nations or any of its related organizations, the essential element of time would have been lost and the end result would have been the same. The funds would have to come primarily from the United States. The United Nations does not of itself possess funds. The Economic and Social Council is an advisory body that recommends economic, financial, and social action to member states. The International Bank, which is just now completing its organization, is set up primarily to make self-liquidating loans for long-term reconstruction purposes. It has not yet made any loans whatsoever. The Economic Commission for Europe is still in its early organization stage.
>
> It may be that at some future time the United Nations will be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey. But, as the President said, the United Nations and its related organizations are not now in position to extend help of the kind that is required. Even if some organ of the United Nations should decide to recommend assistance to Greece and Turkey, it would have eventually to turn primarily to the United States for funds and supplies and technical assistance.

It therefore seems to be the opinion of those who should know, that the present proposed action is certainly not taken in opposition to the United Nations, but in cooperation with it, and our American representative so reported to the United Nations and apparently satisfied the members in this respect.

Whatever may be the situation from a technical, legal standpoint, the legislation proposed provides for the termination of this program if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds—with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto—or that the General Assembly finds that the action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuation of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Are we justified in taking the course recommended, which, in the minds of many, may lead us to the third world war?

In determining this question, no one can overlook the opinion of Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of State, who is recognized by all as one of the greatest military generals in history and who has just returned from the Moscow Conference, and who, while debate on this vital issue was going on, sent to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee a letter which was read and made a part of the record, in which he said, in part, as follows:

> My strong conviction that the immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting at Moscow. * * * I fully endorse the committee's conclusion that the bill pending before the House will enable the United States in this crisis to support the United Nations by pursuing a positive policy in behalf of Greece and Turkey. I am convinced that it will be in our own interest and in the interest of world peace. I hope that the bill will be enacted as expeditiously as possible.

It may well be that it is anybody's guess as to what will happen in the event this legislation is enacted. While I do not wish to be facetious concerning such a serious matter, we may be in the position of the Connecticut farmer who, when asked by a city traveler how to get to the next town, told him that he could take the road to the left, then turn right, and go on a few miles, and he would get there. Or he could turn right and then go left for a few miles and eventually arrive there also, but that whichever road he took he would probably wish he had taken the other.

In my opinion, the present Secretary of State is amply qualified to make an intelligent forecast as to what will be the future. If his opinion is wrong, it will be just too bad for all of us, but I have come to the conclusion that I could take no step to prevent our present Secretary of State from carrying out the program he has so earnestly recommended. I realize that this proposal would seem to be a departure from our historic foreign policy, but after all this is a new world and unlike years gone by. In this atomic age, man's frontier is not the Rhine, but his own doorstep.

It must be conceded that the United Nations is not as strong as some people wish it were, or as some feel that it actually is. At its meetings, there seem to be continual controversy and bickering and failure to come to a meeting of the minds. This is not unexpected for it took many, many years for our own Federal Constitution to arrive to the point where it functioned efficiently and even now our Supreme Court has divided five to four more than once in its interpretation of the same. Certainly the money would have to come from the United States and not from the United Nations for according to the Secretary of State, Greece cannot qualify for a loan from the World Bank as it is not a good credit risk, nor from the Export-Import Bank, for the same reason.

I believe it should be understood, however, that by this action we are not committing ourselves to embark in endeavoring to stamp out communism in all other countries of the world. The Under Secretary of State, in his testimony before the committee, states that we are not, and that each request in the future will be considered on its merits and that it cannot be construed that this Government would undertake such action in any other country identical, or even closely similar, to Greece and Turkey. We may have some difficulty, however, in carrying out this announced policy without embarrassment to ourselves and a charge of discrimination made at a later date.

One compelling reason why I will cast my vote for the pending legislation is the fact that the program is an accomplished fact already in the minds of the people of the world. Failure to pass this bill at this time would be interpreted as an abandonment of free people everywhere to whatever fate may befall them. The President by his action and the Senate by its majority support have left us with little choice except to go forth. It is a difficult but now, apparently, a necessary course that we pursue. Favorable action on this legislation has been stated to be the lesser of two evils. It has been brought about and is the direct result of a policy heretofore pursued by our Chief Executive and his predecessor toward Russia; the situation of necessity was some years in the making and is certainly not a problem created by the Congress.

Let the world understand that we pursue no imperialistic program. We are not intermeddlers, but are granting assistance at the urgent request of the countries presently under consideration. We ask for nothing. We give and sacrifice in order that we may take steps which, in the minds of those who should know, will guarantee safety, security, and peace on American soil and, equally important, make for a condition of peace elsewhere.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

"TIME LIMIT"

The "time limit" or "urgency theme," is a fallacious one.

First. The British precipitated this so-called "urgency theme" by their abrupt announcement of withdrawal from Greece of aid and troops on March 31. Did our State Department have any advance information on the date of probable British withdrawal?

If they did have advance information, it should have been conveyed to Congress and the American people.

If they did not have information or premonition as to this important decision of Great Britain, then I say they stand convicted of stupidity beyond justification.

Second. The President on March 12 gave his message and stressed the emergency which would occur on March 31. He asked for legislation to enable the United States to replace Britain in Greece at the time of her withdrawal.

The legislation was not passed by March 31 nor by April 30, and yet no crisis has occurred. Russia has not marched across the border of Turkey, nor has Tito marched into Greece.

Starvation, guerrilla fighting—yes, Communist organization continues to exist as it has for the past 25 years in Greece. But no change of government has occurred and no attempt at outside aggression or internal military coup has occurred.

What has been more important in the intervening weeks, Turkey has not appealed to the United Nations with a specific claim against an aggressor nation. The appeal of Greece is under UN consideration and we are obligated by the Charter to await the report of the Balkan Commission before interfering further. What is the hurry? Why the rush act? Unless an aggressive action against Greece or Turkey is taken soon, the "urgency" theme is going to have a red face.

The "time limit" rush act has been overplayed. The United Nation's procedure could have been used and can still be used.

Food and rehabilitation funds can continue to be furnished on a bilateral or unilateral basis in harmony with the principles of the United Nations. Such funds and foods can be administered as recommended by the FAO Commission of the United Nations or by an international regional commission as provided for in the Charter.

Let me assure you my friends, that if the will to use the United Nations was there, a way can easily be found.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I do not know whether I am going to illuminate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or anybody else here or whether I will receive illumination. But be that as it may, illumination is what is needed here.

Now, the old red herring has certainly taken a terrible beating here for the last 3 days. I am not ready to join with all of my friends here to give so much credit to the Communists.

If I know a little bit about history, I do know that after the First World War the people of the world—not the Communists but the people of the world—got rid of the Hohenzollern gang, got rid of the Hapsburg bunch, got rid of the czars of Russia, and they got rid of the Ottoman sultans. After this World War the people of the world—not the Communists but the people of the world—said "We have had enough of Madame Lupescu and King Carol and Prince Umberto and King Emanuel and King Peter and King

George and all the rest of that gang of royalists." Those are the people of the world speaking, not the Communists.

Now, here is the Congress of the United States of America jumping into this fight against royalists and monarchs and going into this Balkan mess, to oppose the people. I do not know whether we are diving in head first or tail first, but I think we are going to get our tails burned. We are jumping into this Balkan mess to do what? When everybody is getting rid of kings and queens and princes and dukes and noblemen and landed aristocracy, we are going there to give these Royalists guns and bayonets and bullets. To do what? To kill Russians? No. To kill whom? To kill Greeks and Macedonians. That is what we are giving them these guns for, and you know it, and that is what they are going to do with them. They are going to kill their own people. Today, throughout the Balkans, there is no nation more hated and stinks worse than the British, because of their lousy policies. So we, the United States, will be hated and we will smell just as badly in a short time.

I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 4 days ago, at the beginning of this debate, this simple question: "Are Macedonians Greeks?"

He said: "You know, my friend gets me into an ethnological discussion where I am not too well at home, and I would therefore find some difficulty answering the question."

He had a big chart here, standing here like a professor, showing us all about that Balkan situation. He knew all about it. I asked a simple question, "Are Macedonians Greeks?" and he could not answer it. I think we ought to amend this bill to cease further consideration for 1 year, and hire a couple of professors to come here and give us some lessons in history and teach us something about the Balkans before we jump into this mess. Macedonians are not Greeks. They are Slavs. The Macedonians were under Turkish rule for 500 years. The Turks tried to make Mohammedans and Turks out of them. They could not do it. After the Balkan wars that part of Macedonia was awarded to Greece. It had not been Greece before that. Now, all of a sudden it has become Greece, since 1912, but are you sure that the Macedonians want to be Greeks? Can you make Greeks out of Macedonians? Then, what are you trying to do? You want to send these guns over there to these kings and queens and princes to kill these Macedonians. For what? Did they not fight with us in both World Wars? Did not those Macedonians hate the Turks because of the persecution that they underwent? Did they not hate the Germans and the Italians, and did they not fight with us in both World Wars? And now what is the pay-off? The United States is going to give guns and bayonets to the kings of Greece to kill off Macedonians. For what?

The people cry for bread and we give them bullets. The people cry for freedom and we give them bondage.

For 2 years, the British with their armies, have tried to stuff the Royalists down the throats of the people. They could not do it. Now we step into these discarded British Tory boots and we shall reap the hatred and animosity of a people who have always been our friends. I stand for relief and economic assistance to Greece. I oppose militarism anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike this bill. I dislike the necessity for it. But aid and assistance to the people of Greece in the matter of food, clothing, and shelter, and the means to provide these by way of farm machinery, manufacturing plants, and reconstruction of railroads, are so imperative that the shortcomings of the bill must necessarily be overlooked.

The provision in the bill for military equipment is to me quite contrary to our ideas of a peaceful world, but we must rely on the integrity and good judgment of the President in the handling of these funds. I am sure that the President of the United States would in no sense allot funds for military purposes unless they were of the most urgent and impelling kind. I am sure of this; and, since he is charged with the direction of the foreign policy of this country and has called the attention of the Congress to the dire need of the people of Greece and Turkey, to their poverty and lack of facilities for producing the goods which they need, the Congress cannot turn its back upon this request or refuse to uphold the hand of the President. After all, there is too much poverty and suffering in this world for us to ignore the fact that we are the richest Nation and can provide these goods without the least injury to ourselves. Late statistics prove this; and, if we are to promote in the peoples of the world an interest and desire for our form of Government, particularly on the humanitarian side, then we are obligated to aid in the rehabilitation of these impoverished people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, there are four amendments pending. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 25 minutes, leaving 5 minutes for each of those amendments and 5 minutes to close. I do that at the request of the majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that the amendments are at the conclusion of the bill.

The question now is on the committee amendment creating a new section 6.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 18, strike out "6" and insert "7."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 19, after the word "activities", insert "which shall include uses of funds by the recipient Governments."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MY CONSCIENCE PREVENTS ME FROM VOTING FOR THIS BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it is claimed that this $400,000,000 appropriation is for the purpose of stopping communism all over the world. Naturally, all the great economic royalists and war profiteers, here and everywhere, with all the force and influence at their command, are advocating this dangerous course and are pushing us into it.

Their attitude is no different from that of the financial leaders and industrialists and munitions makers of Germany who, under the pretense of fighting communism, supported Hitler and the Nazi cause and plunged the whole world into holocaust.

BRITAIN UNLOADING BURDENS ON US

If I believed for one moment that our country—my country—were in actual danger, or even that our legitimate interests are threatened by Russia by this overpublicized and overbuilt fear of communism sweeping the Western World, I should vote for this gift, and for additional billions beside, even though I cannot feel that Turkey is entitled to any consideration on her merits, and believing as I do that this bill merely enables the British to unload on us their burdens and responsibilities of empire.

The inhumane cries of danger from Russia, danger from anywhere except the threat of a new fascism, from those who seem chiefly interested in strengthening the undemocratic governments already existing or trying to reestablish themselves, sound feeble and badly inspired to me.

Outstanding military experts have testified that the destruction wrought by the Nazis in Russia is so great that Russia could not conceivably make war for at least 10 years, assuming that she desired to.

CONCENTRATE ON FRIENDSHIP

Rather than this constant preoccupation with the danger from Russia, we should concentrate on the assurances given by Stalin both to General Marshall and to former Governor Stassen. Before we rush to arms to destroy Russia while she is helpless, we should examine these professions of friendship and cooperation with friendly eyes, and look for the good instead of the bad—not forgetting security, but for the sake of security.

So far as we can learn, Russia has punctiliously observed covenants agreed to during wartime when neither Great

Britain nor the United States has been so careful.

Remember that Russian troops began to march against Japan exactly 3 months after VE-day, in accordance with the Yalta agreement. According to newspaper reports, Russia has kept out of north China, although President Roosevelt's assurance to China that British warships would not enter Chinese ports was broken. Russian troops have left Iran; but British troops are still in Greece, and still in Palestine.

Russia made no objection to our trusteeship of the Pacific islands. She has yielded repeatedly in the Danube Basin. Russia proposed disarmament immediately after the end of the war.

DOES NOT CONDONE RUSSIAN ERRORS

Do not mistake me. I make no excuses for those things which Russia has done, and done deliberately, to outrage the western powers. I am not an admirer of a police state. I do not condone press censorship. I do not forgive aggressive action against smaller countries.

But none of the things we dislike about Russia can excuse the bullying attitude, the military aggressiveness, or the fantastic fear that have seized England and the United States. I repeat again and again and again, that the way to keep fascism and communism out of America is to make our own democracy work, and we cannot do that by suppression, by bribes, by concentration camps or bayonets or atom bombs, nor by a third world war. It is clear to me from the arguments advanced that this bill is actually to protect the British Empire's lifeline and to back up the Anglo-American oil trusts who have got their fingers on the largest oil reserves left in one geographical area.

GREECE AND TURKEY NOT DEMOCRACIES

When Under Secretary Acheson, who has been the Acting Secretary of State during General Marshall's absence in Moscow, says that Greece and Turkey are democracies he is just talking bunk.

Neither of these countries is a democracy in our sense of the word, any more than Russia is.

I am equally skeptical about the so-called Communists in northern Greece, or Aegean Macedonia, as it is called. There may be and probably are Communists among those guerrilla bands; there may be and probably are liberal democratic patriots who cannot stomach the fascistic monarchy imposed by the British, nor the virtual occupation of Greece by the British, however disguised it may be.

But the fact is that the majority of the guerrilla bands in Aegean Macedonia are freedom-loving Christian Slavs whose one burning desire is now, as it has been since the Ottoman Empire was first squeezed back from the Balkans, to be able to unite with their blood brothers in those parts of Macedonia which lie in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Time after time we have announced our adherence to the principle of self-determination of small nations; why do we refuse to recognize the rights of the Macedonians?

UN FORCE FOR PEACE

I believe that the United Nations can be a powerful force for world peace and stability. I believed in the League of Nations in the same way. The United States insured failure of the League when the Republicans made it a political issue and kept the United States out of the League. I am fearful that favorable action on this bill will have the same effect on the United Nations, because we are bypassing the world organization which should do this job.

Unfortunately, we have public men and certain newspapers and radio commentators constantly injecting poison into the minds of the people by distorting and obscuring the facts, and sometimes by sheer invention and prevarication. Many sincere, well-meaning men and women in America have had their minds so prejudiced by this unending stream of propaganda that they now believe the lies.

Yes; these distortionists are emulating the tactics of Hitler, who said that no matter how big the lie, if it is repeated often enough it will be believed.

Fourteen years ago, when Hitler came to power, Great Britain tacitly sanctioned Hitler's rearming by failing to prevent occupation of the Ruhr and by making no effective protest against the growing militarism of the Nazi government. Likewise, Great Britain failed to support the other powers in the effort to check Japan and Italy and Spain.

It was disclosed at that time that in this country we had many Nazis and Japanese whose activities were questionable.

I succeeded then in obtaining passage of a resolution setting up a committee to investigate subversive and treasonable activities, which, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] brought many hidden vermin to light.

These activities did not cease, however, and I succeeded in bringing about passage of another resolution. Investigation was undertaken under the chairmanship of Mr. Dies. When the committee became permanent first the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] and now the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] occupied the chair.

That committee, with an efficient and hard-working investigative staff and all the money at its command that it needed, and with the active help and cooperation of the gentleman from Mississippi, and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation still has not succeeded in bringing about conviction of any Communist or alleged Communists of attempting to overthrow the Government by force, or of traitorous or seditious activities, though a number of Nazi sympathizers have been convicted on various counts, or are still awaiting trial, all of them through the investigative activities of executive agencies.

STRUGGLE IS BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND ISMS

The reason is that we have but a handful of Americans parading as Communists, most of them without any understanding of what they are saying, and none of them with any reason or justification for their beliefs. We have no room and no need in this country for communism or Communists.

Once more I repeat: The struggle in America is not between communism and Nazi-fascism, but between American democratic ideals and every kind of foreign and authoritarian ism.

We have in this country the best standard of living, the highest degree of personal freedom, the finest schools, and the greatest productive capacity of any nation. Our task is to make sure that we spread the benefits of those blessings as far as possible, in the interest of the masses and of the public welfare.

I feel that the people promoting the current Red scare know this, and are deliberately pumping up this exaggerated fear of communism in order to cloak their own efforts to destroy American democracy.

Many of the gentlemen who spoke on this bill let the cat out of the bag when they said the purpose of those who advocate this policy is to keep the Dardanelles as they are, and to quarantine the Near East oil fields.

The appeal of huge profits with little personal risk is universal, and our international cartelists are working smoothly to skim the cream for themselves at the expense of the common people everywhere.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PAY BILL

It seems to me that the American people will pay the bill—certainly in sweat and dollars, perhaps in lives and suffering—and the British Empire will reap the profit, if any. Skillfully the British have maneuvered us into a position where they have made themselves appear to be the arbiters between the United States and Russia by forcing us to front for them. They are determined to save the Empire at our expense.

This $400,000,000 advance is only a small beginning. Next year, when this is gone, there will be more money to be appropriated. Even though we are rich and strong and prosperous, we cannot withstand such drains on our resources indefinitely. While we are debating this bill, there are other appeals pending from Korea, from France, from Italy, from China, and again from Great Britain. There will be more because many of the nations are bankrupt morally as well as financially.

Who is manipulating this country we all love to such an end? We know the background of John Foster Dulles, the Republican adviser to the State Department, with his close connections to the Nazi banking and industrial interests. But what of Mr. Acheson? Does his law firm—Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson, and Shorb—have no foreign clients? Has he resigned utterly and in fact from that firm or is he still guided and influenced by their international accounts and clients?

There are many matters of wonder in this entire policy. This bill is being forced on the country by the State Department on the pretext that we must keep Russia from overrunning and dominating Greece and Turkey by having our military advisers in those countries and by building up their defenses.

Yet our own military experts agree that if Russia really wanted to overrun those countries we could not pour enough men and arms in there to hold the Russians back, even if there had never been a Hiroshima.

In this morning's newspaper I read that Under Secretary of State Acheson asserts that we must start rebuilding Germany and Japan. At the same time he insists upon passage of this relief bill for the victims of those who were responsible for bringing on the greatest war of all time, costing us $400,000,000,000 and 300,000 lives and 700,000 casualties, destroying altogether nearly 20,000,000 lives. For those favors, Mr. Acheson says, we must now start making them strong again. For what? To start another world war?

DEAD LINE HAS PASSED

We were told with the voice of doom that April 1 was the dead line. Well, this is the 9th day of May, and I anything happened in Greece or Turkey? If Russia really had any desire to march into those countries, she had plenty of time. If things were as desperate as painted, our frontier on the Aegean was pretty thinly guarded for almost 6 weeks.

On the other hand, we are about to authorize the appropriation of $400,000,000 with which to punish those who fought on our side, who suffered far more in loss of lives and property and resources than we did, at the hands of the Germans and the Japs, for whom Mr. Acheson says we must now rebuild.

Rebuild for whom? For the cartels and the international traders who supported the wars of Hitler and the Japanese war lords?

It is unthinkable.

WHY MUST WE REBUILD GERMANY AND JAPAN?

Only 2 days ago we observed the second anniversary of VE-day, when the Nazi empire crashed utterly and left Germany prostrate, without a government, after 6 years of annihilating warfare.

We have not yet brought home the bodies of our brave men who fell in Europe, in the Pacific, in north Africa, because of Germany and Japan.

The ruined cities of Europe are not yet rebuilt; the people have not enough food or clothes or shelter; General Clay announces that if necessary he will use our troops to force Germans to give up their hoarded stocks of food so that all can share equally.

Yet, Mr. Acheson can say we must—I repeat, he said "must"—"push ahead with the reconstruction" of Germany and Japan.

I feel that we should pause and take stock.

I regret personally that my conscience cannot permit me to support this bill; that I fear it will weaken the United Nations; that I fear it will hurt rather than help the cause of world peace and economic stability.

If we strengthen, not weaken; if we build up, not tear down; if we affirm, not deny, the principle and the fact of the United Nations, the 51 signatory powers will be in far better position together to stop Russia, if need be, than the United States and the disintegrating British Empire by themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

"SEC. 8. In adopting this act the Congress expresses its approval of and reliance upon the statement made by the Secretary of State on February 4, 1947, with reference to Greece, and in particular the hope therein expressed on behalf of the Government of the United States for the political cooperation of all loyal Greek parties for a dynamic program in Greece of amnesty coupled with the disarming of illegal bands, just and vigorous tax reforms, modernization of the civil service, realistic financial controls, and even-handed disposition of justice."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will this be taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman yields it will be taken out of his time.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Then, Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Montana declined to yield. The gentleman from Montana was recognized and he refused to yield. I submit the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. There were various gentlemen seeking recognition.

The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Montana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the point of order comes too late. I had been recognized for 5 minutes and I had refused to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JARMAN. No; I do not care to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana. It seems to be a statement of policy which is related entirely to the extension of aid to Greece provided under the act.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Montana will proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, on February 14, 1947, the Secretary of State made the following statement at his press conference:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MARSHALL ON REFORMS IN GREECE

I have been asked by several correspondents for the views of the Department on the recent broadening of the Greek Government, which I now understand is representative, from a party point of view, of almost 90 percent of the members of Parliament. We welcome this move as an indication that responsible Greek leaders are aware of the urgent necessity of subordinating narrow or personal interests to the greater ideal of national reconstruction.

We are all deeply concerned with the welfare of Greece and with the restoration in that country of economic and political stability, destroyed during the war by the occupation forces of the enemy whose deliberate aim was to leave Greece economically ruined, and by aggravating internal factionalism, to paralyze the Greek body politic. Greece's long history of devotion to liberty and democratic ideals entitles her to the sympathy and respect of the world. It is to the interest of the United States and of all the United Nations that Greece be assisted to maintain her independence and territorial integrity. However, no amount of assistance can prove effective or of lasting benefit unless the Greek people themselves are prepared to work together resolutely for their own salvation.

The road to recovery is a difficult one, calling for the same unity and mutual confidence required for resistance to armed attack. No country divided against itself can hope to solve problems which are national in scope and which affect all citizens and not merely those of one particular political belief. Economic health can be restored only by a comprehensive program in which the whole Greek people participate and to which all make their appropriate contributions. Law-abiding citizens whose main desire is to be allowed to live and work in peace can offer little help to their country as long as they are intimidated by armed extremists of whatever political complexion.

This Government hopes that the recent broadening of the Greek Government is a sign that the Greek people are turning away from the past and forgetting bygone differences, are beginning to face the future with confidence and in substantial unity. It also hopes that this recent development is merely a first step in the direction of the broadest political cooperation of all loyal Greek parties and that partisan differences will be submerged in a dynamic program of amnesty coupled with the disarming of illegal bands, just and rigorous tax reforms, modernization of the civil service, realistic financial controls, and the even-handed dispensation of justice.

That press release was dated February 14, 1947, and fully explains my amendment. You will note that this amendment contains the exact words of Secretary Marshall, and as it contains his sentiments and my own on this very important matter, I urge the Committee to adopt it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the majority leadership which is anxious to conclude action on this bill today, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Can the time be divided so that those who have not had an

opportunity to speak on this bill may do so? I have waited here 4 days to say something, and have not been able to, while some have spoken on the bill a dozen times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) there were—ayes, 18, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, like all thoughtful Americans, I know what the people back home are thinking about—thinking of the future of America.

Their boys—their neighbors' boys—came home from the war not many months ago. They wanted to relax—enjoy their return. They wanted peace and quiet—to visit with their neighbors—to work, to plant, to harvest, to listen to the radio for entertainment—to enjoy the quiet and peaceful way of life and to just enjoy all the wonderful advantages we have in America. Oh yes, they knew we had irritations—the OPA, railroad strikes, coal strikes—but through it all they knew and I knew that these hindrances would pass away—and we would all enjoy our bountiful America after years of strife and agony—of not knowing what the next day would bring in the way of sorrow.

We believed in a fanciful United Nations to stop all aggression in the world. No more wars. Earnestly they prayed for all of this. They knew there was no totalitarian regime in this country to cause them to fear arrest, torture, and a concentration camp. But now after months of waiting—what do we see approaching—Russia with its communistic doctrine.

The Communist doctrine ridicules as hypocrisy the Christian concepts of charity, virtue, monogamous marriage, and home life. Lenin instituted a post-card divorce and remarriage law. All a man had to do was drop a post card in the mail stating he had ceased to live with one woman and was living with another. This morally irresponsible way of life is against every one of the world's leading religions—all of which teach the sanctity of marriage. Communists regard the home and family life as evils to be abolished. The young are to be provided with institutional rearing. The Communists constantly trample underfoot the press, the radio—poking fun at our Christian American way of life and advocate the Marxian system of Godless pagan principles. They are out to destroy America—free enterprise, profit system, and rights of individuals to own anything. Their way would be rationed, centralized, all for the state policy.

The American Council of Christian Churches has adopted a strong resolution calling upon the church people of America to stand solidly against any further appeasement of Russia. They declare the Christian doctrines are now challenged by aggressive communism.

Many loudly proclaim liberalism but most of the liberalism of a lot of societies is nothing more or less than counterfeit communism.

The Greek proposal is simply to my mind an action for the defense of our country. From every cemetery in Europe and in the Pacific, where sleep our American comrades, comes a reminder of our pledge—that war must not come again. We tried appeasement after World War I. Today Russia feels secure—that we are too occupied with domestic friction—our isolationist background—an indifferent attitude to do anything about her aggressive foreign policy.

I know the full import of this stand. Russian domination means revolution by Communists to gain power. Police and firing squads to wipe out opposition—and requisition of all valuable factories and goods to be taken to Russia. Russian countries are areas of poverty.

The United States offers a stabilized peace—a build-up of the countries—that believe in the Bill of Rights.

By contrast, Russia offers these things:

First. Revolution in all countries for Communists to gain control.

Second. An international police to advise on terror and liquidation of opponents.

Third. Requisition of factories and supplies to build up Russia.

Fourth. Russian-dominated countries will be poverty areas.

Russia has sought and has gained strategic victories by maneuvering her fifth columns and political weapons against weak countries.

From the Baltic to the Adriatic, behind the iron curtain, lie all the capitals of central and eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia and their millions are under the control of communism. Athens, the birthplace of democracy, alone is not under communistic power.

In peace as in war, the only strategy that succeeds is an offensive one.

Oh! You say we cannot fight communism with bombs—I agree, but you can fight an idea with a better idea—if you back up your idea with planning and money.

You cannot use the United Nations because Russia has the veto power. She has consistently used this veto power for everything we proposed. Does anyone think she would not use it in the Greek-Turkey question?

The United States must assume the leadership and expect to rally all other peace-loving people who believe in a bill of rights, to our side.

The basic trouble is that Russia, like all dictator nations in the past, thinks appeasement is weakness. Communism is the only force in the world today that threatens peace.

To sum it all up, our action in Greece and Turkey is an action to build them up, not an action to take over the British interests. It is just an action for defense of American people and will prevent World War III.

The alternative of not aiding Greece and Turkey is far more serious than aiding them.

I believe communism to be the enemy of true democracy and all religion, the outspoken foe of all freedom, and in fact the headquarters of the greatest slave market the world has ever known.

What is pressing in on Greece is not a few mountain rebels, but Russian communism. This terrific force is trying to break through as a further step toward setting up world communism.

After two world wars in our generation, we should know by now that you cannot stop aggression by appeasement.

I again repeat—Russia will not stop. She uses the same tactics as Hitler, preaching appeasement, lulling her enemies into a sense of security—and then devouring them.

Do not forget this—some think communism is a political party. It is far more than that. it is a way of life; and remember, Joe Stalin said last spring, "Communism and capitalism cannot survive in the same world. Capitalism must be destroyed."

In case of doubt on any question, I will always be on the side of what I believe to be for the best interests of our country, and alongside of this I am convinced no nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense.

I shall vote for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Chairman, it is not without misgivings that I support this measure which is, in my opinion, a doubtful stopgap against the flood of European statism.

The best we can hope for from a governmental panacea of this sort is the retarding of out and out statism in countries where many assert that statism is inevitable unless our free enterprise system is proven workable outside our own borders in a modern economic age.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S MORAL LEADERSHIP WILL BE HELPED, NOT HURT, BY THE EXTENSION OF AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, two objections have been repeatedly urged against this bill: First, that America's moral leadership will be damaged and, second, that the program authorized by

the measure would expose us to startling new dangers.

Now, let us look at this charge that moral principles are involved. The hearings are deficient in this respect. A number of witnesses representing various organizations appeared before the committee to plead that any display of force to protect the independence of Greece and Turkey would impair our moral position in the world.

In the debate today opponents have asserted that the bill would bypass the United Nations and would hurt our influence in the world. They invoke the principles of moral leadership. The implication is that use of force is incompatible with a strong moral position. They speak of the rule of law as if it can be maintained without an enforcing power. The hope of a long reign of peace is indeed the United Nations, but that hope will never be realized until an adequate force is at the disposal of that great agency. It should be a latent force, but it must be available just as the police force is available for the execution of judgments in the domestic courts of this land. No one can seriously contend that the United Nations is so equipped today.

Some of the voices raised in protest against the use of force to put down disorder and to protect the independence of Greece and Turkey would inveigh against any force at all, even that exerted by a multilateral agency devoted to the peace. Underlying this point of view is the false assumption that force is used only by violators of the peace. Brigands use force, peaceful men must not behave like that. But police must use guns, too. I am not arguing here for military activity by the United States in the affected area except to the very limited extent outlined by the bill. I am arguing only that the strengthening of these two nations whose peace and sovereignty is threatened is not only justified in the light of our own national-security needs but is an act of international morality. It would be immoral not to exert ourselves in defense of our institutions and our ideals. If we were setting ourselves against the policies and aims of the United Nations the arguments of those who speak of moral leadership would have validity but Mr. Warren Austin's message to the Congress dispels any semblance of support for that contention.

I think I know what is in the minds of the opponents and I appreciate their earnest and sincere espousal of a cause. They should not be dismissed with the reply that they may have their moral claims, that we will be practical. To be sure ours is the practical way but it is also the stronger position morally. It is unfortunate that the banners of idealism were seized by groups whose record before Pearl Harbor and afterward reflected an unwillingness to defend our beliefs.

Do we believe in liberty? Do we believe in international decency and in respect for the rights of small nations? Do we believe in the standards of national morality that have made America stand out? Do we believe enough in these things to sacrifice for them? That is the issue and to decide that issue on the basis of using our resources for defending a strategic area in the world is to exhibit moral leadership.

The other objection is that the action contemplated by the bill would lead us into dangers—conceivably, it would. It is only because the other alternative is even more dangerous that we should accept this course. Surely the preceding speakers have been convincing on that point. The dilemma is not pleasant. The bill involves heavy expenditures at a time when we all wish to spare our burdened people. It is only because the dangers of inaction are greater and are certainly more imminent that we should approve this bill.

Our world is full of dangers and perhaps it will continue to be a dangerous world till the youngest among us are old men. We cannot escape danger. The colored preacher who lived down our way was right. He was asked if he had prepared his people for the dangers of the atomic bomb and his reply was, "No, I have not. I figure that we are always here at a very great risk."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to extend their remarks may do so at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GIVING TO BOTH SIDES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, while the House is debating the present bill of money to Greece for the supposed purpose of stopping the spread of communism throughout the world, at the same time, and while the debates are going on to give this money, our Government is actually sending millions of dollars of goods and machinery to Russia. Only this week there are locomotives going from my district direct to Russia and in addition machinery for mining. And in the New York Times of Wednesday, May 7, the State Department is now making arrangements to exchange 50 Russian scientists so that Russia might have full and complete scientific information as to what is going on in this country. By what kind of reasoning can the State Department ask for hundreds of millions of dollars to stop the spread of communism and at the same time give to Russia untold millions of dollars of heavy durable goods in the way of railway equipment, farming machinery, and mining machinery and invite 50 Russian scientists to come to this country to have the benefit of our scientific achievements.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, it is admitted that the proposed loan for Greece and Turkey is for a military adventure aimed at stopping Communist aggression.

It is needless for me to say that I now and always have opposed communism or any attempt to force any kind of a totalitarian form of government upon our people. I have never hesitated to speak against Communist aggression and call attention to the menace of that foreign ideology. I have spent many hours trying to bring to the attention of my people what communism would do to this country. However, I am voting against this loan for I believe that the immediate situation in Greece, and similar problems in the Middle East and elsewhere, are definitely in the realm of the United Nations responsibility and not that of the United States or any other one country alone.

Approval of this loan will lead to similar demands from many other countries. Korea, China, India, Iran, Iraq, and others will contend they are endangered by Communist aggression and request aid from this country. Demands will come thick and fast. I believe it is of far more importance that we first try to set our own house in order by combatting communism here at home. Instead of authorizing huge gift-loans for foreign countries I believe we should give first consideration to providing adequate hospitalization and medical care for our disabled veterans and better welfare benefits for our elder citizens.

No one knows how much the new foreign policy we are embarking upon will cost, or when that cost will end. No one knows how many other countries will demand aid of us to stop the spread of communism. No one knows whether the enactment of this policy will result in war or in peace. No one knows whether this is the best way or the worst way to accomplish our desired purpose of bringing peace, liberty, and freedom to the peoples of the world.

If this new proposed foreign policy is to cost the fifteen to thirty billion dollars many estimate it will, if we are to continue to furnish the food, the clothing, the machinery, and the equipment the world demands, there is a strong possibility we shall so weaken ourselves here at home as to fall an easy prey to those Communists within our own country who are attempting to destroy our representative form of government.

During this debate, our able colleague, Representative REED of New York, inserted in the RECORD a printed article stating that Lenin, godfather of communism, boldly declared: "We shall oblige America to spend herself into destruction." The endless schemes of planners to spend the American Republic toward destruction are without end. Is it only a coincidence that this mad spending fits perfectly into the well-known and diabolical Communist objective to bankrupt us? Where will this proposal to pour money into every trouble spot in Europe end?

From a humanitarian standpoint we should be willing to aid starving people abroad with our surplus food and supplies, but we cannot continue to consistently finance the rest of the world without eventually bankrupting our own country.

If we really want to aid the peace movement we should pass House Resolution 73 which abolishes compulsory military training throughout the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the matter of Greek-Turkish assistance, now before us, can properly and promptly be resolved if you will ask yourselves these few pertinent questions:

Are you for or against communistic encroachment upon the world?

Are you for democracy's survival or against it?

Are you of normal vision or myopic?

Are you sincere or hypocritic?

Are you debating or just gassing?

Are you thinking or just guessing?

Are you saving or wasting precious time?

Are you talking cash or conversation?

Are you talking sense or nonsense?

Are you putting up or shutting up?

Are you serious or just demagoging?

Are you saving or wasting?

Are you penny-wise or pound-foolish?

It is as simple as all that.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, for many weeks, the Congress has been reviewing appropriation bills for every domestic purpose. Discharges of millions of employees have been demanded, and to the extent of at least a million of such employees have been released. The activities of departments have been and still are being curtailed. Projects which have been under way have been abandoned, and others forbidden. Even now, in appropriation bills still to be considered, threats are made regarding appropriations to expand the Rural Electrification program, which has become so essential to agricultural progress in all parts of the country. Other activities for the benefit of agriculture likewise are being condemned. The reclamation policy also is to be crippled and denied the loans through which expansion would be possible.

There is scarcely a program or policy relating to domestic affairs which will escape the ban as the fiscal measures are brought in. The Federal budget is to be balanced and a reduction of income taxes brought about. Not in many years have so many proposals for economy in Government been proposed. Many of them are likely to become effective. Even the school-lunch funds, which have been so valuable to millions of school pupils, are under consideration for curtailment or abandonment. The many thousand young pupils in the day schools for Indians may be put on the list of the hungry, as well as the destitute, if the will of the advocates of economy is to prevail.

Hours might be spent in barely enumerating the items which it is proposed to pare down to the limit.

All this is necessary in the views of some proponents of economy. Our huge national debt is pointed to with shivers of fear. Our country is said to be in a sorry plight, and worse may come. Our economic stability is so seriously threatened, according to some, that only by the most drastic measures can it be saved. The prospect of an early commercial and industrial depression which will affect town and country alike, is emphasized among the dangers said to be imminent.

While all these dismal predictions are being made as to the fiscal situation, Congress is being urged to provide most expansive and extravagant appropriations to foreign countries, amounting to billions of dollars in the next year, with a continuance of the policy of extravagance indefinitely in the future. When considering domestic appropriations, the need of keeping America strong is declared. When pressure is applied from foreign capitals, we are asked to reverse our attitude and permit our country to become exhausted and possibly made bankrupt in an attempt to stabilize the economy of all other countries.

In our own affairs, every request for appropriations is carefully scanned. Every proposal must be justified in detail. In foreign loans and grants, the most meager information is acted upon, and not even investigation and supervision of expenditures is required.

At present, according to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the requests actually under consideration by Congress for the assistance of foreign countries amount to $1,995,000,000—nearly $2,000,000,000. The same committee compiles a list of estimated expenditures of such loans and grants which far exceeds the requests. Its total is placed at $3,643,000,000. That total does not include expenditures for our armed forces in occupied countries abroad.

The bill before Congress for assistance to Greece and Turkey is only one of the many which will come up for action. It provides $400,000,000 for its purposes.

Of that, $11,000,000 are proposed to be expended on the railways of Greece. There is not a word in the committee report as to how such a figure has been arrived at, nor as to how many private fortunes will be restored; not a word as to the foreign stockholders in such railways. Out of thin air, comes the estimate. No provision is made for a just and complete accounting of the moneys spent.

For the Greek Army it is proposed to expend $150,000,000. After VE-day, our Army had to exceed $10,000,000,000 of surplus war commodities abroad. It was sold or given away to various governments. Who is to furnish the additional supplies for the Greek Army? Are they to be bought in our own country, to the further profit of our munition makers, or sold by the nations which obtained such immense supplies from our surplus commodities practically abandoned to them under lend-lease or otherwise.

Similar questions might be asked regarding the $20,000,000 for agricultural rehabilitation, and $50,000,000 for reconstruction. How much of the $80,000,000 for consumer goods will go for the poor and destitute, instead of for commodities less essential. Over $50,000,000 now are available under other appropriations for the direct relief of the destitute of Greece, and other funds are available from UNRRA. This bill and the committee report do not give any assurance that the poor of Greece will be cared for. Our experience under the distribution of foodstuffs by UNRRA was so deplorable that even the facts about it are unobtainable. Why should Congress blindly vote away $400,000,000 without even the possibility of knowing for what it will be spent, who will get it, and who will make exorbitant profits at home or abroad because of such congressional indefiniteness in the measure under consideration.

For Turkey, an even $100,000,000 are provided, mainly for the armies of that country to be expended by the Government of Turkey. Not a line provides for any accounting, any explanation of how it is to be spent, nor where and to whom.

This step toward sending out more billions of money to foreign lands for uncontrolled spending is justified by some as necessary to fight communism and stop the expansion of Russian power in Europe. However commendable such a purpose may be, will this measure prove effective? Is it the first step toward another World War, as some seem to fear? The vast majority of our people are opposed to communism in our own country, and to its spread in Europe. They are as strongly opposed to Russian domination which in the remotest degree threatens the security of our country at home or abroad. But will this measure bring any assurance that it will prove effective?

Have we not had our own experience in Yugoslavia, where Marshal Tito's military dictatorship wheedled over $600,000,000 from our post-war relief program? That dictator built up his army and his political gang with the funds. He now is an associate in any plans for Russian aggression, and spread of communism. The poor and destitute of his land received almost nothing. The funds were spent to build up a totalitarian dictatorship whose existence has became an additional threat to Greece. Because of it, this measure is deemed necessary. Our generosity has been turned against us by Tito and his gangsters.

Days have been spent in debating this measure in the House. Minor amendments have been appended in the other House. It remains incomplete for our own protection and for the purpose for which it is proposed. Before Congress sends more funds abroad, it should make a full and complete investigation as to what has been done with the billions already spent. It should safeguard any further appropriation against wanton waste, extravagance, and squandering which has characterized all our endeavors to win peace for the world by huge sums from our own treasury.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it has been fully evident throughout this debate, that we have all been gaging the risks that are potentially inherent in this measure. There are some who do not see the necessity of intervening in any situation anywhere beyond our boundaries. Some would not intervene here in Greece and Turkey but would step in somewhere else.

For my own part, I have come to the considered conclusion that it is time to draw the line—now.

It is time to give the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States force and effect now.

It is time to say "Thus far and no farther" to Communist leadership and design. So far, Communist policy has

done nothing but push and shove to expand its frontiers.

Unchecked, Soviet leadership will inevitably challenge the world and, therefore, challenge our own American security and interests.

The threat of communism in the Greece-Turkey area must be halted. Today, in Greece, we are witness to communism ruthlesly pushing its way through the creation of strife and turmoil, poverty, hunger, through the desperations of a stricken people.

If we are concretely, realistically, to champion the rights of freedom, we must help sustain those things freedom means. Without our helping hand, through the practical aid that this bill would afford, there is no other outlook in this now blighted area of the world except of human subjugation, human degradation, and political chaos. Communism is on the march, communism that fattens on poverty and the desperate discouragements of human beings; communism that counts on such situations for its acceptance that contrives and connives at conditions where a stricken people, in order to live, will exchange freedom, self-respect, human dignity, for a minimum of protection and existence.

It is unfortunate that the United Nations today are not in a position to undertake directly to prevent Communist aggression in this near eastern area and to help in the rehabilitation and strengthening of Greece and Turkey. Certainly, if the United Nations today were not powerless to act—and we all know why it cannot act—it would be its objective, as it is ours, to aid in the rehabilitation of this area.

We all know the strategic importance of Greece and Turkey in world geography. Control of them means control of the "underbelly of Europe." It means control of the Mediterranean; it means control of the Dardanelles; it means flanking pressure on all the borders of the Mediterranean area.

If communism moves in, it will have a strong strategic position from which to maneuver and to mount pressure campaigns on southern Europe, Asia Minor, north Africa, and eventually South America.

Knowing as we do the history of Soviet actions and policy, I simply cannot bring myself to believe that Communist leaders would be reluctant to seize this opportunity, should we provide it by failing to give support to Greece and Turkey.

It is not enough to think in terms of the world today. It is not enough, also, to rest on our own power and strength as we know it today. The world will move on and we are under the heavy obligation to leave nothing undone at any time to strengthen our present and future security position.

We should not be willing to gamble the future of the United States for the sake of attempting to save the sums of money represented in this Greece-Turkey aid proposal. It is an investment that I feel we should make, both for our future security and to help achieve lasting world peace.

If Communist leaders want peace, a simple matter of aid to Greece and Turkey will not break it. If they are bent on war, no amount of appeasement can stop it.

The choice, then, is not in our hands. We have no choice but to take our stand, with that of other peace-loving nations, at key points of the world, and take it now while we still can fashion and influence the things to come.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the debates on the Greek-Turkish loan with intense feeling. The issues are complex and clouded by many excellent bursts of oratory and fine speeches, but under the maze of arguments a true and strong undercurrent flows. The basic issue, as I see it, is the defense of the United States.

The great majority of the Members of this Congress are utterly opposed to the ideology and practice of communism. The defense of this continent and the world from the imposition of Communist government and rule calls for varied plans and courses to follow.

This particular piece of legislation sets forth one of these plans in strong language. It serves notice upon the Russian Government that the United States is still willing to make sacrifices to attain the goals for which its sons have fought. It is a complete reversal of the heretofore prominent approach of appeasement, which so miserably failed against Hitler, and is so miserably failing against Stalin. Appeasement has always been the approach of the democratic countries, where man has faith in his fellow man, where war is abhorred at almost any price. But there are some things which no freedom-loving man will endure, and when appeasement fails time after time, war stalks the world.

Today we are called upon to act to end the period of appeasement of Communist rule. It has been eloquently argued that this is a commitment toward war. But it has been equally well argued that this is the better calculated risk. It is better to call a bluff when you know the strength of your opponent's hand than to wait until he has gained strength by effectively manipulating his bluffs over a period of years.

The people of the United States have showed almost unanimous accord in supporting the trend to be positive in our dealings with Russia. When the Honorable James F. Byrnes was Secretary of State he was lauded for his efforts to be firm with Russia. Secretary Marshall has been praised for continuing and strengthening this stand. Today Secretary Marshall and the President are asking for our support of a positive program to oppose the spread of communism into the free countries of the world.

If we let them down here, as the representatives of the people of this great Nation, we are giving Stalin and his puppets the green light. Theodore Roosevelt urged that the United States speak softly, but carry a big stick. Secretary Marshall is asking for a big stick. Shall we give it to him, or shall we tell him to continue his fight with words without the true support of the Nation? The basic problem is one of defense of this Nation from Communist aggression. Viewing the problem in this light, I feel that the Greek-Turkish loan merits my vote.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, such prolonged debate on the vital question before us as that to which we have listened in all probability will not change a single vote.

I do not propose to discuss the matter at any length, because, in the first place as I have said before, I reiterate, the time for talk has passed. We face today the heavy responsibility of bringing peace to a war torn world. The unsettled conditions which make this problem so difficult of solution are familiar to us all. They present a real challenge to our generation; one which we cannot ignore nor fail to meet. The course which we chart during the coming months will determine whether the world is to march forward into an era of lasting peace or merely snatch a fitful breather before plunging headlong into another war.

The framework for peace is, in the main, being designed by two great nations—our own and Russia. The struggle for its design goes on apace. Anxious eyes follow every move of these principal contenders, seeking to determine the shape of the final outcome. The attitude and statements of our representatives to the United Nations and to the peace conferences are being analyzed in the light of the actions we are taking here at home.

As Delegate Warren Austin has repeatedly said, the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations, but is and would be a most necessary and contributing support to the United Nations Charter.

We need to act promptly, in the interest of international peace and to attune our military policy to the requirements of our foreign policy. We should move without further delay to strengthen our hand at the peace table by enacting the proposed legislation. Time is of the essence. Unless we stop talking and go to doing something in our own interest we will wake up again to find we have done too little too late. Can we learn nothing from experience?

In my judgment the passage of the act before us will prevent, it will not provoke, war. So I shall vote for it and against all crippling amendments.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, it seems to me, involves four over-all broad considerations:

1. THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM WITH ITS DENIAL OF WESTERN CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

This is not the first time the East has challenged the the West. Attila and his Huns were turned back at Chalons in the fifth century. The Mohammedans were turned back at Tours in the ninth century. Both movements reached France and were there stopped.

In the sixteenth century, the Turks drove to the middle of Europe. They have gradually retreated under pressure to the Dardanelles and have remained at the Bosporus because of their international value in guarding this ancient strategic bridge between Europe and Asia.

The world is big enough for its peoples if properly oriented. They have terrible times keeping settled down. Between ambitious, selfish, and power-drunk leaders and the people imagining vain things, there are political eruptions here

and there at times engulfing the whole planet. The age of the aggressor may not be over; but nations and peoples that selfishly throw their weight around are no more to be tolerated. Communism has ample space in eastern Europe and Asia to work out its destiny.

2. THE FEAR OF WORLD WAR III

This can never be prevented by placing our country in a "sitting duck" position. America should have a positive, affirmative, foreign policy. The nations of the earth should know, without the peradventure of a doubt, where we stand and what we stand for. They should feel the full pressure of our implementation of that policy. Let us never be a saber rattler nor a pollyanna appeaser. Unskilled diplomacy follows these bankrupt policies. Both of them invite war. America should stand for justice and freedom, fair and mutually reciprocal economic relations, religious and social education leading to practical ways of peace, and a spirit of good will without complacency to all peoples. All peoples and nations have their points of interest.

3. THE BYPASSING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I have been an advocate of a League of or a United Nations since the days of Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. I still believe in a World Court and the development of international law. The United Nations can never act as an executive force until it has a police force. The nations have not gotten around to this yet. Some day they will. Atomic energy and modern implements of war may drive them to it before they can be educated to the ways of peace. Otherwise many may prepare to go the way of Babylon, Athens, Rome, and Angkor. I do not think this bill bypasses the United Nations in practical effect. It is unfortunate that the action proposed in this bill has not grown too vigorously out of its Council and Assembly, but it apparently could not. On the other hand, I have not liked some implications involved in the early approach to this legislation. I hope they prove unfounded, and that the implementation of this legislation will be placed on the highest level of moral, social, and patriotic consideration.

4. THE EXPENDITURE OF $400,000,000

I would like to save that, too. We could well use it here at home. But if it forestalls a third world war, it will be well spent. If the communistic forces in eastern and central Europe want peace, our action will not provoke war. If they want war, this action may prevent it.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this bill saw fit to divide among themselves the majority of the time to be devoted to this debate. At first I did not like the idea, as I felt that those who were opposed to this bill should have equal time. However, it is just as well because the more the advocates of President Truman's measure talk, the easier it becomes for Members of Congress to vote against this bill. The smoke screen is lifting. We are seeing this thing more realistically. The proposal first started out on the claim that it would stop communism. It is seen now that it will not stop communism and was never so intended. One gentleman was very frank when he said, "The resolution is military in character and for that reason and that alone I give it my wholehearted support." Another gentleman said, "I do not know much about the detail of its import, nevertheless, I am convinced that it is for the best interests of our country that it be adopted."

It is slowly becoming quite apparent that the stopping of communism and the spreading of freedom are phrases that should not be used in this discussion. The figure $400,000,000 should be erased and a blank left in its stead, because it is admitted by proponents and opponents of this bill that this is liable to cost us between fifteen and twenty billion dollars. The most energetic advocate for this proposal guarantees nothing and assures nothing.

What we are going to do if we do anything is to protect a lot of international interests, and they are not necessarily American interests in the Near East. Why not be frank about it? Why deceive ourselves as to what the true object is? The real advocates for this bill are the big international interests. I have no quarrel with the international interests. If they want to protect their properties I hardly blame them, but they are not going to protect them with American boys and American dollars. We have just emerged from a very weakening World War. We are just digging ourselves out from all of the restrictions that go with a war and a Commander in Chief. To engage upon this hazardous venture would mean the return of price controls, rent controls, the impossibility of even considering corrective labor legislation, or reducing the budget or cutting taxes, or any of the things that we set out to do so bravely when this Congress first met. I shudder when I think of the possibility of the passage of this measure.

When the President spoke to this body at a joint session on March 12 we were told that this was an urgent matter that must be completed by the 31st of March. The 31st of March has come and gone, and this is no more urgent now than it was then. If it ever becomes necessary for us to take such a dangerous step, we can always do so. Delay will result one way only, and that is to make America strong. The best safeguard against communism or any other false ideology is a strong United States. I am beginning to believe that the urgency that existed before March 31 was for the purpose of making a show of strength when General Marshall went to Moscow. If that was the case, it is no longer necessary, because General Marshall is back home. The outcome of his visit to the Kremlin is fairly well known. If we really want to show our strength to Russia we will in the future insist that any future conference of an international nature involving the United States should be held in the city of Washington. This should be the meeting place and not the Kremlin.

To those of you who may be in doubt as to how to vote on this bill I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in supporting H. R. 2616, the Greek-Turkish loan, I am doing it with a conviction that we are obligated to uphold Secretary of State Marshall who has made a last minute appeal to the House for passage of the bill. I still have some doubts about the advisability of this action, but feel that we must resolve these doubts in favor of the bill when a man in a position of Marshall has asked such cooperation.

Russia, it seems, has most respected us when we have been firm with her. This bill is a definite move in the direction of a firm policy toward her.

The situation today resembles a similar one before World War II. One of the saddest stories of that war was the way we treated Finland, the only nation who honored her debts with us to the last. Yet, theoretically she was our enemy. Why? War makes some strange bedfellows. Because of being allied with Russia we had to treat Finland, who had ruthlessly been previously overrun by Russia, as an enemy. Finland naturally fell in line with Germany as her only source of redress. If I were a leader of that hapless country, I may have voted to do as she did.

Russia had a treaty with Germany before she was attacked by the hordes of Hitler. It was doubtful which way she was going until Germany struck. Furthermore, previous to this as the German armies pushed through Poland, the Russians stepped in. Why, to help Poland? No. For her own selfish interests, in taking sections of Poland which she now retains.

What has Russia done with the three little Baltic countries, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? She claimed to take them during the war into protective custody, but I notice that she is still protecting them. At least, from the Soviet's way of thinking.

And so it will be with Greece and Turkey if the United States does not actually assist them.

I have heard some say this aid is in violation to our Monroe Doctrine, but it is not. Greece and Turkey have asked for this assistance. The passage of this bill is a continuation of an international policy of ours for half a century or more. On their invitation, aid was sent Cuba and the Philippines in 1898. Had it not been for American intervention following the Boxer uprising in China in 1900, that nation was heading for vassalage or partition, but John Hay, American Secretary of State, stubbornly insisted on the open-door policy.

Of course Russia and her sympathizers are against this bill. That is proof to me that her plan is to gradually allow these countries to weaken, even she appears to participate in it, and then take them over as she has done with others, one country after another.

If this bill is defeated now, it will be taken as a vote of confidence to Russia, and a signal to the world that we are again going to take the position of isolation which we were accused of before World War II.

It is my belief that in every country where communism now dominates, except Russia, it is where a strongly organized minority have taken over the Government by force.

Some have claimed that passage of this bill will bypass the United Nations, but that is not true. For months Greece has asked for assistance from that body, but due to Russia's clever plan of hindering action, nothing has been done thus far.

Senator VANDENBERG's amendment to this bill permits the Security Council of the United Nations the right to defer United States assistance by a majority vote, and we waive our veto.

I have confidence in democracy and the American way of life. This bill to aid Greece and Turkey is a step to continue its principles and prevent the spread of communism, the greatest threat on earth to democracy today.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Chairman, as the House has debated through three long days this properly controversial measure to grant $400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to the Greek and Turkish Governments, almost every point of contention has been reviewed, and many has been repeated, as speaker after speaker came to the well of this House to express approval or disapproval of the so-called Truman policy.

I have wondered if I had any reason to rise to speak beyond the desire to give emphasis by repetition of the able remarks by colleagues who feel as I do in this matter. It has occurred to me that perhaps there are a few thoughts I might add in justice to the constituents I have the honor to represent. May I preface my remarks, however, with the observation that I face this issue convinced there is no division of opinion on either side of the aisle or within the ranks of either party as to our motive in this legislation. We are as one in seeking to pursue the course best calculated to preserve for this Nation the honored institutions of a free people devoted to the cause of liberty at home. We are as one in our desire to extend a helping hand toward people elsewhere similarly devoted to free institutions and equally willing to pay the price of liberty. And, finally, we are as one in our firm determination to take the course best calculated to protect our own land and our own people from the threat of destruction from any source, internal or external.

I submit, therefore, that our only point of difference is whether the legislation proposed will accomplish its purpose. I contend it will not. I contend it will not bring us added protection abroad. I contend it will not shore up the forces of freedom abroad. I contend it will not implement the cause of peace so dearly won. Rather it will add new fuel to which the spark of world conflagration might be applied at any moment with consequences too catastrophic for the human mind to grasp.

The sum of $400,000,000 will not buy continued peace abroad. If appeasement is to be shunned, then the attempt to settle the problems of the world with American dollars is to be shunned for it is nothing more than a financial Munich.

Even the proponents of this legislation hesitate to say these dollars will do the job. There is an implication amounting to admission that more will be necessary—and more, and more, and more. Where will it stop and where will it end? It will stop with the complete financial collapse of the only world power left today with a hope of solvency and it can end only in an America reduced to the helpless, hapless level of the lands and the people we seek to help.

Proponents have argued that we must not put a price tag on liberty. They remind us that this Congress has voted billions without question to battle the forces of aggression and to crush the threat to our land and our people. Of course you voted those funds, and properly so. We were at war and our enemies were at our very doors. But Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize with all the power at my command that we are now at peace. The shooting war is over. Now it is time to think in terms of a peacetime economy. Now it is time to think in terms of statesmanship calculated to preserve that peace rather than to talk, as so many have talked in this very spot, of a World War III. Now is the time to bend our energies and direct our action toward preserving our victory in peace. Now is the time to count costs and calculate risks with deliberation free from the hysteria rampant in the world since Hitler's legions first marched against the world.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we will permit deliberation to replace hysteria, if we will permit facts to replace wishful thinking we will be forced to the inescapable conclusion that we cannot dissipate our resources around the world and remain the great hope of the world for the preservation of self-government, individual liberty, and the dignity of the individual. If we are to divert $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, if we are to divert other and perhaps even greater sums to other nations, if we are to saddle the American taxpayer with the task and the cost of policing the world, we will find our own land impoverished financially and physically. Here is the real threat to our security. Here is the real hope of the great force now arrayed as opposed to our way of life. An America dissipated of its resources will be vulnerable to the very forces we seek to guard ourselves against. A strong America, a solvent America, a sound America need fear no one.

May I make one point further by way of a partial answer, at least, to the implication that those Members of this House privileged to serve in World War II, are convinced of the wisdom of the course proposed by this bill? I will not undertake to speak for others, but may I say as one of them that there is a certain tragic familiarity in the step we now propose to take. We hear once again the cries of emergency, the shouts of threats from abroad, the requests of other nations for American dollars and American supplies, military and otherwise. We are going to send a military mission, if you please. Where—and when—and under what circumstances have we heard all that before? We know where it took us before. What reason now prevails to indicate it will take us on an opposite course in the future? No, my colleagues, the veterans of World War II, privileged, are not as one in urging that we retrace those tragic steps. I am sure they are as one in urging that we avoid the mistakes of the past, that we weigh with due deliberation our course for the future.

Ours is the solemn responsibility of choosing the course. For my part, I will rest my faith on American strength at home, not on American dollars abroad.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, on March 15, 1947, after President Truman had addressed the joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, I released to the press the following statement:

> The United States should give prompt aid to Greece and Turkey in my opinion. However, I emphatically differ with President Truman and the Department of State in the manner in which aid should be given. They would continue to follow a foreign policy of a unilateral course of action which will ultimately lead us down the primrose path to imperialism and World War III. I believe in collective security of the United Nations and have not been in sympathy with the recent course of our foreign policy. The world had a right to expect something better of us after our foreign policy declaration of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." During the congressional campaign of 1946, I made numerous talks throughout San Diego County on "America at the Crossroads," and pointed out that at Yalta and Tehran we had already departed from our former announced foreign policy of the Four Freedoms.
>
> The only hope for world peace and mutual respect among nations rests within the framework of the United Nations. Aid to Greece and Turkey should be given by us through this channel. All other nations should at least be given a chance to give in the same manner that the British Government has already voted $36,000,000 to Greece.
>
> Only through this collective security of the United Nations can sufficient moral and military force be massed to protect the freedom-loving nations of the world from agressor nations.

Since I released the above statement the bill, H. R. 2616, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey has been reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that it do pass.

I have not changed my views from those I formerly expressed, and still believe that we should give prompt aid to Greece and Turkey as urged by President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and our other diplomatic and military leaders who have available top secret information not made known to the public. However, I have continued to insist that the only hope for world peace and mutual respect among nations rests within the framework of the United Nations. With this thought in mind, the Senator Vandenberg amendment has become a most important part of the bill. In this amendment the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized by the bill if the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds—with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto—or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Warren R. Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, stated that in his opinion the United States program as planned in the bill, H. R. 2616, for aid to Greece and Turkey, does not bypass

the United Nations, and on the contrary, he stated he believed the passage of the bill would support the United Nations Charter and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations. I also hold this viewpoint and intend to vote for this bill, which, in my opinion, is for the best interests of all Americans.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the proposal of President Truman with regard to Greece and Turkey confronts the United States with one of the gravest questions in its history.

Acceptance of that proposal involves complete reversal of our long standing policy in foreign affairs. It involves intervention and participation in and responsibility for the internal affairs of other nations. It involves an economic drain on the people of this country which, from a relatively small beginning, may proceed to an extent which no one can now foresee. More than that, it involves employment of the military power of the United States—again apparently on a small initial scale but again also with no predictable limits. It projects this country directly into the complexes of both Europe and the Middle East under circumstances which may well lead to war.

It has not been established why it is to the vital interest of the United States to take this step. Nor, if it can be conceded that the vital interest of our country is actually affected, has there been any revelation of the facts in this situation that make hasty action imperative.

All that the Congress or the people have been given is the President's assertion that the vital interest of the United States is involved and that immediate action is essential. And the President's address is much more remarkable for its vagueness and resort to generalities than for any light it has shed on the reasons for making it.

As a matter of plain common sense, however serious the straits of Greece and Turkey, they cannot become too much worse in the time that will be required for the open and thorough discussion of this situation which alone can give the American people the opportunity to know what they are being asked to do, what the material cost will be, and what commitments of other natures are to be made in their name.

It is the plain duty of Members of Congress to prevent hasty action—to insist that all the facts are made known—to see that these facts are laid before the people in understandable terms—and finally, to take action in the light of the facts and the expressed will of the people.

Members of Congress can serve no good purpose by premature and ill-considered statements of opinion. Such as "we must uphold the hands of the President." Certainly, our history gives abundant evidence that Presidents can make mistakes. The welfare of the country is always a consideration of far greater moment than support of the President in either national or international affairs.

Twice in a single generation our country has become involved in the wars of others. In each case, the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals. In neither case have they seen those ideals realized. On the contrary, this country emerged from each war weaker than it entered, and after each war the world in general was in a worse condition than before. We lost men and wealth, we exhausted irreplaceable natural resources, and we bred conditions that caused widespread dissatisfaction and doubt among the American people concerning their principles of government and way of life.

Intrinsically, we are a weaker Nation today than ever before in our history. We appear strong only by contrast with a prostrate world. In this weakened condition are we now to embark on a new adventure about which we know nothing, but which may lead, first, to war and, second, to the final demoralization of the world and the disappearance of the slightest hope for an orderly society?

The two world wars caused the virtual destruction of the great British Empire Is that not a sufficient example to make us pause before starting down a road which may lead to the same end?

The President said:

> There is no other country (except the United States) to which democratic Greece can turn.

What does this statement mean? That no other country cares anything about Greece as a democratic country? That no other country cares enough to help alleviate the physical want of her people? Or that no other country has the resources to extend aid?

Under any interpretation, the implication of the President's words are far reaching. There are 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Out of this number can the 140,000,000 people who comprise our Nation be the only ones who can assume the burdens of weaker countries? Is it a practical possibility? If so, can we do it, or even attempt to do it without destroying ourselves?

The President said:

> The United States contributed $341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace.

Where is the freedom and where is the peace? Is the world we have today the kind of a return on "investment" that justifies the beginning of a new outpouring of funds?

The President said:

> The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of this investment.

Does the President or anyone else think for a moment that the amount he proposes will be the whole amount? Obviously, $400,000,000 will be only the start. It will be followed by other millions and billions in those countries and in other countries which, with Greece and Turkey as precedents, will make claims on our generosity.

The President said:

> The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists.

If a government is so weak that it cannot cope with several thousand armed men under any leadership, there is reason to conclude: First, that if many of the people of the country do not actually sympathize with the several thousand, they at least do not care much one way or the other and, second, there is little that an outside power can do to aid such a government.

If we take this action in Greece, we will in effect say to Russia, "We are opposed to communism and intend to help the governments of Greece and Turkey oppose it." Under the circumstances, is not Russia likely to reply, "You are free to do that, but if you do, we will take measures of our own to support communism." It must be remembered that Russia has many means, short of war, to foster the spread of communism; many more, in fact, than we have to oppose it. Unpalatable as the idea may be, we must also realize that many people in countries throughout the world look with favor on communism and regard it as a superior form of government. In our own country, we have a Communist movement which is far from large, yet there is little we can do to halt its acceptance by some of our people. You cannot stop a political growth any more than you can stop a religious growth—particularly by use of force. And the adventure in Greece, whatever its other aspects, is basically a use of force.

At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, commitments were made for the American people without their knowledge or consent. Secrecy was excused by those who indulged in it on the ground that it was essential to war security. Yet there is little doubt today that those secret deals, in which a few men around a table played with the destiny of nations, were important causes of the world's present condition. There is no excuse now, not even a lame one, for asking the American people to move blindfolded and in haste into a situation of most serious consequence. Certainly, the time has come to end secret diplomacy.

The urgency, the need for haste which the President so strongly emphasized has an artificial quality. It smacks of the "rush act" of the high-powered salesman. Britain accepted Greece as a responsibility during and after the war. Admitting that Britain's economic condition is unhealthy, why does it suddenly become absolutely impossible for her to continue that responsibility beyond the outside date of March 31—just 19 days after the President's address? Would Britain collapse if she stayed in Greece until April 30 or May 31? Or was an almost immediate date selected to force Americans to act before they could think?

Although it has been mentioned only in passing, the thing of paramount importance in this entire matter to the United States and her people is the interest of the United States, not only the immediate interest but also long-range interest. Certainly if it is not in the interest of this country to take a step, then there can be no other good reason for it in Greece, Europe, the Middle East or elsewhere. With its present huge debt

and the other weakening influences of the War, the United States should regard any commitment with caution. This caution should be doubled and redoubled in the face of a step as grave as that into Greece with all the implications of a continuing economic drain if not the actual threat of another war. Might not the United States best contribution to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can in fact remain the strongest bulwark of free government?

These questions should be resolved before we take an action which may prove to be a costly gamble. Today, the American people do not have the information on which to base either support or rejection of the President's proposal. Congress alone has the power, and it must exercise that power, to see that the people get the facts, all the facts.

We urge that Congress decisively reject the President's request for $400,000,000 to be expended on supplies and equipment for the Greek and Turkish armies and on economic aid and for authority to send military and civilian personnel to these countries to train their armies and supervise the expenditure of funds.

Of the utmost gravity in itself, this request is the more menacing because, as is evident to all, it marks only the initial move in a new course of action on which this Nation is now asked to embark.

That course is a complete negation of the American tradition in the field of foreign affairs. True to the lofty principles of the Declaration of Independence upon which our Nation was founded, it has been our historic position to abstain from interfering in the internal affairs of other peoples and to extend our sympathetic understanding to their struggles for the establishment of forms of government conforming to their needs and desires. President Truman now urges Congress to scrap this great tradition and to commit American dollars, American arms, and American military technique to bolster up tottering reactionary regimes in every corner of the globe which, but for our intervention, could not withstand the opposition of their own people.

President Truman's proposal is equally a reversal of the solemn commitments which our Nation has entered into with its allies and made to the people of the world. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt and with the full support of the American people, our Nation shaped a one-world foreign policy. In concert with our allies and in consonance with that policy, we established the United Nations as the instrument for the realization of man's hope for a world of peace and security based upon friendship and collaboration of all nations.

President Truman now urges the Congress to scuttle this policy, bypass the United Nations and take unilateral action in pursuit of a program of aggressive American interventionism. His proposal reverses the firm policy of friendship with the Soviet Union inaugurated by his great predecessor, betrays the wartime alliance which resulted in victory over the enemies of mankind, ignores the Soviet contribution to that victory and all that it meant in terms of saving American lives. It presents a great and friendly nation in the guise of a menacing enemy to be blocked at all costs.

The consequences of this policy could only be to undermine the whole structure of the United Nations, divide the world into two hostile camps and destroy the very foundations upon which the nations of the world are attempting to build a stable and an enduring peace.

Such a policy will be disastrous to the economic well-being and the national security of the American people. It will require the maintenance of an enormous military establishment and render illusory the hope for speedy universal disarmamant and relief from the crushing burden of military expenditures. It will require the appropriation of increasingly larger sums for expenditures abroad. These will never be repaid since they will not be devoted to productive purposes.

Such a policy will inevitably consolidate the democratic forces of the world into a solid block of opposition to us and turn the reservoir of good will, upon which Wendell Willkie found America could draw, into a source of enmity and hatred. Such a policy, far from protecting our national security, will be its greatest menace, since it sows the seeds of international dissension and conflict which can only lead to war.

Since President Truman's proposal holds these consequences of gravest import to our national welfare, it is necessary that the reasons he urges for its justification to be subjected to searching and critical examination.

THE PROBLEM OF GREECE

The President bases his request for aid to Greece on an urgent appeal for assistance from the Greek Government, citing its poverty, its cruel devastation by the Germans, and internal strife as the reasons for its plight. He accuses a militant minority of exploiting these conditions to bring Greece to its present chaotic state. He asks for supplies to help the Greek armies repress this minority—composed of the very resistance forces whose heroic struggle against the invaders contributed so greatly to allied victory.

No one denies the present tragedy of the Greek people nor their need for assistance. But let us face the facts as to where the responsibility lies.

It was not the British who liberated Greece. The liberation was accomplished by Greek patriots, 2,000,000 of whom were organized into the EAM, the Greek Liberation Front, and ELAS, its military arm. Milton Bracker, New York Times correspondent, reported from Greece on October 6, 1944:

> It is apparent that the entire visible population here and, most notably, the clergy, are on the side of the EAM and the ELAS.

Other reporters confirmed that EAM included all the democratic forces in Greece, with the Communists making up only some 10 percent. After liberation EAM agreed, under British pressure and in the interests of unity, to support the Greek Government in exile and its weakling Premier, George Papandreau. When the latter took repressive measures against EAM and went back on his pledges to remove the quislings and collaborationists from power, the Greek people organized a peaceful demonstration to protest Papandreau's violations of their democratic rights.

The British-supported police fired on the unarmed crowd. So began the war on the Greek people that was later carried on under Churchill's leadership by British soldiers, tanks, planes, and the Royal Navy. Thousand of Greek patriots were murdered and driven into the hills. British tanks paved the way for the restoration of the Greek monarchy, and for a succession of inept and corrupt regimes that have continued a reign of violence and repression, failed to take any effective reconstruction measures and reduced Greece to its present state of misery.

President Truman puts the plea for aid to Greece on the ground that it must have this assistance "if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy." He calls upon the United States to take over the role of Britain in supplying aid.

We submit that the policies of Britain have meant the destruction of Greek democracy and that aid from the United States of the kind President Truman has outlined will serve only to continue that policy, will make the Greek Government more effective in stamping out opposition, and will be of no avail in rendering Greece self-supporting

President Truman excuses his failure to place the matter before the United Nations and its related organizations on the grounds that the situation is urgent and that they are not in a position to extend the help required.

To bypass the United Nations and take unilateral action on a vital policy of this character is to undermine the basic instrument of world cooperation on which our only hope of future security depends. If we are so concerned with the sufferings of Greece and other countries, why did we scuttle the UNRRA program? Why did we refuse to help set up a new fund for rehabilitation? Why did we oppose the Soviet request to bring up the Greek issue in the United Nations a year ago? Why do we now rush into action without even waiting for the findings of the United Nations Commission investigating conditions on the spot? The United States does not want economic aid to Greece to be extended through an international agency. President Truman insists on arrogating that function to the United States alone.

THE GREEK ELECTIONS

President Truman, acknowledging that the Greek Government is not perfect, insists on the representative nature of the Greek Parliament, and says that foreign observers considered the elections fair.

An Allied mission did, to be sure, whitewash the election results. Chicago Sun and PM Correspondent W. M. Fodor reported that its members were unfamiliar with Greece, saw little of the countryside and drew their information largely from Royalist circles in Athens. An examination of press reports before and during the elections of March 31 last, and the plebiscite of September 1, reveals that a wave of violence and murders preceded the elections.

Not only Leftist, but Centrist groups demanded postponement of the March 31 election date on the ground that fair elections were impossible under such disordered internal conditions. Ten cabinet ministers quit their posts in protest over the early date of the elections, but Britain and the United States insisted there be no postponement. Left wing groups boycotted the elections and official government figures, reported by the UP, the AP, and all the major correspondents, showed that over 50 percent of the electorate failed to vote. In addition, it was generally conceded that the registration lists were padded with dead men, and that the Populist—pro-Royalist—vote was swollen by "repeaters." How could the slight majority of the votes won under such conditions by the Populists possibly be considered a true and free expression of the people's will?

The plebiscite on the restoration of the monarchy which was held September 1, was similarly preceded by a wave of terror, assassinations and jailings. British troops were in the country, American warships steamed into Greek ports. Under such conditions the fact that some 65 to 70 percent of the voters presumably cast their ballots for the King's return likewise cannot be considered the freely expressed will of the majority of the people. The actual plebiscite results are unknown since the government issued at different times contrary sets of figures.

The nature of the monarchy we are now asked to support, was reported on shortly after the plebiscite by several American correspondents, who took a 7-day jeep trip from Athens to the Yugoslav and Hungarian frontiers.

The New York Herald Tribune of September 16 headlined Seymour Freidin's story "Reporter finds reign of terror rife in Greece, says monarchists belittle democracy in crushing all foes of their regime." Wrote Freidin:

> The fury and hysteria attendant upon the Greek Government's campaign to efface opposition to the restoration of the monarchy are cutting entire communities off from food, wrecking the UNRRA antimalaria program and consigning thousands of innocent women and children to exile or prison * * * the word "democracy" is becoming synonymous with death and slavery.

And on September 15:

> The prevalent sentiment among officials in the region is that all nonmonarchists are per se Communists. The officials say they will hunt them down and exterminate them. * * * The Government, moreover, has sanctioned the activities of at least two large bandit groups.

Robert Conway, of the New York Daily News, reported:

> The Greek Government's Army and gendarmes are waging a pitiless war on scores of thousands of women and children in a desperate effort to halt a growing rebellion and wipe out not only Communists but all democratic, liberal, and republican elements. This correspondent is compelled to state that the supporters of King George II are now staging a total civil warfare of the cruelest and most inhuman sort.

Shall America give dollars and supplies to enable the Greek Army to carry on this work?

TURKEY NOW NEEDS OUR SUPPORT

The President found it necessary to put the question of aid to Turkey in somewhat blunter terms. For Turkey was not ravaged by war. On the contrary, Turkey not only refused aid to the United Nations but under the cloak of neutrality, sold vital war materials such as chrome to Germany, and permitted German and Italian warships entry into the Black Sea to fight our Soviet allies. Moreover, there can be no pretense that the Government of Turkey is democratic. The President therefore bases his plea for aid to her on the alleged necessity of defending her national integrity, and preserving order in the Middle East. To these ends we are asked to help maintain her army of a million men since Britain is no longer in a position to do so.

Let us speak plainly. Against whom are we to maintain Turkey's national integrity? The Soviet Union? The Soviet Union is not threatening the national integrity of Turkey nor of any country of the Middle East. The Soviet Union is deeply and justifiably concerned with her own security in the Straits, and has requested that this be assured through appropriate international agreements. Is this an unreasonable request? If we are concerned with maintaining control over the Panama Canal, some 1,300 miles from the tip of Florida, if Britain is concerned with maintenance of control over the Suez Canal, over 3,500 miles from Britain's shores, why should not the Soviet Union's security interests in the Straits, about 350 miles from the port of Odessa, receive serious consideration? The United States and Great Britain would surely resist international control of waterways of such strategic importance to themselves. Why then should we wonder at the attitude of the Soviet Union in insisting that the control of the Dardanelles is a matter for the Black Sea powers and that the Soviet Union and Turkey should jointly fortify them to prevent their use by other states for inimical purposes?

The best guaranty of our own security would be to recognize the right of the Soviet Union to secure its own borders and hold the key to its own house, just as we insist on that right for ourselves and for Great Britain..

A PROGRAM FOR POLITICAL AND MILITARY INTERVENTION

We now come to the basic motivation for the program proposed by President Truman:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. * * * We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.

Since neither the Greek nor the Turkish Governments meet the description of "free people maintaining free institutions," the whole case for aid to Greece and Turkey on these grounds falls apart. The program is revealed in its naked reality—a program for American political and military intervention to keep down people's movements in any state where we fear that popular elements might gain control and friendship with the Soviet Union prevail.

This is in direct contravention to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in violation of the United Nations Charter. It is designed to prevent democratic movements of the people from determining their own forms of government. It reverses the whole policy of cooperating with the Soviet Union as a friendly partner in the making of the peace as she was a valiant ally in the war. It assumes a threat of aggression from the Soviet Union of which there is no evidence, while on the contrary there is every evidence of the desire of the Soviet people and their leaders for peace and for continued cooperation among the wartime allies.

This is the logical projection of the program inaugurated last year by Winston Churchill in Fulton, Mo., where he called for an Anglo-American diplomatic offensive to block the Soviet Union. The British have failed in their part of the arrangement and now we are asked to take over the whole bankrupt policy.

FREEDOM VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM?

The charge that a number of countries have had totalitarian regimes thrust upon them against their will, referring to certain countries of eastern Europe, cannot be substantiated. These countries today have more democracy than they have ever known before. Reactionary, feudal regimes which were subservient to fascism have been replaced by people's governments. The use of the phrase "totalitarian," a term applicable only to Fascist states, is out of place both in relation to the Soviet Union and to the new democracies in eastern Europe. The Soviet Union has not sought to impose her own form of government on other peoples. The type of state being developed in eastern Europe is indeed in many ways closer to the program advocated by the British labor government than it is to communism. To speak of coercion and intimidation in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria while upholding and planning to take over the British policies in Greece is the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, after listening to hours of debate on this bill and the many proposed amendments, I have decided to vote for it on final passage, but I do so with a heavy heart. This is one of the hardest votes—at least one of a half dozen of the hardest votes—that I have had presented to me during the years of my membership in Congress. As I said in the House yesterday, I have appreciated the assurance given me by several leading men in our Government and that assurance has been repeated on the floor of the House today, and it has eased my mind with regard to this necessary measure, but still it is a hard vote to cast. I feel that this move is a necessary thing to be done and I understand the necessity of our Government's acting at once and acting alone. It is indeed a matter of our national concern and one on which our national safety depends, to keep Russian communism from taking control of the eastern Mediterranean lands. We must see to it that

the peoples in those strategic areas shall not be obliged either by want or by military strength to adopt a way of life contrary to their own choosing.

What is it then about this affirmative vote that I am to cast that I most regret? Of course, it is the circumstances which make this action necessary and imperative. It is the fact that, under all the circumstances, our Government must act unilaterally in this case because the United Nations cannot do what ought to be done. The comforting assurance that I was given yesterday and again today that this action does not really by-pass the United Nations eases my mind, but I am still disturbed that this action may adversely affect this young international organization which is the hope of the world for peace. I do not believe that this action on the part of our Government really means a turning away from the United Nations organization, nor that our act will discredit this infant organization which we have struggled for so long and helped to create.

My real fear is that having acted unilaterally in the case of these eastern Mediterranean countries in this instance because we had to do so, may be partly the cause for by-passing the United Nations organization at some future time when it is not necessary for us to act alone but instead where wisdom would dictate that we act as a member of the United Nations. This unhappy necessity of acting apart now should determine us all the more to act through the United Nations later always whenever possible and to build it up and to strengthen it for the great task it has to accomplish, working toward peace.

I have heard a few speak disparagingly of the United Nations here when they need not have done so merely to say that in this particular instance it is not authorized to do what needs to be done and does not have the funds which would be needed and does not have the power required to do the work. It is a sad thing for any Member of this body to speak disparagingly of this infant international organization which is the result of so much effort and which grew out of blood and tears. The very fact that America is taking this momentous step alone, and not through the United Nations, makes it all the more logical and necessary that we increase our efforts to strengthen the new international organization, to increase its powers and use our influence to ripen its maturity. I believe the American people insist that we do everything in our power to support the international organization of which we are a member and by our help enable it to accomplish its mission of establishing justice and peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, since March 12 when President Truman delivered his message on assistance to Greece and Turkey, my mind has been beset by many questions. I have attended every meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee, listened to every witness and read all that I possibly could on the subject matter at hand. I have tried to consider this particular legislation and all its connotations with an open mind because I realized from the beginning the implications and possibilities involved. The road into the future is not always a straight one nor can its twists and turns be seen beforehand. Nevertheless if this measure passes, it will be clear to the world what our policy will be as our commitments will be definite; our purposes specific and the responsibility our own.

Perhaps, it was the absence of such clarity that was one of the contributing factors to two world wars.

The reasons given for this legislation are many.

At the present time there is an internal rebellion going on in Greece. This rebellion, while centered mainly in the north of Greece, is also in effect in other parts of the country as well. The number of guerrillas is estimated at anywhere from twelve to twenty thousand, and it has been brought out that while the great majority of the guerrillas are not Communists, they are in all instances under the leadership of members of the Communist Party directed from the outside.

Aid is being given these guerrilla forces from over the borders in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. There is a school maintained at Boulkes near Belgrade wherein certain guerrillas are sent to receive courses in indoctrination for the purpose of carrying on future activities in Greece in behalf of communism.

Insofar as Turkey is concerned there is, and has been for some time, a war of nerves being waged against the Turks by the Russians. This has been carried on through the use of radio broadcasts from Russia into Turkey; through Russia's demands for the return of the Turkish provinces of Ardahan and Kars and also through Russia's repeated demands that she be given joint control of the Dardanelles. These reasons have been given to us by various members of the State Department and others who are intimately connected and concerned with the present situation as it exists in both Greece and Turkey.

I am under no illusion about the types of governments which exist in both of these countries. It is my hope that if this legislation passes, we will do our utmost to help bring about needed reforms in both countries so that the greatest number of people possible will be allowed to select the type of government they desire; so that the tax structure will be revamped to such an extent that there will be no favored exemptions as at present; and so that both these countries can achieve the peace and security which, I believe, is every nation's right.

It might be well for us to ask what might happen if this measure we are now discussing fails of passage. I believe that one of the first results would be an all-out civil war in Greece, and that as a result of this war, a government under the leadership of Napoleon Zervas, the present Minister of Public Order, would result.

Then there would be a counter revolution staged by all the dissenting elements under the leadership of the Communists who would be aided by outside help from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. This then would mean the setting up of another satellite state within the orbit of the U. S. S. R. If this measure were to fail it would very likely mean that the U. S. S. R. would take it as a green light to carry out its war of nerves still further against the Turks and eventually the Turks would crack and that country would be overrun. It is well to point out that if an active armed clash occurred between Turkey and Russia the Turks, according to the most reliable information the Foreign Affairs Committee has been able to receive, would not be able to stand up for more than a matter of weeks. Furthermore, Turkey, like Greece, would then be within the Soviet's sphere and Russia would be down not only to the Mediterranean but would be very close to the Suez Canal as well.

It is my opinion that, if what I have said should occur, Greece and Turkey would certainly not mark the outer limits of Soviet expansion but, in effect, that expansion would continue still farther not only to the south but to the east, covering Iran, India, Burma and southeastern Asia, and also to the west covering Austria, Germany, Italy, and France as well. What then would our position be? Would we then contemplate the passage of legislation such as this which we are now considering? Would we then become aware of the fact that the expansion of Communist spheres of influence is something that should be stopped? Or should we insulate ourselves in isolation on this hemisphere against a doctrine which we think is insidious and dangerous to our way of life and which, if it achieves the success which it hopes for in Europe, Asia, and Africa will, without a doubt and in time, reach the shores of this hemisphere as well? We know, of course, that communism has penetrated in some degree or form into every country of the Western Hemisphere at the present time. It appears to me that to deny passage of this legislation would, in effect, bring us closer to war than would be the case if we were to pass it today. It seems to me that once we have laid down a policy to the entire world that it is up to us to carry through on that policy and not to indicate weakness and thereby give encouragement to the very things which we despise.

If this measure fails and more countries are brought within the sphere of the Soviet Union, it will mean that the iron curtain will be extended that much farther and that we will have lost our contact with that much more of the world.

Such in brief is the picture as I see it and understand it. I realize what we are up against and I also realize that we Americans have no taste for foreign adventure in times of peace. We very naturally and logically have many questions concerning the possibilities and potentialities of this new policy. We may ponder and debate this question but we cannot dodge the inescapable fact that President Truman's address has in the eyes of the world committed this Nation to a new policy. Our new course will take all our wisdom and skill to make it successful. No man in this Chamber can tell what the outcome of the President's and our decision will be. The issue has been raised and the die has been cast. Not to act now, not to follow through,

would, in my opinion, be most dangerous.

We are not seeking to impose our way of life on either Greece or Turkey. We are extending this assistance to enable them, in time, to select the kind of government their people want. The purpose of this new policy is to oppose forcible Communist aggression—either directly or through satellite countries—on weaker nations opposed to such a philosophy.

Personally, I am sorry that this matter was not referred to the United Nations before it was presented to the Congress, instead of after the President made his speech. On the basis of the evidence before us it appears certain that the United Nations could not have acted, as yet, because it has neither the funds nor the organization to meet such a situation, and, secondly, any such action as here contemplated would be blocked by the veto of a single power.

I believe that it is possible for the United Nations to achieve sufficient strength in the future to take over this task. I shall welcome the day when we may resign this responsibility to that organization because I believe wholeheartedly that only in the United Nations can we eventually find the peace all mankind craves.

Much will depend on how the administration of this policy is worked out. Much will depend on how soon genuine democracy follows our assistance and replaces the kinds of dictatorship now in force in both Greece and Turkey. I believe we can provide the right kind of administration but, in the matter of democratic governments, that is something that only people—and not outside pressures—can decide.

I am going to vote for this bill but not with any enthusiasm. Like all of you my lack of enthusiasm springs from the fact that no one can tell ultimately where the policy on which we are about to embark will lead. We do know, however, that the ideology which we oppose is being spread by force, infiltration, occupation, and revolution. It is a policy very similar to Hitler's policy of grabbing off one nation at a time in the hope that eventually the rest of the world will become so weak that no one power will be left to challenge it. If we reject this legislation we give notice to the U. S. S. R. that we do not propose to do anything to stop or to interfere with its expansion policy. If we accept this legislation we give notice to the U. S. S. R. that we are giving this help in order that Greece and Turkey may continue their own existence, and, I think, we will be putting up a sign which all the world will be able to read and understand. Our policy of appeasement since the end of the war has, I think, run its course. We have allowed nations like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and others to become satellites of the U. S. S. R. even though the majority of people in each country concerned is opposed to communism as an ideology. We know at the present time that Hungary, though having a legally elected anti-Communist government, is slowly being made into another satellite state because of the pressure from within exercised by the Communist minority there. We know also that the Communist minorities in France, in Italy, and elsewhere are exercising power far beyond the numbers they actually control. We have seen too many countries go by default. We have offered every inducement we possibly could to get along with all our neighbors but our efforts so far have, in large part, been in vain. The time has come for the United States to take up a burden very few of us like to assume but take it up we must with fortitude and courage.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I have obtained this time so that I may express my position in connection with this legislation. I speak in dead earnest when I say that things have come to a pretty pass when the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives brings out a measure sponsored by a Democratic administration and then has the unmitigated gall to bring in a rule limiting the debate of those Republicans who are opposed to the measure. The rule adopted for this bill which starts us on the road to international ruin and eventual bankruptcy allowed only 3 hours' time for those of us who oppose the legislation but gave 6 hours to those who support it.

The people of this country ought not to hold this against all Republicans. They ought to search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carefully to see that some Republicans—perhaps a minority, but still some of them—fought this bill that changes the whole course of our ship of state and takes us out on an uncharted sea that may be filled with unseen perils.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to comment on another puzzling thing that occurred to me as I sat here and heard speaker after speaker get up and make talk for the RECORD. It struck me as ludicrous, if not tragic, that some proponents were playing Charley McCarthy for the Department of State. I suspect that some of the speeches were "ghosted" in the Department of State. I marveled at the manner in which the speeches that were delivered on both sides of the aisle in favor of the new policy were perfectly synchronized. It was passing strange that different points were brought out by different speakers without the usual overlapping that can be heard in normal debate.

How naive and how very short-sighted are the supporters of this legislation, considering the long future, may not be known until our children and our children's children have had to bear the burdens that will come as a natural result of this so-called Truman policy.

We talk about a bipartisan foreign policy, Mr. Chairman, and it is true that both Republicans and Democrats will support this Truman policy. It is also true that both Republicans and Democrats are opposing this policy and that they are men of every political color under the American sun. Many Republicans supporting it forget that it will be administered by a Democratic administration that hardly has become noted for its nonpartisan attitude.

I think it is more correct to call this new departure in our foreign policy today the most partisan foreign policy that could be evolved. The policy was put out by the President with two big aims in mind—first, to garner additional political support for 1948, and, second, by trial and error to attempt to find a way to quiet the demands for a whole reexamination of our foreign policy as practiced by the New Deal Party since the end of World War II with such disastrous results to Europe and Asia.

In addition, it was formulated and put forward with the thought in mind that perhaps the people would accept the new policy and sooner or later forget the United Nations organization fiasco which was ballyhooed to the skies until it was deflated by Moscow's constant use of the veto.

That is why I have said before, and I say now, that the new so-called Truman policy is a policy of desperation. It was conceived as hastily as it was presented to the American people, and the men who sponsored it were more interested in their domestic political lives than they were in the long-term best interests of our whole Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called Truman policy for four distinct reasons. I am not ashamed of my all-out opposition to this policy, because, regardless of the men who are on my side, I am convinced by my study of history that such a policy as this has been followed, on a smaller scale, by other nations and always has led to a bad end.

The first reason I oppose this legislation to spend American money in Greece and Turkey is that the policy will bring more inflation in the United States. It is a matter of public record that I opposed the British loan and that I opposed many another American loan that has been used by other nations to increase inflation in the United States.

Before last November, it seemed that the Republicans were pretty unanimous—and that the people agreed also—that our inflation in America was caused by our overseas fiscal policy, among other things. Nothing has happened in recent months to make me feel otherwise. The British, the French, and other nations still are bidding for American wheat and other products in this Nation and are getting these products. In so doing, they have boosted the prices which American consumers must pay at home.

This is true because, speaking broadly, the United States is the only Nation that has had a surplus of food and of other commodities that could be shipped abroad. The people are all against further inflation. Even the President has embarked on a Don Quixote campaign to knock down price windmills with his symbolic sturdy steed and his long lance.

As every man who has served for long in this House of Representatives knows, the mere fact that this first step will cost the United States what many say is the trifling sum of $400,000,000 is not at all indicative of what the policy will cost in the long run. I have served here for more than a decade and I can speak with the voice of experience on this one phase of our work. When we embarked on lend-lease, only a few billion dollars were said to be involved. Before it was

over, tens of billions of dollars went down the drain—much of it to the same Russia against which we have planned this so-called Truman policy.

Mr. Chairman, you and I know that when this bill is passed and if it is put into effect, as it probably will be, it will not be 6 months before there will be demands from other nations claiming to need our help to oppose communism.

Some Republican leaders who support this policy have said that the sum requested by the President could be appropriated and that it would not necessarily interfere with our Republican program of lowering taxes and reducing over-all Federal expenditures. I am willing to say that if the sum were merely $400,000,000 this likely would be true. But all of my experience in Congress teaches me that the $400,000,000 is only the beginning. It is just the nose of the camel edging into the tent. After a little while there will be other requests and the same men who hollered "wolf, wolf" about the so-called Soviet menace in Greece and Turkey will be crying "wolf, wolf" about these other requests. The so-called Truman policy will not be cheap. It will be an expensive policy, just as every other policy followed by this administration in the past 14 years has been expensive.

The Republicans running for office last November very explicitly promised an over-all and significant decrease in the cost of government. They also promised lower taxes. If, by supporting this measure and bringing on other similar measures, they make inevitable a welshing on that policy, they will be doing their party irreparable harm.

The people will fast lose confidence in our Republican Party, as they have lost confidence in the Democrats, if we allow ourselves to be deluded by such catchwords as "let partisanship stop at the water's edge." There can be no such thing in actuality. Our foreign policy is inextricably tied up with our domestic fiscal policy, and if we embark on this new so-called Truman policy, we will see that we have wrecked our domestic Republican fiscal program. The principal men who talk about a nonpartisan foreign policy are those in the Democratic administration who know that it will be administered by Democrats, the salaries paid to Democrats and overseen by a Democratic Cabinet and a Democratic President. Those few Republicans who are appointed to play a part in it will be put in the picture merely for window-dressing and will be expected to stand around and say "Me, too" every time the Democrats make a suggestion.

The second big reason I oppose this measure, Mr. Chairman, is that we are rushing to the assistance of governments that could not be termed "representative republican governments" by the most fantastic interpretation of the term. We have in this country a representative government. It is not perfect, but it probably works better than any other similarly constituted government on earth. We have a free press. We have freedom of speech. We have freedom of movement. We have freedom of religion. All these are parts of our governmental fabric, and without any one of them neither we nor other nations truthfully could call our Government a representative government and our people a free people.

Is there one who will stand up and say that there is a representative republican form of government in Turkey? Is there a thoughtful, intelligent man in the United States who seriously will contend that this is the case? I think not. Just a few weeks ago I read a dispatch from Turkey by Constantine Brown, the foreign-news analyst for the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers. He pointed out that freedom of the press is being allowed temporarily in Turkey to influence Americans. One Turkish official was quoted as having said that the Government deliberately not yet had suppressed one paper because of the possibilities of American aid.

What a travesty on words and the meanings of words it is to call Greece and Turkey democracies in the same breath that we call England and the United States democracies. That is twisting the word as much as Molotov and the other Russians are twisting it when they persistently refer to Russia as a democracy.

The third principal reason I oppose this measure, Mr. Chairman, is that it will project our soldiers into new areas of danger where they may ignite the spark that will start World War III. When World War II was ending, the Democratic administration claimed to have a program that would banish war forever. The United Nations was uncovered in all its pristine glory. Never again would men have to engage in warfare. We could just talk our troubles to death around a council table and then every nation would forget its own self-interests and vote to do this, that, or the other.

A few realists spoke hopefully of a peace of 25 or 50 years, at most, unless the hearts of men everywhere were changed and unless somewhere along the line a miracle in human relations was passed. But now, we are not going to have even 25 or 50 years of peace. The Truman policy in effect is an economic declaration of war on Russia. And when we send military "observers" into Greece and Turkey, we will be running constantly the grave risks of de facto, if not actually declared, war.

It is contrary to all the lessons of history to believe that we can send our soldiers into Greece and Turkey and that there will not be accumulated new "incidents" which can be used as kindling wood to ignite a major bonfire of war. A clash here, a clash there, and before we know it we again are involved in mortal combat.

The amazing thing, to me, about this so-called Truman policy is that it could be sold to the same people in America who only a few short months ago were sold on the United Nations. Their gullibility is as dangerous as it is surprising. If these people this quickly can have their minds diverted from one set course to another set course in foreign affairs, then there is no telling to what lengths they can be led by high-powered propaganda that can be turned on and off like a faucet.

O Mr. Chairman, I know that the United Nations will be defended by many Democrats and Republicans here as they vote for this policy. They will shed many a crocodile tear about how much they hate to take part in such a thing and to leave the poor UN with nothing but a grant of land.

But the truth remains that the so-called Truman policy is an open, flagrant, willful by-passing of the United Nations, on which our Nation spent so much time, effort, and money, and that as this policy is expanded, it will be seen that every new step of the new policy will mean another nail in the coffin of the United Nations organization. This, I think, can hardly be disputed, although it will be disputed for the record and a lot of politicians who are trying to play both ends will try to convince the people that I am wrong.

The fourth principal reason I oppose this policy on which we seem determined to embark, Mr. Chairman, is that it negates the recent Republican platforms and contradicts those Republicans who said before the election last November that when the people had had enough, we would take powers away from the President and return these powers to the Congress, the States, or the local governments. This bill actually represents a sweeping new grant of powers to the President, whoever he may be at whatever period. If I had no other grounds for opposing this bill, I would oppose it for this reason.

We in the Congress have been eating at the second table of government for, lo these many years. Many Democrats have observed this as well as many Republicans and one Member of Congress, our good friend Hatton Sumners, even went so far as to resign his seat here so that he could get out and tell the people about the trend without being accused of speaking politically.

Yet, I have heard men get up and defend this bill who only a short time ago were deploring the increased centralization of power. Why, I would like to know when you will find an issue of centralization of power that is more clear-cut than the issue in this bill. The President can plunge us into war almost any time he pleases. He can precipitate an emergency a month before the next election. And as the inevitable results of this policy bring an enlargement of the funds we will have to spend, there will, of course, be an enlargement of the powers granted to the President.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I am in the minority when I speak against this bill, although I am a Member of the majority party. Our time in this debate has been limited by our own leadership and we of the majority party who are speaking against this radical, new departure in our foreign policy are temporarily out of public favor, at least around the Capitol.

But, I went home last week end and had a visit with some old friends up and down Main Street. I talked with several men in service stations. I talked with the town banker. I visited with the hardware merchant. I contacted a few editors of country newspapers.

I found them rather perturbed about high prices and I heard all of them say that they wished some way could be

found to bring some value back into the dollar. I went out with some veterans who are trying to buy, rent, or build a home and I heard them gripe about prices and how hard it is to get anything done in this new America the New Deal brought to us. I asked them all how they felt about sending some more money overseas to stop communism, or to bolster a corrupt government or two. They were unanimously opposed to it. They were quick to note the connection between our spend-lend-send overseas policy and the increasing worthlessness of our dollar at home and the difficulties of getting anything built that would stand longer than a few years.

It did not take my experience back home to put me against this Truman policy, Mr. Chairman, but the knowledge I gained did not hurt any. Some day, we are going to legislate the straw that breaks the back of the American people. This may well be that straw.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state that it has been agreed to close debate. The Chair would like to divide that time as much as possible among those who wish to be recognized to speak on the bill. I assume that that was the intent of the gentleman from Ohio in making the motion.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Ohio understood that there were four amendments pending, and it was the hope of the committee that the authors of the amendments be given time to explain each one of them and similar time be given to some one who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How come, with a preferential motion up there, I cannot be considered? I offered it a while ago and made a point of order on it, and I was overruled. I want to know under what rule you may disregard the offering of a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not seeking to disregard the gentleman in that regard, but there were some Members who indicated that they wanted to extend their remarks, and the Chair sought to recognize them at that time. The Chair has withheld recognition from the gentleman from Colorado until these unanimous consent requests were taken care of. If the gentleman wants to make his preferential motion at this time, he will be recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would just as soon wait until the gentleman from Colorado finishes, but I want recognition on it sometime.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clarify the position that I have taken before this body in debate. I spoke as effectively as I could in favor of passing this whole problem to the United Nations. I am in complete agreement with those Members who believe that this problem is so critical that we cannot delay action. We must act now. This problem is so important to our national self-interest that we cannot adopt a do-nothing policy. However, I should like to suggest to this body that there is another path, that there is another road. It is true we must not fall into the trap of doing nothing, for that would really endanger our Nation, but I suggest to you that there is another way instead of taking this path alone, ignoring all the nations of the world. They, too, have an interest in world peace. I am very sincere, and I am very serious about this matter.

The President presented this legislative program on March 12. The President stated there was a grave crisis confronting the world. He has said that there exists a threat to world peace. Now that the President of the United States has spoken in this fashion, I say to you that that is the very purpose for which the United Nations was created. That is what was meant by collective security. All nations must band together to overcome any threat which endangers the peace of the world.

I should like to demonstrate in the closing minutes of the debate that there is another road that we can follow without joining those who really want to kill this legislation, and that path is this: There will be submitted here a motion to recommit. Under that motion to recommit, $100,000,000 can be used now by the President of the United States for the purposes stated in this bill. The President can act quickly to relieve economic pressures in Greece. No one can say we are delaying treating the crisis which confronts the world. We are not delaying that at all. We are moving forward to take care of that problem which affects our national self-interest. At the same time the military problems confronting Greece and Turkey will be given the United Nations for proper disposition.

Mr. Chairman, every educator, every religious leader, every world leader who understands the history of civilization has been encouraging all the nations of the world to get together for collective security. Let me tell you what happened yesterday in England. Prime Minister Attlee declared on the second anniversary of VE-day:

> The dangers to world civilization from another world war are greater today than they were between World War I and World War II.

It seems incredible that after only a period of 2 years' time there is such a real danger to world civilization. I am confident that the people at home do not know the nature and the extent of the threat to the peace of the world. Had they that knowledge this Congress would not dare pass legislation which ignores the United Nations. In view of this dire threat to world peace, we should be calling upon the leadership of the world to join with us in making the United Nations strong, vigorous, and effective. We should be bringing into play the brains of the world. We do so to wage war. Why do we not do so in the cause of peace?

The scientists have shouted to the politicians of the world that they must change their method and manner of thinking. They have urged the politicians that they must catch up with the advance made by modern science; that if they do not do so the next war may be so terrible that our civilization, as we know it now, may pass from the earth. Another terrible war will destroy democracy and representative government beyond question of a doubt. Must we wait until we emerge from the ruins of a third world war before we acknowledge and accept the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations?

How can we treat this problem so lightly when we are now producing an atomic bomb that is capable of killing 100,000 people over a wide area? How can you stand before the people of your districts when you return home and say, "The United Nations is too weak to be used at this time." I say to you, if it is weak let us make it strong. Now is the time to throw the combined political, financial, and military strength of this great Nation behind the United Nations, demanding that all of the nations signatory thereto act now to preserve the peace of the world. In that manner we can again give moral and spiritual leadership to the world. There is no basis for moral and spiritual leadership if this bill is passed with this possible exception. The President and the Members of this body have said this measure is designed to strengthen the United Nations. It may be that it will work out that way. The good faith of these statements will be subject to careful scrutiny within the next 12 to 15 months. I admit that the President, if this bill is passed, may by vigorous leadership during that period of time revive the hopes of the people who believe in the United Nations.

Again let me clarify my position. If you fail to recommit this bill, in view of the threat to world peace I am going to vote for it because there is no other alternative. I cannot do otherwise, joining with those who want to hide their heads in the sands of isolationism. We must go forward. It may be that by going to the United Nations there is only a remote possibility of peace, but it is the best choice we have now. At least, if war comes eventually, we shall be supporting the intent and spirit contained in the Charter of the United Nations. By our individual action this Nation may incur the fear and the hatred of the people of the world, some of whom have just cause for seeking social and political changes. I plead again, let us use our vision and leadership, making the United Nations strong now.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 8. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States had adopted as its policy in international affairs (1) intervention in civil strife, civil war, or political conflicts in foreign countres; or (2) unilateral action, either now or in the future, in disregard of its obligations to the United Nations.
>
> "(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms the basic policy of the United States to bring before the United Nations all economic, political, or military conditions which may endanger the peace of the world."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two or three observations.

First, in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] regarding the President's declaration of this being the United States' policy. I remember very well the bill that was brought up in the last session of Congress—that is, the work or fight bill. I remember that was a Presidential "must" also, but when it went to the other body it went out the window. Then, too, I remember on that historic day when the railroad brotherhoods threatened to go on strike and the strike had already been settled, the President came up here and got us all worried and sick about what we were going to do about legislation. We passed it, and in the Senate in a few days it too went out the window.

I am not very much disturbed about these Presidential "must" measures, especially when we have a policy as important as this is to our country which constitutes a departure from the traditional foreign policy of our country. I am not disturbed about Presidential "must" bills.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if in his opinion he thinks any man, including the President of the United States, has the right to put this Congress and the people of the United States in the position where they have to vote for a bill of this kind or else "lose face" with the world.

Mr. BENDER. I have heard that argument used in the other body about losing face. We have lost face so many times, but as long as the American people keep this a Christian Nation, which they have, they are not going to lose face in the world. When we depart from that philosophy, we will lose face, and we are losing face here. We are embarking on an uncharted course fraught with danger.

This amendment provides for the turning of this problem over to the United Nations. If it fails there, then we can take proper action.

Mr. Chairman, two basic facts about the present bill trouble the American people. First, it, in effect, creates a military alliance between the United States and the Greek monarchy and the Turkish dictatorship. In doing so, the present bill is in direct contradiction to the traditional historic American foreign policy of avoiding entangling military alliances with foreign powers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What will the people of the world say about America when they start out on their own hook to try to militarize Greece and militarize Turkey? The first thing you know, we will have to go to every country in Europe, and then they will be asking us to go down to South America to arm some of those countries. When are we going to stop?

Mr. BENDER. And Mr. Chairman, the second basic thing that troubles the American people about H. R. 2616 is the fact that it stabs the United Nations in the back because, Mr. Chairman, we undertake by unilateral action to make decisions in regard to aggression everywhere and anywhere in the world. We and we alone make the decisions. We and we alone on the basis of this bill will attempt to police the world. But by so doing, we will destroy collective security. By so doing, we will undermine the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, the Truman doctrine, by breaking faith with the United Nations and flaunting the Administration's disregard for its solemn commitments to the United Nations, is the first long and dangerous step down the road to a new American isolation. The overwhelming majority of the American people know that the hope for peace in the world lies in a strong and effective international organization. The Truman doctrine is the most insidious kind of isolation because it masks itself as "cooperation," because it pats the United Nations with one hand and stabs it with the other.

Mr. Chairman, the two basic principles of American foreign policy—namely the avoidance of entangling military alliances with foreign powers and wholehearted support for the United Nations—these two basic principles to which the American people are absolutely and completely devoted—these basic principles will be destroyed by the Truman doctrine as it is embodied in the present bill before the House.

Mr. Chairman, because I earnestly and sincerely believe that 85 to 90 percent of all American citizens do not wish us to engage in a policy which involves us in entangling military alliances everywhere in the world, I have offered this amendment, and, Mr. Chairman, because I believe the American people are overwhelmingly right in their conviction that peace can only be maintained by a powerful, strong, and growing United Nations—this also is my reason for offering this amendment.

The House of Representatives, I believe, faces in this bill the most far-reaching and serious change in national policy ever adopted in the Congress since I have been a Member of this body. It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress should repudiate the historic foundations of American foreign policy. It is inconceivable to me that, having come through two devastating international wars in our own lifetime, we as a body would turn our backs upon the organized conscience of all mankind, focused and formulated through the deliberations of the United Nations.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; all of us know some few people who forget that America consists of 140,000,000 people in a world population of 2,000,000,000. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we know some very few individuals who forget that perhaps 20,000,000 Chinese will starve to death this year, and that another 10,000,000 starving Indians in that vast subcontinent of Asia will die because of the failures of our own human institutions.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; there are a few people mad with the lust for power—careless and ruthless in their disregard of the great, crying needs of all mankind for food, for clothes, for education, for all of those things that make life rich and beautiful.

There are in America today, Mr. Chairman, those who are willing to plunge the entire world into another devastating and monstrous blood-bath. It is their thinking which President Truman has expressed in the Truman doctrine, and it is their plan—their mad plan—for world power which is embodied in the present bill before us.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; we have the atomic bomb. Yes, we have the food reserves of the world when hundreds of millions are hungry. Yes, we have half the industrial capacity of the entire earth. Yes, we have the liquid capital—some financial resources which could be extended to assist in reconstructing and in rebuilding the industries of peace and well-being throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said: "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely." We have power, Mr. Chairman, and there are some demoniac characters in American life who want absolute power—not just here at home, but also in the entire world. It is from their mad drive for world power that springs the doctrine for world-wide military alliances and world-wide unilateral action on the part of the American Government without regard for our historic American foreign policy and without regard for our commitments to the United Nations. This policy means war. Let no Member of the House hide from this fact. In our hands we hold the destiny of America and the world. Ours is the responsibility. In the name of all that is holy in American traditions of democracy, freedom and peace—let the House in good conscience and good faith adopt the proposed amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that if the Treasury floated a bond issue to support this program that it would sell overwhelmingly to the American people?

Mr. BENDER. If we floated a bond issue to support this program, you ladies and gentlemen know that the people back home have written to you and the Members on my side, practically every one I have talked to, say that his mail is anywhere from three to six to one against it. Now you are giving the people something they do not want, that they are afraid of and do not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this debate comes to a close within a few moments. There has been a great deal of discussion and confusion which has been preponderatingly on one side. I rise at this time to point out what I think are the salient issues involved in this legislation.

First, no matter how much the proponents of this legislation may try, they cannot get away from the proposition that the United Nations has gone into this matter. They cannot escape the proposition that the United Nations, through one of its organizations, the Food and Agricultural Organization, has

made recommendations with regard to economic rehabilitation in Greece; nor the fact that that same body recommended that action be taken by the United Nations.

I read to this House the other day some of the important recommendations made. The difficulty has been and is that the present regime in Greece refuses, and has consistently refused, to adopt the reforms recommended by the United Nations. In refusing to adopt elementary democratic reforms, this regime backed by British imperialists has caused the civil strife in Greece. The question in Greece is not one of communism. The question involved in Greece is bread, land, equitable taxation, liberty, a square deal for the peasants. This regime refuses to give that to the people of Greece. If this regime gave freedom to the Greek people and adopted the reforms recommended by the United Nations organization, there would be no civil strife in Greece. Why does not this regime accept those recommendations? Because this regime is a Fascist regime. You cannot get away from the fact that we will be giving money to a Fascist regime to shoot down men and women, yes, call them guerrillas—yes, some of them Communists, many of them non-Communists—who fought on our side during the war. You are giving money to buy bullets and guns to shoot down those who saved the lives of Americans with their heroic sacrifices. You are giving that money to whom? To big quislings and petty quislings and Nazi collaborators. I just wonder what the average ex-GI will say when he learns that the men and women who are going to be shot at with the money and material that we provide here were the men and women who fought on his side. What will he say when he learns that we are providing the bullets and guns of the present rulers of Greece who aided and collaborated with the Nazis and Fascists during the last war.

Let me also point out that the United Nations not only went into this question through the Food and Agriculture Organization but even, according to Mr. Austin, the Security Council is already acting on that aspect of the Greek question with which it is now prepared to deal—conditions on the northern frontier. The United Nations Council is in it. It is dealing with this problem. So that when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and others say that the United Nations Council cannot deal with this situation and will be barred from dealing with it, they evade the reality that the United Nations is and has been dealing with this problem.

The mistake we are arrogantly making here today is that we are weakening the United Nations by taking this action. The United Nations finds itself in the same position that the First Congress found itself in in 1789 when it met in New York City. Several States were attempting unilateral action on some questions. Unilateral action was threatened by a few of the States then. It was said that the Congress was too weak to deal with the problems facing the country. It was said that the Federal Government could not act, that it was impotent. But patriots insisted that the Nation could be strengthened only by respecting the right of the Federal Government to act, and they have been vindicated by history. Americans of that day did not weaken the Nation, they strengthened it by supporting its right to function on important problems.

The hope of the world is the United Nations, yet we are weakening the United Nations by the action we are taking here, just as some in 1789 sought to weaken the United States. We are at the same time aiding Fascist interests all over the world by the action we are taking. We do it by raising the anti-Communist cry. It is a Fascist technique. It will not succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 8. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to abolish within 90 days all hereditary offices and titles under such government; (b) to hold within 90 days free and democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive officer of such government and the membership of its legislative body and to grant prior to such election universal suffrage for all persons over the age of 21; (c) to afford to all political parties full opportunities to participate and engage in election activities prior to the holding of such elections; and (d) to grant immediate amnesty to all political opponents of the persons or parties in control of the government requesting such assistance."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in 1776 the American people demonstrated by rebellion that they had had a bellyful of monarchy. For 150 years the American people have distrusted and disliked the entire institution of monarchy. There are, Mr. Chairman, no hereditary titles in America. Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Chairman, undertook to establish the American Bill of Rights. We have free speech, free assembly, free religion, and free association. We have free elections, Mr. Chairman. We have opposition parties. We do not have concentration camps, and for anyone who might think that at some future time the American people will submit to the destruction of their democratic liberties and to the establishment of the tyranny of a few, let it be said now that their efforts will be struck down by an aroused and enraged American citizenry.

Mr. Chairman, a corrupt and venal monarchy exists in Greece. That monarchy has been fought by Greek patriots for 120 years. Those Greek patriots succeeded in driving three Greek kings from the throne to the abject exile they deserved. One Greek king was assassinated. It is indicative of the corruption and degeneracy of the Greek monarchy that the one and only Greek king who died on the throne died from the bite of his pet monkey.

Greek patriots today as in years of old are fighting for the establishment of democracy free from monarchy. They want free and democratic elections. They want full opportunity of all political parties to engage in election activities. They want universal suffrage. They want an end to political concentration camps.

Mr. Chairman, none of these things exist in Greece today. It is a nation under the iron heel of a bought and paid-for monarch, and open agent of the imperialist armies of Great Britain whose bayonets alone maintain him in power. Thousands of Greek patriots are fighting the occupation troops of Britain. Thousands of Greek patriots are dying in the concentration camps of the British monarch. The free and democratic elections which reputedly were held are known by all of us to have been a sham and a lie. Less than 15 percent of the population participated in these elections and then under conditions of terror.

Mr. Chairman, when my constituents ask me if I voted to give $300,000,000 to a dictatorial and corrupt monarch in Greece, I will be able to answer that I did not do so. When I am asked if I voted to throw American arms behind a government known to be undemocratic and maintaining concentration camps—thank God, I will be able to say I voted against it. Mr. Chairman, the insanity of the State Department is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in its utter disregard of the principles of democracy on which America has grown strong. Our State Department officials have never considered the ethical and political desirability of establishing a genuine democracy in Greece. It has never occurred to them that American citizens do not want to pour out their substance to maintain corrupt and venal governments. It apparently has never crossed the minds of the fantastic Machiavellian characters at the other end of the Avenue that we want no part—that we want no dealings with governments who in their very nature are antidemocratic.

Mr. Chairman, as for me, I pledged myself in my oath of office to uphold the principles of the American Constitution and the democratic principles for which the patriots in American history have given their wealth and their lives. I refuse to vote for a bill which violates those principles—which violates the intent and the history of American life. The House, Mr. Chairman, in the vote on this amendment has the opportunity to reaffirm the democratic heritage of the American Declaration of Independence and our Constitution given us by our forefathers. Mr. Chairman, I now present this amendment to the House and in all good faith ask that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall (a) register with the United States Treasury Department all holdings of gold

held by such government, and by the nationals of such government, both at home and abroad; (b) register with the United States Treasury Department all foreign assets, stocks, bonds, or other holdings of such government and of the nationals of such government; (c) make public the full foreign and domestic indebtedness of such government to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, since 1932 the RFC has been functioning. In every contract and in every loan made by the RFC to American businessmen there has been a clause which states that the payment of indebtedness incurred shall take precedence over any current indebtedness of the business involved. The RFC states that all other indebtedness shall be relegated to a subordinate position.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, in the financial operations of the RFC we have introduced sound banking principles, and, as all of us know, the RFC has served a highly useful and successful purpose in stabilizing the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, is there any Member of the House that can advance one good reason why this principle should not be applied to the lending of our money to foreign nations? We have applied it successfully for 15 years to the dealings of the American Government with American businessmen. Why should not this principle now be established as a legal condition for any future foreign loans extended by our Government to other nations?

How can any Member deny the validity of applying to foreign nations the same principle which we apply to our own citizens? I believe that the House will want to consider the question of this principle very seriously because France, China, Britain, Italy, Korea, the Philippines, Finland, Hungary, numerous nations in South America, including Mexico—all of these nations have in some form or another made clear their intention to request loans of the American Government. If we lend to the Greek Government without the RFC condition, are we not setting a precedent from which it will be most difficult to escape in the consideration of any future loans to be made to foreign governments?

Mr. Chairman, in the case of Greece, the RFC principle is particularly pertinent because Greece already owes roughly $500,000,000 in foreign debts—95 percent of which are payable at the Hambro Bank of London. These debts, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, have accumulated over the past 100 years as the result of the extravagances of the corrupt Greek monarchy and the machinations of the international bankers of London in the political affairs of Greece. It is a curious fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Greek monarchy, frequent Balkan wars, and repeated foreign loans from the London banks have gone hand in hand in Greek history. Will our money be used to pay the interest and principal of the Greek foreign indebtedness to the London bankers? Is that why Great Britain wants us to assume her obligations in Greece? Are we to bail out the British despite the fact that they have already collected three times the principal in interest and carrying charges of the original Greek debt? Where will the American dollars lent to Greece finally come to rest? Will they be paid out in dividends to the family of Winston Churchill through the Hambro Bank in London?

Mr. Chairman, common sense—ordinary horse sense—regular sound business banking practices persuade me that the RFC principle which regulates our dealings with our own businessmen should be a standing, standard requirement of all foreign loans made by the United States Government. Now let us establish this principle in the case of Greece. There has already been too much scandal attached to international finance in this country for the Congress of the United States to assume the obligations of the debts of a corrupt and venal monarchy without any attached conditions and with no controls established. There is no reason under God's sun for the Congress of the United States to sign a blank check for President Truman so that he can send it to Athens and have the Greek King fill in the amount—particularly when the Greek King is told what amount to fill in by the Hambro Bank in London. The 58,000,000 Americans who worked for wages and salaries and who earn their living in the sweat of their brow will never be able to understand the thinking of a Congress which refuses to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in all good conscience and good faith, I urge the House to adopt the amendment which I now introduce.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and the nationals of foreign governments."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, that great and august body, the Senate of the United States, without dissent and without any question of its propriety and without any question of its relevancy, adopted the amendment which I have just read.

Mr. Chairman, as I believe all of us know, one-half to three-fourths of all the oil reserves of the world are today believed to be in the Near and Middle East. Those oil reserves are under concession to the great oil companies of America and England, and even while we deliberate here in the Congress secret negotiations are under way in London over the method and manner of exploiting these oil reserves.

Mr. Chairman, pending before the Senate of the United States Foreign Relations Committee is an international oil agreement. Pending before the Brewster committee is a scandal involving purchases by the United States Navy Department of oil from American companies in the Near and Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has stated that the present Greek-Turkish military alliance bill smells of petroleum. Other competent investigators have suggested that this bill is nothing but a $400,000,000 subsidy to the American and British oil industries. Mr. Chairman, whatever the truth may be in regard to these allegations, it is clear that the private oil companies of America have no right to bind the Government of the United States by their private agreements. Mr. Chairman, frequently in American history dollar diplomacy has been denounced. It has also been said, Mr. Chairman, that American guns will follow American dollars. It is interesting that one-fourth to one-third of our entire investment abroad is in the oil industry. This simple fact raises the question of what importance the oil industry has in the formulation and development of American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, the American people do not want war. The American people want peace. For my part, I would not shed one drop of blood of a single Ohio boy for all the oil of the Middle East. Let us make clear, Mr. Chairman, that this bill before us is not an international charter for unlimited oil imperialism. Let us make clear that the private international cartel agreements now being negotiated in London cannot be considered in any way binding upon the United States Government. Let us separate the questions of oil and our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there will be opposition to this amendment. In all good conscience and good faith, I now introduce this amendment into the House and ask for its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, that motion has already been made and was voted down once.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been several amendments adopted on the bill, it has been changed since that motion was previously acted on. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, debate is limited on the bill by action of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has offered a preferential motion which is in order in spite of the agreement on closing debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, pursuant to House Resolution 205, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and wa read the third time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the committee on the minority side who is opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit?

Is the gentleman from California opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"SECTION 1. It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States, through the appropriate representative of the United States, shall initiate in the Security Council of the United Nations and in other appropriate bodies of the United Nations proposals designed to insure the security and national integrity of Greece and Turkey, and to resolve any related problems in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum not exceeding $100,000,000 for the purpose of relief and rehabilitation of the Greek economy. The President may expend funds appropriated pursuant to this provision through existing agencies of the Federal Government and through transfer of such amounts as he deems appropriate to the Government of Greece and the Secretary General of the United Nations for expenditure by them. Such funds shall be expended for the purchase and other provision of supplies for the civilian economy of Greece, including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services, but no part of such money shall be used for the provision of military supplies or services."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 107, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—287

Abernethy	Donohue	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Dorn	Jones, Wash.
Allen, Calif.	Drewry	Jonkman
Allen, La.	Durham	Judd
Almond	Eaton	Karsten, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Kearney
	Elliott	Kearns
Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	Keating
Andresen, August H.	Elston	Kee
	Engel, Mich.	Keefe
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kefauver
Andrews, N. Y.	Evins	Kelley
Arends	Fallon	Kennedy
Auchincloss	Feighan	Keogh
Bakewell	Fellows	Kerr
Barden	Fernandez	Kersten, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Kilburn
Bates, Mass.	Fletcher	Kilday
Battle	Fogarty	King
Beall	Foote	Kirwan
Beckworth	Forand	Lane
Bell	Fulton	Lanham
Blackney	Gamble	Larcade
Bloom	Gary	Latham
Boggs, La.	Gathings	Lea
Bolton	Gearhart	LeCompte
Boykin	Goff	LeFevre
Bradley, Calif.	Goodwin	Lesinski
Bramblett	Gordon	Lewis
Brooks	Gore	Lodge
Brophy	Gorski	Love
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	Lucas
Bryson	Grant, Ala.	Lusk
Buchanan	Griffiths	Lyle
Buck	Gross	Lynch
Buckley	Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Hagen	McCormack
Burke	Hale	McDonough
Burleson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillan, S. C.
		McMillen, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	MacKinnon
Byrnes, Wis.		Macy
Camp	Halleck	Madden
Canfield	Hardy	Mahon
Cannon	Harless, Ariz.	Manasco
Carroll	Harris	Mansfield, Mont.
Carson	Harrison	
Case, N. J.	Hart	Meade, Md.
Case, S. Dak.	Hartley	Merrow
Chadwick	Havenner	Michener
Chelf	Hays	Miller, Calif.
Clason	Hébert	Miller, Md.
Coffin	Hedrick	Mills
Cole, Kans.	Heffernan	Monroney
Cole, N. Y.	Hendricks	Morgan
Colmer	Herter	Morrison
Combs	Heselton	Morton
Cooley	Hess	Muhlenberg
Cooper	Hill	Mundt
Corbett	Hinshaw	Murdock
Cotton	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Coudert	Hoeven	Nixon
Courtney	Holmes	Nodar
Cox	Hope	Norblad
Cravens	Horan	Norrell
Crosser	Howell	Norton
Cunningham	Huber	O'Brien
D'Alesandro	Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole
Davis, Ga.	Jackson, Wash.	Passman
Davis, Wis.	Jarman	Patman
Dawson, Utah	Javits	Patterson
Deane	Jenkins, Pa.	Peden
Delaney	Jennings	Peterson
Devitt	Johnson, Okla.	Philbin
Dingell	Johnson, Tex.	Pickett
Domengeaux	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Poage	Sadlak	Tibbott
Potts	Sasscer	Tollefson
Poulson	Scott, Hardie	Towe
Price, Fla.	Seely-Brown	Trimble
Price, Ill.	Sheppard	Vorys
Priest	Sikes	Wadsworth
Rabin	Simpson, Pa.	Walter
Rains	Smathers	Welch
Rankin	Smith, Kans.	West
Rayburn	Smith, Maine	Wheeler
Rayfiel	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Redden	Snyder	Whittington
Reeves	Somers	Wigglesworth
Richards	Spence	Williams
Riehlman	Stevenson	Wilson, Tex.
Riley	Stigler	Winstead
Rivers	Sundstrom	Wolcott
Robertson	Taber	Wood
Rogers, Mass.	Talle	Worley
Rohrbough	Teague	Zimmerman
Rooney	Thomas, Tex.	
Ross	Thomason	

NAYS—107

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Phillips, Calif.
Arnold	Gillie	Phillips, Tenn.
Banta	Graham	Powell
Barrett	Granger	Ramey
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Gwynne, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.	Hoffman	Rees
Bishop	Holifield	Rich
Blatnik	Hull	Rizley
Boggs, Del.	Jenison	Robsion
Bradley, Mich.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rockwell
Brehm	Jensen	Russell
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath
Buffett	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Busbey	Jones, Ohio	Sanborn
Butler	Kean	Sarbacher
Celler	Klein	Schwabe, Mo.
Chenoweth	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Chiperfield	Kunkel	Scoblick
Church	Landis	Scrivner
Clevenger	Lemke	Shafer
Clippinger	McCowen	Short
Cole, Mo.	McGarvey	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	McGregor	Smith, Ohio
Crow	McMahon	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Maloney	Springer
Dague	Marcantonio	Stanley
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Dolliver	Mason	Stockman
Dondero	Mathews	Stratton
Doughton	Meyer	Twyman
Douglas	Miller, Conn.	Vail
Ellis	Morris	Van Zandt
Fenton	Murray, Wis.	Weichel
Gallagher	O'Konski	Woodruff
Gavin	Pfeifer	Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Folger

NOT VOTING—35

Angell	Gregory	Ploeser
Bland	Hand	Preston
Bonner	Harness, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	St. George
Clements	McDowell	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Tenn.	Mansfield, Tex.	
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Ky.	Taylor
Dirksen	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Vinson
Fisher	O'Hara	Vursell
Fuller	Owens	Wilson, Ind.
Gifford	Pace	Wolverton

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Miller of Nebraska against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Owens against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Vursell against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Folger against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mrs. St. George against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Preston.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. Angell with Mr. Gregory.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Clements.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BONNER. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, it is now in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in the bill H. R. 2616.

The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 938 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in the bill H. R. 2616.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings under which the bill H. R. 2616 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the House the program for next week.

Monday will be District Day. The Consent Calendar will also be called on Monday.

On Tuesday we will begin debate on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. I do not know just how much time will be devoted to the debate. That is to be determined, of course, when the bill is taken up, but it will very likely continue through Tuesday.

On Wednesday we will continue with the consideration of the appropriation bill, and also on Thursday if it is not completed before that time.

The following bills, if they are not disposed of earlier in the week, will be called on Friday and Saturday:

S. 814, a bill to provide support for wool.

There has been a bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture. No rule has been granted. Of course the action on that measure would depend upon the action of the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 2780, which has to do with the completion of veterans temporary reuse housing program.

House Resolution 176, an investigating authority for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and similar resolutions, House Resolution 93 and House Resolution 141, for the Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Armed Services.

Then House Resolution 153, a continuation of an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter dated April 22, addressed to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Austin, our representative with the United Nations, signed by 30 Members of the House making certain inquiry with respect to the attitude of the United States representatives on the Palestine question, together with a copy of the reply sent to these Members by the Secretary of State as well as a list of the signers of the letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in today's Star entitled "Arms, Not a Loan, What the Turks Want."

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain excerpts and quotations.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article in the New York Times by Hanson W. Baldwin.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement by David Wills.

FREE COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION CONFERENCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, has the gentleman from California taken this up with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have. I have taken it up with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is present. It is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prohibit United States communication common carriers from rendering free communication services to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUST FUNDS HELD IN JOINT OWNERSHIP BY SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1098) entitled "An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation," with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "to a trust fund" and insert "in the principal."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "for" and insert "to a principal trust fund account and one-half of the total amount in the interest account to an interest trust fund account for."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Comptroller of the United States."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "to" where it occurs the second time and insert "the Secretary of the Treasury shall."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "earned" and insert "shall accrue on the principal fund only."

Page 2, line 11, after "annum", insert "and."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "principal" and insert "interest."

Page 2, line 15, after "the", insert "principal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gen-

tleman taken this up with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. BARRETT. I have consulted with the minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and with the ranking member on the minority side on the committee, as well as the majority leader and chairman of the committee, and it is agreeable to all of them that this action be taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARBLEHEAD MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 450), an act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "directed", insert ", upon payment to the United States of the sum of $5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by a distinguished special writer of the Boston Post, Mr. Robert L. Norton, on March 16, the title being "Mr. Truman and the United Nations."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted on next Monday and Tuesday for Members of the House who are members of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, which was put off yesterday and today because of duties on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAND, for 5 days, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), adjourned until Monday, May 12, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

665. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

666. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, of amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

667. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 for the Civil Service Commission in the amount of $16,160,000, and for the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the amount of $8,740,000, in all $24,900,000 (H. Doc. No. 242); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

668. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $12,115,000, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $15,285,000, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 243); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

669. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 1, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 5, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

670. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Henderson River, Ill., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2746. A bill to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges; with amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 565. An act to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins; without amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins; without amendment (Rept. No. 343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 969. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pensions payable to Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents; with amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1054. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); without amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3391. A bill to provide for the sale by the Federal Works Administrator of the property situated in Washington, D. C., known as the Capitol Park Hotel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3392. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATNIK:

H. R. 3393. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to

acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3395. A bill to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3396. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the destruction of the battleship U. S. S. *Maine* on February 15, 1898; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3397. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the destruction of the battleship U. S. S. *Maine*; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3398. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3399. A bill to provide office space at first-class post offices for certain Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3400. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the Postal Service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3401. A bill to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3402. A bill to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. R. 3403. A bill to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unlading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside of regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3404. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3405. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PACE:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution relating to peanut marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution declaring that the state of war between the United States and the Government of Italy has ended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the right of naturalization to all persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Herrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Kiichi Yajima (formerly Kiichi Matsumoto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 3408. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph L. Rolewicz against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3409. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Mark D. Williams, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3410. A bill for the relief of James Lekos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Polvere, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3412. A bill for the relief of the estate of Howard Cletus Malkmus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

476. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of T. C. Thompson, general chairman, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, and 20 transportation employees of Rapid City, Lead, and Deadwood, S. Dak., covered by the Railroad Retirement Act, expressing opposition to any changes in or repeal of the so-called Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

477. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 180 residents of Colville, Wash., urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

478. By Mr. KELLEY: Petitions from residents of Westmoreland County, Pa., urging the $5,000,000 appropriation for the next fiscal year to permit continuance of the construction of the Conemaugh Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

479. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., urging the enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

480. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Lee Dix and 25 other residents of Linn County, Iowa, urging the enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

481. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of El Paso Voiture, No. 605, 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, that time limit under Public, 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, be extended so that qualified servicemen who become veterans subsequent to June 30, 1947, may receive the benefits of this act providing automobiles for certain amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

482. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tyrone, Pa., urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

483. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Los Angeles Irish Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to furtherance of the principles of self-government and self-determination, consistent with the welfare of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

484. Also, petition of members of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the Third Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

486. Also, petition of membership of the Crescent City Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

487. Also, petition of members of the Jacksonville Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this, the day that the Lord hath made, help us, O God, to appreciate its beauty and to use aright its opportunities.

Deliver us, we pray Thee, from the tyranny of trifles. May me give our best thought and attention to what is important, that we may accomplish something worth while. Teach us how to listen to the prompting of Thy spirit, and thus save us from floundering in indecision that wastes time, subtracts from our peace, divides our efficiency, and multiplies our troubles.

In the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the World Telecommunications Conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 450) providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to sit during the session today and the remainder of the week.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is conducting hearings today on Senate bill 265, introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce, either by public or private carrier, and including the Post Office Department, of alcoholic-liquor advertising. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to continue in session this afternoon. There are 50 to 75 people from out of town who are here to testify, whom we desire to accommodate as far as we can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee is authorized to sit this afternoon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ecton	Lodge
Baldwin	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Barkley	Flanders	McCarthy
Brewster	Fulbright	McClellan
Bricker	George	McFarland
Bridges	Green	McGrath
Brooks	Gurney	McKellar
Buck	Hatch	McMahon
Bushfield	Hawkes	Magnuson
Butler	Hayden	Malone
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Martin
Cain	Hill	Maybank
Capehart	Hoey	Millikin
Capper	Holland	Moore
Chavez	Ives	Myers
Connally	Jenner	O'Conor
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kem	Overton
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Dworshak	Knowland	Reed
Eastland	Langer	Revercomb
Robertson, Va.	Taylor	Wagner
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith	Thye	Wiley
Sparkman	Tydings	Williams
Stewart	Umstead	Wilson
Taft	Vandenberg	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States' share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Resolution 79

"Resolution relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments

"Whereas the problem of the acquisition and ownership of Federal lands in the several States is causing considerable concern because of the reduced evaluation base upon which local property taxes can be levied; and

"Whereas such lands are and have been acquired for game reserves, forest reserves, public parks, public monuments, mineral reserves, Federal building for governmental purposes, expanding military facilities, property acquired and used in a proprietary sense, and land remaining in public domain; and

"Whereas the accumulation of land for governmental purposes in the heart of metropolitan areas of large cities has substantially

reduced the tax base used in the determination of the ad valorem tax; and

"Whereas the accumulation of land for these several purposes has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all the lands in California; and

"Whereas such accumulation has extended to 50 percent of all the lands in 17 counties of said State; and

"Whereas in all the 11 Western States, 47 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such large accumulation of land by the Federal Government in California and the other 10 Western States has been destructive to the fiscal structure of local government; and

"Whereas the withdrawal of such large amounts of land from taxation has left local government without adequate revenue for its support; and

"Whereas this loss of revenue cannot be supplanted by other sources; and

"Whereas it is necessary for local government to provide protection of life and property, the maintenance and construction of streets, roads, and highways, and other local facilities to service the properties acquired by the Federal Government and the people living thereon: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, as follows:

"(1) That the Federal Government assume its financial responsibilities in relation to local governmental jurisdictions where such property is located; that Congress immediately enact legislation to this end;

"(2) That said legislation provide that local government be reimbursed in amount equivalent to taxes lost by virtue of such acquisitions by the Federal Government; or that such property as is owned by the Federal Government be permitted to be taxed locally in the same manner and to the same extent as other local property;

"(3) That property now held by the Federal Government which is not clearly necessary for a public purpose be disposed of in order that it may be returned to the local tax rolls for the purpose of local taxation and support of local government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 27

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has protected and defended American interests in all parts of the globe ever since its inception; and

"Whereas in every military venture which the United States has undertaken the achievements of the Marine Corps have always typified the ultimate in heroism and self-sacrifice; and

"Whereas it would be a shocking travesty for the people of the United States to sound the death knell of an institution which has served them so nobly; and

"Whereas legislation pending before the Congress of the United States, if enacted as presently constituted, would bring to an end the existence of the Marine Corps as an independent unit: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we urge the Congress of the United States not to approve any legislation unifying or merging the armed forces unless there is contained therein assurance that the Marine Corps will be retained in its present form; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, April 29, 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States to persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in World War II and who themselves have not been disloyal to the United States of America

"Whereas the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, by Senate Joint Resolution 2 duly enacted into law, memorialized the Congress of the United States of America to extend the right to become naturalized citizens of the United States to all those persons whose sons and daughters served honorably in the late World War and who have not themselves been disloyal to the United States and who, except for race and nationality, complied with the naturalization laws; and

"Whereas the injustice of denying to such persons the privilege of citizenship, which they have earned by the devotion which they and their children have displayed for the United States, becomes constantly more apparent: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, earnestly and respectfully requested to extend the right of naturalization to all persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces, merchant marine, the Army Transport Service, and other like services of the United States of America and who themselves have not been disloyal to the United States and who, except for race and nationality, comply with the naturalization laws.

"SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Approved this 2d day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by reducing the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year

"Whereas the Hawaiian Organic Act provides that no divorce shall be granted by the courts of the Territory unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 2 years next preceding the application; and

"Whereas by said Hawaiian Organic Act all citizens of the United States who reside in the Territory for 1 year are declared to be citizens of the Territory; and

"Whereas the restrictions in granting of divorces thereby deprives persons otherwise bona fide citizens of the Territory from the operation of the divorce laws of the Territory; and

"Whereas it is desired that all citizens of the Territory may have full access to the relief granted by the laws of the Territory in matters relating to domestic relations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to amend section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act by reducing the residence qualifications in divorce proceedings from 2 years next preceding the application for divorce to 1 year next preceding the application for divorce; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States of America."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Society of St. Ann, Branch 37, of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, New York City, N. Y., relating to the political status of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Post No. 24, the American Legion, of Columbus, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation to give veterans of World War I the same benefits, pensions, and relief as the Spanish-American War veterans are now receiving; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Veterans' Action Committee, of Denison, Tex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 595) to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A petition signed by 23 citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 51 citizens of Wellington, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by 250 citizens of Blacksburg, Va., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I request that the petition be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ECONOMY VERSUS WESTERN DEVELOPMENT—LETTER FROM MONROE SWEETLAND

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post of Friday, May 2, 1947, from Monroe Sweetland, editor of the Molalla Pioneer, Molalla, Oreg.,

and request that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY VERSUS WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

This letter is an appeal across the country, in the hope that even yet something may be done to salvage a little from the wreckage committed last week by the eastern Republicans. As it looks from here our Columbia River Development in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho has been set back a decade.

The Northwest cannot adequately defend itself politically, since our congressional and electoral college strength is small. Apparently GOP Chairman Reece and his man, Congressman TABER, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, have cold bloodedly decided to sacrifice the Northwest to show something for their campaign pledges to eastern finance and capital that there would be tax cuts. The letter is an appeal, over their heads, to the fair-minded people of all regions who place national interest above sectional or corporate interests.

These projects are not tax burdens. All of them are self-liquidating, and greatly increase the total national wealth by developing our unused land and waterpower and natural resources. Bonneville Dam, whose budget was cut 47 percent and whose growing usefulness was halted where it is, is repaying the Federal Treasury well ahead of schedule. If this is Republican economics, its folly will lose that party the Northwest region again in 1948, as in the last four Presidential elections, in spite of basic Republican majorities at least in Idaho and Oregon.

For months threats and indecent proposals of compromise have alternately been made to the Northwest. Most specific of these, which Secretary Krug properly rejected, was that Bonneville power rates (the lowest in the Nation) be doubled, so that eastern industry could compete with its expensive Diesel plants. This public-be-damned proposal, put forth by GOP Congressmen JONES and JENSEN on behalf of eastern industry, reflects the hostility of some elements to the rapid industrialization of this area.

And when we protested through Senator MORSE and others Chairman TABER, speaking for the Republican majority, dismissed our pleas as (according to an April 22 Associated Press dispatch widely published here) "the squeal of a stuck pig."

Already we are drawing up our battlelines to do the best we can with our limited regional strength. Through Americans for Democratic Action, and our regional Grange Farmers Union, and labor groups, we will try to see to it that Senators MORSE, TAYLOR, and MAGNUSON have solid congressional support next time. But our ultimate appeal has to be to fair-minded people everywhere who view this as a national, not a sectional, problem—and with them we rest our case.

From the earliest days, when Thomas Jefferson was opposed in his request for funds for the Lewis and Clark expedition which made this region part of the United States, every step in its development has been aided by forward-looking Americans from all sections. To them we appeal for help again now, knowing that they will see in our case more than, as Chairman TABER put it, "the squeal of a stuck pig."

MONROE SWEETLAND,
Editor, Molalla Pioneer.

MOLALLA, OREG.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1081. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 161).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1154. A bill to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 162).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1073. A bill to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; without amendment (Rept. No. 163).

FEDERAL COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 450) to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 164) thereon. The accompanying report pertains to the amendments made by the committee. I request that the bill as amended by the committee, and the report, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the report and bill will be printed as requested by the Senator from Washington, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1265. A bill to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act; and

S. 1266. A bill to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1267. A bill for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1268. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1269. A bill to subject Indians of the State of California to the laws of that State; and

S. 1270. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain funds of the Indians of California held in trust by agencies of the Department of the Interior or in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.)

PROPOSED CALIFORNIA INDIAN PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, two bills relating to Indians of the State of California. I request that a statement in connection with the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

S. 1269. A bill to subject Indians of the State of California to the laws of that State; and

S. 1270. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain funds of the Indians of California held in trust by agencies of the Department of the Interior or in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFACE TO STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Public Lands: we have been officially advised that the Indian Bureau has been for some time negotiating with the Governor and members of the State Legislature of California to the end that the Indians of California may be transferred from Federal to State supervision, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, to joint supervision to be provided by a specially created board of managers, the cost of such board to be paid for jointly by the Federal Government, the State of California, and the Indians of California out of their $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to their credit. We understand that at least two officials of the Indian Bureau are now in California for that purpose.

We are confident that our Indian people are definitely and unalterably opposed to the creation of a new Indian Bureau. For many years our people have asked that they be freed from Indian Bureau supervision and that they be accorded full citizenship, including the right to manage their own property now held in trust by the Indian Bureau. Our people are qualified to manage their own affairs without cost to the Federal Government.

The Indians of California desire to be accorded the same rights and privileges as other citizens. They desire to be freed from Federal supervision by the earliest date possible. We feel that unless a definite program is adopted by Congress, with the aid of the Indians of California, the unnecessary cost of their supervision will continue as heretofore, years without end. We are relying on you, as Members of Congress, for remedial legislation. There is no other tribunal from which the relief we need can be secured. We need, among other things, legislation that will permit our people, by the process of delegates in convention, to reach conclusions whereby our people will be vocal, and recognized by Congress, as to their recommendations. A bill for that purpose, S. 1102, is now pending before the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

For several weeks, beginning January of this year eight Indian delegates representing Indians of California conferred in Washington with each other and with officials who

could furnish them with information. They had before them the recommendations of Mr. Zimmerman, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which he presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee on February 8, 1947. A copy of his recommendations and tabulation of amounts now being expended by the Indian Bureau through its agencies in California—a total of more than $1,000,000 annually—is attached to the statement handed to you, entitled "Statement of Delegates, Alternates, and Special Delegates Representing Indians of California."

In order for you to get the picture clearly before you, I shall first read the statement of Mr. Zimmerman, followed by the statement of the delegates.

PROPOSED CALIFORNIA INDIAN PROGRAM

Objective: Orderly withdrawal of Federal service and supervision over the affairs of California Indians.

Joint Indian Welfare Board: Obtain congressional and California State legislative authority for the establishment of a joint State-Federal Indian Welfare Board of five members, two Indians appointed by the governor from a list recommended by the organized California Indians, two State officials, one Federal representative appointed by Secretary of the Interior.

Transfer to this board the following:

Any service, guidance, and supervisory functions deemed essential for Indian welfare and the proper use and protection of Indian property during the existence of the board.

The administration and disposition of the California Indian judgment fund of more than $5,000,000 and of any other compensation which may accrue to the Indians of California.

Finance the operation of the board by Federal and State contributions and from available judgment funds.

Law enforcement: Transfer to State and counties.

Trust lands: Retain title of present Indian lands in the United States in trust for a definite period.

Approve fee patents to public domain allotments and homesteads upon application by the owners and recommendation by the board.

Require from fee patent applicants a waiver of right to any special Federal Indian gratuity services for himself and family.

Tribal lands and allotments: Authorize the organization of Indian cooperative associations and/or corporations under State or Federal law to manage tribal lands and personal property under proper safeguards with the consent of a majority of the adult members of the group and the approval of the articles and bylaws by the joint board. Organized groups may, upon application by the allottees, undertake management of individual allotments. Applications for removal of restrictions or fee patents for allotments must have approval of the joint board. Organized tribes and groups may make contributions to counties and school districts in lieu of taxes while land remains in trust.

Potential reductions: Reduction in Federal personnel and expenditures will depend upon two factors: The availability of a substantial part of the $5,000,000 judgment fund for use through the proposed board for constructive purposes and administrative costs; the willingness of the State to contribute personnel and funds; the rate of fee patent applications for public domain and other allotments. If the State of California will participate and the Indians of California will approve an act of Congress for the cash distribution of one-half of the judgment fund and authorizing the use of the remaining part of the fund for defraying the cost in whole or in part, of the management of the fund, it should be possible substantially to reduce Federal Indian expenditures in California within 2 years after the enactment of the legislation and the establishment of the board. Within 10 years after the establishment of the board, the State assuming the financial responsibility, Federal expenditures could probably be cut to 25 percent of the 1947 level, and within 25 or 30 years they could cease entirely.

Sherman Institute: The cost of operating the Sherman Institute at Riverside, Calif., is considered separately. That expense may be eliminated entirely at any time if Congress so ordains.

1947 Federal expenditures: The Federal expenditures in California during the present fiscal year are as follows:

(1) Reservation administration, including construction and maintenance of buildings and utilities	$153,170
(2) Education, including State contractual subsidy	181,729
(3) Health service, including cost of State medical contract	239,037
(4) Welfare and relief	23,533
(5) Forestry protection	31,393
(6) Agricultural extension and credit	20,841
(7) Irrigation, M & O	37,241
(8) Roads	110,000
Subtotal	839,344
(9) Sherman Institute	253,324
(10) Allotted to Yuma from Colorado River (Ariz.) Agency (estimated)	30,000
Total expenditure in California	1,122,668

The personnel at the agencies consists of 104 full-time classified employees and of 73 unclassified employees, principally Indian aides and part-time employees.

Th California Indian roll lists some 23,000 names. The total Indian holdings of trust land in California are 605,000 acres, of which 415,000 acres are in tribal status and 190,000 acres are in individual allotments and homesteads. Most of the Indian land is in the mountains and deserts.

STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Indians of California should be freed from all supervision by the Federal Government and the Government should be freed from its total cost of such supervision. The Indians should be treated the same as other citizens of the State. As far back as 1916, in a test case (Anderson (an Indian) against Shafter Mathews, county clerk of Lake County), the Supreme Court of California found and declared that the Indian is a born citizen, entitled to all the privileges and amenable to the same laws as other residents and citizens, including the right to register and vote (174 Cal. 537).

The Indians are required to pay for hunting and fishing licenses the same as other persons within the confines of the State, when hunting or fishing off the reservation. The majority of the Indians do not have any connection with any reservation, and are therefore required to secure licenses. They are assessed taxes in all cases, the same as other persons residing in California, including automobile and gasoline taxes, sales, property, and school taxes. Under the laws and the Consitution of California, the Indians are entitled:

(1) To vote.

(2) To attend public schools. (Whether the Indian has taxable property or not, he is not required to pay any tuition, and his school books are furnished free. In 1929, the Supreme Court of California declared unconstitutional, null, and void, the act of the State legislature intended to bar Indian children from attending public schools if the Indian resided within 3 miles of a Government school) (193 Cal. 664).

(3) To receive old-age pensions when they are 65 years of age, or over.

(4) To receive monthly allowances for the care of orphan and half-orphan children.

(5) To receive monthly and temporary allowances when blind or in indigent circumstances, also to be admitted to county hospitals and alms houses, under the same circumstances as any other resident of the county; also free care in State institutions.

(6) To social-security benefits when unemployed.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Indians of California are treated by the Indian Bureau as wards of the Federal Government, which involves many thousands of dollars each year for the maintenance of Indian agencies. According to Mr. Zimmerman's report to the Senate Civil Service Committee recently, the Interior Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1947, appropriated for California a total of $1,122,668. We believe this total is in error.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

We recommend:

A. That item 9, page 3, of Mr. Zimmerman's advice to your committee, entitled "Proposed California Indian program," regarding cost of maintaining and operating "Sherman Institute" at Riverside, Calif., *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government an annual cost of $253,324

B. That item 2, page 3, of Mr. Zimmerman's proposed California Indian program, "Education, including State contractual subsidy," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually the sum of 181,729

C. That item 3 of Mr. Zimmerman's proposal, page 3, "Health services, including cost of State medical contract," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually the sum of ... 239,037

D. That item 4, page 3, "Welfare and relief," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government an annual cost of 23,533

E. That item 5, page 3, relating to "Forestry protection"; item 6, relating to "Agricultural expenses and credit"; and item 7, relating to "Irrigation, M & O," and item 8, "Roads," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, or transferred to the appropriate department of the State or Federal Government having facilities and appropriations to absorb these activities, thereby saving the Federal Government for these four items an annual total of 199,475

F. That item 1, "Reservation administration, including construction and maintenance of buildings and utilities," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually a total of (or as much of that sum as may not be needed for an orderly liquidation and a readjustment that may be found to be advisable) 153,170

Grand total 1,050,268

We are not sufficiently familiar with item 10, relating to the amount, "Allotted to Yuma

from Colorado River, Arizona, Agency (estimated), $30,000," to make any recommendations.

Undoubtedly a large number of the "104 full-time classified employees" and "73 unclassified employees" can be reduced as to their numbers.

While it is a fact that as of May 18, 1928, there were in round numbers 23,000 Indians of California enrolled as such, according to the Census Bureau's vital statistics figures this number has been reduced by deaths to approximately 17,000. The children born since May 18, 1928, are not classified by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as Indians of California, due to the fact that they have not been identified as qualified enrollees.

We also recommend:

G. That in fairness to the State of California (in view of the fact that a total of "605,000 acres, of which 415,000 acres are in tribal status and 190,000 acres are in individual allotments and homesteads" and "most of the Indian land is in the mountains and deserts" and are therefore held in trust by the Government and are exempt from taxation) Congress authorizes the payment to the State of California an amount equal to the tax levied by the State of California on similar properties.

A large portion of the Indians of California do not reside on restricted land. Many of them have acquired land and homes of their own. They are enterprising and self-respecting citizens.

H. The Court of Claims records show that more than 611,000 acres of restricted lands have been charged against Indians of California at $1.25 per acre, as an offset in their judgment which resulted in a net recovery of $5,000,000. The Indians have therefore paid for such lands. No title of any kind or description has been accorded to the Indians for these lands for which they have paid. The Indians should be given titles to these lands, thereby freeing the Government of further personnel and cost of supervision.

I. That (1) allotments and tribal lands held in trust, retain their present status until the trust period has expired, or until Congress has otherwise directed: Provided, That the allottee may make application to the Secretary of the Interior for fee patent at any time, and that such application, if not granted, may be presented to the appropriate committee of Congress for such action as it deems appropriate, and that the Indians concerned shall be fully advised as to any and all actions contemplated; and (2) that fee patents to public-domain allotments and homesteads be approved upon application by the owners.

J. That Indians concerned with tribal property be authorized by Congress to submit, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the committees of Congress concerned with Indian affairs, recommendations as to the use and final disposition of tribal property.

K. That the rancheria lands, now held in common for Indians of California in trust by the Federal Government, be subdivided and assigned as equitably as possible to individual Indians, and that immediately, or as soon as Congress may deem proper, the Indians concerned be given a fee patent to their individual holdings. The present uncertain tenure of holding of lands does not create initiative or encourage the development of the lands and improvements thereon.

L. That no waiver would be necessary by an Indian who was freed from Bureau control in the State of California to the effect that he would not assert a "right to any special Federal Indian gratuity services for himself and family." No other citizen or alien who acquires citizenship is called on to make any such waiver.

M. That the roll of Indians of California be revised to remove from it all persons who have died since May 18, 1928, and by adding to that roll all Indian children and their descendants, now living, born since May 18, 1928, and by adding the names of such persons who can establish that they are descendants of Indians residing in California on June 1, 1852, and their descendants now living. There were a few Indians who happened to be living in adjacent States on May 18, 1928, but, although they could establish themselves as being Indians of California, were deprived of enrollment at that time because they were not living "in said State." Therefore, they are not classified as beneficiaries in common with other Indians of California.

N. That $4,000,000, and accumulated interest on the net judgment of $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, be paid (to all who are now or may hereafter be enrolled) on a per capita basis, and that $1,000,000 be retained in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California as a reserve fund, subject to the wishes of the Indians of California and subsequent authority by Congress.

O. That law enforcement be transferred to the State and counties of California, thereby relieving the Federal Government of any cost or responsibility for that purpose. Federal policing of reservations would not then be necesssary.

P. That a Joint Indian Welfare Board is not necessary or advisable. The Indians of California should be treated in the same manner and not different from any other citizens or residents of the State of California.

Q. That Congress establish a committee of five members to be selected from the Indian Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to work out the details of the complete surrender of the Federal Government over the affairs of the Indians of California.

R. That the individual Indians of California concerned be given a full and complete accounting of their individual, tribal, and community funds now being held by the Department of the Interior or any of its agencies, and the source of such funds, giving name and last-known address of each such person, and the names and locations of the depositaries of such funds, and that such report be filed with the Civil Service and Public Lands Committees of the United States Senate.

S. That the dual system maintained by the State and Federal Governments be discontinued. The present system makes the Indian a shuttlecock between the two Governments, resulting in grave perplexity as to where the Indian should look for relief accorded to other citizens and residents in similar circumstances.

INQUIRY

We would like to know if the Indian Bureau, under the provisions of the Interior Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1947, is authorized to use as much as $50,000 of money now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, and can a portion of that sum be used to pay the expenses of the undersigned delegates, alternates, and special delegates representing the Indians of California, from their respective homes to Washington, D. C., and return, including a per diem comparable to that allowed delegations of Indians from other States. The provision referred to is found on page 12, Public Law 478, Seventy-ninth Congress, and reads as follows:

"MISCELLANEOUS INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

"Administration of Indian tribal affairs (tribal funds): For expenses of administering the affairs and property of Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses, $278,170, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the particular tribe benefited; not to exceed $50,000 for any one tribe."

Sincerely yours,

Delegates, Alternates, and Special Delegates Representing Indians of California: Clyde F. Thompson, chairman; Herbert A. Bellas; Manuel C. Cordova; Alfred C. Gillis; Mrs. Frankie Moorhead; Dewey Conway; Hathaway L. Stevens; Adam Castillo, President, Mission Indian Federation of California.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

There are many instances in California where Indians have acquired trust patents under authority of Congress to lands occupied by them. The trust provides that the lands shall be held for the allottees and delivered to them or their heirs at the expiration of the trust period, free of all encumbrances.

Through executive orders of the President and special acts of Congress some of the Indians have acquired vested rights in certain other lands in California. By agreement Congress has created in the Indians concerned a vested right. The courts have repeatedly held that—

"Wherever the rights are vested, it is the duty of the courts to protect such rights against the executive officers of the Government, even to the head of the Department, the Secretary of the Interior, for he, like all others, is subject to congressional legislation."

The courts have also held repeatedly that a vested right is a sacred right and should be protected. A selection made at a time when the rights exist to do so, creates an interest or right so vested that it descends to the heirs and fixes the right of property. We therefore doubt that there exists any right for the transfer of the trust holdings of Indians of California from the Federal Government to the State. Furthermore, the Indians do not want to be so transferred. They have sought for years and earnestly plead now that they be accorded their full rights, and freed from all governmental supervision, Federal or State, that in any way treats them apart from or in a different way from other citizens.

Former United States Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who acquired a thorough knowledge of the Indians of California by his many visits to all parts of the State as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, on April 30, 1934, said to his committee colleagues:

"There is not any more reason why those Indians out there (in California) should not handle their own affairs than any white man. Hardly any of them are more than quarter-breeds, and most of them are eighths. They are white people. And this Government of the United States is handling their affairs. In my judgment, those Indians ought to have that land allotted to them. They ought to run their own affairs. They ought to come under the laws of the State of California, and the guardianship over those Indians ought to cease completely." (Senate hearings on Wheeler-Howard bill, p. 151.)

The Indians of California do not owe the Government of the United States anything for services heretofore rendered to them.

The Indians of California have the distinction of having repaid the United States Government all it claimed to have expended for their benefit through the years from 1850 to 1944—a total of more than $12,000,000.

Furthermore, although they have been allowed a settlement for the claims of only from one-third to one-half of the Indians of California (as shown by the records of the Court of Claims), the Indians of California have repaid the Government the total

amount claimed to have been expended by it for *all* of the Indians of California. It is our contention that this was not an equitable settlement.

Now the Indians of California ask for their freedom from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They desire to control their own money and property.

The Indian Bureau's answer to us and to our people is a proposal, now being negotiated with the Governor and other officials of the State of California, whereby the more than $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California may be controlled by a new board or Indian bureau. Is that the kind of a real estate deal our people merit? We want our freedom. We want to be treated as other citizens. We appeal to this committee and to the Congress for just treatment.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA JARVIS, FOUNDER OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, yesterday the Nation paused to recognize the first Mother's Day since the official end of hostilities following World War II.

Even in this era of atomic energy it is probably still true that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world." A very great amount of power has been placed at the hands of humanity and we are becoming more and more aware of the importance of the kind of guidance which shapes the character of the people placed in charge of this and other responsibilities.

In this connection, I should like permission to print at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from an article which appeared in the Mentor magazine in May of 1928. While the article is somewhat historical in nature, it is also very much in the form of a tribute to Miss Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a tribute to her mother, Miss Anna Jarvis, a native of West Virginia but now of Philadelphia, resolved to set aside a day in May of each year as a memorial to her. On that day she selected a white flower and wore it—fitting emblem, she thought, of the love and devotion between mother and child. When her friends learned about it she told them she was going to observe the same day each year. They too become interested and asked her to arrange a service in which their entire community might have a part. While planning this memorial meeting to her own mother the thought came to her: Why not make it a national celebration in commemoration of the debt owed to mothers—a tribute of deference and respect not only to absent mothers but to all mothers and the home?

Thus out of Miss Jarvis' own personal sorrow came the idea of Mother's Day. The first observance was in Philadelphia. The day soon became recognized by other cities in the State of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. In 1912 Governor Colquitt, of Texas, inaugurated the custom of pardoning a number of prisoners on Mother's Day. In 1913 it was made a State flag day by the Nebraska Legislature.

In 1914 Miss Jarvis called on a Member of the House of Representatives and requested him to introduce a resolution providing for a day to be known and observed as Mother's Day. In May of the same year a resolution passed the United States House of Representatives and the Senate commending Mother's Day for observance by the House and Senate, by the President of the United States and his Cabinet, and by other heads of Government departments, pursuant to which President Wilson issued a proclamation setting aside the second Sunday in May as a national day of remembrance.

Since then the observance of Mother's Day has spread to all parts of Europe, to Japan, China, Africa, Palestine, and other countries.

Churches of every denomination hold special services on the second Sunday in May. Many business houses and organizations observe the Saturday preceding the second Sunday in May. Schools celebrate on Friday.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—THE YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish briefly to address myself to the subject of the penny-wise and pound-foolish type of economies indulged in by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and by the House of Representatives itself, in reducing by approximately 47 percent the appropriations recommended by the President for the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior is the agency of the Federal Government charged with conserving and developing the natural resources of our country. Its expenses are in many cases to be classed as capital investments, rather than as running expenses.

With the help of one of my Idaho constituents, Mr. S. E. Brady, an official of the Tri-State Yellowstone Park Civil Association, I have found a case in which even in appropriating for running expenses, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives has indulged in very shaky economics. Mr. Brady has written me that it is regrettable that the Park Service does not receive for the operation of Yellowstone Park an amount even equal to the fees paid by visitors to the park. He points out that if larger appropriations were made, it would be possible to keep the park open for longer seasons, thus increasing the number of visitors and actually increasing the amount of revenue which the Government receives from the park.

Mr. President, I have found it difficult to believe that the United States Government, committed as it is to a policy of providing the people of the country with great recreation areas such as Yellowstone Park, is not providing some public moneys for the operation of those parks. I have found it even more difficult to believe that the Government is actually making a profit on that operation.

So I checked on the matter with the officials of the National Park Service, and I found, surprisingly enough, that in the 1947 fiscal year Yellowstone Park received approximately $572,000. In the period from July 1946 until April 30, 1947, Yellowstone Park revenues—that is, fees paid by visitors to the park—totaled $534,059. On the basis of those receipts, the Park Service estimates that the revenue during May and June will be $105,000.

Thus, the revenue for Yellowstone Park during the 1947 fiscal year would be $639,059. So the Federal Government will make a profit of more than $50,000, on the basis of present operations.

It would seem, Mr. President, that the Republican economizers have overlooked something. If they would merely arrange to build a few more national parks, and to keep the seasons open for a longer period each year, they might be able to pay off the national debt, on the basis of profits like these.

The Budget Bureau recommended an appropriation for the 1948 fiscal year of $562,248. The House committee completely ignored this situation, since their bill has cut the National Park Service appropriations by 28 percent, recognizing, as it did so, that all-time peaks in the number of visitors to national parks were to be expected this summer, and excusing its action by saying that it has thus made a smaller reduction than it otherwise would have made.

Mr. President, in order to make entirely clear to Members of the Senate this ironical situation I should like to have incorporated in my remarks at this point the lettter which I received from Mr. Brady, of Pocatello, Idaho.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *April 18, 1947.*

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The citizens of Montana, Utah, and Idaho, the States which surround Yellowstone Park, have banded themselves together under the Tri-State Yellowstone Park Civic Association, for the sole purpose of promoting and developing Yellowstone Park and in aiding the Park Service officials in securing sufficient appropriation to properly carry on the park service and improvements.

I regret to say that in recent years, and particularly during the war, the service in Yellowstone Park has been very inadequate, due in part to lack of personnel from the fact that the wages paid were so much less than wages outside the park. As a result concessions have not been kept up to standard and the park roads have not been kept in proper care. This is regrettable when one realizes that the entrance fee paid at the gates of Yellowstone Park are sufficient to pay all operating expenses and improvements of roads in the park, but this money goes into the general fund and Congress in voting the appropriation seems to feel that they are voting millions of dollars for park purposes with no, or little return being received.

One thing that our association has been harping on for years is the inadequacy of the information folder that is given at the gate when visitors enter. The supply is so meager that they cannot supply all visitors, and they often run out before the season is

over. This publication has been the same for years, with very little improvement.

Another thing that we feel would be of great advantage to the tourist is to have an earlier opening of the park and a later closing. This could be done without too much extra expense, and, we feel, would relieve a great deal of congestion during the peak season. This information should be given greater publicity than is being given at the present time. The folder I mentioned above leaves the information that the park is only open while the hotels are open, from May 20 to September 15, when even now it is open much longer and there are ample facilities for the tourist in the cabin camps and the Hamilton stores. You will note on the envelope that encloses this letter it states that Yellowstone Park is open to auto tourists May 1 to October 15 of each year. While I have just been informed that the road will not be open to Old Faithful until May 10 and that the other roads through the park will not be open until May 20, this is due to lack of personnel for handling the public. It seems that they will not open the park until they have a full crew.

There has been appointed a committee on concessionaires for the national parks, with Mr. Clem Collins, chairman. This summer this committee will investigate all concessionaires in all national parks and recommend to the Interior Department the necessary improvements and changes, if any.

The facilities in Yellowstone Park for housing and feeding tourists is very inadequate, and there should be improvements of these facilities, opening of other facilities in new locations to accommodate the public, and many facilities should be located where they can be used for winter sports and provided with steam heat, for there is a great demand for winter-sport facilities in Yellowstone Park and ski slopes have been developed in the northern part of the park in the past.

Pardon my taking so much of your time, but I have just scratched the surface. I wish that you would give the Park Service appropriation of the Interior Department careful scrutiny when it comes before you and see that adequate appropriations are made.

Sincerely yours,

S. E. BRADY,
Managing Director.

ADVERTISEMENT BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hit Dogs Always Howl," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1126.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it would not be charged that Life magazine is a Democratic journal, but in the last issue of Life there appears a commentary about the pending legislation, which, in view of the known friendliness of that publication to the majority party, I thought it not inappropriate to read. I read from the editorial:

> Take the labor bill. The House got to work promptly on a labor bill and adopted a very tough one—too tough. But its best features were readily adopted by the Senate Labor Committee, which reported a bill with these main provisions: (1) It bans the closed shop and restricts the union shop; (2) it excludes foremen from rights under the Wagner Act; (3) it grants free speech to employers (which the Wagner Act has limited); (4) it separates the prosecuting and judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board; (5) it defines unfair practices of unions and authorizes NLRB to enjoin jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts; (6) it makes unions suable and subject to financial accounting; (7) it gives the Attorney General special powers against strikes in interstate transportation, communications, or utilities.
>
> Instead of settling for these reforms, however, the Republican leadership has stalled and higgled over amendments which are for the most part either unnecessary or merely punitive. Some Republican Senators support these amendments on the ground that they will make it easier to get together with the House. But others, and Senator TAFT seems to be their leader, are less concerned with getting a good labor bill on the statute books than they are with a primitive political game known as "putting the White House in the hole." They expect, nay, invite, a White House veto of their measure. Thus, unless they can override the veto, we may get no labor reform this session. The onus, these Republicans hope, will be on the President.

Mr. President, those are the words of a publication which, as I said, has not been identified with the Democratic Party, and it is an editorial, so it reflects the deliberative judgment of this publication respecting the pending measure. Everyone knows, therefore, that there is a serious improbability of any labor legislation whatever being enacted at the present session of the Congress and becoming law, due to the nature of the position taken by the majority in the House and in the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, several members of the minority in the Senate, thinking that, certain things along the line of proper labor legislation might be accomplished by this session of the Congress, offered a substitute proposal which was presented to the Senate on Friday evening by the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and by him briefly described.

In short, the substitute bill provides for improved mediation, conciliation, and arbitration machinery in the Department of Labor. That is in conformity with the recommendations of the Labor-Management conference held in Washington in 1945. It will be recalled that the pending bill takes the Conciliation Service entirely out of the Department of Labor and organizes it as a separate and distinct institution. The substitute bill provides a fact-finding board, if requested by management of labor, analogous to the fact-finding board authorized by the Railway Labor Act, which has received general approval from the country and from management and labor, as well as from Members of Congress. This fact-finding board, of course, would be appointed by the President.

The substitute bill also provides for a labor-management advisory committee. In other words, it gives statutory reality to the labor-management machinery which was established during the war and which contributed so much to the minimum number of work days lost by work stoppages during the war, and the unparalleled production record we made during that period.

The substitute bill does not grant industry-wide bargaining unless the employers involved agree to associate themselves for industry-wide bargaining. In that respect the substitute bill is analogous to the bill of the majority.

The substitute bill provides that supervisors—and we generally call them foremen—may belong to a union, provided that union is not affiliated with the rank-and-file of the employees in the plant where the supervisors are engaged. In other words, the substitute recognizes the wisdom of the Wagner Act as it exists at the present time. It embodies the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which gives to supervisory employees—generally meaning foremen—the right to work together to better their wages and working conditions and to achieve recognition as a bargaining unit.

The substitute proposal does not permit supervisory employees to belong to the same union with the rank and file of the workers. I think a ready analogy which occurs to our minds is that the noncommissioned officer in the Army is like the foreman in a factory, and the private in the Army is like the rank-and-file employee in a manufacturing plant. We have recognized the desirability of the two groups belonging to separate unions or bargaining groups. But we do not believe it to be fair or right to deny to foremen or supervisory employees the privilege of associating themselves together in a separate and distinct union to try to better their own working and living conditions.

The substitute bill protects the right of the employer in the practice of free speech, but makes it clear that free speech on the part of the employer does not mean the right to intimidate or coerce or otherwise improperly to influence employees in the exercise of their democratic right to join a union or not to join a union, according to their privilege and pleasure. Fundamentally, and speaking for myself, I believe that an employer has no more right to try to influence his employees in associating themselves together in a labor union than he has to intimidate them from joining a church or fraternal organization of their choice. But in view of the misunderstanding of the Wagner Act and

the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, as well as the adjudications of the courts, that employers do not possess that privilege today, we have tried to make it clear that the employer has the right and privilege of free speech, provided it is fair free speech.

In the substitute bill we have provided for certain unfair labor practices. Generally speaking, they are some of the unfair labor practices which are included in the majority bill. For example, if a union should attempt to induce an employer to recognize a union which was not the one certified by the National Labor Relations Board, that would be an unfair labor practice. If the union were to make an effort to determine who should be the bargaining representative of employers, that would be an unfair labor practice. There are some others; but we have not adopted the stringent, severe, and repressive provisions of the majority bill which make so many legitimate activities on the part of employees unfair labor practices. In no case do we allow an injunction in respect to the exercise of those privileges on the part of employees.

We have made another concession. In the substitute bill we have authorized employers to deal with individual workers in the expression of their grievances. We have also authorized employers to petition for elections, provided there is a conflict between unions or between respective groups claiming the right to be the duly chosen bargaining agent.

The substitute bill authorizes the National Labor Relations Board to delegate certain of its powers to State boards.

The substitute deals with the boycott and the jurisdictional strike. It makes a boycott in aid of a jurisdictional strike an unfair-labor practice, as the President recommended. It was felt that there should be some method by which work stoppages caused by jurisdictional strikes might be peacefully prevented.

It was recognized, as was recommended by the President, that the boycott in aid of the jurisdictional strike might be made an unfair-labor practice; but I wish to emphasize that there is no right of injunction, either by the employer or by a representative of the National Labor Relations Board, against any of the unfair-labor practices provided for in the substitute bill. On the contrary, authority is given to the National Labor Relations Board to hear and adjudicate the dispute and, of course, under appropriate circumstances, to issue a cease-and-desist order and apply to the courts for the enforcement of such order, as can be done today.

The substitute bill also gives the National Labor Relations Board authority to appoint an arbitrator, and gives the arbitrator the right of process, to subpena witnesses, documents, and records, but it does not give any coercive power to the arbitrator in the adjudication of a dispute.

The substitute requires both employer and employee to disclose certain information in the form of certain reports, as for example, the number of collective-bargaining contracts, the awards which have been made in labor-dispute cases, and to disclose certain other information. I emphasize that it applies to employer and employee alike, not merely to the employee, as does the majority bill.

The substitute provides for the temporary investigating commission recommended by the President. That commission, as the Senate will recall the President's recommendation, is to consist of representatives of management, labor, and the public; and we believe, Mr. President, that such a commission, widely representative as it would be, could ascertain the real causes and the real cures for industrial strife in the land.

The substitute bill also authorizes the union to sue in its union name or to be sued by its union name in the Federal courts, provided that Federal jurisdiction is otherwise satisfactory, namely, that there is diversity of citizenship, and the amount in issue is at least $3,000.

Some will say that those provisions are meaningless and that they will accomplish nothing. Mr. President, if one means that labor legislation must effectively strangle or destroy the labor-union movement in America, they are correct in that description of the substitute bill. It will not do that. It was not intended to do that. It is not the belief of the sponsors of the substitute that such a policy is good for employers or for the American public generally.

On the contrary, it is the belief of the sponsors of the substitute and of others who are in opposition to the committee bill that that bill will not stop strikes; it will cause them. It will not minimize work stoppages; it will exaggerate and increase them. It will not achieve labor rest; it will stimulate labor unrest. It will provoke discord instead of bringing an era of peace and harmony in the industrial life of America. Not only that, Mr. President, but the pending bill, if enacted into law, will contribute to another depression, and many a member of the National Association of Manufacturers will suffer probably the loss of his business, and surely the loss of his profits, which are now at an all-time high. Many who today are advocates of this legislation will regret their part in it economically, if not politically, in the days and years ahead.

Mr. President, the public has wanted some kind of labor legislation. The pending legislation is supposed to be in response to the public demand. I hear Senators in the majority party saying it is in response to a mandate of the people of America; that the Nation demands that there be the kind of repressive legislation which is embodied in the bill. In reality, what the American public wants is something which will prevent work stoppages, something which will stop strikes, because, Mr. President, it is the strike that inconveniences the public. It is the strike which interrupts American production. It is the strike which impairs general prosperity, and therefore it is the strike which the American public is trying to prevent.

What is the principal cause of strikes? I have before me some figures which I think may be of interest. For example, in the year 1946, 82 percent of all time lost by strikes was due solely to disputes over wages and hours; and 95 percent of the working time lost in 1946 by strikes was due to disputes over wages and hours or recognition of the union. Not only that, but 75 percent of all workers involved in strikes in 1946 were on strike solely because of disputes over wages and hours, and 85 percent of all the workers on strike in 1946 were on strike because of disputes over either wages and hours or the recognition of the union. Furthermore, only 7½ percent of the time lost was by reason of disputes in connection with the closed shop or the union shop or related issues; and 13½ percent of the time lost involved wages and hours and union organization questions.

That shows, Mr. President, that unless the legislation enacted by the Congress is able to provide a means for bringing about a meeting of minds between employer and employee as to wages and hours, the overwhelming majority of the strikes in the past will be repeated in the future—unless we so strangle the worker that he does not have the power effectively to strike. I must say that that is the way the pending bill attempts to solve the problem of labor unrest. It simply proposes not to make the employer pay a fair wage or to grant fair working conditions to the worker. It proposes to achieve industrial peace at the price of the wage level and the living standards of the American worker and his family. That is the price of peace which is provided for in the pending bill. It is taken out of the living level of the American worker. That is how industrial peace is to be obtained. The worker is to be prevented from striking; he is to be made incapable effectively of bargaining collectively with the employer.

Let us consider one illustration. The committee bill provides that there may be an injunction brought at the instance of the Attorney General in cases where it is believed that the health and safety of the Nation are involved. Such an injunction against a work stoppage or so-called strike may last up to 80 days. That is 80 days of involuntary servitude, Mr. President, by American men and women. Are they working for the Government? No; they are working for a private employer who today is making the highest profits he has ever made in America, including wartimes.

Yes, Mr. President; this bill would make it possible, at the instance of the Attorney General, to chain the American worker in the industrial dungeon in order that a private employer might make the highest profits he has ever made in all past years. I have not yet seen a case in which the United States Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has upheld the validity of the injunction to make a man or a woman work for a private employer for the employer's own profit. I am not talking about a case in which the employee is working for the Government. Under the Smith-Connally Act we allow the Government to take over an enterprise, a mine, a factory, or a mill. But what further did that act authorize? It authorized the Government to fix wages and working conditions, and even to provide for a welfare fund.

Mr. President, the basis of the decision in the Lewis-United Mine Workers' case

was, if I correctly understand it, that the miners were working for the Government of the United States. Mind you, Mr. President, they were working under a contract entered into with a representative of the United States Government, the Secretary of the Interior. In that case the Secretary of the Interior had fixed the wages in the contract or had agreed to the wages fixed in the contract. He had even gone so far as to agree, for the first time in the history of the mining industry, to the establishment of a welfare fund. But that is not this case, Mr. President. I am not going to discuss that case. It has already been adjudicated by the Court.

Mr. President, I am saying that in the present case it is proposed to go far beyond the Lewis-United Mine Workers' case, because in that case at least the Court held that the workers were working for the Government, under a contract, entered into with the Government, which fixed the wages and the working conditions of the employees.

But this bill would for 80 days chain the workers to their jobs and force them to make further profits for a private employer; and during those 80 days the Government would have no power to make the employer raise the wages, shorten the hours, or grant more favorable working conditions. Is that one-sided, or is that impartial legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. President, what to do about work stoppages in the public-utility field is a very difficult question. The solution of it has not yet been found, in my opinion. Of course, we do not want work stoppages to occur in Nation-wide industries which affect the health and safety of the land; but if we are to achieve peace in the public-utility field, it must be done by requiring concessions on both sides, not by the exaction of a concession only on the part of the workers.

I have previously referred on this floor to the recommendation of a distinguished citizen of my State, a former governor of Ohio for three times, and the Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1920, with Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt as his running mate—the Hon. James M. Cox. Respecting the question of what to do in order to avoid a Nation-wide work stoppage respecting an essential commodity or service, Governor Cox recommended that there be created something like a TVA Authority to regulate such an industry, to determine wages, and working conditions, and profits, and, if need be, to give general direction to that industry, so as to assure that it would perform its maximum public service. Of course, he contemplated that the board would not be a group of political appointees, but would be composed of businessmen capable of operating the industry wisely and well, with due regard for the public service.

Others have suggested compulsory arbitration; but management and labor have opposed such a plan.

In England, the remedy has been the nationalization of the mines. That may sometime become necessary in the United States; I do not know.

I am saying that when we find the solution, if it is to be representative of American democracy, it will be a solution that in the public interest will require concessions on both sides, and will not require sacrifice from the workers alone. Yet that is what this bill does by authorizing the issuance of an injunction for as much as 80 days, without requiring any concession whatever on the part of the management involved, at a time when the workers are working for the private profit of a private employer.

I have previously stated, Mr. President, that in the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Governor Stassen of Minnesota, whom I think we all greatly respect, testified that a stern and repressive and strangling labor bill adopted now would have the same effect as that which flowed from a similar labor policy after the last war. What was that policy, Mr. President? He said that the labor legislation and labor policy adopted by the Government in that period weakened the labor unions of the United States from their wartime strength. Being weakened, they had less strength to bargain for the workers' wages, and the workers' wages therefore dropped; and when the workers' wages dropped—the workers being essentially the people of America—the purchasing power of the American public was diminished, and the diminished purchasing power of the American public contributed to the greatest depression which, until that time, we had ever experienced. Many of those—I say it with some regret, Mr. President—who probably favored that kind of labor policy, later on jumped out the windows of some of the citadels of finance in the great financial capital of the United States.

Governor Stassen declared that whenever the corporations begin to get a disproportionate share of the national income in relation to other income groups, that is a danger sign for American prosperity, a red-light warning that a depression, an abysmal cataclysm, lies ahead.

Mr. President, do we find those conditions existing today? Let us see what now exists. From 1945 to 1946 the national income increased $4,000,000,000. During the same period the net profits of agricultural proprietors increased $2,400,000,000. The net corporate profits of the corporations of America increased $3,000,000,000 during that year. The net profits of nonagricultural proprietors increased $2,200,000,000. But what happened to wages and salaries? They declined $5,000,000,000. In other words, in the same year in which net corporate profits were increasing $3,000,000,000, wages and salaries went down $5,000,000,000. In a year when the national income increased, when the income of agricultural and nonagricultural proprietors increased, in a year when corporate profits increased, wages and salaries declined $5,000,000,000. That is what happened last year, and today that trend is being accentuated.

Mr. President, when I last spoke in the Senate, I said that the way that procedure worked out was that between January 1945 and December 1946 there was a diminution of 22 percent in the real wages of the workers of the United States. In other words, the real wages of the workers had diminished more than one-fifth between January 1945 and December 1946. Of course, that was due to the fact that the workweek was shortened and prices increased between January 1945 and December 1946.

So we are already in that very trend; we are already in that very downward spiral of wages and salaries and public purchasing power which led us in a toboggan slide to the last depression, after the last war.

I have already mentioned, for example, that in respect to corporate profits, 625 companies earned $950,000,000 in the last quarter of 1946, or about twice their earning rate during the war. In other words, total corporate profits increased about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, what has the Congress done since the war, or since the late days of the war, for the corporate group in America as compared with the ordinary men and women of the Nation? Let us see what the Congress has indicated as the national policy in legislation in the last 2 years, let us say. One thing we did for the corporations was the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law. We also passed legislation popularly known as the carry-forward-carry-back law. Let me indicate, first, the effects of the latter legislation upon the corporate financial position.

In 1946 there were paid out of the United States Treasury $3,119,000,000 to enterprises which came within the carry-forward-carry-back tax law. I have instances of what was paid under that law to a good many corporations. For example, in 1946 General Motors got back $83,000,000 under that law. The Aluminum Co. of America got back $47,000,000. The American Rolling Mills got back nearly $7,000,000. The American Viscose Co. got back in excess of $6,000,000. The Cramp Shipbuilding Co. got back nearly $10,000,000. The Du Pont enterprises got back more than $6,000,000. The General Electric Co. got back $6,250,000. The Shell Oil Co. got back more than $9,000,000. Standard Oil Co. of California got back nearly $6,000,000. The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana got back nearly $7,000,000.

Credits allowed on the balance sheets of these companies for tax adjustments were the following amounts for the companies named:

Allis-Chalmers	$25,400,000
Bell & Howell	500,000
Borg-Warner	294,000
Consolidated Vultee	765,000
General Electric	24,000,000
General Motors	82,820,000
Packard Motors	5,650,000
Westinghouse	62,289,000

And so forth. That was money paid out of the Treasury of the United States to these large corporations in 1946 under the carry-forward-carry-back tax law.

I am not saying that that was unfair as related to those recipients, but I am saying—and I shall continue saying—that we have not done comparably for the small taxpayer in the United States.

I said that we repealed the excess-profits tax law. Naturally, who got the

benefit of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law? It was the individuals and the companies paying excess-profits taxes.

In 1947 corporate profits were estimated at $16,100,000,000. Let me state the effects of the repeal of the corporate excess-profits-tax law.

In 1943 corporate profits, before taxes, amounted to $25,000,000,000. In 1946 they amounted to $20,000,000,000. So it will be seen that the amount made by the corporations, before taxes, was $5,000,000,000 less in 1946 than in 1943. But on account of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law, the corporate profits, in 1946, after taxes, amounted to $12,000,000,000, whereas in 1943 they were only $9,900,000,000. In other words, the corporations gained $2,100,000,000 by virtue of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law.

I have heard, by rumor and report, that the loss to the Treasury was far in excess of the figures I have given today. Whether that law cost the United States Treasury $2,100,000,000, as I have said, or $6,000,000,000, as I have heard said, I am asking the Senate, have we done anything for the workers of America comparable to what we did for the corporations and for those who had made large excess profits?

Let us look at the corporate savings of the country as well. In 1943 corporate savings were at their all-time peak of $5,700,000,000. But in 1946, the year when the repeal of the excess-profits tax was bearing fruit, corporate savings reached $7,000,000,000, or $1,300,000,000 more than in the peak year, 1943.

What about corporate dividends? In 1945 there was the all-time peak up to that time of $4,500,000,000 in corporate dividends. In 1946, corporate dividends had increased to $5,000,000,000, or an increase of $500,000,000 in the year 1946.

Let us take the figures respecting net returns on investment of nonfinancial companies. In 1945 the return was $7,700,000,000, but in 1946 the return was $9,500,000,000, or nearly $2,000,000,000 more. That was after taxes. So we can see the direct effect of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law.

Mr. President, let us look at the people of America and see how they fared. Two-thirds of all the families of America have an annual gross income of less than $2,000. That is a little less than $40 a week. We hear talk about rich Americans. Yes; there are many rich people and many rich corporations, but there are also many poor folks in America.

Two-thirds of all the families of this land have, for total living allowances, gross incomes of less than $40 a week. Ten dollars a week is all the individual in two-thirds of all American families has to live on, gross, with the high cost of living we have at the present time.

It is said the people who worked in the plants and on the farms got rich during the war. It will be recalled that a little while ago the Federal Reserve Board made a study of savings in America, what they were in amount, and who had them. They reported that two out of five of the families of America had total liquid savings of less than $40. That is America, Mr. President; that is Main Street; that is the suburbs; that is the country; that is the people.

Remember that during that time we did not make any appreciable reduction in the taxes of those people, while we were giving more than $3,000,000,000 in refunds to the large taxpayers during the war days and adding more than $2,000,000,000 to the net corporate profits of the corporations by repeal of the excess-profits-tax law. Yet, Mr. President, we did not increase the social-security benefits of those who are the beneficiaries of that legislation, except—and I should emphasize this—we raised old-age pensions $5 a month. It will make a fine record, will it not, when we look back and consider it? Yes; we raised old-age pensions $5 a month, and we provided a small increase for those covered by the railroad retirement law. But, Mr. President, we did not increase the wage rate under the minimum-wage law. How much is it now? Forty cents an hour. We were not able last year to get through the Congress legislation raising the minimum wage. No; that would be "uneconomic"; that would be "unwise"; we could not agree on that. But I dare say the two Houses of Congress will be able to agree in conference on severe antilabor legislation. They were able to agree on repeal of the excess-profits tax; they were able to agree on the carry-forward and carry-back legislation; and, Mr. President, they were able to agree on legislation providing favorable conditions for the termination of wartime contracts by those who generally made a profit out of the war.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the record of our last few Congresses shows that we have given greater consideration to the "haves" than to the "have nots." Now, what do we propose to do? At a time when wages and salaries are forward in respect to the other income groups of America, we propose legislation, the design and effect of which will be, by weakening the labor unions, to diminish the bargaining strength of the workers of America, to lower wage levels, to lengthen hours, to diminish public purchasing power not only to the injury of the worker but of the general public. Is that wise legislation? Is there any emotional justification? To put it another way, does the animosity that anyone may feel towards certain labor abuses justify a national policy which will have that national effect? I do not think so. I think that this is a matter that is not any more important to the labor unions than it is to the American public generally; and by the American public I mean everybody in America—the banker, the manufacturer, the farmer, and every other segment of our American economy.

In the first place, Mr. President, what are the effects of low incomes on the American people, if that is to be the inevitable effect of the pending legislation? I have before me a report of the very committee which was the predecessor of the committee which has reported favorably the pending legislation. It was then called the Committee on Education and Labor. It is part 2 of Report 1012, which was filed March 14, 1946. It is on the minimum-wage legislation which was pending before that committee. Here are a few excerpts from the report. Quoting from page 26:

Substandard wages exact a heavy toll on all low-income people in broken health, high mortality—

That means that more people die—

limited education, poor housing, and high taxes. In short, substandard wages create a degradation of our people and stunts their lives in a manner that is a festering sore in our economic, social, and political existence. Such items as lack of savings, poor housing, lack of adequate educational opportunities, juvenile problems—

I might have added criminality—

and inadequate health care are the concomitants of low wages.

That is what the pending bill is designed to achieve.

Savings: As family incomes decrease, savings decrease and deficits rise. In 1935-36, families with incomes below $1,000 and large families with incomes below $1,750 accumulated debts instead of savings. A study of savings for a southern and a midwestern area made in 1945 shows a concentration of savings in higher-income groups.

Let us now take housing, Mr. President; and I am quoting again from the report, at page 27:

The low-income workers cannot afford good housing and this condition causes overcrowding. Overcrowding in existing housing facilities bears a direct relation to family incomes and contributes greatly to poor environmental and health conditions among low-income families.

Let us take education, Mr. President, quoting from page 28:

It has been evident to many educators and to many citizens that children withdraw from school at an early age because their parents cannot afford their continuance at school. Of the 1,000,000 young people who drop out of school each year about one-third do so because of economic necessity.

Let us take selective service. That is the defense of America, Mr. President; that is the defense of democracy. That is to save our country's security and freedom. What is the effect of low income upon the ability of the citizen to defend his country? I quote again, from page 29:

There is a significant relationship between income and physical fitness as indicated by records of Selective Service and per capita income payments by States. The failings of our economic and social organization are reflected in Selective Service rejection rates. Table 11 shows that in general States with the lower per capita incomes are those with the higher rejection rates. For example, South Carolina, Arkansas, and North Carolina—

Let me interpolate—States which were among the very leaders in the number of volunteers; so the rejection had nothing to do with the response of the people to the country's need—

For example, South Carolina, Arkansas, and North Carolina, which were among the lowest per capita income States, had the highest rejection rates. Rejection rates when analyzed by occupations were highest for do-

mestic-service workers, unemployed persons, farm laborers, and general laborers.

The people who get the lowest share of the national income.

Mr. President I come now to speak of life itself. I read from page 30 of the report:

Disability and death: The record of the hearings shows that families of low incomes have more illnesses and receive less medical care than high-income families.

The national health survey of 1935-36 shows that families with incomes of $1,000 or less had nearly 40 percent more total illness than families with incomes of $2,000 or more and they had 75 percent more chronic illnesses. Among low-income families, the proportion of workers prevented by disability from earning any livelihood or even seeking work was three and one-half times greater than that among families with incomes of $2,000 or over.

Mind you, Mr. President, even now, with all the pressure labor unions can apply through collective bargaining, two-thirds of the families of America have a gross income of less than $2,000 a year, less than $40 a week.

Furthermore, families with incomes under $1,000 in 1935–36 lost nearly twice as much time from work because of illness as did the average individual in the higher income groups.

Again I am going to interpolate: We become excited about a few million hours lost in strikes, Mr. President, but we have not so far been able to have a bill passed which would diminish illnesses suffered by the workers of America, although the man-days lost through illness are many times more than the man-days lost through strikes in the land.

I read further from the report:

Many studies have emphasized the coexistence of high infant and maternal mortality with low incomes.

I emphasize that statement. All it means, in substance, is that in families of low incomes a greater number of mothers and children die. That is all that language means. They die; there are more of them who do not live in those income groups.

In 1940 the six States with the highest infant mortality rates were New Mexico, Arizona, South Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama. All were in the lower half of the States ranked according to their per capita income.

The deaths of mothers in the child-bearing process bears a direct relationship to the per capita incomes of the respective States. In 1942 the maternity mortality rate for the country as a whole was 2.6 maternal deaths per 1,000 live births. Of the 15 lowest income States, 14 had maternity mortality rates higher than that of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, is not a Senator within his rights in opposing a policy which he believes will cost more mothers and children their lives, more children their education, more people decent homes, and will result in less prosperity for America?

I shall read one more excerpt from page 32 of the report:

8. Effect of raising incomes on health: Improvement in the wage status of our low-income families contribute to the better health status of the Nation and those underprivileged groups and areas, although it is recognized that a high minimum wage policy is only part of a national program to contribute to better health among our people. It is well established that high-income families buy more fruits, meats, dairy products, vegetables, and other items than do low-income families. Low-income families depend primarily on bread, beans, potatoes, and other inexpensive foods. With a rise in the income of low-wage groups, such families can be expected to buy products which contain minerals and vitamins essential to good diets and health.

As I stated, Mr. President, I have been reading from a report of the Committee on Education and Labor, as it was called in 1946, now the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have been speaking about the effect of low incomes upon the people who have such incomes. Now, I want to turn it around and see whether higher purchasing power which is achieved by higher incomes benefits other groups of people. The same report bears on that question. I turn now to page 38 of the report and call the attention of the Senate to these words:

4. Farm and other purchases by low-income groups: The importance of increasing incomes in low-wage groups is shown by the following: In 1944, 32,500,000 persons had annual incomes under $2,000, or a total consumer purchasing power of $45,700,000,000. Their total income is three times greater than the total income of all those with incomes of $10,000 a year or more and they are the major consumers of our farm and factory products.

Mr. President, I pause in my reading to say that those who buy the produce of the farms and the products of the factories are the masses of the people, not those who have higher incomes. I repeat the last sentence I read:

Their total income—

Meaning that of the people making less than $2,000 a year—

Their total income is three times greater than the total income of all those with incomes of $10,000 a year or more and they are the major consumers of our farm and factory products.

Mr. President, I do not know of any fallacy which is more prevalent than the belief propagandized by some that if a man in public life advocates policies designed to lift up the masses of the people, he is either a demagog or a scoundrel; that he is either trying to steal from the rich their money or deceive the people who vote. I affirm that Franklin D. Roosevelt will stand in history as the best friend big business in America ever had. Why do I say that? Because he did more for the people of America than any President ever did. When those people had money they bought the commodities the farmers grew on their farms and the articles the manufacturers made in their plants and the services which were made available by other segments of our people.

There is only one recipe, Mr. President, for prosperity and that is the welfare of the people. America cannot be made well off by providing large incomes for the few people at the top. An edifice of national prosperity is not built the way a bottle is filled—from the top; it is built the way a house is built—from the foundation up. Why it is that so palpable a truth is appreciated by so few people is beyond my comprehension.

I am basing my opposition to the bill today primarily upon the fact that it is a disservice to the American public, not merely to labor. It is unfair to labor, I believe. That is my own private opinion. I am not disparaging the sincere beliefs held by other Senators. I believe that this proposed legislation is not properly balanced. It imposes no obligation on the employer to meet the worker halfway in his wage demand. As I have shown already, that was the reason for 82 percent of the man-days lost by strikes in 1946. The principal cause was disagreement over wages and hours. Yet this bill does not provide any machinery to make adjustments of wage and hour disputes, except mediation and arbitration. It takes those agencies out of the Department of Labor, where the labor-management conference held in Washington in 1945 recommended that they should be. I do not know what is to be gained by taking them out of the Labor Department, where they are already functioning, where there are experienced personnel and a competent Secretary in charge of the whole department, where they are correlated with all the other activities of the Department, and yet have a splendid record of impartiality in dealing with industrial disputes, and putting them in in a separate agency which will cost a great deal of money to establish. Yet, so far as I can see, that is the only provision in the bill which has any relation to the fundamental problem of industrial peace, the attainment of which requires that in some way management and worker should get together on the question of wages, hours, and working conditions. The sponsors of the pending bill provide a way to do it. They simply do not let the worker strike in certain cases. In other cases they make it hard for him to strike. They destroy the strength of the union by giving the employer opportunity after opportunity to undermine the union by calling for elections, or in some instances by getting rid of the union entirely through replacing the workers who are on strike with other workers, and then calling an election so that the new workers will displace the workers on strike in the selection of their bargaining agent.

The report to which I have referred shows that three times the purchasing power of all the people making $10,000 a year or more is in the hands of the two-thirds of American families making less than $40 a week, less than $2,000 a year.

By the way, sitting in the Chamber at the present time is the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas]. He has been making a fight in which I hope he will be successful. I hope the Senate will agree with him. He contends that if we are to reduce taxes they should be reduced primarily upon the lower-income groups. The figures which I have just given substantiate the position of the Senator from Illinois. If we want

greater purchasing power in America we can get it by reducing taxes on the lower-income groups, rather than on the people in the higher-income brackets, because if we lump together all those making $10,000 a year or more, they buy only a third as much as do the rest of the people. So if our friends really mean to try to preserve our present prosperity and to give our farmers, our manufacturers, and our service industries a market in the first place, they will do better by the rest of the people through reducing taxes primarily upon those who deserve it, and in the second place will do the most good to the Nation as a whole through such a reduction.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line with what the able Senator has said, I may point out that the evidence before the Committee on Finance shows that those who have incomes of less than $5,000 are now paying 60 percent of the individual income taxes.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; and every time the people in that group pay their money in taxes, it is taken out of the purchasing power of the people to buy commodities from the farm and the factory.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Every time we help those in the lower-income brackets we place the money in circulation. It is the velocity of money that makes the mare go.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for that observation.

I read from page 38 of the report:

> The Commissioner of Labor Statistics in testifying before the Temporary National Economic Committee established by Senate resolution pointed out that if families earning less than $1,200 a year in 1938 had their income raised to $1,500—

I want Senators to listen to these figures—

> they could have bought $800,000,000 additional in food; $416,000,000 additional in clothing; $613,000,000 in housing or rentals; $215,000,000 in fuel, light, and refrigeration; $385,000,000 in transportation; automobiles, and the like; $234,000,000 in recreation; $208,000,000 in medical care.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. If they had had that extra amount of money to spend, that would have been only the beginning, because if they could have bought more goods, that would have meant more jobs for other people, who would have had more money to spend, and they could have spent it. That would have provided jobs for still others. Such a process works on the affirmative side in increasing prosperity. On the other hand, reduced purchasing power works to bring on a depression. It is like knocking down tenpins.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. What the Senator is emphasizing is that by legislation such as this we are risking having to pay relief benefits to people who have their incomes lowered below a subsistence level, or who lose their jobs altogether because of the declining economy, to which legislation such as that proposed would contribute.

I continue to read from page 38 of the report:

> Before World War II, there was inadequate feeding of low-income families and a need for larger markets of agricultural products.

Let me interpolate again. In the days of the depression we were giving away farm products. Farmers had surpluses which they could not sell, and the people were hungry. They could not buy. They did not have jobs, or they did not get sufficient money from their jobs to buy a decent portion of food.

Reading further from the report:

> In 1941, the average expenditure for food by urban families of two or more persons was $706 and the minimum adequate maintenance diet for a family of four cost $518. Had those below the $518 been brought up to that level, it would have increased food product sales by three and one-third billion, or 23 percent. A similar increase would have caused a rise of 30 percent in the consumption of clothing.

Mr. President, I emphasize these figures to Senators who come from farm States. To my mind the greatest tragedy today, aside from some of the hysteria now prevalent, is the animosity which has been built up—and in some cases played up by selfish groups—between the workers and the farmers, between industrial employees and agricultural employees or proprietors. They are as much a part of the same body as the mouth and the eyes. They are inextricably interrelated one to the other in our national life. If the wages and the purchasing power of the workers decline, the sales of the farmers fall. It works the other way as well. If the farmer is not prosperous there is a great loss in the national market for manufactured goods, and the workers lose their jobs. How pitiful it is that there has been built up a misunderstanding and, in many cases, a bitter prejudice, between those two essential elements of the economic body of America. They are together in destiny and in duty. They will live together or they will starve together. Farmers ought to be opposing the pending legislation, Mr. President, just as they should be supporting the minimum wage law which some of us are endeavoring to have enacted by the Congress. They should be in favor of national health legislation, involving whatever is the best plan that will give the people the best health. Anything that will give a larger purchasing power to the American people is of vital interest to the American farmer. I am rather happy that I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think those two committees represent the two great segments of the American economy, and I hope to be able to make some contribution to a better understanding by each of the other's position, point of view, and interest.

I was saying, Mr. President, that the effect of the pending legislation will be to diminish the market and the prices of the American farmer. I wish to make one further reference to a matter of that character, and to read a paragraph from page 43 of the report to which I have alluded. I have already read portions to indicate that declining wages have a deleterious effect upon our national life; that increasing wages have a beneficial effect upon the living standards of the people and the purchasing power of the people. Just a word about productivity; and I shall read as I have said, from page 43 of the report:

> An examination by the committee of the relationship of wage raises and the long-run productivity of labor shows that the productivity of labor in manufacturing industries increased fairly steadily from 1909 through 1944. However, during the years 1919 to 1923 productivity increased more rapidly than in any preceding period and a similar sharp advance is anticipated in the next few years. This expected rise accounts for the reason why prices probably will not swing up sharply as a result of the passage of this bill.

That has reference to the minimum wage bill. I read further, as follows:

> Between 1921 and 1929 the average output per man-hour rose about 43 percent whereas average hourly earnings in these industries rose about 12 percent. The lag of the increase in wages behind productivity is regarded by many economists as a major reason for the financial and economical collapse between 1930 and 1933. Had wages increased to such extent in that period that it could have absorbed the productivity of labor during that period, it is quite probable that the depression of 1930-33 would not have taken place. Between 1937 and 1939 output per man-hour rose roughly 11 percent, whereas average hourly earnings remained about the same and prices fell sharply.

Mr. President, what is the effect of that? It is simply this: Our technology has been improving so rapidly that we have had a pretty constant increase in productivity in our American economy. That means greater output, which in turn means a larger income to be divided. But if we give more of it to the entrepreneur, to the manufacturer, to the proprietor, and a less amount to the worker than he deserves, it means putting more money into the speculative stock market, which happened in the days of the boom in 1929, or in some other wild ventures that involve hoarded savings which do not contribute to the purchasing power or prosperity of the country; and we take money away from the workers who would pour it into the stores, into buses, into trains, and a few, into airplanes, and into farm commodities and manufactured goods which contribute to the prosperity of a great and powerful land.

If those, who have the matter at their disposal, are too selfish, if they put too much into the hands of the proprietor, like the fabled Midas, who could not be satisfied with enough but had to have all, with the result that he lost all, they, too, will lose all. Some of the manufacturers, some of the financiers, and some of the others who spoke for them robbed the rich of America as well as the poor by such policies, because the depression cost this country, it is estimated, in excess of $300,000,000,000. The depression cost more than the cost of the war. If the last war cost that much—and we can take the cost of the next depression in relation to that of the last one, as the cost of the First World War in relation to the cost of the last war—the cost of the next depression will be simply astronomical, Mr. President, not only in dollars and cents but in what it will take from the people of America and in the

contribution it will make to World War III.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will bring up the relief bill after the pending measure has been disposed of. I am for it, not only for $200,000,000 for relief, but for $350,000,000; and that does not touch the surface of need. Furthermore, I am in favor of there being international collaborative effort to try to save the world's economy for free enterprise. I want to save the world from being engulfed by communism, but I think the best way to do it is to try to build up the economies of the other countries, and not to send them swords, bayonets, artillery, and tanks. I ask leave to insert that interpolation in my remarks. I am saying that if America collapses economically we shall drag the world down to a level which will make the virus of communism become a contagion which will engulf all of us. Anything which tends seriously to weaken the American economy contributes to war and to communism. It contributes to international chaos because it diminishes our ability to help. It was out of chaos in Germany that Hitler came; it was out of chaos in Italy that Mussolini came, and with them came the evil winds of war.

Senators may think that all they are doing is voting for a labor bill; all they are doing is putting the screws on what they call the labor leaders who have abused their power; all they are doing is bringing about a balance in the National Labor Relations Act between employer and employee; all they are doing is righting injustice to the employer. I say here, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate, with my own responsibility to back it up, that this bill, if enacted into law, will contribute to depression, chaos, anarchy, communism, and war. It is inevitable that they will follow in the wake of a weakened American economy. I venture to let time be the judge of my prediction.

I have only a little more to say, Mr. President.

It is rather singular that this legislation comes at a time when not only profits but monopolies in America are at an all-time high. For example, in 1909, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned one-third of our national assets. In 1929, 20 years later, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned 48 percent of our national assets. In 1946, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned 60 percent of our national assets. See what has happened between 1909 and 1946: 200 nonfinancial corporations in the United States have increased by more than double their ownership of the national assets; I mean in respect to the proportion of the national assets of which they owned one-third in 1909. Today they own nearly two-thirds—60 percent.

In 1880, the four largest steel rolling mills controlled 25 percent of the productive capacity in that industry in the United States. In 1938, they controlled 64 percent—a great deal more than double.

Two-thirds of the usable manufacturing facilities in the United States are controlled by 250 corporations.

One hundred of our largest corporations are controlled by eight groups of banking industries.

In 1940–41, one one-thousandth percent of our people owned one-fourth of the corporate stock of United States concerns, and six one-hundredths percent of our people owned 50 percent of the corporate stock of the United States concerns. To state it in another way, Mr. President, as I recall, 10,000 people in the United States own one-fourth of all the corporate stock outstanding in the United States, and 75,000 people own 50 percent, or one-half, of all the corporate stock, which means the control of all the corporations in the United States of America. Think of that. Ten thousand people own one-fourth of all the corporate stock in the United States, and 75,000 people own one-half of all the corporate stock in the United States—which means all the corporate assets in this land.

Mr. President, that is monopoly. Not only is monopoly something of great power and danger, but I should like to read a little of what was said by the Federal Trade Commission about monopoly in the United States. The statement I shall read was made in response to an inquiry last year from the House Committee on Small Business, and it is to be found at page 144 in the committee print of a report entitled "United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, a Staff Report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Pursuant to House Resolution 64":

In the opinion of the Commission—

In other words, the Federal Trade Commission—

the present, and still growing, concentration of economic power in the United States constitutes today's greatest domestic challenge to the American theory of competitive enterprise, and, along with it, all that is embodied in the meaning of the somewhat intangible, but nonetheless real, meaning of "the American way of life" and "freedom of economic enterprise."

Concentration of economic power, as here used, may be accomplished either through the familiar methods of corporate consolidations and acquisition of properties that bring a large part of an industry, or line of trade, under a single management (i. e. true monopoly), or by the more subtle, and less well understood, means of cooperation among a relatively few strongly intrenched but (corporately speaking) mutually independent managements. These corporately separate managements may work together through any or all of a myriad of means and methods to accomplish group monopoly restraints and control both within and without the cooperating group.

Mr. President, I skip now to page 147, and read the following:

The ultimate alternative to such reasonable control is the end of free competitive enterprise, either through private monopoly which runs the government or government monopoly which runs business. Nothing in past history indicates that either—

Meaning either monopoly or governmental control of everything—

will serve consumer interests more economically than a fair competitive field for private initiative.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the able Senator from Wyoming.

MEN WITHOUT PROPERTY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to note that the Senator from Florida has read that particular extract from the Small Business Committee report. It strikes me, if the Senator will pardon me, that it bears a little amplification in connection with the nature of the bill which is now before us.

To me the most significant factor about the increase in the concentration of economic power is the effect it has upon employees. The truth of the matter is that the further the concentration proceeds, the greater is the—I hesitate to say the word, but, nevertheless, it is the correct word—the greater is the number of those who may be classified as members of the proletariat. The proletariat is that group of our population which has no opportunity to own property, which cannot own a business, and which cannot own the means of livelihood. Labor trouble arises from the fact that a large proportion of our people are no longer able to own and control the means of production. Revolutions have been caused all through history when people have been unable to control the means of production. It was the ownership of land by the feudal overlords that provoked the conditions which overthrew the feudal system, because the people would not tolerate conditions by which they were deprived of the right to own the only means of production.

The characteristic of the industrial revolution is that the land is no longer the principal means of production. The huge tools which modern industry needs now constitute the principal means of production.

What we fail to observe, Mr. President, is that the employees in these great national industries no longer have any opportunity to own the means of production, and a great number of workers, as a consequence, are dependent solely upon their organizations to defend their economic interests. Therefore, when Congress, in the midst of this concentration of economic power, with the multiplication of the workers who cannot own their tools, undertakes to weaken the means of the organizations for collective bargaining, then Congress, by passing such laws, is increasing the danger of the creation in this country of a proletariat.

We talk about the conflict of ideologies that is appearing in the world now between the American idea and the communistic idea. We shall never understand that conflict unless we realize, first of all, that the American idea is based soundly upon the theory that the people have the right to own the means of production. When they do not own the means of production, then they lose the very basis of what we call the American way of life.

The Communist theory is that the people, in the modern world, cannot own

the means of production, and that therefore there should be arbitrary state control. If the United States of America is to defend the American way of life, which is the system of private property, then it must make sure that nothing shall be done to increase the number of people without property. When the proletariat is created and permitted to expand, the very foundations of the American system are weakened. Let us never forget that the Soviet system is also called the "dictatorship of the proletariat." The best antidote for communism is the wide distribution of property.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for what he has said. It is recognized by the Senate that he is the best-informed man on this subject of all the Senators, due to his magnificent work as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which made the best survey that has ever been made in this field.

I happen to have before me portions of the report, Document No. 206, entitled "Economic Concentration and World War II, Report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, United States Senate," submitted to the Senate June 14, 1946. This is what it says about the subject the able Senator from Wyoming was just mentioning:

It will be noted—

Referring to a chart on the adjoining page—

It will be noted that there has been a steady and continuous decline in the relative importance of the self-employed members of the working community. Self-employed enterprisers constituted 36.9 percent of all the gainful workers in 1850, but their proportion had fallen to 30.8 percent at the turn of the century, to 23.5 percent in 1920, and to 18.8 percent in 1939.

In other words, Mr. President, the percentage of gainfully employed, self-employed, workers in America decreased from nearly 37 percent of the whole in 1880 to a little less than 19 percent in 1939, or a loss of 20 percent in the period of 59 years.

The chart clearly shows that the greatest decline among the self-employed workers occurred in the farming community. In 1880, 27.8 percent of the workers were independent farmers; but by 1939 this group had decreased to only 11.8 percent of the total. Professional practitioners likewise declined from 1.1 percent in 1880 to 0.9 percent in 1939.

Then it goes on to show that nonfarm business enterprisers declined from 8 percent of all gainful workers in 1880 to 6.1 percent in 1939.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming has emphasized, America is gradually gravitating into the hands of the few. Not only that but the doors of opportunity are steadily being closed to the many. Instances like the Horatio Alger story, From Rags to Riches, are diminishing to a very small number in America today, because how can a man start out and hope to build a business which will compete with the great industrial and financial giants, which have monopolies in nearly every field of American economy?

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to cite many instances showing four corporations, or three corporations, or two corporations, controlling the whole or nearly the whole of the national output of some commodity. For example, three or four automobile concerns control 70 percent of all of the automobile market. There are many instances of the whole output of a commodity being controlled by one corporation or two corporations. The public says, "I do not see that I have any interest in that. If they can produce goods more cheaply, perhaps that is to the public interest."

Let me illustrate what the monopolies use their power for. I have here a quotation from the report to which I referred a minute ago, United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives. On page 92 I find this:

Monopoly means high prices. Competition means low prices. A statistical study of 37 census industries made by the National Resources Committee revealed that the dominant factor in making for depression, insensitivity of prices, is the administrative control over prices which results from the relatively small number of concerns dominating particular markets.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As we analyze what is now going on and relate what has taken place with reference to the political and economic control of the Nation to the efforts which are being made, for instance, by the pending legislation, does it not seem that we are returning to the philosophies of an earlier day in the history of the country? If we believe in the American way of life, we should study what has happened in the past. For instance, what is the difference between the philospohy of Alexander Hamilton, in the early days, and what is going on now? Is it not a conflict between concentrated wealth on the one hand and the people on the other? Who should be concerned?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator put his hand right on the matter. I will comment further, in a moment.

Mr. President, the Bible says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." I lay it down as a political axiom, it is impossible to identify oneself with the welfare of the masses of the people of America and at the same time advocate policies that foster and protect corporate monopoly. A man must take one side or the other in a fight; and in the political life of the country, I believe the two interests are irreconcilable, and a man is forced to a choice.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The political history of the country corroborates what the Senator says; it is necessary to take one side or the other whether it be for economic betterment or not. The political history of this country indicates that it is just as necessary today to take sides as it has ever been. Jefferson was a philosopher. The philosophy that is now the Republican philosophy existed even in the early days. There was a practical application of the philosophy of a government by the people, under the Jacksonians. What is the situation today? It is exactly the same. The issue is clean cut between the power of wealth, the power of might, the power of industry, the power of monopoly, on the one hand, and the people on the other hand.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was very much interested in the Senator's comment on the concentration of economic power. I wondered whether or not the Senator had any figures showing to what extent the concentration of economic power had increased during the last 12 or 14 years?

Mr. PEPPER. The process has been going on continuously in American life, at least I will say, ever since 1880, when there really began what we might call the industrial revolution in this country. It has received a great acceleration in recent years. I can save the Senator the statement of his conclusion by stating it for him. He wants me to note the fact that in the last 13 or 14 years the Democrats have been in power, and Franklin D. Roosevelt failed to break up this monopoly. I will say to the able Senator from Maine that in my opinion he is also forgetting that Franklin D. Roosevelt said, in his inaugural address, or in a campaign speech of 1936, "It is my hope that big business will say that in my first term they met their——

Mr. BREWSTER. "Match."

Mr. PEPPER. "Match." And in the second term——

Mr. BREWSTER. In the second term, "their master."

Mr. PEPPER. "Their master." I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know it a little better than does the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. It is natural for a Republican, when he reaches the "master" part of it to think of that, without having to think of it very reflectively. But the Senator will recall, I think, if he will examine the records of the Congress, that the failure to break the stronghold of monopoly upon the throats of the American people was not the fault of Franklin D. Roosevelt but of the Congress, who would not support him.

I will go further and say that President Truman has made a recommendation on the same subject. I read from the address delivered by the President in January of this year:

Second, restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices; assistance to small business; and the promotion of the free competitive system of private enterprise.

In his message, the President goes on to say:

Restriction of monopoly and promotion of private enterprise: The second major policy I desire to lay before you has to do with the growing concentration of economic power and the threat to free competition in private enterprise. In 1941 the Temporary National Economic Committee completed a comprehensive investigation into the workings of the national economy. The Committee's study showed that, despite half a century of antitrust law enforcement, one of the gravest threats to our welfare lay in the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations.

During the war, this long-standing tendency toward economic concentration was accelerated. As a consequence, we now find that to a greater extent than ever before, whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production in the interest of higher profits and thus reduce employment and purchasing power.

In an effort to assure full opportunity and free competition to business we will vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. There is much the Congress can do to cooperate and assist in this program.

To strengthen and enforce the laws that regulate business practices is not enough. Enforcement must be supplemented by positive measures of aid to new enterprises. Government assistance, research programs, and credit powers should be designed and used to promote the growth of new firms and new industries. Assistance to small business is particularly important at this time when thousands of veterans who are potential business and industrial leaders are beginning their careers.

We should also give special attention to the decentralization of industry and the development of areas that are now underindustrialized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the frankness with which the Senator anticipated the trend of my queries, and I wondered whether he would go along similarly with equal frankness to recognize, in the light of what President Truman, as I understood him, said, that today we face a greater concentration of economic power than ever before in our history. Was not that the substance of it?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that is at the end of 14 years of the absolute control of this body by a group other than the Republican Party. I appreciated, however, the Senator's suggestion that President Roosevelt still held this lofty goal, and that he put the responsibility on the Congress. Would it not also be pertinent to observe that throughout that entire period the Congress was controlled by overwhelming majorities of the party represented by Senators on the other side of this aisle, and that apparently they, even under the leadership of President Roosevelt had been entirely unable to cope with this situation. What assurance can we have, then, that a restoration of that control, so eagerly sought by the Senator from Florida, would give us any more hope in another 14 years.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Maine that there is certainly no hope in giving the Republican Party a majority of the Congress. That is not going to help any. The record of the Republican Party thus far this year affirms that to be a fact. I will say to the Senator that this country is not controlled by the Congress; it is controlled by the corporations. As a general rule, politicians are but puppets of corporate dominance, and the reason of it is, if we strive to do right, in many instances we are thwarted from doing so by their control of the press, and the radio, and the other media of communication. So that, generally speaking, the man elected to office does not have free access to the public mind, and the people do not have free access to information respecting the truth and the facts about their country and their government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield again to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am much interested in what the Senator has had to say. I came here 14 years ago, after coping with the alleged power of monopoly which was personified by the person of Samuel Insull in my State. I came here by the voice of those who said the forgotten man would have to be remembered. I came here with high hope of continuing here the same crusade for what I conceived to be the interest of the common people that we had conducted in my own State. I found here a curious thing, that throughout the earlier stages of the New Deal, the first 5 to 8 years, the policies which were pursued seemed to be nicely calculated to make it impossible for the smaller businessman to survive. We saw more and more of the concentration of power here with which the little businessman was entirely unable to cope. Unless one had the affluence to hire a Philadelphia lawyer, the requirements for filing of returns and the constant passing of new legislation made it absolutely impossible for the small businessman even to stay out of jail. At first I thought this was inadvertence. As time passed on, it seemed to be part of a calculated plan that would result exactly as it has resulted, in a greater and greater concentration of economic power.

Whether or not that was with the idea that the achievement of the socialistic dream of expropriation of all American industry would become simpler, I began to ponder. I have not yet reached a conclusion, but the only two things which have emerged clearly from the 14 tragic years through which we have passed have been, on one hand, what was apparently a design for chaos, and, on the other, a design for the concentration of economic power which has certainly been achieved. Whether that may serve the purpose of any of those who believe that such a condition would simplify the nationalizing of our industry along the English or the Russian pattern, I do not say. I say simply that it seems to be a most interesting coincidence. Whether it has been planned that way I leave to those subtle minds that have conceived the various measures by which the American people for the last 14 years have been bemused.

Mr. PEPPER. That is an unworthy comment for a man of the intelligence of the Senator from Maine to make. If he has an innuendo, as he has calculated to put it in his assertion, that Franklin D. Roosevelt was striving for a form of communism or something along that line, the facts speak so much more loudly than anything the Senator from Maine can intimate that it is, in my opinion, unworthy of the Senator. If it had not been for the Republican corruption and the Republican policies which thrust us into the depression, it would not have been necessary to impose the restraints and regulations which it was required that the New Deal establish. I said awhile ago, and I reaffirm, that Franklin D. Roosevelt gave America the best record of service to American business that it has had, and I certainly do not consider that there has been anything to the contrary of that statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment more?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust that in his calmer moments the Senator from Florida will read with some care precisely what I said, in order to be quite clear that I did not lay responsibility for what had transpired in the course of the 14 years on the doorstep of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I neither condone nor condemn. I think our Government is something far vaster. I think he was subject to many influences and forces. No man in the White House can control the situation. It is something which transcends him, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. There were many influences operating. I do think there were groups more or less consolidated that had definite ideas as to how America could be improved and that "would make America over." I think they were in contact with President Roosevelt. I think to some extent President Roosevelt accepted their advice. I certainly charge no deep and dark plot to President Roosevelt. I think it was utterly beyond the comprehension of any single man to determine the trend of all these forces. But I state the net result of 14 years, and "by their fruits ye shall know them." The Senator from Florida admits that at the end of 14 years of other than Republican administration—I will leave it there—other than Republican administration of the Congress and the executive branch, we had the greatest concentration of economic power this country had ever seen. Then what use is it for the same people to ask to be entrusted again with power?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I will say to the Senator from Maine that in every depression the big monopolists and the powerful come out the winners. The Republican Party thrust this country into a depression which ruined the ordinary American citizen and the ordinary American businessman. The few that survived were the strong and the powerful monopolies which were able to buy up for nothing at bankruptcy sales the business enterprises of America which went through the Hoover wringer.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment. That is the first aspect of it. That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democrats inherited from 12 years of corrupt and colossally ignorant Republican rule. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. They are admonished that no manifestations of approval or disapproval are permitted under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Then came the other period, Mr. President, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was struggling not only for recovery but for reform, thank God. I never knew of a Republican ticket contemplating reform. One does not ordinarily think of reform, for it means taking money out of the monopoly pocket, as being associated with Republican policy, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, thank God, believed not only in recovery, but in reform. Thank God, he did try to make over America, the America the other group had stolen from the people, and if he had had an opportunity to have effected such reform, if it had not been for the Liberty League crowd that conspired against him, if it had not been for the monopolistic controls of 90 percent of the press that lied about him, if the people had understood the facts, we would have had a better America today and a wealthier and a happier and more prosperous citizenship than we have.

Yes; then we had a war, Mr. President, and the great acceleration of this concentration occurred in the war. We all know that to be so. The major part of the contracts went to the large corporations, but, Mr. President, that was wartime. Then we were thinking not so much about the nature of the economy as to get war materials and other products to the men overseas. We know that for those purposes monopoly may serve the public interest, because great corporate enterprises do have the capacity to make goods. So America allowed that concentration of power—or it occurred in spite of the people, who preferred not to see it—because it was an inevitable part of the war itself, and a part of an all-out effort to build up productivity in America which would help win the victory with the least possible loss of life of our boys and girls and men and women who were fighting the war.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment. Now that the end of the war has come, now that we have achieved a recovery from the depression days, and the Republican Party finds itself in power in the Congress, and the President recommends legislation which will do certain things in the labor field and try to break the stranglehold of monopoly on American trade, all we find from the Republican Party leadership is a bill to strangle labor. One could not get a bill to strangle monopoly 3 inches on the Republican side of the aisle, Mr. President. So I say that if we will put the Democratic Party in power, and if the Democratic Party will achieve its mission in American political life, which is to be the champion of the people, and if it can break the stranglehold of the monopolists upon American opinion, we may be able to get something done. But all I see so far is an antilabor bill, totally ignoring the President's recommendation that we approach the subject of monopoly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. It was not the Roosevelt administration which brought about the control of monopoly by a few. It was the times. We were in war; and of necessity everyone has to serve as best he can in war. That is what brought about monopoly in many instances. Possibly we should have gone back to the days of Jackson; but on whom could we depend? Americans—be they monopolists, so-called, Socialists, Communists, Democrats, or Republicans—were in control. There is no question whatsoever in my mind that the same monopolists who are now controlling the country took advantage of the emotions and the loyalty and patriotism of the American people to increase the hold of monopoly.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to press on to a conclusion. I believe that when the record of this Congress is written in legislation enacted while the other party is in power, it will be found that taxes have been reduced to prefer the rich against the poor. It will be found that public money has been spent so as to strangle the development of public power and public improvements in the West and on the Pacific coast. It will be found that the favors of the party have gone to the faithful, who are the big financial entrepreneurs, the manufacturers, and the great business groups of America. I leave the record to speak for itself. In time the people will, of course, be able to see it.

I was saying a while ago that the report to which I was then referring showed what the monopolists do to the people when they have monopolistic power. I read from page 92 of the report:

A few cases of price changes during the depression from 1929 to 1932 illustrate the point.

Only slight price declines occurred in concentrated industries.

Single producers controlled all the output of nickel and aluminum. Nickel prices remained unchanged, while aluminum declined 4 percent.

Two producers in each field controlled the markets for sulfur, plate glass, and bananas. Sulfur prices showed no change. Plate-glass prices decreased 5 percent, while banana prices dropped only 2 percent.

That was during the depression.

Three top producers controlled automobile production and the potash market. Auto prices fell 21 percent. Potash prices fell only 9 percent.

One company produced about 41 percent of the agricultural implements and the largest four producers produced 72 percent; prices declined only 15 percent.

Yet look at the farmers—having their farms sold under the hammer at foreclosure sale, losing the savings of a lifetime, yet farm machinery declined, even in the pit of the depression, only 15 percent. The monopolists had control of it.

On the other hand, price declines during the depression were made sharper in concentrated industries:

Lumber, where the largest four producers account for only 5 percent of the output, prices fell 36 percent.

In cotton textiles, where the top four concerns produced 8 percent of the total, prices declined 42 percent.

Wheat and corn, highly competitive fields with thousands of independent producers, experienced price declines of 56 percent and 66 percent, respectively.

The farmers were not organized into monopolies, and their prices went down more than 50 percent.

I could show, for example, with respect to flashlight bulbs, that the General Electric Co. reduced the life of lamp bulbs and discouraged bulb testing by purchasers, trying to give the user less than he was entitled to have in a common light bulb. In connection with fluorescent lamps, General Electric Co., Westinghouse, and public utilities delayed the introduction of fluorescent lamps and sought to prevent their use on any basis that would reduce the consumption of electricity.

In connection with synthetic rubber, the report tells the story of how the great Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey blocked the development of synthetic rubber in the United States by suppressing the development of butyl, the best of the synthetics, cheaper than natural rubber and superior to natural rubber for inner tubes.

In connection with 100-octane gasoline, the Standard Oil Co., under a cartel arrangement with I. G. Farben, a German company, blocked the commercial development of 100-octane gasoline in the United States, and withheld technical information from the Army Air Corps.

In connection with military optical glass, by cartel agreement between Bausch & Lomb and Carl Zeiss, German firms, the heads of the Bausch & Lomb department responsible for military research were to be appointed only with the agreement of the Zeiss firm, a German firm.

The Germans had pretty good information as to what we had on our ships and in other parts of our defense because of this cartel agreement with American firms. Not only was there control of our economic welfare, but the security of America was jeopardized.

Bausch & Lomb maintained artificially high prices on spectacles by controlling patents and withholding supplies from concerns attempting to reduce prices.

The same situation was true of plexiglass, tungsten carbide, magnesium, dyestuffs, vitamin D, which affects health, synthetic hormones, quebracho extract for tanning leather, titanium, and so forth.

So, Mr. President, the record speaks for itself as to what the effect of these monopolies is upon the American people.

I should like to mention one other thing. I hold in my hand a letter to which I wish to call the attention of the press, because it deals with newsprint. I hold in my hand a letter with the name

"Scankraft" at the top of the letterhead. Its headquarters are in Stockholm, Sweden. Under the name appears the following:

The Price-Quoting Association of the Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish kraft paper manufacturers.

In other words, the Finns, the Swedes, and the Norwegians have got together and, through a single company, have fixed all prices on kraft paper which they produce. They do the same thing with respect to newsprint. The cartel agent in respect to newsprint is called Scannews. I hold in my hand a secret document taken from the files of the secret council of the Finnish newsprint cartel, showing for the first time the working together of the Finnish newsprint cartel with the Canadian newsprint cartel, the effect and design of which was to limit the amount of newsprint that goes on the American market, and to keep up the price to American publishers. Those in America who are participating in that price-fixing and quantity-limiting program from Finland and Canada, in my opinion, are violating the laws of this land.

At present there is under way an investigation, and a grand jury will sit in New York on the 26th of this month in the Federal court to hear information possibly leading to the indictment of persons who are operating in this field. I shall lay that document before the grand jury and see if there cannot be some criminal prosecution of those participating in the criminal cartels in violation of our antitrust laws. The effect of such operations today is to starve the American press of necessary newsprint and to make it pay higher prices than it should pay for that commodity. In my State there are many weekly newspapers which use only one roll of paper every 2 weeks. They are having to close because they cannot get newsprint. Yet giant international cartels limit the quantity of newsprint production on the American market and make American publishers pay exorbitant prices for it. That is an exploitation of the American people.

Mr. President, I have only one thing to say in conclusion. In yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article by Mr. James Reston, the title of which was "Europe's Broken Economy Challenges United States—More Aid To Rebuild Continent Held Necessary To Block Communism."

I have already adverted to the necessity, in my opinion, of the United States working with the other economies of the world to rebuild the war-broken economy of Europe and the world.

I think we cannot do that merely by pouring American money into other countries—certainly not for military purposes—but I believe that through the United Nations and its many instrumentalities for international collaboration and cooperation we can find a basis upon which we can maintain in Europe, and in most of the world, the free American way of life and the private enterprise economic system.

After all, Mr. President, here in America is the most assured market for American production.

Mr. Reston points out in the article to which I have referred that we are now sending abroad $16,000,000,000 worth of goods and services a year and are getting back from abroad about $5,000,000,000 worth of goods and approximately $3,000,000,000 worth of their savings. He emphasizes that their savings are rapidly running out; they will be exhausted by the middle of 1948. Mr. Acheson said the same thing when speaking to the Delta Council in Mississippi a few days ago. Europe needs $16,000,000,000 a year of goods and services from America. She is able at the present time to send us only $5,000,000,000 worth of goods and she has no prospect of sending more in the future. That means that every year we shall have to give Europe $8,000,000,000 worth of goods and services if we are to keep the people alive. Can we do that, Mr. President, except with a strong America, with manufacturing, labor, and agriculture and everyone working together? Can we do it with industrial and economic strife and strikes in America? No, Mr. President. Not only that, but we can have no assured market for the productivity of our factories and farms unless the masses of the American people are able to buy our goods to the very maximum.

Mr. President, the design and effect of the pending bill are to diminish the power of the people, to contribute to the weakening of the American economy at home, the production of chaos abroad, the encouragement of communism and, Mr. President, war itself.

Therefore it is my earnest hope that the Senate will not pass this bill, that, if any legislation is to be passed, Senators will be satisfied to have it strike specifically at certain abuses, but that we will not crucify the American workingman upon the cross of hate which anyone has in his heart, and that we will adopt the American policy of passing legislation for the benefit of the prosperity and well-being of the whole people. If we do so, Mr. President, we shall repudiate this vindictive bill which is now before us.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 8, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interests of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

(2) by detailing to assist those countries any person in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in any advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall

furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of the United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act; and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out.

SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments under authority of this act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommuncations conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 12, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to yield the floor, for the purpose of permitting me to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin will resume the floor after the proposed agreement has been acted upon.

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall have to absent myself from the Chamber for the remainder of the afternoon, but I desire to give my acquiescence to the unanimous-consent agreement which the Senator from Nebraska is about to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. That being the case, I should like to say that unanimous consent proposal is that when the Senate takes a recess tonight no further amendments shall be offered to the bill, and that at 12:30 tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote upon whatever amendment is pending to the bill, which is the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and then on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That proposal will be reduced to writing and will be submitted later.

I believe that the absence of a quorum should now be suggested, because, inasmuch as the proposed agreement relates to the final passage of the bill, it is necessary to have a quorum present.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. The proposed agreement has been discussed, and I feel that the suggestion is agreeable.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Conor
Barkley	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair understands the Senator from Nebraska has a unanimous-consent request in writing to submit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have not yet reduced it to writing. The quorum call proceeded a little more rapidly than I had anticipated, and if there is nothing to come before the Senate, I should like to ask for a brief recess, of 5 minutes, perhaps, if that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not proceed un-

til we get the unanimous-consent request prepared.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the Senator from Maryland should offer a small amendment, about which I think there is no controversy, and the Senate should act on it, would that make it necessary to have another quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it would not be necessary.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not want to interfere with the unanimous-consent request. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me, I should like to submit an amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed merely to help a great number of hospitals which are having very difficult times. They are eleemosynary institutions; no profit is involved in their operations, and I understand from the Hospital Association that this amendment would be very helpful in their efforts to serve those who have not the means to pay for hospital service, enable them to keep the doors open and operate the hospitals. I do not believe the committee is opposed to the amendment. I do not believe the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], is opposed to it, and I hope there will be no objection from any quarter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The committee considered this amendment, but did not act on it, because it was felt it was unnecessary. The committee felt that hospitals were not engaged in interstate commerce, and that their business should not be so construed. We rather felt it would open up the question of making other exemptions. That is why the committee did not act upon the amendment as it was proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate the reasons given why the committee did not act on it. I think we all realize that hospitals that are working on a nonprofit basis are not engaged in interstate commerce, but I know they are having a hard time to keep going, and I think it would be very helpful if the committee would put the specific language in the bill. They serve all mankind. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to address an inquiry to the Senator from Maryland about the proposed amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does the amendment do, may I ask the Senator from Maryland? Does it prevent hospital employees, particularly nurses, from organizing? Is that the sense of the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. It simply makes a hospital not an "employer" in the commercial sense of the term. It is not a business operating on a profit basis. It is a charitable institution which is kept open, and it is to lift it out of the category of ordinary business, and is to except such charitable institutions. It is, rather, to relieve them from the pressures that normally go with business. Such institutions cannot keep open, in certain cases, I may say to the Senator, unless relief is afforded. The people who are affected are the poor people of the country. The amendment affects only charitable institutions, which do not derive a cent of profit, but are maintained by donations almost entirely, except for a small amount of revenue received for services rendered.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator has made that clear, but I wanted to know what would be the effect if nurses in a hospital should decide to organize. Would it prevent their organization?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it would.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. TYDINGS. They should not have to come to the National Labor Relations Board, as in the case of ordinary business concerns. They are not in interstate commerce. A hospital is a local institution, quite often kept up by the donations of benevolent persons. I hope the Senate will let the amendment go to conference. Employees of such a hospital should not have to come to the National Labor Relations Board. A charitable institution is away beyond the scope of labor-management relations in which a profit is involved. No profit is involved in this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be true, but nevertheless I have in mind that nursing is one of the most poorly paid professions in America; outside the profession of school teaching it is perhaps the poorest paid, in proportion to the service rendered to humanity. I do not want to place the nursing profession under any handicap in their efforts to obtain an improved standard of living.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the amendment will affect them in the slightest way as to salaries. I will say to the Senator they can still protest, they can still walk out. The only thing it does is to lift them out of commercial channels of labor-management where a profit is involved. The most of these institutions are maintained by the benevolence of thousands of people who contribute to community funds and so on, to keep them going. I am told it will be a big aid to the community if they are not brought in under the strict scope of labor-management commercial relations where profit is involved.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the Senator. These may not be profit-making institutions, but even so I feel that, simply because an institution, even one like the Red Cross, is kept up by popular subscription, the professional workers, even employees of the Red Cross, should be permitted a decent living and should not be hamstrung in their efforts to obtain it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. With that assurance, I shall not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wanted to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Is the amendment so worded that it applies only to hospitals not operated for profit?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely.

Mr. KILGORE. There are hospitals that are highly profitable.

Mr. TYDINGS. The specific language is, "that are operated with no effort to make a profit." The amendment applies to completely nonprofit organizations. There is not a penny of profit in it for anybody.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Maryland to tell us at what point the amendment is to be inserted?

Mr. TYDINGS. On page 4, line 10, after the comma.

Mr. DONNELL. What is the language, please?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not have the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I send to the desk the unanimous-consent request which I said I would propose. It has been reduced to writing, and I now ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon the pending amendment to the bill, S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the said bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended; that the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the House bill be considered as ordered, and that a vote be immediately taken upon the final passage of the House bill, as amended: *Provided,* That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that there be added the last paragraph which was in the original draft which would prevent any amendments at all being offered tomorrow, so that the Senate will be fully advised tonight of what the amendments are.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that it be read at the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Ohio if there is any virtue in fixing the hour at 12:30. I have consumed no time discussing the pending measure. I wish briefly to comment upon it. Would 1 o'clock suit as well as 12:30?

Mr. TAFT. We have worked it out with great difficulty, to accommodate Senators, and I hope we shall not have to change it. We should be glad to give the Senator from Kentucky plenty of time tomorrow, or today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure I can speak on it today, but would the Presiding Officer give me his moral assistance in an effort to obtain recognition tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky wish?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would require 30 or 40 minutes, probably.

Mr. TAFT. I am sure we could give the Senator from Kentucky certainly 45 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to suggest to the minority leader that we will recess until 11 o'clock, if agreeable to the Senate. That will give us from 11 until 12:30 for final consideration of the bill, and I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I will give him my moral support to see that he is given an opportunity to speak, if it is agreeable to other Senators, and I feel it will be.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. As the former Senator from Alabama, Mr. Heflin, used to say, "Under those heads, I have no objection."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the agreement proposes that no amendment shall be submitted to the bill after the agreement is entered into?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to read an additional part of the unanimous-consent agreement which should have been incorporated in the agreement and read at the desk:

Ordered further, That after the recess of the Senate today no further amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

I will read the proviso which was read, which appears at the end of the agreement, and the clause following the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received.

Ordered further, That after the recess of the Senate today no further amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my inquiry was prompted by the statement of the Senator from Ohio because at the very moment that the unanimous-consent agreement was being proposed I was reading the bill reported by the committee, and I found therein on page 8 what appears to be an obvious oversight, which ought to be corrected by amendment. It occurred to me that if the committee, which had reported the bill, has made such an obvious oversight as the one I am about to point out, there may be many others found on examination.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me merely to state the oversight. Section 3 (a) on page 8 reads as follows:

There is hereby created a board, to be known as the "National Labor Relations Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of seven members. Of the four additional members, whose positions on the Board are established by this amendment, two shall be appointed for terms of 5 years, and the other two for terms of 2 years.

I read on then to find out by whom it was proposed that these appointments should be made. The original Wagner Act provides that the three members on the existing Board shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. For some reason or another that phrase apparently has been dropped from the bill. So we now have reported by the committee a measure which proposes to increase the membership of the National Labor Relations Board from three to seven, which contemplates the appointment of these additional members but which provides no method for the nomination, and no procedure for confirmation by the Senate. I am sure that the committee in charge of the bill will want to propose an amendment to correct this obvious error.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me there is enough in the agreement at the present to make it clear that amendments of any character are in order all afternoon. The only restriction is that they shall be germane to the bill, in order that after we enter into the unanimous-consent agreement all sorts of amendments may not be proposed. Any amendment germane to the bill may be offered all afternoon. The only other restriction is that tomorrow there shall be no amendments offered, so that when we recess tonight we shall know everything we are going to vote on, and amendments of which we have had no knowledge will not be offered tomorrow.

If the provision referred to by the Senator from Wyoming is a mistake, and I do not think it is, it can be corrected by amendment at any time during the afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the copy of the bill before us there is obviously this mistake, since when I rose to call attention to the matter I sent for a copy of the Wagner Act, and I find that the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Wagner Act, which is proposed to be amended by the pending bill, reads as follows:

SEC. 3 (a). There is hereby created a board, to be known as the "National Labor Relations Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

That phrase has been omitted from the bill before us. Therefore, Mr. President, if it is in order at this time, I move that the bill be amended on page 8, line 13, by striking out the period after the word "members," and inserting a comma and the words "who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] temporarily has the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Wyoming, and therefore the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming would be in order after the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say that it was my desire to call the attention of the Senate to the oversight.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question. Assuming that no amendments may be offered after today, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, does that mean that any amendment which has been sent to the desk and has been printed for the information of the Senate, which would not be voted on today, cannot be offered tomorrow? We can only have one amendment at a time before the Senate, and usually there are three or four amendments which have been proposed, and which are printed and are lying on the table awaiting an opportunity to be offered. Does the unanimous-consent agreement mean that if there is no vote on any amendment by the time we recess today, although it has been printed for the information of the Senate and lies on the desk in contemplation of being offered later, it cannot be offered tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that we have concluded action on all amendments

which have been offered, with the exception of the pending substitute. That is the only amendment left to the bill, and that is the pending question.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if an amendment were offered this afternoon and not disposed of by the time we recess today, it would not be in order to dispose of it tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; if it is not offered when we recess tonight, then we proceed, at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow to vote on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say for the information of the Senate that there are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some amendments might be offered. Some Senator might offer an amendment this afternoon, and it would have to be disposed of under this unanimous-consent order by the time we recess today.

Mr. WHERRY. By the time we recess tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. If an amendment were offered and were pending at the time the Senate takes a recess today it could not be voted on tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Before we recess I think we should vote on all amendments that are pending, provided they are offered today.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I am trying to clear up.

Mr. TAFT. The agreement may be modified so as to provide for that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not object to the program, but it ought to be clearly understood that if any Senator offers an amendment this afternoon and it has not been disposed of by the time we recess, the Senate would not be barred from voting on that amendment tomorrow prior to 12:30.

Mr. WHERRY. The unanimous-consent request provides that at 12:30 the Senate shall proceed to vote on the bill and any amendments thereto, so that would take care of amendments offered today.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the interpretation?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the interpretation of the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], as modified. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

The agreement, as modified, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be submitted on today—Monday, May 12, 1947—as intended to be proposed, to the bill S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the said bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill as amended; that the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the House bill be considered as ordered, and that a vote be then taken upon the final passage of the House bill as amended.

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received, and that after the recess of the Senate today no new amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should now like to offer the amendment I had previously referred to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming has submitted an amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment is to correct what appears to be an obvious omission in the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the bill as it is reported. It will be understood that the first title of the bill is an amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. There was no intention on the part of the committee to eliminate the portion of the present National Labor Relations Act providing for the appointment of members of the Board by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. My amendment is to add to the first sentence the clause which appears in the National Labor Relations Act, section 3 (a), and which I think was omitted from the bill by mere oversight. After the word "members" at the beginning of line 13, on page 8, I propose to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the insertion of the words omitted by error, but I think they should be inserted at another place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is proposed to insert the words after the word "members" at the beginning of line 13 on page 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator will find that that is the correct place.

Mr. TAFT. At any rate, it is satisfactory to me for the present. We can straighten it out in conference.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he thinks his amendment is necessary, in view of the fact that the Constitution provides, in article II, that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law"?

Does not the Senator believe that that is a self-executing clause? Although there may be no objection to the amendment, after all, is it not an omission of language unnecessary in this act rather than an erroneous omission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Knowing the tendency of courts and others who read the law to ascribe particular motives and reasons when specific language is inserted or omitted, I propose the amendment merely for the purpose of removing all danger of misconstruction, so that no one will wonder why the clause was omitted.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection whatever to the insertion of the amendment, but I undertake to say that, under the language I have read, the amendment is unnecessary. Perhaps it is advisable from the standpoint of ultracaution, but it is unnecessary. Therefore, there has been no error in the bill arising from the fact that the language was not therein included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I never rise in the Senate, after listening to my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], but I wish that his great abilities and great fecundity of expression were devoted to what I call a little more level-headed thinking.

I do not rise in order to pose either as a prophet of evil or a prophet of good. I feel that the American people should have faith in this Congress. I want to say that in reply to what has been said in relation to power that develops because of the accumulation of wealth, I can agree with that; but I also want to say, as one who has gone into the proposition that under our antitrust laws there is adequate remedy, that we cannot turn to any antitrust law on our books including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, with amendments without finding that from the very start there is power in the Federal Government and there has been power there for years and decades with which to handle the evils resulting from monopoly. The question is whether the administrative branch or the executive branch, whose duty it is to carry out the intent of the law, will carry through.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise to reply to the Senator from Florida; I rose to give my own views in relation to the pending measure, the bill which has been before the Senate for quite a number of days. I am sure that everyone who listens to me can appreciate the fact that America stands for the rule of law, not the rule of the racketeer or the rule of violence; it stands for the rule of democracy, not the rule of labor-boss dictatorship, management dictatorship, or dictatorship by monopoly; it stands for the rule of equality, not the rule of inequality of treatment of either labor or management; the rule of public

welfare, not the rule of special interests. Above all I hope America will return to the rule of self-help, not of reliance on Washington, D. C., to legislate the millennium into labor-management relations.

Mr. President, we shall shortly complete our work on the pending bill. I call it a bill restating sound American principles. I have refrained thus far from expressing my views on the measure, largely because I am not a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and did not have the opportunity to examine in the closest detail all of the provisions of the bill. I have, however, followed the arguments very closely and would now like to express some general thoughts in summary on the nature of this legislation.

I shall not attempt to review all of the specific phases of the amendments which we have enacted, the provisions of the Senate bill itself, or of the House bill, but shall confine my remarks to the principles underlying our action here.

As I see it, the basic purpose of the legislation we are enacting is to protect the public welfare from the arbitrary abuses of power by labor monopoly and racketeering. Our basic purpose is to halt the callous and wanton frittering away of America's values over the last decade and more. Too long have we ignored the termite process on America's Constitution, on her Bill of Rights, on the basic liberties of our people in the field of labor.

We cannot in this critical period overlook much longer this unhealthy condition in the ranks of labor, which is just one phase of the unhealthy condition in the world. Concentrated power corrupts and destroys, whether it be in politics, in capital, or in labor; and that is especially true when men do not appreciate what they are doing to the American way of life.

Ordinarily, I would be among the last persons to state that any legislation is necessary along this line, if it were at all possible to get labor and management to clean their own houses. But we have seen years and years of industrial chaos, with resulting economic loss to the Nation. What is worse, we find a growing disrespect for law and the rights of man. We have seen strikes halt production and bring closer the menace of inflation. We have seen Congress enact a constructive labor bill, only to have it vetoed by the President, with the result that we were plunged back into the same sort of chaos that existed before. I trust that that will not occur again.

There are, as I see it, four parties involved in any labor-management controversy. They are:

First. Management, representing the investors, stockholders, bondholders, and the actual management personnel.

Second. The union, represented by its officers, and supposedly speaking and acting for the best interests of the workingman.

Third. The workingman himself, the honest rank and file of American labor, 95 percent of whom, as I have stated again and again in the Senate, are honest, law-abiding, hard-working citizens who ask only for their right to work, and that Congress does not fail to protect their inherent American rights.

Fourth. The fourth party in any dispute is the most important party—the general public, meaning all segments of our society. Heretofore, we have legislated segment-wise, bearing in mind only the first two parties, organized management and union organization. Congress enacted antitrust laws to curb management monopoly. Congress enacted the Wagner Act in order to establish a firm bargaining position for unions. But we in Congress have neglected the rights of the public and the individual, with the result that a condition which now requires a remedy has arisen.

We have allowed some labor organizations to degenerate to such a point that in many instances they are used as personal instruments for power and wealth of a few racketeering bosses. We have allowed some labor organizations to become cesspools of corruption that smell to high heaven and cry for correction in the public interest and in the interest of the individuals belonging to them.

If the wrongs existing in labor organizations here and there affected only those organizations themselves, we would not be enacting such comprehensive legislation as this. We do so only because we recognize that these wrongs are sabotaging the American public's basic interest, because they are sabotaging the very foundations of the Republic and the inherent rights of the individual man.

Mr. President, our purpose now is to restore the conditions of freedom for American labor, and to provide equality with American management, so that this land of freedom and opportunity may realize its tremendous potentiality in this Atomic Age, rather than to go the European way, torn by internal conflicts, by organized brigandage, and by starvation. We are confronted with a situation in which the American Garden of Eden has been invaded by the serpent of racketeering, which threatens to make of this earthly paradise a European-like scene of chaos and conflict.

I have spoken of the menace of the undermining of basic American values. Let me illustrate:

First. We have allowed farmers and other producers bringing their produce to market to be forced by union racketeers to pay toll, as if the highways of America were tollgates for a class.

Second. We have allowed Americans who want to work and have the ability to work in many crafts and occupations to be denied work solely because they could not or would not pay the cost of entering a union which had a closed-shop agreement with management.

Third. We have allowed union organizations virtually to become courts, exercising in some instances brutal discipline and punishment and taking away from man his inherent right to work.

Fourth. We have permitted the power of taxation by what might be called a government within a government, in spite of the constitutional provision that the Government alone can levy taxes.

Fifth. There are instances in which unions, because we have allowed them to do so, have imposed fines upon their members up to $20,000 because they crossed picket lines—dared to go to the place of employment.

Sixth. We have allowed labor groups during the war to require of free American citizens payments up to hundreds of dollars to be permitted to work on Government war projects. Others, who would not pay, were denied the right in wartime to work for Uncle Sam.

Seventh. We have allowed the heads of unions to discharge members who, under subpena, testified in court to the truth when the subpena of the court required them to appear and testify.

Mr. President, that directly interferes with the judicial process.

Eighth. We have allowed "goon" squads to terrorize and assault, and secondary boycotts to operate to the detriment of the public interest.

Ninth. We have allowed communists and foreign-minded men to dominate some American union labor and threaten the economic life of American communities.

Tenth. We have allowed monopoly power to be vested in the hands of some labor leaders, which power has threatened the very life of the Nation. Illustrations have been cited on the floor of the Senate.

It must be clear to everyone that these powers border on pure fascism. Bad men make bad conditions. All we do here is to provide a way to stop bad men. That is our job.

Ninety-nine percent of the working men in America—and I am speaking from knowledge of many of them—together with their wives, want the Congress of the United States to get rid of the men who make bad conditions.

Many of those who defend these fascist practices are the very same ones who:

(a) Denounce the poll tax, claiming that it infringes upon the right of a citizen to vote. I am not in favor of the poll tax; but they do this at the very time they deny a man his right to earn his daily bread which seems as important, if not more important, than a man's right to vote.

(b) They want legislation which would attempt to prevent discrimination in employment against persons because of race, color, creed, or national origin. Yet they are the very same men who would discriminate against workers, denying the right to work simply because they refuse to pay a toll to a union which they do not want to join.

I have voted for all of the amendments which in my belief will strengthen this labor legislation and enable it to better protect the public interest and the interest of the individual working man. Among those amendments have been provisions giving employers their rightful voice in the administration of union welfare funds and limiting the uses for which the money may be spent. Other provisions permit employers to secure injunctions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts which crucify the public interest as well as the interests of management and the working man. I voted also for the Ball amendment and for the Aiken amendment which would have granted injunctive relief in cases in which there is interference with the farmer and others using the highways by

requiring them to pay tribute for the conveyance of their products.

It must be clearly understood that purely from the viewpoint of labor itself, as indicated by the mail from union men and their wives and others, there is a demand for Government to take a firm hand that will result in doing no man harm, but in preserving the rights of the individual citizen and the public. I personally feel that there is need for intestinal fortitude in the administration of law on a local level and if this were adequately looked after, then I would be willing to leave the entire enforcement of an American citizen's rights to the cities and counties and States. But we have waited a long time for this adequate law enforcement. The attitude of the Federal Government has caused this laxity. It has now become apparent that the Federal Government must step into this picture and in no uncertain terms restrain not only the foreign elements which have infiltrated the Republic, but many of our own citizens who have been perverted in their thinking and who will not respect the rights of others.

I have urged my colleagues on the Labor Committee, who will take this bill to conference, to insure the concurrent jurisdictions of State labor boards and the National Labor Board, so that insofar as possible each of the State boards may handle problems at the State level, rather than attempt to send all of the problems to Washington to be decided far from the scene of the dispute.

I have pointed out some of the amendments for which I have voted. Let me point out some of the things that neither these amendments nor the Senate bill nor the House bill will do. Thus, for example:

First. None of the provisions impairs the original intent of the Wagner Act or infringe upon any of labor's legitimate rights thereunder.

Second. None of these provisions establishes standards on unions which are not already established on management. These provisions simply make for equality before the law—a basic American principle for labor and management. After all, we are proud of the fact that we are a Nation of laws.

Third. None of these provisions interferes unduly with union affairs, except to the extent necessary to protect the individual rights of employees. I stress individual rights—the individual rights of the employee who also is an American citizen, and who, even if he gets mixed up with racketeers, is entitled to our consideration and our defense.

Fourth. None of these provisions repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act or restores the abuses which prevailed prior to the establishment of that act, though I would have given injunction relief in certain cases.

Fifth. None of these provisions destroys the right of collective bargaining or the right to peaceful picketing or any other peaceful or lawful persuasion.

Sixth. None destroys the right to strike but merely makes it consistent with the public interest and the rights of the individual employees.

Seventh. None of these provisions permits the interstate transportation of strikebreakers or any other condition which existed prior to the Byrnes Act.

I know that in spite of the fact that this legislation does not do any of these things, there will be those who will attempt to smear it as antilabor, as they have already attempted to do. But I submit that this bill is for the best interests of labor, the rank-and-file of labor.

Let labor remember that the committee sat week after week and asked the so-called leaders—that is what they are; merely so-called leaders, because they did not show leadership—to submit to the committee their ideas as to how to remedy the situations because of which America is getting pretty much "het up" and which I have enumerated. Not one suggestion was given. So, Mr. President, the problem is in our laps.

I repeat that this bill is in the best interests of labor. It harms no one but the union racketeer who has been abusing the rights of labor as well as the rights of the public and of management. In other words, it restates what have always been the rights of an American citizen.

I reaffirm the basic thesis that I stated at the very outset. The purpose of this legislation is to put a halt to the "termiting" of American values which we have tolerated for over a decade. It is to vitalize the constitutional freedoms and liberties of every American worker, not only the 15,000,000 organized workers, but the 45,000,000 of unorganized workers, and the rights and liberties of one-hundred-and-forty-odd-million Americans as a whole.

We remember the advice of the period of the American Revolution: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." For over a decade we have been asleep at the switch. We have not been vigilant. Now is the time to stand up and be counted in vigilant defense of liberties which have been so long abused.

Is there anyone who will say, after listening to the 10 or 11 or 12 abuses which I have enumerated and which have become so prevalent in America, that such conditions do not interfere with the personal liberties of the individual citizen?

America has always had as its chief cornerstone "the rights of man"—the individual man. We all remember that it was Thomas Payne who wrote that famous book entitled "The Rights of Man," and it was that bit of human wisdom which contributed much to making the American Revolution a success. Washington said that without that volume the American Colonists never could have succeeded. Why? Because in that volume are stated definitely the inherent God-given rights of man; and the right of man to work, to make his own living, and not be required to pay toll and tribute for that privilege is one of those rights.

Elsewhere in the world these rights are being dissipated. The biggest job of us legislators is to see that these rights are not dissipated here in America.

While the doing away with strife and misunderstandings—nationally and internationally—is not primarily a political job—rather, it is a spiritual undertaking—nevertheless, in the affairs of mortals, we, as the representatives of this people, must in the field of the political define and protect the rights of our fellowman—seeing to it that fetters which interfere with man's progress are stricken from him.

This, Mr. President, is what we have been talking about; this is what this proposed legislation does.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article which I wrote for the magazine Public Service on this subject be reprinted following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LABOR PROGRAM FOR THE ATOMIC AGE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

America is living in a new age, and she needs a new labor program for that age. With 58,000,000 of her people employed, with all America hungry for goods, with great unfulfilled needs throughout the world, with technological miracles available to us through full production, we must get out of the labor-management ruts of the preatomic age.

Those ruts—ruinous, prolonged strikes, paralyses of whole communities and the Nation, bitter feeling between employees and employers—must not continue in this new age.

What is it then that America does not need to get out of these ruts?

AMERICA DOESN'T NEED THESE ITEMS

1. We don't need any foreign "isms" or ideologies in the picture. That means we don't need the phony solutions of communism or fascism. We don't need and don't want their provocation and incitement, their alien spirit of hatred, their venom in setting class against class, race against race.

2. We don't need name calling, bitter prejudices and anger. We need a calm, reasonable, peaceful approach to our problem.

3. We don't need segmented thinking—the sort of thinking that is concerned only about the welfare of one segment of our population. We've got to think about all segments—about the public interest, most of all the interest of 140,000,000 Americans—labor, management, farmer, housewives—all of us.

4. We don't need backward thinking that would try to make us turn back the clock to the days before there were unions, before there was collective bargaining. Unions and collective bargaining are here to stay, but collective bargaining must become a two-way street. Union busting, antiunionism are not American any more than management busting or antimanagement are American.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN PRINCIPLE

Well, if this is what America does not need, what does she need? You can summarize what she needs in these few words:

(A) The rule of law—not the rule of racketeering or of violence.

(B) The rule of democracy—not the rule of labor boss dictatorship or management dictatorship.

(C) The rule of equality—not the rule of inequality of treatment of either labor or management.

(D) The rule of the public welfare—not the rule of special interest.

(E) The rule of self-help—not reliance on Washington, D. C., to legislate the millennium in labor relations.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN SPECIFIC ACTION

Now, these are just five principles, and they are useless unless we apply them. Let's do just that. Let's list the specific, concrete

actions which every one of us—labor, management, Congress must take—to realize the fine possibilities of the atomic age.

Here we go:

1. Labor must take steps to clean up its own house. This is labor's most important job—to do for its own good and the good of the Republic. This self-help, this self-reliance can be as important to labor as anything else Congress can do.

Labor must purge itself of the Communist cells and Communist leadership that has taken over so many unions. Labor must eliminate its racketeers—the vermin who want to play the industrial game only for their own profit and only their own way—breaking all rules. Labor must oust the bosses who control crooked union elections. Labor must take an interest in union affairs; it must not cast ballots for union officers who are America-breaking, who do not respect the rights of the public.

2. The primary action for cleansing unions must come from labor itself, but Congress can help by passing legislation to insure secret union elections and for publicizing of union finances.

3. The abuses of the closed shop should be outlawed. We should protect every American's constitutional freedom to work wherever he pleases and under what conditions he pleases, in a union or outside a union. Many folks have objections, as I do, to a poll tax on voting which prevents a man from balloting if he doesn't pay a certain fee. These folks say such a tax is unconstitutional. Isn't it then, unconstitutional if a man is required to join a union and pay what the union says in order to get his job and hold his job?

4. Mass picketing, violence at the plant gate and within a plant, threats or other strong-arm tactics must be outlawed.

5. Slow downs and other limitations on production must be barred.

6. Bona-fide supervisory employees are members of management and should therefore not be organized into the same unions as rank and file workers, lest the conflicting loyalties of these foremen between labor and management ruin their effectiveness.

7. Unions should be made liable for damages if they break contracts just as businesses are liable.

8. Jurisdictional strikes between unions should be outlawed, as well as secondary boycotts. In these actions, one union boycotts an employer simply because his products are in part made from or use another union's materials.

9. No union should be allowed to impose a tax levy or royalty on an employer's products. This infringes on the taxing power of the State, it increases cost of the product, impedes commerce and forces private, unregulated monopoly.

10. Employers should be given the right of free speech under the National Labor Relations Act. They should be given the right to petition for union elections just as unions have that right.

11. Machinery for conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration should be strengthened so that collective bargaining can settle disputes peacefully.

12. Where all other efforts fail and wherever the public interest is threatened by a proposed strike in a public utility like electricity, transportation, telephone, gas, or a key Nation-wide industry like coal or steel, Congress should set up means for compulsory arbitration of disputes. This means that the settlement of the dispute should be made by an impartial arbitrator or board of arbitrators which would hand down the decision which would then be binding on both management and labor. Strikes in utilities and key Nation-wide industries must be outlawed. The public welfare must be protected.

No one regrets more than I do the need for Government compulsion in settling labor disputes, but the public interest requires such compulsion if all other settlement means fail.

13. Congress, labor and management should take steps to promote industrial safety. Factory accidents last year cost over sixteen thousand lives and countless more losses of limbs and of working time.

14. Congress should stimulate voluntary profit-sharing plans in industry—employees' bonuses and other incentives to encourage full production wherever these plans are feasible.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

These are but 14 points. Many more could be added. Their total goal is the same: to give the laboring man a break; to give management a break; most of all, to give the public a break; so that America can have full production and industrial peace. With full production, the supply of goods can be increased and when that happens, when supply catches up with demand, the high cost of living will come down.

Production means work, honest work, effective work. There is nothing wrong with this Nation that honest work cannot cure—in the atomic age or any other age.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending so-called labor bill. This bill reminds me of one of the more popular ditties that used to delight us back in the prewar thirties. As I recall it, the refrain went something like this: "Oh, the music goes round and round—round and round—and it comes out here." Over 12,000 words and 59 pages of tricky, legalistic clauses go round and round—and come out with no answer to the vital problems facing our country today in regard to how to maintain industrial peace, full production and employment under a democratic, free-enterprise system.

The bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage collective bargaining and self-organization of our Nation's wage earners in order to reduce industrial strife, protect the free flow of commerce, and promote economic stability. But its provisions have the effect of weakening the ability of the American wage earner to act together with his fellows to obtain a decent living for himself and his family.

The bill talks of "restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees". But its technicalities tie the employees and their unions up in such knots as to leave the giant corporations and monopolies which dominate our economic life even more powerful and better able to grab an increasing share of the pie.

The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] pointed out earlier today that wages, the take-home pay of workers, have decreased during the last year approximately $5,000,000,000 from what they were during the war, but that corporation profits have increased approximately $3,000,000,000.

I am convinced that the inequalities and insecurities which are the cause of most of our industrial unrest would be aggravated rather than alleviated by Senate bill 1126, because it would make the industrial and financial giants stronger, and would weaken the labor unions which protect millions of Americans. It would do that at a time when the welfare of the Nation demands that the growing disparity between prices, profits, and wages be reduced, not increased.

Everyone knows that since the end of the war, prices and profits have far outrun wages. Prices and profits are higher than ever before in our history, while real wages have actually fallen. Consumer prices have risen more than 25 percent since the end of the war, and food by more than 43 percent. At the same time, the total paid out in salaries and wages in 1946 actually fell, even though the number of employees increased. This means that the average share of labor in the national income was smaller than in 1945.

But corporate profits in 1946 hit an all-time high of about $12,000,000,000 and now are running at a rate of about $17,000,000,000 a year for 1947. Basic to all this is the fact that today 250 large corporations control two-thirds of the manufacturing facilities in the entire United States, and more than 100 of the largest corporations are controlled by 8 groups of banking interests. But under such circumstances at this time, the Congress sets out to atomize labor unions and break them up into small constituent parts.

I fear that a continuation of this condition can only lead to the most disastrous depression this country has ever suffered. The lesson of 1929–33 is there for all to see. Gross maldistribution of wealth and excessive concentration of economic power once led us to the edge of the abyss. Do we want to risk that terrible experience again?

Have we forgotten that we cannot enjoy prosperity for long if millions of workers and their families do not have enough money to purchase the products of our farms and factories?

Already we see signs and hear talk of an approaching recession. Inventories are piling up and retail sales are dropping.

In terms of the average American family, all of this adds up to a lower standard of living—less food, less clothes, less recreation, and postponement of the purchase of a long-awaited new car, radio, washing machine, or refrigerator.

As for housing—if I may digress—it looks as if the people of America may never get an adequate number of houses. I was on a radio program a few evenings ago debating with a lobbyist for the real-estate interests, and about the only solution he had to the question of the housing shortage was to tear down the slums, just tear them down, he said, as we get the old cars off the road. He did not say what the people who lived in the slums would do after their houses were torn down.

All this means a dwindling market for the farmers of my State and the other great farm areas of the country.

It has led to a return of a sense of insecurity and anxiety as to the future in millions of American homes.

I urge you to consider the merits of this bill against that background. It is a background depressingly similar to the situation that obtained after World War I. Such a background of increasing monopoly, higher profits, higher prices, lower wages, and attempts to weaken the labor unions can only lead, as it did be-

fore, to another smash-up. Think of what that would mean in terms of human suffering—unemployment for millions of workers; poverty for their wives and children; bankruptcy for thousands of farmers and small businessmen; demoralization of your youth; waste of human and material resources. Such a crisis, if it occurred again, would imperil the very foundations of our free enterprise system. It could breed hatreds and divisions destructive of our democracy. It might encourage the would-be dictators and war mongers in our midst. We cannot afford to take the chance that we shall get off this time even with the heavy penalty we had to pay in 1929–32.

The legislation we need today is legislation to remedy, not aggravate, the inequalities and injustices making for another depression. We do not need laws which will weaken unions and impair their ability to win a fairer share of the economic product for our wage earners and their families.

We do need a vigorous program to combat the trend toward complete monopoly. We need to revise our tax structure to relieve the burden on those least able to pay. We must extend our social-security system, provide more and better housing, establish a national health program, and raise the level of our minimum-wage laws.

I recognize the need for remedial legislation in the labor field. I support the recommendations for labor legislation made by President Truman at the opening of this Congress. I am proud to be cosponsor of the bill translating those recommendations into legislative terms, which was introduced last week by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. That bill is a real labor peace bill. It is designed to achieve peace and equity in the field of labor relations.

It seeks to achieve that through strengthening of the mediation machinery, through improvements of the National Labor Relations Act, through elimination of unjustifiable secondary boycotts and work stoppages, and through the creation of a temporary commission to devise a long-range approach to the problem of eliminating the causes of labor disputes.

I sincerely believe that our bill represents the constructive solution to our present-day labor problems, and I greatly fear the results of the legislation now before us, which seems to approach present-day difficulties more in anger than in sorrow.

Organized labor is not perfect. Abuses have been committed both by labor and by management. I am anxious to correct the abuses. But I am unalterably opposed to the pending bill because it goes far beyond the treatment of these abuses. Indeed, it hits at the fundamental rights gained by labor at great cost over long years of bitter struggle.

Mr. President, I should like to refer back to the sentence I spoke earlier when I said that abuses have been committed by both labor and management. What has been our reward to labor? The repressive proposal now before us. On the other hand, for management, the big monopolies, we passed the carry-back tax provisions, which have netted them millions upon millions of dollars, we removed the excess-profits tax, which has netted them further millions, and now a tax bill is proposed which will save millions upon millions of dollars to the large taxpayers, and will buy the little man hardly a package of cigarettes. That is the way some propose to treat all Americans alike.

I oppose the committee bill, as amended, because it would impoverish and weaken the farmer's best customers—the American wage-earner and his family. I oppose it because it undermines the democratic rights and welfare of not only organized labor, but of the entire American people. It favors those who have most as against those who have least. It would increase the already dangerous maldistribution of wealth and further augment the power of monopoly.

I hope with all my heart that my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle will vote on this bill, of all bills, in a spirit free from narrow partisan or class interest. We can ill afford to play politics with the prosperity and welfare of our country at this time.

Let us bear in mind the splendid example of fair play and reasonable give-and-take just displayed by labor and management in the steel, auto, and electrical industries. Let us not "rock the boat" by passing punitive antilabor legislation at this juncture.

Industry and labor have just given us a vivid demonstration of the power of genuine, free, collective bargaining to promote industrial peace and production. They have done so under rules long established and well known. Why change the rules of the game now? Why plunge industry and labor, and, indeed, the entire country, into the uncertainty and confusion bound to ensue pending judicial determination of the validity and meaning of those 12,000 words of new law?

I feel that now that immediate postwar tensions are over, we can expect labor and management to maintain industrial peace through the collective-bargaining techniques they had forgotten during the war.

Mr. President, I am deeply conscious of the importance and significance of this debate. The eyes of the world are upon us. They are watching to see if we can solve the problem of maintaining full production and employment in peacetime in a free society. They are asking whether we can provide a decent standard of living for all our people, and industrial peace, under our free-enterprise system. They are waiting to see whether we are once more going to place property rights above human rights. They are wondering about the stability of our democratic free-enterprise system.

These are questions that are also being asked by millions of Americans here at home. The continuation of our way of life depends on the answers to those questions. I declare with all the conviction at my command that the bill before us will not help us to answer those questions wisely and humanely.

On the contrary, passage of the bill will cause dismay to millions of liberty loving men and women here and abroad. It will signal the resurrection of Hooverism and reaction. It will dishearten our friends abroad. At a time like this, when the free-enterprise system is under attack throughout the world, we can ill afford the luxury of another postwar orgy of labor-baiting and boom-and-bust economics.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against the passage of S. 1126. I shall vote against it because I value human rights over property rights—and because I place the welfare of all the people above the narrow, selfish interest of a few monopolies.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think it is pretty generally understood—at least it is here in the Senate—that for a long period of time I have advocated the enactment of reasonable legislation tending to correct defects in existing laws as regards the relations between labor and management, and also to provide substantial remedial measures which would help correct and adjust some of the differences which have long existed and have caused much loss to labor, management, and the country.

In advocating and even in sponsoring such legislation, it has never been my purpose to enact legislation punitive in character. Whatever evils exist, whether in the ranks of labor or in capital, they can never be corrected by any attempt to destroy either labor or capital by the force of legislative enactment. Any person who approaches the grave and serious problems which exist in this vast field of human relations in a spirit of antagonistic hostility or animosity kills his own purpose and is of no help, but, on the contrary, is a decided hindrance to the cause of both labor and capital.

Legislate as we may, restrict, hamper, and hamstring organized labor as much as we like, we can never kill or destroy

the fundamental rights of laboring men to organize and act together for the purpose of protecting and furthering their own cause. The welfare of the great masses of the laboring people is of such tremendous importance to the economy and welfare of the entire Nation that any harsh, rigorous, revengeful legislation which cripples and destroys the rights of organized labor would likewise injure all the country.

Similarly it is true that the force and power of labor itself has grown so strong that if reasonable, fair, and just legislation is not enacted and the great force of organized labor should be exercised without due regard for the equally fundamental rights of management or the strong interest of the public generally, the failure so to enact fair and reasonable legislation will be most injurious to management, the entire country, and, in my opinion, labor itself.

Therefore, Mr. President, when we approach the problem of enacting legislation of the nature and character pending before us, we in the legislative branch of the Government have a tremendous responsibility to all of these interests—labor, management, and the public generally. In the discharge of this responsibility, none of us is, I hope, and none of us should be swayed by any motive whatsoever, except what is fair, just, and reasonable for all the people—and all the people necessarily includes both management and labor. Certainly, no outside influence such as anger, prejudice, bitterness over past wrongs or fancied wrongs and, least of all, any partisan angle or aspect, should enter into our deliberations or our decisions.

Already during the course of the debate I have more than once stated my own desire to aid in securing the passage of that type of legislation which I have mentioned, that is, legislation which is fair and reasonable to all the interests involved, but I have realized that the enactment of such legislation is not by any means easy. As has been stated on the floor many times, we have not only to consider our own wishes and desires here in the Senate but we have to deal with the House of Representatives, equal with us in the constitutional processes of making the law of the land. Not only do we have to take into consideration the House of Representatives, but, also as a part of the constitutional process, the President of the United States, who must approve or disapprove any legislation we enact, must likewise be considered.

As I have stated before in consideration of all these things, I had believed that, if we passed the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and added no amendments to that measure, we would be in a much better position to secure the final enactment of a law. There are two things involved in this consideration. In passing the bill as reported by the Senate committee, there is left a wide area of compromise and agreement with the House of Representatives when the measure goes to conference, as I presume it undoubtedly will.

Moreover it was my judgment—and merely by personal opinion—that such a measure would have far better chance of securing Presidential approval. I said during the course of the debate that each amendment which was added to the Senate bill—and again giving my own personal opinion—decreased the chance or likelihood of that bill being approved by the President and likewise decreased the chances of overriding a Presidential veto, which situation could very well result in complete failure to pass at this session of Congress any legislation whatsoever. Entertaining these thoughts, I have steadfastly voted against amendments which were proposed and some of which I might have supported under other circumstances and conditions.

At the conclusion of these remarks I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD a chart which bears out what I have said about the possibility of a Presidential veto. That chart shows the substantially similar provisions of the Case bill, which was vetoed on July 11, 1946, and the pending bill. It indicates that all the provisions which were objectionable to the President in June of last year are repeated in substance in the present bill, as it has been amended. True, the provisions of the so-called Taft bill differ in some respects from the Case bill provisions but they are substantially the same. In addition, the chart which I shall place in the RECORD contains a list of provisions in the pending bill, as it has been amended, which are even more restrictive than the Case bill.

The chart and list to which I have referred led me to the definite conclusion which I have expressed, that there is grave danger that neither the bill which the Senate is about to approve nor the one which passed the House of Representatives will ever become the law of the land. This is a most deplorable situation and one which, in my opinion, could and should have been avoided. There yet remains some hope that, when the measure passes the Senate and goes to conference, the conferees will realize the situation with which they are confronted and will report to the separate Houses a measure which will be so fair, reasonable, and just that it can meet with Presidential approval, or, in the event the President fails to approve, that it can be passed over his veto.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator whether in his opinion, from the parliamentary point of view as to their jurisdiction, it would be possible for the conferees to report a bill which would so vary from the bill passed by the House and the measure which has been reported by the Senate committee and thus far amended upon the floor of the Senate, as to meet the problem which he thinks ought to be met.

Mr. HATCH. Probably the Senator from Wyoming is correct in his statement as to the parliamentary situation. I was merely expressing the hope that such a bill, which the President could sign, could be reported from the conference committee.

I was about to say that in the event the President should, for reasons of his own, veto the bill, I have been hopeful that a measure could pass the Congress which could be enacted into law, even over the Presidential veto. Of course, such a bill would have to be so fair and just in its terms that the Presidential veto could be overridden.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator another question. What in his opinion would be the prospect of such a result if, instead of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate should enact the proposed substitute? Would that bring appreciably nearer accomplishment the preparation in the conference committee of a reasonable bill which would meet the situation?

Mr. HATCH. I think there is no question of it. Just as I stated with respect to the bill which was reported by the Senate committee, there would be such a wide area from a parliamentary standpoint in which the conferees could rightfully get together on new legislation that I think, without question, what the Senator has said would be correct. From that standpoint there would be greater opportunity for the conferees to agree upon a bill which the President could approve, or which could be passed over the President's veto.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it the Senator is of the opinion that there is a certain obligation upon the Congress to go as far as it can in meeting the opinions of the President with respect to this very grave problem.

Mr. HATCH. Before the Senator entered the Chamber I expressed the thought that we must consider the Senate a coordinate branch with the House of Representatives, because it has equal authority with us in enacting legislation. I also expressed the thought which the Senator has just expressed, that the President himself is constitutionally a part of the legislative branch of Government, and certainly we should act with full knowledge of the constitutional powers of the President.

Mr. President, I am stressing this point now as I have stressed it in the past, to place the responsibility in the first instance upon the Congress, for that is where it belongs now. It will be extremely unfortunate if policies of the majority party in the present Congress fail to provide such remedial measures so fair, just, and reasonable that the bill can become the law of the land even though the President should veto it.

In saying this and in placing the responsibility now upon the majority party in the Congress, I raise no partisan implication whatever. That is the situation as it exists in the legislative branch of the Government. The obligation in the first instance is ours and in accordance with long-established practices, customs, and uses, the responsibility first rests upon the majority party.

As I indicated in other remarks on the floor, it is my opinion that if political considerations which are currently referred to in the press of the country and elsewhere do enter into the passage of the law by the Congress or in its veto by the President, neither political party will gain any advantage by such action. The country will rightly place responsibility, in the first instance, in the majority party in Congress and its leadership and will say, "You were most unwise and ir-

responsible in passing legislation which you were bound to know or should have known the President would veto, unless you had the assurance that you could pass the measure over his veto." Likewise, the President would be subjected to criticism by some who want labor legislation of any kind, no matter how harsh or restrictive it might be.

Therefore it continues to be my judgment now, as it has been all through the course of this debate, that if we let this session pass without enacting fair and reasonable legislation—speaking only of the political angle—neither party will gain, and labor, management, and the country will lose.

Mr. President, after these general observations I want to discuss very briefly some of the provisions of the pending bill as it has been amended.

I have no argument with any of the changes which will be made in the definitions contained in section 2 of the Wagner Act.

I approve the changes made in the NLRB by sections 3 through 6. Trial examiners should be, I think, only examiners. I am in accord with the provisions of section 4 preventing them from acting also as prosecutors.

I have no argument with section 8 (a), which in effect does away with the closed shop and subjects union shop arrangements to rather close limitations, with one exception. It seems to me it might be well to permit unions, even in a union shop plant, to fix for their members certain standards of efficiency and to permit the unions to exclude members who fall below such standards.

I agree in principle with the provisions of section 8 (b) establishing a list of unfair labor practices for unions. I have some doubts, however, of the effectiveness of the amendment to subsection 1, which the Senate adopted on May 2. It appears to me that by prohibiting unions from interfering with the employees' exercise of their rights relating to the selection of representatives, and in the next sentence stating that such a prohibition shall not impair the right of a union to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership, we are outlining the boundaries of a legalistic battlefield which may lead to unlimited argument.

I approve subsection 3 of section 8 (b) making it an unfair labor practice for a union to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer if the union is the authorized bargaining representative. The whole purpose of the Wagner Act is to bring about bargaining. A union certainly should not be permitted to thwart such a laudable purpose simply by keeping mum until an employer is financially exhausted.

I heartily endorse subsection 4 making secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes unfair union practices. Surely there is no justification for such activities. I believe that this subsection, together with the amendment adopted as section 303, authorizing actions for damages in such cases, will be effective in stopping such practices. No one will benefit more from this provision than will organized labor itself.

The unfair labor practice described in subsection 5 of section 8 (b) is also fair. A union should not be able to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement with impunity.

The intention of section 8 (d) is admirable. However, I have some doubt that its intent will be realized. We can urge employers and unions to bargain collectively, but we cannot legislate good faith into such bargaining. I personally believe that the 60-day cooling-off period provided in this section is desirable, but let me mention here that a substantially similar provision was in the Case bill, and that the President in his veto message stated that in his opinion such a provision would increase rather than decrease the number of strikes.

With regard to section 9 (b), I agree with the principle that professional employees should be permitted to determine for themselves whether they wish to be included in a bargaining unit. I am skeptical of the provisions of this section intended to protect or advance the rights of craft unions. Will it not widen the abyss which now exists between our two great international labor organizations?

The purpose of section 9 (c) is undoubtedly desirable. My one question concerning this section is the efficacy of subsection 2, requiring the Board to accord equal treatment to independent unions. If such unions were independent in all cases, it would be a simple matter for the Board to administer this section. I feel, however, that by requiring the Board to recognize all so-called independent unions, we may be encouraging employers to set up controlled individual unions. If such is the effect of this subsection, it will undermine all of the protective measures contained in the Wagner Act.

I am in thorough accord with section 9 (e) requiring secret ballots. This is merely an extension of our general voting practices to the field of labor organizations. Were it possible to redraft this measure, I would recommend that we give the Board a more specific guide as to what is meant by the "substantial number of employees" whose petitions it must recognize.

I am in accord with the provisions of sections 9 (f), 9 (h), 10 (a), and 10 (b).

The amendments of section 10 (c) authorizing the Board to charge unions with back pay in the event the union is guilty of an unfair labor practice seem fair enough, although I anticipate some difficulty on the Board's part in assigning responsibility for the initiation of strikes in many cases. I foresee that they may be faced with many "chicken or egg" decisions.

I generally am opposed to the issuance of restraining orders or injunctions in labor controversies, such as those provided in section 10 (j), (k), and (l), no matter how grossly unfair the practice complained of may be. I cannot forget the harsh and indiscriminate use made of these remedies in the 1920's. To me a step backward in this particular area is fraught with peril. To avoid the perils the NLRB must remain liberal in its attitude. If so, these sections might not be objectionable. In this hope of a fairer and more liberal attitude than has been manifested by the Board in times past, I forego further discussion of these provisions now.

I am not favorable to section 14. I believe the practical result of this section will be to deprive millions of foremen of the right to bargain collectively. I would not advocate permitting foremen to join the same union with other employees of a plant, nor would I advocate permitting foremen to join pseudo-independent unions. I believe, however, that foremen should be permitted to organize in order to protect their own wage standards and working conditions if the union is absolutely independent of any other union. I am not here endorsing the Foremen's Association of America, but I feel provision could have been made in this bill for truly independent foremen's unions, perhaps by requiring certification of independence by the NLRB as a condition to their recognition.

Much could be said against that portion of title II which establishes the new Federal Mediation Service as an independent agency. The Secretary of Labor is presumably the President's expert in all matters relating to labor and the mediation of disputes.

The President is responsible to the people for the effective administration of the laws which Congress enacts. It is strongly urged that he should be permitted to control the Federal Mediation Service through the Secretary of Labor. If the hopes of the Republican Party should, by some mischance, be fulfilled in 1948, the majority party will quite possibly adopt a different view of an independent Federal Mediation Service. However, the independent agency may prove to have decided merit; and I see no harm in giving it a trial.

I favor those sections of title II authorizing the Attorney General to interfere when he deems a threatened or actual strike to be of such magnitude that the national health or safety is imperiled. However, in my judgment this is rather an innocuous and weak provision. It is not adequate to meet such situations. Stronger and better legislation is needed, but this is better than no legislation at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as I am concerned, the provision to which the Senator has referred is the most important one involved in the bill which is before us. The Senator says that it is rather innocuous, in his opinion. How does this provision of the bill intertwine with or relate to the present law which was used by the Government in the case against the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis? Can the Senator tell me that?

Mr. HATCH. There is no intertwining.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no relation whatever?

Mr. HATCH. No; none whatever. Under the law to which the Senator refers the plants were under Government seizure. There is no seizure involved here.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that fact. Do I correctly understand that in the opinion of the able Senator from New Mexico this provision is much weaker, so far as the Government is concerned, than is the present law?

Mr. HATCH. Without question, I think it is. My ideas on this situation I have many times expressed. I think that Congress is under the obligation to substitute some means for the settlement of Nation-wide strikes where the public health and safety are involved, so that none of them can ever occur. I do not think this measure even touches that situation. I think it is rather weak. But I understand that the House bill contains practically no provision in relation to such strikes; and this bill is merely better than nothing, as I see it.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may add one word, I have always thought that that was the No. 1 labor problem of America, and I have so stated from time to time. It is difficult for me to understand why the committee did not consider that as their primary obligation to the citizens of this Nation. There are many provisions in the bill which are meritorious and some which are not, as I view it. If we can enact legislation which will prohibit a labor organization from paralyzing the economy of the country overnight we shall have settled the major difficulty of the labor problem.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois that he is not alone in that thought. I think the anxiety of the people of America concerning strikes is directed to that one situation, as in the coal strike last fall which could have brought actual distress and suffering to the great body of the American people and the great transportation strike which could have brought hunger and want to many of the people of America. It is with regard to such a situation that the people are more concerned than with anything else. This bill is entirely inadequate, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to criticize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare because the members of it have worked long and hard.

Mr. HATCH. And this is a most difficult problem to work out.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that it is. But I want to say to the able Senator from New Mexico that had I been the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that is one problem, if no other, that I would have been working on continuously from the beginning of this Congress in an effort to place on the statute books a measure which would undertake to solve the problem the Senator is discussing. A strike that can paralyze the economy of the Nation overnight should be prohibited and the Government should have the power to intervene.

Mr. BALL and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is a great loss to the Congress that the two able Senators did not devote some of their talent to making such suggestions while the bill was being prepared. They might have even made suggestions by way of amendments.

Mr. HATCH. If I may be so immodest as to say so, if the Senator had read the bill which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and I introduced in the Senate, he would have found a provision far superior to this and one which was fair and just to labor and which I think would absolutely have prevented this type of strike.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator introduce that bill during this Congress?

Mr. HATCH. No. I realized that it was useless.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator make known his views to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. HATCH. Again may I say to the Senator that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were fully aware of my views. I cannot think that the committee ignored the bill which was introduced nor the statements which were repeatedly made on the floor. I know that the Senator from Louisiana was familiar with it. It was unnecessary for me to appear before the committee because on that committee was the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who at that time entertained the same ideas that I did, but from which I fear he has departed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with both the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] that the problems involved were many. Few were easy of solution and many were partially solved through compromise. I doubt that it would have been possible to report a bill which would have dealt with that subject more in detail, but I believe that the provisions which we have in the bill probably will assist in dealing with Nation-wide strikes.

If we had proceeded to draft a measure outlining a more detailed method of dealing with the problem, and if such a measure became law, it might be that either one side or the other would try to gain an advantage by means of its provisions. Senators know that it is almost impossible to pass a bill that could be interpreted so as to give both sides in a controversy equal advantage. Something always crops out wherein one side or the other gains some advantage over the other. The Smith-Connally Act was passed with a view of preventing or curbing Nation-wide strikes. It partially failed and the charge has been frequently made that its provisions have been so used as to assist management. As we have the bill now worked out, the injunctive process may be resorted to; a period of 75 days is required to elapse during which the strike may be settled. Both sides will be admonished to settle. Time and more effort on the part of the Mediation Service might bring the parties to their senses. At the end of 75 days, if it is not settled, the problem will be thrown back into the lap of Congress by the President. In short, a crisis will be declared to exist and the Congress, the representatives of the people, will be called upon to deal with the existing problem. Such action as might be taken may be drastic, depending on the seriousness of the situation. Such action will be directed solely to deal with the existing condition and the Congress will no doubt be in position to deal with the situation most effectively. During the committee hearings I felt that if the problem were left dangling, and if both sides realized that the Congress might deal with it, they would be more likely to compromise, inasmuch as they would not know what Congress might do. That is one of the reasons which prompted me to support the title dealing with the subject, as it is now incorporated in the bill. I am desirous of utilizing such a method instead of providing for a specific that may cause more strife and misunderstanding between labor and management.

Let me say to my distinguished colleagues that I realize some of the weaknesses of the proposal. It is my hope that the Commission to be established by the act will be able to find a more plausible solution to that, one of our most vexing management-labor problems.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not intend to be too critical of the committee. I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said, and I hope the bill will have the effect for which he hopes. But I wish to have the people of the country know that I believe this bill will not cure or correct that situation. It may be helpful regarding it; and I would rather have it than to have nothing at all.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New Mexico is speaking of the effect of the industry-wide shut-downs which affect the entire national economy. Unfortunately, both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico voted against the one amendment dealing with that subject which was offered on the floor of the Senate—not an amendment trying to patch up the effects, but an amendment dealing with the cause, which is industry-wide bargaining, of course. The amendment dealt with that matter very mildly, simply attempting to give local unions some autonomy and freedom of choice as to whether they would bargain on an industry-wide basis, which is an opportunity that employers now have.

Both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico voted against that amendment. Although the amendment would not have cured the entire evil or difficulty, at least it went to the cause of it, and would have given to local unions the same autonomy and freedom of choice which employers have, and it might have arrested the trend toward industry-wide bargaining which inevitably, if the disagreement continues, will lead to an industry-wide strike.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not know how the Senator from Illinois voted in regard to that amendment, but what the Senator from Minnesota has said

about my vote on it is quite correct. I voted against that particular amendment; and if it were to come before us again or were before us now, I would vote against it again. That amendment did not touch the problem I am discussing. It touched the entire field, and in my opinion it would have created more difficulties than it would have cured If that amendment had touched the particular problem I have been discussing, I would have supported it, because I was convinced, and I still am, that the present provision against Nation-wide strikes is totally inadequate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. During the debate, I have interrogated various Senators in regard to different provisions of the bill, and from time to time I have found that Senators disagree as to what the provisions mean. That situation has been clearly demonstrated only today. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is an able lawyer, definitely states that in his opinion the bill is practically innocuous in regard to meeting the problem of stopping a strike which would paralyze the Nation overnight.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree with me as to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly agree with the Senator from New Mexico as to that. However, the Senator from Louisiana disagrees; and, of course, I do not know what other Senators will say in regard to the position the Senator from New Mexico is taking.

But, Mr. President, all this only confirms my belief regarding the bill, and especially regarding the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota was discussing a moment ago. I have not had an opportunity to study this labor bill as much as I should like, in view of the fact that during the time the labor bill has been debated on the floor of the Senate, I have been engaged during the mornings and afternoons, and sometimes in the evenings, in studying a tax bill which is before the Committee on Finance, of which I am a member. Consequently, I do not have the completely detailed information on this bill which I should like to have.

But I doubt that anyone who has studied the bill from the beginning of its consideration to the present time has a thorough grasp and understanding of it and understands all its implications, and I believe I am justified in having that opinion after hearing Senators disagree as to what various provisions of the bill mean.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will permit me to interrupt him at this point, let me say that what he has said has been exemplified throughout the entire course of the debate, and notably during the debate indulged in by Senators on the other side of the aisle. The two Senators who perhaps are more familiar with labor matters than any other Members of this body, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], have continually disputed with their own leaders as to the meaning and effect of certain provisions of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and those able Senators were on the committee, and heard the testimony, and studied the bill and the amendments day after day.

In regard to what the able Senator from Minnesota has said about my vote against the amendment which he offered, I simply wish to observe that it is correct. I voted against the amendment, and I wish to say that I voted against it for practically the same reason for which the Senator from New Mexico voted against it, namely, it was a Nation-wide proposal with no teeth in it. I submit that it not only reached the few labor organizations which have control of the economy of the Nation, but it touched every segment of our labor society, insofar as the workingman is concerned. In my humble opinion, instead of clarifying or helping in that situation or doing something constructive for labor and management, that amendment would have brought on chaos and confusion throughout the country. It would have added to the labor difficulties which exist in the United States today, instead of reducing the number of them. For that reason, if for no other reason, I could not support the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to continue with my discussion of the various sections of the bill, and I desire to mention section 302, relating to union welfare funds. I was necessarily absent from the Senate when that provision was considered. However, I have been against it, not because I think a union official or union officials should be permitted to use such funds as they see fit, but because, as I stated previously, I believe that every additional restriction lessens the chance of the bill's survival.

I neglected to mention title 3, which provides for suits against unions in their common name, for violation of collective-bargaining contracts. In my opinion, that is a salutary provision, provided the employers do not use it as a means of harassing unions and decreasing their effectiveness, by filing actions indiscriminately every time one member of a union deviates slightly from the terms of the contract.

I voted against section 303, authorizing damage actions for boycotts and secondary strikes, for the same reason that I voted against other amendments, namely, to prevent adding to the bill amendments which might lessen its chance of passage and finally becoming enacted into law. Moreover, there were objections to some of the language contained in that amendment. That language could have been greatly improved in ways which would have removed some of the legal objections. However, in principle I agree that unions should be held responsible for damages resulting from ill-considered activities. But what will it gain us if we add provisions like this to the bill, and only increase the chances of a Presidential veto?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Apparently the Senator has made a close examination and analysis of each and every provision of the bill, along with the amendments which have been added to it. Did the able Senator, in his examination of the bill and the amendments, attempt to analyze what he would term "punitive measures"?

Mr. HATCH. I have not analyzed it from that standpoint. I am putting in the RECORD, or shall presently ask permission to do so, a chart showing the provisions of the Case bill, which the President vetoed. I have already said that practically all those provisions are included in the pending bill. I am also adding a list of other provisions which go even beyond those of the Case bill. They will be printed in the RECORD, if I can get permission.

Mr. LUCAS. My reason for propounding the inquiry was that many Senators have said that they would not vote for punitive measures, but that they would vote for a moderate labor bill, and that the dividing line could be found when the legislation reached the point where it began to discriminate against the laboring man, and showed that it became punitive in its nature. I just wondered whether the Senator had made that a matter of examination.

Mr. HATCH. I have not examined the bill from that standpoint, but from the standpoint of what I myself shall do in voting on the bill. I suggested in the very beginning of my remarks that I did not want to approach this important piece of legislation from any such standpoint as that of attempting to enact punitive or revengeful legislation, to enact something to punish someone for some past or fancied wrong. I have reached my own conclusion, which I shall presently state, but it is one which I really would not want to endeavor to persuade any other Senator to adopt, because it is a matter about which each individual Senator must make up his own mind. I would not even argue or persuade on that point. I shall presently say what I myself intend to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the statement last made by the Senator from New Mexico. Whether or not he wants any Member of the Senate to be persuaded by his arguments, I may say to him that frequently Senators are persuaded by his logic and his eloquence on the floor of the Senate. Knowing the Senator, as I do, as one of the most able lawyers in the Senate, and knowing his qualities of fairness and understanding in connection with problems like the one we are considering, I was hoping he might have made an examination of the bill section by section from the standpoint I have suggested, because that is something I wanted to do, and I just have not had the time to do it.

Mr. HATCH. I deeply appreciate the Senator's kind remarks, and thank him for them. But I prefer not to discuss the bill from that standpoint.

I must add, Mr. President, that during the course of the debate I have been disturbed and am now disturbed by what appears to me to have been a total disregard of fundamental causes of labor-management difficulties. In the pending

as well as in all similar legislation, we are not meeting at all the deep-seated causes which give rise to the pains and agonies about which we are endeavoring to legislate.

I agree that many of those fundamental and deep-seated causes cannot be reached by legislation. It is beyond the capacity of legislative bodies to correct injustices or right wrongs which are due to that selfishness and greed which places profits and gains over and above the welfare of human beings. Nor can we cure by legislative process all the evils which flow from ambitious thirst for power by irresponsible and unscrupulous men who would dictate to and dominate over industry, labor, and even government itself. But there are certain corrective measures we can and should enact, realizing full well, however, that peace and happiness in labor-management relations can only come through those advanced, progressive steps which must be taken by both sides to improve, expand and enlarge that area of agreement and understanding which comes, and can only come, through relations based upon mutual understanding, trust, and confidence. These can be inspired, and many companies are adopting means and measures which have so improved relations that when differences arise they are quickly and fairly adjusted to the satisfaction of both, and for the welfare of all, including the country generally.

Much as labor organizations have been criticized, I for one want to pay them a sincere tribute for endeavoring, as many of them now are, to promote annual wage plans throughout industry generally. I have long been an advocate of such measures, for I have felt that the welfare of the laboring man depends more upon the security of his employment than on increased wages or even shorter hours. It is in the knowledge that his employment is certain that he can buy a home, and provide it with necessary furnishings, even to the point of having some luxuries.

Why should not a laboring man have these simple things? Why should he not have that security of employment which will enable him to plan his way of life on an annual basis, rather than on an hourly wage arrangement, by which he cannot know from one day to the next how to plan, or whether he will even have a job? I think that if management and the responsible officials employed in activities of management would endeavor to place themselves in the shoes of the man who labors, realizing that he has his hopes for security and has the same desire to provide comfortably and adequately for his family that actuates every worth-while citizen, some of the bitterness and the causes of dispute might be quickly dissipated.

It is in these basic solutions that the answers to our problems will be found. Necessary as may be corrective legislation, harmony in this field will not come until both labor and management understand and respect the problems of each other. It is here in the broad area of mutual understanding, respect, confidence, trust, and good will that lies our chief hope of industrial peace. In this field only labor and management can participate. Into it, except by indirect ways, government cannot enter.

Title 4 of the bill provides some method for such indirect approach. Creation of the committee to study and report on basic problems may be the best feature of the whole bill. Should this measure become a law, I sincerely hope that both labor and management will cooperate with the committee in making a determined effort to find those means by which, as stated in the bill, "permanent friendly cooperation between employers and employees and stability of labor relations may be found throughout the United States." Even though similar methods may have been tried before, they still remain the chief hope of finding that accord, agreement, and cooperation so essential to the welfare of all industry, all labor, and all the people generally. It should at least be given an earnest and an honest trial.

I have tried to speak without vindictiveness or animosity. I have not been severe in any criticism of the bill, or how it originated, or the way it has been handled. I have wholly disregarded the charge currently made that the majority party seeks political advantage alone, and does not expect any legislation to be passed. I hope that no person has such a hope, and that no one could be so unmindful of the country's welfare as to approach this grave problem with such an attitude, and especially with the desire, the intention, and the purpose to place the President of the United States on the spot.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows the President was placed on the spot by some members of the majority party when they told him definitely, in advance, that unless he signs the pending bill there will be no labor legislation at this session.

Mr. HATCH. I expect to comment on that presently.

Mr. LUCAS. It needs comment. If that is statesmanship, then I do not understand the term. It sounds more like politics.

Mr. HATCH. If that be true, Mr. President, if it be the purpose of anyone to deal with the proposed legislation from a strictly political, partisan standpoint, with the sole purpose of putting the President of the United States on the spot, not only will he miserably fail in his efforts but he should fail.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are not so easily deceived; they are not easily misled. Let a bill come out of conference, so harsh in its terms and so contrary to the well-known views of the President, and the people will rightfully reach the conclusion that the legislation is not desirable; that unworthy political ambitions have influenced Members of Congress rather than a genuine purpose to serve the country through the enactment of sound legislation. If anyone thinks political advantage can be gained by such procedure, he deceives himself and misleads no one. I make these remarks solely in the hope that they may be in some way persuasive to conferees and others to endeavor to agree upon provisions so fair and so just that the President can and will sign the measure; but if he does not, for reasons of his own, that the measure will still be so fair and so just that it could be rightfully passed over his veto and still become the law of the land.

Arrogantly, as I thought, Mr. President, leaders of the majority party issued in the press of the country a defiance, a challenge, a threat to the President of the United States, when they said, or were quoted as saying, "Mr. President, take this bill or nothing; you will have no other chance of securing labor legislation at this session of the Congress."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. There was also a threat that if the President did not sign the pending bill, he would be given no assistance in case a coal strike occurred again.

Mr. HATCH. O Mr. President, I hope that is untrue.

Mr. MURRAY. Such a statement was in the press.

Mr. HATCH. I did not see it. I do not know which branch of the Congress it was in, and I do not want to be unduly critical, but I certainly hope no Member would ever voice such a thought as that. In so doing, he would be saying to the President and to the country, "I think more of the political welfare of my party than I do of the safety and welfare of the people of America."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would have been said had the President of the United States issued an ultimatum to Congress demanding that we pass the kind of labor legislation he suggested or he would veto the bill? Would the Senator care to elaborate on that?

Mr. HATCH. Words are inadequate; my imagination is not sufficiently vivid to permit me to attempt to express the angry protests which would have gone up from this body.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me that through the various spokesmen of the President on the Senate floor we have been receiving exactly that kind of ultimatum for the last 2½ weeks, that if we change the pending bill in one respect or another, regardless of what we thing of its merits of it, it will be vetoed, because the President will not take it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have the utmost regard for the Senator from Minnesota. I do not question his motives. He is one Senator who cannot be charged with partisan desire, or with a desire to gain advantage through partisan activities in this regard. I say that with utmost sincerity and truth. But, Mr. President, I defy the Senator from Minnesota to search through the statements which have been made in the RECORD and find where any Senator has ever said or intimated that he would not vote for adequate legislation to protect against a coal strike, or anything of the sort. I have said that I might vote

to override a Presidential veto, but it was the statement of a fact based upon the record, and a thing which I thought the Congress should take into consideration. Never was it said by way of an ultimatum, never was it said by way of a threat. If the Senator will read my remarks, he will find that each time I stated that, I also said, "While we must consider it, let us be so sure of our ground, so sure that we are right, that if the President should veto it we could pass the bill over the Presidential veto."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely wrong in the statement that he made. The point I made a moment ago was that certain leaders in Congress have definitely served notice on the President of the United States what he may expect, unless he does certain things with the labor bill. Everyone has a right to reach a conclusion as to what he thinks the President of the United States will do; and Senators have a right to reach that conclusion, primarily on what he did with the Case bill last year. One of the first things I asked the able Senator from Louisiana when he opened the debate, was whether or not the provisions of the pending bill were more stringent than the provisions of the Case bill. I had in mind the veto of that bill. But the point I make is that the President of the United States himself has never to my knowledge given to a single Senator any indication of what he will do in connection with the pending bill. Obviously he could not, until the bill is amended and agreed upon by both Houses and properly before him, and has been analyzed by him in the careful and conscientious way he always considers measures of such national importance. Let it further be said that in my humble opinion any threat of that kind made to Harry Truman will have no effect upon him whatever; and certainly those who served with him in the United States Senate should understand that better than anyone else, because whatever Mr. Truman finally does will be in line with the dictates of his own conscience and what he believes to be for the best interests of the greatest number and for the general welfare of the country that he loves—the country for which he fought in World War I—the country for which he is doing a great and magnificent job under the most trying circumstances that any President has ever experienced in the peacetime history of this Nation.

Mr. President, I have no fears as to what any kind of intimidation or coercion or threat addressed to Harry Truman will do, because they simply make no impression on him. It would have been better had they been left unsaid in the trying period through which we are passing, when we are endeavoring to solve serious problems for the benefit of the Nation and for the benefit of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, agreeing with everything said by the Senator from Illinois, I should like to add that in consideration of the dignity of Congress, in consideration of the high dignity of the office of President of the United States, regardless of who may fill it, it ill becomes any Member of Congress to resort to threats or intimidation. Like the Senator from Illinois, I served with the President when he was a Member of the Senate. I know that when he acts on this measure he will consider it in the same careful manner as he considers every measure, and that he will not be influenced by promises, on the one hand, nor will he be deterred by threats, on the other. That is exactly the way the President of the United States should discharge his duties, and it is the way the President will discharge his duty in this respect.

I realize full well that in the case of legislation of this kind it may come to the pass that the President may disagree with me or with the Senate as to the type of legislation that is proper and just, and he may in the exercise of his duties see fit to veto a measure for which I may have voted. If he does so, he will merely discharge the obligation which the Constitution of the United States places upon him. And even though he disagree with me, and I may be completely opposed to what he does, I shall still respect and honor the man who discharges his duty as he sees it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I add one more observation? I want to say in conclusion in this debate, so far as I am concerned, that those who have made these so-called threats in attempting to intimidate the President of the United States apparently forget his fight with John L. Lewis, when the President did not choose to run.

Mr. HATCH. The country has not forgotten that incident.

Mr. President, I say that if this measure is passed by the Congress and fails to become law, either by Presidential veto or for some other reason, we have no right to say that we will abandon our efforts to secure some legislation. Petty spite, ill will, partisan political influence, must not enter into the consideration of the measure. There would be ample time, after the bill is vetoed and after the veto is sustained, if that should come to pass, for the passage of some legislation upon which the committee members on the other side, the full committee for that matter, could agree which would be helpful and beneficial to the entire country. I say to them they have no right to deny the country such a measure.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. From the Senator's phraseology, "after the bill is vetoed," I gather he thinks the veto is foreordained.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think that would be a very violent assumption in view of the record which has been made, and with which every Senator ought to be familiar. I feel in my own mind that the measure will be vetoed. But that is only my opinion. So if the Senator wants to assume that I entertain that belief, he has a perfect right so to assume, because I do entertain that belief.

Mr. LUCAS. But that does not mean that the Senator from New Mexico is quoting anything that the President has said.

Mr. HATCH. No. I have repeatedly said that, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the implication which it seems is constantly desired to be left in connection with this debate.

Mr. HATCH. I have previously said, and I now repeat, lest someone may misunderstand me, that I have not discussed labor legislation with the President or with any member of the executive branch of the Government. The opinions I have discussed are my own, but I think they are based upon rather substantial grounds.

Mr. President, I have pointed out what appear to be some of the better features of the bill, and I have pointed out some of its defects. From what I have previously said, it is now needless for me to say that the measure does not meet with my complete approval. In some respects it is weak where it should be strong. In other respects it is strong where it should be weak. It is far from being a first-class piece of legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In line with the thought previously expressed, and with the thought just now expressed by the Senator, is it not correct to say that labor legislation, if it is to be curative, must necessarily impinge upon a number of congressional acts?

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it really possible, in the heat and fervor of debate, and under pressure, now properly to go into that subject without a thorough study of all the congressional acts involved, because while Senators may think they are curing something in one congressional act which it may be thought needs to be cured, something in another act may be wrecked, as I think happened in connection with the portal-to-portal measure which is now on the President's desk. In going after portal-to-portal pay we got so far away from portal-to-portal pay as to deal with child labor and minimum wages. I believe a thorough survey should be made of what is needed to cure industry-labor troubles so as to determine what subjects are proper for Congress to pass upon, and that Congress should not attempt to write a contract between the employer and his employees.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator has just said is something I casually mentioned in connection with the title proposing to set up a committee to survey the whole field. I expressed the hope that such a survey might be made, and I stated that when we have the report of that committee, if the committee is authorized, and if it does its work, we may find that practically everything we are now proposing to do is wrong, and we may want to go back and undo it all.

Mr. President, finally, I think the country expects, nay, more, it demands, that the Congress enact some labor legislation. Therefore, notwithstanding what I consider to be some of the weaknesses of the bill, some of its defects, and without any enthusiasm and with many misgivings, I have determined that on

the final passage I shall vote for the measure in the hope that somehow, some way, we may eventually secure some legislation. As to what I shall do after the Presidential veto, I have not yet come to any conclusion, and I shall not do so until I see what type of bill comes out of conference and what are the grounds of the veto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the record as part of my remarks the chart and the list to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR PROVISIONS OF CASE BILL AND TAFT BILL

These provisions in the Case bill are substantially repeated in the Taft bill, S. 1126.

Case bill	Taft bill
Sixty-day cooling-off period (sec. 3).	Section 8 (d).
Creation of Federal Mediation Board (sec. 4).	Sections 201 through 205.
Limitation of public utility strikes (sec. 6).	Sections 206 through 211.
Welfare-fund limitations (sec. 8).	Section 302.
Excluding supervisors (sec. 9).	Sections 2 (11) and 14.
Union contracts binding (sec. 10).	Section 301.
Secondary boycotts (sec. 11).	Sections 8 (b) (4) and 303.

PROVISIONS OF TAFT BILL MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN CASE BILL

Section 2 (11): The definition of "supervisors" who are to be excluded from the Wagner Act is appreciably broader than in the Case bill.

Section 2 (12): Professional employees are excluded from the Wagner Act. No such provision in the Case bill.

Section 2 (3) and (13): The definition of persons exempt from the provisions of the Wagner Act as agricultural employees is appreciably broadened. No such provision in the Case bill.

Section 8 (a) (3): Closed shop is abolished. Union-shop agreements are restricted by requiring prior approval of a majority of employees in the plant. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 8 (b) (3): Unions are compelled to bargain with the employer. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 8 (b) (4): Jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practice. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 9 (f): Unions are required to submit financial reports to Secretary of Labor and all union members. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (b): Charges of unfair labor practices must be filed within 6 months after occurrence. No provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (c): Unions may be made responsible for back pay in certain cases. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (j), (k), and (l): NLRB is authorized to seek injunctions prior to a full hearing if unfair labor practices are complained of, and is required to obtain an injunction if a secondary boycott is charged. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 208: Injunctions may be obtained by the Attorney General in case of strikes affecting the national health or safety. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 302: Unions will be unable to request employers to check off dues unless each member agrees in writing. No such provision in Case bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I want to state briefly why I shall vote against the omnibus labor bill.

A detailed discussion would be burdensome at this time. The Congress and the public have heard all the detailed arguments—many times, and over many years.

My objections to the bill rest upon general principles. As I see it, the bill is untimely, trouble-making, reactionary, unfair, and unduly political.

It is an untimely bill because we are now in a period of good relations between management and labor. The transition from a controlled war economy to a relatively free peacetime economy has posed enormous difficulties. Measured against these difficulties, management and labor have made their adjustments with surprising rapidity. Compared with the period after the First World War, the results have been remarkable. This bill would disarrange the relationships between management and labor just as they are settling down. It would establish a new basis of operations, far less sound and far less safe than the basis already tested by experience.

This bill is a trouble-making bill. It would generate friction over the interpretation and settlement of new and untried definitions of rights and duties. It would provoke and instigate unnecessary conflicts, both in the courts and in the collective-bargaining process. It would do this at the very time when we most need smoothness and stability.

This bill is a reactionary bill. It seeks to strip workers of hard-earned rights which are at the core of industrial freedom. With a few spectacular instances as pretext, the bill brands all of labor as a culprit. It diminishes the rights of all unions and all labor leaders. Yet, all experience shows that the exercise of these rights has resulted in a more productive, more prosperous, and more just America.

The proposals in the bill, directed toward these backward-looking purposes, are not novel proposals. They have not been developed to meet novel situations. They are a resurrection of proposals which were advanced by the opposition from the beginning of the effort to afford legal protection to the industrial rights of workers.

This bill is an unfair bill. It singles out workers and their unions for harsh and punitive treatment, at the very time when the wrongs which need to be corrected are elsewhere in our economy. It is based upon the idea that unions have acquired too much monopolistic power. But the truth is that business monopoly—the concentration of economic power in finance and industry—is now, even more than before, the real evil. Today, the whole country recognizes that workers, even with the help of their unions, cannot keep pace with the increasing cost of living caused by excessive prices and exorbitant profits. It is not labor, but the opponents of labor, whose greed is endangering our prosperity and threatening a depression. It is not labor, but the opponents of labor, who have too much power. Who are these overly powerful people of whom I speak? Look to the organizations backing this bill, and there you will find them.

That is why I say that this bill is unfair from beginning to end. One illustration will be ample proof. In matters relating to the organization of workers into unions, the bill would impose the same restraints upon labor organizations that the National Labor Relations Act imposes upon employers. To call this equality or fairness is a grievous error.

This grievous error was exposed when the National Labor Relations Act was under consideration in 1935. At that time, it was proposed that employees and labor organizations, as well as employers, should be prohibited from interfering with, restraining or coercing employees in their organization activities or their choice of representatives.

The report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1935 rejected this erroneous argument as follows:

> The argument most frequently made for this proposal is the abstract one that it is necessary in order to provide fair and equal treatment of employers and employees. The bill prohibits employers from interfering with the right of employees to organize. The corresponding right of employers is that they should be free to organize without interference on the part of employees; no showing has been made that this right of employers to organize needs Federal protection as against employees.
>
> This erroneously conceived mutuality argument is that since employers are to be prohibited from interfering with the organization of workers, employees and labor organizations should also be prohibited from engaging in such activities. To say that employees and labor organizations should be no more active than employers in the organization of employees is untenable; this would defeat the very objects of the bill.

I say also that this bill is a political bill, because narrow political considerations have played an excessive part in its formulation. I do not mean to say that everyone who votes for or against this bill is guided by narrow political considerations. But I do say that political jockeying for position has had so much to do with the formulation of this bill at every stage as to discredit it on its face.

The present Congress is the first one elected since the close of World War II. It has been confronted with an opportunity, unique in our history, to help build a stronger and better America—to expand social legislation, to provide better housing for the people, to maintain economic stability, and to protect and advance the welfare and contentment of the average American family. But the record of the present Congress on all these fronts is as barren as the sands of the Sahara. The present Congress has not only stood still; it has moved steadily backward. New pages in this record of reaction are being written every day.

This bill is the foremost example in this record of reaction. If it should become law, which I hope it never will, it would foment and augment industrial strife. It would soon incur the just resentment of management and labor alike, both of whom would be vexed and frustrated by its unworkable and ill-considered provisions. Serving no useful public purpose, it would weaken the exercise

of fundamental rights which have long been proved beneficial to the whole country.

No group is perfect, and no one group is exclusively charged with the welfare of the American people. But every Member of the Congress knows this: The working people of this country, through their organizations, have been the strongest and most consistent fighting force for economic progress and human betterment. Without their sustaining efforts, we would be back in the dark era of the longer day's work for the shorter day's pay, back in the dark era of neglected unemployment, lower productivity, more widespread poverty, and much lower national income. Today it is these same workers who through their organizations, are the strongest single fighting force for greater economic stability, for a lower cost of living through curbing excessive prices, and for a better distribution of the national income to provide more buying power. In these efforts the workers and their organizations are acting in the best interests of the whole American people.

This bill is not in the best interests of the whole American people. On the contrary, this bill seeks to repress, to reprove, to demoralize, and to weaken the workers and organizations whose welfare is a part of the national welfare. This bill seeks to weaken them, with the avowed purpose of giving relatively more strength to those very employer organizations whose selfish policies are threatening our prosperity and blocking our progress. And all this the bill does in the name of greater equality between employers and workers. I say that if the intentions of this bill were carried out, they would result in an even greater inequality between employers and workers than now exists or than existed before the National Labor Relations Act became law.

This bill, if it became law, would be an antidemocratic step. There are some people in other lands who say that America will lose its democracy when it loses its prosperity. This bill goes further than that. It commences to throw away our democracy while we still have our prosperity.

That is why, I repeat, that this bill is untimely, troublemaking, reactionary, unfair, and unduly political.

Viewing the record, it is too much to expect that a majority of the present Congress will bury this bill. But I earnestly hope that the President vetoes it. Such a veto would, I believe, be sustained here. Certainly, it would be sustained by the liberty-loving, forward-looking, fair-dealing American people.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not want the debate on this bill to close without making a few remarks on the overall issues involved. Personally, I have been so occupied with the amendments proposed that I have not devoted any of my time on the floor to a discussion of the general issue.

I listened with a great deal of interest, during the colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], to the talk about threats of a Presidential veto and the so-called ultimatums delivered to the President in connection with the pending legislation—all of which sounded quite familiar. We have heard it on the floor of the Senate, and also in a little different form in the cloakrooms.

However, there is one point in this situation which I do not think has been brought out clearly. That is the fact that if the President wanted to get together with Congress on the shape and form of labor legislation he could do so very easily by becoming a little more specific and telling us exactly what he would like and what he would oppose.

All we have to go by in the current session of Congress is a few paragraphs in his state of the Union message, and the message in which he vetoed the so-called Case bill a year ago. Personally, I have not considered the veto message as much of a guide. I read it very carefully at the time. In that message he opposed and found fault with virtually every section of the bill. Yet, obviously, if we are to do anything constructive in labor legislation we must do some of the things that were done in the Case bill; and a great many of the provisions are in the current bill.

But I question whether the President would stand on every single phrase in that veto message, because, as I recall, one of the sections in that bill was the so-called Hobbs antiracketeering measure, which the President opposed just as strongly as he did any of the other sections; and yet when we passed it separately he signed it.

Mr. President, one of the fields in which the President recommended legislation in his state of the Union message was legislation to deal with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. As I recall—I would not attempt to quote his exact language without having the message before me—he said that there were some secondary boycotts which were justified and that a distinction should be drawn. The Secretary of Labor was before our committee twice. I would assume that he could more or less speak for the President on this type of legislation. We did our best to get him to describe, in terms which we could define in legislation, what he considered to be a justifiable secondary boycott. We never got any kind of definition from him. The only kind of action in regard to secondary boycotts which the Secretary was willing to recommend was one dealing with secondary boycotts in jurisdictional strikes where the boycott was directed against a specified union. That would not touch at all one of the worst situations which has arisen, such as that in New York where a local of the IBEW is using the secondary boycott to maintain a tight little monopoly for its own employees, its own members, and a few employers in that area. The Secretary admitted that he had nothing further to offer.

Mr. President, not only could the President of the United States be a little more specific about what he is for and what he is against, but if he really wanted to cooperate with Congress in writing legislation in this field he could very easily indicate that he would like to have those in the executive branch who are most directly concerned in writing this bill come to the Capitol and confer with Members of the Congress in an effort to see if there could not be a meeting of minds. He can still do that. I think the initiative in that kind of cooperation must necessarily come from the President. It is not our province as Members of Congress to try to put him on the spot. He has a perfect answer, which I understand he has made to newsmen, to the effect that he cannot pass on legislation until he knows what it is going to be. If the President in such a conference took the position that he would like to have this or that or he would veto any bill which contained any provision dealing with other problems which Members of Congress considered equally urgent, then, of course, we could not have cooperation on that kind of a basis, as we have found out in certain international negotiations.

I listened the other night to a very prominent union leader describing on the radio this legislation and what its effect would be on unions and the men and women who work. I must confess that, although I have spent most of the last 6 months working on and studying this type of legislation, and I think I know the pending bill almost by heart, I certainly should never have recognized it from the description which I heard of it over the radio from this union leader. I got the impression that he thought it was a bill which repealed all laws requiring duties of employers and imposed a great many harsh duties on the men and women who work. Apparently, judging from the line that leaders of unions are taking both on the radio and in their full-page advertisements, they have not learned a thing from the election last November, from the nearly three-to-one vote in the House for what is admittedly a pretty tough bill, or from the fact that the pending bill is certain to pass the Senate. They are as arrogant as they were before the committee when, one after another, they refused to admit that there was anything at all wrong which should be corrected, and they refused consistently to make any kind of constructive suggestion to the committee. Perhaps they have been somewhat encouraged by the fact that two or three amendments which a substantial minority of the committee thought should go into the bill have been defeated on the Senate floor. But, for their information, I think the opposition and lobbying of certain employer groups probably had as much to do with the defeat of those amendments as did the opposition of the union leaders. I have been reliably informed, for instance, that Big Steel, certain lumber groups, and the glass industry were all represented in Washington by persons lobbying in opposition to the amendment to give autonomy to local unions, which was defeated last Wednesday by one vote. If the union leaders have regained their arrogance as a result of those votes of the Senate, I think they have somewhat misread the signs.

Mr. President, I have had printed and had intended to offer another amendment dealing with the problem of industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide strikes. After the defeat of the first one I did not offer it, but I ask unanimous

consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment prepared by Mr. BALL for himself and Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 54, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 304. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to prohibit any one or more labor organizations from acting jointly in bargaining collectively with the representatives of two or more employers whose respective employees they represent; but, unless the principal places of employment of such employees are within the same metropolitan district or county, the provisions (except section 7) of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, as amended, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, be applicable, in any proceeding instituted by the United States, with respect to any agreement entered into pursuant to such bargaining and to any concerted action by employers or labor organizations bringing about a simultaneous stoppage of work among the employees of two or more employers, other than employees whose principal places of employment are within the same metropolitan district or county."

Mr. BALL. Very briefly, Mr. President, the amendment simply provides that whenever unions and employers beyond the limits of the metropolitan district or county decide to bargain in groups, regional or industry-wide, thereupon the immunities and special privileges conferred upon labor organizations and collective bargaining negotiations by sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act and the Norris-La Guardia Act shall no longer apply either to the agreement reached or to any concerted action by either the unions or the employers to stop production.

I myself am convinced, from my discussions with various employers although admittedly we did not have any evidence of it in the committee, but that some of the industry-wide bargaining is clearly monopolistic. For instance, I have good reason to believe that one reason the captive coal mines, which are controlled largely by Big Steel, are insisting on splitting in the Southern group of operators to bargain by themselves with representatives of their own employees, is that those big concerns rather like the idea of dominating the negotiations and, in effect, determining the terms and conditions under which their competitors operate. I am not so sure that there is not a great deal of that going on in so-called regional and industry-wide bargaining. However, it became obvious from the rejection of the mild little amendment which we offered, which gave the employees of a single employer, or employees organized into a local union, the right to determine for themselves what terms they were willing to accept or reject in a proposed contract with employer, that the Senate was not yet prepared to deal with the real cause of industry-wide bargaining and strike situations in the way which I have proposed. Therefore I decided not to take up the time of the Senate by offering the amendment.

I should like to make this observation: The people and the Government of the United States have grown great and powerful. We have achieved a standard of living and a volume of production unequalled anywhere in the world, because in the United States generally opportunity has been open on equal terms to all, whether they worked for wages, whether they had a little capital and wanted to start a business, whether they were professional men, or were engaged in any other line of endeavor. It is because we have kept that door of opportunity open to individual initiative and individual ideas that we have grown great, that our production has been so tremendous, and that our standard of living is still almost unbelievable to many millions of people in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, today, by means of the strangle hold which, through the devices of industry-wide bargaining, regional bargaining, the secondary boycott, and the closed shop, union leaders have obtained on both workers and small employers and new enterprises starting out, the doors of free opportunity are fast closing in the United States.

There are many communities, one in the Pacific Northwest, where any person who wishes to start a business, to ascertain whether he "has what it takes" to succeed, does not dare begin it unless he first gets the permission of the labor-union overlord in the particular district. I think most Senators know the particular union about which I am talking.

In one city after another, merchants are not free to do business in the way that they decide is best.

Farmers are not free to sell their produce where they wish to sell it; they must do what the business agent of the teamsters' union tells them they can do, "or else."

Mr. President, I think that before many years have passed Congress will move in the general direction in which my thinking has been going, namely, to break up and diffuse and restore to the people directly concerned this monopolistic power, in order to solve this problem and situation, and once again to have equal freedom of opportunity in these United States. Clearly we are not ready to do that at this time.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] said that he did not think this bill contained any provision for dealing effectively with industry-wide strikes. True, it does not go to the cause of such strikes. The provision in title II which authorizes the Attorney General to enjoin and stop such strikes for a period of 80 days, while there is mediation and fact finding, and finally, if those do not result in the settlement of the dispute, providing for a secret ballot by all the employees affected as to whether they wish to accept the best offer made by the employers or go on strike, is admittedly not an absolute cure; and, as I say, it deals with the effect—the industry-wide strike—and not with the cause, which is the concentration in labor unions of control over employees in great industries and in their associations with employers. The proper solution would be to place those relationships back on a realistic basis, in which the employees would really have a voice in determining the conditions under which they would work.

However, I think the bill will be an effective deterrent to industry-wide strikes, will at least provide a period during which mediation will have a chance to work, and will give the men themselves a chance to think over the situation. Above all, the bill will give them, finally, a chance to vote in regard to what an impartial board of inquiry will determine are the best terms offered by the employer; and in voting on that question, the employees will have an opportunity to vote whether they wish to accept those terms or to strike.

I think that some day we shall have to deal directly with the matter of the concentration of power, which is really the root and cause of the problem. But obviously we are not ready to do so yet.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has referred rather insidiously to statements made by some of the leaders on this side of the aisle that in their opinion if the President vetoes this bill and if Congress does not override the veto, that will end the possibility of the enactment of labor legislation at this session of Congress. It seems to me that is simply a plain statement of fact. In view of the amount of legislation that has been piling up on us, I do not see how we could possibly devote another 3 weeks to the consideration of labor legislation, and finally pass another labor bill. If the Senator was referring to the possibility of having the Congress do once again what was done during the war, namely, to pass a hurriedly drafted measure granting to the Executive vast, undefined powers to deal with a crisis, instead of trying to get rid of the causes of the crisis, I say, as one Senator, that I will oppose such legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota is known to his colleagues as a man of very studious temperament; and I know from what he has said on the floor that he has given a great deal of consideration to all phases of the proposed legislation. So I desire to ask him about some of the differences between the bill as it is now written and the measure which was passed by the House of Representatives. I propound this question because it is perfectly obvious that the bill which will finally go to the President for signature will be a bill which will come to us from the committee of conference.

The Senate committee has declined, so far, to report the House bill. Therefore, I feel that the members of the Senate committee have the feeling, which has been generally expressed, that the bill passed by the House of Representatives is considerably more drastic than the bill now before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. I have not studied the House bill in detail. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is not still in the committee; it is

on the calendar. I believe that after the Senate disposes of the bill now pending, the intention is to have the Senate take up the bill passed by the House, and to substitute for the text of that bill the bill now before the Senate, and send to conference the House bill thus amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; that is a regular parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BALL. But I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the House bill lists certain major activities which in that bill are defined as unlawful and are made subject to severe restrictions and penalties. The Senate bill does not contain such a list. The principal difference between the two is that the House bill contains what it calls a bill of rights for union members, and in it an attempt is made to regulate in some detail the internal affairs of unions, requiring reports, giving each member a right to have a secret ballot in regard to certain issues, if that is desired, and so forth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I have only hurriedly examined the House bill, for my attendance upon other committees has prevented me from giving detailed attention to it; but I was impressed by the fact that the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives would create a new, independent office, namely, the Office of Administrator, as I understand the bill.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The House bill has separated completely the judicial and the prosecuting functions of the National Labor Relations Board, whereas the Senate bill contents itself with trying to cure two of the worst defects which have grown out of having those two functions handled jointly. I refer to the central review section of attorneys, which tends to centralize the making of decisions, and the lawyers—rather than the Board members—write them; and second, the practice of permitting the trial examiner to argue, ex parte, before the Board, in defense of his findings, after the open hearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By the creation of that special new official, the Administrator, who would not be a part of the National Labor Relations Board or a part of the Department of Labor, but would be completely independent, and by clothing the Administrator with what amounts to the power of prosecution, it has seemed to me that if that provision finally were incorporated into the bill, it would create the danger of setting up special machinery which could be used by such an official, if he were so minded, utterly to destroy the entire labor-union movement.

The Senator from Minnesota has been very patient with me in yielding; but what I have said thus far is preliminary to the question. In view of the fact that there must be a conference, and that the conference committee will have to adjudicate between the drastic House bill and the bill which the Senator believes is a more-or-less moderate one, does not the Senator believe that there is, therefore, a great danger that the conferees on the part of the Senate may be compelled to yield upon matters which the Senate committee refused to write into the bill?

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will head the Senate conferees, and I expect to be one of them, and I think the Senator can depend on the Senate conferees fighting pretty vigorously to come out with a bill about as near the Senate version as possible. I have hope that we can talk the House conferees into our viewpoint on a great many of the issues. In fact, I am quite confident we can. I know there are many provisions in the bill as it passed the House which I think wolud be very wrong and bad, and do more harm than good. I rather expect the bill which comes out of Congress to be very much closer to the Senate version than to the House version, although obviously we will have to make some concessions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is one of the reasons why so many Senators, at least on this side, have the apprehension that with so many provisions in the Senate bill which have been subjected to criticism, we are likely to end with a bill which will be used as an instrument against the entire labor-union movement, instead of a measure designed to reform abuses and defects which should be abolished or corrected.

Mr. BALL. It is always possible that the House will be very insistent on the provisions of its bill. However, I recall that last year, when the Senate rewrote completely the so-called Case bill, the House did not even send it to conference, but took the Senate version, and I am hopeful they will feel somewhat the same this year.

Mr. President, I think the most serious criticism that could be made of the pending bill—at least the most serious in my judgment—is that it tries to do far too much of the job which needs to be done by the administrative-law approach. In other words, the bulk of the bill is in the form of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. Under that act, of necessity, it is necessary to delegate a great deal of discretion and power to an appointive board, which in this case has administrative, quasi-judicial, and, to a degree, prosecuting functions.

As I have said on this floor, the rights guaranteed to employees in the National Labor Relations Act could be made a complete dead letter overnight by a National Labor Relations Board that was so inclined because no employers, employees, or unions can possibly get into court to protect their rights without first getting the National Labor Relations Board to enter a complaint in the case, and get a decision from the Board.

Mr. President, I think that is the wrong way to legislate in a free society. It seems to me one of the fundamental differences between a free democratic government and a totalitarian government is that in the latter all power is delegated to administrative tribunals—what they say is the law—and the courts have little authority to pass on the questions submitted or define the rights of citizens, whereas under a free democratic system the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the people individually are written into the law, and any individual can go into court to see that his rights are protected. I think we have gotten away from that principle, in expanding rather than contracting the field of administrative law, in our approach to the problem in the pending bill.

For that very reason, Mr. President, although I think we have in the pending bill covered the major problems, outside of industry-wide bargaining, in my opinion, three-fourths of its effectiveness will depend entirely on the way in which it is administered. The National Labor Relations Act in the beginning was administered by a Board whose bias was so terrific that they made a mockery of the guaranties which the sponsors of the act had intended. So at least half—and I believe 75 percent—of the effectiveness of the proposed law will depend on the spirit and effectiveness with which it is limited to the new seven-member National Labor Relations Board which is to be set up. If they want to make it a bad law, if they want to pervert the clear intent of some of the new language we have written in, I know of no way to prevent that. We have provided for a little better court review of findings of fact, but it is not much better than the present rule.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. In line with the thought of the Senator from Minnesota, which is so well expressed, I should like to raise the question whether our real purpose in what we are doing is not to pave the way for the day when no labor law and no labor board will be necessary, and all the difficulties will be settled by the voluntary approach, by which, by the way, more than 90 percent of them are handled at present.

Mr. BALL. In the hope that we can eventually get rid entirely of this administrative-law approach, I am entirely in accord with the Senator from New York. I doubt if we can do it without legislation entirely, but I hope that some day we will know enough about the issues involved so that we can write directly into the law the rights, responsibilities, and duties of the various parties and individuals, and let them go directly into court, instead of routing them through another bureau.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to point out again what I think should be our objective in all we are doing, that is, to pave the way in the legislation we are supporting and which we seek to have enacted, so that ultimately, and as soon as possible, the day will arrive when no such statute will be required, when men will understand one another sufficiently so that there will be no requirement for laws of this nature. I believe that day can come. Unfortunately, it has not yet arrived.

Mr. BALL. I hope the Senator is right, but I think that day is somewhat distant.

As I said, I believe the pending bill does deal with all the most urgent issues, outside of industry-wide bargaining, on a substantially sound and fair basis. Contrary to the charges made against it, it is not an employer's bill. As a matter of fact, very few of the provisions give any additional rights to employers. The

great bulk of them are designed either to protect the public, which in recent years has become the major victim of industrial strife, or to protect the rights and freedoms of individual employees.

I realize that some of them, when they do protect the rights and freedoms of the employees, inevitably will decrease somewhat the powers which union leaders have usurped for themselves. I say "usurped"; the Supreme Court has ratified them, I think; but I still think they are illegitimate powers, at least. But if it is necessary to give to individual employees the freedom and rights to which they are entitled under section 7 of the bill, I think it is about time we did that. I think we must make a decision in this country as to whether we want a labor movement in which an oligarchy of leaders dictate the terms and conditions for the millions of employees and members of their unions, with the individuals having their little voice, or whether we want a labor movement which reflects the wishes and the needs of free American workers who voluntarily choose the union they want to represent them.

Practically all of title II of the bill, which sets up a new Mediation Service, with improved procedures, and provides for the 80-day period in industrial disputes, when the Attorney General thinks the national health and safety are threatened, and can convince the court of that fact, is primarily to protect the public, which is always the secondary sufferer in strikes, no matter how small they may be, and in the industry-wide strikes often becomes the major victim.

The provision in the National Labor Relations Act defining collective bargaining, and providing that where a contract between a union and an employer is in existence, fulfilling the obligation on both sides to protect collectively means giving at least 60 days' notice of the termination of the contract, or of the desire for any change in it, is another provision aimed primarily at protecting the public, as well as the employee, who have been the victims of "quickie" strikes. I do not think that is taking away any rights of labor or of unions either one; it is simply saying that they should all follow the sound, fair, and sane procedure which a majority of the good ones now follow.

So far as employers are concerned, I think it should be emphasized that the pending bill makes absolutely no change in the unfair practices which may be charged against employers under the National Labor Relations Act. All five of them, now in the law, are contained in the pending bill in exactly the same language, with one addition: it is made an unfair labor practice for an employer to violate the terms of an agreement with the union representing his employees.

A few additional rights are given to employers. I think that is done on the basis that if a free economy and a free enterprise system are to be maintained, employers as well as employees must be entitled to the same rights and to equal justice under the law. One such right is the right to petition the National Labor Relations Board for an election to determine the bargaining representative of an employer's workers, whenever one or more unions present to the employer a demand for recognition as representing the employees. When an employer becomes the innocent victim of a jurisdictional strike, when two unions become involved in a dispute over who shall control his employees, he is not only given a chance to have an election to determine that issue, but, when he is presented by a union with a demand for recognition, I think the employer is also entitled to know, through the secret ballot provided by the bill, whether the union really represents and is the choice of the majority of his employees.

Second, there is a provision covering the issue respecting foremen. All Senators know that both the National Labor Relations Board and the United States Supreme Court—by split decisions, I might add—have held that foremen are employees within the meaning of the present act, and that therefore if the foremen join a union, the employer is compelled to bargain with the union, even though it be the union of the rank-and-file employees whom the foreman is supposed to supervise. The committee took the position that foremen are an essential and integral part of management, and that to compel management to bargain with itself, so to speak, by dividing the loyalties of foremen between the union and the employer, simply did not make sense, and inevitably would prove harmful to the free-enterprise system. It might be stated that both the House and Senate bills deal with that subject in substantially the same way.

A third right given to employers is the right to file an unfair practice charge against unions that refuse to bargain collectively in good faith. That would not mean very much to General Motors or Big Steel or any of the great corporations; they do not have much trouble getting the unions to bargain with them; but it is going to mean a good deal to the smaller employers who, time and again, in recent years have had a contract laid on their desk with an ultimatum from the business agent, "Take it, 'as is,' or else." How much good the filing of an unfair practice charge is going to do to such employers is problematical, but at least it gives them some psychological leverage to induce the union agent to sit down and talk over the special problems of the small employers.

Fourth, we give to employers the right to sue a union in interstate commerce, in a Federal court, for violation of contract. It does not go beyond that. As a matter of law, I think they have that right, now, but because unions are voluntary associations, the common law in a great many States requires service on every member of the union, which is very difficult; and, if a judgment is rendered, it holds every member liable for the judgment.

The pending measure, by providing that the union may sue and be sued as a legal entity, for a violation of contract, and that liability for damages will lie against union assets only, will prevent a repetition of the Danbury Hatters case, in which many members lost their homes because of a judgment rendered against the union which also ran against individual members of the union.

Finally it is supposed that in the pending measure employers who are the victims of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are given the right by petition to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board, to seek relief, if they can get the Board to go into court to enjoin the practices. "Secondary boycotts" and "jurisdictional strikes" have been defined by me on the floor of the Senate, and I think the definitions are substantially correct. It is the attempt by the employees of employers A, B, and C, through their union, to dictate, not to employer X, but to his employees, the terms and conditions of the union under which they shall work. Basically, the primary objective of the majority of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts is not the employer but the employees, over whom control is sought. I think the secondary boycott provisions of the pending bill even more fully protect the right of employees to choose freely the union they want, rather than having a union foisted upon them by the economic force of a secondary boycott. The provisions protect the employees more than they do the employers, although obviously employers often are the innocent victims, the secondary victims, so to speak, of such practices. There is also given the right to file charges and to sue for damages.

The majority of the provisions of the measure—and I am going over them very briefly—further protect the rights and freedoms of employees. In that respect, I think the two that are most important are the provisions relating to the secondary boycott, to which reference has just been made, and the provisions of the so-called union-security clauses—the closed shop, the union shop, preferential hiring, and maintenance of membership. The closed shop as now practiced gives to the union complete control over the individual's right to work, his opportunity to earn a living in his chosen occupation. There are no limits on it.

I cited on the floor of the Senate the case of two veterans who were expelled from a union in Missouri because they refused to buy raffle tickets, whom the union caused to be discharged from the job, under a clause that goes into a majority of contracts today.

The bill outlaws completely the closed shop under which an employee must become a member of the union before he can be employed. It permits the union shop under which the employee must join the union within 30 days after going to work. It permits maintenance of membership only when it is voted by a majority of all the employees affected, and even when it is negotiated on that basis the employer cannot fire a man if he is denied membership in the union or expelled from the union for any reason other than nonpayment of regular dues and initiation fees. Mr. President, I think that that is the real Magna Carta for the American working men and women.

I object to the whole basis of compulsory membership but I think the bill is largely going to eliminate compulsory membership unless the union leadership is so good that a majority of all the employees want it and will get out and vote for it in a secret election. Obviously the union leaders—and I heard one of them the other night make his major argument against this provision—are quite sure that a majority of the employees are not going to want it, and I agree with them. So this provision, in my opinion, is far more the Magna Carta of American working men and women than is the present so-called Wagner Act. This measure will really make the labor movement of America a voluntary movement, voluntarily supported by the working men and women who belong to it.

The amendment the Senate adopted on the floor gives employees protection against coercion and restraint by unions or business agents, in exercising their rights freely to choose their representatives under section 7 of the measure. They are protected now against coercion by the employer, but as all of us know from our mail, many more of them are worried today about coercion from the unions than they are about coercion from the employers.

With respect to the amendment adopted by the Senate dealing with welfare funds which under any kind of construction are contributed by the employer out of earnings of his employees, all that amendment does is to see to it that the benefits to which employees are entitled shall be spelled out in the agreement setting up the fund which they pay for with their labor, and that it shall be in the nature of a trust fund so that the employees cannot be arbitrarily deprived of the benefits.

The amendment, as Senators know, grew out of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] last year to the Case bill at a time when John Lewis of the United Mine Workers was demanding a royalty of 10 cents a ton, as I recall the figure, on all coal mined, to be paid over to the union to establish a welfare fund, without any strings whatever being attached to it. Having listened to the explanation by Mr. Lewis himself of the way his union functions, I can imagine how many rights in such a fund an employee who had the temerity to oppose anything the leadership of the mine workers wanted would ever have. So all that provision really does is to protect the rights of employees to benefits out of these funds which are created by their own labor.

In the revision of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act which sets forth the procedure in holding elections to elect bargaining agents, we have again, I believe, made a number of provisions to assure the employees of really full freedom of choice by providing, for instance, that members of genuine crafts or genuine bona fide professional workers, shall have a separate vote, if they want it, to determine if they want to go into a plant-wide union or whether they want a separate unit of their own. It requires that independent unions and unions affiliated with national or international organizations must be treated the same way by the NLRB, which now is so biased in favor of the two great federations that it has one rule for unions belonging to those federations and a completely different and much harsher rule for dealing with independent unions.

Another provision requires that when the NLRB holds a run-off election, the election must be between the top choices in the first election. That is necessary again to correct an arbitrary decision by the Board which actually deprived large minorities of employees of their freedom of choice.

Finally, we provide that not only may employees file a petition for election to determine a representative, but they may also file an election for the decertification of a representative.

Mr. President, I have not paid much attention to the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and his colleagues. As I have glanced through it, it seems to be made up of all the completely innocuous provisions of the pending bill, and nothing else. It would not cure any of the really serious problems we are facing today in this field. In my opinion, to pass such a measure would be to perpetrate a fraud on the American people, who would think that Congress had done something to meet these problems, when in reality it had not.

I repeat, Mr. President, that it is perfectly understandable that union leaders who have heretofore, I say, usurped powers which were granted to the employees themselves, who heretofore have used the closed shop and the secondary boycott and provisions they have wangled into their international constitutions and bylaws to secure a stranglehold on whole communities and whole industries, and all the men and women who work in them—it is natural that they should oppose the pending bill, which merely seeks to restore to individual employees and to the small employers who have been the major victims of that concentration of power and its ruthless use by some union leaders, a reasonable equality of rights and freedoms and responsibilities under the law.

Mr. President, I hope that if the bill encounters a veto we will be able to override it both in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the hour is getting late and I will not detain the Senate very long. I had hoped to be able to speak at some length on the bill, as I consider it to be one of the most important bills to have come before the Congress in many years, but pressure of other work has made it absolutely impossible for me to prepare the material which would adequately express my opinion on this legislation.

In my opinion the bill as it came from the Senate committee was a fair bill, a just bill, and as good a bill as it was possible to bring out of any committee. It was in truth a committee bill, because little help was received in writing it from anyone outside the committee. Labor took simply a negative attitude and said that it wanted no legislation whatsoever. So no help was received from labor in writing the bill. The leaders of industry, who gave the committee members all kinds of advice, were for the most part vindictive, and it was clear to me, at least, from their attitude that their principal desire was to destroy labor organizations completely. So I say that the bill as it came from the committee was a just bill. It is neither satisfactory to the leaders of labor, who want no legislation whatsoever, nor to the leaders of industry, who want no labor unions or collective bargaining whatsoever.

In my opinion the amendments which have been made to the bill since it has come to the floor of the Senate do not warrant a vote against it. I think it would have been a better bill if they had been left out. However, the first amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was so changed as not to do any particular damage to labor. The second amendment was defeated. The third amendment, relating to welfare funds, will undoubtedly put a greater burden upon employers than upon unions. So unless it is further amended to make it unfair in some way, I expect to vote for the bill.

It is a wonder that Members of the Senate can hold their tempers and vote on the bill according to their best judgment, because we have been subjected to the most intensive, expensive, and vicious propaganda campaign that any Congress has ever been subjected to.

I do not refer to the propaganda campaign of the labor unions, although I hold no brief for that. I refer to a propaganda campaign which has cost well into the millions of dollars. I should not be surprised if the total amount spent in this campaign would amount to at least $100,000,000. I told the Senate last spring that the single March advertising campaign in the newspapers against labor by the National Association of Manufacturers cost $2,000,000, and that statement has not been contradicted as yet, although it was made a year ago.

This propaganda campaign has been conducted through letters to the press; it has been conducted through radio commentators whose services have been for hire by various organizations. It has been conducted through speakers sent everywhere in the United States where they could get an opportunity to expound the antilabor doctrine. One town in my State engaged a speaker to speak to the combined service clubs of that town, and he was so utterly antilabor in his remarks that I was asked to find out something about the organization which he claimed to represent. I enlisted the aid of the Library of Congress. The Library could not find that any such organization as he claimed to represent even existed.

The campaign had been conducted through newspaper advertising. Even today both labor and industry are carrying large advertisements in the daily newspapers. It has been conducted through circulars, and it has been conducted by Nation-wide organizations which ought to know better than to employ the methods which they have used.

I have before me circulars from one of the biggest organizations representing

commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce. This is a sample: In a special issue of Governmental Affairs published under date of April 16 there was an obvious effort to get members of the various chambers of commerce throughout the United States to favor a destructive labor law. The circular tells them what to do. Let me read the language of the circular, under the heading "What to do":

The enactment of a program for industrial peace depends upon two things. First, there must be a widespread public understanding of the legislative proposals, subject by subject. Second, an informed public must be quick to express its convictions to its Senators and Representatives.

Use this special number as a basis for radio programs, public forums, membership meetings, and committee study. Give it generous circulation with the urgent request that those who receive it make their views known now.

The issue of April 18 appears to carry a comparison of the two bills, the House labor bill and the Senate labor bill. While it carries all the provisions of the House bill, it fails to mention many of the provisions of the Senate bill. The chamber did not place the truth before its members.

I ask unanimous consent to have the comparison of the two bills, as distributed over the country by the United States Chamber of Commerce, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BILLS

Here is a comparison of the House and Senate labor bills:

1. Both ban the closed shop, but permit the union shop if it is approved by a majority of the employees. New employees would be required to join the union within 30 days. The House bill, however, forbids unions to strike for the union shop.

2. The House bill bans industry-wide bargaining except for plants employing fewer than 100 persons and located within a 50-mile radius. It also forbids competing employers to get together on a wage scale to offer unions. The Senate bill does not mention industry-wide bargaining.

3. The House bill prevents the NLRB from recognizing unions having officers who are now, or ever were, members of the Communist Party. The Senate bill as yet does not touch on the Communist issue.

4. The House bill would deprive unions of their Wagner Act privileges for 1 year if they engaged in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts. Some organizational strikes are made "unfair labor practices" and the NLRB is permitted to seek injunctions against them. The House bill also forbids Federal employees to strike against the Government.

5. Both bills would permit the Government to obtain injunctions to enforce a cooling-off period before strikes could be called in transportation, public utility or communications industries. The House bill calls for a 75-day cooling-off period and the Senate for an 80-day.

6. Both bills would remove the Federal Conciliation Service from the jurisdiction of the Labor Department and set it up as an independent agency. The House bill would replace the NLRB with a three-member Labor-Management Relations Board. The Senate measure would increase the NLRB to seven members.

7. Both bills would prevent unions from refusing to bargain or from trying to coerce an employer into accepting a particular union as bargaining agent for the employees.

Mr. AIKEN. The inference is given that the Senate bill does nothing whatsoever about jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

This propaganda campaign has been carried on through corporations which have circularized their stockholders, asking them to write to Members of Congress favoring the House bill and opposing any mild bill. We have all received many such letters. They have asked for drastic and restrictive labor legislation. The two words most frequently used are "drastic" and "restrictive." This is a sample of the manner in which corporations have circularized their stockholders. This happens to be from the Fruehauf Trailer Co., of Detroit, Mich. It begins:

DEAR STOCKHOLDER: If you've had enough of radical labor leaders, if you feel that their monopolistic powers need to be destroyed or drastically curbed, then now is the time for you to write your United States Senators and urge them to pass a labor bill at least as strong as the one just passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Fruehauf says further:

You know I have opposed the Wagner Act from the start because it has given too much power to one segment of society. Under its protection, radical labor leaders have demanded raise after raise, privilege after privilege, from employers, threatening, "Come across, or else."

We have a better name for collective bargaining. We call it collective "bludgeoning."

I submit those quotations from the letter from the Fruehauf Trailer Co. to its stockholders simply as a sample of the manner in which people have been misinformed or given half truths and urged to write Members of the Senate and of the House.

I have one other exhibit showing the absolutely vicious propaganda campaign which has been conducted by certain segments of our society. I have before me a letter which has been widely distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. This letter is signed by Sumner Gerard, treasurer. I do not know who he is, but I do know of the organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. That organization has recently been in trouble with the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. As Senators may recall, its director was cited for contempt by the House committee, but escaped punishment by reason of a technicality.

Let me quote from this letter. Speaking of the labor bills, it says:

Senate Labor Committee members, either because they believe it is good politics, or because they shrink from facing the hard fact that swollen union powers must be curbed, will probably fail to do anything effective against (1) closed shop; (2) industry-wide unionization and Nation-wide strikes; (3) mass picketing and violence; (4) bill of rights protecting workers from internal union abuses; (5) compulsory welfare funds; (6) labor monopolies' special privileges and exemptions under Wagner, Norris-LaGuardia, and Clayton Acts.

So far as I know, this organization never did a single thing to retract the inference that the Senate bill does not carry any provisions in regard to those matters.

Then they go on and say, in regard to the House Committee on Labor:

House: Labor Committee—15 Republicans, 10 Democrats—is a much stronger group, and nearer the people. Its leaders are trying to do a real job. They need your help. They have built into their hearings a shocking record of labor-union abuses, but the record has not been given the publicity it deserves.

Then it goes on to tell what the House labor bill will do for them. On the next page it says this:

Write to your own Senators and Congressmen today. Send carbons to all committee members. Better still, write to every Member of your State's delegation. If you can, relate briefly experiences you have had (or of which you have accurate information) with labor-union abuse, why not address your letter to every Member of Congress? Congress must be made to know what the country is thinking.

What Congress does now will depend on what you and others tell your Representatives. What it leaves undone at this session must be taken up again—on whatever foundation of education is laid now.

Then it says:

Therefore, use the best educational tool at your command. It is the little book, Labor Monopolies—or Freedom, by John W. Scoville. The complimentary copy sent you with this letter is a gift from individuals responsible for a Nation-wide crusade for real labor-law reform.

Please read your copy tonight and put it into circulation tomorrow. Buy 5, 10, 50 copies or more, yourself, and put them to work. Have your firm buy 100, 200, 500, or more.

Incidentally, the price is given as $1 for one, and it goes down to 50 cents, I think, for 100 or more.

The letter continues as follows:

Two hundred and fifty thousand have been distributed, and wherever they go they create demand for action by Congress.

This is both an immediate and a long-term fight to restore and save our freedom. Books have swayed the thinking of nations. Help us project Scoville's penetrating analysis of the menace of labor monopolies to 1,000,000 thought leaders who must guide our Nation in this critical period.

Here are the people to whom they want to send a million copies:

Ten thousand editors and publishers of rural weeklies.

Sixty thousand farm leaders.

One hundred thousand business leaders, large and small.

One hundred and sixty thousand lawyers.

One hundred and thirty thousand clergymen.

One hundred and ten thousand physicians.

Sixty thousand dentists.

Twenty thousand heads of women's clubs.

Forty thousand directors of chambers of commerce service clubs.

Forty thousand college presidents, school superintendents, and educators.

One hundred and forty thousand important stockholders.

One hundred and thirty thousand miscellaneous, making 1,000,000 in all.

We might think that this is the work of a crackpot organization until we read in their report—I think it was in yesterday's newspapers—that they have spent $150,000 to $160,000 already this year to influence this Congress, and are soliciting $750,000 more in order to put the heat on Congress to break labor unions. That is only one organization that is doing this kind of work.

As I have said, the House Committee on Un-American Activities had before it this organization either last fall or the early part of the winter. They could find out little about the manner in which the organization was financed or the manner in which it spends its funds. But it is a well-financed organization.

I am not going to bring in the names of those who I understand are backing it, because I think some of them are real Americans who do not know what they are doing.

I have here the little book to which they refer as the best tool to use against labor unions. It is entitled "Labor Monopolies—or Freedom," by John W. Scoville. I found this book on my desk this morning. As I understand, it has been sent to all Members of Congress. Two hundred and fifty thousand copies of the 167-page book have been distributed by this organization, and they are contemplating distributing one million more to the professional people of this country.

The book reveals the real purpose of the people who are asking this Congress today to pass a law which would have the effect of destroying labor organizations in this country, and I am equally sure—there is not a shadow of a doubt in my mind—that these same people, and others like them in other organizations, are equally determined to destroy the farm organizations of this country as quickly as they can get Congress to destroy labor organizations.

I have not read the entire book, but I have read the last few pages of it to see what their conclusions are, and I wish to quote from it. I read from page 152:

> What should we do?
> What can we do?

Here is the real purpose, as set forth in the book:

> What we should do is to repeal all Federal labor laws on wages, hours of labor, collective bargaining, minimum wages, etc., and abolish all boards, bureaus, and commissions that result from these laws.

I turn to page 153 and read as follows:

> There should be no laws which would recognize strikes as legitimate and lawful, such as legal cooling-off periods, posting of intention to strike, etc.

Reading further from page 153:

> A strike should be considered as an offense against society, rather than an offense against the employer.
>
> It is true that the strikers suffer losses, but they strike because they expect their ultimate gains will exceed their losses. The employer has no expectation of gain.

They plan to distribute 1,000,000 copies of this book. Many Members of the Senate probably know some of the people connected with the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. We have seen them around here for years, spreading their poison propaganda.

Let me turn to page 154 of their "bible" and read further:

> We are told that workmen have a right to withhold their labor until they can get the price at which they are willing to sell it. But does this right exist for a combination of workmen?

I turn to page 57 and quote further from the book distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.:

> Collective bargaining and the formation of monopolies should be unlawful, whether the purpose be to raise the price of wheat, of steel, or of labor. An employer who signs a collective bargaining agreement or a closed-shop agreement should be considered equally guilty with the officers of the labor union who sign the agreement. The fact that the agreement is desired by the employer as well as by the employees should have no weight, for the offense is against society.

Reading from farther down on the same page:

> It would probably be desirable to make it illegal for an employer to grant a wage increase to any employee who had been on strike during a preceding period, say 6 months.

Finally, I turn to pages 158 and 159, and read further:

> For some years, perhaps for many years, we will struggle to eliminate the abuses of collective bargaining. Some day it may dawn on the majority of our citizens that the abuse to be eliminated is collective bargaining itself—that competition is superior to monopoly—and that economic freedom is better than compulsion.

It is evident from this statement that the present labor bill is just the beginning of the campaign to destroy labor itself.

I now turn to the last page, 164, and read this:

> To think is difficult. Most people have neither the capacity nor the inclination to think deeply on any subject.

Evidently they do not have a very high opinion of the intelligence of the average American.

Mr. President, this is an alien doctrine, which is being distributed, unhampered, by an organization supposedly financed by respectable publishers, businessmen, and commodity exchange people in the United States. The material it is distributing is a sample of the material that millions of dollars are being spent to distribute all over our land, to poison the minds of our people against the working classes of America. I do not see why the Columbians were prosecuted in Georgia, if this group goes free—as it has thus far, even after having shown contempt for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by refusing to answer their questions and tell about their affairs, where they get their money, and how they spend it. But that is a fact.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this situation involves something more than labor legislation, and that it is time for the FBI or the Attorney General, or any other governmental agencies which are concerned with inquiring about organizations in the United States which preach Nazi or Fascist doctrines to look into this matter. I am sorry to have to take the time of the Senate this evening to mention it; and I am sorry to have to mention it at all, because I know some of the people who are engaged in that work. I think some of them who are helping to finance it and carry it on do not know what they are doing. But if such activities are carried far enough, the final result will be the destruction of democracy in the United States and the prohibition of the right to organize on the part of any group. Under such a program, there is no doubt that workingmen will come first, and farmers will come next.

Mr. President, in relation to the bill now before us, let me say there is no question that it will pass, and will go to the House of Representatives, and a committee of conference will take it up. If the conference committee is willing to accept the bill about as it now stands, it can become law. If the conference committee undertakes to do to the bill what certain organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., wish to have done to it, such a bill should not become law, and the President would be fully justified in vetoing it; in fact, it would be his duty to veto any bill which forbids any group in America to work together to promote the mutual welfare of their members, so long as they do not threaten our form of government itself.

Mr. President, I do not believe it does any good to threaten the President that if he vetoes any bill which the Congress sends him for his signature, the Congress will get even with him by refusing to enact any legislation whatever on the subject, no matter what happens to the country as a result.

I wish to say that although this bill is not as I would have it—it was at its best when it came from the committee, and it should have been passed just as it came from the committee—nevertheless, it has not been amended sufficiently to warrant a vote against it on my part.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the McClellan amendment, on page 25, was adopted. That amendment deals with the question of Communist officers of labor organizations. I ask that the motion be entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to know whether those who are interested in that amendment are aware of the motion of the Senator from Ohio to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have simply filed the motion. I do not ask for action on it at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which nominating messages

were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Warner W. Gardner.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Charles F. Uhl, term expired;

Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii; and

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico, vice Enrique Campos del Toro, resigned.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. If there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas, vice Clyde O. Eastus, term expired.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

POSTMASTER

William P. Heath to be postmaster at Esmont, in the State of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Thomas C. Donlan, Order of Preachers, director of the Nazareth Conference, Fenwick High School, Oak Park, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Almighty and Merciful God, we beseech Thee to enlighten the minds of our lawgivers that they may know the ways of truth in directing the citizens of our Republic. Enkindle in their hearts an ardent desire for justice that they may deal with each according to his rights and obligations in promoting the peaceful conduct of the affairs of our beloved Nation.

We pray Thee also to strengthen in the minds and hearts of our legislators the virtue of prudence, without which the works of charity, justice, and peace cannot flourish in our land. Enkindle in their memories the grateful recollection of Thy past benefactions, and inspire them to repent sincerely and to make amends for any past offenses. Instill in their minds a clear understanding of present affairs and in their hearts the humility necessary to share in the wisdom of others. Arm them with vigilance in crises and with clear reasoning in every situation. Make them provident in carrying out Thy holy will, circumspect in judging all things, and cautious and courageous in facing dangers.

Grant us all, most merciful Father, the wisdom to respect and obey the laws that they frame. Guard and protect us, that in unity of purpose we may lovingly and prudently pursue the paths of justice to that tranquillity of order which is the peace Thou hast promised to men of good will.

Grant us these favors, O loving Father, through the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ, Thy only Son our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Spirit reignest now and forever throughout eternity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 338) entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEEFE, H. CARL ANDERSEN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma, CHURCH, ROONEY, HENDRICKS, and FOGARTY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain statement made by Carl H. Wilken before the Committee on Agriculture on May 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address made by him on the Greece-Turkish loan.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Air Power at Stake."

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include four resolutions by the Izaak Walton twenty-fifth annual conference.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two petitions.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

A PLAN FOR A PERMANENT FARM PROGRAM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very comprehensive statement made by Carl H. Wilken, of Sioux City, Iowa, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council, before the House Committee on Agriculture on May 8, 1947.

Mr. Wilken presents a plan for a permanent farm program for agriculture which is worthy of our serious consideration. His statement is doubly important at this time in view of the fact that the 90-percent-parity formula under the Steagall amendment expires December 31, 1948. Mr. Wilken points

out very definitely that there is a direct relationship between farm income, the industrial pay roll, and the national income at a ratio of 1–1–7. When farm income rises and falls, so does the industrial pay roll, and the national income rises and falls seven times farm income as the dollar paid for the production of raw materials turns seven times in the channels of trade.

I respectfully suggest that Members of Congress take the time to read Mr. Wilken's splendid statement.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Public Works Committee may have permission to sit tomorrow during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. During general debate?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS STEEL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in the fore part of February I had occasion to take the floor and call attention to the enormous quantities of steel in the hands of the War Assets Administration, over 500,000,000 pounds. The War Assets Administration claimed it only had 112,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, it has advertised in New York a sufficient quantity to indicate that in the 33 regional offices it has at least 157,000,000 pounds of steel. If you put the pressure on that gang, they may sell the stuff where it will do some good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Instead of selling it and turning the money in to the Treasury, why not give the money to some foreign nation?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

U. S. FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION"

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, October 21, 1947, marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the U. S. frigate *Constitution*, affectionately known as Old Ironsides.

I am today introducing a resolution to provide for the commemoration of that historic day. This grand and noble vessel, one of the parent vessels of our Navy, is berthed at the Boston Navy Yard. It seems to me fitting and proper that Navy Day this year be celebrated on the anniversary day of her launching, 150 years ago, and that appropriate ceremonies be held aboard her.

The U. S. frigate *Constitution* was the beginning of our Navy. Her exploits made the people of this country aware of the value of a strong Navy, and today we have the greatest Navy in all the world. No better date could be selected to celebrate Navy Day than the anniversary of the frigate *Constitution*, which has represented the finest of Navy tradition and Navy valor.

The U. S. frigate *Constitution* was built in 1797, at the order of President George Washington. She first saw action in the naval war with France, between 1797 and 1801, saving many of our merchant ships from the hands of French privateers.

During the war with Tripoli she shelled the stronghold of the Barbary pirate and brought him to terms. She was the flagship of Commodore Edward Preble, and the preliminary articles of the treaty were signed aboard Old Ironsides.

During the War of 1812, the frigate *Constitution*, under the command of Capt. Isaac Hull, achieved world recognition when she escaped from the British squadron off New York. On August 19, 1812, she captured and sank the British frigate *Guerriere* in less than 30 minutes. And in two other actions three more British ships fell before her.

The U. S. frigate *Constitution* was immortalized by the poem Old Ironsides of Oliver Wendell Holmes. Every American knows this poem, and every American looks upon this vessel as representing everything that is American—courage, valor, strength, determination, and skill.

The United States Constitution guaranteed freedom for the American people who set up their government on this continent. The U. S. frigate *Constitution* established freedom of the seas, and she made the United States a world power.

Mr. Speaker, not only do I believe that Navy Day should be celebrated on the anniversary of the launching of the *Constitution*. I also believe we should commemorate her anniversary by the issuance of a special stamp that will remind our people of the sacrifices that have been made to make this Nation great. One hundred and fifty years ago we were a small, struggling Nation. Today we are the strongest in the world. To the U. S. frigate *Constitution* we owe a great deal. She represents the finest in American tradition, which must never die.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

THE LATE FINLY H. GRAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to perform the sad duty of reporting the death of the Honorable Finly H. Gray, a former Member of the House of Representatives, which occurred on Thursday, May 8, 1947. He was 83 years of age. Mr. Gray was my predecessor in office, representing the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana. He was a good citizen, a kindly neighbor, and a very distinguished statesman. His last illness spanned the period of only a few days, following a major surgical operation.

Representative Gray was admitted to the bar in 1897, he began the practice of the law with his brother, George L. Gray, who was then serving as prosecuting attorney in his judicial district. His practice of his chosen profession was somewhat limited to office work, and politics, because of an impediment of speech which he experienced in his earlier years, but which had greatly improved during the after-years of his life. He was elected and served as mayor of his home city for two terms. Later, and in 1910, he was nominated and elected to Congress, and he served in this body for three full terms, serving in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses. That service was during the administration of Woodrow Wilson, as President. He was elected from the old Sixth, or the "Burnt District," during that term of service in Congress. Later, and in 1932, he again reentered politics, becoming a candidate for Congress from the Tenth Congressional District, which had been changed by the process of redistricting, but which embraced his home county; he was nominated and elected to Congress, in 1932, and he served for three terms, or 6 years—serving in the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses—until he was defeated at the general election in 1938.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of the House, still serving, will recall the speeches he made on the floor of the House on the "money question"; he was an ardent advocate of the revaluation of gold to broaden the base on which currency could be issued. After his retirement from Congress, in 1916, he toured the country on the Chautauqua platform, lecturing on the subjects The Moral Force, and The Lessons of the Great War. He was a firm believer in States rights and local self-government, and he opposed with all of the vigor of his manhood the policies and principles of the Ku Klux Klan. He was very active during his earlier years, and this activity continued until after the death of his

wife, which occurred in the year 1943. The only child of this family died many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Finly H. Gray from my early boyhood. In our very close association, as friends, I came to recognize in him those rare qualities which directly appeal to men, and I knew him in the intimacies of those close contacts which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few; I knew him in the stress of great turmoil when multitudinous worries were at hand. He was as kindly as he was brave, and as he meditated thus he spoke. He carried on, bravely, to the finish.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, his life work has ended. The career of this splendid man has thus terminated. His life, and his living of it, stand before us in splendor. While his entire family has gone on before him—we extend to the distant relatives our deepest sympathy upon his passing. My tribute to him, I give in the words which were spoken of a great hero—in the years gone by—"This was a man."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The Members on this side who served with Finly Gray certainly join in the brilliant tribute the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has just paid to him.

He was one of the most colorful characters with whom I have ever served. I was most intimately associated with him in one vigorous fight he made for rural electrification in Indiana. I can never forget his struggle and the assistance he rendered in that worthy cause.

I can say also of Finly Gray, "the elements were so mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up, and say to all the world, 'This was a man'."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join completely in the eloquent and beautiful eulogy of our late friend that the gentleman from Indiana has just delivered. It is one that cannot be broadened in any respect. I am very sorry to hear of the passing of our friend, Finly Gray, to whom the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] so properly referred as a colorful character, a man possessed not only of a colorful personality but of nobility of character.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED ADVANCED TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide that veterans who have at any time suffered from service-connected advanced tuberculosis shall be rated as permanently and totally disabled by the Veterans' Administration. My purpose in introducing this bill is to take care of the thousands of veterans who have at some time had advanced tuberculosis and who still are susceptible, but who cannot get jobs because when their record is examined and it is found that they have had tuberculosis in an advanced stage they are refused jobs, yet these men are charged with the responsibility of earning a livelihood for themselves and their families. I think this is a very meritorious bill and I hope the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give it an early hearing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on representation without taxation, by Paul R. Alwine, of Vestal, N. Y.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, from Ankara, Turkey, comes the report that Turkey's representatives on the United Nations voted with Russia on the Palestine issue against the United States on Friday. On Friday the Congress of the United States, or the House of Representatives, voted $100,000,000 for military purposes at the request of Harry S. Truman for the benefit of Turkey.

I would like to say to President Harry S. Truman that he wants to be very careful when he spends these $100,000,000 for the armament of Turkey that it is not at some future time used against us. "A word to the wise should be sufficient."

It seems to me that in our deliberations over the things that we are going to have to do for foreign countries we want to look after the United States of America and have that uppermost in our minds. If we do not keep our own country strong—we will go down, down, down—while other countries go up, up, up. Be wise and economize.

SHIPMENTS OF HEAVY MACHINERY TO RUSSIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since VJ-day we have shipped $233,000,000 worth of lend-lease equipment to Russia. There still remains $16,500,000 worth of equipment to be shipped.

I understand shipments are now in progress and will be completed in the near future. Of these $16,500,000 worth of heavy equipment, comprised of oil refining equipment, mine hoists, locomotive storage batteries, power equipment, electric equipment, mining equipment, electric motors and controllers, together with much other miscellaneous machinery and equipment.

Now, if there is any sense, rhyme, or reason in giving Greece and Turkey $400,000,000 to stop the Russian armies while at the same time giving the Russian Government these millions of dollars of supplies, then I fail to see it.

Therefore, I am presenting to this House a resolution calling for the immediate cancellation of all lend-lease shipments to the Soviet Union. I hope there will be no opposition to my resolution and that it will receive immediate consideration. I am confident that this will meet with the universal approval of our people. I know that a few will say that this equipment is being shipped under a previous contract, but under the circumstances and due to the fact that Russia is upholding progress along the lines of peace and has violated every international agreement into which she has ever entered, and since they only understand force, I think it is high time to begin getting tough. The time is long overdue. Had we had a foreign policy and talked firmly to Russia at San Francisco I am confident that the present alarming condition would not exist and that this drastic action would not be necessary.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post regarding the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a disposition on the part of some of the leadership on both sides of the aisle to discourage new Members from speaking in the House and especially from taking part in the debates. I lay no claim at all myself to having any special abilities along any line, but I will tell you that among these new Members are men of the very highest character and the very highest ability. I say to you that I protest that the House or any of the leadership should have such an attitude that these new Members should not give voice to their sentiments and I tell you, if you will listen to some of them, they can help you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know anything about the Republican side; I have seen no evidence of it, but what evidence has the gentleman on the Democratic side that the leadership has been doing anything other than to get new Members to make speeches?

Mr. MORRIS. If you had followed me closely, I did not say that all of the leadership; I said that some of the leadership.

Mr. McCORMACK. But when you make a general charge it is all wrong.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I do not care to call names, but everybody knows it is true. These new Members know it is true, and it is true.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has expired.

DEBATE ON THE FLOOR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objeection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] is unfair to the membership of the House and to the leadership. If there is an organized group of people anywhere in the world where there is ever present the desire to be helpful and considerate in every way to its new associates, it is this body. I know that the leadership on either side, rather than do that which might be considered as a depressant upon new Members, are anxious to aid and support and afford opportunity to them to express their views upon all legislation. This criticism certainly should not have come from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] because, if I recall correctly, he consumed about as much time in consideration of the legislation all last week as any other Member of this House. Certainly he is not in any position to complain.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. That was the first time I ever engaged in debate. I have been here about 4 months and have spoken very few times. That was the first time I engaged in debate. Your very statement indicates the fact that you resented it.

Mr. COX. Of course, I did not resent it. I was impressed with the zeal of the gentleman. It is true I did not get very much worth while from what the gentleman said, but nevertheless I was glad to see him have the opportunity to say what he wanted to.

Mr. RANKIN. I think you ought to bear in mind the fact that 12 other Democrats voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma on that measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorial comments.

Mr. DEANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Catholic Labor Guild.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PRICE of Florida addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a sermon delivered by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article in regard to national defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain articles and editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, May 13, I may address the House for 30 minutes following the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMPLIMENT ON THE HANDLING OF THE BILL TO AID GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay a sincere compliment to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who handled the Greece-Turkey aid bill last week. I think he gave us one of the finest demonstrations of parliamentary wielding of the gavel and of fairness that I have ever seen in the House.

At the same time I wish to pay my compliments to the chairman and ranking minority members of the committee handling the bill for the fairness in which they handled the debate, particularly under the 5-minute rule, in allowing every Member who felt seriously about the bill an opportunity to speak. Although under the 9-hour debate I was granted only 5 minutes, I realized that the number of requests for time was responsible.

I for one wish to say I am greatly pleased with the fairness with which the leaders handled that bill and the way in which the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House handled the gavel.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, due to the consideration of the Greek-aid bill last week, the proper suspension during some of the consideration of the bill of the 1-minute rule, Members did not have an opportunity to congratulate our distinguished friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO] on the splendid victory accorded him by the residents of the city of Baltimore on last Tuesday.

We in the House, without regard to party, have a very high regard for the gentleman from Maryland, TOM D'ALESANDRO. His service here in the House has been very constructive—a service marked by ability, vision, and courage.

While we are sorry to see him leave here, we realize that the fine experience he received as a Member of this body, together with his unusual ability and courage, qualify him to render to the people of one of our great metropolitan cities, the city of Baltimore, as its mayor, service of the outstanding character that is so necessary in these trying days.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include three editorials.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3370, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a minimum of $3.10 a hundred on milk going into manufactured dairy products. My purpose is not to provide a low nor a high support price.

My purpose is to provide a legal, lawful support price as guaranteed by the law of the land under the Steagall amendment. I do not know whether or not the Department of Agriculture has been deceiving, kidding, or misleading the dairymen of this country. You can take any one of the descriptive adjectives you wish, but there is something going on.

This morning I received the following letter from one of the good dairymen of the State of Wisconsin, in which he states:

I just came home from the dairy meeting in Chicago and this seems to be the dope:

1. That P. and M. A. field offices had been told to lay off any agitation for higher prices for milk; and

2. That the administration was inclined to let dairy prices drop this year and let farmers compare receipts under a Republican Congress with 1946 prices. I got this impression from what I heard.

Once again I repeat, I am not asking for a high or a low support price. I am asking and expecting to keep right on asking, as I have since November 23, 1945, for a fair support price in accordance with legislation already passed and a part of the law of the land.

I realize that there is always a tendency to get politics mixed up with economics, but I fear the time has come that we must ask the dairy department of this Government to live up to the law of the land, such laws as the so-called Steagall amendment. It is time that we make them fish or cut bait and I want to say to the Dairy Department of the United States Department of Agriculture that so far as I am concerned they cannot continue their double talk and expect to get it over. They do not have to make a political football out of this situation and I do not believe they can get away with it either. They can continue if they wish to tell dairymen that a "90 percent parity floor" would put them out of business, inferring, of course, they were for a parity or above parity floor. They can see cheese go down from 50 cents to 29 cents per pound without blinking an eye if they wish. But in Wisconsin no one plays politics with agriculture, and when 50 percent of the State of Wisconsin farm income comes from the milk pail, it is apparent that they want the legal, lawful price for their products maintained.

A few days ago the dairy plant workers in Chicago got a raise to have $1.50 per hour for putting milk in the bottles, and the White House nor the Secretary of Agriculture did not seem to think that would affect prices. However, they do not seem to be interested in seeing that the dairymen receive 50 cents per hour for putting the milk into the milk pails of the Nation.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon, notwithstanding the fact the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, when the Greek-Turkish aid bill was under consideration, I was absent from the floor on official business, but had left instructions with the pair clerk that I be paired in favor of the bill. I am informed that it was not possible to find a Member to pair in opposition so my pair was not recorded. If I could have been present and had voted I would have voted for the bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit for the rest of this week during general debates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXPENDITURE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, every time the Appropriations Committee has brought in a bill to cut expenditures, much to the disgust of certain groups, first one group then another in my district, I have gone along and voted for those cuts, thinking that there was a limit to the amount of money in the Government Treasury or to the amount which could be borrowed. I was against the bill giving three hundred and fifty million to Greece and Turkey which we considered last week, one reason being that we did not have the money and another that if we had it we needed it here at home. There were many other reasons. But I was outvoted. However, I want to say to the 107 Members who voted against that gift that after turning it over Saturday and Sunday in my mind, I think I have discovered a way to stop that "give away" business. If the 107 of us will go ahead, I think we can pick up enough votes here and there, to increase every single item in every appropriation bill. That will bankrupt this country so that there will not be money enough to give to these people in Europe. If we are to give away until we "bust" why not give to the home folks. I do not say I favor that procedure but I do say "think that one over."

RANKIN-TRUMAN DOCTRINE VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Daily Worker in one of its editorials today uses this language:

While southern poll taxers and GOP Tories joined the administration in an outcry against Russia again, it was plain that the whole world was the objective of the Rankin-Truman doctrine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what they call the Rankin-Truman doctrine is for the protection of the American people against the evils of communism. But I want to show you that the whole world is the objective of the Communist doctrine of bloody revolution and destruction.

This man, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, who was here last week attempting to lead a bunch of exservicemen into the ways of subversion, if not treason to this country, testifying before a committee of Congress, was asked this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Do the Communists in this country advocate world revolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the Communists in this country realize that America is connected up with the whole world system, and the capitalist system displays the same characteristics everywhere—everywhere it makes for the misery and exploitation of the workers—and it must be abolished, not only on an American scale but on a world scale.

Later the Chairman asked him this question:

The CHAIRMAN. They are opposed to our republican form of Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Most assuredly.

That is the same William Z. Foster who as the head of the Communists came before the Committee on Un-American Activities and admitted making the statement that, "The Communists are just as sure to take over this country as the sun rises," and he said, "When that day comes, it will not be a capitalist government, but will be a Soviet government," and he said, "Behind that government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Talk about us fighting this battle on a world scale? The Communists, with money from Moscow, are out now to try to spread communism all over the world, wreck every government on earth they cannot control, destroy the Christian way of life and put atheistic communism in its stead.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I have just received from Italy written by an Englishman who has lived there since 1925. I hope every Member of Congress and everyone else who peruses this RECORD will read what this gentleman has to say about communism in Italy at the present time.

The matter referred to follows:

Congressman JOHN RANKIN,
Mississippi,
The Capitol, Washington, U. S. A.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the Italian press a short account of your speech in Congress on the subject of communism and I write to express my appreciation and absolute agreement.

Nowadays nobody has a good word to say for fascism (public enemy No. 1) and people express themselves as shocked and pained to think that a nice people like the Italians should have, by an enormous majority, wel-

comed such a horror, and thereafter, when it had taken the wrong road, and had a stranglehold on the country, had not the strength and pluck to uproot it.

Various theories have been propounded to account for the phenomenon; but I have yet to hear in press or on radio the perfectly simple real reason for it, or indeed any mention at all of the reign of Communist outrages and excesses which gave birth to fascism. These outrages which are being repeated today (only on a far vaster scale) included murder, incendiarism, bomb-throwing, etc. (perhaps you remember the bomb throws in the Diana Theater, Milan, killing some hundreds of perfectly innocent spectators). Then, as now, it was definitely antipatriotic and antireligious, and as now financed and supported by Russia. The utter chaos in administration, in every public service, and in the national life generally was a thing that could not go on. Order was restored and the Nation for a few years content, while not a few foreign statesmen openly expressed their approval. I daresay now Mr. Churchill would be sensitive about any mention of a certain speeech of his in February 1933 on Mussolini and fascism; but I don't think he need be.

I, myself, am not Fascist, and never have been, but am an Englishman, married to an Italian wife and resident here since 1925. Perhaps my comments on Italian communism may possibly be of some interest to you.

Communism is an ideology which inevitably attracts to itself the most criminal and unscrupulous elements in any nation.

Moreover, it makes a too often successful appeal to the basest and most ignoble instincts, cupidity, envy, hatred and even cruelty, latent in many people who have never yet been criminal.

To begin with, the Communist Party is extremely wealthy, thanks to lavish Russian subsidies; and a complete lack of all moral scruple affords to its followers ample opportunity for a rapid rise to great riches.

An otherwise admirable English book on Italy contains this sentence, "Having fulminated so loudly, and so justifiedly, against all the corruption of fascism, anti-Fascists would hardly venture to stultify themselves by equally corrupt conduct."

Blessed innocence—would they not? In fact, their very frank slogan throughout has been "Adesso tocca a noi"—in other words, "Now it is our turn"—but they have gone far indeed beyond the excesses of fascism, which may be accounted for by the fact that very soon after the arrival of the Allies in any area most of the worst characters of fascism passed hurriedly over to swell the Communist ranks, being received (unless too prominently compromised by acts of savagery and treachery) with open arms.

Enrollment in the Communist Party meant absolution for past, present, and future crimes, an assured income and position giving every opportunity of enrichment.

Those of bloodthirsty nature, or with old animosities and vendettas to satisfy, found themselves in the agreeable position of being able to gratify them with little danger to themselves and with an army of scribes and orators to find justification for every one of their crimes. The Vatican, I believe, gives the figure of persons slaughtered in cold blood, under the excuse of political motive, as over 140,000, but most authorities place it higher. I suppose this figure includes the victims of the massacre of the Prison of Schio, when 14 armed men forced their way into the prison, herded the occupants (Fascists, or presumed such—their own phrase) into 2 cells, and incontinently shot dead 30 men, 14 women, wounding 30 others; this almost under the eyes of the horrified but apparently impotent AMGOT; but the 14 heroes are still at large.

The anti-Fascist purge under the direction of Pietro Nenni (himself original founder of the Fascio of Bologna and subsequent servant of Mussolini in the OVRA abroad) became an instrument of blackmail, rapine, and vendetta.

Every local authority in Communist hands became a center of unabashed graft and dishonesty and injustice even to such abuses as unequal distribution of food and of taxation, as between those enrolled in the Communist Party and those not; and most of them have been guilty of sanctioning and even encouraging every form of illegality and violence.

More serious still is the fact that two successive Ministers of Justice, Togliatti and Gullo, have both been guilty of the grossest irregularities and illegalities directed to the favoring of their own supporters, and have not hesitated to tamper with the authority, independence, and even the integrity of the magistrature.

A disquieting and unpleasant feature of the Italian communism is its entire lack of any feeling of loyalty or patriotism toward their own country. They seem always ready to act against Italy and Italians in the interests of Russian plans for the country, sabotage of production and reconstruction, promoting disturbance, smuggling Yugoslavia badly needed corn and foodstuffs, cooperating with the Yugoslavs in their plans for territorial expansion, and in the massacre and maltreatment of their fellow Italians in the lands adjacent to Yugoslavia.

To sum up, Moscow-subsidized communism has reduced Italy to a chaos of misery and anarchy from which there can be no exit so long as the Communists are on top.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt at all of Tito's intention to attack Italy directly Allied troops are withdrawn.

It is just too easy, as he has the full support of Russia and of a formidably armed fifth column of Communists in Italy itself, while the territorial military clauses of the fatuous and dishonorable peace treaty leave Italy wide open to any attack and completely unable to defend herself. It beats me that, even with the noble objective of appeasing Russia before them, the Allies have been so blind.

I suggest that Italy has for the western powers a strategical importance very little, if at all, inferior to that of Greece and Turkey, and that the sooner the weakness and folly of those military clauses are remedied the better it will be for the peace and safety of the world.

Italy is not Communist and never will be willingly, but the apathy and incomprehension of the Allies has helped to give a quite disproportionate power to a violent, unscrupulous, and well-armed minority.

Why did the Allies not disarm the Italian Partisans and why did the Allies recognize the self-styled committee of national liberation even as a temporary authority.

If you would get a clear light on the absurd claims of Communists and Partisans to be the sole saviors of Italy, and on their actual accomplishment, I recommend you read Some Affairs of Honour, by Captain Chappell, of the OSS, published by William L. White.

All my statements have been of simple fact, easily verified and confirmed by a careful study of the press of all parties (even the Communists). The state of Italy is discreditable to the Anglo Americans, who are primarily responsible for it, and something should be done to help Italy, other than pouring food and goods into Italy, which she won't be able to pay for and which mostly land in the black market. Italy needs guidance, needs a master.

If our King Charles I was a traitor who merited trial and execution (if), then every Communist and even social minister, exminister, and others outside the Government are traitors and thieves far worse than he.

Communism is sheer poison, criminal, and immoral, and any nation desiring peace, order, progress, and prosperity, and the spirit of fraternity within her borders must extirpate it.

To cut off Russian subsidies would be a good first step and a close surveillance of all foreigners, especially Russians, with the elimination of undesirables.

I think also that the supply of food and goods to Jap-Slavia and Albania, who are our sworn enemies, ought to cease now.

Please excuse a frightfully long letter from an utter stranger, but really I do know what I am talking about.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LUGERT-ALTUS IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 797) to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 214, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in honor and recognition of the outstanding service of the late W. C. Austin in securing irrigation for the benefit of southwestern Oklahoma, the project in the State of Oklahoma known as the Lugert-Altus irrigation project shall hereafter be known and designated as the W. C. Austin project. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to under the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project shall be held to refer to such project under and by the name of the W. C. Austin project.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 797) was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1556) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ALLOWANCES TO PRISON INMATES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1999) to authorize additional allowances of

good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 534, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the discretion of the Attorney General and under rules and regulations promulgated by him—

(a) the additional deductions from sentences of prisoners employed in industries or camps authorized by section 8 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744h), may be extended to prisoners performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services in institutional operations; and

(b) the prison industries fund established by section 4 of the act of June 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744–1), may be employed in paying compensation to such prisoners.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF TRUMAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress should be willing to face facts. They ought to be completely honest with themselves and with the people back home. They should tell the truth—the whole truth—to the Nation when they pass legislation that affects the welfare and happiness of all the people of the Nation. This the House did not do when it passed the Greco-Turkish aid bill.

The fact is that at the very moment we were acting favorably on the Greco-Turkish aid bill the Foreign Affairs Committee of another body—the Senate—was giving its full approval to a treaty of peace for Italy that violates the so-called Truman policy and absolutely nullifies the effect of the Greco-Turkish aid bill. I am told that both President Truman and our State Department have also placed their stamp of approval upon this proposed treaty of peace with Italy.

Mr. Speaker, here are some of the drastic provisions of that treaty. Judge for yourself whether the treaty is in accord with the Truman policy or whether it violates and nullifies that policy.

(a) Defortification of the entire Italian frontier.

(b) Confiscation and dispersal of the Italian Navy.

(c) Reduction of Italian Army to 85,000 men.

(d) Reduction of Italian Air Force to 200 fighter planes and 150 transport planes.

(e) Payment of heavy war indemnities—$100,000,000 to Russia, $105,000,000 to Greece, and $125,000,000 to Yugoslavia.

(f) Cede considerable valuable territory to Yugoslavia, France, and Greece.

If the treaty is ratified in its present form, Italy will be rendered helpless before her Communist-dominated neighbor, Yugoslavia, whose dictator ruler, Tito, is a Charlie McCarthy for Stalin. Thus, the provisions of the Italian Peace Treaty that we have agreed to, go absolutely contrary to President Truman's announced policy in connection with aid for Greece and Turkey. On the one hand, we strengthen Stalin's hands by weakening Italy, and, on the other hand, we propose to strengthen Greece and Turkey in order to block Tito and Stalin. Does this make sense? Can Uncle Sam "ride with the hounds and run with the hare" at one and the same time?

The distinguished genial gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in his arguments on Friday for the passage of the Greco-Turkish aid bill, stressed the point time and again that unless we extended military aid to Greece and Turkey, Italy would fall and the Mediterranean Sea would become Soviet-controlled and Soviet-dominated. He does not seem to realize that Italy has fallen—that she lies prostrate and helpless at the feet of her avowed enemy, Yugoslavia—as a direct result of the inconsistency of Truman's foreign policy. "Consistency thou art a jewel"—a jewel sadly lacking, however, in the Truman foreign policy, in the affairs of the State Department, and in the actions of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my friend from Illinois made reference to some remarks that I made the other day, it is very apparent that his powers of interpretation of what I said have led him on a remarkably erroneous journey.

The gentleman from Massachusetts said, and I repeat, that after Greece, if it does come under the control of the Communist element and the Communist element take over the Government with the repressive measures that follow and the liquidation of the decent element in that country, I predicted it would only be a matter of a short time when the same thing would happen in Italy. The gentleman misinterprets what I said and in his misinterpretation he misquotes what I said. Italy today is fighting with its back to the wall against communistic influences. If Greece goes, Italy cannot be saved, in my opinion.

The situation in the world is such that today the only government outside of the Iron Curtain, which has a coalition government with a Communist in it, is Italy. Recently because of the measures employed by the Communist members of the French Cabinet, France caused them to resign or be removed from the Cabinet. The same thing has happened in Belgium and Brazil.

The only country outside of the Iron Curtain where there is a Communist member in the Cabinet is the Government of Italy. I say this with no criticism of the decent forces in Italy because they are probably forced to accept that condition for the time being as an expedient but I hope they will very quickly change that condition, but that is dependent upon the decent element in Italy receiving that encouragement and support which will enable them to take measures which will produce that desired result.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I yield to my distinguished and valued friend.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not recognize the fact that I recognize, namely, that Italy has already fallen, so far as the terms of the peace treaty are concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the minds of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Illinois are very far apart on that matter at this time. I say there is an imminent danger. I say, in my opinion, the success of the decent elements in Italy depends upon their receiving some encouragement. It will be a catastrophe if Italy comes under the control of the Communist faction. It means that all of Europe will very rapidly be enveloped. I say that Italy is not at the present time under the domination of communism. There is no question but what communistic influences are powerful there and that the decent elements of Italy are fighting hard in order to resist those influences and prevent Communists from taking over the Government of Italy.

What I said in the debate and what I now say is that affirmative action in connection with Greece is of vital importance in connection with the preservation of Italy and the establishment in that country of a government free from Communist control.

The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, even in disagreement, and I respect his views in disagreement, caught the spirit of my position. My spirit is one of pro-American—to go forward—pro-religious, whether it is Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—organized religion. You and I who believe in God and try to live a decent life have to lead an affirmative life to be decent. As a matter of fact, the Communists say that religion is a drug. I think the answer to that is that communism is a drug because communism is like a narcotic that enables people to follow the line of least resistance, to respond to the law of nature which we all know is a lowering and degrading influence.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I am in full accord with the gentleman as far as being pro-religious and anti-Communist.

Mr. McCORMACK. To be pro-religious means that one is anti-Communist. The greater always includes the lesser.

Mr. MASON. But I cannot see the consistency of weakening Italy and making her lie prostrate at the feet of her enemy, a Communist enemy—Yugoslavia—and then build up Greece to fight off communism. That does not make sense to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see that there was not a meeting of our minds. The gentleman, I think, was talking about another subject, in relation to the treaty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. My remarks were on the basic question of preservation. In connection with the treaty I have no observations to make, because I think the gentleman criticized what happened at Trieste, the settlement made there, and other things, which I could not take the floor and seriously challenge. But my considerations in connection with the debate of last week were basic. We are faced with a challenge. It is a dynamic, constructive challenge to the way of life in which we believe. I take the position that we cannot separate our country and our people from other nations of the world who may not have the same form of government that we have, but who basically believe in the same fundamentals in which we believe. If they ever get themselves emancipated from fear and force and influence, whether direct or indirect, they will respond to the fundamentals in which they believe, which are identically the same as those in which we believe, the foremost of which is free religious conscience, and as a result of that, the dignity and personality of the individual and the rights of man, which necessarily follow a situation in which the dignity and personality of the individual can exist and function. My position is that we cannot afford to let the peace of the world, the countries of the western civilization, be further encroached upon and that if Greece goes, Italy is bound to go, in my opinion. If Italy and France go, then all of Europe goes, and it will be due to the inactivity of our country exercising its power affirmatively. That is the basic position I took in the debate last week and that is the basic position that I maintain now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts have just made interesting speeches but they are not germane to any bill on the Consent Calendar nor to any amendment to any bill on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request to speak and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The membership should hear these bills.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-eight Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Allen, Calif.	Beall	Bland
Barden	Bell	Blatnik
Bates, Ky.	Bender	Bloom
Bolton	Grant, Ind.	Norrell
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Norton
Brophy	Hall,	O'Hara
Buckley	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Buffett	Hand	Owens
Bulwinkle	Hardy	Pace
Butler	Hart	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Philbin
Canfield	Hébert	Ploeser
Celler	Heffernan	Potts
Chapman	Hinshaw	Powell
Clements	Javits	Rabin
Clippinger	Johnson, Calif.	Rayfiel
Coffin	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Wash.	Riehlman
Coudert	Kearns	Rivers
Cravens	Keefe	Rooney
Crow	Kelley	St. George
Dague	Keogh	Schwabe, Mo.
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Scoblick
Davis, Ga.	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Scott,
Dawson, Ill.	King	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Klein	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Kunkel	Shafer
Douglas	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Drewry	Latham	Smith, Kans.
Eaton	Lea	Snyder
Ellis	LeFevre	Somers
Elsaesser	Lemke	Stanley
Elston	McConnell	Stockman
Fallon	McDowell	Stratton
Fellows	McGarvey	Sundstrom
Fernandez	Macy	Taylor
Fisher	Maloney	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Fulton	Marcantonio	Vorys
Gallagher	Miller, Md.	Weichel
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	West
Gearhart	Mitchell	Wolverton
Gifford	Muhlenberg	Zimmerman
Gore	Nodar	
Granger	Norblad	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSENT CALENDAR

ALLOWANCES TO PRISON INMATES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1999) was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes on the wool problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Secretary Krug before the Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 2.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

CONSENT CALENDAR

TO PUNISH CUSTODIANS WHO NEGLIGENTLY SUFFER PRISONERS TO ESCAPE

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 26, to make criminally liable persons who negligently suffer prisoners in their custody to escape.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some questions with reference to this bill. It seems to me the bill is intended for a laudable purpose, but it is rather wide in its scope. In certain sections of the country, the United States Government makes arrangement with local jails to keep prisoners. Under that bill members of the sheriff's office that had control of that prisoner would be liable in case of any negligence, would they not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not quite. May I make this explanation.

Mr. BROOKS. I would be glad to have the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, sometime last year two prisoners were incarcerated in the District of Columbia jail. Due to the negligence of the guards, those prisoners escaped. Both were murderers who have subsequently been executed. As an outgrowth of that the Attorney General prepared the bill in question. Fortunately, after the two escaped condemned murderers had been apprehended, it was found that the common law would apply in the District of Columbia, and the guards were tried and were convicted just within the last few days.

When this bill first came up on the 9th of April, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] raised the same question. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] raised the question of guards being negligent during military operations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read a letter from the Attorney General with reference to my inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may read the letter.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM (reading):

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1947.

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In response to your request I have given further study to the question of the possible scope of the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape, which is now pending on the House Calendar. Particular attention has been given to the question of whether the bill, if enacted, would apply to enlisted men guarding military prisoners.

As you know, this bill was drafted in this Department and was introduced at my request to correct a serious deficiency in the law. At common law it was a misdemeanor negligently to permit a prisoner to escape, but the common law is not applicable to the Federal Government, and the existing statute (18 U. S. C. 244) punishes only those who voluntarily suffer a prisoner to escape.

Reference to the RECORD of proceedings of the House of Representatives on April 9, 1947 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3257), when this measure was called up for consideration, shows an apprehension on the part of several Members of the House that the bill is too broad in its scope and might be interpreted to apply to enlisted men who are charged with the custody of prisoners committed to confinement by a military or naval court. It was pointed out that enlisted men are not professional jailers, their security facilities are not the best, and the prisoners are allowed considerable freedom on the base of station. It is recognized that enlisted men are not always experienced custodians of prisoners and do not always have the best security facilities at their disposal. Even if the provisions of this bill should apply to them, these circumstances should cause no alarm because they are merely factors which would have to be considered in determining whether the action of the accused constituted negligence.

While concern lest a law be enacted which would cast an undue responsibility upon enlisted men charged with the guarding of military prisoners is understandable, there is no basis for such apprehension in this instance. Military personnel may now be punished for negligently suffering a prisoner to escape. Article of War 73 (10 U. S. C. 1545) provides that any person subject to military law who through negligence or design suffers a prisoner to escape shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Under a well-recognized principle of stautory construction, military offenders would be prosecuted under the pertinent article of war rather than under the provisions of this bill, should it be enacted.

The enactment of this measure will assist materially in the care and custody of prisoners, and I would appreciate its favorable consideration by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As a matter of fact, the introduction of this bill was prompted by the grossly negligent, if not criminal, misconduct of guards here in the District jail, in the case of this fellow Medley, who was guilty of the murder of a woman here in Washington, and of another fellow who committed rape and followed it by killing the little girl whom he outraged. They permitted these felons to leave their cells, and habitually gambled with them and took money from them. It is conduct such as that that this bill is aimed at.

Mr. BROOKS. That was a most diabolical crime and of course I think it should have been punished; but what concerns me here is, for instance, a case where the United States enters into an arrangement to have prisoners lodged in a local jail. Will the sheriff's department that normally has control of that jail be criminally liable for any carelessness on the part of anybody handling those prisoners?

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not believe it goes that far.

Mr. BROOKS. It goes very far. I will read the gentleman the language:

Whenever any deputy marshal, marshal, ministerial officer, or other person—

In other words, it would seem to me since one group is characterized as "ministerial officers" it might go as far as covering the "county commissioners" and those in nonministerial offices who have advisory control of the local jail.

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may say that the distinguishing criterion in this bill is the differentiation between one who voluntarily permits a prisoner to escape and one who by negligence permits him to escape.

There is a case on almost all fours with this proposition, that of prisoners incarcerated in a county jail at Toledo, Ohio. There, because of negligence of the guards, they were permitted to escape.

Mr. BROOKS. The language of the bill which on page 2 uses the phrase "negligently suffers" indicates a broader character than simply permitting a man in custody to get away.

Mr. GRAHAM. The prisoner is placed in the custody of the jailer, and where by his negligence the jailer fails to perform the duties incumbent upon him as such jailer, then in that case there would be negligence under this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 20 (A) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2331) to amend section 20 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for the purpose of suggesting that the author of the bill or some member of the committee undertake to explain the bill provided the explanation is not too involved or too extended.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply attempts to clarify section 20 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act. That section forbids common carriers by railroad or corporations organized for the purpose of engaging in transportation by railroad from issuing securities without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or from having interlocking directors except on the Commission's authorization. There was a previous order, however, which excluded the sleeping-car companies from section 20 (a).

A situation has arisen which almost demands that we clarify this because the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania approved sale of the capital stock of the Pullman Co. to a group of railroads. Previous to that time the same court had ordered the Pullman Co. to divest itself of either its sleeping-car business or its car-manufacturing business in compliance with the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Pullman Co. chose to dispose of the sleeping-car business. This decision has been appealed to the Supreme Court and for that reason the Interstate Commerce Commission feels it is necessary to clarify the language of section 20 (a). All this amendment does in the first section is add the sleeping-car company and make it subject to this part of the act.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that the Supreme Court has affirmed the judgment of the district court in approving this sale?

Mr. CARSON. It has recently approved the sale.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this necessary then?

Mr. CARSON. It is, because of the language of the first part of the section. There is a previous decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission which held that the sleeping-car companies are not a part of the interlocking directives which they had control of. They want any doubt in their mind taken away by the enactment of this legislation. It has been approved by Mr. Splawn, Chairman, Legislative Committee, and Mr. Mahaffie and Mr. Rogers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission asks for this clarifying language. The bill has passed unanimously the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the issue involved in this legislation an issue before the Court itself?

Mr. CARSON. No. It simply clarifies the act.

Mr. CARROLL. Was that raised in either the district court or the Supreme Court?

Mr. CARSON. It was raised in the district court because the Pullman Co. had been prohibited from going into two businesses, as you will note in the report on the bill, No. 204. The district court in the first instance ordered them to divest themselves of either the sleeping-car business or the car-manufacturing business under the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law. The Pullman Co. decided to dispose of the sleeping-car business.

There has always been a doubt in the mind of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to whether they had jurisdiction over the Pullman Co. the same as they had over the railroad company, because the language of section 20 (a) forbids common carriers or any corporations organized for the purpose of engaging in transportation by railroad to issue any securities without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or having interlocking directors. That is the thing which the Interstate Commerce Commission was in doubt about.

This only adds that the Pullman Co. shall be subject to section 20 (a) and section 21 (l).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(1) That as used in this section the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by railroad (except a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway which is not operated as a

part of a general steam railroad system of transportation) which is subject to this part, or any corporation organized for the purpose of engaging in transportation by railroad subject to this part, or a sleeping-car company which is subject to this part."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (12) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and by inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "After this section takes effect it shall be unlawful for any officer or director of any carrier to receive for his own benefit, directly or indirectly, any money or thing of value in respect of the negotiation, hypothecation, or sale of any securities issued by such carrier, or to share in any of the proceeds thereof: *Provided, however*, That where any carrier shall have any dealings in securities with another corporation, firm, partnership, or association when the carrier shall have as officer or director any person who is at the same time a director, member, manager, or purchasing or selling officer of, or who has any substantial interest in, such other corporation, firm, partnership, or association, participation of such officer or director of such carrier in the profits of such other corporation, firm, partnership, or association, resulting from such dealings, shall not be considered a violation of these provisions, if such dealings shall be with the bidder whose bid is the most favorable to such carrier, to be ascertained by competitive bidding under regulations prescribed by rule or otherwise by the Commission, and if such participation is due solely to such officer's or director's position with, or interest in, such other corporation, firm, partnership, or association, and not to his position with such carrier. It shall be unlawful for any officer or director of any carrier to participate in the making or paying of any dividends of an operating carrier from any funds properly included in the capital account."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that some member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce undertake to explain the bill which, apparently, is rather complicated and technical and which modifies various provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This bill, H. R. 2759, is a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide a limitation of 2 years on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by motor carriers, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The reason for this legislation, I think, is quite apparent if anyone will give the matter a bit of thought. If there is an overcharge by any one of these carriers under the present situation, the statute of limitations applicable in the separate States is brought into effect in connection with any litigation that may arise. There is vast confusion and a great difference in the statutes of limitation in the various States, and this legislation is to provide a 2-year limitation uniformly applicable to motor transport, to water transport and to freight forwarders. Hearings were held on this bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The persons who were interested appeared, and the bill is drafted in a manner that has the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the freight forwarders, the motor transport people and, as I understand, all concerned have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire of the gentleman if this statute of limitations which the bill carries runs against the Government as to any claims the Government might have against a carrier for overcharges?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I believe it is applicable to all parties who are interested in overcharges and undercharges.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did the gentleman's committee give consideration to that phase of this problem?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I believe so, and it was thought a proper limitation in connection with the Government.

Mr. COLE of New York. When does the 2 years start to run? From the time the charge was imposed, I suppose.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, there is a saving clause in that connection, I believe.

Mr. COLE of New York. I may be in error, but it is my understanding that the Transportation Act vests in the Comptroller General all right to claim refunds for overcharges made to any operating agency of the Government. The War Department or the Navy Department does not make claims for overcharges, nor does any other agency of Government; that is done by the Comptroller General. It occurs to me in view of that responsibility imposed on the Comptroller General that it necessarily entails considerable delay in getting the paper work to the Comptroller General.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Let me say to the gentleman that this brings the statute of limitations in relation to this class of carriers in line with the statute of limitations in regard to railroads. This is merely to bring the freight forwarders, the marine forwarders, and the motor-carrier people in line with the statutes already in existence.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I call the gentleman's attention to the provision of subsection (4), appearing at the bottom of page 2 and top of page 3:

> The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. It seems to me that the statute of limitations should not be made applicable to the Government for any overcharges. Unless the gentleman is absolutely certain on that point, I suggest that we pass this bill over until that point is cleared up, or at least until the author has had a chance to confer with the other members of the committee on the point.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. How does this affect existing legislation on claims?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does the gentleman mean that are now in existence?

Mr. CARROLL. Is the legislation retroactive?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; it is not retroactive. It goes forward from the time as suggested by the gentleman from Maine. It accrues on the delivery or tender of delivery.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the bill cannot relate to any proceedings instituted by the Government. I further call attention to the provision of section 204a on page 1, "All actions at law by common carriers"; then section 3 on page 3, "All actions at law by carriers"; then on page 3, line 22, "All complaints against carriers for the recovery of damages"; and on page 4, line 1, "For the recovery of overcharges action at law." That certainly does not mean claims by the Government or criminal proceedings.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, until we can be sure that the effect of this bill is not to operate against claims of the Government, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MARKETING OF VIRGINIA SUN-CURED TOBACCO

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 152) relating to the marketing of Virginia sun-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH, Mr. MASON, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio objected.

COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1362) to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all active service, for purposes other than training, under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officer in the Regular or Reserve forces of the United States Navy or the United

States Marine Corps shall be included in the computation of the 6-year period of service required for eligibility for promotion from warrant officer to commissioned warrant officer, with permanent appointment, in the service in which the temporary appointment was held: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be allowed by reason of the passage of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "a", insert "permanent or."

Page 2, line 5, after "in which the", insert "permanent or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSIGNMENT OF LINE OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS TO SUPPLY DUTY ONLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1371) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers of the line of the Marine Corps of the permanent grades of captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel may, upon application, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be assigned to supply duty only: *Provided*, That when so assigned they shall retain the lineal position and precedence which they hold at the time of assignment or may later attain and shall be promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as on the date of passage of this act, or as thereafter may be provided for other officers of the line of the Marine Corps, except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That the recommendation of selection boards in the cases of officers assigned to such duty shall be based upon their comparative fitness to perform the duties prescribed for them: *And provided further*, That officers of the permanent grades of captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel assigned to supply duty only in accordance with this act shall, on assignment and on promotion up to and including the grade of brigadier general, be carried as additional numbers in grade; but not more than six such officers, exclusive of the officer serving as head of the supply department, shall be allowed on the active list in the grade of brigadier general at any one time.

SEC. 2. The number of officers so assigned in accordance with this act shall be in accordance with the requirements of the service as determined by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That all officers of the Marine Corps now assigned to assistant quartermaster duty only and assistant paymaster duty only are hereby assigned to supply duty only, without change in their lineal positions and precedence solely as a result of such change of assignment.

SEC. 3. The head of the supply department shall have the title of "Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps" and shall, while so serving, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general, and shall be in addition to the number of general officers otherwise provided by law. He shall be carried in the grade or rank from which appointed.

SEC. 4. When a vacancy shall exist in the office of Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, the President may appoint to such office, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer of the Marine Corps on the active list assigned to supply duty only of the rank of brigadier general, who shall hold office as such quartermaster general for a period of 4 years, unless sooner relieved.

SEC. 5. In such numbers as may be required to meet the needs of the service officers of the line may be detailed for duty in the supply department for a period of 4 years unless sooner relieved.

SEC. 6. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(a) Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 609; 34 U. S. C. 625). Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 610; 34 U. S. C. 635).

(b) Sections 3, 11, and 14 of the act of May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 811; 34 U. S. C. 625a, 667c, 667f).

(c) Act of July 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 537; 34 U. S. C. 632a).

(d) Act of March 24, 1944 (58 Stat. 121; 34 U. S. C. 625b).

SEC. 7. All other laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby amended accordingly.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after "grade" strike out the remainder of the sentence.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2368) to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $3,000,000, to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administration may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements, not exceeding $100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation under this part, and advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of compensation, pension, or retirement pay."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1465) to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 132) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no collector of customs shall be held liable to the United States for his failure to collect special tonnage duties provided for in the first sentence of section 4219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 121), nor for his failure in connection therewith to collect light money provided for in section 4225 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 128), in connection with the entry from a foreign port of any foreign vessel prior to October 1, 1940; nor shall any such vessel hereafter be held liable for the payment of any such special tonnage duties or light money in connection with any entry prior to October 1, 1940.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1465) was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT ON ESPIONAGE AND ALIEN REGISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1467) to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows: Renumber sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 as sections 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively, and insert after section 5 the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) In addition to the other penalties that may be imposed for violation of this act, those persons found guilty under this act may be sentenced to the forfeiture of pension privileges, retirement pay, retainer pay, active-duty pay and allowances, or other compensation from the United States to which such person was entitled at the time said violation was committed. Such forfeiture may extend to all amounts due subsequent to the time of the commission of said violation.

"(b) In the event that the person charged with violation of this act is beyond the jurisdiction of the court, or in cases where the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Attorney General is of the opinion that there will be appreciable delay between the charging of the offense and the date when the findings and sentence of the court shall be final, such Secretary may certify such fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the said Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to order that the payment to such person of all moneys set forth in subsection (a) of this section shall be withheld until such charge and certification are withdrawn or until such time as said person shall be tried on the charge by a court of competent jurisdiction and either acquitted of said charge or, in the discretion of the court, spared the forfeiture provided for in this section."

SEC. 2. That section 5 of title I of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, is hereby amended by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) In addition to the other penalties that may be imposed for violation of this act, those persons found guilty under this act may be sentenced to the forfeiture of pension privileges, retirement pay, retainer pay, active-duty pay and allowances, or other compensation from the United States to which such person was entitled at the time said violation was committed. Such forfeiture may extend to all amounts due subsequent to the time of the commission of said violation.

"(2) In the event that the person charged with violation of this act is beyond the jurisdiction of the court, or in cases where the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Attorney General is of the opinion that there will be appreciable delay between the charging of the offense and the date when the findings and sentence of the court shall be final, such Secretary may certify such fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the said Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to order that the payment to such person of all moneys set forth in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be withheld until such charge and certification are withdrawn or until such time as said person shall be tried on the charge by a court of competent jurisdiction and either acquitted of said charge or, in the discretion of the court, spared the forfeiture provided for in this subsection."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "follows" insert the following: strike the word "six" where it appears in section 1 (a) and substitute in lieu thereof the word "seven."

Page 1, line 4, strike out the capital "R" in renumber and insert a small "r."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 1 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1565) to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

This is the first of several bills on the Consent Calendar which seek to codify various parts of the existing law and various titles of the United States Code. Since it is the first bill, I suggest that some member of the Committee on the Judiciary explain to the Membership the procedure that is followed by the committee with respect to this codification.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, there is a series of five bills which were considered by the committee on the revision of the laws, beginning in 1944. I was a member of that committee. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] was also a member, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] was its former chairman.

These five bills were reported to the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses and were passed by unanimous consent in the House. There have been no changes made in these bills. They merely codify the five titles of the United States Code to 1, 4, 6, 9, and 17.

These titles as they now appear in the United States Code are comprised of numerous sections of Revised Statutes and Statutes at Large and are merely prima facie evidence of the law. The United States Code was adopted by Congress more than 20 years ago. It was thought at that time that it should be subjected to a testing period of a number of years. I believe that it has survived that test and that these five titles which I propose to enact into positive law may be so enacted without change in substance.

The bill H. R. 1565 is intended to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions." This title relates to rules of construction of statutes, formalities of enactment, the preparation of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, and so forth. When this bill is enacted all the law relating to this subject will be found in title 1 of the United States Code and it will be no longer necessary to have recourse to the Revised Statutes and the Statutes at Large in order to present legal evidence of these laws. One of the features of this bill is the repeal provision contained in section 2 which specifically repeals all provisions of existing laws incorporated in the new title. House Report No. 251 on this bill complies fully with the Ramseyer rule by setting up in two parallel columns the proposed law and the existing law which is to be repealed. This enables the Members to ascertain readily that no change in the substance of the law is intended by the bill.

It is my earnest hope that eventually all 50 titles of the United States Code will be enacted into positive law so that they will then form the framework for future additions to the Code. In preparing amendments of existing law the Congress will then be assured that all the law on the subject is contained in the appropriate title, and amendments will thereby be facilitated.

It is proposed that the United States Code be set up under 50 titles and this is the first title to be brought out. There are two other bills that will be considered a little later on the calendar. I doubt whether in my years of service in the House I have ever known of any bill that has received more thorough and painstaking consideration, by the bench and bar, statements of the American Bar Association, and the approval of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department and other agencies involved. Even the Supreme Court justices have taken time to sit in on these conferences in the consideration of some of these titles.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I ask him whether this bill and the four bills which are to follow make absolutely no change in the substantive law?

Mr. ROBSION. None whatsoever. These are purely codifications and setting up of the titles covering the laws, so that in subsequent years if the Congress enacts other laws they will be fitted into the appropriate titles. The bench and bar are vitally interested in the passage of these bills.

Mr. COLE of New York. This is the fourth Congress that has approved this codification program?

Mr. ROBSION. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. That in itself speaks for the widespread demand for it.

Mr. ROBSION. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. I personally feel it is highly desirable. I would like to inquire of the gentleman as to the reason why it has taken so long to arouse the interest of the other branch of the legislative department of government.

Mr. ROBSION. Well, action was delayed for some reason or other in the House and they did not get to the Senate in time for them to consider them. It is a very formidable undertaking. For instance, our Subcommittee on Revision of the Laws, before that committee was taken into the Judiciary Committee, spent weeks and weeks reading, word by word and line by line, every one of these bills. In connection with this matter we had the aid not only of the leading lawyers and judges of the country but we also had able codifiers of many years of experience.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to clarify this situation a little.

It is the intention of the committee that this bill and the bills to follow are merely a restatement of existing law. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBSION. Well, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] raised the question about a series of five bills. The first five bills are purely a recodification, word by word and line by line, of the law as is. There is not any change whatsoever.

Mr. MACKINNON. And there is no intention, by adopting this codification, to make any change in the law?

Mr. ROBSION. Well, certainly not the bills that we are now considering. They were passed in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses, unanimously.

Mr. MACKINNON. You say the bills are the same as they were in those sessions, but the point I want to make clear is that the bills are the same as existing law on the subject. Is that right?

Mr. ROBSION. I understand there is no change whatsoever in the law as it is written on the books today.

Mr. MACKINNON. And that there is no intention to make any changes?

Mr. ROBSION. No. There is no intention. There is some little change in the two bills that we shall take up later, title 18, the criminal law, and title 28, courts and court procedure.

Mr. MACKINNON. But each of those changes will be fully explained when they occur?

Mr. ROBSION. Yes; they certainly will.

Mr. MACKINNON. And for the first five bills there is no change?

Mr. ROBSION. I will name them: H. R. 1565, title 1; H. R. 1566, title 4; H. R. 1567, title 6; H. R. 2083, title 17; and H. R. 2084, title 9——

Mr. MacKINNON. And the intent with respect to them is to merely put forward the body of the law as it exists today in more readable form?

Mr. ROBSION. Yes. To place these laws under their appropriate titles and make them more easily found by the bench, bar, and laymen.

Mr. MacKINNON. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 1 of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions", is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "1 U. S. C., § —", as follows:

TITLE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Chapter	Section
1. Rules of construction	1
2. Acts and resolutions; formalities of enactment; repeals; sealing of instruments	101
3. Code of Laws of United States and Supplements; District of Columbia Code and Supplements	201

CHAPTER 1—RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

§ 1. Words denoting number, gender, etc.
§ 2. "County" as including "parish", etc.
§ 3. "Vessel" as including all means of water transportation.
§ 4. "Vehicle" as including all means of land transportation.
§ 5. "Company" or "association" as including successors and assigns.
§ 6. Limitation of term "products of American fisheries."

Words denoting number, gender, and so forth

§ 1. In determining the meaning of any act or resolution of Congress words importing the singular number may extend and be applied to several persons or things; words importing the plural number may include the singular; words importing the masculine gender may be applied to females; the words "insane person" and "lunatic" shall include every idiot, non compos, lunatic, and insane person; the word "person" may extend and be applied to partnerships and corporations, and the reference to any officer shall include any person authorized by law to perform the duties of such office, unless the context shows that such words were intended to be used in a more limited sense; and a requirement of an "oath" shall be deemed complied with by making affirmation in judicial form.

"County" as including "parish", and so forth

§ 2. The word "county" includes a parish, or any other equivalent subdivision of a State or Territory of the United States.

"Vessel" as including all means of water transportation

§ 3. The word "vessel" includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water.

"Vehicle" as including all means of land transportation

§ 4. The word "vehicle" includes every description of carriage or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on land.

"Company" or "association" as including successors and assigns

§ 5. The word "company" or "association," when used in reference to a corporation, shall be deemed to embrace the words "successors and assigns of such company or association," in like manner as if these last-named words, or words of similar import, were expressed.

Limitation of term "products of American fisheries"

§ 6. Wherever, in the statutes of the United States or in the rullings, regulations, or interpretations of various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States there appears or may appear the term "products of American fisheries" said term shall not include fresh or frozen fish fillets, fresh or frozen fish steaks, or fresh or frozen slices of fish substantially free of bone (including any of the foregoing divided into sections), produced in a foreign country or its territorial waters, in whole or in part with the use of the labor of persons who are not residents of the United States.

CHAPTER 2—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS; FORMALITIES OF ENACTMENT; REPEALS; SEALING OF INSTRUMENTS

§ 101. Enacting clause.
§ 102. Resolving clause.
§ 103. Enacting or resolving words after first section.
§ 104. Numbering of sections; single proposition.
§ 105. Title of appropriation acts.
§ 106. Printing bills and joint resolutions.
§ 107. Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions.
§ 108. Repeal of repealing act.
§ 109. Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities.
§ 110. Saving clause of Revised Statues.
§ 111. Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness.
§ 112. Statutes at Large; contents; admissibility in evidence.
§ 113. "Little and Brown's" edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence.
§ 114. Sealing of instruments.

Enacting clause

§ 101. The enacting clause of all acts of Congress shall be in the following form: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."

Resolving clause

§ 102. The resolving clause of all joint resolutions shall be in the following form: *"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."*

Enacting or resolving words after first section

§ 103. No enacting or resolving words shall be used in any section of an act or resolution of Congress except in the first.

Numbering of sections; single proposition

§ 104. Each section shall be numbered, and shall contain, as nearly as may be, a single proposition of enactment.

Title of appropriation acts

§ 105. The style and title of all acts making appropriations for the support of government shall be as follows: "An act making appropriations (here insert the object) for the year ending June 30 (here insert the calendar year)."

Printing bills and joint resolutions

§ 106. Every bill or joint resolution in each House of Congress shall, when such bill or resolution passes either House, be printed, and such printed copy shall be called the engrossed bill or resolution as the case may be. Said engrossed bill or resolution shall be signed by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be sent to the other House, and in that form shall be dealt with by that House and its officers, and, if passed, returned signed by said Clerk or Secretary. When such bill or joint resolution shall have passed both Houses, it shall be printed and shall then be called the enrolled bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be, and shall be signed by the Presiding Officers of both Houses and sent to the President of the United States. During the last 6 days of a session such engrossing and enrolling of bills and joint resolutions may be done otherwise than as above prescribed, upon the order of Congress by concurrent resolution.

Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions

§ 107. Enrolled bills and resolutions of either House of Congress shall be printed on parchment or paper of suitable quality as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Repeal of repealing act

§ 108. Whenever an act is repealed, which repealed a former act, such former act shall not thereby be revived, unless it shall be expressly so provided.

Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities

§ 109. The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability. The expiration of a temporary statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the temporary statute shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

Saving clause of Revised Statutes

§ 110. All acts of limitation, whether applicable to civil causes and proceedings, or to the prosecution of offenses, or for the recovery of penalties or forfeitures, embraced in the Revised Statutes and covered by the repeal contained therein, shall not be affected thereby, but all suits, proceedings, or prosecutions, whether civil or criminal, for causes arising, or acts done or committed prior to said repeal, may be commenced and prosecuted within the same time as if said repeal had not been made.

Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness

§ 111. No inference shall be raised by the enactment of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 202, 47 Stat. 1431) that the sections of the Revised Statutes repealed by such act were in force or effect at the time of such enactment: *Provided, however,* That any rights or liabilities existing under such repealed sections shall not be affected by their repeal.

Statutes at Large; contents; admissibility in evidence

§ 112. The Secretary of State shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all treaties to which the United States is a party that have been proclaimed since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding; all international agreements other than treaties to which the United States is a party that have been signed, proclaimed, or with reference to which any other final formality has been executed since that date; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since that date; and also any amendments to the Constitution of the United States proposed or ratified pursuant to article V thereof since that date, together with the certificate of the Secretary of State issued in compliance with the provision contained in section 160 of title 5. In the event of an extra session of Congress, the Secretary of State shall cause all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during said extra

session to be consolidated with, and published as part of, the contents of the volume for the next regular session. The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

"Little and Brown's" edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence

§ 113. The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, shall be competent evidence of the several public and private acts of Congress, and of the several treaties therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public officers of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof.

Sealing of instruments

§ 114. In all cases where a seal is necessary by law to any commission, process, or other instrument provided for by the laws of Congress, it shall be lawful to affix the proper seal by making an impression therewith directly on the paper to which such seal is necessary; which shall be as valid as if made on wax or other adhesive substance.

CHAPTER 3—CODE OF LAWS OF UNITED STATES AND SUPPLEMENTS; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE AND SUPPLEMENTS

§ 201. Publication and distribution of Code of Laws of United States and Supplements and District of Columbia Code and Supplements.
(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large.
(b) Curtailing number of copies published.
(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one Supplement for each Congress.
§ 202. Preparation and publication of Codes and Supplements.
(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress.
(b) Cumulative Supplement to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress.
(c) New editions of Codes and Supplements.
§ 203. District of Columbia Code; preparation and publications; cumulative supplements.
§ 204. Codes and Supplements as evidence of the Laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements.
(a) United States Code.
(b) District of Columbia Code.
(c) District of Columbia Code; citation.
(d) Supplements to Codes; citation.
(e) New edition of Codes; citation.
§ 205. Codes and Supplements; where printed; form and style; ancillaries.
§ 206. Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies.
§ 207. Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives.
§ 208. Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, etc., under direction of Joint Committee on Printing.
§ 209. Copies of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; conclusive evidence of original.
§ 210. Distribution of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; slip and pamphlet copies.
§ 211. Copies to Members of Congress.
§ 212. Additional distribution at each new Congress.
§ 213. Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements.

Publication and distribution of Code of Laws of United States and supplements and District of Columbia Code and supplements

§ 201. In order to avoid duplication and waste—

(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large: Publication in slip or pamphlet form or in the Statutes at Large of any of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202 and 203 of this title, shall, in event of enactment, be dispensed with whenever the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives so directs the Secretary of State;

(b) Curtailing number of copies published: Curtailment of the number provided by law to be printed and distributed of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202 and 203 of this title may be directed by such committee, except that the Public Printer shall print such numbers as are necessary for depository library distribution and for sale; and

(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one supplement for each Congress: Such committee may direct that the printing and distribution of any supplement to the Code of Laws of the United States or to the Code of the District of Columbia be dispensed with entirely, except that there shall be printed and distributed for each Congress at least one supplement to each such code, containing the legislation of such Congress.

Preparation and publication of codes and supplements

§ 202. There shall be prepared and published under the supervision of the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives—

(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress: A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of Laws of the United States, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement, and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

(b) Cumulative Supplement to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress: A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of the District of Columbia, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement, and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

(c) New editions of Codes and Supplements: New editions of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the Code of the District of Columbia, correcting errors and incorporating the then current supplement. In the case of each code new editions shall not be published oftener than once in each five years. Copies of each such edition shall be distributed in the same manner as provided in the case of supplements to the code of which it is a new edition. Supplements published after any new edition shall not contain the legislation of supplements published before such new edition.

District of Columbia Code; preparation and publication; cumulative supplements

§ 203. The Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives is authorized to print bills to codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws relating to the District of Columbia and cumulative supplements thereto, similar in style, respectively, to the Code of Laws of the United States, and supplements thereto, and to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Codes and supplements as evidence of the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of codes and supplements

§ 204. In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

(a) United States Code: The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included: *Provided, however*, That whenever titles of such code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

(b) District of Columbia Code: The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of the District of Columbia current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws, general and permanent in their nature, relating to or in force in the District of Columbia on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included, except such laws as are of application in the District of Columbia by reason of being laws of the United States general and permanent in their nature.

(c) District of Columbia Code; citation: The Code of the District of Columbia may be cited as "D. C. Code."

(d) Supplements to Codes; citation: Supplements to the Code of Laws of the United States and to the Code of the District of Columbia may be cited, respectively, as "U. S. C. Sup. ", and "D. C. Code, Sup. ", the blank in each case being filled with Roman figures denoting the number of the supplement.

(e) New edition of Codes; citation: New editions of each of such codes may be cited, respectively, as "U. S. C., ed.", and "D. C. Codes, ed.", the blank in each case being filled with figures denoting the last year the legislation of which is included in whole or in part.

Codes and supplement; where printed; form and style; ancillaries

§ 205. The publications provided for in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be printed at the Government Printing Office and shall be in such form and style and with such ancillaries as may be prescribed by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives. The Librarian of Congress is directed to cooperate with such committee in the preparation of such ancillaries. Such publications shall be furnished with such thumb insets and other devices to distinguish parts, with such facilities for the insertion of additional matter, and with such explanatory and advertising slips, and shall be printed on such paper and bound in such material, as may be prescribed by such committee.

Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies

§ 206. All bills and resolutions referred to or reported by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall be printed in such form and style, and with such ancillaries, as such committee may prescribe as being economical and suitable, to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of Congress; and such committee may also curtail the number of copies of such bills to be printed in

the various parliamentary stages in the House of Representatives.

Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives

§ 207. The Public Printer is directed to print, in addition to the number provided by existing law, and, as soon as printed, to distribute in such manner as the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall determine, 20 copies in slip form to each public act and joint resolution.

Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, and so forth, under direction of Joint Committee on Printing

§ 208. The functions vested by sections 201, 202, 204–207 of this title in the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives may from time to time be vested in such other agency as the Congress may by concurrent resolution provide: *Provided*, That the printing, binding, and distribution of the volumes and publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be done under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Copies of supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and supplements; conclusive evidence of original

§ 209. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia and copies of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title printed at the Government Printing Office and bearing its imprint, shall be conclusive evidence of the original of such code and supplements in the custody of the Secretary of State.

Distribution of supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and supplements; slip and pamphlet copies

§ 210. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title shall be distributed by the Superintendent of Documents in the same manner as bound volumes of the Statutes at Large: *Provided*, That no slip or pamphlet copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title need be printed or distributed.

Copies to Members of Congress

§ 211. In addition to quotas provided for by section 210 of this title there shall be printed, published, and distributed of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia with tables, index, and other ancillaries, suitably bound and with thumb inserts and other convenient devices to distinguish the parts, and of the supplements to both codes as provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title, ten copies of each for each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress in which the original authorized publication is made, for his use and distribution, and in addition for the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a number of bound copies of each equal to 10 times the number of members of such committees, and 1 bound copy of each for the use of each committee of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Additional distribution at each new Congress

§ 212. In addition the Superintendent of Documents shall, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, supply to each Senator and Representative in such Congress, who may in writing apply for the same, one copy each of the Code of Laws of the United States, the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and the latest supplement of each code: *Provided*, That such applicant shall certify in his written application for the same that the volume or volumes for which he applies is intended for his personal use exclusively: *And provided further*, That no Senator or Representative during his term of service shall receive under this section more than one copy each of the volumes enumerated herein.

Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements

§ 213. For preparation and editing an annual appropriation of $6,500 is authorized to carry out the purposes of sections 202 and 203 of this title.

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed insofar as such provisions appeared in title 1, United States Code, 1940 edition, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE OR REVISED STATUTES

	Title 1, United States Code, section
R. S., sec. 1	1
R. S., sec. 2	2
R. S., sec. 3	3
R. S., sec. 4	4
R. S., sec. 5	5
Act June 11, 1940, ch. 325, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 305	6
R. S., sec. 7	21
R. S., sec. 8	22
R. S., sec. 9	23
R. S., sec. 10	24
R. S., sec. 11	25
Res. Nov. 1, 1893, 28 Stat. Append x 5; act Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 769	26
Act Mar. 6, 1920, ch. 94, sec. 1, 41 Stat. 520	27
R. S., sec. 12	28
R. S., sec. 13; Mar. 22, 1944, ch. 123, 58 Stat. 118	29
R. S., sec. 5599	29a
Act Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 3, 47 Stat. 1431	29b
Act Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 73, 28 Stat. 615; June 20, 1936, ch. 630, sec. 9, 49 Stat. 1551; June 16, 1938, ch. 477, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 760	30
R. S., sec. 908	30a
R. S., sec. 6	31
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 1540	51a
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1007; Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1541	52
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1007	53
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1007; Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, Sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1541	54
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1542; Act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1, 2, 48 Stat. 948	54a
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1542; Act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1, 2, 48 Stat. 948	54b
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1542	54c
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1542	54d
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1007	55
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1007	56
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1008	57
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 8, 45 Stat. 1008	58
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 10, 45 Stat. 1008	59
Act Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 2, 47 Stat. 1431	60

With the following committee amendments:

Page 10, following line 3, strike out "Committee on Revision of the Laws" wherever it appears, and insert "Committee on the Judiciary."

Page 11, line 10, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 12, line 6, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 13, line 8, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 15, line 15, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 16, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Revision of Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 16, line 4, after the word "resolutions", insert the words "relating to the revision of the laws."

Page 16, line 5, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 16, line 15, strike out "Revision of Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 16, line 19, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 17, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 17, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

Page 18, line 23, strike out "Revision of the Laws" and insert "the Judiciary."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the passage of each of these five bills, the numbers of which I have heretofore named.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 4 OF UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1566) to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and the successive bills down to and including Calendar No. 76, all of which have been under discussion and have been explained, be considered as read and with committee amendments be approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 1566?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, Seat of Government, and the States", is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "4 U. S. C., § —," as follows:

TITLE 4—FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES

Chapter	*Section*
1. The Flag	1
2. The Seal	41
3. Seat of the Government	71
4. The States	101

CHAPTER 1—THE FLAG

§ 1. Flag; stripes and stars on.
§ 2. Same; additional stars.
§ 3. Use of flag for advertising purposes; mutilation of flag.

Flag; stripes and stars on

§ 1. The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white in a blue field.

Same; additional stars

§ 2. On the admission of a new State into the Union one star shall be added to the union of the flag; and such addition shall take effect on the 4th day of July then next succeeding such admission.

Use of flag for advertising purposes; mutilation of flag

§ 3. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, in any manner, for exhibition or display, shall place or cause to be placed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, drawing, or any advertisement of any nature upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America; or shall expose or cause to be exposed to public view any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign upon which shall have been printed, painted, or otherwise placed, or to which shall be attached, appended, affixed, or annexed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, or drawing, or any advertisement of any nature; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall manufacture, sell, expose for sale, or to public view, or give away or have in possession for sale, or to be given away or for use for any purpose, any article or substance being an article of merchandise, or a receptable for merchandise or article or thing for carrying or transporting merchandise, upon which shall have been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed a representation of any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, to advertise, call attention to, decorate, mark, or distinguish the article or substance on which so placed; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall publicly mutilate, deface, define or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court. The words "flag, standard, colors, or ensign," as used herein, shall include any flag, standard, colors, ensign, or any picture or representation of either, or of any part or parts of either, made of any substance or represented on any substance, of any size evidently purporting to be either of said flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America or a picture or a representation of either, upon which shall be shown the colors, the stars and the stripes, in any number of either thereof, or of any part or parts of either, by which the average person seeing the same without deliberation may believe the same to represent the flag, colors, standard, or ensign of the United States of America.

CHAPTER 2—THE SEAL

§ 41. Seal of the United States.
§ 42. Same; custody and use of.

Seal of the United States

§ 41. The seal heretofore used by the United States in Congress assembled is declared to be the seal of the United States.

Same; custody and use of

§ 42. The Secretary of State shall have the custody and charge of such seal, and shall make out and record, and shall affix the same to, all civil commissions for officers of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone. But the seal shall not be affixed to any commission before the same has been signed by the President of the United States, nor to any other instrument, without the special warrant of the President therefor.

CHAPTER 3—SEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT

§ 71. Permanent seat of government.
§ 72. Public offices; at seat of government.
§ 73. Same; removal from seat of government.

Permanent seat of government

§ 71. All that part of the territory of the United States included within the present limits of the District of Columbia shall be the permanent seat of government of the United States.

Public offices; at seat of government

§ 72. All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.

Same; removal from seat of government

§ 73. In case of the prevalence of a contagious or epidemic disease at the seat of government, the President may permit and direct the removal of any or all the public offices to such other place or places as he shall deem most safe and convenient for conducting the public business.

CHAPTER 4—THE STATES

§ 101. Oath by members of legislatures and officers.
§ 102. Same; by whom administered.
§ 103. Assent to purchase of lands for forts.
§ 104. Tax on motor fuel sold on military or other reservation; reports to State taxing authority.
§ 105. State, etc., taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax.
§ 106. Same; income tax.
§ 107. Same; exception of United States, its instrumentalities, and authorized purchasers therefrom.
§ 108. Same; jurisdiction of United States over Federal areas unaffected.
§ 109. Same; exception of Indians.
§ 110. Same; definitions.

Oath by members of legislatures and officers

§ 101. Every member of a State legislature, and every executive and judicial officer of a State, shall, before he proceeds to execute the duties of his office, take an oath in the following form, to wit: "I, A B, do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States."

Same; by whom administered

§ 102. Such oath may be administered by any person who, by the law of the State, is authorized to administer the oath of office; and the person so administering such oath shall cause a record or certificate thereof to be made in the same manner, as by the law of the State, he is directed to record or certify the oath of office.

Assent to purchase of lands for forts

§ 103. The President of the United States is authorized to procure the assent of the legislature of any State, within which any purchase of land has been made for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings, without such consent having been obtained.

Tax on motor fuel sold on military or other reservation reports to State taxing authority

§ 104. (a) All taxes levied by any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia upon, with respect to, or measured by, sales, purchases, storage, or use of gasoline or other motor vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, with respect to such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders, and other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are not for the exclusive use of the United States. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on or before the 15th day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia within whose borders the reservation is located, showing the amount of such motor fuel with respect to which taxes are payable under subsection (a) for the preceding month.

State, and so forth, taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax

§ 105. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, on the ground that the sale or use, with respect to which such tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a Federal area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect any such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to sales or purchases made, receipts from sales received, or storage or use occurring, after December 31, 1940.

Same; income tax

§ 106. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for any income tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, by reason of his residing within a Federal area or receiving income from transactions occurring or services performed in such area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to income or receipts received after December 31, 1940.

Same; exception of United States, its instrumentalities, and authorized purchases therefrom

§ 107. (a) The provisions of sections 105 and 106 of this title shall not be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from the United States or any instrumentality thereof, or the levy or collection of any tax with respect to sale, purchase, storage, or use of tangible personal property sold by the United States or any instrumentality thereof to any authorized purchaser.

(b) A person shall be deemed to be an authorized purchaser under this section only with respect to purchases which he is permitted to make from commissaries, ship's stores, or voluntary unincorporated organizations of Army or Navy personnel, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Same; jurisdiction of United States over Federal areas unaffected

§ 108. The provisions of sections 105 to 110 of this title shall not for the purposes of any other provision of law be deemed to deprive the United States of exclusive jurisdiction over any Federal area over which it would otherwise have exclusive jurisdiction or to limit the jurisdiction of the United States over any Federal area.

Same; exception of Indians

§ 109. Nothing in sections 105 and 106 of this title shall be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from any Indian not otherwise taxed.

Same; definitions

§ 110. As used in sections 105–109 of this title—

(a) The term "person" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 3797 of title 26.

(b) The term "sales or use tax" means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, sales, receipts from sales, purchases, storage, or use of tangible personal property, except a tax with respect to which the provisions of section 104 of this title are applicable.

(c) The term "income tax" means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, net income, gross income, or gross receipts.

(d) The term "State" includes any Territory or possession of the United States.

(e) The term "Federal area" means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State.

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed insofar as such provisions appear in title 4, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE OR REVISED STATUTES

	Title 4, United States Code, section
R. S., secs. 1791, 1792	1
R. S., sec. 1792	2
Feb. 8, 1917, ch. 34, 39 Stat. 900	3
R. S., sec. 1793	4
R. S., secs. 203 (first clause), 1794	5
R. S., sec. 1795	6
R. S., sec. 1796	7
R. S., sec. 4798	8
R. S., sec. 1836	9
R. S., sec. 1837	10
R. S., sec. 1838	11
June 16, 1936, ch. 582, sec. 10, 49 Stat. 1521; Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 7, 54 Stat. 1030	12
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1059	13
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 2, 54 Stat. 1060	14
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 3, 54 Stat. 1060	15
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 4, 54 Stat. 1060	16
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 5, 54 Stat. 1060	17
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 6, 54 Stat. 1060	18

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like the bill, H. R. 1565, to enact title 1 of the United States Code into positive law, is intended to enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States." This bill makes no change in existing law. For the reasons which I have stated in connection with the bill, H. R. 1565, I recommend that this bill be enacted into positive law by the Congress.

Title 4 of the United States Code as proposed by this bill will contain four chapters: First, the flag; second, the seal; third, seat of government; and fourth, the States. This is an orderly arrangement of existing law with ample provisions for future amendments without upsetting the proposed section number.

What I have said concerning the Ramseyer rule applies to this bill also.

A similar bill passed the House unanimously during the Seventh-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 6 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1567) to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds," is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "6 U. S. C., § —," as follows:

TITLE 6—OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS

§ 1. Custody.
§ 2. Examination as to sufficiency of sureties.
§ 3. Renewal; continuance of liability.
§ 4. Notice of delinquency of principal.
§ 5. Limitation of actions against sureties.
§ 6. Surety companies as sureties.
§ 7. Same; appointment of agents; service of process.
§ 8. Same; deposit of copy of charter.
§ 9. Same; quarterly statements.
§ 10. Same; jurisdiction of suits on bonds.
§ 11. Same; nonpayment of judgment.
§ 12. Same; estoppel to deny corporate powers.
§ 13. Same; failure to comply with the law
§ 14. Rate of premium on bond; premium not to be paid by United States.
§ 15. Bonds or notes of United States in lieu of recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking; place of deposit; return to depositor; contractors' bonds.

CUSTODY

§ 1. All bonds of the Treasurer of the United States, collectors of internal revenue, collectors, comptrollers of customs, surveyors, and other officers of the customs, either as such officers or as disbursing officers of the Treasury, bonds of the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, shall be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury and filed as he may direct; and the duties required by law on March 2, 1895, of the Comptroller of the Treasury in regard to such bonds, as the successor of the Commissioner of Customs and First Comptroller of the Treasury, shall be performed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

EXAMINATION AS TO SUFFICIENCY OF SURETIES

§ 2. Every officer required by law to take and approve official bonds shall cause the same to be examined at least once every 2 years for the purpose of ascertaining the sufficiency of the sureties thereon; and every officer having power to fix the amount of an official bond shall examine it to ascertain the sufficiency of the amount thereof and approve or fix said amount at least once in 2 years and as much oftener as he may deem it necessary.

RENEWAL; CONTINUANCE OF LIABILITY

§ 3. Every officer whose duty it is to take and approve official bonds shall cause all such bonds to be renewed every 4 years after their dates, but he may require such bonds to be renewed or strengthened oftener if he deem such action necessary. In the discretion of such officer the requirement of a new bond may be waived for the period of service of a bonded officer after the expiration of a 4-year term of service pending the appointment and qualification of his successor. The nonperformance of any requirement of the provisions of sections 1 to 3 of this title, or of that part of section 27 of title 19 relating to transmitting copies of oaths to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the part of any official of the Government shall not be held to affect in any respect the liability of principal or sureties on any bond made or to be made to the United States. The liability of the principal and sureties on all official bonds shall continue and cover the period of service ensuing until the appointment and qualification of the successor of the principal. Nothing in said sections shall be construed to repeal or modify section 38 of title 39: *Provided*, That the payment and acceptance of the annual premium on corporate surety bonds furnished by postal officers and employees officers and employees of other civilian agencies of the United States and bonded officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be a compliance with the requirement for the renewal of such bonds within the meaning of sections 1 to 3 of this title.

NOTICE OF DELINQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL

§ 4. Whenever any deficiency shall be discovered in the accounts of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, it shall be the duty of the accounting officers making such discovery to at once notify the head of the department having control over the affairs of said officer of the nature and amount of said deficiency, and it shall be the immediate duty of said head of department to at once notify all obligors upon the bond or bonds of such official of the nature of such deficiency and the amount thereof. Said notification shall be deemed sufficient if mailed at the post office in the city of Washington, D. C., addressed to said sureties respectively and directed to the respective post offices where said obligors may reside, if known; but a failure to give or mail such notice shall not discharge the surety or sureties upon such bond.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AGAINST SURETIES

§ 5. If, upon the statement of the account of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, by the accounting officers, it shall thereby appear that he is indebted to the United States, and suit therefor shall not be instituted within 5 years after such statement of said account, the sureties on his bond shall not be liable for such indebtedness.

SURETY COMPANIES AS SURETIES

§ 6. Whenever any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking conditioned for the faithful performance of any duty, or for doing or refraining from doing anything in such recognizance, stiplations, bond, or undertaking specified, is by the laws of the United States required or permitted to be given with one surety or with two or more sureties, the execution of the same or the guaranteeing of the performance of the condition thereof shall be sufficient when executed or guaranteed solely by a corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or of any State having power to guarantee the fidelity of persons holding positions of public or private trust, and to execute and guarantee bonds and undertakings in judicial proceedings. Such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be approved by the head of department, court, judge, officer, board, or body executive, legislative, or judicial required to approve or accept the same. No officer or person having the approval of any bond shall exact that it shall be furnished by a guaranty company or by any particular guaranty company.

SAME; APPOINTMENT OF AGENTS; SERVICE OF PROCESS

§ 7. No such company shall do business under the provisions of section 6 to 13 of this title beyond the limits of the State or Territory under whose laws it was incorporated and in which its principal office is located, nor beyond the limits of the District of Columbia, when such company was

incorporated under its laws or the laws of the United States and its principal office is located in said district, until it shall by a written power of attorney appoint some person residing within the jurisdiction of the court for the judicial district wherein such suretyship is to be undertaken, who shall be a citizen of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, wherein such court is held, as its agent, upon whom may be served all lawful process against such company, and who shall be authorized to enter an appearance in its behalf. A copy of such power of attorney, duly certified and authenticated, shall be filed with the clerk of the district court of the United States for such district at each place where a term of such court is or may be held, which copy, or a certified copy thereof, shall be legal evidence in all controversies arising under sections 6 to 13 of this title. If any such agent shall be removed, resign, or die, become insane, or otherwise incapable of acting, it shall be the duty of such company to appoint another agent in his place as hereinbefore prescribed, and until such appointment shall have been made, or during the absence of any agent of such company from such district, service of process may be upon the clerk of the court wherein such suit is brought, with like effect as upon an agent appointed by the company. The officer executing such process upon such clerk shall immediately transmit a copy thereof by mail to the company, and state such fact in his return. A judgment, decree, or order of a court entered or made after service of process as aforesaid shall be as valid and binding on such company as if served with process in said district.

SAME; DEPOSIT OF COPY OF CHARTER

§ 8. Every company, before transacting any business under sections 6 to 13 of this title, shall deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a copy of its charter or articles of incorporation, and a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities. If the said Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that such company has authority under its charter to do the business provided for in sections 6 to 13 of this title, and that it has a paid-up capital of not less than $250,000, in cash or its equivalent, and is able to keep and perform its contracts, he shall grant authority in writing to such company to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

SAME; QUARTERLY STATEMENTS

§ 9. Every such company shall, in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year, file with the said Secretary of the Treasury a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities, as is required by section 8 of this title. The said Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to revoke the authority of any such company to transact any new business under sections 6 to 13 of this title whenever in his judgment such company is not solvent or is conducting its business in violation of sections 6 to 13 of this title. He may institute inquiry at any time into the solvency of said company and may require that additional security be given at any time by any principal when he deems such company no longer sufficient security.

SAME; JURISDICTION OF SUITS ON BONDS

§ 10. Any surety company doing business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title may be sued in respect thereof in any court of the United States which has or may have jurisdiction of actions or suits upon such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking, in the district in which such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking was made or guaranteed, or in the district in which the principal office of such company is located. For the purposes of sections 6 to 13 of this title such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be treated as made or guaranteed in the district in which the office is located, to which it is returnable, or in which it is filed, or in the district in which the principal in such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking resided when it was made or guaranteed.

SAME; NONPAYMENT OF JUDGMENT

§ 11. If any such company shall neglect or refuse to pay any final judgment or decree rendered against it upon any such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking made or guaranteed by it under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, from which no appeal or supersedeas has been taken, for 30 days after the rendition of such judgment or decree, it shall forfeit all right to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

SAME; ESTOPPEL TO DENY CORPORATE POWERS

§ 12. Any company which shall execute or guarantee any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title shall be estopped in any proceeding to enforce the liability which it shall have assumed to incur, to deny its corporate power to execute or guarantee such instrument or assume such liability.

SAME; FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LAW

§ 13. Any company doing business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title which shall fail to comply with any of its provisions shall forfeit to the United States for every such failure not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, to be recovered by suit in the name of the United States in the same courts in which suit may be brought against such company under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, and such failure shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into by such company.

RATE OF PREMIUM ON BOND; PREMIUMS NOT TO BE PAID BY THE UNITED STATES

§ 14. Until otherwise provided by law no bond shall be accepted from any surety or bonding company for any officer or employee of the United States which shall cost more than 35 percent in excess of the rate of premium charged for a like bond during the calendar year 1908. The United States shall not pay any part of the premium or other cost of furnishing a bond required by law or otherwise of any officer or employee of the United States.

BONDS OR NOTES OF UNITED STATES IN LIEU OF RECOGNIZANCE, STIPULATION, BOND, GUARANTY, OR UNDERTAKING; PLACE OF DEPOSIT; RETURN TO DEPOSITOR; CONTRACTORS' BONDS

§ 15. Wherever by the laws of the United States or regulations made pursuant thereto, any person is required to furnish any recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking, hereinafter called "penal bond," with surety or sureties, such person may, in lieu of such surety or sureties, deposit as security with the official having authority to approve such penal bond, United States Liberty bonds or other bonds or notes of the United States in a sum equal at their par value to the amount of such penal bond required to be furnished, together with an agreement authorizing such official to collect or sell such bonds or notes so deposited in case of any default in the performance of any of the conditions or stipulations of such penal bond. The acceptance of such United States bonds or notes in lieu of surety or sureties required by law shall have the same force and effect as individual or corporate sureties, or certified checks, bank drafts, post-office money orders, or cash, for the penalty or amount of such penal bond. The bonds or notes deposited hereunder, and such other United States bonds or notes as may be substituted therefor from time to time as security, may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, a Federal Reserve bank, or other depositary duly designated for that purpose by the Secretary, which shall issue receipt therefor, describing such bonds or notes so deposited. As soon as security for the performance of such penal bond is no longer necessary, such bonds or notes so deposited shall be returned to the depositor. In case a person or persons supplying a contractor with labor or material as provided by sections 270a to 270d of title 40 shall file with the obligee, at any time after a default in the performance of any contract subject to said sections 270a to 270d, the application and affidavit therein provided, the obligee shall not deliver to the obligor the deposited bonds or notes nor any surplus proceeds thereof until the expiration of the time limited by said sections 270a to 270d for the institution of suit by such person or persons, and, in case suit shall be instituted within such time, shall hold said bonds or notes or proceeds subject to the order of the court having jurisdiction thereof. Nothing herein contained shall affect or impair the priority of the claim of the United States against the bonds or notes deposited or any right or remedy granted by said section 270a to 270d or by this section to the United States for default upon any obligation of said penal bond. All laws inconsistent with this section are hereby so modified as to conform to the provisions hereof. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of courts over the security, where such bonds are taken as security in judicial proceedings, or the authority of any administrative officer of the United States to receive United States bonds for security in cases authorized by existing laws. The Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations necessary and proper for carrying this section into effect. The term "person" in this section means an individual, a trust or estate, a partnership, or a corporation; the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury. In order to avoid the frequent substitution of securities such rules and regulations may limit the effect of this section, in appropriate classes of cases, to bonds and notes of the United States maturing more than a year after the date of deposit of such bonds as security. The phrase "bonds or notes of the United States" shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to mean any public-debt obligations of the United States and any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the United States.

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 6, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 6, United States Code, section
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, second paragraph, 28 Stat. 807; June 17, 1930, ch. 497, sec. 523, first paragraph, 46 Stat. 740	1
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, third paragraph, 2 Stat. 807	2
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, fourth paragraph, 28 Stat. 807; Mar. 8, 1928, ch. 148, 45 Stat. 247	3
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 1, 25 Stat. 387	4
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 2, 25 Stat. 387; as modified by June 10, 1921, ch. 18, sec. 301, 42 Stat. 23	5
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 279	6
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 2, 28 Stat. 279	7
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 3, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	8
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 4, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	9

	Title 6, United States Code, section
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 280	10
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 6, 28 Stat. 280; as modified Jan. 31, 1928, ch. 14, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 54	11
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 7, 28 Stat. 280	12
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 8, 28 Stat. 280	13
Aug. 5, 1909, ch. 7, 36 Stat. 125, first paragraph under "Department of Commerce and Labor"	14
Feb. 24, 1919, ch. 18, sec. 1320, 40 Stat. 1148; Nov. 23, 1921, ch. 136, sec. 1329, 42 Stat. 318; Feb. 26, 1926, ch. 27, secs. 2 (a) (1), (6), 1126, 44 Stat. 9, 122; Feb. 4, 1935, ch. 5, sec. 7, 49 Stat. 22; Mar. 31, 1944, ch. 148, 58 Stat. 135, 136	15

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like the bill H. R. 1565, to enact title 1 of the United States Code into positive law, is intended to enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds." This bill makes no change in existing law. For the reasons which I have stated in connection with the bill H. R. 1565, I recommend that this bill be favorably enacted into positive law by the Congress.

Title 6 of the United States Code as proposed by this bill will contain an orderly arrangement of existing law on this subject with ample provisions for future amendments without upsetting the proposed section numbering.

What I have said concerning the Ramseyer rule applies to this bill also.

A similar bill passed the House unanimously during the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2083) to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "Title 17, U. S. C., § —", as follows:

TITLE 17—COPYRIGHTS

Chapter	*Section*
1. Registration of copyright	1
2. Infringement proceedings	101
3. Copyright Office	201

CHAPTER 1—REGISTRATION OF COPYRIGHTS

§ 1. Exclusive rights as to copyrighted works.
§ 2. Rights of author or proprietor of unpublished work.
§ 3. Protection of component parts of work copyrighted; composite works or periodicals.
§ 4. All writings of author included.
§ 5. Classification of works of registration.
§ 6. Registration of prints and labels.
§ 7. Copyright on compilations of works in public domain or of copyrighted works; subsisting copyrights not affected.
§ 8. Copyright not to subsist in works in public domain, or published prior to July 1, 1909, and not already copyrighted, or Government publications; publication by Government of copyrighted material.
§ 9. Authors or proprietors, entitled; aliens.
§ 10. Publication of work with notice.
§ 11. Registration of claim and issuance of certificate.
§ 12. Works not reproduced for sale.
§ 13. Deposit of copies after publication; action or proceeding for infringement.
§ 14. Same; failure to deposit; demand; penalty.
§ 15. Same; postmaster's receipt; transmission by mail without cost.
§ 16. Mechanical work to be done in United States.
§ 17. Affidavit to accompany copies.
§ 18. Making false affidavit.
§ 19. Notice; form.
§ 20. Same; place of application of; one notice in each volume or number of newspaper or periodical.
§ 21. Same; effect of accidental omission from copy or copies.
§ 22. Ad interim protection of book published abroad.
§ 23. Same; extension to full term.
§ 24. Duration; renewal and extension.
§ 25. Renewal of copyrights registered in Patent Office under repealed law.
§ 26. Terms defined.
§ 27. Copyright distinct from property in object copyrighted; effect of sale of object, and of assignment of copyright.
§ 28. Assignments and bequests.
§ 29. Same; executed in foreign country; acknowledgment and certificate.
§ 30. Same; record.
§ 31. Same; certificate of record.
§ 32. Same; use of name of assignee in notice.

§ 1. Exclusive rights as to copyrighted works: Any person entitled thereto, upon complying with the provisions of this title, shall have the exclusive right:

(a) To print, reprint, publish, copy, and vend the copyrighted work;

(b) To translate the copyrighted work into other languages or dialects, or make any other version thereof, if it be a literary work; to dramatize it if it be a nondramatic work; to convert it into a novel or other nondramatic work if it be a drama; to arrange or adapt it if it be a musical work; to complete, execute, and finish it if it be a model or design for a work of art;

(c) To deliver or authorize the delivery of the copyrighted work in public for profit if it be a lecture, sermon, address, or similar production;

(d) To perform or represent the copyrighted work publicly if it be a drama or, if it be a dramatic work and not reproduced in copies for sale, to vend any manuscript or any record whatsoever thereof; to make or to procure the making of any transcription or record thereof by or from which, in whole or in part, it may in any manner or by any method be exhibited, performed, represented, produced, or reproduced; and to exhibit, perform, represent, produce, or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever; and

(e) To perform the copyrighted work publicly for profit if it be a musical composition; and for the purpose of public performance for profit, and for the purposes set forth in subsection (a) hereof, to make any arrangement or setting of it or of the melody of it in any system of notation or any form of record in which the thought of an author may be recorded and from which it may be read or reproduced: *Provided*, That the provisions of this title, so far as they secure copyright controlling the parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, shall include only compositions published and copyrighted after July 1, 1909, and shall not include the works of a foreign author or composer unless the foreign state or nation of which such author or composer is a citizen or subjects grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States similar rights. And as a condition of extending the copyright control to such mechanical reproductions, that whenever the owner of a musical copyright has used or permitted or knowingly acquiesced in the use of the copyrighted work upon the parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, any other person may make similar use of the copyrighted work upon the payment to the copyright proprietor of a royalty of 2 cents on each such part manufactured, to be paid by the manufacturer thereof; and the copyright proprietor may require, and if so the manufacturer shall furnish, a report under oath on the 20th day of each month on the number of parts of instruments manufactured during the previous month serving to reproduce mechanically said musical work, and royalties shall be due on the parts manufactured during any month upon the 20th of the next succeeding month. The payment of the royalty provided for by this section shall free the articles or devices for which such royalty has been paid from further contribution to the copyright except in case of public performance for profit. It shall be the duty of the copyright owner, if he uses the musical composition himself for the manufacture of parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, or licenses others to do so, to file notice thereof, accompanied by a recording fee, in the copyright office, and any failure to file such notice shall be a complete defense to any suit, action, or proceeding for any infringement of such copyright.

In case of the failure of such manufacturer to pay to the copyright proprietor within 30 days after demand in writing the full sum of royalties due at said rate at the date of such demand, the court may award taxable costs to the plaintiff and a reasonable counsel fee, and the court may, in its discretion, enter judgment therein for any sum in addition over the amount found to be due as royalty in accordance with the terms of this title, not exceeding three times such amount.

The reproduction or rendition of a musical composition by or upon coin-operated machines shall not be deemed a public performance for profit unless a fee is charged for admission to the place where such reproduction or rendition occurs.

§ 2. Rights of author or proprietor of unpublished work: Nothing in this title shall be construed to annul or limit the right of the author or proprietor of an unpublished work, at common law or in equity, to prevent the copying, publication, or use of such unpublished work without his consent, and to obtain damages therefor.

§ 3. Protection of component parts of work copyrighted; composite works or periodicals: The copyright provided by this title shall protect all the copyrightable component parts of the work copyrighted, and all matter therein in which copyright is already subsisting, but without extending the duration or scope of such copyright. The copyright upon composite works or periodicals shall give to the proprietor thereof all the rights in respect thereto which he would have if each part were individually copyrighted under this title.

§ 4. All writings of author included: The works for which copyright may be secured under this title shall include all the writings of an author.

§ 5. Classification of works for registration: The application for registration shall specify to which of the following classes the work in which copyright is claimed belongs:

(a) Books, including composite and cyclopedic works, directories, gazetteers, and other compilations.

(b) Periodicals, including newspapers.

(c) Lectures, sermons, addresses (prepared for oral delivery).

(d) Dramatic or dramatico-musical compositions.

(e) Musical compositions.

(f) Maps.

(g) Works of art; models or designs for works of art.

(h) Reproductions of a work of art.

(i) Drawings or plastic works of a scientific or technical character.

(j) Photographs.

(k) Prints and pictorial illustrations including prints or labels used for articles of merchandise.

(l) Motion-picture photoplays.

(m) Motion pictures other than photoplays.

The above specifications shall not be held to limit the subject matter of copyright as defined in section 4 of this title, nor shall any error in classification invalidate or impair the copyright protection secured under this title.

§ 6. Registration of prints and labels: Commencing July 1, 1940, the Register of Copyrights is charged with the registration of claims to copyright properly presented, in all prints and labels published in connection with the sale or advertisement of articles of merchandise, including all claims to copyright in prints and labels pending in the Patent Office and uncleared at the close of business June 30, 1940. There shall be paid for registering a claim of copyright in any such print or label not a trademark $6 which sum shall cover the expense of furnishing a certificate of such registration, under the seal of the Copyright Office, to the claimant of copyright.

§ 7. Copyright on compilations of works in public domain or of copyrighted works; subsisting copyrights not affected: Compilations or abridgments, adaptations, arrangements, dramatizations, translations, or other versions of works in the public domain or of copyrighted works when produced with the consent of the proprietor of the copyright in such works, or works republished with new matter, shall be regarded as new works subject to copyright under the provisions of this title; but the publication of any such new works shall not affect the force or validity of any subsisting copyright upon the matter employed or any part thereof, or be construed to imply an exclusive right to such use of the original works, or to secure or extend copyright in such original works.

§ 8. Copyright not to subsist in works in public domain, or published prior to July 1, 1909, and not already copyrighted, or Government publications; publication by Government of copyrighted materials: No copyright shall subsist in the original text of any work which is in the public domain, or in any work which was published in this country or any foreign country prior to July 1, 1909, and has not been already copyrighted in the United States, or in any publication of the United States Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part, thereof: *Provided*, That copyright may be secured by the Postmaster General on behalf of the United States in the whole or any part of the publications authorized by section 1 of the act of June 27, 1938 (39 U. S. C. 371).

The publication or republication by the Government, either separately or in a public document, of any material in which copyright is subsisting shall not be taken to cause any abridgment or annulment of the copyright or to authorize any use or appropriation of such copyright material without the consent of the copyright proprietor.

§ 9. Authors or proprietors entitled; aliens: The author or proprietor of any work made the subject of copyright by this title, or his executors, administrators, or assigns, shall have copyright for such work under the conditions and for the terms specified in this title: *Provided, however*, That the copyright secured by this title shall extend to the work of an author or proprietor who is a citizen or subject of a foreign state or nation only:

(a) When an alien author or proprietor shall be domiciled within the United States at the time of the first publication of his work; or

(b) When the foreign state or nation of which such author or proprietor is a citizen or subject grants, either by treaty, convention, agreement, or law, to citizens of the United States the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as to its own citizens, or copyright protection substantially equal to the protection secured to such foreign author under this title or by treaty; or when such foreign state or nation is a party to an international agreement which provides for reciprocity in the granting of copyright, by the terms of which agreement the United States may, at its pleasure, become a party thereto.

The existence of the reciprocal conditions aforesaid shall be determined by the President of the United States, by proclamation made from time to time, as the purposes of this title may require: *Provided*, That whenever the President shall find that the authors, copyright owners, or proprietors of works first produced or published abroad and subject to copyright or to renewal of copyright under the laws of the United States, including works subject to ad interim copyright, are or may have been temporarily unable to comply with the conditions and formalities prescribed with respect to such works by the copyright laws of the United States, because of the disruption or suspension of facilities essential for such compliance, he may by proclamation grant such extension of time as he may deem appropriate for the fulfillment of such conditions or formalities by authors, copyright owners, or proprietors who are citizens of the United States or who are nationals of countries which accord substantially equal treatment in this respect to authors, copyright owners, or proprietors who are citizens of the United States: *Provided further*, That no liability shall attach under this title for lawful uses made or acts done prior to the effective date of such proclamation in connection with such works, or in respect to the continuance for 1 year subsequent to such date of any business undertaking or enterprise lawfully undertaken prior to such date involving expenditure or contractual obligation in connection with the exploitation, production, reproduction, circulation, or performance of any such work.

The President may at any time terminate any proclamation authorized herein or any part thereof or suspend or extend its operation for such period or periods of time as in his judgment the interests of the United States may require.

§ 10. Publication of work with notice: Any person entitled thereto by this title may secure copyright for his work by publication thereof with the notice of copyright required by this title, and such notice shall be affixed to each copy thereof published or offered for sale in the United States by authority of the copyright proprietor, except in the case of books seeking ad interim protection under section 22 of this title.

§ 11. Registration of claim and issuance of certificate: Such person may obtain registration of his claim to copyright by complying with the provisions of this title, including the deposit of copies, and upon such compliance the Register of Copyrights shall issue to him the certificates provided for in section 209 of this title.

§ 12. Works not reproduced for sale: Copyright may also be had of the works of an author, of which copies are not reproduced for sale, by the deposit, with claim of copyright, of one complete copy of such work if it be a lecture or similar production or a dramatic, musical, or dramatico-musical composition; of a title and description, with one print taken from each scene or act, if the work be a motion-picture photoplay; of a photographic print if the work be a photograph; of a title and description, with not less than two prints taken from different sections of a complete motion picture, if the work be a motion picture other than a photoplay; or of a photograph or other identifying reproduction thereof, if it be a work of art or a plastic work or drawing. But the privilege of registration of copyright secured hereunder shall not exempt the copyright proprietor from the deposit of copies, under sections 13 and 14 of this title, where the work is later reproduced in copies for sale.

§ 13. Deposit of copies after publication; action or proceeding for infringement: After copyright has been secured by publication of the work with the notice of copyright as provided in section 10 of this title, there shall be promptly deposited in the copyright office or in the mail addressed to to the Register of Copyrights, Washington, D. C., two complete copies of the best edition thereof then published, or if the work is by an author who is a citizen or subject of a foreign state or nation and has been published in a foreign country, one complete copy of the best edition then published in such foreign country, which copies or copy, if the work be a book or periodical, shall have been produced in accordance with the manufacturing provisions specified in section 16 of this title; or if such work be a contribution to a periodical, for which contribution special registration is requested, one copy of the issue or issues containing such contribution; or if the work is not reproduced in copies for sale there shall be deposited the copy, print, photograph, or other identifying reproduction provided by section 12 of this title, such copies or copy, print, photograph, or other reproduction to be accompanied in each case by a claim of copyright. No action or proceeding shall be maintained for infringement of copyright in any work until the provisions of this title with respect to the deposit of copies and registration of such work shall have been complied with.

§ 14. Same; failure to deposit; demand; penalty: Should the copies called for by section 13 of this title not be promptly deposited as provided in this title, the Register of Copyrights may at any time after the publication of the work, upon actual notice, require the proprietor of the copyright to deposit them, and after the said demand shall have been made, in default of the deposit of copies of the work within 3 months from any part of the United States, except an outlying territorial possession of the United States, or within 6 months from any outlying territorial possession of the United States, or from any foreign country, the proprietor of the copyright shall be liable to a fine of $100 and to pay to the Library of Congress twice the amount of the retail price of the best edition of the work, and the copyright shall become void.

§ 15. Same; postmaster's receipt; transmission by mail without cost: The postmaster to whom are delivered the articles deposited as provided in sections 12 and 13 of this title shall, if requested, give a receipt therefor and shall mail them to their destination without cost to the copyright claimant.

§ 16. Mechanical work to be done in United States: Of the printed book or periodical specified in section 5, subsections (a) and (b), of this title, except the original text of a book of foreign origin in a language or languages other than English, the text of all copies accorded protection under this title, except as below provided, shall be printed from type set within the limits of the United States, either by hand or by the aid of any kind of typesetting machine, or from plates made within the limits of the United States from type set therein, or, if the text be produced by lithographic process, or photoengraving process, then by a process wholly performed within the limits of the United

States, and the printing of the text and binding of the said book shall be performed within the limits of the United States; which requirements shall extend also to the illustrations within a book consisting of printed text and illustrations produced by lithographic process, or photoengraving process, and also to separate lithographs or photoengravings, except where in either case the subjects represented are located in a foreign country and illustrate a scientific work or reproduce a work of art: *Provided, however,* That said requirements shall not apply to works in raised characters for the use of the blind, or to books of foreign origin in a language or languages other than English, or to books published abroad in the English language seeking ad interim protection under this title, or to works printed or produced in the United States by any other process than those above specified in this section.

§ 17. Affidavit to accompany copies: In the case of the book the copies so deposited shall be accompanied by an affidavit under the official seal of any officer authorized to administer oaths within the United States, duly made by the person claiming copyright or by his duly authorized agent or representative residing in the United States, or by the printer who has printed the book, setting forth that the copies deposited have been printed from type set within the limits of the United States or from plates made within the limits of the United States from type set therein; or, if the text be produced by lithographic process, or photoengraving process, that such process was wholly performed within the limits of the United States and that the printing of the text and binding of the said book have also been performed within the limits of the United States. Such affidavit shall state also the place where and the establishment or establishments in which such type was set or plates were made or lithographic process, or photoengraving process or printing and binding were performed and the date of the completion of the printing of the book or the date of publication.

§ 18. Making false affidavit: Any person who, for the purpose of obtaining registration of a claim to copyright, shall knowingly make a false affidavit as to his having complied with the above conditions shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000, and all of his rights and privileges under said copyright shall thereafter be forfeited.

§ 19. Notice; form: The notice of copyright required by section 10 of this title shall consist either of the word "Copyright" or the abbreviation "Copr.", accompanied by the name of the copyright proprietor, and if the work be a printed literary, musical, or dramatic work, the notice shall include also the year in which the copyright was secured by publication. In the case, however, of copies of works specified in subsections (f) to (k), inclusive, of section 5 of this title, the notice may consist of the letter C enclosed within a circle, thus ©, accompanied by the initials, monogram, mark, or symbol of the copyright proprietor: *Provided,* That on some accessible portion of such copies or of the margin, back, permanent base, or pedestal, or of the substance on which such copies shall be mounted, his name shall appear. But in the case of works in which copyright was subsisting on July 1, 1909, the notice of copyright may be either in one of the forms prescribed herein or may consist of the following words: "Entered according to act of Congress, in the year —, by A. B., in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington"; or, at his option, the word "Copyright", together with the year the copyright was entered and the name of the party by whom it was taken out; thus, "Copyright, 19—, by A. B."

§ 20. Same; place of application of; one notice in each volume or number of newspaper or periodical: The notice of copyright shall be applied, in the case of a book or other printed publication, upon its title page or the page immediately following, or if a periodical either upon the title page or upon the first page of text of each separate number or under the title heading, or if a musical work either upon its title page or the first page of music. One notice of copyright in each volume or in each number of a newspaper or periodical published shall suffice.

§ 21. Same; effect of accidental omission from copy or copies: Where the copyright proprietor has sought to comply with the provisions of this title with respect to notice, the omission by accident or mistake of the prescribed notice from a particular copy or copies shall not invalidate the copyright or prevent recovery for infringement against any person who, after actual notice of the copyright, begins an undertaking to infringe it, but shall prevent the recovery of damages against an innocent infringer who has been misled by the omission of the notice; and in a suit for infringement no permanent injunction shall be had unless the copyright proprietor shall reimburse to the innocent infringer his reasonable outlay innocently incurred if the court, in its discretion, shall so direct.

§ 22. Ad interim protection of book published abroad: In the case of a book first published abroad in the English language, the deposit in the copyright office, not later than 60 days after its publication abroad, of one complete copy of the foreign edition, with a request for the reservation of the copyright and a statement of the name and nationality of the author and of the copyright proprietor and of the date of publication of the said book, shall secure to the author or proprietor an ad interim copyright, which shall have all the force and effect given to copyright by this title, and shall endure until the expiration of 4 months after such deposit in the copyright office.

§ 23. Same; extension to full term: Whenever within the period of such ad interim protection an authorized edition of such books shall be published within the United States, in accordance with the manufacturing provisions specified in section 16 of this title, and whenever the provisions of this title as to deposit of copies, registration, filing of affidavit, and the printing of the copyright notice shall have been duly complied with, the copyright shall be extended to endure in such book for the term provided in this title.

§ 24. Duration; renewal and extension: The copyright secured by this title shall endure for 28 years from the date of first publication, whether the copyrighted work bears the author's true name or is published anonymously or under an assumed name: *Provided,* That in the case of any posthumous work or of any periodical, cyclopedic, or other composite work upon which the copyright was originally secured by the proprietor thereof, or of any work copyrighted by a corporate body (otherwise than as assignee or licensee of the individual author) or by an employer for whom such work is made for hire, the proprietor of such copyright shall be entitled to a renewal and extension of the copyright in such work for the further term of 28 years when application for such renewal and extension shall have been made to the copyright office and duly registered therein within 1 year prior to the expiration of the original term of copyright: *And provided further,* That in the case of any other copyrighted work, including a contribution by an individual author to a periodical or to a cyclopedic or other composite work, the author of such work, if still living, or the widow, widower, or children of the author, if the author be not living, or if such author, widow, widower, or children be not living, then the author's executors, or in the absence of a will, his next of kin shall be entitled to a renewal and extension of the copyright in such work for a further term of 28 years when application for such renewal and extension shall have been made to the copyright office and duly registered therein within 1 year prior to the expiration of the original term of copyright: *And provided further,* That in default of the registration of such application for renewal and extension, the copyright in any work shall determine at the expiration of 28 years from first publication.

§ 25. Renewal of copyrights registered in Patent Office under repealed law: Subsisting copyrights originally registered in the Patent Office prior to July 1, 1940, under section 3 of the act of June 18, 1874, shall be subject to renewal in behalf of the proprietor upon application made to the Register of Copyrights within 1 year prior to the expiration of the original term of 28 years.

§ 26. Terms defined: In the interpretation and construction of this title "the date of publication" shall in the case of a work of which copies are reproduced for sale or distribution be held to be the earliest date when copies of the first authorized edition were placed on sale, sold, or publicly distributed by the proprietor of the copyright or under his authority, and the word "author" shall include an employer in the case of works made for hire.

§ 27. Copyright distinct from property in object copyrighted; effect of sale of object, and of assignment of copyright: The copyright is distinct from the property in the material object copyrighted, and the sale or conveyance, by gift or otherwise, of the material object shall not of itself constitute a transfer of the copyright, nor shall the assignment of the copyright constitute a transfer of the title to the material object; but nothing in this title shall be deemed to forbid, prevent, or restrict the transfer of any copy of a copyrighted work the possession of which has been lawfully obtained.

§ 28. Assignments and bequests: Copyright secured under this title or previous copyright laws of the United States may be assigned, granted, or mortgaged by an instrument in writing signed by the proprietor of the copyright, or many be bequeathed by will.

§ 29. Same; executed in Foreign Country; acknowledgment and certificate: Every assignment of copyright executed in a foreign country shall be acknowledged by the assignor before a consular officer or secretary of legation of the United States authorized by law to administer oaths or perform notarial acts. The certificate of such acknowledgment under the hand and official seal of such consular officer or secretary of legation shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of the instrument.

§ 30. Same; record: Every assignment of copyright shall be recorded in the copyright office within three calendar months after its execution in the United States or within six calendar months after its execution without the limits of the United States, in default of which it shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee for a valuable consideration, without notice, whose assignment has been duly recorded.

§ 31. Same; certificate of record: The Register of Copyrights shall, upon payment of the prescribed fee, record such assignment, and shall return it to the sender with a certificate of record attached under seal of the copyright office, and upon the payment of the fee prescribed by this title he shall furnish to any person requesting the same a certified copy thereof under the said seal.

§ 32. Same; use of Name of Assignee in Notice: When an assignment of the copyright in a specified book or other work has been recorded the assignee may substitute his name for that of the assignor in the statutory notice of copyright prescribed by this title.

CHAPTER 2—INFRINGEMENT PROCEEDINGS

§ 101. Infringement:
(a) Injunction.
(b) Damages and profits; amounts; other remedies.
(c) Impounding during action.
(d) Destruction of infringing copies and plates.
(e) Royalties for use of mechanical reproduction of musical works.
(f) Rules of procedure.
§ 102. Jurisdiction of courts in enforcing remedies.
§ 103. Joinder of proceedings for different remedies.
§ 104. Willful infringement for profit.
§ 105. Fraudulent notice of copyright, or removal or alteration of notice.
§ 106. Importation of article bearing false notice or piratical copies of copyrighted work.
§ 107. Importation, during existence of copyright, of piratical copies, or of copies not produced in accordance with section 16 of this title.
§ 108. Forfeiture and destruction of articles prohibited importation.
§ 109. Importation of prohibited articles; regulations; proof of deposit of copies by complainants.
§ 110. Jurisdiction of actions under laws.
§ 111. District in which actions may be brought.
§ 112. Injunctions; service and enforcement.
§ 113. Transmission of certified copies of papers for enforcement of injunction by other court.
§ 114. Review of orders, judgments, or decrees.
§ 115. Limitation of criminal proceedings.
§ 116. Costs; attorney's fees.

§ 101. Infringement: If any person shall infringe the copyright in any work protected under the copyright laws of the United States such person shall be liable:

(a) Injunction: To an injunction restraining such infringement;

(b) Damages and profits; amount; other remedies: To pay to the copyright proprietor such damages as the copyright proprietor may have suffered due to the infringement, as well as all the profits which the infringer shall have made from such infringement, and in proving profits the plaintiff shall be required to prove sales only, and the defendant shall be required to prove every element of cost which he claims, or in lieu of actual damages and profits, such damages as to the court shall appear to be just, and in assessing such damages the court may, in its discretion, allow the amounts as hereinafter stated, but in case of a newspaper reproduction of a copyrighted photograph, such damages shall not exceed the sum of $200 nor be less than the sum of $50, and in the case of the infringement of an undramatized or nondramatic work by means of motion pictures, where the infringer shall show that he was not aware that he was infringing, and that such infringement could not have been reasonably foreseen, such damages shall not exceed the sum of $100; and in the case of an infringement of a copyrighted dramatic or dramatico-musical work by a maker of motion pictures and his agencies for distribution thereof to exhibitors, where such infringer shows that he was not aware that he was infringing a copyrighted work, and that such infringements could not reasonably have been foreseen, the entire sum of such damages recoverable by the copyright proprietor from such infringing maker and his agencies for the distribution to exhibitors of such infringing motion picture shall not exceed the sum of $5,000 nor be less than $250, and such damages shall in no other case exceed the sum of $5,000 nor be less than the sum of $250, and shall not be regarded as a penalty. But the foregoing exceptions shall not deprive the copyright proprietor of any other remedy given him under this law, nor shall the limitation as to the amount of recovery apply to infringements occurring after the actual notice to a defendant, either by service of a process in a suit or other written notice served upon him.

First. In the case of a painting, statue, or sculpture, $10 for every infringing copy made or sold by or found in the possession of the infringer or his agents or employees.

Second. In the case of any work enumerated in section 5 of this title, except a painting, statue, or sculpture, $1 for every infringing copy made or sold by or found in the possession of the infringer or his agents or employees;

Third. In the case of a lecture, sermon, or address, $50 for every infringing delivery;

Fourth. In the case of a dramatic or dramatico-musical or a choral or orchestral composition, $100 for the first and $50 for every subsequent infringing performance; in the case of other musical compositions $10 for every infringing performance;

(c) Impounding during action: To deliver up on oath, to be impounded during the pendency of the action, upon such terms and conditions as the court may prescribe, all articles alleged to infringe a copyright.

(d) Destruction of infringing copies and plates: To deliver up on oath for destruction all the infringing copies or devices, as well as all plates, molds, matrices, or other means for making such infringing copies as the court may order.

(e) Royalties for use of mechanical reproduction of musical works: Whenever the owner of a musical copyright has used or permitted the use of the copyrighted work upon the parts of musical instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, then in case of infringement of such copyright by the unauthorized manufacture, use, or sale of interchangeable parts, such as disks, rolls, bands, or cylinders for use in mechanical music-producing machines adapted to reproduce the copyrighted music, no criminal action shall be brought, but in a civil action an injunction may be granted upon such terms as the court may impose, and the plaintiff shall be entitled to recover in lieu of profits and damages a royalty as provided in section 1, subsection (e), of this title: *Provided also*, That whenever any person, in the absence of a license agreement, intends to use a copyrighted musical composition upon the parts of instruments serving to reproduce mechanically the musical work, relying upon the compulsory license provision of this title, he shall serve notice of such intention, by registered mail, upon the copyright proprietor at his last address disclosed by the records of the copyright office, sending to the copyright office a duplicate of such notice; and in case of his failure so to do the court may, in its discretion, in addition to sums hereinabove mentioned, award the complainant a further sum, not to exceed three times the amount provided by section 1, subsection (e), of this title, by way of damages, and not as a penalty, and also a temporary injunction until the full award is paid.

(f) Rules of procedure: Rules and regulations for practice and procedure under this section shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

§ 102. Jurisdiction of courts in enforcing remedies: Any court given jurisdiction under section 110 of this title may proceed in any action, suit, or proceeding instituted for violation of any provision hereof to enter a judgment or decree enforcing the remedies herein provided.

§ 103. Joinder of proceedings for different remedies: The proceedings for an injunction, damages, and profits, and those for the seizure of infringing copies, plates, molds, matrices, and so forth, aforementioned, may be united in one action.

§ 104. Willful infringement for profit: Any person who willfully and for profit shall infringe any copyright secured by this title, or who shall knowingly and willfully aid or abet such infringement, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year or by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or both, in the discretion of the court: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this title shall be so construed as to prevent the performance of religious or secular works such as oratorios, cantatas, masses, or octavo choruses by public schools, church choirs, or vocal societies, rented, borrowed, or obtained from some public library, public school, church choir, school choir, or vocal society, provided the performance is given for charitable or educational purposes and not for profit.

§ 105. Fraudulent notice of copyright, or removal or alteration of notice: Any person who, with fraudulent intent, shall insert or impress any notice of copyright required by this title, or words of the same purport, in or upon any uncopyrighted article, or with fraudulent intent shall remove or alter the copyright notice upon any article duly copyrighted shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than $100 and not more than $1,000. Any person who shall knowingly issue or sell any article bearing a notice of United States copyright which has not been copyrighted in this country, or who shall knowingly import any article bearing such notice or words of the same purport, which has not been copyrighted in this country, shall be liable to a fine of $100.

§ 106. Importation of article bearing false notice or piratical copies of copyrighted work: The importation into the United States of any article bearing a false notice of copyright when there is no existing copyright thereon in the United States, or of any piratical copies of any work copyrighted in the United States, is prohibited.

§ 107. Importation, during existence of copyright, of piratical copies, or of copies not produced in accordance with section 16 of this title: During the existence of the American copyright in any book the importation into the United States of any piratical copies thereof or of any copies thereof (although authorized by the author or proprietor) which have not been produced in accordance with the manufacturing provisions specified in section 16 of this title, or any plates of the same not made from type set within the limits of the United States, or any copies thereof produced by lithographic or photoengraving process not performed within the limits of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of section 16 of this title, is prohibited: *Provided, however*, That, except as regards piratical copies, such prohibition shall not apply:

(a) To works in raised characters for the use of the blind.

(b) To a foreign newspaper or magazine, although containing matter copyrighted in the United States printed or reprinted by authority of the copyright proprietor, unless such newspaper or magazine contains also copyright matter printed or reprinted without such authorization.

(c) To the authorized edition of a book in a foreign language or languages of which only a translation into English has been copyrighted in this country.

(d) To any book published abroad with the authorization of the author or copyright proprietor when imported under the circumstances stated in one of the four subdivisions following, that is to say:

First. When imported, not more than one copy at one time, for individual use and not for sale; but such privilege of importation shall not extend to a foreign reprint of a book by an American author copyrighted in the United States.

Second. When imported by the authority or for the use of the United States.

Third. When imported, for use and not for sale, not more than one copy of any such book in any one invoice, in good faith by or for any society or institution incorporated for educational, literary, philosophical, scientific, or religious purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning, or for any State, school, college, university, or free public library in the United States.

Fourth. When such books form parts of libraries or collections purchased en bloc for the use of societies, institutions, or libraries designated in the foregoing paragraph, or form parts of the libraries or personal baggage belonging to persons or families arriving from foreign countries and are not intended for sale: *Provided*, That copies imported as above may not lawfully be used in any way to violate the rights of the proprietor of the American copyright or annul or limit the copyright protection secured by this title, and such unlawful use shall be deemed an infringement of copyright.

§ 108. Forfeiture and destruction of articles prohibited importation: Any and all articles prohibited importation by this title which are brought into the United States from any foreign country (except in the mails) shall be seized and forfeited by like proceedings as those provided by law for the seizure and condemnation of property imported into the United States in violation of the customs revenue laws. Such articles when forfeited shall be destroyed in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or the court, as the case may be, shall direct: *Provided, however*, That all copies of authorized editions of copyright books imported in the mails or otherwise in violation of the provisions of this title may be exported and returned to the country of export whenever it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, in a written application, that such importation does not involve willful negligence or fraud.

§ 109. Importation of prohibited articles; regulations; proof of deposit of copies by complainants: The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are hereby empowered and required to make and enforce individually or jointly such rules and regulations as shall prevent the importation into the United States of articles prohibited importation by this title, and may require, as conditions precedent to exclusion of any work in which copyright is claimed, the copyright proprietor or any person claiming actual or potential injury by reason of actual or contemplated importations of copies of such work to file with the Post Office Department or the Treasury Department a certificate of the Register of Copyrights that the provisions of section 13 of this title have been fully complied with, and to give notice of such compliance to postmasters or to customs officers at the ports of entry in the United States in such form and accompanied by such exhibits as may be deemed necessary for the practical and efficient administration and enforcement of the provisions of sections 106 and 107 of this title.

§ 110. Jurisdiction of actions under laws: All actions, suits, or proceedings arising under the copyright laws of the United States shall be originally cognizable by the district courts of the United States, the district court of any Territory, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the district courts of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and the courts of first instance of the Philippine Islands.

§ 111. District in which actions may be brought: Civil actions, suits, or proceedings arising under this title may be instituted in the district of which the defendant or his agent is an inhabitant, or in which he may be found.

§ 112. Injunctions; service and enforcement: Any such court or judge thereof shall have power, upon bill in equity filed by any party aggrieved, to grant injunctions to prevent and restrain the violation of any right secured by this title, according to the course and principles of court of equity, on such terms as said court or judge may deem reasonable. Any injunction that may be granted restraining and enjoining the doing of anything forbidden by this title may be served on the parties against whom such injunction may be granted anywhere in the United States, and shall be operative throughout the United States and be enforceable by proceedings in contempt or otherwise by any other court or judge possessing jurisdiction of the defendants.

§ 113. Transmission of certified copies of papers for enforcement of injunction by other court: The clerk of the court, or judge granting the injunction, shall, when required so to do by the court hearing the application to enforce said injunction, transmit without delay to said court a certified copy of all the papers in said cause that are on file in his office.

§ 114. Review of orders, judgments, or decrees: The orders, judgments, or decrees of any court mentioned in section 110 of this title arising under the copyright laws of the United States may be reviewed on appeal in the manner and to the extent now provided by law for the review of cases determined in said courts, respectively.

§ 115. Limitations of criminal proceedings: No criminal proceeding shall be maintained under the provisions of this title unless the same is commenced within 3 years after the cause of action arose.

§ 116. Costs; attorney's fees: In all actions, suits, or proceedings under this title, except when brought by or against the United States or any officer thereof, full costs shall be allowed, and the court may award to the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs.

CHAPTER 3—COPYRIGHT OFFICE

§ 201. Copyright office; preservation of records.
§ 202. Register, assistant register, and subordinates.
§ 203. Same; deposit of moneys received; reports.
§ 204. Same; bond.
§ 205. Same; annual report.
§ 206. Seal of copyright office.
§ 207. Rules for registration of claims.
§ 208. Record books in copyright office.
§ 209. Certificates of registration; effect as evidence; receipt for copies deposited.
§ 210. Catalogs of copyright entries; effect as evidence.
§ 211. Same; distribution and sale; disposal of proceeds.
§ 212. Records and works deposited in copyright office open to public inspection; taking copies of entries.
§ 213. Disposition of articles deposited in office.
§ 214. Destruction of articles deposited in office remaining undisposed of; removal of by author or proprietor; manuscripts of unpublished works.
§ 215. Fees.

§ 201. Copyright office; preservation of records: All records and other things relating to copyrights required by law to be preserved shall be kept and preserved in the copyright office, Library of Congress, District of Columbia, and shall be under the control of the register of copyrights, who shall, under the direction and supervision of the Librarian of Congress, perform all the duties relating to the registration of copyrights.

§ 202. Register, Assistant Register, and subordinates: There shall be appointed by the Librarian of Congress a Register of Copyrights, and one Assistant Register of Copyrights, who shall have authority during the absence of the Register of Copyrights to attach the copyright office seal to all papers issued from the said office and to sign such certificates and other papers as may be necessary. There shall also be appointed by the Librarian such subordinate assistants to the register as may from time to time be authorized by law.

§ 203. Same; deposit of moneys received; reports: The Register of Copyrights shall make daily deposits in some bank in the District of Columbia, designated for this purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury as a national depository, of all moneys received to be applied as copyright fees, and shall make weekly deposits with the Secretary of the Treasury, in such manner as the latter shall direct, of all copyright fees actually applied under the provisions of this title, and annual deposits of sums received which it has not been possible to apply as copyright fees or to return to the remitters, and shall also make monthly reports to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Librarian of Congress of the applied copyright fees for each calendar month, together with a statement of all remittances received, trust funds on hand, moneys refunded, and unapplied balances.

§ 204. Same; bond: The Register of Copyrights shall give bond to the United States in the sum of $20,000, in form to be approved by the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury and with sureties satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, for the faithful discharge of his duties.

§ 205. Same; annual report: The Register of Copyrights shall make an annual report to the Librarian of Congress, to be printed in the annual report on the Library of Congress, of all copyright business for the previous fiscal year, including the number and kind of works which have been deposited in the copyright office during the fiscal year, under the provisions of this title.

§ 206. Seal of copyright office: The seal used in the copyright office on July 1, 1909, shall be the seal of the copyright office, and by it all papers issued from the copyright office requiring authentication shall be authenticated.

§ 207. Rules for registration of claims: Subject to the approval of the Librarian of Congress, the Register of Copyrights shall be authorized to make rules and regulations for the registration of claims to copyright as provided by this title.

§ 208. Record books in copyright office: The Register of Copyrights shall provide and keep such record books in the copyright office as are required to carry out the provisions of this title, and whenever deposit has been made in the copyright office of a copy of any work under the provisions of this title he shall make entry thereof.

§ 209. Certificate of registration; effect as evidence; receipt for copies deposited: In the case of each entry the person recorded as the claimant of the copyright shall be entitled to a certificate of registration under seal of the copyright office, to contain the name and address of said claimant, the name of the country of which the author of the work is a citizen or subject, and when an alien author domiciled in the United States at the time of said registration, then a statement of that fact, including his place of domicile, the name of the author (when the records of the copyright office shall show the same), the title of the work which is registered for which copyright is claimed, the date of the deposit of the copies of such work, the date of publication if the work has been reproduced in copies for sale, or publicly distributed, and such marks as to class designation and entry number as shall fully identify the entry. In the case of a book, the certificate shall also state the receipt of the affidavit, as provided by section 17 of this title, and the date of the completion of the printing, or the date of the publication of the book, as stated in the said affidavit. The

Register of Copyrights shall prepare a printed form for the said certificate, to be filled out in each case as above provided for in the case of all registrations made after March 2, 1913, and in the case of all previous registrations so far as the copyright office record books shall show such facts, which certificate, sealed with the seal of the copyright office, shall, upon payment of the prescribed fee, be given to any person making application for the same. Said certificate shall be admitted in any court as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein. In addition to such certificate the register of copyrights shall furnish, upon request, without additional fee, a receipt for the copies of the work deposited to complete the registration.

§ 210. Catalog of copyright entries; effect as evidence: The Register of Copyrights shall fully index all copyright registrations and assignments and shall print at periodic intervals a catalog of the titles of articles deposited and registered for copyright, together with suitable indexes, and at stated intervals shall print complete and indexed catalog for each class of copyright entries, and may thereupon, if expedient, destroy the original manuscript catalog cards containing the titles included in such printed volumes and representing the entries made during such intervals. The current catalog of copyright entries and the index volumes herein provided for shall be admitted in any court as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein as regards any copyright registration.

§ 211. Distribution and sale; disposal of proceeds: The said printed current catalogs as they are issued shall be promptly distributed by the copyright office to the collectors of customs of the United States and to the postmasters of all exchange offices of receipt of foreign mails, in accordance with revised lists of such collectors of customs and postmasters prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, and they shall also be furnished in whole or in part to all parties desiring them, at a price to be determined by the Register of Copyrights for each part of the catalog not exceeding $10 for the complete yearly catalog of copyright entries and not exceeding $1 per annum for the catalogs issued during the year for any one class of subjects. The consolidated catalogs and indexes shall also be supplied to all persons ordering them at such prices as may be determined to be reasonable, and all subscriptions for the catalogs shall be received by the Superintendent of Public Documents, who shall forward the said publications; and the moneys thus received shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and accounted for under such laws and Treasury regulations as shall be in force at the time.

§ 212. Records and works deposited in Copyright Office open to public inspection; taking copies of entries: The record books of the copyright office, together with the indexes to such record books, and all works deposited and retained in the copyright office, shall be open to public inspection; and copies may be taken of the copyright entries actually made in such record books, subject to such safeguard and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Register of Copyrights and approved by the Librarian of Congress.

§ 213. Disposition of articles deposited in office: Of the articles deposited in the copyright office under the provisions of the copyright laws of the United States, the Librarian of Congress shall determine what books and other articles shall be transferred to the permanent collections of the Library of Congress, including the law library, and what other books or articles shall be placed in the reserve collections of the Library of Congress for sale or exchange, or be transferred to other governmental libraries in the District of Columbia for use therein.

§ 214. Destruction of articles deposited in office remaining undisposed of; removal of by author or proprietor; manuscripts of unpublished works: Of any articles undisposed of as above provided, together with all titles and correspondence relating thereto, the Librarian of Congress and the Register of Copyrights jointly shall, at suitable intervals, determine what of these received during any period of years it is desirable or useful to preserve in the permanent files of the copyright office, and, after due notice as hereinafter provided, may within their discretion cause the remaining articles and other things to be destroyed: *Provided*, That there shall be printed in the Catalog of Copyright Entries from February to November, inclusive, a statement of the years of receipt of such articles and a notice to permit any author, copyright proprietor, or other lawful claimant to claim and remove before the expiration of the month of December of that year anything found which relates to any of his productions deposited or registered for copyright within the period of years stated, not reserved or disposed of as provided for in this title. No manuscript of an unpublished work shall be destroyed during its term of copyright without specific notice to the copyright proprietor of record, permitting him to claim and remove it.

§ 215. Fees: The Register of Copyrights shall receive, and the persons to whom the services designated are rendered shall pay, the following fees: For the registration of any work subject to copyright, deposited under the provisions of this title, $2, which sum is to include a certificate of registration under seal: *Provided*, That in the case of any unpublished work registered under the provisions of section 12 of this title, the fee for registration with certificate shall be $1, and in the case of a published photograph the fee shall be $1 where a certificate is not desired. For every additional certificate of registration made, $1. For recording and certifying any instrument of writing for the assignment of copyright, or any such license specified in section 1, subsection (e), of this title, or for any copy of such assignment or license, duly certified, $2 for each copyright office record-book page or additional fraction thereof over one-half page. For recording the notice of user or acquiescence specified in section 1, subsection (e), of this title, $1 for each notice of not more than five titles. For comparing any copy of an assignment with the record of such document in the copyright office and certifying the same under seal, $2. For recording the renewal of copyright provided for in section 24 of this title, $1. For recording the transfer of the proprietorship of copyrighted articles, 10 cents for each title of a book or other article, in addition to the fee prescribed for recording the instrument of assignment. For any requested search of copyright office records, indexes, or deposits, $1 for each hour of time consumed in making such search: *Provided*, That only one registration at one fee shall be required in the case of several volumes of the same book deposited at the same time.

SEC. 2. The following sections or parts thereof of the Revised Statutes and Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this Act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 17, United States Code and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal:

REVISED STATUTES AND STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 17, United States Code, section
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, secs. 1, 64, 35 Stat. 1075, 1088	1
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 2, 35 Stat. 1076	2
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 3, 35 Stat. 1076	3
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 4, 35 Stat. 1076	4
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 5, 35 Stat. 1076; Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 356, 37 Stat. 488; July 31, 1939, ch. 396, sec. 2, 53 Stat. 1142	5
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 6, 35 Stat. 1077	6
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, secs. 7, 64, 35 Stat. 1077, 1088	7
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 8, 35 Stat. 1077; Dec. 18, 1919, ch. 11, 41 Stat. 369; Sept. 25, 1941, ch. 421, 55 Stat. 732	8
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 9, 35 Stat. 1077	9
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 10, 35 Stat. 1078	10
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 11, 35 Stat. 1078; Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 356, 37 Stat. 488	11
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 12, 35 Stat. 1078; Mar. 28, 1914, ch. 47, sec. 1, 38 Stat. 311	12
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 13, 35 Stat. 1078	13
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 14, 35 Stat. 1078	14
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 15, 35 Stat. 1078; July 3, 1926, ch. 743, 44 Stat. 818	15
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 16, 35 Stat. 1079	16
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 17, 35 Stat. 1079	17
Acts June 18, 1874, ch. 301, sec. 1, 18 Stat. 78; Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, secs. 18, 64, 35 Stat. 1079, 1088	18
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 19, 35 Stat. 1079	19
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 20, 35 Stat. 1080	20
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 21, 35 Stat. 1080; Dec. 18, 1919, ch. 11, 41 Stat. 369	21
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 22, 35 Stat. 1080	22
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 23, 35 Stat. 1080; Mar. 15, 1940, ch. 57, 54 Stat. 51	23
R. S., sec. 4953; Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, secs. 24, 64, 35 Stat. 1080, 1088	24
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 25, 35 Stat. 1081; Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 356, 37 Stat. 489	25
Act. Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 26, 35 Stat. 1082	26
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 27, 35 Stat. 1082	27
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 28, 35 Stat. 1082	28
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 29, 35 Stat. 1082	29
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 30, 35 Stat. 1082	30
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 31, 35 Stat. 1082	31
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 32, 35 Stat. 1083	32
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 33, 35 Stat. 1083; Apr. 11, 1940, ch. 81, 54 Stat. 106	33
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 34, 35 Stat. 1084; May 17, 1932, ch. 190, 47 Stat. 158; June 25, 1936, ch. 804, 49 Stat. 1921	34
Act Mar 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 35, 35 Stat. 1084	35
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 36, 35 Stat. 1084	36
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 37, 35 Stat. 1084	37
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 38, 35 Stat. 1084	38
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 39, 35 Stat. 1084	39
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 40, 35 Stat. 1084	40
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 41, 35 Stat. 1084	41
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 42, 35 Stat. 1084	42
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 43, 35 Stat. 1084	43

	Title 17, United States Code, section
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 44, 35 Stat. 1084	44
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 45, 35 Stat. 1085	45
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 46, 35 Stat. 1085	46
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 47, 35 Stat. 1085	47
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 48, 35 Stat. 1085; Mar. 4, 1923, ch. 265, sec. 1, 42 Stat. 1483	48
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 49, 35 Stat. 1085	49
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 50, 35 Stat. 1085	50
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 51, 35 Stat. 1085	51
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 52, 35 Stat. 1085	52
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 53, 35 Stat. 1085	53
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 54, 35 Stat. 1086	54
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, secs. 55, 64, 35 Stat. 1086, 1088; Mar. 2, 1913, ch. 97, 37 Stat. 724	55
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 56, 35 Stat. 1086	56
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 57, 35 Stat. 1086; May 23, 1928, ch. 704, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 713	57
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 58, 35 Stat. 1086	58
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 59, 35 Stat. 1087	59
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 60, 35 Stat. 1087	60
Acts Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 61, 35 Stat. 1087; May 23, 1928, ch. 704, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 714	61
Act Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 320, sec. 62, 35 Stat. 1087	62
Act July 31, 1939, ch. 396, sec. 3, 53 Stat. 1142	64
Act July 31, 1939, ch. 396, sec. 4, 53 Stat. 1142	65
Act June 27, 1938, ch. 10, sec. 1 (last proviso), 52 Stat. 6	Title 39, U. S. C., sec. 371 (last proviso)

With the following committee amendments:

Page 21, line 19, strike out "June 3" and insert "June 18";

Page 34, line 9, strike out the comma after "Puerto Rico" and strike out "and the courts of first instance of the Philippine Islands";

Page 34, line 18, strike out "bill in equity" and insert in lieu thereof "complaint";

Page 39, line 22, strike out "March 2, 1913" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1909."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like the bill H. R. 1565, to enact title I of the United States Code into positive law, is intended to enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights." This bill makes no change in existing law. For the reasons which I have stated in connection with the bill H. R. 1565 I recommend that this bill be enacted into positive law by the Congress. It has the endorsement of the Register of Copyrights.

Title 17 of the United States Code as proposed by this bill will contain three chapters: First, registration of copyrights; second, infringement proceedings; and, third, Copyright Office. This is an orderly arrangement of existing law with ample provisions for future amendments without upsetting the proposed section numbering.

What I have said concerning the Ramseyer rule applies to this bill also.

A similar bill passed the House unanimously in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION: Page 41, lines 8 and 9, strike out "and not exceeding $1 per annum for the catalogs issued during the year for any one class of subjects."

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an explanation of this amendment for the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota. Strange to say, in drawing up the report and the bill, by some mistake on the part of the printer, instead of copying the law as it is, they copied the language that had been stricken out or repealed. My amendment strikes out the language that had been repealed.

This amendment merely strikes out the words indicated in lines 8 and 9 on page 41, so that with the adoption of the amendment the language of the bill is the law as it now is.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 9, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2084) to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration," is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "9 U. S. C., § —," as follows:

TITLE 9—ARBITRATION

§ 1. Maritime transactions and commerce defined; exceptions to operation of title.
§ 2. Validity, irrevocability, and enforcement of agreements to arbitrate.
§ 3. Stay of proceedings where issue therein referable to arbitration.
§ 4. Failure to arbitrate under agreement; petition to United States court having jurisdiction for order to compel arbitration; notice and service thereof; hearing and determination.
§ 5. Appointment of arbitrators or umpire.
§ 6. Application heard as motion.
§ 7. Witnesses before arbitrators; fees; compelling attendance.
§ 8. Proceedings begun by libel in admiralty and seizure of vessel or property.
§ 9. Award of arbitrators; confirmation; jurisdiction; procedure.
§ 10. Same; vacation; grounds; rehearing.
§ 11. Same; modification or correction; grounds; order.
§ 12. Notice of motions to vacate or modify; service; stay of proceedings.
§ 13. Papers filed with order on motions; judgment; docketing; force and effect; enforcement.
§ 14. Contracts not affected.

"MARITIME TRANSACTIONS" AND "COMMERCE" DEFINED; EXCEPTIONS TO OPERATION OF TITLE

§ 1. "Maritime transactions," as herein defined, means charter parties, bills of lading of water carriers, agreements relating to wharfage, supplies furnished vessels or repairs to vessels, collisions, or any other matter in foreign commerce which, if the subject of controversy, would be embraced within admiralty jurisdiction; "commerce," as herein defined, means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation, but nothing herein contained shall apply to contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce.

VALIDITY, IRREVOCABILITY, AND ENFORCEMENT OF AGREEMENTS TO ARBITRATE

§ 2. A written provision in any maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction, or the refusal to perform the whole or any part thereof, or an agreement in writing to submit to arbitration an existing controversy arising out of such a contract, transaction, or refusal, shall be valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS WHERE ISSUE THEREIN REFERABLE TO ARBITRATION

§ 3. If any suit or proceeding be brought in any of the courts of the United States upon any issue referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing for such arbitration, the court in which such suit is pending, upon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or proceeding is referable to arbitration under such an agreement, shall on application of one of the parties stay the trial of the action until such arbitration has been had in accordance with the terms of the agreement, providing the applicant for the stay is not in default in proceeding with such arbitration.

FAILURE TO ARBITRATE UNDER AGREEMENT; PETITION TO UNITED STATES COURT HAVING JURISDICTION FOR ORDER TO COMPEL ARBITRATION; NOTICE AND SERVICE THEREOF; HEARING AND DETERMINATION

§ 4. A party aggrieved by the alleged failure, neglect, or refusal of another to arbitrate under a written agreement for arbitration may petition any court of the United States which, save for such agreement, would have jurisdiction under the judicial code at law, in equity, or in admiralty of the subject matter of a suit arising out of the controversy between the parties, for an order directing that such arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement. Five days' notice in writing of such application shall be served upon the party in default. Service thereof shall be made in the manner provided by law for the service of summons in the jurisdiction in which the proceeding is brought. The court shall hear the parties, and upon being satisfied that the making of the agreement for arbitration or the failure to comply therewith is not in issue, the court shall make an order directing the parties to proceed to arbitration in accordance with the terms of the agreement. The hearing and proceedings, under such agreement, shall be within the district in which the petition for an order directing such arbitration is filed. If the making of the arbitration agreement or the failure, neglect, or refusal to perform the same be in issue, the court shall proceed summarily to the trial thereof. If no jury trial be demanded by the party alleged to be in default, or if the matter in dispute is within admiralty jurisdiction, the court shall hear and determine such issue. Where such an issue is raised, the party alleged to be in default may, except in cases of admiralty, on or before the return day of the notice of application, demand a jury trial of such issue, and upon such demand the court shall mak an order referring the issue or issues to a jury in the manner provided by law for referring to a jury issues in an equity action, or may specially call a

jury for that purpose. If the jury find that no agreement in writing for arbitration was made or that there is no default in proceeding thereunder the proceeding shall be dismissed. If the jury find that an agreement for arbitration was made in writing and that there is a default in proceeding thereunder, the court shall make an order summarily directing the parties to proceed with the arbitration in accordance with the terms thereof.

APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATORS OR UMPIRE

§ 5. If in the agreement provision be made for a method of naming or appointing an arbitrator or arbitrators or an umpire, such method shall be followed; but if no method be provided therein, or if a method be provided and any party thereto shall fail to avail himself of such method or if for any other reason there shall be a lapse in the naming of an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, or in filling a vacancy, then upon the application of either party to the controversy the court shall designate and appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, as the case may require, who shall act under the said agreement with the same force and effect as if he or they had been specifically named therein; and unless otherwise provided in the agreement the arbitration shall be by a single arbitrator.

APPLICATION HEARD AS MOTION

§ 6. Any application to the court hereunder shall be made and heard in the manner provided by law for the making and hearing of motions, except as otherwise herein expressly provided.

WITNESSES BEFORE ARBITRATORS; FEES; COMPELLING ATTENDANCE

§ 7. The arbitrators selected either as prescribed in this title or otherwise, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them or any of them as a witness and in a proper case to bring with him or them any book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case. The fees for such attendance shall be the same as the fees of witnesses before masters of the United States courts. Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpenas to appear and testify before the court; if any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States court in and for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided on February 12, 1925, for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.

PROCEEDINGS BEGUN BY LIBEL IN ADMIRALTY AND SEIZURE OF VESSEL OR PROPERTY

§8. If the basis of jurisdiction be a cause of action otherwise justiciable in admiralty, then, notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the party claiming to be aggrieved may begin his proceeding hereunder by libel and seizure of the vessel or other property of the other party according to the usual course of admiralty proceedings, and the court shall then have jurisdiction to direct the parties to proceed with the arbitration and shall retain jurisdiction to enter its decree upon the award.

AWARD OF ARBITRATORS; CONFIRMATION; JURISDICTION; PROCEDURE

§ 9. If the parties in their agreement have agreed that a judgment of the court shall be entered upon the award made pursuant to the arbitration, and shall specify the court, then at any time within 1 year after the award is made any party to the arbitration may apply to the court so specified for an order confirming the award, and thereupon the court must grant such an order unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected as prescribed in sections 10 and 11 of this title. If no court is specified in the agreement of the parties, then such application may be made to the United States court in and for the district within which such award was made. Notice of the application shall be served upon the adverse party, and thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of such party as though he had appeared generally in the proceeding. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident, then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court.

SAME; VACATION; GROUNDS; REHEARING

§ 10. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order vacating the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

(a) Where the award was procured by corruption, fraud, or undue means.

(b) Where there was evident partiality or corruption in the arbitrators, or either of them.

(c) Where the arbitrators were guilty of misconduct in refusing to postpone the hearing, upon sufficient cause shown, or in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy; or of any other misbehavior by which the rights of any party have been prejudiced.

(d) Where the arbitrators exceeded their powers, or so imperfectly executed them that a mutual, final, and definite award upon the subject matter submitted was not made.

(e) Where an award is vacated and the time within which the agreement required the award to be made has not expired the court may, in its discretion, direct a rehearing by the arbitrators.

SAME; MODIFICATION OR CORRECTION; GROUNDS; ORDER

§ 11. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order modifying or correcting the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

(a) Where there was an evident material miscalculation of figures or an evident material mistake in the description of any person, thing, or property referred to in the award.

(b) Where the arbitrators have awarded upon a matter not submitted to them, unless it is a matter not affecting the merits of the decision upon the matter submitted.

(c) Where the award is imperfect in matter of form not affecting the merits of the controversy.

The order may modify and correct the award, so as to effect the intent thereof and promote justice between the parties.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO VACATE OR MODIFY; SERVICE; STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

§ 12. Notice of a motion to vacate, modify, or correct an award must be served upon the adverse party or his attorney within 3 months after the award is filed or delivered. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court. For the purposes of the motion any judge who might make an order to stay the proceedings in an action brought in the same court may make an order, to be served with the notice of motion, staying the proceedings of the adverse party to enforce the award.

PAPERS FILED WITH ORDER ON MOTIONS; JUDGMENT; DOCKETING; FORCE AND EFFECT; ENFORCEMENT

§ 13. The party moving for an order confirming, modifying, or correcting an award shall, at the time such order is filed with the clerk for the entry of judgment thereon, also file the following papers with the clerk:

(a) The agreement; the selection or appointment, if any, of an additional arbitrator or umpire; and each written extension of the time, if any, within which to make the award.

(b) The award.

(c) Each notice, affidavit, or other paper used upon an application to confirm, modify, or correct the award, and a copy of each order of the court upon such an application.

The judgment shall be docketed as if it was rendered in an action.

The judgment so entered shall have the same force and effect, in all respects, as, and be subject to all the provisions of law relating to, a judgment in an action; and it may be enforced as if it had been rendered in an action in the court in which it is entered.

CONTRACTS NOT AFFECTED

§ 14. This title shall not apply to contracts made prior to January 1, 1926.

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 9, United States Code and supplements thereto as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 9, United States Code, section
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 1, 43 Stat. 883	1
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 2, 43 Stat. 883	2
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 3, 43 Stat. 883	3
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 4, 43 Stat. 883	4
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 5, 43 Stat. 884	5
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 6, 43 Stat. 884	6
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 7, 43 Stat. 884	7
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 8, 43 Stat. 884	8
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 9, 43 Stat. 885	9
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 10, 43 Stat. 885	10
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 11, 43 Stat. 885	11
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 12, 43 Stat. 885	12
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 13, 43 Stat. 886	13
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 14, 43 Stat. 886	14
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 15, 43 Stat. 886	15

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like the bill H. R. 1565, to enact title I of the United States Code into positive law, is intended to enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration." This bill makes no change in existing law. For the reasons which I have stated in connection with the bill H. R. 1565, I recommend that this bill be enacted into positive law by the Congress.

Title 9 of the United States Code as proposed by this bill will contain an orderly arrangement of existing law on arbitration with ample provisions for future amendments without upsetting the proposed section numbering.

What I have said concerning the Ramseyer rule applies to this bill also.

A similar bill passed the House unanimously in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING ERROR IN NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2237) to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (58 Stat. 745; U. S. C., Supp. 742 (b) (8)), is amended by striking out "maximum fee of 50 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "minimum fee of 50 cents."

With the following committee amendment:

On line 5, page 1, strike out all after the word "amended", and insert "to read as follows:

"(8) Reasonable fees, with the approval of the Attorney General, in cases where such fees have not been established by law, to cover the cost of furnishing copies, whether certified or uncertified, of any part of the records, or information from the records, of the Service. Such fees shall not exceed a maximum of 25 cents per folio, with a minimum fee of 50 cents for any one such service, in addition to a fee of $1 for any official certification furnished under seal. No such fee shall be required from officers or agencies of the United States or of any State or any subdivision thereof, for such copies or information furnished for official use in connection with the official duties of such officers or agencies."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2238) to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill of the Senate (S. 460) be substituted in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I, subchapter III, section 327, subsection (h), of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1151; 8 U. S. S. 727 (h)), be and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 327. (h) The officers in charge of property owned or leased by the Government are authorized, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General, to provide quarters, without payment of rent, in any building occupied by the Service, for a photographic studio, operated by welfare organizations without profit and solely for the benefit of persons seeking to comply with requirements under the immigration and nationality laws. Such studio shall be under the supervision of the Commissioner."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2238) was laid on the table.

ARTHUR ALEXANDER POST, NO. 68, AMERICAN LEGION, BELZONI, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1412) to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in the lands and improvements comprising the site of lock and dam No. 1 on the Big Sunflower River, Miss., conveyed to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., pursuant to act of Congress, approved June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1230), is hereby relinquished and granted to said Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, which is hereby authorized to sell, convey, and alienate such property subject only to the perpetual right of the United States of American to flood such part of such land as may be necessary from time to time in the interest of flood control or navigation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 317 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1147; 8 U. S. C. 717) is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any person who lost citizenship in the United States by reason of entering or serving in the armed forces of any country while such country was at war with the United States."

SEC. 2. That section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1147; 8 U. S. C. 323) is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: "Such person shall have, from and after the taking of the oath provided for in this section, the same citizenship status as that which existed prior to its loss."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "following", add "sentence at the end of paragraph 1."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF FISCAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2076) to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 273, an identical bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, the monthly or quarterly accounts of any disbursing, accountable, or certifying officer of the Government shall be settled by the General Accounting Office within a period of not to exceed 3 years from the date of the receipt of the account by the General Accounting Office. A copy of the certificate of settlement in each case shall be sent to the officer involved and such settlement shall be final and conclusive on the General Accounting Office after the expiration of 3 years from the date of receipt of the account to the extent that no further charges or debts shall be raised in such account thereafter except as to moneys which have been or may be lost to the United States due to fraud or criminality on the part of said officer: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit recovery from any payee of public moneys illegally or erroneously paid to such payee or to preclude the recovery from the disbursing, accountable, or certifying officer or his surety of any balance found due the Government under a settlement made within the period of 3 years as herein provided: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deprive any such officer of his right at any time to clear his accounts of questioned items in accordance with the provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That the period of limitation above prescribed shall be regarded as suspended for the duration of any future war in which the United States may be engaged.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2076) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 174) to amend section 26, title I, chapter I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588).

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PATENTING OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF MONTANA (HILL COUNTY, MONT.)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public park purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, upon payment of a price set by him through appraisal or otherwise, to convey by patent to the State of Montana or to the Board of

County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., the following-described public lands located in Hill County, Mont.: South half south half section 23, east half southeast quarter section 25, southeast quarter southeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter, west half northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, northwest quarter northwest quarter section 26, township 31 north, range 15 east; west half, northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 4, east half southeast quarter section 5, east half northeast quarter section 8, south half, northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter section 9, all sections 16 and 21, northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter section 22, all sections 28 and 33, west half section 34, township 29 north, range 16 east; all section 5, northeast quarter section 6, east half, east half west half section 8, west half west half section 9, west half section 16, east half, east half northwest quarter section 17, east half east half section 20, west half, west half east half section 21, southeast quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter, north half south half, north half section 28, south half south half, northeast quarter southeast quarter, east half northeast quarter section 33, township 30 north, range 16 east; south half, northwest quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter section 31, southwest quarter section 32, township 31 north, range 16 east, principal meridian, Montana, containing nine thousand two hundred and fifty-three and forty-eight one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That payment for the lands may be made in equal annual installments over a period of not to exceed 10 years, the payment of the second and subsequent installments to be due on the corresponding anniversary dates of the first payment made under this act: *Provided further*, That interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum shall also be paid for the period for which an installment which has become due continues in default: *And provided further*, That no patent shall issue until all payments have been made, but until patent issues the Department of the Interior by a use permit may authorize the use of the lands for park or recreational purposes.

SEC. 2. The paten conveying the lands described in the first section of this act shall provide (1) that the lands shall be used for park and recreational purposes; (2) that all minerals, including oil and gas, shall be reserved to the United States together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and (3) that title to the lands shall revert to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that for a period of five consecutive years the land has not been used for park or recreational purposes, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to other use.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 12, strike out "(1) that the lands shall be used for park and recreational purposes; (2)."

Page 3, line 17, strike out the semicolon and the balance of the line and all of lines 18 to 22, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2573) to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have this bill explained?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. The Department informs us that there are so many requests coming in now for copies of photographs, prints, and so forth, that they feel they should be authorized to sell some of these to the public. The Department states that new and modern developments in the art of photography have resulted in an ever-increasing number of requests upon the Geological Survey for photographs. Under its existing authority, the Survey can supply prints only at the expense of serious inroads upon the funds set up for its regular functions. Our committee believes the Survey should be authorized to respond adequately and without handicap to its regular functions by permitting the returns received from the copies of photographs during the fiscal year to be credited to the annual appropriations and the committee urges enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is the point. It seems to me this merely results in a device to increase the amount of appropriated funds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; it is not. If we desire that this service be withheld from the public, then we simply serve notice on the Department of the Interior not to use its regular departmental supplies for that purpose. It is a question of rendering a service to the public and permitting the Department to use the funds it obtains from the sale of the photographic supplies to purchase same.

Mr. MACKINNON. Where do those funds go now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Into the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. MACKINNON. And they are appropriated out?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. This would be a revolving fund then, hence supplemental to their original appropriations?

Mr. CRAWFORD. To give service to the public; yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Most departments do not operate that way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That may be true, but suppose the Department simply says, "We will not use our supplies, we will keep them for departmental use strictly," then that deprives the public from having the service. It is simply a question whether or not you want the public to have the service; that is all.

Mr. MACKINNON. I notice in the report it is stated that there is a precedent for this legislation, inasmuch as the Department of Agriculture has the same authority. Is that the only other Department in the Federal Government that has similar authority?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We buy photostatic copies of patents from the General Land Office and we pay for them. That is somewhat similar.

Mr. MACKINNON. It may be somewhat similar but it is not the same. That money goes to the Treasury. Do you know whether it goes into the general fund or is the Patent Office permitted to use that without any question, or does it operate to reduce the regular appropriations?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know where it goes. I pay 40 cents for a photostat copy of a patent, which goes to the General Land Office.

Mr. MACKINNON. You could gather from the report here that the only proper precedent in our entire Government is the Department of Agriculture, one instance, and I think before we adopt this we ought to have some assurances as to how this would apply generally with respect to our appropriations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think this is a necessary service to the people who are willing to pay for it. Whether it goes into the Department or into the Treasury, the people should have the service.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes; I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly in that respect. I like the service very much myself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, I think the gentleman is informed of the fact that since the war began the photographic supplies have been greatly in short supply. Here is a case where we will assume, for instance, the gentleman is the head of a department. He is having serious trouble in getting his supplies to run his department, we will say; not to serve the public, but to run his department; strictly departmental details. If the trouble of obtaining supplies is further increased, I should think the disposition would be to prevent the public from obtaining the service or the supplies, and it is simply a question of whether or not we want to facilitate the department in rendering this service to the public on the basis of public demand.

Mr. MACKINNON. Does the gentleman know how much is involved? Could the gentleman from Michigan give the House any estimate as to the amount of money that might be involved in this?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The amount of money involved depends on what the public demands in the way of service. If I am running a grocery store, I cannot tell you how many dollars I may need to buy groceries with, unless I know what the demands of my customers are.

Mr. MACKINNON. We should have some estimate; does the gentleman not think so?

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand, these are now being furnished, but furnished free in many cases, whereas this

is to permit them to be paid for; is that not right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not understand they are being furnished free. If the gentleman will refer to page 28 of the bill he will find this language on lines 13 to 18, "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies or reproductions as herein authorized."

So I do not think there is any possible way that the department can unnecessarily spend funds.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It would be impossible for the public to get these if we do not pass a law of this kind, because the head of the department is not going to risk his funds to prepare with what he has got, to give stuff away, and the public cannot avail itself of these prints unless they do something like this.

Mr. MACKINNON. I cannot agree to that conclusion at all. If you will read the bill, the present law is quite clear in requiring the Geological Survey to furnish this material. It says:

The Director of the Geological Survey shall hereafter furnish to any person, concern, or institution, in the interest of education and the dissemination of knowledge, that shall pay in advance the whole cost of material and services thereof, copies of any photographs or lantern slides in the possession of the United States Geological Survey; and the moneys received by the Director for the same shall be deposited in the United States Treasury.

The only thing that I can see that this bill does that is not done now is to take the funds out of the Treasury and put them into the hands of the Department of Agriculture. Is that not a correct interpretation of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman just read from the bill is the existing law.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. If he will read down farther he will see that this bill carries a reservation that the proceeds of the sale of these maps and photographs, and so forth, are deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the current appropriation of that geological service.

Mr. MACKINNON. And that is the only difference the bill proposes to make in existing law; in other words, they can do everything they want to do now except that the funds are paid into the Treasury instead of being paid into the Treasury in such a way that the Department of the Interior can get their hands on them without going to the Committee on Appropriations. If this is an incorrect interpretation of the bill, I do not understand the English language, and I would like some person to correct me if that is not correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Committee on Appropriations is traditionally opposed to the creation of revolving funds, and if that is correct, being a revolving fund in the ordinary sense, certainly I would be objecting to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman is speaking to the point of my inquiry. Does the gentleman think it does create a revolving fund?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it does not. I think there is a distinct difference here and that is that the funds are to be credited to the current appropriation. This means that at the end of the year any of those funds which have accumulated and have not been expended will lapse and be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. In other words, all this does is say that if the appropriations that are made to the department are not sufficient to cover the disbursements for the reproduction of these mosaics or whatever they may be, someone wanting them may deposit the money to pay for them, that money will go into that particular fund and, at the end of the year, if not expended, the balance will go back into the Treasury. I think it does not create a revolving fund because they are credited to the appropriation then current. That means they would lapse at the end of the year if not used.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman very much for his explanation. That is exactly the information I wanted and which I am sure the House wanted as several Members had discussed that phase of the bill with me.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 945, 989; 43 U. S. C., sec. 45), reading "The Director of the Geological Survey shall hereafter furnish to any person, concern, or institution, in the interest of education and the dissemination of knowledge, that shall pay in advance the whole cost of material and services thereof, copies of any photographs or lantern slides in the possession of the United States Geological Survey; and the moneys received by the Director for the same shall be deposited in the United States Treasury" is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Director of the United States Geological Survey hereafter may produce and sell on a reimbursable basis to interested persons, concerns, and institutions, copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics that have been obtained in connection with the authorized work of the United States Geological Survey and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records in the official custody of the Director at such prices (not less than the estimated cost of furnishing such copies or reproductions) as the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies or reproductions as herein authorized."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD'S WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota inform the House why we should make this gift to the WCTU, in spite of the fact that the State Department, in its letter of March 5, 1947, states, "The granting of the proposed assistance in this case might serve as an undesirable precedent for the granting of similar assistance to many other nongovernmental organizations that would be holding meetings from time to time in this country"?

Mr. JUDD. The sentence the gentleman has read is the same language that appeared in the report of the State Department on an exactly similar bill that the House passed by unanimous consent in 1936. The precedent was established in 1914, $40,000 was appropriated toward the expenses of entertaining the delegates from abroad to the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union convention held in this country then. In 1936 $10,000 was appropriated for the same purpose, and that identical sentence—it is a standard sentence—was put in by the Bureau of the Budget, and the House passed the bill just the same. So this does not establish a precedent. If it does anything with precedent, it follows precedent.

One of the reasons I favor the passage of this bill is that the World's WCTU is one of the few organizations working effectively in the international field on the problems of reducing the opium traffic and the white-slave traffic, and fighting the exploitation of children, child marriage, child labor, even child slavery in many parts of the world. Constructively it works for education, peace, public health, anything bettering the condition of women and children around the globe. It represents women in 55 countries. For example, I am told that in Palestine it is about the only organization in which Jews, Arabs, and Christians all cooperate. There will be coming to this convention leading women, outstanding women from countries in South America, Africa, Europe, and Asia—Mohammedan countries and Buddhist countries, as well as Christian countries.

Last Friday we authorized the appropriation of $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey because we thought the United States had a vital interest in developing good relations with people in the Middle East—that is 80,000 times as much as this bill authorizes for the same general purpose of promoting good relations.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs after having carefully gone over the prob-

lem the gentleman raised of its being a possible precedent, reported it out because it thought this an insignificant sum to contribute for extending hospitality and helping with the expenses, travel, entertainment, and so forth, of these women who will be coming from countries all around the world. The amount this time is $5,000 instead of $10,000, as in 1936, because then the convention was held here in Washington and they had to pay $5,000 for the use of Constitution Hall. This year it is being held up in the gentleman's State of New Jersey, at Asbury Park or Ocean Grove, and they do not have to pay for a hall.

The primary objective of the bill is to build good relations by extending to the guests of this country the same sort of hospitality that our own delegates have received from other countries when the convention was held abroad.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman feels that conventions of this sort have to be looked into each time rather carefully to see whether or not such appropriations are justified?

Mr. JUDD. Absolutely. I certainly would not vote for one I did not feel was justified. I am sure a bill will be coming along soon for entertaining the Olympics, if they are held in this country. I will not object, and I do not believe anyone else will, to a contribution by the United States as the host country for the purpose of building better bodies and better relations between people interested in athletics. Periodically, once every 10, 15, or 20 years, one of the triennial conventions of the World's Woman's Christain Temperance Union is held in the United States. This is the first one since before the war. It is to bring together women interested in building better bodies and to promote understanding and friendly relations.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth triennial convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947, such sum to be expended for such purposes and under such regulations as the Secretary of State shall prescribe and without regard to any other provision of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE DAN RIVER IN NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 64) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a low dam across Dan River at a point in Rockingham County, N. C., near Leaksville, and about 91 miles above the mouth of said river at Clarksville, Va., for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam electric plant: *Provided*, That work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to deviate from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That in approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States: *And provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy: *And provided further*, That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Philpott Reservoir or of the proposed dam across Dan River at Schoolfield, Va., as proposed in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved for construction in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other Federal project: *And provided further*, That the grantee shall, at the direction of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, reconstruct or relocate the existing stream-gaging facility owned by the United States Geological Survey and situated on the Dan River in the vicinity of Leaksville, N. C.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL POST ROADS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1874) to amend the bill entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker I reserve the right to object in order that some member of the Committee on Public Works may explain the bill for the information of the Members of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I call upon the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], as a member of that committee and also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads to explain the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so. The Seventy-eighth Congress passed Public Law 521, now known as the 1944 Postwar Federal Highway Act. That act provided for the furnishing by the Federal Government for each of three postwar fiscal years the sum of $500,000,000 per year to be matched by the States on a 50–50 basis for each year. This money is allocated to each year. This money is allocated to the States on the formula of 50 percent according to population, 25 percent according to area, and 25 percent according to post road mileage. The act also provided that it should not go into effect until the first year following the termination of the war. Following the end of the war with Japan in the autumn of 1945, your Congress passed another act which stated that for the purposes of this act only the war was considered terminated that year.

Therefore, the first fiscal year, so far as this bill is concerned, would end on June 30, 1946. This means then that the first year of the act is 1945 to 1946, the second year 1946 to 1947, and on July 1 of this year we will go into the third year of the act. In 1944 the Committee on Roads of the House and the Congress recognized that there might be a shortage of material and labor and that the price situation might retard the development of roads immediately following the war and that some additional time might be necessary. So subdivision (d) of section 4 of the act provides that any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 1 year after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized. In other words, there was a 12-month grace period allowed to each State to use up the money for the respective fiscal year. There was another reason why that was done, because the legislators had not met and we did not know exactly when they would meet. They had to pass laws to provide for the funds for the matching of the Federal contribution before they could use the Federal funds. The net result of the whole thing is that we are now nearing the commencement of the third year. Much of the work that should have been done the first year has not been completed because there was more trouble in getting material, equipment, and labor than was anticipated, and prices also are quite high.

The program has been slowed up by a number of the States. This bill simply extends the grace period another 12 months by giving one additional year for the States to take advantage of each year's appropriation before the money will lapse or come back into the Federal Treasury.

Hearings were held on the bill. The secretary of the American Road Builders' Association and also representatives of the Contractors' Road Builders' Association testified in favor of the bill. The American Association of State Highway Officials representing the State highway department of each of the 48 States spoke in favor of the bill. The representatives of the rural letter carriers and rural mail carriers spoke favorably for the bill, primarily because this Postwar Highway Act of 1944 has a specific

amount each year for the development of farm-to-market roads. The Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, spoke in favor of the bill. General Fleming, Commissioner of Public Works, favored the bill. No one appeared in opposition to the bill. It was reported unanimously by the Public Works Committee. Three identical bills have been introduced in the other body by three different Senators. The President recommended the passage of such measure in his message to the Congress on January 3 of this year. This bill will not require a single dollar of appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the extension apply to the farm-to-market roads as well as to the primary system?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It certainly does, as well as the development of the highways in the urban areas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill is very much in order for two reasons. One is that the time when the Japanese war expired, creating the resolution which the gentleman has referred to before, came along in the fall, which gave the States a short year the first year.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. No States started building highways prior to October of 1945. They lost 4 months to start with. Then, there was a lack of material and shortage of labor and high prices, which caused the program to be held up. The whole program will be retarded and the States will lose some of this appropriation and there will be tremendous waste if this bill is not enacted. Possibly 12 months' grace period is not sufficient, but if it is not sufficient we can bring up another bill later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I remember correctly prior to this authorization the old Federal-aid authorization gave the States 2 years in which to act.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to state at this time that in my opinion this is very necessary legislation. As a previous member of the Committee on Roads, I would like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this bill up at this time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has already covered the ground, but is it not a fact that because of the conditions enumerated by the gentleman, many of the States have been unable to comply with the provisions of this act, which makes this bill mandatory in order to protect the States?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is absolutely true. In addition, there would be tremendous waste, because the highway program would be stopped, and highways partly completed would be left in status quo until the Congress took some additional action.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as one of the members of this committee, I had an opportunity to study this bill very carefully. The people in my particular area in the Northwest are very, very much in sympathy with this bill. I think what the chairman has said and what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has said is absolutely true, that this bill is essential for our road-building program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (d) of section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, Public Law 521, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 20, 1944, is hereby amended by striking out the term "one year" where it appears in said paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the term "two years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill the second time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 434, line 11, after the word "of", strike out "three" and insert "five."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment you have just heard reported would have the effect, if adopted, of increasing the membership of the parole board from three to five.

At the last session of the Congress one of the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, in studying the legislation which we hoped might have the effect of cutting down the criminal rate in this country, found a perfectly appalling situation in the parole board. That board of three members actually interviews upward of 10,000 prisoners each year. That is, personal interviews. In addition to that, they have to review the cases acted on after personal interviews.

There are 21 criminal institutions in the United States that must be visited by this Board at regular intervals. So they have a perfectly impossible job with the result that men are paroled according to formula who should be compelled to serve their full sentence. I am not thinking about those men who are eligible for parole and in whose cases no action can be taken because the Board has not the time to reach their cases; that is bad enough, but, significantly enough, over 50 percent of the criminals in the Federal institutions are repeaters. It seems to me that the least we can do is to make it possible or probable for a Board intelligently to pass on applications for parole in order to determine whether or not men should be released from their incarceration.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the gentleman's amendment change existing law?

Mr. WALTER. It does not change existing law at all.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. If it does not change existing law, and this bill is designed to codify existing law, what is the necessity of offering the amendment?

Mr. WALTER. It changes existing law in that it changes the number of members on the Board. It does not, however, in any way affect the purpose of the law establishing the parole system; it merely changes the number of members of the Board. This is not different from what has been done by this committee in this very bill. The period of sentence has been changed in order to make different crimes fit the sentences that have been fixed by Congress from time to time. That is done throughout this entire title 28.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand the gentleman's amendment it increases the number of members from three to five.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. But it does not increase the rate of compensation of the members.

Mr. WALTER. That is right, exactly.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. I may say this to the gentleman, this matter came up before our Judiciary Committee and former Senator George Wharton Pepper, who is tremendously interested in this subject, and others felt they had to have additional authorization to increase the number from three to five. Otherwise we are not amending the law. I think there is no objection to it. We have a bill which can be called up to do this thing.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman is correct, but we are this far. I do not think there is any doubt but that the Judiciary Committee would unanimously approve a separate bill, but we have gotten this far with this legislation and it certainly seems to me the situation is so critical that we ought to act as quickly as we possibly can. That is the reason I have offered this amendment at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, this bill differs from the five codification bills which have preceded it on this calendar in that it constitutes a revision, as well as a codification, of the Federal laws

relating to crimes and criminal procedure.

A bill similar to this passed the House unanimously in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress but was not acted upon in the other body. I believe that I should make a brief statement explaining the method of drafting the bill and its scope.

The work on this revision was commenced under the supervision of the former Committee on Revision of the Laws in 1944. That committee engaged the services of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co., two law-publishing companies that have assisted in the preparation of the original United States Code and every supplement and new edition of that code. These companies have worked continuously and closely with the Committee on Revision of the Laws and, since the beginning of this Congress, with the Committee on the Judiciary, and counsel for the committees. In turn, the companies supplemented their regular editorial staffs by engaging the services of a reviser who was long familiar with the operation and administration of these laws. In addition they assembled an outstanding group of men as an advisory committee who labored unselfishly toward achieving the best revision of the criminal laws. A number of these men—members of the bench and bar of the country—appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and testified that in their opinion this bill is eminently worthy of favorable action by the Congress. The Department of Justice also designated a representative of the Criminal Division to cooperate in the preparation of this revision.

Several preliminary drafts of the revision were studied most carefully, word for word and line for line, by these various groups, culminating in the bill now up for consideration.

At the last Congress the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, through its chairman, appeared before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, in a number of sessions, pointed out and explained every change in substantive law made by the bill which had been reported by that committee. After full discussion the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously endorsed the then pending bill, which is similar to the bill before us today, and that bill was passed unanimously by the House on July 16, 1946, in the closing days of the session. The bill had received the endorsement of the Department of Justice and the Section on Criminal Law of the American Bar Association. I believe that I am not engaging in overstatement when I say that no bill of this magnitude ever came to the House with such a background of careful and painstaking preparation and critical appraisal by so many leaders in this branch of the law.

So much for the method of preparation—and I want to express our appreciation to the learned members of the bench and bar who contributed so much of their talent and time toward this work.

Now as to the scope of the bill.

This bill is a restatement of the Federal laws relating to crimes and criminal procedure in effect on April 15, 1947. Most of these laws are now set forth in title 18 of the United States Code and are based upon the 1909 Criminal Code—which was the last revision of criminal laws enacted by the Congress—and subsequent laws on the subject. Of course, title 18 of the United States Code is only prima facie evidence of the law which is contained in numerous volumes of the Statutes at Large. Upon the enactment of this bill it will no longer be necessary to have recourse to those numerous volumes. All the law will be set out in one place and amendments in the future will be facilitated because of the orderly arrangement of the laws within one title.

Just a year ago with the adoption of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure many statutes became obsolete or superseded, but, of course, were not specifically repealed. These together with other obsolete, superseded, redundant, and repetitious statutes are repealed by this bill, and the effect of the rules is clearly set forth in the revision.

The law is restated in simple, clear, and concise language. Many sections of existing statutes are consolidated to facilitate finding the law. The advantages of codes are too well known to require any lengthy exposition on my part at this time.

You will find no radical changes in the philosophy of our criminal law in this bill. There is no attempt made here to coddle criminals and wrongdoers. Nor is this bill a subject of partisanship. Its predecessor which passed the House unanimously in the Seventy-ninth Congress had been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Revision of the Laws and had received the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill has also been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Favorable action by the House today will constitute a big step toward an orderly and systematic code of laws and will prove a boon to the bench and bar and the public generally.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment only for the purpose of suggesting that to some extent the gentleman's amendment is in violation of the understanding on which these bills were submitted to the House for passage today. It was understood that they were simply codifications of existing law and undertook to make no changes in existing law.

I understand that probably the gentleman's amendment has considerable merit, and I see several members of the Committee on the Judiciary on the floor. I certainly am not in a position and have no desire to raise any criticism of procedure or objection to it, but it does seem to be a violation of the understanding under which these bills were submitted.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. I pointed out when I made my statement with reference to the first five bills that we considered, that they were purely a codification. But there are some changes in this bill (H. R. 3198), I mean, for instance, when we were considering this bill the Philippine Islands were a part of the United States. We had many laws applicable to the Philippine Islands when she was a part of the United States that are no longer in force because the Philippines are no longer a part of the United States. Those laws we cut out.

We also found going through criminal law with the Department of Justice, the bar association, and the representatives of the Federal courts that Congress has passed many acts almost identical. In some of them the penalty was fixed at 5 years and in others, fixed at 6 months. We thought it wise to clarify and harmonize these.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, so long as these distinguished gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee are satisfied with this procedure and with this bill, I shall not use the time of the House further.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the committee report which I wish the Members would look at carefully. Where there is any indication of change every one of these questions is fully explained in the report. If we start to amend now we are liable to get into trouble. I favor the bill suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania but I hope it will not be interjected here because it will upset the procedure which must be followed if we ever hope to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the report accompanying this bill to which he has referred?

Mr. MICHENER. No; it is not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 38, noes 6.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report to his constituents.

REVISION OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill H. R. 3214 deals with the judiciary and judicial procedure and I wish to call attention merely to one part of it. That is the part

which deals with The Tax Court of the United States. I do this at the specific request and direction of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire if it is the gentleman's intention to object to the passage of the bill in view of the question which he has raised?

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will give me just 1 minute I expect to have it passed over.

Mr. COLE of New York. Why not do it now?

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. Is not what the gentleman is driving at permitting persons other than lawyers to practice?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I have no reference to that at all. This bill establishes a new court, called the United States Tax Court, and it is given all the jurisdiction and powers vested in the Tax Court of the United States. But nowhere is it stated expressly that the new court is the successor of the existing agency. What will be the status of the present judges of the Tax Court is not determined. What will be the status of the cases pending before it is not determined. In addition to that, it provides that this administrative agency becomes a part of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. In reply to the observations that the gentleman has made, this does not change the functions of the Tax Court in the least. It does not change the procedure in the least. It simply makes it a court. Whereas we call it a court, it has been in the administrative branch of the Government, and we now put it in the judiciary branch of the Government which, it seems to me, is highly desirable.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think that matter has been studied sufficiently.

Mr. GOSSETT. Oh, yes; it has.

Mr. CURTIS. And I do not agree to the proposition that it makes no changes. It makes a lot of changes.

Mr. GOSSETT. The matter has been studied by a very distinguished committee of the bar and the bench. The Treasury has studied it, the Justice Department has studied it, our committee has studied it, and it has been studied backward and forward by everybody in the land almost who has any interest in the matter. Another thing, as a purely administrative agency, your taxpayer who may be aggrieved lacks certain rights of appeal which this bill gives.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood the gentleman to say it did not make any changes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Well, it does not make any change in the procedure except it makes it a court of record.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

MARKETING OF ECONOMIC POISONS AND DEVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1237) to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when I first saw this bill it was my judgment that it was of such a nature and volume that it should be obliged to lie over for a while so that the Members could have an opportunity to study it and the public generally understand its provisions. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] assures me that the bill is very important, and although there are several other bills still on the Consent Calendar to be called, some of which are deserving of further explanation, I will not ask to have it passed over at this time if the gentleman from Minnesota can give us any assuring explanation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It is a highly technical bill, and for the protection of the public. The bill proposes to replace and expand the Insecticide Act of 1910; in other words, to bring the present insecticide law down to date so that the Federal Government can have some jurisdiction over many new insecticides that have been perfected during the past few years.

I will make a brief explanation of the bill. The Insecticide Act of 1910 was enacted at a time when insecticides and fungicides were comparatively simple, consisting largely of paris green, pyrethrum, bordeaux mixture, and similar materials. Rodenticides and herbicides were not then marketed to any great extent.

Since 1910 great changes have occurred in the field of economic poisons, and the present law is now inadequate. New plant materials and synthetic chemicals developed through research by both private industry and the Government have greatly increased the number of economic poisons and the scope of their usefulness. An important example at the present time is DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane), which is revolutionizing many phases of the insecticide industry. Herbicides are becoming increasingly important in the control and eradication of weeds as the result of the recent development of 2-4-dichloro-phenoxy-acetic acid and other synthetic materials.

This bill embraces, in addition to insecticides and fungicides, rodenticides, herbicides, devices and preparations intended to control other forms of pests which are not subject to the present Insecticide Act of 1910. Rodenticides are being marketed in large quantities and many of them are weak and ineffective and have tended to imperil various rodent-control programs. The importance of rodenticides can readily be appreciated when it is realized that the estimated damage by rats alone has amounted to some $200,000,000 annually.

Other important improvements and changes over the present law which would be provided by this bill are as follows:

First. A provision requiring the registration of economic poisons prior to their sale or introduction into interstate or foreign commerce.

Second. The inclusion of provisions for protection of the public against poisoning by requiring prominently displayed poison warnings on the labels of highly toxic economic poisons.

Third. A provision requiring the coloring or discoloring of dangerous white powdered economic poisons to prevent their being mistaken for flour, sugar, salt, baking powder, or other similar articles commonly used in the preparation of foodstuffs.

Fourth. A requirement that warning or caution statements be contained on the label of the economic poison to prevent injury to living man, other vertebrate animals, vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals.

Fifth. A provision requiring instructions for use to provide adequate protection for the public.

Sixth. A provision declaring economic poisons to be misbranded if they are injurious to man, vertebrate animals, or vegetation, except weeds, when properly used.

Seventh. A provision requiring information to be furnished with respect to the delivery, movement, or holding of economic poisons and devices.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Who administers this law?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under the act of 1910, the Insecticide Act is being administered by the Department of Agriculture, because it relates primarily to the use of these insecticides in the production of food. I may say to the gentleman that the insecticide industry, the Department of Agriculture, the distributors, and the organizations representing the producers of this country are all in accord on the need for this bill. Some of the manufacturers do not like the registration proposition, but it was deemed advisable that they should be required to register their product with the Department of Agriculture so that the public could be protected.

Mr. KEEFE. Why is it that the actual work is not handled by the Pure Food and Drug Administration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They deal with food, and this deals with insecticides, and under the act of 1910 the Department of Agriculture has handled it.

Mr. KEEFE. They are dealing with a large number of drugs. They handle the Cosmetic Act, for example.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. I am just wondering why you should have two laboratories set up.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This does not set up additional laboratories.

Mr. KEEFE. They deal with all sorts of insecticides; for example, in the spraying of fruit trees and all that sort of thing. Why should you have two organizations set up, one in the Department of Agriculture and one in the Federal Security Agency, to handle this proposition? Why cannot one do the job?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Perhaps one agency can do the job, but this is already in the Department of Agriculture. This does not give the Department of Agriculture any new duties, except as are provided in the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. They are required under the terms of the act, are they not, to make examinations of insecticides and rodenticides and what not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They already have that laboratory.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point I am making. You have such a laboratory over in Agriculture. You have another great big laboratory doing the same type of work, exactly the same type of work, except a larger amount of work, in the Pure Food and Drug Administration. Now we are trying to simplify government and do away with overlapping bureaus and that sort of thing. I am asking what appears to me to be a perfectly decent and reasonable question: Why cannot this work of examination of new insecticides and rodenticides and what have you be done by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, that is already doing that in that field?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They are not doing that, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This act at present is being administered by the Department of Agriculture. It primarily affects the farmers. It is to control the use of these insecticides, some of them very dangerous, that are being brought on the market or have been brought on the market during the past 2 or 3 years. It only amends the old act. It is not new legislation. It only brings the legislation up to date in order to give the farming interests of America protection against the use of these dangerous insecticides that are now being brought on the market.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say I have no objection to the spirit and purpose of this act. I think it is a perfectly laudable one. But the Pure Food and Drug Administration is presently engaged in the business of examining insecticides for spray material for the treatment of fruit trees, for example, and that sort of thing. They have a great big laboratory established, and they have their agencies throughout the country doing that sort of work.

What I would like to know is: Why cannot this work of examining and passing upon the potency of proposed rodent control material and insecticide material be done by them?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman that undoubtedly there is considerable merit in his statement that this activity should be consolidated, but that question has not been gone into. The only thing we are doing in this legislation is amending the present act. The present act provides that this work shall be done in the Department of Agriculture and it is left there. Hereafter if it is thought fit that these activities should be consolidated, then proper consideration should be given to that question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I feel a thorough investigation of the Department of Agriculture and other agencies of the Government should and would disclose matters that we could eliminate to avoid duplication. This may be one of them. But I think that should be the subject of separate legislation because of the vital need of this legislation to protect the growers of food so that they can know what they are buying when they purchase these insecticides.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], who apparently are interested in this bill. I do not happen to be a member of any legislative committee, but I do happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles the appropriations for the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and by reason of that fact, I am somewhat familiar with the operations of the Administration.

We are obliged to the people of America to economize in government and wherever the opportunity presents itself to wipe out duplicating agencies of government. Here is a flagrant case where in the Department of Agriculture there are a number of scientists who are set up for the purpose of examining insecticides and not permitting the misbranding of fungicides, rodenticides, and a few other things of that character, the exact type of work that is being done by the Pure Food and Drug Administration. Why not start in now and economize a little bit?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am not saying that the gentleman is not right—that there should be consolidation, but the defeat of this legislation will not bring about that consolidation. This legislation is for the purpose of bringing about an efficient administration with reference to these dangerous insecticides that are being sold to the farmers today so as to protect the people of America who are producing the food.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am in thorough accord with his proposal to do away with duplication of activities on the part of many bureaus. This duplication should be eliminated, even though it might require the transfer of the enforcement of the insecticide law by the Pure Food and Drug Administration, or the transfer of the Pure Food and Drug over to the Department of Agriculture. Several hundred million dollars can be saved by eliminating duplications in Federal activities, and I will go along with the gentlemen and other Members of the House to accomplish this result.

In view of the emergency for the measure before the House, I hope that there will not be any objection at this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

a. The term "economic poison" means any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any insects, rodents, fungi, weeds, and other forms of plant or animal life or viruses, except viruses on or in living man or other animals, which the Secretary shall declare to be a pest.

b. The term "device" means any instrument or contrivance intended for trapping, destroying, repelling, or mitigating insects or rodents or destroying, repelling, or mitigating fungi or weeds, or such other pests as may be designated by the Secretary, but not including equipment used for the application of economic poisons when sold separately therefrom.

c. The term "insecticide" means any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any insects which may be present in any environment whatsoever.

d. The term "fungicide" means any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any fungi.

e. The term "rodenticide" means any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating rodents or any other vertebrate animal which the Secretary shall declare to be a pest.

f. The term "herbicide" means any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any weed.

g. The term "weed" means any plant which grows where not wanted.

h. The term "insect" means any of the numerous small invertebrate animals generally having the body more or less obviously segmented, for the most part belonging to the class insecta, comprising six-legged, usually winged forms, as for example, beetles, bugs, bees, flies, and to other allied classes of arthropods whose members are wingless and usually have more than six legs, as, for example, spiders, mites, ticks, centipedes, and wood lice.

i. The term "fungi" means all non-chlorophyll-bearing thallophytes (that is, all non-chlorophyll-bearing plants of a lower order than mosses and liverworts) as, for example, rusts, smuts, mildews, molds, yeasts, and bacteria, except those on or in living man or other animals.

j. The term "ingredient statement" means either—

(1) a statement of the name and percentage of each active ingredient, together with

the total percentage of the inert ingredients, in the economic poison; or

(2) a statement of the name of each active ingredient, together with the name of each and total percentage of the inert ingredients, if any there be, in the economic poison (except option 1 shall apply if the preparation is highly toxic to man, determined as provided in section 6 of this act);

and, in addition to (1) or (2) in case the economic poison contains arsenic in any form, a statement of the percentages of total and water soluble arsenic, each calculated as elemental arsenic.

k. The term "active ingredient" means an ingredient which will prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects, fungi, rodents, weeds, or other pests.

l. The term "inert ingredient" means an ingredient which is not active.

m. The term "antidote" means a practical immediate treatment in case of poisoning and includes first-aid treatment.

n. The term "person" means any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or any organized group of persons whether incorporated or not.

o. The term "Territory" means any Territory or possession of the United States, excluding the Canal Zone.

p. The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

q. The term "registrant" means the person registering any economic poison pursuant to the provisions of this act.

r. The term "label" means the written, printed, or graphic matter on, or attached to, the economic poison or device or the immediate container thereof, and the outside container or wrapper of the retail package, if any there be, of the economic poison or device.

s. The term "labeling" means all labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter—

(1) upon the economic poison or device or any of its containers or wrappers;

(2) accompanying the economic poison or device at any time;

(3) to which reference is made on the label or in literature accompanying the economic poison or device, except to current official publications of the United States Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the United States Public Health Service, State experiment stations, State agricultural colleges, and other similar Federal or State institutions or agencies authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons;

t. The term "adulterated" shall apply to any economic poison if its strength or purity falls below the professed standard or quality as expressed on its labeling or under which it is sold, or if any substance has been substituted wholly or in part for the article, or if any valuable constituent of the article has been wholly or in part abstracted.

u. The term "misbranded" shall apply—

(1) to any economic poison or device if its labeling bears any statement, design, or graphic representation relative thereto or to its ingredients which is false or misleading in any particular;

(2) to any economic poison—

(a) if it is an imitation of or is offered for sale under the name of another economic poison;

(b) if its labeling bears any reference to registration under this act;

(c) if the labeling accompanying it does not contain instructions for use which are necessary and if complied with adequate for the protection of the public;

(d) if the label does not contain a warning or caution statement which may be necessary and if complied with adequate to prevent injury to living man and other vertebrate animals, vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals;

(e) if the label does not bear an ingredient statement on that part of the immediate container and on the outside container or wrapper, if there be one, through which the ingredient statement on the immediate container cannot be clearly read, of the retail package which is presented or displayed under customary conditions of purchase.

(f) if any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this act to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or graphic matter in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use; or

(g) if in the case of an insecticide, fungicide, or herbicide when used as directed or in accordance with commonly recognized practice it shall be injurious to living man or other vertebrate animals, or vegetation, except weeds, to which it is applied, or to the person applying such economic poison.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 3. a. It shall be unlawful for any person to distribute, sell, or offer for sale in any Territory or in the District of Columbia, or to ship or deliver for shipment from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, or to receive in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia from any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or foreign country, and having so received, deliver or offer to deliver to any other person, any of the following:

(1) Any economic poison which has not been registered pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of this act, or any economic poison if any of the claims made for it or any of the directions for its use differ in substance from the representations made in connection with its registration, or if the composition of an economic poison differs from its composition as represented in connection with its registration: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary, a change in the labeling or formula of an economic poison may be made within a registration period without requiring reregistration of the product.

(2) Any economic poison unless it is in the registrant's or the manufacturer's unbroken immediate container, and there is affixed to such container, and to the outside container or wrapper of the retail package, if there be one through which the required information on the immediate container cannot be clearly read, a label bearing—

(a) the name and address of the manufacturer, registrant, or person for whom manufactured;

(b) the name, brand, or trade-mark under which said article is sold; and

(c) the net weight or measure of the content: *Provided*, That the Secretary may permit reasonable variations.

(3) Any economic poison which contains any substance or substances in quantities highly toxic to man, determined as provided in section 6 of this act, unless the label shall bear, in addition to any other matter required by this act—

(a) the skull and crossbones;

(b) the word "poison" prominently (in red) on a background of distinctly contrasting color; and

(c) a statement of an antidote for the economic poison.

(4) The economic poisons commonly known as a standard lead arsenate, basic lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, magnesium arsenate, zinc arsenate, zinc arsenite, sodium fluoride, sodium fluosilicate, and barium fluosilicate unless they have been distinctly colored or discolored as provided by regulations issued in accordance with this act, or any other white powder economic poison which the Secretary, after investigation of and after public hearing on the necessity for such action for the protection of the public health and the feasibility of such coloration or discoloration, shall, by regulation, require to be distinctly colored or discolored, unless it has been so colored or discolored: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exempt any economic poison to the extent that it is intended for a particular use or uses from the coloring or discoloring required or authorized by this section if he determines that such coloring or discoloring for such use or uses is not necessary for the protection of the public health.

(5) Any economic poison which is adulterated or misbranded or any device which is misbranded.

b. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, no article shall be deemed in violation of this act when intended solely for export to any foreign country and prepared or packed according to the specifications or directions of the foreign purchaser.

c. It shall be unlawful—

(1) for any person to detach, alter, deface, or destroy, in whole or in part, any label or labeling provided for in this act or the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, or to add any substance to, or take any substance from, an economic poison in a manner that may defeat the purpose of this act;

(2) for any manufacturer, distributor, dealer, carrier, or other person to refuse, upon a request in writing specifying the nature or kind of economic poison or device to which such request relates, to furnish to or permit any person designated by the Secretary to have access to and to copy such records as authorized by section 5 of this act;

(3) for any person to give a guaranty or undertaking provided for in section 7 which is false in any particular, except that a person who receives and relies upon a guaranty authorized under section 7 may give a guaranty to the same effect, which guaranty shall contain in addition to his own name and address the name and address of the person residing in the United States from whom he received the guaranty or undertaking; and

(4) for any person to use for his own advantage or to reveal, other than to the Secretary, or officials or employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, or other Federal agencies, or to the courts in response to a subpena, or to physicians, and in emergencies to pharmacists and other qualified persons, for use in the preparation of antidotes, in accordance with such directions as the Secretary may prescribe, any information relative to formulas of products acquired by authority of section 4 of this act.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 4. a. Every economic poison which is distributed, sold, or offered for sale in any Territory or the District of Columbia, or which is shipped or delivered for shipment from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or which is received from any foreign country shall be registered with the Secretary: *Provided*, That products which have the same formula, are manufactured by the same person, the labeling of which contains the same claims, and the labels of which bear a designation identifying the product as the same economic poison may be registered as a single economic poison; and additional names and labels shall be added by supplement statements; the registrant shall file with the Secretary a statement including—

(1) the name and address of the registrant and the name and address of the person whose name will appear on the label, if other than the registrant;

(2) the name of the economic poison;

(3) a complete copy of the labeling accompanying the economic poison and a statement of all claims to be made for it, including the directions for use; and

(4) if requested by the Secretary, a full description of the tests made and the results thereof upon which the claims are based.

b. The Secretary, whenever he deems it necessary for the effective administration of this act, may require the submission of the complete formula of the economic poison. If it appears to the Secretary that the composition of the article is such as to warrant the proposed claims for it and if the article and its labeling and other material required to be submitted comply with the requirements of section 3 of this act, he shall register it.

c. If it does not appear to the Secretary that the article is such as to warrant the proposed claims for it or if the article and its labeling and other material required to be submitted do not comply with the provisions of this act, he shall notify the registrant of the manner in which the article, labeling, or other material required to be submitted fail to comply with the act so as to afford the resigstrant an opportunity to make the corrections necessary. If, upon receipt of such notice, the registrant insists that such corrections are not necessary and requests in writing that it be registered, the Secretary shall register the article, under protest, and such registration shall be accompanied by a warning, in writing, to the registrant of the apparent failure of the article to comply with the provisions of this act. In order to protect the public, the Secretary, on his own motion, may at any time, cancel the registration of an economic poison and in lieu thereof issue a registration under protest in accordance with the foregoing procedure. In no event shall registration of an article, whether or not protested, be construed as a defense for the commission of any offense prohibited under section 3 of this act.

d. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, registration is not required in the case of an economic poison shipped from one plant to another plant operated by the same person and used solely at such plant as a constituent part to make an economic poison which is registered under this act.

BOOKS AND RECORDS

SEC. 5. For the purposes of enforcing the provisions of this act, any manufacturer, distributor, carrier, dealer, or any other person who sells or offers for sale, delivers or offers for delivery, or who receives or holds any economic poison or device subject to this act, shall, upon request of any employee of the United States Department of Agriculture or any employee of any State, Territory, or political subdivision, duly designated by the Secretary, furnish or permit such person at all reasonable times to have access to, and to copy all records showing the delivery, movement, or holding of such economic poison or device, including the quantity, the date of shipment and receipt, and the name of the consignor and consignee; and in the event of the inability of any person to produce records containing such information, all other records and information relating to such delivery, movement, or holding of the economic poison or device. Notwithstanding this provision, however, the specific evidence obtained under this section shall not be used in a criminal prosecution of the person from whom obtained.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. a. The Secretary (except as otherwise provided in this section) is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act, including the collection and examination of samples of economic poisons and devices subject to this act. The Secretary is, in addition, authorized after opportunity for hearing—

(1) to declare a pest any form of plant or animal life or virus which is injurious to plants, man, domestic animals, articles, or substances;

(2) to determine economic poisons, and quantities of substances contained in economic poisons, which are highly toxic to man; and

(3) to determine standards of coloring or discoloring for economic poisons, and to subject economic poisons to the requirements of section 3a (4) of this act.

b. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly prescribe regulations for the enforcement of section 10 of this act.

c. The examination of economic poisons or devices shall be made in the United States Department of Agriculture or elsewhere as the Secretary may designate for the purpose of determining from such examination whether they comply with the requirements of this act, and if it shall appear from any such examination that they fail to comply with the requirements of this act, the Secretary shall cause notice to be given to the person against whom criminal proceedings are contemplated. Any person so notified shall be given an opportunity to present his views, either orally or in writing, with regard to such contemplated proceedings, and if in the opinion of the Secretary it appears that the provisions of this act have been violated by such person, then the Secretary shall certify the facts to the proper United States attorney, with a copy of the results of the analysis or the examination of such article: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for prosecution or for the institution of libel proceedings minor violations of this act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable written notice of warning.

d. It shall be the duty of each United States attorney, to whom the Secretary or his agents shall report any violation of this Act, to cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States without delay.

e. The Secretary shall, by publication in such manner as he may prescribe, give notice of all judgments entered in action instituted under the authority of this act.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. a. The penalties provided for a violation of section 3a of this act shall not apply to—

(1) any person who establishes a guaranty signed by, and containing the name and address of, the registrant or person residing in the United States from whom he purchased and received in good faith the article in the same unbroken package, to the effect that the article was lawfully registered at the time of sale and delivery to him, and that it complies with the other requirements of this act, designating this act. In such case the guarantor shall be subject to the penalties which would otherwise attach to the person holding the guaranty under the provisions of this act;

(2) any carrier while lawfully engaged in transporting an economic poison or device if such carrier upon request by a person duly designated by the Secretary shall permit such person to copy all records showing the transactions in and movement of the articles;

(3) to public officials while engaged in the performance of their official duties;

(4) to the manufacturer or shipper of an economic poison for experimental use only by or under the supervision of any Federal or State agency authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons; or by others if a permit has been obtained before shipment in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 8. a. Any person violating section 3a (1) of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction be fined not more than $1,000.

b. Any person violating any provision other than section 3a (1) of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction be fined not more than $500 for the first offense, and on conviction of each subsequent offense be fined not more than $1,000: *Provided*, That an offense committed more than 5 years after the last previous conviction shall be considered a first offense: *And provided further*, That in any case where a registrant was issued a warning by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of section 4c of this act, he shall in each instance upon conviction for an offense concerning which he had been so warned, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment; and the registration of the article with reference to which the violation occurred shall terminate automatically. An article the registration of which has been terminated may not again be registered unless the article, its labeling, and other material required to be submitted appear to the Secretary to comply with all the requirements of this act.

c. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in case any person, with intent to defraud, uses or reveals information relative to formulas of products acquired under the authority of section 4 of this act, he shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or both such fine and imprisonment.

d. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure, of any officer, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any person shall in every case be also deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such person as well as that of the person employed.

SEIZURES

SEC. 9. a. Any economic poison or device that is being transported from one State, Territory, or District to another, or, having been transported, remains unsold or in original unbroken packages, or that is sold or offered for sale in the District of Columbia or any Territory, or that is imported from a foreign country, shall be liable to be proceeded against in any district court of the United States in the district where it is found and seized for confiscation by a process of libel for condemnation—

(1) in the case of an economic poison—

(a) if it is aduulterated or misbranded;

(b) if it has not been registered pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of this act;

(c) if it fails to bear on its label the information required by this act; or

(d) if it is a white powder economic poison and is not colored as required under this act; or

(2) in the case of a device if it is misbranded.

b. If the article is condemned it shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may direct and the proceeds, if sold, less the legal costs, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but the article shall not be sold contrary to the provisions of this act or of the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is sold: *Provided*, That upon the payment of the costs of the libel proceedings and the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that the article shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of this act or the laws of any State, Territory, or District in which sold, the court may direct that such articles be delivered to the owner thereof. The proceedings of such libel cases shall conform, as near as may be, to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

c. When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article, court costs and

fees, storage, and other proper expenses shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article.

IMPORTS

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Treasury shall notify the Secretary of Agriculture of the arrival of economic poisons and devices offered for importation and shall deliver to the Secretary of Agriculture, upon his request, samples of economic poisons or devices which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary of Agriculture and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of a sample that it is adulterated or misbranded or otherwise violates the prohibitions set forth in this act, or is otherwise dangerous to the health of the people of the United States, or is of a kind forbidden entry into or forbidden to be sold or restricted in sale in the country in which it is made or from which it is exported, the said article may be refused admission, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall refuse delivery to the consignee and shall cause the destruction of any goods refused delivery which shall not be exported by the consignee within 3 months from the date of notice of such refusal under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may deliver to the consignee such goods pending examination and decision in the matter on execution of a penal bond for the amount of the full invoice value of such goods, together with the duty thereon, and on refusal to return such goods for any cause to the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury, when demanded, for the purpose of excluding them from the country, or for any other purpose, said consignee shall forfeit the full amount of the bond: *And provided further*, That all charges for storage, cartage, and labor on goods which are refused admission or delivery shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against any future importation made by such owner or consignee.

DELEGATION OF DUTIES

SEC. 11. All authority vested in the Secretary by virtue of the provisions of this act may with like force and effect be executed by such employees of the United States Department of Agriculture as the Secretary may designate for the purpose.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 12. a. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes and administration of this act. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, which take effect prior to the repeal of the Insecticide Act of 1910, appropriations available for the enforcement of such act are authorized to be made available.

b. The Secretary is authorized from the funds appropriated for this act to make such expenditures as he deems necessary, including rents, travel, supplies, books, samples, testing devices, furniture, equipment, and such other expenses as may be necessary to the administration of this act.

COOPERATION

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with any other department or agency of the Federal Government and with the official regulatory agency of any State, or any State, Territory, District, possession, or any political subdivision thereof, in carrying out the provisions of this act, and in securing uniformity of regulations.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this act and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. All provisions of this act, except section 3, "Prohibited Acts"; section 8, "Penalties"; section 9, "Seizures"; and section 10, "Imports," shall take effect upon enactment, and sections 3, 8, 9, and 10 of this act shall take effect as follows: (1) As to devices, upon enactment; (2) as to rodenticides and herbicides, 6 months after enactment; and (3) as to insecticides, fungicides, and all other economic poisons, 1 year after enactment: *Provided*, That the Secretary, upon application, may at any time within 1 year after sections 3, 8, 9, and 10 of this act become applicable to devices, rodenticides and herbicides, and insecticides, fungicides, and other economic poisons, respectively, if he determines that such action will not be unduly detrimental to the public interest, and is necessary to avoid hardship, exempt, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, any economic poison from the provisions of this act if such economic poison was labeled, shipped, and delivered by the manufacturer thereof prior to the time the sections of this act referred to above become applicable to such economic poison and in case the economic poison is an insecticide or fungicide if its sale, delivery, or shipment has not been and will not be in violation of the provisions of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

REPEALS

SEC. 16. The Insecticide Act of 1910, approved April 26, 1910 (36 Stat. 331, 7 U. S. C. 121–134), is hereby repealed 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That, with respect to violations, liabilities incurred, or appeals taken prior to said date, and with respect to sales, shipments, or deliveries of insecticides and fungicides under an exemption granted by the Secretary under section 15, all provisions of the Insecticide Act of 1910 shall be deemed to remain in full force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or other proceeding with respect to any such violations, liabilities, appeals, or to such sales, shipments, or deliveries of insecticides and fungicides exempted by the Secretary under section 15.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "or weeds."

Page 6, line 11, strike out the word "instructions" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directions."

Page 7, line 2, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary may permit the ingredient statement to appear prominently on some other part of the container, if the size or form of the container makes it impracticable to place it on the part of the retail package which is presented or displayed under customary conditions of purchase."

Page 8, line 4, insert after the phrase "deliver or offer to deliver" the following: "in the original unbroken package"; and insert a comma after the word "person."

Page 9, line 16, strike out the article "a."

Page 14, line 14, insert a new subsection e, as follows:

"e. The Secretary is authorized to cancel the registration of any economic poison at the end of a period of 5 years following the registration of such economic poison or at the end of any 5-year period thereafter, unless the registrant, prior to the expiration of each such 5-year period, requests in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary that such registration be continued in effect."

Page 15, line 15, strike out the period after the word "act" and insert the following: "and the determination and establishment of suitable names to be used in the ingredient statement."

Page 18, line 22, strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

Page 18, line 23, insert after the figures "$1,000" and before the colon the following: "or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

Page 24, line 4, insert after the word "official" the following: "agricultural or other."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSED SITE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3029) providing for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, as I understand it, is designed primarily to authorize the expenditure of $400,000 to prepare architect's plans for a new courthouse. But in the bill a commitment is made to the effect that the price of the site on which the courthouse is to be erected will be $2,400,000. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the basis for that appraisal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the question asked by the gentleman from New York is a fair one. The site involved for the erection of a new courthouse for the United States District Court of Appeals is located on Independence Avenue at Marshall Place.

The District of Columbia acquired that site nearly 20 years ago. The price that was paid for it was approximately $1,800,000. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia had an appraisal made, and Mr. Robert Reynolds, United States Director of Public Buildings and Grounds, also appraised the property on behalf of the United States Government. The appraisals were so nearly alike that there was no dispute about it, and that price was fixed. Ninety-nine and one-half percent of the title to the site is in the District of Columbia. This whole project is on a 50–50 basis. The District of Columbia pays half and the United States Government the other half. I may say that the present courthouse now occupied by the United States District Court of Appeals was erected in 1823. Those on the Public Works Committee who visited the court in action, and especially those members who are lawyers and practice law themselves, saw a great need for a new courthouse in the District of Columbia.

The price about which the gentleman inquires, $2,400,000, while it is somewhat

in excess of the amount paid by the District of Columbia, nevertheless we must realize they have held it nearly 20 years for the purpose for which we now desire it, a courthouse site. Inasmuch as the representatives of the District of Columbia and of the United States believe that is a fair price, it does not seem that the amount is excessive or open to objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would the gentleman advise us the date on which this appraisal was made by Mr. Reynolds?

Mr. DONDERO. Within the last year.

Mr. COLE of New York. And the gentleman is satisfied that this parcel of ground, which is now and for some years past has been used as a parking space, is reasonably worth $2,400,000?

Mr. DONDERO. I am satisfied and no member of the committee has found himself in disagreement with it. I believe it is a fair price.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, that additional $600,000, since the District of Columbia pays half of the cost, one-half of that would be paid anyway by the District of Columbia. So it is only an increase of $300,000 over the appraisal agreed upon and that covers that period of 20 years. Is that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to prepare drawings and specifications, and do all work incidental thereto, for a building (including equipment, approaches, architectural landscape treatment of the grounds and connections with public utilities, and the Federal heating system) for the use of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to be located on that part of reservation 10 which is bounded by Constitution Avenue on the south, C Street on the north, John Marshall Place on the west, and Third Street on the east, containing 245,266 square feet, title to which is in the District of Columbia with the exception of two pieces of land having a combined total area of 1,238 square feet, title to which said two pieces of land is in the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The plans for the building shall be prepared under the direction of, and shall be approved by, a committee of six members to be composed of the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to be designated by the chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to be designated by said Board, the Commissioner of Public Buildings, and the Architect of the Capitol.

(b) The said committee shall estimate the cost of such building and report its findings to the Congress.

SEC. 3. The exact location of the building on the site shall be approved by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the design shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to convey to the United States title to that part of reservation 10 which is owned by the District of Columbia within the area described in section 1 of this title, excepting a strip 5 feet wide immediately adjacent to the south line of C Street and running parallel with said south line of C Street from Third Street to John Marshall Place, said strip to be reserved for the widening of C Street: *Provided*, That the said Commissioners are hereby authorized to continue to lease such land for parking purposes and to receive and use for expenses of the District of Columbia any income derived therefrom, until such time as the use of the land is required by the Federal Government for the new court building. The compensation for the site, which is herein fixed at $2,420,000, shall constitute a credit to the District of Columbia for its share of the cost of the entire project as hereafter established by the Congress.

SEC. 5. The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to employ the necessary personal and other services, to enter into the necessary contracts, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not in excess of $400,000 for such purposes, which shall include all architectural fees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 14 OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice, for the reason that both the War and the Navy Departments expressed opposition to it, and for the further reason that the committee report, in an effort to comply with the rules of the House, is not very clear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION TO PERSONS PERFORMING DUTIES OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1203) to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be expended, from the appropriation for compensation to postmasters in the annual Post Office Department's appropriation acts, compensation, at the rate provided by law for postmasters' compensation, to persons who perform the duties of the postmaster at post offices of the fourth class during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, as provided in Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "leave", strike out "as provided in Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945" and insert "or leave without pay."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2229) to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

CONSOLIDATION OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WITH THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 239) to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard by authorizing the commissioning, appointment, and enlistment in the Coast Guard, of certain officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1939, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and, after the first day of the month following enactment hereof, in computing longevity, for the purpose of pay in the Coast Guard, of any person commissioned, appointed, or enlisted under the provisions of this act, there shall be included all service of such person in the Lighthouse Service."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED RETIRED PAY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF FORMER LIFE SAVING SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2054) to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the compensation which any individual who served in the former Life Saving Service of the United States as a keeper or surfman received under the provisions of section 1 of the act of April

14, 1930 (46 Stat. 164; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 14, sec. 178a), shall be increased by 33⅓ percent, beginning on the first day of the month following approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING EASEMENT ACROSS COAST GUARD STATION, BALTIMORE, MD.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2654) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, a municipal corporation of the State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main and its usual appurtenances in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, under such terms and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such land for the purpose of said depot.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of some members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee whether this bill is approved by the Veterans' Administration. The report does not satisfactorily explain the purposes of the bill, nor does it indicate the attitude of the Veterans' Administration on the bill. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts care to express any opinion on the subject?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How can the Veterans' Administration object to this bill when they are doing the very same thing by regulation. I may say to the gentleman that I have just been talking with the Veterans' Administration, who tell me that the amount involved is the amount they are asking in the 1948 budget. They are doing the same thing today by regulation. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs want the regulation made into substantive law. It was a unanimous vote. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is the author of this bill. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] have similar bills.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentlewoman from Massachusetts assure the House that the Veterans' Administration approves the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They neither approve nor disapprove. But how can they object as they are operating now the same way by regulation?

Mr. COLE of New York. Did a representative of the Veterans' Administration appear before the committee at any time in regard to the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This matter was handled by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Judge RAMEY. A representative appeared before the subcommittee. The amount involved is the same as that asked for Veterans' Administration in the 1948 budget.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. A representative of the Veterans' Administration appeared before the subcommittee, and the author of the bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. COLE of New York. The representative of the Veterans' Administration appeared before the subcommittee, not the full committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say that before the full committee the representatives of the Veterans' Administration agreed that this was the fact, that they were in effect operating under the provisions of the bill at this time in that regulations covered such operation. This bill simply enacts the regulations into law. This was brought out at the full committee meeting by a representative of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman from Ohio has assured us that a representative of the Veterans' Administration did appear before the committee and support the bill when it was considered by the subcommittee I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 4 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by striking out "(including apprenticeship and refresher or retraining training)" and by inserting in lieu thereof "(including apprenticeship, refresher or retraining and institutional on-farm training)."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by striking out "The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution" and by inserting in lieu thereof "The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution (including the institution offering institutional on-farm training)."

SEC. 3. Paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by striking out "While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part" and by inserting in lieu thereof "While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part (including an institutional on-farm training course)."

SEC. 4. Paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(c) As used in this part the term 'institutional on-farm training' shall include any course of instruction approved by the appropriate agency of the State or the Administrator which, when taken as a full-time course, combines (1) organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year (and of at least 8 hours each month) at an educational or training institution, with (2) supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment. To be approved, such a course shall be developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm on which the veteran is to receive his supervised work experience and to the need of the veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farm management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts. Such a course shall, in addition, satisfy the requirements of either of the following:

"1. If the veteran performs the noninstitutional part of his course on a farm under his own control—

"a. He shall receive not less than 100 hours of individual instruction per year, not less than 50 hours of which shall be on such farm (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products;

"b. He shall be assured of control of such farm (whether by ownership, lease, management agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course; and

"c. Such farm shall be of a size and character which (1) together with the institutional part of the course will occupy the full time of the veteran, (2) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained, and (3) if the veteran intends to continue operating such farm at the close of his course, will assure him a satisfactory income under normal conditions.

"2. If the veteran performs the noninstitutional part of his course as the employee of another—

"a. He shall receive, on his employer's farm, not less than 50 hours of individual instruction per year (with at least one visit by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction;

"b. His employer's farm shall be of a size and character which (1) together with the institutional part of the course will occupy the full time of the veteran, and (2) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of a farm of the type for which the veteran is being trained; and

"c. His employer shall agree to instruct him in various aspects of farm management in accordance with the training schedule developed for the veteran by his instructor, working in cooperation with his employer. If it is found that any approved course of institutional on-farm training has ceased to meet the requirements of this paragraph, the Veterans' Administration shall cut off all benefits under this part as of the date of such withdrawal or approval."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted. Until such effective date, the practices of the Veterans' Administration as to institutional on-farm training in effect on the date of the enactment of this act shall remain in effect.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 7, strike the words "the non-institutional."

Page 3, line 24, strike the word "institutional" and insert in lieu thereof the words "group instruction."

Page 4, line 6, strike the words "the non-institutional."

Page 4, line 15, strike the word "institutional" and insert in lieu thereof the words "group instruction."

Page 5, line 1, strike the word "paragraph" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act."

Page 5, line 5, before the word "calendar", insert the word "first."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the pending legislation, H. R. 2181, I would like to call to the attention of the House certain historical facts concerning the bill.

In August of 1946 the Veterans' Administrator issued an administrative order which in effect abolished the institutional on-the-farm training feature of the GI bill of rights. This order was withdrawn at the instance of certain Members of Congress with the understanding that it was to be held in abeyance pending action by this Congress.

As an indication of the importance of this piece of legislation there are at present 130,000 veterans who are taking this training in the United States. Under the present set-up the State training agencies are at a great disadvantage in that the program has no degree of stability. As it stands under existing law, the head of a State vocational-training program does not know whether he can contract the services of instructors for 1 day or for 1 year. This condition is certainly not conducive to a well-rounded program. Just as the people who are charged with the responsibility of conducting the program cannot, under existing law, make plans from 1 day to the next by the same token the veterans who are taking the training cannot make plans for the future.

The condition I have just outlined is not true of veterans who are taking training in industrial on-the-job training. It is very unfair to have one set of standards for a veteran who is trying to learn to be a machinist and another set of standards which excludes a veteran from training who wants to learn to be a farmer.

This bill simply clarifies existing law in such a way as to stabilize the program. It sets up minimum standards which are to be maintained by the States but says to the Veterans' Administrator that he will, if the State meets the standard, pay the required full subsistence.

This legislation tends to give impetus to a much needed back-to-the-farm movement in that it allows veterans to get technical agricultural training through approved vocational-training programs without the necessity of going to a regular agricultural school.

There are those who say that the whole vocational on-the-job training program should be abolished. If this is to be done then it should be done to all types of training without picking out one group, the farmers, and destroying their part of it. If we are to pay subsistence to veterans who are training for industrial careers then we should provide subsistence for those who desire training for agricultural careers. The question has been raised as to whether the Veterans' Administration has been heard on this bill. For the record I would like to quote General Bradley who appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs January 30, 1947:

As to the payment of subsistence allowance: Since Public 346 specifically provides for paying less than full subsistence allowance when the veteran is pursuing less than full-time training, the question was raised whether full subsistence allowance would be paid the veteran for the time spent by him on his farm when the instructor was not present. The question was resolved favorably to the veteran because the course to conform to published policy must provide for the full-time of the trainee to be spent on the course and definite and adequate work and training assignments are required to be made by the instructor and required to be completed by the trainee during the time between the visits of the instructor; thus, if the instructor fulfilled the requirements of the contract made with the school, it was considered that the time between the instructor's visits should be regarded as training time and full subsistence allowance should be paid the veteran. That policy was adopted and practiced. Moreover, the program of institutional-on-farm training as specified by the Veterans' Administration in its contracts with schools and other educational agencies for the training of veterans under Public 16 provides that the school shall offer, teach, and administer the whole course, including that part of it which is pursued on the veteran's own farm; that the veteran's own farm for the purpose of the course of training is to be considered by the school and by the veteran to be an integral part of the teaching facilities of the school; and that the veteran can be considered to be in training on his own farm under Public 346 only when what he does on the farm has been planned by and with the school as part of the course which is being given by the school.

This statement shows that the Veterans' Administration approves institutional on-the-farm training as such. The question to be determined by this legislation is one having to do with the standards that are to be met if full subsistence is to be paid. This bill answers this question in that it sets up a minimum standard which is uniform for the country as a whole and says to the Veterans' Administrator that, if the State approving agency approves training programs that meet these standards, full subsistence will be paid.

It has been alleged that the passage of H. R. 2181 will necessitate the expenditure of $69,000,000 in addition to that which is being presently spent each year for each 100,000 veterans. There is no sound basis for this argument for passage of this bill will not necessarily bring more people into the program than are now in it. The $69,000,000 figure is the difference between the current cost of the program and that which it would have cost had the Veterans' Administration administrative order of last August been effected. Insofar as cost is concerned, there is the possibility that the setting up of the definite standard as is set-up in this bill might well cause the program to cost less than it costs now with no uniform standard. The only additional cost over the present cost that can possibly accrue upon enactment of this legislation would be realized if more veterans decide they want to take agricultural training instead of some other form of training that is provided by the GI bill of rights.

There is every logical reason for the immediate passage of this bill and no reason at all why it should not be passed. We will be doing the farmer-veteran population of this country a real favor in passing this bill. If it is not passed many veterans will be driven to industrial training in order to qualify under the GI bill of rights.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING AUTHORIZATION FOR PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 673) to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the committee report on this bill does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar eligible for consideration today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 141 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming with the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present session of Congress at such times and places, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present session of Congress the results of its studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more I can add to this. You have heard the Clerk read what the resolution provides. We have been giving other standing committees this right of subpena. I may say that we are keeping this away from subcommittees. The Rules Committee feels that the standing committees of the House are rightfully the ones that should hold these investigations, that they are probably in a better position to judge things coming within their jurisdiction than some special committees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee is divided in such a way that we have among other subcommittees a subcommittee known as the legal subcommittee, headed by that distinguished member of the bar from the State of Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], as chairman, and the equally distinguished Member on the minority side from the Texas bar [Mr. KILDAY]. That committee unanimously requested the full committee to adopt this resolution which does nothing more nor less than provide under the rules of the House the full committee and the subcommittee in particular with the subpena power. That is the body of the pending resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, but I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from New York. Is this investigation practically the same type of investigation that the previous Committee on Navy Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs had authority to conduct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that insofar as I know there is no plan at the moment to invoke the power of subpena nor are there any immediate investigations contemplated. It is presumed the Congress will go out of session and this extends the power to this committee during recess. It will be used in the same way that any investigating committee used it during the war, either the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman's committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs in the last Congress had the power to subpena, made investigations and recommended special legislation?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is no request for funds at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume you are carrying on in the same way.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what you have just heard read. It states very specifically what the provisions are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO INVESTIGATE THE TRANSPORTATION SITUATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, call up House Resolution 153 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1947, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for such purposes shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such House Resolution 318. The committee may from time to time make such preliminary reports to the House as it deems advisable; and shall, during the present Congress, report to the House the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as you have just heard read, this is a continuance of the authority granted this Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under House Resolution 318.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WOOL PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the wool problem has become so much an issue during the past few months and so many questions have been asked about it that I shall enumerate some of the questions and answers.

Question. Why has there been an accumulated stock pile of domestic wool of 412,000,000 pounds?

Answer. The direct cause of course was the war. The program set up in 1943 to support the price of wool, and legislation by Congress that required the domestic wool could not be sold at less than parity. Another cause was the fact that foreign wool was shipped to the United States from Australia so that it would not fall into the hands of the Japs. While these huge imports of foreign wool may have been put in bonded warehouses, their presence depressed domestic prices of wool. During these years when the domestic wool could not be sold below parity, foreign wools were and could be sold to American manufacturers for less than the fixed prices on domestic wool. Sellers of imported wool knew and now know what the United States parity price is and can undersell the domestic wool.

Question. Where are sheep produced in the United States?

Answer. In many States, largely in a dozen States nearly one-fifth of them in Texas.

Question. Why has not this problem been solved before this late hour?

Answer. Because the present administration's suggestion was to give a blank check to the CCC. This prevented the legislation coming on the floor for consideration even last year.

Question. How much wool is owned by the CCC at the present time and how much are the carrying charges? How much are the estimated losses?

Answer. The following memoranda from the United States Department of Agriculture gives the official answer.

Average carrying charge per month, for present stock pile of wool—first 3 months of 1947	$531,713
Stock on hand Mar. 31, 1947 pounds	412,481,000
Cost of stock on hand	$217,825,000
Estimated loss on orderly[1] liquidation of present stock pile	$47,462,000

[1] By the term "orderly liquidation" it is meant that this liquidation would take around 2 to 4 years and would have to be

done without any interference by foreign market competition.

If it were necessary to compete with foreign markets it would be necessary to sell at an additional loss of perhaps 10 cents per pound.

Question. Are the American wool growers entitled to legislation in their present dilemma?

Answer. Most assuredly yes. Wool growers are faced with an unprecedented and abnormal situation as a result of the war.

Question. Why is it an unprecedented situation?

Answer. Before the war the domestic wool grower had a part of the domestic market for wool. The United States has, at least since 1909 been on an import basis so far as wool is concerned.

Question. How much wool has been imported in the past?

Answer. From 1920 to 1930 an average of 159,000,000 pounds of apparel wool per year were imported, from 1930 to 1940, a yearly average of 64,000,000 pounds were imported. Low domestic wool prices prevailed.

There was an average of 711,000,000 pounds of wool imported from 1940 to 1947.

Question. What is the annual production and what was the annual production of wool in the United States?

Answer. The domestic production of wool in the United States has been each year from 1930 to 1945—411 to 454 million pounds. The production in 1945 was 378,000,000 pounds, and in 1946 349,000,000 pounds.

Question. What were the provisions of the administration's sponsored bill?

Answer. The bill was as follows:

H. R. 1625

A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, by extending that statute to all programs of the Department of Agriculture and agencies operating under its direction, and in other respects

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any articles or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he find and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

You will note that the last paragraph nullifies all to be accomplished by this bill. The paragraph means that the Secretary of Agriculture can do so and so, unless someone in the State or other Departments of Government think it is better or best to do something else.

Question. What is the law now in regard to imports?

Answer. The following is from the United States Tariff Commission:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington.

IMPORT SECTION OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT (OF 1933)

SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary to prescribe in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or will not reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantity of any article which may be imported from any country which reduces such permissible total quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, both dates inclusive.

(c) The fees and import restrictions proclaimed by the President under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be specified in such proclamation, revocation, suspension, or modification, and such fees, which shall not be in excess of 50 percent ad valorem, shall be treated for the purposes of all provisions of law relating to customs revenue as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930.

(d) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

(e) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended by the President whenever he finds that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist, or may be modified by the President whenever he finds that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section. (49 Stat. 773, sec. 31; 49 Stat. 1152, sec. 5; 50 Stat. 246, sec. 1; act of Jan. 25, 1940, H. R. 7171, 76th Cong.; 7 U. S. Code 624.)

Also the following from the United States Tariff Commission:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF JUNE 12, 1934, AS AMENDED

An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930

Be it enacted, etc., That the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end of title III the following:

PART III. PROMOTION OF FOREIGN TRADE

SEC. 350. (a) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

(2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder. No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent [any existing rate of duty] *any rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress)*, or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists. The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly or indirectly: *Provided*, That the President may suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts (*including the operations of international cartels*) or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section; and the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified in the proclamation. The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation in whole or in part.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the application, with respect to rates of duty established under this section pursuant to agreements with countries other than Cuba, of the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902, or to preclude giving effect to an exclusive agreement with Cuba concluded under this section, modifying the existing preferential customs treatment of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of Cuba: *Provided*, That the duties [payable] on such an article shall in no case be increased or decreased by more than 50 percent of the duties, [now payable thereon], *however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress)*.

(c) As used in this section, the term "duties and other import restrictions" includes (1) rate and form of import duties and classification of articles, and (2) limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importation or imposed for the regulation of imports.

Question. Is this a tariff question?

Answer. No; it is not necessarily one, but of course it lends itself to that approach to the politically minded.

Question. Have the section 22 provisions been used for other crops or commodities?

Answer. Yes. The following excerpt from a letter from the United States Tariff Commission on April 29, 1945, is as follows:

On February 1, 1947, the President, acting under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as amended, imposed an absolute import quota of 70,000,000 pounds per year on harsh or rough cotton having a staple length less than three-quarters of 1 inch. (Proclamation 2715, Treasury Decision 51624.) This class of cotton had previously been exempt from import quotas.

Question. Have the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act been used previously?

Answer. Yes. The following excerpt from a letter of April 29, 1947, from the United States Tariff Commission shows that it has:

The absolute import quota on silver fox pelts was terminated by Presidential proclamation issued under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended (the Trade Agreements Act). This proclamation was issued on March 18, 1947 and takes effect on May 1, 1947. In other words, the import quota is eliminated on May 1, 1947. (T. D. 51647.)

Question. Was H. R. 1825 needed for further authority and power to take care of the wool problem?

Answer. Yes and no. Since the near embargo quota on wheat imports and since at least two near embargo quotas have been placed on cotton imports under section 22, and since this section says that when imports "render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken" it would appear no legislation is necessary, but wool was never in any previous program nor were section 32 funds used so it would appear that a wool bill is necessary to set up a quota. The section 350 of the Tariff Act could be used to increase the duty or to put on an import fee which is really an increase in duty.

Question. Who submitted the wool bill to the Congress?

Answer. The Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson in January 1947. He also announced the discontinuation of the wool buying program as of April 15, 1947.

Question. Were extended hearings held on the wool problem by the Agricultural Committee?

Answer. Yes; very extended hearings were held and Chairman HOPE has shown the patience of Job in trying to iron out this wool problem. All phases of the wool industry were heard.

Question. What is the duty on wool imports?

Answer. Thirty-four cents per pound, cleaned basis. Natural basis, 17 cents per pound.

Question. Is this duty of 34 cents a pound sufficient to protect the producer of domestic wool?

Answer. It apparently was a sufficient duty to satisfy the wool people under normal times, but the present wool problem is before us in spite of this duty. This administration put an embargo in addition to the 42-cents-per-bushel duty on wheat, and wool finds itself in the same embarrassing situation.

Question. Is there a world wool monopoly?

Answer. Yes. I presume that since the British control 85 percent of the world's wool, it could appropriately be called a monopoly.

Question. Why should the American wool producer be compelled or expected to compete with a world wool cartel?

Answer. They should not and most assuredly are entitled to have protection from a world monopoly as well as from any domestic monopoly.

Question. Why are and why should millions of dollars be appropriated each year to control domestic monopolies at a time we refuse to protect a domestic industry—like the wool producers—from a foreign monopoly?

Answer. Americans are entitled to protection from any foreign or domestic monopoly.

Question. How much of the world wool is controlled by the British wool monopoly?

Answer. An estimated four to five billion of pounds, and at this time a continuing world monopoly to face as well.

Question. Why are American wool producers having difficulty in selling their wool at the present time?

Answer. One reason is the Secretary of Agriculture has discontinued the CCC purchases; Two, the wool buyer does not wish to purchase a commodity that is in such a liquid price set-up; Three, the wool buyer does not wish to invest in wool if Mr. Clayton is going to reduce duty from 34 cents to 17 cents per pound or by 50 percent, which act would have a direct effect on wool prices.

Question. How much wool is consumed in the United States?

Answer. The following memorandum is an official answer from the United States Department of Agriculture:

Wool consumption in the United States

	Pounds
1942	1,077,000,000
1943	1,061,000,000
1944	1,009,000,000
1945	1,013,000,000
1946 (civilian basis)	1,072,000,000

During 1942–45 war years average consumption over a billion pounds; 1935–39 prewar average, 592,000,000 pounds.

Source of information: Mr. R. H. Roberts, Livestock Branch, Production and Marketing Administration U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Question. What will be the United States wool consumption in the future?

Answer. That depends on economic conditions. The income of the people will be the answer to that question. You can compare the prewar and wartime consumption and your best judgment. Factory pay rolls must be maintained if anywhere near a billion pounds yearly consumption is to be maintained.

Question. How have the customs receipts been on our wool during the years?

Answer. From 1940 to 1947 the 711,000,000 pounds of imports should have provided $120,000,000 in revenue. This should have provided some $36,000,000 for section 32 funds.

Question. Is wool one of the larger agriculture imports?

Answer. Yes, the largest agriculture import. The custom receipts from this one agriculture product have furnished large amounts of money for section 32 funds.

Question. The 30 percent of the custom receipts provide funds for section 32 funds, do they not?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What are these section 32 funds used for?

Answer. For disposing of surpluses. For paying export subsidies on cotton and wheat, and still we hear talk about a soil-conservation program; to furnish funds to find new uses for cotton; to furnish funds for school-lunch programs.

Question. Is wool a Steagall commodity?

Answer. No; in my opinion, it should have been made a Steagall commodity in the beginning. The fact that a wool-support program was put in operation is conclusive evidence to justify a consideration of wool comparable to the consideration accorded a Steagall commodity.

Question. What legislation should a wool bill include?

Answer. Legislation that definitely places wool under the provisions of section 22 of the AAA Act.

Question. Should the support price be definitely fixed in amount?

Answer. Yes; for two reasons. One reason is that wool has been put on the spot as a war casualty. Two, because if the definite price is not fixed there is no assurance that this administration will even follow the law and live up to a "not-less-than-90-percent-parity" floor price.

Question. Have any other crops or farm produce had consideration under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and section 22 of the AAA Act?

Answer. Yes; section 22. There has been two import quotas put on cotton. Yet, the Smoot-Hawley duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat was not effective, so a near-embargo was added to the Smoot-Hawley duty.

Question. Has section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 been used by the President?

Answer. Yes; on May 1, 1945, the import quota was removed on silver fox. In fact, the country making the largest shipments to the United States were subsidizing silver-fox production in their own country at the very time the import quota was removed by President Truman.

Question. Have the letters of the wool trade given the facts about the wool problem?

Answer. No; not exactly. They seem to be laboring under the impression that the law says a support of 90 percent is guaranteed under certain commodities when the law says "not less than 90 percent of parity." There is not much use talking about a support price to anyone so long as the Secretary of Agriculture allows Steagall commodities to sell below even the 90-percent parity guaranteed floor price as is the case of a part of the milk industry today.

Question. What will be the future of domestic sheep production if no additional protection is given the American sheep industry?

Answer. The future is obvious. The numbers have already been reduced from 55,000,000 in 1943 to 38,000,000 on January 1, 1947.

Question. What will be the United States wool prices if the domestic producers are liquidated?

Answer. The $1 a pound for imported rubber after World War I should be some indication as to what might happen if the American wool consumers are placed in the clutches of a world wool monopoly.

Question. Do you remember sugar prices after World War I? What will be the attitude of the public toward support prices to agriculture if the 412,000,000,-pound stock pile is not disposed of with as little loss as possible?

Answer. If a loss on wool that could be avoided is really allowed to take place, public opposition to the whole support program can be expected. The millions lost through maladministration of the potato program adds to this public disapproval.

Question. Will the American sheep industry be ruined if no action is taken?

Answer. Apparently so.

Question. Has there been a similar situation in other agricultural fields?

Answer. Yes; the fur farmers have been subjected to treatment not in keeping with a desirable policy, so far as the administrative agencies are concerned. An Administration delegation was sent to invite imports, and the quota on imports was removed on certain furs when the country doing the importing was subsidizing their own producers. Small agricultural groups are the ones neglected or penalized while the big operators, with large numbers, have special privileges extended to them in various ways.

Question. Was not wool really included as a Steagall commodity indirectly when the sheepmen were asked to increase lamb and mutton production?

Answer. There is reason to believe that if wool is to be denied support, then additional support should go to the meat producer.

Question. Could the antidumping provisions of the tariff laws be effectively invoked?

Answer. Yes, I presume they could, but the antidumping provisions of the law are rather ambiguous to say the least. Understand that they have been interpreted to mean that they provide for assessment of additional duties on goods which are sold in export to the United States below the prevailing price in the country exporting. The additional duty is equal to the disparity referred to. However, if the goods have a market and are sold for as much in the export government, the antidumping law does not apply.

Question. Would any wool bill affect what Mr. Clayton is doing at Geneva?

Answer. Yes, I presume it might. However, I do believe we should go into the whole tariff argument at this time. I will point out that Mr. Clayton nor any other individual should be allowed to have the power to cooperate with a foreign monopoly.

Question. Does not the price of wool determine the wage per hour to American wool producers? Does the price of woolen cloth determine the wage per hour to the workmen in the American woolen mills?

Answer. Surely.

Question. Has Australia an embargo on exports of certain types of high quality wool producing sheep?

Answer. Yes, they have an embargo on rams if not ewes and I understand this embargo applies to other parts of the British Empire as well as to the United States.

Question. Could the President not now raise the duty by 50 percent and slow up imports and help liquidate the domestic stock pile of wool?

Answer. Yes, I presume he could, but it appears that an import fee is less palatable than a quota. There are many precedents for the quota, though no increased import fee has been put in operation during the past 15 years.

Question. Were quotas ever put in operation during the past 15 years?

Answer. Yes. Several times that I know of. Once on wheat and twice on cotton.

Question. Section 22 if amended then could be used the same as it was used for additional protection for cotton and wheat?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did not the custom receipts on the 900,000,000 pounds of wool imported in 1946 put over $156,000,000 in the United States Treasury in 1946?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. If some public funds are necessarily used to dispose of the present wool stock pile would not the United States Treasury still have some millions left?

Answer. That depends wholly on the administrative procedures. If the whole $150,000,000 were used the United States Treasury would be as well off as it is where other products are imported free of duty with no custom receipts channeled to the United States Treasury.

Question. Does it not appear rather ridiculous to talk about soil conservation, then acquire custom receipts from a live stock product, and then use 30 percent of the custom receipts to dispose of soil depleting crops?

Answer. It sure does not make sense—economic or any other kind.

Question. Have not these section 32 funds, representing 30 percent of the customs receipts and in this case as a result of wool imports, been used to export subsidy for cotton?

Answer. Yes, not only for subsidized cotton exports but for other soil depleting crops like corn and wheat and even tobacco. These funds have been used to pay 6 to 9 cents per pound subsidy on cotton for making undulating material and other uses. In fact, this domestic use experimental program appears mostly subsidy and little experimental.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include certain memorandum.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. DINGELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

671. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering the cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

672. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

673. A letter from the Director, Office of Selective Service Records, transmitting a list of the selective-service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the Selective Service System as of March 31, 1947, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

674. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2276. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games; with amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3124. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3413. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than $3.10 per hundred pounds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3414. A bill to amend section 2357 of the Revised Statutes to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3415. A bill to prohibit further shipments to Russia under the Lease-Lend Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3416. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3417. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 3418. A bill to provide that veterans who have at any time suffered from service-connected advanced tuberculosis shall be rated as permanently and totally disabled by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3419. A bill to make permanent the special survivorship protection provided for veterans under section 210 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3420. A bill to make permanent the special survivorship protection provided for veterans under section 210 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3421. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national soil-fertility policy and program, to authorize the construction of certain fertilizer plants as a part of said program, to provide for the testing and demonstrating of fertilizer produced in such Government and other plants on a Nation-wide scale, to provide for the exploration of fertilizer resources on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3422. A bill to amend section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the inclusion in the gross estate for purposes of the estate tax of certain transfers taking effect at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3423. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the United States frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the United States frigate *Constitution;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of June 22 to 28, 1947, as National Air Tour Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 208. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, Memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to establishing September 17 as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take early action on statehood; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available as Hawaiian homelands a certain parcel of land situated on the island of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to enable veterans who obtained guaranteed loans prior to December 28, 1945, to come within provisions of Public Law 268; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the development of deposits of mineral ores in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to approve any legislation unifying or merging the armed forces unless there is contained therein assurance that the Marine Corps will be retained in its present form; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by reducing the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States protesting the order of the Secretary of War inactivating the United States Army post at Camp McCoy and requesting that steps be taken to prevent such order from taking effect; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3424. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mitsu Yajima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 3425. A bill for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and and Mrs. Lem Motlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3428. A bill granting an annuity to Emma June Wilbur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

488. By Mr. BRADLEY of California: Petition of Mrs. C. D. Rasmussen, of Long Beach, Calif., and 226 other residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of all such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

489. By Mr. BRAMBLETT: Petition of Elmer J. Grain, Monterey, Calif., and others, regarding immediate cashing of veterans' terminal-leave bonds; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

490. By Mr. HOLMES: Petitions of residents of Walla Walla, Wash., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and broadcasting alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

491. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 94 residents of Cadiz and surrounding communities, in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

492. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of citizens of Mount Vernon, Ohio (Knox County), in behalf of passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

493. By Mr. COTTON: Petition of the executive committee of the New Hampshire Bar Association, urging Congress to endorse H. R. 1639; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

494. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of May 8, 1947, by Kenosha Jewish Welfare Fund, Kenosha, Wis., calling upon the United States Government to take the initiative during the special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in championing the program for Palestine, to insist that the Jewish people be accorded full representation in all deliberations regarding Palestine within the United Nations through the Jewish agency, and to bring weight to bear on the mandatory government to the end that an interim policy based upon the existing mandate be set in motion at once providing for immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal of discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish national home; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

495. By Mr. WELCH: California State Senate Resolution No. 17, relative to the development of deposits of mineral ores in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

496. Also, California State Senate Resolution No. 6, memorializing and petitioning the President and Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation to enable veterans who obtained guaranteed loans prior to December 28, 1945, to come within provisions of Public Law 268; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

497. By the SPEAKER: Petition of officers and members of the Townsend conference from the Eighth District of the State of Massachusetts, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

498. Also, petition of members of Townsend Club, No. 2, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

499. Also, petition of Donald P. Dooley, Janesville, Wis., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for an impartial investigation of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.'s behavior in an 11-month strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the first calendar quarter, 1947.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) _____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) _____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) _____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) _____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) _____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) _____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

Employed by _____

Address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) _____

(2) To whom paid:

(2) _____

(3) For what purposes:

(3) _____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) _____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the first calendar quarter 1947, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (3) Termination at will. (4) $333.33 per month plus actual out-of-pocket expenses in travel. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (6) Actual out-of-pocket travel expenses. (7) Fares of transportation, hotel, and out-of-pocket expenses.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Self. (2) In my own interest and in behalf of others in the manganese and strategic minerals industry. (3) Indefinite; any time or expense I might spend in connection with legislative matters is incidental only. (4) I am neither paid nor do I know that I will be, but if I am I will report it on Form C. (5) Normally a producer of manganese or other strategic minerals. (6) Nothing at present, but those which may be paid at any future date will be reported. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxicabs, stamps, stationery and stenographic service.

American Nurses' Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Act on behalf of its membership consisting of 180,000 graduate, registered nurses. (2) In the interest of its membership. (3) The term for which the American Nurses' Association is organized is perpetual. (4) No special funds are

collected for a specific purpose, such as legislation. Dues ($3 per capita) are paid into the general treasury of the association. Legislative activities account for a small percentage (2.3 percent in 1944; 3.4 percent in 1945). (5) All expenditures of the association (including overhead expenses) met through dues of membership ($3 per capita). (6) See item No. 4. (7) Communications to constituent State nurses' associations—telephone, telegraph, letters, printing and mimeographing, legal advice, travel expenses of witnesses (officers and members of the association).

Atkinson, Arthur K., 1618 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) Registrant is chairman of a special tax committee of reorganization railroads and files this statement as a matter of information to the Congress, although it is felt that registrant does not come within the purview of the act. The committee of which registrant is chairman is a voluntary committee originally formed in 1944 at a meeting of financial and accounting officers and counsel of sundry railroads which were in bankruptcy or receivership or had emerged therefrom. (For list of reorganization railroads, see appendix A attached.[1]) The sole purpose of the committee was and is to work for the enactment of legislation granting or confirming the right of reorganization railroads to avail themselves of the so-called carry-over and carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as contained in section 122 and as were contained in section 710 (c) during the period it was in effect. The work would be carried on by the Association of American Railroads but for the fact that the proposed legislation is of interest only to certain railroads. The committee has neither solicited nor received any funds to carry on its work. It is composed exclusively of financial and accounting officers and counsel of certain of the railroads listed in appendix A,[1] and their time, services, and ordinary and necessary expenses as members of the committee are donated by the individual railroads with which they are respectively associated. The services rendered by the members of the committee in working for the enactment of the proposed legislation are purely incidental to their regular duties as financial or accounting officers or counsel of such railroads and occupy only a minor portion of their time. In view of the foregoing facts, it is believed that neither section 307 nor 308 of the act is applicable to the committee or its members. However, since the committee's sole purpose is to influence the passage of certain remedial legislation, and since its work is principally carried on by the registrant as chairman thereof, registrant voluntarily files this statement. (2) See generally the answer to question (1). Wabash Railroad Co., of which registrant is an officer, is one of the reorganization railroads interested in the proposed legislation. (3) Indefinite. (4) As indicated in the answer to question (1), registrant receives no compensation from the committee. As vice president of Wabash Railroad Co., in charge of finance and accounting, registrant receives an annual compensation from the company for the performance of his regular duties. His activities in behalf of the proposed legislation are only incidental to his regular duties, and he receives no special or additional compensation therefor. (5) See answer to question (4). (6) As indicated in the answer to question (1), registrant is not paid or reimbursed for his expenses by the committee. Registrant is reimbursed by Wabash Railroad Co. for ordinary and necessary expenses. (7) Ordinary and necessary expenses actually incurred, such as hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, transportation, etc.

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and James R. Crowell, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is employed as publicity counsel by National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (See appendix attached.[1]) (2) See (1) above. (3) Registrant is engaged on a month-to-month basis. (4) The association pays N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., $2,100 a month plus a 16⅔ percent commission on printing, photographs, and like expenditures; and also miscellaneous expenses. (5) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is paid by National Association of Electric Companies and the individual registrants are paid by N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (6) The expenses are estimated at an average of $200 per month exclusive of any expenses on any special work. (7) Principally mimeographing, printing, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses.

Baldrige, H. M., room 605 at 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Cane sugar refiners. (3) Continually since October 1, 1946. (4) $18,000 per year. (5) United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association. (6) None for legislative activity. $2,400 a year for travel, investigations, and contact work with sugar-producing areas. (7) Travel and New York and Washington club expenses and dues.

Ballinger, Willis J., suite 715 Bond Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Federation of Small Business, Inc. Home office: San Mateo, Calif. Washington office: Suite 715 Bond Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) I am employed as an economic adviser by the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., to advise its directors, officers, and members on all economic problems including the effect of legislation, or proposed legislation, on small business. (3) Indefinite. I am a director and its vice president in charge of all economic matters and problems, and my employment will continue as long as mutually satisfactory. (4) I am to receive for one-half of my time $5,000 per annum payable in monthly installments of $416.66 per month. I am also provided an office, and all expenses in connection therewith, including postage, and so forth, clerical and stenographic help, telephone. (5) National Federation of Small Business, Inc. (6) None. The National Federation of Small Business, Inc., pays all actual expenses of its Washington office. (7) The expenses include: Office rent, equipment, stenographic and clerical help, stationery, printing, telephone, postage, transportation, purchase of documents, etc., totaling at present $450 per month. There is a petty cash account of $100 per month to pay small bills for office accessories. There are no allowances for entertainment, or for any purpose other than actual necessary office expenses.

Bannell, Marshall F., 1 Maiden Lane, North Haven, Conn. (1) Waterman Airlines, Inc., Mobile, Ala. (2) Waterman Airlines, Inc. (3) Undetermined; dependent on services required. (4) Indefinite; dependent on legislative services and time spent on legislative matters. (5) Waterman Airlines, Inc. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Administrative as are properly attributable to legislative activity.

Bannister, L. Ward, Equitable Building, Denver 2, Colo. (1) California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif. (2) Said company. (3) Indeterminate. (See also further information attached.[1]) (4) $60 per day except if away from Denver, then $70. (5) Said company. (6) Only such amount as would cover actual expenses; no definite amount. (7) Such as long-distance phoning, telegrams, traveling, hotels, to extent actually incurred.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (2) Eastman Kodak Co. (3) At pleasure of named client. (4) Reasonable compensation on quantum meruit basis as an attorney at law. (5) Eastman Kodak Co. (6) All necessary out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) Traveling, long-distance telephone, telegrams, and like expenses.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (2) The Haloid Co. (3) At pleasure of named client. (4) Reasonable compensation on quantum meruit basis as an attorney at law. (5) The Haloid Co. (6) All necessary out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) Traveling, long-distance telephone, telegrams, and like expenses.

Beecroft, Tom Taylor, foreman at Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Memphis, Tenn. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) Monthly salary, $299.50; Foreman's Association of America, Chapter 255. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Chapter 255, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Memphis, Tenn. (6) Actual transportation plus hotel and personal expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Actual transportation plus hotel and personal expenses up to $12 per day.

Bennett, Harry L., Jr., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $250 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus, and car fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y. (1) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. (3) Engaged as Grand Lodge representative since August 15, 1941. Duration indefinite. Called from time to time for legislative work. (4) $4,050 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative work. (5) Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous.

Berckes, Herbert C., 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (2) Southern pine industry through Southern Pine Industry Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,000 per year. (5) Southern Pine Industry Committee. (6) Per diem of $10 per day while traveling plus transportation. (7) Those incident to work of committee.

Bergin, Preston B., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Retail Federation and its members. (3) Permanent. (4) $1,600 which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) American Retail Federation. (6) Reimbursed for allowed out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi fare and occasional meals.

Bernard, William S., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) $7,500 per year plus reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Berns, Karl H., National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (3) Annual basis. (4) March 1 to April 1, 1947, salary: $520 for both legislative and nonlegislative service. Estimated for legislative service $104. (5) Legislative-Federal Relations Division. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Beverage, Albion P., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (3) January 1944 to date. (4) $5,400 annually. (5) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Transportation, lodging, meals, taxis, telephone calls, porter and other small expenses in connection with speaking trips and field trips.

Biorn, Norman E., 407–8 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minn. (1) Minnesota Small Business, Inc., 407–8 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minn. (2) The members of Minnesota Small Business, Inc., being various small businessmen and small corporations in the State of Minnesota. (3) Employment is on an annual basis. Present employment will continue until the annual elections of the corporation in January 1948. (4) $150 per month retainer to March 1947. (5) Minnesota Small Business, Inc. (6) Registrant will be reimbursed for all actual cash expenses. (7) Phone, travel, stationery, letter services, postage, and miscellaneous.

Bishop, John H., 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Universal Zonatite Insulation Co., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Universal Zonatite Insulation Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant is a lawyer, employed regularly by Universal Zonatite Insulation Co. Fees to be paid are the same as for other legal work—$15 an hour. (5) Universal Zonatite Insulation Co. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses in traveling, etc. (7) Travel expense, hotel bills, and such miscellaneous expense as is incurred when away from Chicago.

Blohm, George C., 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (1) News Publishers Association To Amend the Antitrust Laws, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (During period when registrant is not employed by said association he is employed by Tribune Co., 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.) (2) News Publishers Association To Amend the Antitrust Laws, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (See attached statement of names and addresses of officers and directors of said association.[1]) (3) Such period or periods of time as may be necessary or desirable during the consideration by the Eightieth Congress of a bill designated as H. R. 110 or such other or amended proposed legislation as shall be similar to or designed to effect the same purpose as said H. R. 110. (4) Salary at the rate of $245 per week plus traveling expenses, living expenses while not in Chicago, office rental, stationery, supplies, stenographic services, telephone and telegraph charges, and other miscellaneous clerical and office expense. (5) News Publishers Association To Amend the Antitrust Laws, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (6) It is not yet possible to make any accurate estimate of expenses that will be incurred. However it is presently contemplated that they will not exceed an average of $750 per month. (7) Traveling expenses, living expenses while not in Chicago, office rental, stationery, supplies, stenographic services, telephone and telegraph charges, and other miscellaneous clerical and office expense.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.) (1) Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (2) See (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) See quarterly report, Form C. (5) See (1) above. (6) Will pay own expenses. (7) See quarterly report, Form C.

Bonamarte, Robert F., 301 East Oxford Avenue, Alexandria, Va., telephone Alexandria 1209. (1) Fleet Reserve Association, 427–429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) The membership of the Fleet Reserve Association, a benevolent naval veteran organization, chartered November 11, 1924, under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. (3) Elected national president of the Fleet Reserve Association for a term of 1 year, September 2, 1946, to September 2, 1947, and a member of the national service committee of the said Fleet Reserve Association. (4) The office of national president is honorary for which no salary is paid. (5) No salary paid. (6) I am allotted $1,000 for traveling, permitting the national president to visit branches throughout the United States. (7) None other.

Booth, Herman M., Jr., first mate, Nicholson Transit Co., Ecorse, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $400 per month paid by Foreman's Association of America, Marine Chapter No. 159. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Marine Chapter No. 159. (6) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La. Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (2) Sugar growers and processors who are dues-paying members of the two above-named associations. (3) Since 1929, and on an annual basis. (4) $15,750 annually. (See memorandum attached.[1]) This amount is in full for all services performed, including contacts with Government departments in all matters affecting sugar. (5) American Sugar Cane League and Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association. (6) No specific amount. (7) Only minor incidental expenses are connected with legislative matters.

Bovello, Charles J., 5 East Hamilton Avenue, Silver Spring, Md. (1) Barbers Union, Local 239, Master Barbers Association Independent Barbers. (2) Barbers of Washington in general. (3) Pending bills in the Senate and House of Representatives pertaining to health and labor. (4) No salary, only the current expense. (5) Current expense to be paid by the barbers' legislative committee composed of the organizations in question, No. 1. (6) No limit. (7) Printing, postage stamps, telegrams, and taxi fees.

Bowden, B. E. (residence: 10 Independence Avenue, Southwest, Railway Labor Building), 267 Robbins Drive, Newark, Ohio. (1) American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Train Dispatchers Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $372 per month. (5) American Train Dispatchers Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Meals, lodging, and incidentals.

Boyd, H. B., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Since January 1, 1947, continuing. (4) $18,000 as secretary-treasurer of the association only an incidental part of which relates to legislation. (See letter attached.[1]) (5) United States Beet Sugar Association. (6) Necessary travel and other incidental expenses. (7) See answer to (6) above.

Bream, John H., 22 South Third Street, Harrisburg, Pa. (1) Pennsylvania Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Box 966, Harrisburg, Pa. (2) Independent, taxpaying Pennsylvania business. (3) Indeterminate. (4) No salary. (5) None. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses not to exceed $50 per month. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, meals, and hotel while away from Harrisburg.

Brewbaker, James M., 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Association of Manufacturers. (2) National Association of Manufacturers. (3) Continuously since June 1944. (4) At the rate of $7,500 annually. (5) National Association of Manufacturers. (6) Office and secretarial, telephone and telegraph services, etc., are supplied by employer. Employer reimburses registrant for actual expenses incurred, pursuant to monthly itemized expense account. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, entertainment, incidentals, etc., incurred in the course of the employment.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (2) Southern pine industry through Southern Pine Industry Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,500 per year. (5) Southern Pine Industry Committee. (6) Necessary and proper expenses such as taxi, etc. (7) Those incident to the work of the committee.

Brittin, L. H., 435 Woodward Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Independent Air-freight Association, 435 Woodward Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Independent Air-freight Association, a nonprofit association comprised of certain air freight carriers. (See letter attached.[1]) (3) Permanent. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Independent Air-freight Association. (6) Reimbursement for actual travel and out-of-pocket expenses as the same are incurred. (7) See (6) above.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (1) The American Chamber of Commerce, Mexico City, Mexico. (2) Taxes on nonresident United States citizens carrying on and doing business abroad. (3) Two years. (4) $10,000 retainer; $4,000 additional fee—tentative arrangement. (5) The American Chamber of Commerce, Mexico, and other nonresident United States citizens (6) $6,000. (7) Foreign and domestic travel, and office expense.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1127 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite; subject to change by action of the board of directors of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) An annual fee of $18,000 is paid by the association to Clark & La Roe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur La Roe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the partnership agreement. This fee is paid for general legal services, no part being allocated for legislative work, and legislative work has not and will not constitute more than a very small proportion of the services rendered. If and when such work is performed, appropriate quarterly reports will be made as required. (5) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing, taxi fares, postage, travel.

Brown, Robert E., secretary, The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis 4, Ind. (1) The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis 4, Ind. (2) The Indiana

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Tax Equality Committee, Inc., which committee is composed of and represents businessmen and firms in all lines in Indiana in an effort to further equality of taxation among competing businesses. (3) From February 1946 to indefinite. (4) Expense reimbursement only. (5) The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred on behalf of committee. (7) Hotel, meals, automobile, and all other living and travel expenses incurred in service on behalf of committee.

Brown, Russell B., 500 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Independent Petroleum Association of America, 500 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., a nonprofit association the membership of which primarily consists of producers of crude petroleum but also includes persons engaged in other phases of the petroleum industry. (2) Independent Petroleum Association of America. (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) See attached statement.[1] (5) See attached statement.[1] (6) See attached statement.[1] (7) See attached statement.[1]

Brylawski, A. Julian, 702 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Motion Picture Theater Owners of Metropolitan District of Columbia, 702 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Motion Picture Theater Owners of Metropolitan District of Columbia. (3) Calendar year 1947. (4) $500 per year. Salary as president of Motion Picture Theater Owners of Metropolitan District of Columbia. Legislative appearances are incidental to this work. (5) Motion Picture Theater Owners of Metropolitan District of Columbia. (6) As incurred; has never been more than $300 per year. (7) Telephone, telegraph, stenographic, traveling, and incidentals.

Buck, Elizabeth, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $360 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus and car fares, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Bugbee, George, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill. (1) American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Permanent. (4) $17,000 per annum; however, the principal purpose of such employment is not the influencing of legislation. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Necessary traveling expenses. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, and other actual necesary expenses.

Bunje, Ralph B., manager, 2044 Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif. (1) The Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc. (2) The Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc. (3) On monthly basis. (4) Monthly salary for regular duties of position. No other compensation. (5) The Agricultural Labor Bureau. (6) Traveling expenses reimbursed upon completion of trips. No set amount. (7) Just ordinary traveling expenses.

Burke, Harold, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Cane sugar refiners. (3) Continuously since 1936. (4) $7,500 per year. (5) United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association. (6) None for legislative activity; $2,400 a year for travel, investigations and contact work with sugar-producing areas. (7) [Blank.]

Burroughs, J. Edward, Jr., 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Maryland Realty Investment Trust, Inc. (Wallaston's Manor Corp., 1511 Gilford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.); The Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Co., Ltd., 150 William Street, New York, N. Y.; North America Cos., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, 111 William Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Employed solely to draft private bill for relief of Wallaston's Manor Corp. and to assemble and present evidence in support thereof. (4) Maximum of 10 percent of the amount of claim set forth in H. R. 1573 or maximum of $1,088 99; have received $500 retainer to be credited against total fee. (5) Same as in No. 1 above. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Butler, Eugene J., 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Catholic Welfare Conference, legal department, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations. (3) Indefinite. Less than 20 percent of my time is devoted to legislative matters since this is an incidental part of my duties as assistant director of the legal department. (4) $7,036 per annum, less insurance, retirement, hospitalization, and withholding, with no special compensation for legislative work. (5) National Catholic Welfare Conference. (6) No specific amount. No budgetary allocation. Reimbursed for actual amount expended for transportation, telephone, and similar items of expense. (7) See No. 6.

Butts, Joseph G. Jr., attorney, law offices of Gall and Lane, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee, Riverton, Va. (2) The Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,000 per month paid to Gall and Lane for all legal research, memoranda, and consultation rendered by registrant and firm. The total current monthly retainer for all legal memoranda and consultation is reported under question 4, for the reason that it is impossible to determine from the language of Public Law 601 what part, if any, of this compensation is in consideration of services within the scope of the act. The amount shown is subject to adjustment in the event of a reduction in the services required. (5) The Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee. (6) Undetermined, see item 7. (7) Travel, telephone, and incidentals only; estimated not to exceed $10 per month.

Carothers, Richard Butler, 1103 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Old Hickery Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Bell Clay Co., United Clay Mines Corp. (3) Indefinite. (4) Actual expenses. (5) Those companies listed in (2) above. (6) Actual expenditures. (7) All expenses.

Carver, Leslie O., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C., a nonprofit membership corporation under Delaware law organized by firms engaged in manufacturing and distribution. (2) National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc. (3) Permanent; the registrant has been continuously employed since June 4, 1937. (4) Registrant's salary as associate general counsel is $6,600 per annum for the substantial and varied duties heretofore performed. He will receive no additional compensation for any activities covered by the act which are expected to occupy a very small percentage of total time employed. Registrant has neither supported nor opposed any legislation before Congress since August 2, 1946. (5) National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc. (6) No fixed allowance. Registrant is stationed at the association's offices and is furnished as an employee customary clerical assistance. He is reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred. (7) Actual necessary expenses. At this time anticipate no expense other than taxicabs; legislative activity to occupy very small percentage of total time employed by employer.

Case, Ralph H., 222 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak.; (1A) Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash. (2) Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak.; (2A) Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash. (3) Four years from December 1, 1946; (2A) 7 years from November 30, 1944. (4) (2) $4,000 per annum; (2A) contingent on recovery. (5) (2) Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; (2A) in the event of recovery, by order of the United States Court of Claims. (6) (2) Reimbursement up to $200 per month; (2A) necessary expenses upon approval of the Secretary of the Interior. (7) (2) Office rent, stenographic wages, necessary travel and subsistence; (2A) necessary travel and subsistence while away from Washington.

Casey, Kathryn P., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) International Apple Association, 154 East Avenue, Rochester, N. Y. (2) International Apple Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Annual salary is remuneration for all services, of which representation before Congress constitutes less than 10 percent. (5) International Apple Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Chace, W. E., 610 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Hill & Knowlton, 610 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Hill & Knowlton, 610 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) $700 per month. (5) Hill & Knowlton. (6) Indefinite; reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses for cab fares, phone calls, and the like. (7) See (6) above.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, room 703, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) American Society of Civil Engineers. (3) Full time in connection with general affairs of the society. Acts as eastern representative to work with local sections and student chapters in Eastern States. Attention to legislative matters is incidental to general activity. (4) $1,000 per year for attention to legislative matters. (5) American Society of Civil Engineers. (6) Certain out-of-pocket expenses; no fixed limit. (7) Office, travel, and minor miscellaneous items.

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, 33 West Sixtieth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Part time; indefinite. (4) No compensation, except as indicated below. (5) National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. (6) Actual travel, hotel and meals, only as incurred. (7) Same as in paragraph (6), above.

Clay, Homer C., 221 North La Salle Street, suite 426, Chicago, Ill. (1) Self. (2) All defendants in all pending actions brought by the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration or his successor pursuant to section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. (3) Until July 1, 1947. (4) Undetermined. (5) Undetermined. (6) Undetermined. (7) Undetermined.

Cohn, Marcus,[2] 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (3) Year to year. (4) See attached statement.[3] (5) American Jewish Committee. (6) See attached statement.[3] (7) Rent, luncheons, travel, dinners, stationery, office supplies, secretary, entertainment, postage, and other miscellaneous expenses.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

Coleman, Frank J., 414 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Washington Plate Printers Union; Washington Central Labor Union; Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor. (2) Washington Plate Printers Union (labor); Washington Central Labor Union (labor); Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor (labor). (3) January 1 to December 31, 1947; elected yearly. January 1 to December 31, 1947; elected yearly. January 1 to December 1, 1947; elected yearly. (4) $5,000 per year as salary as editor and legislative representative; $300 per year as secretary and legislative representative; $700 per year as secretary and legislative representative. (5) Washington Plate Printers Union; Washington Central Labor Union; Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor. (6) I have no expense account. (7) Carfare, taxi fare, and lunch while engaged in legislative work.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is an associate of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary from that firm for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Collett, F. G., P. O. Box 1476, Washington, D. C. (1) Indians of California, Inc., 2619 Regent Street, Berkeley, Calif. (2) The Indians of California. (3) Indefinite number of years. (4) No stipulated amount. Compensation to be determined on a quantum meruit basis. (5) The Indians of California. (6) Necessary monthly traveling expenses. (7) Transportation, room, meals, telephone and telegraph, stenographic services, printing, mimeographing, postage, stationery, and other supplies, etc.

Coman, Ellis S., 701 Architects Building, 816 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, 701 Architects Building, 816 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (2) Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. (3) Only as directed and usually not exceeding 2 or 3 weeks during a year. (4) Only that portion of regular monthly salary which is paid during time in Washington, D. C. (5) Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. (6) Only traveling expenses to and from Washington, D. C., and living expenses while in Washington, D. C. (7) See (6).

Condon, Arthur D., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. W. (2) Attorney for Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc. (3) November 12, 1946, to May 12, 1947. (4) $1,700 per month. (5) Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc. (6) Expenses included in amount stated in (4). (7) Not specified.

Cooley, Thomas M., II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (3) At will. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass. (1) Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (2) Veterans employed in navy yards. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) None. (6) Reimbursement for transportation, hotels, and meals while on official business. (7) Transportation, hotels, and meals.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, 233 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y. (1) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (3) Indefinitely employed as northeastern district manager. Principal duties are furnishing research and informational services to trade organizations and other organizations interested in tax reform. (4) $10,000 per annum. No additional allowance for legislative work (should any be done). I do not solicit or receive money or anything of value for the purpose of influencing legislation. (5) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills, and other similar incidental expenses.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (2) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (3) No definite date specified. (4) Dependent on time spent and expenses incurred. (5) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (6) Necessary disbursements incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio 5, Tex. (1) State Rights Association, Gordon H. Turrentine, secretary, post office box 2371, Houston 1, Tex. (2) State Rights Association, above. (3) Annual basis, to devote such time as may be required. (4) $10,000 annual retainer; $10,000 per year prorated for time devoted to this employment. (5) State Rights Association. (6) No specific allowance; expenses to be reported for reimbursement. (7) Travel, hotel, and living expenses while away from home city and all other expenses incurred in behalf of the association.

Cunniff, Joseph P., 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (1) International Association of Machinists, District Lodge, No. 29. Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C., grand lodge address; 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., district lodge address. (2) Legislation effecting membership employed in railroad industry. (3) Only while legislation is pending. Regular employment is general chairman of district lodge No. 29. (4) Monthly salary is $350; expenses are $9 per day. (5) Salary is paid by district lodge No. 29; expenses are paid by grand lodge while engaged in lobbying. (6) $9 per day. (7) Hotel, food, cab and trolley fares, and any other incidental expenses.

Curran, Roland, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Central Valley Project Association, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (2) Same. (3) Since 1939; indefinite. (4) $500 per month plus $10 per day when in Washington. (5) Central Valley Project Association. (6) Long-distance telephone and telegraph charges and transportation costs to and from Washington. (7) All expenses other than above are to be borne by me.

Curtiss, Ralph E., Kellogg Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 215 Sixth Street, Racine, Wis. (2) Tavern Owners of Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Philadelphia, Pa., who are members of the above-named association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Retainer, $100 per month; per diem fee of $50 for appearances. (5) Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Travel expenses.

Dacci, Guy P., suite 203, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Voters League of America Against Vivisection, suite 203, 1101 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of all members of the national organization and the abolition of vivisection (the Lemke dog bill, H. R. 462). (3) Until annual election in 1948, when I may be voted out as president. (4) So far have received nothing, but according to bylaws I am to receive $75 weekly (if and when). (5) By the treasurer, Helen K. Kiefer, from the funds of the organization. (6) Necessary expenses entailed in the building up of the organization. (7) Travel, etc.

Danaher, John A., 406 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. (1) Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City. (2) See (1); as an attorney engaged in the practice of law I represent the above-named client in appearances before Government departments and agencies principally, but incidental thereto may be required to appear before a congressional committee. (3) Indefinite; depends upon business matters requiring appearances as indicated before Government departments; admitted to practice, also, before United States Supreme Court, United States district courts in District of Columbia and Connecticut, highest courts in Connecticut and United States circuit court of appeals. (4) Indefinite; charges will be made in accordance with appearances and effort, and time expended, and professional judgment, experience, and services rendered. (5) See (1). (6) Indefinite; but as incurred. (7) Necessary stenographic and office expenses, essential travel, telephone charges.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (2) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (3) Employed continuously since January 1937. (4) $6,250 per annum. (5) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (6) I expect to be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling and business expenses while away from my office. The amount for any period of time cannot be estimated. (7) Actual and necessary travel and business expense.

Davidson, John B., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing 8, Mich. (1) Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing 8, Mich. (2) Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing; I am secretary of the Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., serving without pay. (5) Expenses paid by Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, and other incidental expenses necessary to the performance of duties.

Davis, Hugh P., rooms 8-9, 3030 East Ninety-second Street, Chicago 17, Ill. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite elected office. (4) $6,000 per annum, elective office, second vice president. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation plus hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

Davis, Martin H., 10615 Madison Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Midland Steel Products Co., P. and B. division, 10615 Madison Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Foreman's Association of America, independent. (3) Indefinite. (4) [Blank.] (5) Chapter No. 105, Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual. (7) Travel and living expense and time lost from work.

Dickerman, John M., 1185 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) All air line transport pilots. Not more than 20 percent of time is spent on legislative matters within

purview of the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,000 annual retainer. (5) Air Line Pilots Association. (6) No definite amount; reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incident to duties for Air Line Pilots Association. (7) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telephone, telegraph, etc.

Dickinson, Mrs. LaFell (Lucy J.), 1734 N Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 1944. (2) A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. See pamphlet Resolutions, attached. (3) Elected to office for 3 years, June 1944 to June 1947. (4) No salary. (5) No salary. (6) Yearly appropriation of $4,200. This amount used primarily for travel and entertainment in connection with activities of the organization. Travel expense to board meetings and conventions of the organization allowed. (7) See question (6).

Disney, Wesley E., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Engaged in general law practice. (2) General counsel for Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street, Washington, D. C. Retained by fluorspar mining group headed by Mr. S. H. Davis, vice president, Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla. Retained by talc mining group headed by Mr. E. W. Magnus, vice president, Eastern Magnesium Talc Co., Inc., Burlington, Vt. (3) Annual retainer from Independent Natural Gas Association of America, others indefinite. (4) $833 per month retainer from Independent Natural Gas Association of America, $15,000 fee for extended services from talc mining group; undetermined fee from fluorspar mining group. (See next quarterly report.) (5) Same as (2) above. (6) See (7) below. (7) No expense account for entertaining or any other purpose. Expect to be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling expenses.

Dixon, Karl S., Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United States Business Organizations, Inc., which represents affiliated national, State, and local business organizations and associations. (2) United States Business Organizations, Inc. (3) Full-time employment beginning January 1, 1947. Contacts with Congress are only incidental to other services and assistance rendered to affiliated organizations. (4) $12,000 per year. (5) United States Business Organizations, Inc. (6) Moving expenses from Chicago and nothing but actual expenses incurred in connection with his work. (7) Nothing except actual expenses incurred as executive vice president of the United States Business Organizations, Inc.; no entertainment or comparable expenses.

Dow, Wilbur E., Jr.,[2] 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the firm of Dow & Symmers, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quantum meruit, plus traveling and subsistence expenses. (5) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (6) Amount actually paid out. (7) Subsistence, traveling, and stenographic.

Dowell, W. L., 604 Odd Fellows Building, Raleigh, N. C. (1) The North Carolina Merchants Association, 604 Odd Fellows Building, Raleigh, N. C. (2) The North Carolina Merchants Association, 604 Odd Fellows Building, Raleigh, N. C. (3) At the pleasure of the board of directors; it has been continuous since July 1927. (4) My salary as executive secretary of the association is $7,500 annually payable in equal monthly installments. I receive no additional compensation for any particular service rendered. (5) The North Carolina Merchants Association. (6) The full amount of actual traveling expenses when on association business and away from the headquarters city. (7) Hotel, transportation, and incidental traveling expenses.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association. (2) Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) None. (5) No one. (6) Have not exceeded $25 per month (average). (7) Necessary expenses.

Dryden, Mildred L. (Mrs.), suite 305, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (3) Full time employed secretary to executive director of the association. (4) $4,000 per annum. (5) Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (6) Any necessary expense incident to my employment. (7) See (6) above.

Dunbar, Charles E., Jr., care of Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, tenth floor, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee, care of Mr. Joseph W. Montgomery, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (2) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee (most of the activities of this committee at the present time are unrelated to lobbying). (See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed herewith.[1]) (3) Registrant is employed on an annual retainer basis. (4) Retainer of $1,000 a month. (5) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (6) Actual expenses only. (7) Any necessary expenses such as cost of printing briefs, court costs, traveling expenses, telegrams.

Dunford, Edward B., 131 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) The Antisaloon League of America, 131 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (2) The Antisaloon League of America. (3) Two years from November 18, 1946. (4) $5,500 per annum. (5) The Antisaloon League of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Office expenses, clerical help, postage, telephone, telegraph.

Dunn, William M., 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) No specific pay for legislative work as such; yearly salary, $7,200. (5) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW, Washington 1, D. C. (6) No specific amount; actual expenses voucherable. (7) Local transportation, meals, and other incidental expenses.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York 20, N. Y. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Entered employ of American Petroleum Institute January 1, 1933. (4) $10,000 annually for all services rendered American Petroleum Institute, which include many duties other than those related to legislation. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses of character set forth in (7) below. (7) Cost of Government documents pertaining to oil, traveling expenses, meals, entertainment, taxis, and other miscellaneous items.

Dyer, Gus W., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn. (2) Economic adviser to Southern States Industrial Council on a part-time basis. (3) Annual. (4) $1,800 per annum. (5) Southern States Industrial Council. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Traveling and hotel expenses, etc., when on trips for the council.

Eaton,[2] Edna L., room 36, 607 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (3) Permanent. (4) Weekly salary including expenses, $75. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) Included in salary. (7) [Blank.]

Elliott, Francis Leo, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Appointed national director, yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $5,400 per annum as national director. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual traveling, hotel, meals, and incidental expenses, about $12 per day excluding transportation fares. (7) Same as (6).

Ellison, Newell W.,[2] 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) St. Joe Paper Co., and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (2) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be fixed with regard to time spent on the normal attorney-client basis. (5) St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated and associated companies, including Florida National Group of Banks. (6) To be reimbursed for amount actually spent. (7) Telephone calls, taxicab fares, and other similar miscellaneous expenses of a routine nature.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Same as (1). (3) Month to month. (4) $700 per month, for legal services of this office in connection with power contracts, tax matters, and departmental business, and such incidental legislative questions as may arise. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket office expenses. (7) Telegraph, telephone, teletype, travel, and similar out-of-pocket expenses, but not office overhead.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Colorado River Board of California, a public agency of the State of California, and the Six Agency Committee, comprising the representatives upon that board of Imperial irrigation district, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Coachella Valley County Water District, Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, Palo Verde irrigation district, and city of San Diego. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite; subject to termination on reasonable notice. (4) Usual office rate of $20 per hour with minimum of $600 per month for legal services relating to legislation and litigation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River, consultations with Federal departments and officers and others with respect to investigations, plans, and policies relating to irrigation, reclamation, power, etc. Of above amounts, $500 per month is paid by the State and the balance by the Six Agency Committee. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket office expenses. (7) Telegraph, telephone, teletype, travel, etc., but not office overhead.

Ely, Myron Ray, box 2385, Knoxville, Tenn. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) $6,000 per year plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Englar, George M.,[2] 107 Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (1) National Apartment Owners Association, 506 American Building, Baltimore 2, Md. (2) National Apartment Owners Association. (3) Elected president at annual convention November 19, 1945; re-elected November 19, 1946. (4) No salary is

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

paid to the president. (5) See above. (6) No expenses were paid during the first year of office. Traveling expenses to be paid second year. (7) Actual traveling expenses.

Evans, Earl C., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Members of the above association. (3) Present term expires August 1947. (4) Actual expenses. (5) National Star Route Mail Carriers Association. (6) All necessary actual expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, and any necessary expenses.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.; Percy Hamilton Goodsell, Jr., president general, Tenacre, Purchase Road, White Plains, N. Y. (2) In the interest of Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, an unincorporated society. (3) Until Congress passes an act incorporating the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. (4) No payment yet made and no definite sum agreed upon. It is agreed that he will be paid reasonable compensation for his time and services, as approved by the governing board of the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. (5) Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. (6) No agreement. It is not anticipated that he will incur expenses. If any are necessary, they will be small and he will be reimbursed. (7) No agreement. See answer to question (6).

Falzgraf, B. F., Greeley, Colo. (1) Mountain States Beet Growers Marketing Association, sugar legislation and farm labor legislation. (2) Colorado farmers. (3) No limitation. (4) $10 per day and expenses. (5) Mountain States Beet Growers Marketing Association. (6) $10 per day and expenses. (7) Travel, room, and meals.

Fawcett, C. J., 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) National Wool Marketing Corporation, 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (2) Domestic wool growing industry. (3) Since 1934. (4) No additional salary is received for work on legislative matters pertaining to the domestic wool growing industry. Sole salary is for duties in connection with duties of general manager of the corporation which is a cooperative wool selling agency. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual cash outlay carfare, board, and lodging when away from office. Do not consider my activities constitute lobbying within register any way. (7) Actual as above outlined.

Filer, H. L., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven 6, Conn. (1) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (2) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (3) Continuing. (4) See schedule A attached.[1] (5) Howard S. Palmer, James Lee Loomis, and Henry B. Sawyer, trustees, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses in connection with entire employment, only a part of which concerns Federal legislation. (7) Actual expenses while away from headquarters such as traveling expenses, hotel bills, taxicab fares, etc.

Finucane, James, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council for Prevention of War (same address as above). (2) National Council for Prevention of War (same address as above). (3) Indefinitely. (4) $75 a week. (5) National Council for Prevention of War. (6) As required. (7) Transportation, and so forth.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Floyd, William M.,[2] 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Regular Veterans Association, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) Regular Veterans Association. (3) Elected for period of 1 year to expire August 31, 1947. (4) Yearly salary $3,600. (5) Regular Veterans Association. (6) Nothing. (7) [Blank.]

Fondahl, John E., No. 11 Police Precinct, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. (1) Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. (2) Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia (active membership of over 2,100 members of the Metropolitan, U. S. Park Police, U. S. White House Police, and certain retired members). (3) Elected president Policemen's Association. January 1941, to serve for period of 1 year. (4) No pay involved. (5) [Blank.] (6) No expense money involved. (7) [Blank.]

Fox, O. J., 215 Majestic Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Inc., 215 Majestic Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (2) Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Inc.; for old-age pension legislation. (3) Until further notified. (4) $25 per week and expenses. (5) Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Inc. (6) Whatever my detailed report shows. (7) Traveling, hotel, meals, printing, postage, cleaning and pressing, laundry, and stationery. If there are other items they will be shown in my detailed report.

Frampton, Merle E., Dr., 999 Pelham Parkway, New York City. (1) New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, 999 Pelham Parkway, New York 67, N. Y. (2) Handicapped individuals. (3) At times when legislation or appropriations affecting the handicapped are before the Congress. (4) Nothing; pays his own expenses. (5) [Blank.] (6) Nothing. (7) [Blank.]

Franzen, John T. D., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at per diem based on $420 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus, and carfares; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Fraser, Samuel, 154 East Avenue, Rochester, N. Y. (1) International Apple Association, 154 East Avenue, Rochester, N. Y. (2) International Apple Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) Annual salary is remuneration for all services, of which representation before Congress constitutes less than 10 percent. (5) International Apple Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Lafayette Hotel, Washington 6, D. C. (1) North Dakota Resources Board, Fargo, N. Dak.; North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (2) North Dakota Resources Board, Fargo, N. Dak.; Greater North Dakota Association, Fargo, N. Dak.; North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,000 per annum. (5) $3,800 by North Dakota Resources Board, and $1,200 by North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission. (6) Reimbursed by North Dakota Resources Board for all expenses; no fixed amount. (7) All expenses, including travel, living, office, stenographic, postage, telephone, and telegraph, etc.

Gann, Glenn, supervisor, United States Rubber Co., 6600 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly employment and indefinite. (4) $305 per month paid by the Foreman's Association of America, Chapter No. 8. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Chapter No. 8. (6) Actual transportation plus hotel and incidentals up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Gannon, Peter J., 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J. (1) American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J. (2) American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J. (3) Since September 1939. (4) Unsalaried. (5) Unsalaried. (6) As incurred. (7) Traveling, hotel bills, meals.

Gardiner, Elizabeth, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $335 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus and car fares; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Gary, Barham R., 815 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Anne Arundel Antiairport Association, Annapolis, Md. (2) Anne Arundel Antiairport Association. (3) Relationship of attorney and client; no definite period agreed upon. (4) No amount has been paid or agreed upon. (5) Anne Arundel Antiairport Association. (6) No amount to be paid for expenses. (7) None.

Geaslin, Bon, 520 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala., and Waterman Airlines, Inc., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. I am not engaged "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress." I am vice president and general counsel of the two companies named herein and the other subsidiaries of the Waterman Steamship Corp., and perform the usual functions of the chief legal officer of a corporation. These companies are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine or the operation of aircraft. This, of necessity, requires appearances before congressional committees and the presentation of facts to the members of such committees. This work is only incidental to the general functions of my office. (2) Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala.; Waterman Airlines, Inc., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (3) Permanent, I hope. (4) $25,000 per annum. (5) Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (6) I am paid no expenses "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress." (7) Waterman Steamship Corp. pays the office rent, telephone, telegraph, and traveling expenses incidental to the performance of my duties as general counsel of it and its subsidiary corporations.

Gentner, Leo F., 311 Colorado Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Federation of Apparel Associations, Inc., 311 Colorado Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) A group of clothing manufacturers who make up the membership of the trade association known as National Federation of Apparel Associations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $12,000 yearly. (5) National Federation of Apparel Associations. (6) Any necessary expenses incurred in the course of regular business. (7) Traveling expenses and entertainment.

Gilbert, C. C., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn. (2) Executive secretary, Southern States Industrial Council (one-half of time). (3) Annual. (4) $6,000. (5) Southern States Industrial Council. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Traveling expenses, hotels, etc., when on trips for council.

Goddard, George V. R., 1641 East Eyre Street, Philadelphia 25, Pa. (1) Federal Employees Veterans Association, third regional council, 1641 East Eyre Street, Philadelphia 25, Pa. (2) Chairman, third regional council, legislative committee, interested in all legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment, retirement acts concerning Federal employees. (3) Elected annually. (4) Actual expenses; no salary. (5) Federal Employees Veterans Association. (6) Various; actual traveling and living expenses when away from home. (7) Railroad fare, hotel and board when away from home, stenographic services.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York 17, N. Y. (2) American Institute of Accountants and its members. (3) During the pendency of any proposed legislation tending to restrict the right of accountants to appear before Government agencies, such as H. R. 2657. (4) Reasonable compensation to be determined by agreement. (5) American Institute of Accountants. (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Telegrams, long-distance telephone calls, taxicabs, etc.

Goss, Bert C., 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Hill & Knowlton, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Hill & Knowlton, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Registrant is a member of the firm, a partnership. (4) Indefinite; a partner. (5) Hill & Knowlton. (6) Indefinite; reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses such as cab fares, phone calls and the like. (7) See (6) above.

Gradel, John G., 7149 Ditman Street, Tacony, Philadelphia 35, Pa. (1) Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees. (3) Have been engaged as grand lodge representative since November 1, 1938; duration indefinite called from time to time on legislative work. (4) Salary at the rate of $4,050 per year. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, and transportation.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu 4, T. H. (2) Sugar producers of the Territory of Hawaii. (3) Since January 1, 1937, and continuing. (4) $45,180 per annum as vice president and general mainland representative of the association; only an incidental part of such representation applies to legislation. (See letter attached hereto and made a part thereof.[1]) (5) Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. (6) Necessary travel and other business expenses. (7) See answer to (6) above.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Cargill, Inc., a corporation with its principal office at 761 Grain Exchange Building, Minneapolis 15, Minn. (2) In the interest of dealers in and warehousemen and shippers of grains, seeds, and beans and manufacturers of feed for livestock and poultry, the ingredients thereof, and vegetable oils. (3) See letter attached.[1] (4) $1,108.34 per month plus additions or bonuses not exactly determinable in advance. The total additions or bonuses actually received by me during the calendar year 1946 was $12,000. (5) Cargill, Inc. (6) Reimbursed in full for all expenses; no fixed limit as to amount (in addition to (4)). (7) All usual business expenses including office rent, telephone, etc. (in addition to (4)).

Grinberg, P. Irving, 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (2) Entire jewelry industry of the United States, including retail, wholesale, manufacturing, jobbing, and importing. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary, $15,000 per annum; duties include various activities besides lobbying. (5) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel fares, hotel room, meals, local and long distance telephone tolls, telegrams, taxicabs, miscellaneous tips, etc.

Groom, B. E.,[1] 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. (1) North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Fargo, N. Dak. (2) The Taxpayers of North Dakota. (3) Indefinite; started work January 1, 1947. (4) No salary paid to date. (5) If any salary is paid it will be by North Dakota Tax Equality Committee. (6) Actual expense incident to promotional work when away from office. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, and usual miscellaneous expenses for groups at meal, etc., in organization work.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (1) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (2) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations. (3) Annual. (4) $1,500 (annually). (5) National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations. (6) $1,076. (7) Stenographic help, travel, printing, stationery, postage, telephone, and telegraph.

Harper, Ford C., 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (1) Oklahoma Tax Equality League, 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (2) Oklahoma Tax Equality League, 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. I serve as secretary of the Oklahoma Tax Equality League without salary. (5) Oklahoma Tax Equality League. (6) No predetermined amount, but am reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in carrying out my duties. (7) Travel, hotel, postage, stenographic, phone, etc.

Harris, Peggy (Mrs.), 39 East Thirty-sixth Street. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) Above committee. (3) Terminable at will. (4) $433.33 per month plus actual out-of-pocket travel expenses. (5) Above committee. (6) Actual out-of-pocket travel expenses. (7) Fares of transportation, hotel, and out-of-pocket travel expenses.

Harris, Ronald D., 602 T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif. (1) California Irrigation Districts Association, Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Association's. (3) Indeterminate; each trip must be authorized. (4) No agreement as yet; depends on how much remains in budget at year end. (5) Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, housing, food; nothing for entertainment.

Harris, Winder R., room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York 6, N. Y. (2) Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York 6, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) $15,000 annual salary. (5) Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York 6, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Routine business disbursements, such as travel, taxicabs, and carfare; printing; stationery; telephone and telegraph; towels; and other routine office expenses.

Hart, Merwin K., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y. (1) National Economic Council, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, organized under the membership corporation law of the State of New York, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y. (2) National Economic Council, Inc., whose purpose is to aid in developing an informed public opinion on the major political, social, and economic problems of the Nation. Said National Economic Council, Inc., does not in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicit, collect, or receive money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, nor is its principal purpose to aid, in the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States or to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of such legislation. Consequently nothing in this statement is to be construed as an admission that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applies to it. (3) Indefinite; currently serving as president of National Economic Council, Inc. (4) Nominal; during calendar year 1946, compensation amounted to $800. (5) National Economic Council, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses; principally stationery, stenography, postage, and traveling expense. (7) See (6) above.

Hayes, William E., 601 Washington Building, Fifteenth Street and New York Avenue NW. (1) The undersigned is an officer of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., with general offices at La Salle Street Station, Chicago 5, Ill. His title is executive representative, and his duties are to act for the company's chief executive officer in contacts with the various agencies of the Government, with officers of the Association of American Railroads in operating and traffic matters where necessary, and with the officers of other railroads in matters of common interest. He handles with Government agencies, or aids and assists other officers of his company in handling matters which from time to time concern his company directly. He advises the chief executive officer of his company, and the executives of various departments, of all current developments relating to the railroad industry. His efforts in matters of proposed or pending legislation are a very minor part of his work, and only incidental. Because of diversity of opinion as to whether this act applies to him, the undersigned files this form as a matter of precaution. (2) Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. (3) Continuing. (4) The undersigned receives an annual salary as an officer in the executive department of his company, this salary covering all his activities, the least of which concerns legislation. Since it is impossible to estimate in advance what portion of his time, if any, may be devoted to legislative activities, he will report quarterly on the prescribed forms that part of his salary which may be apportioned to cover whatever time is actually spent in pursuits covered by this act. (5) Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Actual out-of-pocket expenditures incurred in the services of his company including traveling expenses while away from Washington.

Hays, William J., 4863 Potomac Avenue NW., Washington 7, D. C. (1) United Public Workers, CIO, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) United States Government employees. (3) Indefinite; end of present session. (4) $250 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Hebble, George C., White House Police Department. (1) White House Police Department. (2) Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia (active membership of over 2,100 members of the Metropolitan, United States Park, and White House Police, and certain retired members). (3) Elected to serve as a member of the legislative committee for a period of 3 years from January 1, 1947. (4) No pay involved. (5) [Blank.] (6) There is no certain amount of money appropriated for expenses. During the year, from time to time, as necessary, the association may appropriate up to $45 for the expenses of the legislative committee. The money is spent for work incidental to the committee, mostly for printing and stenographic work. (7) As noted above.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Full-time employment consisting of various phases of business of Western Union Telegraph Co., only a part of which concerns legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

(4) $9,600 per annum which is paid for all of services rendered. (See (3) above.) (5) Western Union Telegraph Co. (6) No specified amount; reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in connection with entire employment only a part of which concerns legislation. (7) Transportation and incidental expenses incurred on business of the telegraph company, including that part which concerns legislation. By filing this registration or any subsequent quarterly report, registrant does not concede that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applies to him or to the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001-1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York 7, N. Y. (See explanatory letter attached hereto and made a part hereof.[1]) (2) The National Association of Insurance Agents, a voluntary, unincorporated, nonprofit trade association of local fire, marine, casualty, and surety insurance agents. (3) Indeterminate; at will of employers. (4) An annual salary of $7,200 and incidental expenses incurred or paid by registrant on itemized expense bills rendered to said national association. (5) National Association of Insurance Agents, which maintains a small office at the above address for which it pays the rent, telephone, and telegraph bills as rendered, and any incidental office expenses, together with the salary of two stenographers. (6) Actual and necessary expenses in connection with his duties as assistant Washington representative and fieldman, which duties largely involve traveling over the country and meeting with State associations and local groups. (7) Travel expenses, hotels, meals, taxis, telephone, telegraph, and small items of entertainment in connection with his duties as assistant Washington representative and fieldman.

Herrington, Alfred B., 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National Federation of Telepnone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) No specific pay for legislative work as such; yearly salary, $7,200. (5) National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (6) No specific amount; actual expenses voucherable. (7) Local transportation, meals, and other incidental expenses.

Hester, Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (2) Boston Wool Trade Association. (3) Annual basis. (4) $5,000 per annum. (5) Boston Wool Trade Association. (6) All necessary expenses. (7) Office, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, travel, and so forth.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M Merritt. 93 Elm Street, Hartford 6, Conn., and 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (2) Approximately 215 member life insurance companies of the Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y., and the American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and their policyholders. (3) Indefinite. (4) No payment has been made but the firm of Hewes and Awalt will be paid a reasonable fee for legal services rendered. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Usual out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed. (7) Expenses customary in legal work such as carfare, taxi fares, telephone and telegraph charges, transportation, and traveling expenses.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Hibbard, Lorin P., 220 Mace Arcade, 36 South Howard Street, Akron 8, Ohio. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 24, Mich. (2) Foremen's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis, indefinite and appointed. (4) $400 per month. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation, hotel expenses, and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

Hinman, Ray C., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (2) Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) $5,000. The registrant, in addition to his duties of following Federal legislation, is also charged with many other duties not relating to Federal legislation. The compensation named represents the estimated portion of the registrant's entire remuneration which is attributable to the performance of the duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act. (5) Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (6) No stated amount; only reimbursement for normal traveling expenses. (7) Railroad and taxi fare, hotel, meals, telegraph, telephone, postage, stationery, stenographic expenses.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (2) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (3) No definite date specified. (4) Dependent on time spent and expenses incurred. (5) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (6) Necessary disbursements incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Hofherr, Milton, foreman, General Ceramics & Steatite Corp., Keasbey, N. J. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $460 monthly paid by chapters of eastern district, Foreman's Association of America. (5) Foreman's Association of America, chapters of eastern district. (6) Actual transportation plus hotel expenses and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

Holloway, Hubert, room 315, Stoneleigh Court, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Institute of Public Relations, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Permanent employee. (4) Annual salary of $12,000. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Traveling, luncheons, taxis, tips, etc.

Holmes, George T., 429 West Jefferson Street, Louisville 2, Ky. (1) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 429 West Jefferson Street, Louisville 2, Ky. (2) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (3) Indefinite. (4) $150 per month as secretary, Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (5) Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (6) Necessary travel expense. (7) Necessary travel expense.

Holste, Oscar W., room 301, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Court and Vine Streets, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (3) Indefinite. (4) $15 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. (6) Living expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, cab, and laundry service; streetcar and traveling expenses.

Hornett, Joseph George, foreman, Hudson Motor Car Co., 12601 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $432 monthly salary paid by Foreman's Association of America, Chapter No. 6. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Chapter No. 6. (6) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expense up to $12 per day. (7) Same as above stated.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 4849 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) $365 per month. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Meals, lodging, and miscellaneous.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (2) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. I am employed in the capacity of manager of the Washington office, American Institute of Laundering, in the interest of the laundry industry and the members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (6) Indefinite; estimated not to exceed $5,000 per annum. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, committee meeting expenses, gratuities, etc. (See also letter attached and made a part hereof.[1])

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. (2) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Amount earned under normal attorney-client retainer which has existed for some time. It is contemplated that most of the work will be, as heretofore, administrative and departmental but some legislative work will be involved. Fees will be computed on the basis of time and effort expended. (5) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling, hotel, food, taxi, telephone, and telegraph.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association, 804 Commercial Building, Dayton 2, Ohio. (2) Foremen's League for Education and Association, 804 Commercial Building, Dayton 2, Ohio. (3) Indefinite; month to month. (4) $5,000 retainer, $1,000 monthly. (5) Foremen's League for Education and Association, 804 Commercial Building, Dayton 2, Ohio. (6) Nothing; excepting authorized out-of-pocket expenses, if necessary. (7) See (6) above.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich.; J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.; The Falk Corp., Milwaukee, Wis. (2) Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich.; J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.; The Falk Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis. (3) Indefinite; month to month. (4) $1,700 per month. (5) Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich.; J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.; The Falk Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis. (6) Nothing; excepting authorized out-of-pocket traveling expenses as necessary. (7) See (6) above.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite, month to month. (4) $300 per month. (5) American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (6) Nothing, excepting authorized out-of-pocket traveling expenses, as necessary. (7) See (6) above.

Institute of Public Relations, Inc., John W. Darr, president, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Arkansas-Oklahoma Gas Co., Fort Smith, Ark.; Homer W. Long, Guymon, Okla.; Oklahoma Natural Gas Co., Tulsa,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Okla.; Republic Natural Gas Co., Dallas, Tex.; Shamrock Oil & Gas Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Southern Union Gas Co., Dallas, Tex. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) The year 1947. (4) Total fee and expenses, $18,000. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Included in (4) above. (7) Traveling, mailing, printing, luncheons, etc.

Jackson, Boyd J., Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin bands of Snake Indians, known as the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon. Was elected and authorized by Klamath General Council to act in Washington, D. C., as its representative. Address: Klamath Agency, Oreg. (2) Interest of Klamath Tribe of Indians. (3) Subject to termination or extension of stay in Washington by Commissioner of Indian Affairs under the act of May 15, 1945. No present time limitation fixed. (4) While so acting is paid a salary of $10 per day and $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence. The tribe also pays transportation expenses on vouchers approved by the superintendent of Klamath Agency. All are paid from tribal funds. (5) Klamath Indian Agency, Klamath Agency, Oreg., in accordance with the act of Congress May 15, 1945, and resolution of Klamath General Council of December 19, 1946. (6) Transportation and $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence. (7) Transportation expenses and per diem.

Jacob, Betty Muther, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same as above. (3) February 1 to February 15, 1947. (4) There is to be no remuneration. (5) See (4) above. (6) About $30. (7) Railroad fare to and from Philadelphia, taxis, trolleys, telephone, meals, and overnight lodging.

Jhung, Walter, Hotel Pennsylvania, 20 F Street NW., Washington 13, D. C. (1) Won Soon Lee (Korean-American Trading Co.), 105 East Houston Street, New York 2, N. Y. (2) Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee, headquarters, Hotel Pennsylvania, Washington 13, D. C. (3) Until concurrent passage of Korean bills in Congress. (4) $4,000 per year. This salary is as employee of the Korean-American Trading Co. as its public relations and promotional manager. (5) Korean-American Trading Co. (Won Soon Lee), 105 East Houston Street, New York 2, N. Y. (6) No specific amount agreed upon. (7) Hotel rentals; general office expenses; telephone, cable, and telegram expenses, transportation.

Jobe, William T., 1706 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Association of Ice Industries, as general counsel. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) Since September 1, 1941. (4) $10,000 yearly salary virtually all of which is for services other than legislative. (5) National Association of Ice Industries. (6) None. (7) (a) Railroad fare, plus per diem, at $10 per day, for any required association travel outside of Washington; (b) local taxi fares spent in connection with association business.

Johnson, Alfonso, 1101 Commerce Street, Dallas 2, Tex. (1) Federal Tax Equality League of Texas (same address). (2) Federal Tax Equality League of Texas. (3) Purely on volunteer basis without contract or agreement as to term of service. (4) No compensation. (5) Reimbursed for general office expense by the Federal Tax Equality League of Texas. (6) Postage, general office supplies, and general office expense. (7) See (6).

Johnson, Clare A.,[2] room 1027, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) The responsibilities of my position are to disseminate information and research to trade associations, chambers of commerce, and other interested organizations. Do not anticipate any appearances or work falling under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The undersigned does not contemplate activities falling under the specific language or apparent intent of Public Law 601. Authoritative interpretations of that statute, however, are lacking and this registration is filed solely as a precaution against the possibility of future interpretations beyond the apparent scope of the act. (3) As a permanent staff member, the duration of employment is indefinite. (4) Entire salary is paid for services not falling within Public Law 601. (5) National Tax Equality Association. (6) Actual travel expenses, if any. (7) Hotels, meals, travel, and incidental miscellaneous.

Johnson, Curtis Edward, 4619A South Thirty-sixth Street, Arlington, Va. (1) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Mutually, at will. (4) At the rate of $7,500 per year. (5) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Actual outlay for transportation and telephone and telegraph charges, plus $10 per diem, when stationary, and $5 per diem, when traveling. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses on basis given in (6).

Jones, L. Dan, 500 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Independent Petroleum Association of America, 500 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., a nonprofit association, the membership of which primarily consists of producers of crude petroleum but also includes persons engaged in other phases of the petroleum industry. (2) Independent Petroleum Association of America. (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) See attached statement.[1] (5) See attached statement.[1] (6) See attached statement.[1] (7) See attached statement.[1]

Jones, Walter J., legislative representative, Canal Zone Central Labor Union, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Balboa, C. Z. (2) Employees of the Panama Canal. (3) Until fired, resigned, retired, or dead. (4) $312 a month. (5) Canal Zone Central Labor Union. (6) As submitted for actual expenses. (7) Taxis, messengers, phone, hotel, and other incidentals, including secretarial, mailing charges.

Kaiser, Herbert G., 2323 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (residence: 3904 Jocelyn Street NW., Washington, D. C.). (1) Government Group Insurance Conference, of which associations of employees of Government departments and District of Columbia are members. The associations are organized for group life insurance and other benefits for their members, and membership continues after leaving the service. No partner. Address of conference secretary is E. C. Mellor, 209 Wilson Lane, Bethesda, Md. (2) Department of Agriculture Beneficial Association; United States Departments of Commerce and Justice Beneficial Association; United States Department of Labor Beneficial Association; Department of the Interior Beneficial Association; Government Services, Inc.; War Department Beneficial Association; Navy Department Beneficial Association; Employees' Welfare Association, Veterans' Administration; United States Treasury Department Beneficial Association, Inc.; Post Office Department Immediate Benefit Association; Employees' Beneficial Association, Federal Security Agency; Government Printing Office Group Life Insurance Association, Inc.; Municipal Employees' Group Insurance Association; Washington Navy Yard Group Life Insurance Association. (3) As chairman of legislative committee until and if a successor is named. (4) Nothing from Government Group Insurance Conference; as president of United States Treasury Department Beneficial Association, $150 a month for all services, which includes numerous other duties. (5) See (4). (6) Whatever small amount may be necessary for stenographers, etc. (7) See (6).

Kass, Rear Adm. I, Post Office Box 4037, Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C. (1) I. Kass; my own initiative, enterprise. (2) In my own interest; and in interest of the Southern States, race relations, and liberal government. (3) Not certain. (4) Not certain. (5) By favorable congressional action; and if an organization will back my educational project. (6) Not arranged. (7) My professional services; and postage, printing, travel, and conferences.

Kay, Raymond, 109 East Twenty-eighth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) National Committee for Fair Taxation, its members, and contributors. (2) National Committee for Fair Taxation, its members, and contributors. (3) Subject to determination by employer. (4) No arrangement has as yet been made or discussed in the matter of salary or other compensation. (5) National Committee for Fair Taxation. (6) Not as yet decided; it is assumed that all actual and proper expenses will be paid. (7) Subject to determination by the National Committee for Fair Taxation.

Keller, Joseph E., 930 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) Same as (1) above. (2) Indefinite. (4) Regular salary of $75 a month; additional compensation may be received at end of year depending upon extent of time devoted and services rendered. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses of character set forth in (7) below. (7) Taxis, luncheons, other miscellaneous out-of-pocket expenses.

Kelly, Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Retail Credit Institute of America, 917 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Retail Credit Institute of America. (3) Indeterminate. (4) $2,400 per year as consultant on the institute's general program of public relations and necessary expenses and additional compensation for additional time, if, and when necessary. (5) By the institute. (6) No allowance stipulated. (7) Such times as out-of-town travel, long-distance calls, etc.

Kennedy, Harold L., 912 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 303 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (2) Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association. (6) No fixed amount; reimbursed for actual expenses such as taxis, meals, and hotel bills while away from Washington office, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Ketcham, Frank S., Braverman & Ketcham, Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Shotwell Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., General Confections, Inc., New York, N. Y. (2) Shotwell Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; General Confections, Inc., New York, N. Y. (3) Undetermined. (4) $6,000 per annum by Shotwell Manufacturing Co. under normal attorney-client arrangement for routine legal work. For other than routine legal work compensation will be computed upon the basis of the time expended. $2,500 retainer from General Confections, Inc., plus additional amounts to be determined later. An extremely small portion only of the services rendered by registrant for Shotwell Manufacturing Co. and General Confections, Inc., are such as might possibly be construed as being covered by any provision of this act. (5) Shotwell Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; General Confections, Inc., New York, N. Y. (6) As much as incurred. (7) Reimbursable expenses normal in the practice of law.

Kieran, James M., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Com-

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

mittee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary of $15,000 per year plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel, subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

King, Karl V., attorney at law, 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorono, Pete Elguezabal, Zenon Zubieta, Francisco Alluntiz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, Elko, Nev.; Jose Antonio Odriozola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida, Battle Mountain, Nev. (2) Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorono, Pete Elguezabal, Zenon Zubieta, Francisco Alluntiz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, Elko, Nev.; Jose Antonio Odriozola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida, Battle Mountain, Nev. (3) Two years or until business is completed. (4) Actual expenses plus $50 from each person aided. (5) Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorona, Pete Elguezabal, Zenon Zubieta, Francisco Alluntiz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, Elko, Nev.; Jose Antonio Odriozola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida, Battle Mountain, Nev. (6) Actual living and travel expenses. (7) Actual living and travel expense.

King, Willfurd I.,[1] room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (2) Same as above. (3) Since July 9, 1945. (4) $150 per week. (5) The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. (6) $242.14 for the entire quarter ending March 31, 1947; only actual expenses incurred for the benefit of the committee (travel, secretarial, etc.). (7) See above.

Kirk, Jesse L., Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Bands of Snake Indians, known as the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon. (2) Interest of Klamath Tribe of Indians. (3) Indefinite. Appearing solely as a witness. (4) While so acting, he receives $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence. The tribe also pays transportation expenses on vouchers approved by the superintendent of Klamath Agency. All are paid from tribal funds. (5) Klamath Indian Agency, Klamath Agency, Oreg., in accordance with the act of Congress, May 15, 1945, and resolution of Klamath General Council of December 19, 1946. (6) Transportation and $6 per diem in lieu of subsistence. (7) Transportation expenses and per diem.

Koch, Robert M., 1426 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1426 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc. (3) As long as may be necessary in any year. (4) $2,000. This is an amount which has been estimated by the board of directors as the proportion of my total salary that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. If I find that this estimate is not correct, I will file a supplementary statement. (5) National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc. (6) Office and secretarial, telephone, telegraphic services, etc., are supplied by the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc. I will be reimbursed by my employer for actual expenses incurred as indicated by itemized monthly expense accounts. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, entertainment, incidentals, etc., incurred in connection with this employment.

Kocher, Eric, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $420 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus and carfare, hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone and postage.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Savings and Loan League. I have a legal opinion from counsel advising that my activities do not come within the purview of this act inasmuch as work done by me in connection with legislation is only incidental to my other duties and consumes only a relatively small portion of my time. Therefore, I am filing this form subject to the foregoing reservations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $15,000 per annum in payment for services as executive manager of the league, only a small part of the duties of this position being connected with legislative activities. (5) National Savings and Loan League. (6) $3,000 per annum plus travel expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, gratuities, entertaining, customarily incident to traveling done by persons holding similar positions who are requred to attend meetings, etc., throughout the United States.

Lacques, Paul H., 99 John Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York 7, N. Y. (2) Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (3) Partner in firm since January 1, 1929. (4) A percentage of the earnings of the firm. (5) Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (6) No sum is specifically set aside for expenses. (7) Cost of transportation and hotel accommodations.

Lance, James Work, War Assets Administration, 121 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) War Assets Administration, Lafayette Building, Fifth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (home address: 57 Princeton Road, Havertown, Pa.). (2) Federal Employees Veterans' Association; The American Legion. (3) Indefinite: I am not representing my employer but two veterans' organizations. (4) No remuneration. (5) None. (6) If at all, minimum travel expenses. (7) Travel only.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1127 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite; subject to change by action of the board of directors of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) An annual fee of $18,000 is paid by the association to Clark & La Roe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur La Roe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the partnership agreement. This fee is paid for general legal services, no part being allocated for legislative work, and legislative work has not and will not constitute more than a very small proportion of the services rendered. If and when such work is performed, appropriate quarterly reports will be made as required. (5) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing, taxi fares, postage, travel.

Laylin, John G., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (2) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (3) No definite date specified. (4) Dependent on time spent and expenses incurred. (5) Aluminum Research Institute, Chicago, Ill. (6) Necessary disbursements incurred. (7) Traveling, telephone, and telegraph.

Leiser, Clara, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $435 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares, taxi, bus, and carfare; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Lemmon, James H., Lemmon, S. Dak. (1) National Wool Marketing Corp., 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (2) Wool growers. (3) Acting as president 6 years. (4) Receive no compensation except expenses and salary as president, National Wool Marketing Corp. (5) Answer (4): National Wool Marketing Corp. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Railroad fare, berth, hotel bill, meals, taxi expenses, telephone and telegraph, stationery, stamps.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas 1, Tex. (1) National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (2) National Tax Equality Association (as above). (3) Indefinite employment as southwestern district manager; principal duties are to furnish research and informational service to trade associations and other organizations interested in tax reform. (4) Salary $8,500 per annum; no additional allowance for legislative work (should any be done). I do not solicit or receive money or anything else of value for the purpose of influencing legislation. (5) I am paid salary as above indicated by the National Tax Equality Association. (6) I am reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred and paid by me for travel and incidental expenses. (7) Expenses include only transportation, hotel, restaurant, and other similar expenses incident to travel.

Levitan, Selig J., 165 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (1) Joseph Villar, 121 West Seventy-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) Joseph Villar, 121 West Seventy-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (3) Such employment shall terminate either upon the passage of the legislation (H. R. 1021) by the Congress, or adjournment or recess of the current first session of the Eightieth Congress, or June 30, 1947, whichever shall occur earlier. (4) $300 per day, up to a maximum of $1,800. If the legislation referred to above is hereafter passed and signed, $2,500 additional. (5) Joseph Villar. (6) Indefinite; actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Expenses anticipated are travel, long-distance telephones, and possibly cost of printing a brief or statement.

Linton, Donald H., 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (1) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (2) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $1,000, dependent upon portion of time spent in such employment. (5) Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (6) Unspecified. (7) Travel and incidental expenses.

Little, Charles R., executive secretary, Kenwood Road, Box 153M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati 27, Ohio. (1) Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress (Dr. Charles E. Holzer, president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio). (2) Individuals, business, and industrial firms who are voluntary contributors financially to the Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress. (3) Full time or permanent basis. (4) Salary, $300 per month, less social-security tax reduction. (5) Forrest W. Ingraham, treasurer, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress (care of Marietta Manufacturing Co., Point Pleasant, W. Va.). (6) $200 per month. (7) Travel and living expenses away from home, telephone and telegraph charges, and any office expenses (including stationery, postage, office supplies, papers, magazines, etc.).

Little, Walter J., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (1) Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco 5,

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

Calif.; Union Pacific Railroad Co., 423 West Sixth St., Los Angeles, Calif.; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles; the Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Northwestern Pacific Railroad Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) The railroad companies named above. (3) The duration of such employment is indefinite. (See statement A on reverse side.[1]) (4) He is not paid any stated or determinable amount for services in connection with Federal legislation. (See statement A on reverse side.[1]) (5) The railroads named above. (6) He is not paid any stated or determinable amount for expenses incurred in connection with Federal legislation. (See statement A on reverse side.[1]) (7) His expenses include only actual expenditures for rent, office supplies, hotel bills, traveling expenses and the like. (See statement A on reverse side.[1])

Lloyd, Joanne, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO). (2) Members of the UAW-CIO and on behalf of all working people. (3) Indefinite. (4) $60 weekly and expenses. Registrant performs work other than legislative which is included in salary and expenses. (5) UAW-CIO. (6) $5 weekly. (7) Transportation, cabs, miscellaneous.

Lucas, James C., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Retail Federation and its members. (3) Permanent. (4) $800, which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) American Retail Federation. (6) Reimbursed for allowed out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi fare and occasional meals.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (2) Townsend Recovery Plan. (3) Temporary. (4) A 25-percent commission on the income from Arizona, which goes to national headquarters, and this is all used for postage and such other expenses. Income not sufficient to pay salary. (5) National Headquarters, Townsend Recovery Plan, Inc. (6) None, except as stated in (4) above. (7) Postage and such incidentals.

Lyon and Lyon, attorneys, comprised of R. B. H. Lyon and Richard K. Lyon, partners, suite 701, Evans Building, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Seventy-two trust companies as set forth in the attached copy of S. 1241 (79th Cong., 1st sess.).[1] (2) Same as answer to (1). (3) Indefinite. This firm continually has represented such trust companies since approximately 1926 for the principal purpose of obtaining refund of bankers' special tax erroneously overpaid under acts of June 13, 1898, and October 22, 1914. (4) Since the inception of such representation, this firm has been performing its legal services pursuant to a 25-percent contingent fee arrangement with each of such trust companies. To date the firm has performed extensive work over a period of approximately 20 years, including court action in the United States Court of Claims on behalf of all of these trust companies. (5) The firm is to be paid by each of the trust companies listed in the attachment. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

McAvoy, Harold, 907 Lormer Street, Brooklyn 23, N. Y. (1) National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers. (2) All members of the National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers. (3) Until a successor is elected at the national convention, which is held every 2 years. (4) $400 a month, which must take care of everything, including the $1,600 for lobbying. (5) National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers. (6) About $200 a month, which includes everything. (7) All expenses.

McBride, Don, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Reclamation Association, Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Reclamation Association comprising 17 western reclamation States. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 annually. (5) National Reclamation Association. (6) Maximum of $2,000 per year for travel and out-of-pocket expenses not to exceed $500 per year. (7) (See above.) Copy of constitution of the National Reclamation Association attached.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark. (1) Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Mississippi Valley Association. (See attached statement.[1]) (3) Indefinite. (See attached statement.[1]) (4) $300 per month. (See attached statement.[1]) (5) Mississippi Valley Association. (6) Actual authorized expenditures. (7) Travel and subsistence.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) Northern Pacific Railway Co., Smith Tower, Seattle 4, Wash.; Great Northern Railway Co., Great Northern Building, Seattle 1, Wash.; Union Pacific Railroad Co., Union Station, Seattle 4, Wash.; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., White Building, Seattle 1, Wash.; Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., American Bank Building, Portland 5, Oreg. acting through a local committee designated "Washington Railroad Association." (2) Railroad companies listed in (1) above. (3) Registrant is full-time employee of Washington Railroad Association, as stated in (1) above; his employment is indefinite. (4) Matters of Federal legislation are not principal purpose of registrants' employment and he is not paid any stated or determinable amount in connection therewith. (See statement A on reverse side hereof.[1]) (5) Washington Railroad Association, as stated in (1) above. (6) Services in connection with Federal legislation are incidental to registrant's regular duties and no stated or determinable amount is paid therefor. (See statement A on reverse side.[1]) (7) Expenses allowed registrant include only actual expenditures for office rent, supplies, hotel bills, and traveling expenses.

McKee, Jerome B., 321 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) District of Columbia Retail Liquor Dealers Association, 321 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Members of the association who are class A retail liquor dealers. (3) No contract, continously employed as executive director since January 16, 1946. (4) $6,000 per annum, and is to supply his own automobile to be used in this capacity. (5) District of Columbia Retail Liquor Dealers Association. Dues are $100 a year, payable $50 semiannually; some paid for the entire year and some memberships were for one-half of year; total 1946 dues collected, $13,750. (6) In 1946 cabs aside from use of car, $23.40, and luncheons, $78.85. (7) Taxicabs when private automobile is not available, and such luncheons as deemed necessary. If any out-of-town trips are necessary they will have to be authorized.

McKenzie, J. Chase, Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. (2) National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. (3) Three months or more, depending upon reelections by the organization's executive committee. (4) $350 monthly. (5) National Organization, Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. (6) $100 a month. (7) Clerk hire, travel, communication services.

McMahon, W. E., the Mayflower, Washington, D. C. (1) West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association, Fairmont, W. Va., Post Office Box 48. (2) See (1) and perhaps other natural gas associations. (3) Uncertain. (4) To be determined. (5) See (1). (6) See (4). (7) See (4).

McNaughton, Donald J., 98 Bloomfield Avenue, Buffalo 20, N. Y. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Appointed regional director; yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $4,800 per year as regional director. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual travel, hotel, meals, and incidental expenses (about $12 per day excluding transportation fares). (7) Same as (6) above.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 2151 California Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Yearly basis. (4) Salary, $4,000. (5) The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. (6) Not to exceed $600. (7) Travel, postage, office supplies, secretarial help, telephone, and telegraph.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Optometric Association, 142 South State Street, Marion, Ohio; and Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) American Optometric Association and Remington Rand, Inc. (3) Mutually at will. (4) See attached statement.[1] (5) American Optometric Association and Remington Rand, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Out-of-pocket expenses directly attributable to this work, such as travel, telegrams, long-distance telephone expenses, etc.

Mackenzie, James,[2] 6108 Northeast Eighth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) 25 cents on each dollar received by Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., from Oregon. (5) [Blank.] (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Maginnis, Thomas O.,[2] 6024 Alma Street, Philadelphia 24, Pa. (1) Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Federal Employees Veterans Association, 311 North Sixteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) Annual. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) Maximum actual expenses incurred (average $15 per day). (7) Train fare, meals, hotel bills.

Mahoney, C. P., Blythe, Calif. (1) Palo Verde irrigation district, a public agency of the State of California, Blythe, Calif. (2) Palo Verde irrigation district. I am a public official acting in my official capacity and as such am advised I am not covered by Public Law 601. (3) Employed continuously by district as its chief engineer and manager. (4) $750 per month, inclusive of all services. Services relating to legislation are minor and incidental. (5) Palo Verde irrigation district. (6) Actual amount spent on expenses below; no fixed allowance. (7) Traveling, hotel, meals, and the like.

Mann, Charles B., foreman at Ford Motor Co., Chicago, Ill., branch. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $355 per month by Ford Chicago Chapter No. 151, Foreman's Association of America. (5) Ford-Chicago Chapter No. 151, Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses.

Margolin, Leo J., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (3) At will. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses.

Margolin, Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (3) Indefinite; terminable on notice in accordance with union contract. (4) $3,200 per year. (5) National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (6) No definite amount; paid only as expenses arise. (7) Carfare and postage.

Marks, Raymond E., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. (2) Three major steam railroads operating within the State of Nevada. (See annexed statement.[1]) (3) Continuing. (See annexed statement.[1]) (4) $400. (See annexed statement.[1]) (5) Railroads named in answer to question (2). (See annexed statement.[1]) (6) No specific sum; expenses as incurred. (7) All out-of-pocket expenditures. (See annexed statement.[1])

Martin,[2] Robert F., 1010 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (a nonprofit trade association), 1010 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Vitrified China Association, Inc. Legislative matters are purely incidental to the regular functions of the association and its executive secretary, the registrant. (3) Permanent. (4) Under $3,000 per annum of registrant's salary would be allocable to legislative matters. (5) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (6) None in connection with legislative matters. (7) None.

Maslow, Will, 212 West Fiftieth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) American Jewish Congress, Inc., 1834 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) American Jewish Congress, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $450 a year. (5) American Jewish Congress, Inc. (6) Maximum of $200 a year. (7) Only travel, transportation, hotel, meals, cabs, telephone.

Masaoka, Mike M., post office box 1628, Washington 13, D. C. (1) Japanese-American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (2) Japanese-American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (3) During first session, Eightieth Congress. (4) $30 per month. (5) Japanese-American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake Cty 1, Utah. (6) Only what he legitimately incurs. (7) Traveling, if necessary; office expenses.

Messer, Ross A., post-office box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (1) National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, 525 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Post office custodial employees. (3) February 15 to September 1947. (4) $4,000 per year salary. (5) National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (6) Approximately $50 per week. (7) Rent, telephone, telegrams, postage, stationery, taxi, etc.

Middleton, P. Harvey, First National Bank Building, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) Railway Business Association, First National Bank Building, Chicago 3, Ill. (2) Railway Business Association. (3) Have been employed by the Railway Business Association for 25 years, 1914–18; 1922–47. (4) Annual salary, $16,000. (5) Railway Business Association. (6) No expense allowance. The Railway Business Association reimburses me for out-of-pocket expenses and pays my hotel bills. Such expenses are normally from $1,000 to $1,500 per year. (7) Actual traveling expenses, only a small part of which has any relation to legislative matters.

Miller, Ben W., 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (2) American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (3) Employed on an annual basis. (4) Quarterly salary, $1,625. Percentage of salary estimated for legislative service, $81.25. (5) American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (6) Refund for any actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, tips, hotel, and usual expenses incurred in any necessary trip involving legislation, away from Washington, D. C.

Miller, Charles C., 428 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (2) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade association of rubber manufacturers. (3) Regularly employed as a member of the public-relations staff of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (4) See statement attached covering salary and division of time between duties of various types.[1] (5) The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc. (6) No fixed amount; such routine expenses as travel, hotel, meals on the road, cabs, etc., varying from month to month depending upon the extent of travel required, as indicated in attached statement [1] on salary and duties. (7) All expenses for items shown in (6).

Moon, James D.,[2] Naval Gun Factory, Washington D. C. (1) War Veterans in Federal Employment, 512 Washington Boulevard, Washington 19, D. C. (temporary headquarters). (2) Members of the War Veterans in Federal Employment of which he is an unpaid elected commander. (3) On a yearly basis as elected. (4) None. (5) [Blank.] (6) As incurred. (7) Transportation; stenographic fees as incurred; hotel and meals only when required.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (2) International Association of Machinists. (3) Indefinite. (4) $400 per month. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $12 per diem. (7) Lodging, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous.

Morrow, Giles, 225 Colorado Building, Fourteenth and G Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) The Freight Forwarders Institute and members thereof. (3) January 1, 1940, continuously to present time; elected annually by board of governors. (4) $9,400 per year for all services rendered the Freight Forwarders Institute as executive secretary and general counsel. Duties cover a wide range, and only as an incident to such duties does registrant appear and present the views of the industry to committees or interested Members of Congress on pending legislation directly affecting the industry. Primary duties consist of administering affairs of the institute, which is a national trade association, representing the institute in proceedings and matters before the Interstate Commerce Commission and other administrative agencies, acting as secretary to all institute committees and groups, disseminating information and other related activities. Only a small fraction of time devoted to legislative matters. (See attached statement made a part hereof.[1]) (5) Freight Forwarders Institute. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred on the business of the institute, including taxi fare on office business and necessary traveling expenses while out of town on institute business. (7) Same as answer to (6).

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 142 Central Street, Gardner, Mass. (1) Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., Shoreham Hotel, Washington 8, D. C. (2) Same as above. (3) Indefinite period. (4) $50 per diem and actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., Shoreham Hotel, Washington 8, D. C. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses on itemized, monthly reports. (7) Traveling, hotel, meetings, entertainment, taxis, etc.

Mullin, Patrick, foreman at Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Elected president of Chapter No. 1, Foreman's Association of America (1-year term). (4) $6,000 per year as president of Chapter No. 1 on full-time employment from January 1 until December 31, 1947. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual travel, hotel, meals, and incidental expenses (about $12 per day excluding transportation). (7) Same as question (6).

Murdock, Ray R., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of County Officials, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of County Officials. (3) Until terminated by parties. (4) Employer pays to law firm of Seegmiller & Murdock, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $6,000 annually for Washington representation, including lobbying, of which I receive one-half. (5) National Association of County Officials. (6) Law firm receives annually for expenses: Rent, $900, and reimbursement for actual expenditures. (7) Transportation, telephone and telegraph, printing and duplicating, postage. (No allowance for gifts or entertainment.)

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., chiropractor, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington 11, D. C. (1) National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa. (2) Chiropractor. (3) Have worked for the chiropractors for 8½ years. Have been employed by the National Chiropractic Insurance Co. for 7 months. (4) Salary covers public-relations work. No salary is paid for lobbying, which is incidental to public relations work. (5) National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa. (6) Expenses cover public-relations work. No expenses allowed for lobbying. (7) [blank.]

Murphy, Rev. Wallace J., 1340 South Cinn, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Tulsa Rental Property Owners Association, Inc., 1340 South Cinn, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Independent Rental Property Owners of Middle West. (3) Indefinite. (4) $150 a month. (5) Association treasury. (6) The actual, reasonable expense incurred. (7) Traveling, living, and stenographic expenses.

National Postal Committee for Books, John O'Connor, chairman, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) The committee's membership comprises book publishers, book sellers, and book manufacturers. Members have been appointed by the American Book Publishers Council, Inc., American Textbook Publishers Institute, Inc., College Publishers Group, Association of American University Presses, American Booksellers Association, Inc., National Association of College Stores, Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., and others. (2) In the interest of its membership. Attached hereto is a list of the members of the committee as of the present date.[1] (3) Indefinite. (4) The committee may receive voluntary contributions from the above associations and others for the work of the committee. The members will not receive any compensation for their services to the committee. (5) All expenditures of the committee (including overhead expenses) are met through contributions of the above associations and others. (6) The committee is reimbursed for the actual amount of its expenses, but no payments will be made to members for their services. (7) Reimbursable expenses include travel and hotel expense, postage, and miscellaneous expense.

Nau, Carlton L., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Public Power Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Public Power Association and its member systems, which are operating electric utilities owned by cities, counties, States, or political subdivisions or wholly-owned instrumentalities thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. However, legislative activities are only incidental to primary function as employee of service and management organization. (5) American Public Power Association. (6) Uncertain, but nominal. (7) Actual expenses incurred, such as travel, communication, and miscellaneous.

Neal, William S., Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Manufacturers. (2) National Association of Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 monthly. (5) National Association of Manufacturers. (6) Indefinite but limited to expenses incidental to work. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, lunches, incidentals.

Nelson, W. Allen, foreman at Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Designated annually and assigned to active duty for temporary and indefinite periods, usually about 2 weeks at a time. (4) Reimbursement for time lost from regular employment at Ford Motor Co. to be paid by Foreman's Association of America, Ford Chapter No. 1. Monthly rate of pay, $325. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Ford Chapter No. 1, 5746 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich. (6) Actual transportation costs plus personal hotel and incidental expenses not to exceed $12 per day while serving in this capacity. (7) Actual transportation costs plus personal hotel and incidental expenses not to exceed $12 per day while serving in this capacity.

Nestor, William E., 6 Wells Street, Hornell, N. Y. (1) International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 85; main office, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (2) International Association of Machinists. (3) September 15, 1948. (4) Salary $400 monthly; expenses $9 a day for 20 days per month. (5) District No. 85, International Association of Machinists. (6) $9 per day for 20 days per month. (7) Expenses while on the railroad in connection with my position as general chairman.

Nielsen, Ras A., 300 Indiana Avenue NW., room 4070, Washington, D. C. (1) Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. (2) Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia. Active membership of over 2,100 members of Metropolitan Police, United States Park Police, White House Police, and certain retired members. (3) Elected to serve 3 years as member of legislative committee from January 1, 1946; chairman of this committee. (4) No pay involved. (5) [Blank.] (6) There is no certain amount paid for expenses. As expenses are incurred, the association is authorized to appropriate, from time to time, up to $45 for the work of the committee. (7) Expenses of transportation, printing, stenographic work, and other minor expenses incidental to the work of the committee.

Noffsinger, J. S.,[1] 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; a trade association of private business schools. (2) I am the chief executive officer of (a) the National Council of Business Schools; (b) the National Council of Technical Schools; and (c) the National Home Study Council, and as such am responsible for all of the interests of all non-tax-supported schools holding membership in these organizations. Their legislative interests, however, are relatively minor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $33 per day as chief executive officer, which includes all incidental legislative services. (5) National Council of Business Schools. (6) Whatever incidental expenses are necessary. (7) Telephone, taxi, and similar incidental but necessary expenses.

Nortman, Walter, 1135 West Vliet Street, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Street, Madison, Wis. (See rider attached.[1]) (2) The member lines of the association, which are all class I steam railroads operating in Wisconsin. Registrant's employment pertains principally to State legislation and State affairs and only incidentally to Federal legislation. (3) Registrant's employment is of a continuing nature during sessions of the State legislature in Wisconsin, with occasional interim work between sessions. (4) Registrant is paid $350 per month during legislative sessions. This contemplates about 17 days' work per month in State legislation, and State administrative work. In the event that more time than that is regularly taken, registrant will be compensated on a pro rata basis for the additional time. (5) Wisconsin Railroad Association. (6) No special sum; reimbursement is made for out-of-pocket expenditures incurred in connection with the discharge of his duties. (7) Away from home: Hotel rooms, meals, cabs, tips, telephone calls, and similar items customary in traveling.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., 504 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (3) Calendar year 1947. (See supplementary information attached.[1]) (4) $5,000. (See supplementary information attached.[1]) (5) National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (6) Actual and necessary cash disbursements. (7) Telephone tolls, telegrams, and taxicab fares.

O'Hara, Bart W., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Secretary-treasurer, Colorado Tax and Equality Committee, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (2) In the interest of the membership of said committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) There are no paid employees on said committee. (5) Colorado Tax Equality Committee, Inc., reimburses me for out-of-pocket cash expenditures. (6) Out-of-pocket, cash expenditures to carry out the program of the committee. (7) Postage, telephone, telegrams, stationery, envelopes, and miscellaneous printing, travel, and stenographic assistance.

Olden, Rev. James Clarence, Sr., 1934 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Militant church movement. (2) The American Negro. (3) Until the problem is solved. (4) No fixed amount. (5) Free-will offerings of churches and interested individuals. (6) No fixed amount because nothing is to be paid for lobbying. (7) None; this is not a lobbying organization but just want the privilege of contacting Congressmen.

Oleson, Lloyd F., national commander and national director of legislation, Disabled American Veterans, Inc.; 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Disabled American Veterans, Inc., 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) Disabled American Veterans, Inc. (3) August 23, 1947. (4) Actual expenses. (5) Disabled American Veterans, Inc. (6) Actual expenses on voucher. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, telegrams, clerical assistant, cab fare, tips.

Olmstead, Frank I., 535 Cedar Street NW., Washington 12, D. C. (1) Half time by the House on Cedar Street, 535 Cedar Street NW., Washington 12, D. C.; half time by the War Resisters League, 5 Beekman Street, New York 7, N. Y. (2) All relations to Congress will be on behalf of the House on Cedar Street, which is being opened at this time to help social and religious groups of the country relate themselves more closely to their Government. My work for the War Resisters League is field work director and is educational. They have no lobby program. (3) There is no contract, but the arrangements will be reviewed at the end of the year. (4) A total of $3,725 a year and living quarters. (5) $2,000 and quarters comes from the House on Cedar Street, and is guaranteed by Mr. and Mrs. John D. Overholt, Post Office Box 326, Wooster, Ohio. $1,725 comes from the War Resisters League. (6) Out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Actual transportation costs in travel, hotel, telegraph and telephone, postage, taxicabs, incidentals.

O'Neil, Thomas G., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (1) Upstate New York Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (2) I act as secretary for the group of independent businessmen who compose the committee. These men are interested in tax equality. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary; reimbursed for actual disbursements on behalf of the committee. (5) No one. (6) Actual amounts expended. (7) Telephone, postage, and paper, and other small disbursements for office supplies and necessary equipment.

Owens, Mrs. Mary E., local, 144 B Street NE., home, 214 Fifth Street, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Not employed. (2) National Woman's Party. (3) Six weeks. (4) None. (5) None. (6) $2 per day and room. (7) Room, $2 allowed for meals.

Parry, Thomas W., 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis 2, Mo. (1) Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (2) William H. Baldwin of the above firm. (3) Thirty days. (4) $250, which amount is to include expenses incurred. (5) Baldwin & Mermey. (6) Expenses estimated at $25 to $50 included in above-mentioned amount. (7) Postage, telegrams, and long-distance telephone.

Patton, James G., 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver 16, Colo. (See statement attached.[1]) (2) Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (commonly known as National Farmers Union). (3) Elected for 3-year term which expires in March 1948. (4) Salary of $5,000 per year. (5) Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America. (6) Actual expenses. (7) None except reimbursement for expenditures actually involved in transportation, hotel, meals, and service expenses.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1307 H Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Investors League, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (2) Investors League. (3) Until September 15, 1947. (4) $7,700 per annum. (5) Investors League. (6) As they occur. (7) Transportation, telephone, stenographic, and any other which may occur.

Pearson, Robert W., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $500 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus, and car fares; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Phillips, George C., foreman, Chrysler Corp., 7900 Joseph Campan, Hamtramck, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $285 per month. (5) Chrysler Chapter No. 3, Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation, hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) [Blank.]

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Pollitzer, Anita, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) National Woman's Party. (2) National Woman's Party. (3) Eightieth Congress. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Reimbursed in part for what I spend. (7) Traveling expenses such as railroad fare, porters' tips, etc.; room at national headquarters when in Washington.

Posner, Stanley I., 213 Standard Oil Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America; National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association. (2) See above. (3) January 1 to December 31, 1947. (4) $7,500 annually from each association. (5) See above. (6) Reimbursement. (7) Long-distance telephone, telegraph, mimeograph, etc.

Powell, W. Royce (residence 1527 31st St. NW., Washington, D. C.), 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Berkley A. Thomas, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee of Americans, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Weekly. (4) $50 a week. (5) Committee of Americans, Inc. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Prentice, H. A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Tinkham & Tinkham, 708 Calumet Building, Hammond, Ind. (2) American Maize-Products Co. (3) Estimated duration—3 months on a part-time basis. (4) $400. (5) Tinkham & Tinkham. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Cash disbursements for postage, taxis, travel, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Press, William H., 204 Star Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building (1101 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.), Washington 4, D. C. (2) Washington Board of Trade. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) Washington Board of Trade. (6) Nothing; he is reimbursed for necessary expenses incurred. (7) [Blank.]

Pyle, Schuyler S., 429-431 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., phone National 8027, Washington, D. C. (1) Fleet Reserve Association, 429-431 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) The membership of the Fleet Reserve Association, a benevolent naval veteran organization chartered November 11, 1924, under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. (3) Elected to the full-time office of national financial secretary by the delegates assembled in national convention on September 2, 1946, to serve for a term of 2 years. Is a member of the national service committee of the said Fleet Reserve Association. (4) Only his salary in his capacity as national financial secretary. By virtue of his membership in the Fleet Reserve Association and membership on the national service committee, he is designated to support or oppose legislation affecting the membership of the Fleet Reserve Association as may be directed from time to time by competent authority within the said Fleet Reserve Association for which no additional salary, compensation, or fee is paid for such service by the Fleet Reserve Association, or by any of its members. (5) [Blank.] (6) None. (7) None.

Ray, L. S., 304 Chandler Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 304 Chandler Building, Washington 5, D. C. This is a nonprofit association of officers who incurred line-of-duty disability during active war service. (2) The Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars and all disabled officers of World War I and World War II and their dependents. (3) Annual. (4) $1,200 per year as legislative consultant. (5) The Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Taxi fare, etc., only necessary expense in connection with the work.

Ray, L. S., 304 Chandler Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Self. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To be determined later when and if I represent clients requiring registration under this act. (6) [Blank.] (7) Actual.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., a nonprofit membership organization organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. (2) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, which is organized to promote the interests and welfare of the beauty and barber industry. The employment is a regular yearly employment as counsel and not specifically in connection with legislation. In his own right. (3) The registrant has been continuously employed as counsel by the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association since February 1942 on an annual agreement. (4) The registrant is paid at the rate of $6,000 per annum to act as counsel to the aforementioned trade association and to direct its Washington office, which includes substantial duties and activities not covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. (6) The registrant does not receive from the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association any fixed expense allowance, but is reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses monthly upon the submission of a detailed, itemized statement. (7) Registrant is authorized to expend moneys in the performance of his duties as counsel for the above association for postage, telephone, telegraph, traveling expenses, stationery, mimeographing, trade and Government publications.

Rice, Richard M., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (2) Wisconsin Tax Equality Association. (3) No time limit. (4) Nothing. I am secretary of the Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, serving without pay. (5) Wisconsin Tax Equality Association. (6) Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, and other incidental expenses necessary to the performance of duties.

Richardson, Pearl, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $435 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus, and car fares; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. (2) Answered in (1). (3) Permanent. (4) Registrant devotes less than 5 percent of his time, if any, to activity within the terms of the statute. Therefore, 5 percent of his annual compensation, if any, is chargeable thereto—approximately $500 per annum. (5) Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith. (6) Registrant receives only reimbursement for actual expenses in connection with his activity. Based upon percentage described in (4) herein, amount is approximately $500 per annum. (7) Cabs and telephones.

Ritter, Patricia, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $340 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus, and car fares; hotels; meals; telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Roark, L. E., 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago. (2) National Founders Association; National Castings Council. (3) Year to year; regular employment. (4) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; National Castings Council, no salary. (5) See (4) above. (6) Nominal travel and hotel expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals.

Root, Ballantine, Harland, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York 5, N. Y.; 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Greenwich Country Day School, Inc., Old Church Road, Greenwich, Conn. (2) Greenwich Country Day School. Urging amendments to extend old-age and survivors insurance benefits to school teachers on a permissive basis. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses only. (See (6) and (7) below.) (5) Greenwich Country Day School. (6) No fixed amount. (See (7).) (7) Necessary expenses for travel and communications actually incurred.

Rosenman, Samuel I., 165 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, Inc., 393 Seventh Avenue, New York 1, N. Y. (2) Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, Inc. (3) I am not employed specifically for the purposes encompassed by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. I am employed on a yearly basis as general legal counsel for the above association and only an incidental part of my duties as such counsel is to present the cause of the members of the association in respect to legislation affecting their business. (4) My retainer as general counsel is $40,000 per year, plus necessary expenses and disbursements. I am not being paid specifically for presenting the fur manufacturers' views on pending legislation. (5) I am paid for my employment as its general counsel by the Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, Inc. No such payment is earmarked for my presenting its views on legislation. (6) My expenses are not fixed in amount. They are paid periodically. No special expenses are paid to me for presenting the association's views on legislation. There is an oral understanding that they are not to exceed $2,500 per year. (7) My expenses include transportation fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephones, and other similar expenses necessarily incurred by me in the course of my employment by the association as general legal counsel, under my retainer with it.

Ross, John H., 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Oil Transfer Corp., 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (2) Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (3) 1935 to date. (4) Nothing; not a salaried or paid office. (5) No one. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Traveling, hotel, subsistence, and other incidentals, such as taxis, phones, etc.

Ross, John H., 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (1) New York State Waterways Association, Inc., 17 Battery Place, New York 4, N. Y. (2) New York State Waterways Association, Inc. (3) January 1, 1945, to date. (4) Employed part time as acting secretary on salary of $1,500 per annum. In addition to following Federal legislation concerning New York State Waterways performs the duties of secretary of the association. (5) New York State Waterways Association, Inc. (6) All actual expenses incurred when engaged outside of New York City in the interest of the association. (7) Traveling, living, and incidentals.

Rowan, James F., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, Inc. (See exhibit A.[1]) (3) Registrant has been employed continuously since August 1937. (3) See exhibit A.[1] (5) Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, Inc. (6) Only actual expenses incidental to

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

lobbying activity. (7) Out-of-pocket expenditures, such as taxi fares, etc.

Rule, Gordon W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See (1). (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Lyon & Lyon, attorneys, comprised of R. B. H. Lyon and Richard K. Lyon, partners. (2) Retained to assist the firm of Lyon & Lyon in prosecuting claims for refunds as set out in form B filed by this firm this date. This involves the representation by them of the 72 trust companies set out in S. 1241 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), attached hereto.[1] (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined; normal attorney and client relationship. (5) The firm of Lyon & Lyon, attorneys. (6) Reimbursement for any additional out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, actual hotel expenses, long-distance telephone calls, if any.

Rush, Charles J., 1417 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 1417 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) The members of the Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., an association of realtors which was incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the laws of the District of Columbia. (3) Have been in employ of Washington Real Estate Board since October 1, 1934, as executive secretary and treasurer on an annual salary basis. (4) Annual salary of $8,000. (5) Washington Real Estate Board, Inc. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed for legitimate out-of-pocket expense. (7) Transportation and such other expenses as may be incurred in connection with my duties.

Ryan, Elmer J., Grand Building, South St. Paul, Minn. (1) Claimants former employees of Northwest Airlines, 2,500 individuals. (2) As indicated in (1). (3) Indefinite; probably 1 year. (4) A percentage of recovery in pending legal actions dependent upon amount eventually recovered. (5) Individuals above mentioned. (6) Paying own expenses. (7) Only travel and other personal expenses.

Saks, Jay Benson, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (2) American Jewish Committee. (3) Yearly. (4) See statement attached.[1] (5) American Jewish Committee. (6) See statement attached.[1] (7) Some office expenses, travel, reasonable entertainment, miscellaneous expenses.

Saltzman, Charles E., 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant is vice president and secretary of the New York Stock Exchange. Any Federal legislative work of registrant is occasional and incidental to his main duties. It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing of form C for a given quarter) what portion of registrant's salary, based on an allocation of time expended, will be attributable to activities covered by the act. (5) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (6) Registrant will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, telegraph, and miscellaneous expenses.

Sanders, J. T., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the farmer membership of the National Grange. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per year salary. (5) The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry. (6) Approximately $300, but only actual expenses. (7) Traveling and entertainment.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Schoen, Paul W., post office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (2) Forest Farmers Association Cooperative. (3) Permanent. (4) $5,160 and all traveling expenses when in field. This is a regular salary received annually and work here is considered part of regular duties. (5) Forest Farmers Association Cooperative. (6) Unlimited expense account for necessary expenditures. (7) Railroad fare, hotel, meals, and local transportation.

Schwenker, Warren L., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Remington Rand, Inc., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same as (1). (3) Since January 15, 1920. (4) Salary and commission aggregating about $15,000 per year in my capacity as assistant branch manager of the Washington, D. C., branch of the tabulating-machines division of Remington Rand, Inc. (5) Same as (1). (6) Averages about $75 per month for all sales activities. (7) Necessary entertainment expense only; none to date for lobbying.

Scott, Clifton H., Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) C. H. Scott and associates, Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C. (2) Some producers of strategic minerals who sustained losses during the war emergency, September 1939 to September 1945, and C. H. Scott and associates (E. Ray Scott, Fred L. Scott, Frank S. Scott, William Scott, and C. B. Senhausen, of Little Rock and West Memphis, Ark.). I, C. H. Scott, am the only one of these taking an active part in proposed legislation. (3) Indefinite. (4) I am paid nothing on proposed legislation, not even expenses. (5) There is no remuneration to be received in the actual passage of proposed legislation. (6) None. (7) None.

Scott, William C., 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (2) National Postal Committee for Books. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee for legal services based upon duration and nature of employment. (5) National Postal Committee for Books. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Travel and hotel expenses, postal and other incidental expenses.

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, industrial organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) United States Business Organizations, Inc. (2) Firm is retained by and works for United States Business Organizations, Inc. (3) The firm is paid an annual retaining fee. (4) Firm is to receive $1,000; firm is retained for organizational and counseling work. (5) United States Business Organizations, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on client's behalf. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, incidentals.

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, industrial organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Various State businessmen's associations. (See attached statement.[1]) (2) Firm is retained by and works for the associations listed under (1). (3) The firm is paid annual retaining fees. (4) Firm is retained for organizational and counseling work. Clients are kept advised of legislative matters in Congress which pertain to the taxation of their businesses, and of businesses in competition therewith. (See attached statement.[1]) (5) Firm is paid by associations retaining it. (See attached statement.[1]) (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on clients' behalf. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, and similar incidental expenses.

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, industrial organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill., Various State businessmen's associations. (See attached statement.[1]) (2) Firm is retained by and works for the associations listed under (1). (3) The firm is paid annual retaining fees. (4) Firm is retained for organizational and counseling work. Clients are kept advised of legislative matters in Congress which pertain to the taxation of their businesses, and of businesses in competition therewith. (See ttached statement.[1]) (5) Firm is paid by associations retaining it. (See attached statement.[1]) (6) To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on clients' behalf. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, and similar incidental expenses.

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, industrial organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill., Various State businessmen's associations. (See attached statement.[1]) (2) Firm is retained by and works for the associations listed under (1). (3) The firm is paid annual retaining fees. (4) Firm is retained for organizational and counseling work. Clients are kept advised of legislative matters in Congress which pertain to the taxation of their businesses, and of businesses in competition therewith. (See attached statement.[1]) (5) Firm is paid by associations retaining it. (See attached statement.[1]) (6 To be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on clients' behalf. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, and similar incidental expenses.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Seay, Clant M., 203 Walthall Hotel, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Independent Business Association, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from December 1946, and works on a voluntary basis. (4) Nothing; is reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. For the months of January, February, and March 1947 this expense item has amounted to $39.35. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement of expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Seegmiller, Keith L., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of County Officials, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of County Officials. (3) Until terminated by parties. (4) Employer pays to law firm of Seegmiller & Murdock, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $6,000 annually for Washington representation, including lobbying, of which I receive one-half. (5) National Association of Couty Officials. (6) Law firm receives annually for expenses, rent $900 and reimbursement for actual expenditures. (7) Transportation; telephone and telegraph; printing and duplicating; postage. No allowance for gifts or entertainment.

Selby, Meredith, 155 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, Colo. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) $4,800 per year plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel, subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Shaw, Arvin B., Jr., 835 Rowan Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Palo Verde Irrigation District, a public agency of the State of California, Blythe, Calif. (2) Palo Verde Irrigation District. I am a public official acting in my official capacity and as such am of opinion I am not covered by Public Law 601. (3) Indefinite, has continued since 1919. (4) Retainer of $280 per month for general professional service as attorney for district; per

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

diem for special services as may be agreed. Services relating to legislation are minor and incidental. (5) Palo Verde Irrigation District. (6) Reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses as per itemized statement therefor. (7) Traveling expenses, court costs, telegrams, long distance and the like, not including office expenses.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose 76, Mass., and 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) National Council for Prevention of War. (3) Since October 1937. Heretofore, however, my service has been in the field of educational peace work rather than in legislative work, and will continue to be largely in the educational field. (4) $2,500 annually. (5) National Council for Prevention of War. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Railroad and other transportation, taxis, lodging when away from home, telephone and telegraph, meals when away from home, and other small expenses.

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Since November 1, 1946, continuing. (4) $40,000 as executive vice president and general counsel of the association for directing all of its activities only an incidental part of which relates to legislation. See letter attached.[1] (5) United States Beet Sugar Association. (6) Necessary travel, representation, and other incidental expenses. (7) See answer to (6) above.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Mutually at will. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses.

Smith,[2] Allen L., post office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc. post office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (2) Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., post office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (3) Not specific; present office until next election in November 1947. (4) Nothing; gratuitous. (5) [Blank.] (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures only; none to date. (7) Will cover reimbursement of travel, food, lodging, and miscellaneous items relative thereto.

Smith, Anthony W., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) Congress of Industrial Organizations, International Woodworkers of America, CIO. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant is engaged primarily in administrative work, not related to the above employment. Not more than 5 percent of his time is spent in the above employment. Total salary is $6,000 a year, approximately $300 a year being allocable to the above legislative employment. (5) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (6) It is unlikely that registrant will incur and be paid any expenses in the above legislative employment. (7) See (6).

Smith, C. Ray, 4865 Stenton Avenue, Philadelphia. (1) Bowman Gum, Inc., 4865 Stenton Avenue, Philadelphia. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) $18,000 per year. (5) Same as (1). (6) Actual expenses for quarters and telephone expenses, etc.; approximately $200 per month. (7) Actual; no entertainment.

Smith, Dudley, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 per month (as compensation for all activities). (5) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses for travel, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Smith Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (3) Continuing full-time employment as special representative, whose duties include liaison between the company and Government departments, public relations, obtaining copies of orders, directives, and other documents issued by Government agencies, and general representation of the company's interests in Washington, D. C. (4) Salary of $6,000 per year paid for all services performed for the company, only part of which involve legislation. Office space and stenographic service are provided at the company's headquarters and general office in Washington, D. C., which is maintained at the above address. (5) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expense incurred on behalf of the company in connection with his various duties, which involve legislation only to a limited extent. The actual amount of such expenses is variable, subject to monthly approval by the general solicitor of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. at Chicago. (7) See answer to question (6).

Steinert, Blossom, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $420 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, subsistence, and out-of-pocket expenses.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander), 1734 F Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa. (2) Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription. (3) Indefinitely. (4) No salary. (5) Receive no salary from above committee. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Room, board, railroad and carfare.

Stoner,[2] Henry, 363 Bank Street, New London, Conn. (1) Am president of the Connecticut Reapportionment Association, and in that sense am self-employed. (2) I am working for a strict and thorough enforcement of section 4, article IV, and section 2, amendment XIV, United States Constitution, within the intent of the framers of said constitutional sections. (3) No doubt permanent from now on. (4) At present contributions are minute for we are just beginning our drive for funds. Plan to be paid enough to support life in monastic fashion. (5) By the Connecticut Reapportionment Association. (6) Please see answer to (4) above. Will need enough for stationery and postage, letters to editors, etc. Most of our contributions will go for expenses for promotional work. (7) Please see answer to (6) above.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1045 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. (1) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota. The corporation is a proponent of full development of the water resources of the upper Mississippi River as it relates to all types of public benefits. (2) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association. (3) Registrant was first employed as secretary of the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association in 1934 and has held said office continuously since. His employment is on a yearly basis, by action of the board of directors at an annual meeting held on the third Wednesday in October of each year. (4) Registrant receives a salary of $275 a month, on a yearly basis. (5) Upper Mississippi Waterway Association. (6) During the last 3 or 4 years, registrant's expenses have averaged $2,500 a year. This amount covers registrant's expense of traveling in connection with his duties. (7) Traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meeting, hearings, and conventions.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Retail Federation and its members. (3) Permanent. (4) $800 which amount is an estimate of the proportion of total salary per year that is allocated to activities regulated by this act. (5) American Retail Federation. (6) Reimbursed for allowed out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi fare and occasional meals.

Sullivan, Francis M., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $8,250 per annum. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred. (See (7).) (7) Taxis, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol; also actual traveling expense.

Swomley, John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Am not employed but serve as volunteer for occasional work which does not amount to more than 1 or 2 days a week. (2) National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (3) Indefinite beginning January 6, 1947. (4) No salary or other remuneration except actual expenses. (5) National Council Against Conscription will pay expenses. (6) For actual expenses incurred on the basis of an itemized statement. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, and other incidental expenses.

Tarver, Malcolm C., Dalton, Ga. (1) Committee on taxation, Barytes Industry of the United States, Holland W. Smith, chairman, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) Barytes Industry of the United States. (3) Indefinite but not beyond first session, Eightieth Congress. (4) $5,000. (5) Committee on taxation, Barytes Industry of the United States, Holland W. Smith, chairman, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (6) $1,000. (7) Railroad fare, meals, and hotel bills.

Taylor, Russell J., 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (2) United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (3) Permanent employment. (4) $80 salary. (5) United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (6) $10 per week, plus legitimate expenses. (7) Hotel, transportation, meals.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (2) General counsel, Southern States Industrial Council. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Equivalent of $15,100 (includes $5,000 payment salary research assistant and $2,600 payment on salary of secretary). (5) Southern States Industrial Council. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Only traveling expenses when on trips for council.

Thomas, Dorothy W. (Mrs.), 300 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) My employment will start shortly by the American Parents Association, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (2) I am to be assigned by the American Parents Association to serve as executive vice chairman of the national committee working for the enactment of the National School Health Services Act (offices at

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York 17, N. Y., and at 300 B St. SE., Washington 3, D. C.) (3) I am working subject to cancellation of employment on 2 weeks' advance notice. (4) I am to be paid $110 per week plus any necessary traveling expenses. (5) I am to be paid by the American Parents Association. (6) I am to be paid just my railroad, hotel, and other out-of-pocket traveling expenses. (7) Railroad expenses, hotel expenses, taxicabs, meals, etc.

Tolbert, William H., 237 Terminal Sales Building, Portland 5, Oreg. (1) Oregon State Farmers' Association, 237 Terminal Sales Building, Portland 5, Oreg. (2) Farm organizations and farmers who are members of the State association. (3) Permanent. (4) Since only a minor part of my time is involved in so-called lobbying, reports will be made showing the amount of my salary and expenses paid while actually involved in activities which might be termed "lobbying." (5) Oregon State Farmers' Association. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, etc.

Tone, Joseph M., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (2) International Association of Machinists. (3) Will be assigned to assist in legislative work while Congress is in session after which the international president will determine the duties. (4) $7,500 per year. (5) International Association of Machinists. (6) $12 per day for 60 days, after which $5, except Sundays and holidays. (7) Taxicab, streetcar, dinners, meetings, etc.

Truitt, Paul T., Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (3) From January 1, 1943. (4) $18,000 a year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Mr. Paul Nipkow, 468 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Mr. Paul Nipkow and Mrs. Louisa Russell Nipkow, his wife, in connection with H. R. 715, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of Louisa Russell Nipkow. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. The fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time expended. (5) Mr. Paul Nipkow. (6) Actual. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expense customarily reimbused in connection with legal services.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; The Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Insurance Co. of North America; The Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania. (3) Indefinite. (4) Retainer of $10,000 paid April 5, 1937, representing contributions of $6,000 from the Insurance Co. of North America, and $4,000 from The Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania. Any additional fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time expended. (5) Insurance Co. of North America; The Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses which may be incurred. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expense customarily reimbursed in connection with legal services.

Turnbull, Robert, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite; appointed as national director. (4) Salary $5,400 per annum. (5) Foreman's Association of America. (6) Actual transportation plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

VanArnum, John R., 512 F Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (2) Employer. (3) Permanent. (4) $8,000 per annum, 1947. (5) Employer. (6) Amount incurred. (7) Normal out-of-pocket or traveling expenses.

Van Curler, Delivan, Hotel Benedick, 1808 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Committee of Alaska Railroad Labor Organizations: American Federation of Government Employees, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railway Telegraphers, American Train Dispatchers Association. (2) All of the above-named organizations. (3) Ninety days. (4) $1,000. (5) Jointly, by all the above-named organizations. (6) $1,000. (7) Stenographic work, telephones, telegraphic messages, hotels, transportation, meals, laundry.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, which firm receives an annual retainer from the New York Stock Exchange for professional services. It is impossible to determine in advance (prior to filing of Form C for a given quarter) what portion of such annual retainer based on an allocation of time expended will be attributable to activities covered by the act. Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (6) The firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley will be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred by any member or associate of the firm. (7) See (6) above. Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Villmoare, Edwin S., 1227 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 monthly, which is a general legal retainer. Only a small percentage of my time is spent in legislative work. (5) Same. (6) None. (7) None.

Von Morpurgo, Henry W.,[4] 406 Sutter Street, San Francisco 8, Calif. (1) Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (2) William Baldwin, of the above firm. (3) Thirty days. (4) $500. (5) Baldwin & Mermey. (6) $72.24. (7) Telegrams, mimeographing releases, and bulletin; transportation, long-distance phone calls, messenger service, mailing and delivery releases and incidentals.

Walker, Amelia Himes (Mrs.), (home) York and Walker Roads, Baltimore 12, Md. (1) National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (2) The organization above named. (3) Indefinite. (4) Receive no salary or reimbursements. (5) Receive no money or considerations. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Walker, Dow V., chairman of national finance committee and special legislative assistant to national commander, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, Inc., 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) Disabled American Veterans, Inc. (3) June 30, 1947. (4) Actual expenses. (5) Disabled American Veterans, Inc. (6) Actual expenses on voucher. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, telegrams, clerical assistant, cab fare, tips.

Walsh, George,[3] 1 Gardner Street, Newton, Mass. (1) World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine. (2) World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine. (3) November 1947. (4) No remuneration. (5) [Blank.] (6) Whatever is required. (7) Traveling and hotel.

Walter, Stephen M., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See exhibit 1.[1] (2) (See exhibit 1.[1]) Approximately one-fourth of the time of registrant organization is estimated to be devoted to activities within the scope of the act. These activities come intermittently throughout the year as occasion demands and are not necessarily a regular function of the registrant organization. (3) Permanent. (4) See exhibit 1.[1] (5) See exhibit 1.[1] (6) All clients are charged flat fee, which includes normal expenses, salaries, miscellaneous office expenses, such as rent, telephone, and out-of-pocket expenses (7) None except for travel or special assignments not included in scope of retainer.

Ward, D. J., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Imported nut section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 100 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Imported nut section, Association of Food Distributors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $500 per month. (5) Imported nut section, Association of Food Distributors. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, cabs, entertaining, travel.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (2) National Postal Committee for Books. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee for legal services based upon duration and nature of employment. (5) National Postal Committee for Books. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Travel and hotel expenses, postal and other incidental expenses.

Waring,[2] Frank Rogers, 77 Harding Avenue, Oaklyn, N. J. (1) United States Government (Philadelphia Naval Shipyard). (2) Federal Employees Veterans Association; annual elective officer (vice commander). (3) One year (expires in September 1947; subject to re-election). (4) Unpaid. (5) No pay. (6) Expenses only as incurred. (7) Train fare, room, meals, phone calls, leave time.

Wasserman, Jack, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (3) At will. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (6) Reimbursement for actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) All out-of-pocket expenses.

Wellington, Beatrice, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary at $420 per month, plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Air and railroad fares; taxi, bus, and car fares; hotels, meals, telegraph, telephone, and postage.

Welliver, Edward M., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Trucking Associations, Inc. (see exhibit A).[1] (3) Continuously since January 2, 1940. (4) See exhibit A.[1] (5) American Trucking Associations, Inc. (6) No established figure, but only out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Traveling expenses, taxi fares.

West, Oscar H., 1001-1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington 4, D. C. (1) National Association of

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[3] Registration with the Clerk only.
[4] Registration with the Secretary only.

Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York 7, N. Y. (see explanatory letter attached hereto and made a part hereof).[1] (2) The National Association of Insurance Agents, a voluntary, unincorporated, nonprofit trade association of local fire, marine, casualty, and surety insurance agents. (3) Indeterminate. At will of employers. (4) An annual salary of $11,000 and incidental expenses incurred or paid by registrant on itemized expense bills rendered monthly to said national association. (5) National Association of Insurance Agents, which maintains a small office at the above address, for which it pays the rent, telephone, and telegraph bills as rendered, and any incidental office expenses, together with the salary of two stenographers. (6) A nominal amount of actual and necessary expenses in connection with his duties as the person in charge of the Washington office of said National Association of Insurance Agents. (7) Incidental items of expense, such as taxis, luncheon or dinner conferences, and small items of entertainment expense in connection with his duties in Washington.

Westfall, Mrs. G. S., 1800 Sigma Chi Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex. (1) Bataan Veterans Organization. (2) Bataan Veterans Organization. (3) Undetermined. (4) Actual expenses. (5) Bataan Veterans Organization. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, incidentals.

Wheeler, Samuel Robert, 11 Franklin Road SW., Roanoke 11, Va. (1) District No. 30, International Association of Machinists, 11 Franklin Road SW., Roanoke, Va. (2) Railroad employees. (3) My term of office expires December 31, 1949. (4) $400 per month. (5) District No. 30, International Association of Machinists. (6) $8 per day away from home, $1 per day at home. (7) All expenses except railroad and pullman.

White, Richard P., 636 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) American Association of Nurserymen, Inc. (3) Annual since 1938. (4) $10,000 annually, of which not more than 10 percent is allocable to the "principle purpose" of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) American Association of Nurserymen, Inc. (6) No definite amount. (7) Travel, hotel, meals, taxis, telephone, and other actual disbursements made in connection with my duties.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,250 per annum; however, the principal purpose of such employment is not the influencing of legislation. (5) Same as (1) above. (6) Necessary traveling expenses. (7) Travel, hotels, meals, and other actual necessary expenses.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Seventeenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago 37, Ill. (2) American Public Welfare Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,200 per annum (half time) which includes all services, only a small proportion of which deal directly with legislation. (5) American Public Welfare Association. (6) Actual travel expenses. (7) Transportation and per diem.

Widmar, Rudolph J., foreman at the Midland Steel Products Co., 106 East Madison, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $400 per month paid by the Foreman's Association of America, Chapter 105, Cleveland, Ohio. (5) Foreman's Association of America, Chapter 105, Cleveland, Ohio. (6) Actual transportation, plus personal hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

Wiley, Harvey W. (Mrs.), chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. Not employed for pay; volunteer worker. (2) As chairman of legislation in the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. (See pamphlet, Resolutions, attached.[1]) (3) Appointed for 3 years—June 1944 to June 1947. (4) No salary. (5) No salary. (6) Yearly appropriation of $100; travel expense to board meetings and conventions of the organization. (7) Postage and small amount for typing.

Wilkinson, Ernest L. (Francis M. Goodwin, Glen A. Wilkinson, Woodruff J. Deem, doing business in the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson), 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath, Oreg. (2) Klamath Indian Tribe. Francis M. Goodwin, Glen A. Wilkinson, and Woodruff J. Deem are associated with Mr. Ernest L. Wilkinson and are occasionally called upon to render services for him in connection with the Klamath Indians. (3) Ernest L. Wilkinson is employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior to act as general counsel for said tribe. This general employment includes among various other matters the representation of the tribe on legislative matters, in which, from time to time, it may be interested. This contract runs for 3 years from July 1, 1945. (4) $4,500 per year for services and expenses (legislative matters are only a part of the services rendered). (5) Paid out of funds belonging to the said tribe deposited in the Treasury of the United States upon being appropriated by Congress for that purpose. (6) Nothing additional for expenses. For the particular service in question, the amount of expense would be very small, consisting chiefly of the cost of transportation from office to Capitol and return. (7) Only actual expenses, such as transportation.

Willis, Peter, 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (2) Foreman's Association of America. (3) Yearly basis and indefinite. (4) $4,000 per annum as regional director (appointed). (5) Foreman's Association of America, chapters of the eastern area. (6) Actual transportation, plus hotel and incidental expenses up to $12 per day. (7) Same as (6).

Willis, Purl,[2] box 1548, San Diego, Calif. (1) The Mission Indian Federation of Southern California, Adam Castillo, president, San Jacinto, Calif. I am not employed; am not being paid for my services. They are gratis. (2) Mission Indians in particular and California Indians generally. (3) Been acting as their counselor and adviser since about 1932. (4) Being paid nothing for services. Printed Senate and House hearings during past 13 years carries my declaration regarding this. No pay for services. No contract. (5) Being paid by no one; either Indian or otherwise. (6) No agreement to pay anything. Federation president, who came to Washington with me on present trip, in my 1937 Plymouth, paid part of actual expense from California and also part of expense since arriving on February 1, 1947. (7) Weekly expense here about $25. Total expense since leaving California about $60.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (2) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico. (3) Last 10½ years. (4) $666.67 per month (as compensation for all activities). (5) Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico. (6) Only out-of-pocket expenses for travel, etc. (7) See (6) above.

Wilson, Glen S.,[2] 102 West Sixteenth Street, Austin, Tex. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend Plan. (3) Annual. (4) Fifty percent of income from the State of Texas. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan. (6) Pay my own. (7) Pay my own.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (3) Casual, as the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen may require. (4) $10 per day when actually engaged as per question (3). (5) Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (6) $10 per day. (7) All necessary expenses up to $10 per day.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison 3, Wis. (1) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison 3, Wis. (2) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (3) Indefinite. (4) I receive an annual retainer for a variety of services. The amount of the retainer for the current year has not yet been determined; nor would it be possible to estimate what portion of the retainer relates to efforts to influence Federal legislation. (5) Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (6) I am to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred in connection with the services rendered. It is impossible to estimate in advance the amount that may be so incurred. (7) Customary traveling expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, etc.; also any other expenses that may be reasonably incurred as, for example, telephone tolls, telegrams, etc.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1127 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (2) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite; subject to change by action of the board of directors of The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) An annual fee of $18,000 is paid by the association to Clark & LaRoe, a law partnership consisting of three partners: Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Frederick E. Brown, and Arthur L. Winn, Jr. Each of the partners named shares in this fee under the partnership agreement. This fee is paid for general legal services, no part being allocated for legislative work, and legislative work has not and will not constitute more than a very small proportion of the services rendered. If and when such work is performed, appropriate quarterly reports will be made as required. (5) The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Inc. (6) No amount is specified but it will be merely reimbursement of incidental expenses incurred and will be relatively small. (7) Those incurred for incidental matters, such as telephone, printing, taxi fares, postage, travel.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr. (1) Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite, see attached statement.[1] (4) See attached statement.[1] (5) Mississippi Valley Association. (6) Actual expenditures. (7) Travel and sustenance.

Wisdom, John Minor, care of Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee, care of Joseph W. Montgomery, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (2) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee (most of the activities of

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

this committee at the present time are unrelated to lobbying). (See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed herewith.[1]) (3) Registrant is employed on an annual retainer basis. (4) Retainer of $416.66 a month. (5) Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (6) Actual expenses only. (7) Any necessary expenses such as cost of printing briefs, court costs, traveling expenses, telegrams.

Woodman, Russell John, 12 Liberty Place, Weehawken, N. J. (1) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3673 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Mo. (2) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary $400 per month plus necessary expenses. (5) The Order of Railroad Telegraphers. (6) $10 per diem. (7) Lodging, meals, transportation, and miscellaneous.

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex. (1) Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, Tyler, Tex.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas Southeastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; The Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; The Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; The Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (2) Same as (1). (3) January 1, 1947, through December 31, 1948. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reasonable travel expenses when away from Houston, Tex. (7) Reasonable personal travel expense such as transportation, hotel, meals, stenographic, telephone, and telegraphic.

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex. (1) Imperial Sugar Co., Sugar Land, Tex. (2) Imperial Sugar Co. (3) Continuing. (4) $833.33 per month. Work with Congress incidental. Am a stockholder, director, and attorney for said company. (5) Imperial Sugar Co. (6) Reasonable personal traveling expenses when away from Houston. (7) Transportation, hotel, telephone, and telegraph; any stenographic or other reasonable travel expense.

Wright, Leslie Bowdinot,[2] 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, Northwest Council of Citizens Associations, and Forest Hills Citizens Association. (2) Same as above. (3) Until election this June. (4) Nothing. (5) [Blank.] (6) $5 a year Federation of Women's Clubs; $5 a meeting Forest Hills Citizens Association for secretarial work alone. (7) Secretarial work; postage.

Yonkers, Andrew J., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (2) Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y., (3) Indefinite. (4) $3,500. The registrant, in addition to his duties of following Federal legislation, is also charged with many other duties not relating to Federal legislation. The compensation named represents the estimated portion of the registrant's entire remuneration which is attributable to the performance of the duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act. (5) Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (6) No stated amount; only reimbursement for normal traveling expenses. (7) Railroad and taxi fare, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, postage, stationery, stenographic expenses.

Young, Roslyn D., 15 William Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) Rubber Trade Association of New York, Inc., 15 William Street, New York 5, N. Y. (2) Rubber Trade Association of New York, Inc., 15 William Street, New York 5, N. Y. (3) The above-named person is president of Rubber Trade Association of New York, Inc., and has been such president since February 1, 1944. Any matters with which he may be concerned before Congress are merely incidental to his general duties as president of said corporation and he is not employed in any way specially to perform any work in connection with congressional matters. (4) As such president, he is paid a salary. Such compensation is for all of his services as president of the association and no part of it is specially for work on congressional matters. (5) Rubber Trade Association. (6) It is not anticipated that any expenses will be specially incurred in connection with any congressional matters. (7) It is not anticipated that any expenses will be specially incurred in connection with any congressional matters.

Ziegler, Vinton E., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Salary of $8,000 per year plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel, subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Zock, Anthony N.,[2] 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the firm of Dow & Symmers, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (2) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Quantum meruit, plus traveling and subsistence expenses. (5) American Tramp Shipowners Institute. (6) Amount actually paid out. (7) Subsistence, traveling, and stenographic.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 17 South High Stret, Columbus 15, Ohio. (2) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (3) Employed since July 1944. (4) $5,600 per annum. (5) Ohio Chamber of Commerce. (6) I expect to be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling and business expenses while away from my office. The amount for any period of time cannot be estimated. (7) Actual and necessary travel and business expense.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the first calendar quarter, 1947, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 5063) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Addis, Rhoena I., Box 1604, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) Commission for 13 weeks: $845 less $123.50 withholding tax, $8.45 social-security tax, expense $390, net $323.05. (2) Above named. (3) For acting as State representative and organizer of Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. (4) None. (5) Legislation to effectuate the recovery plan and better the conditions of the aged.

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Expenditures, $25.70; receipts, $9.50. (See attached.[1]) (2) See attached.[1] (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Albers, Wayne B., 7 McGinley Building, West Palm Beach, Fla. (1) Twenty-five percent of the revenue received by the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., in the State of Florida, approximately $40 per week covering the months of October, November, and December 1946. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Townsend national recovery plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16.

Alifas, Nels Peter, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,999.98; $30 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 25 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical published for the information of the membership covering activities of the organization. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money received; however, expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Nurses' Association, The, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None during last quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) See item (1). (4) The American Journal is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) None at present or during last quarter.

Atkinson, Arthur K., Wabash Railroad Co., 1618 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) None. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) The enactment of legislation granting or confirming the right of reorganization of railroad to avail themselves of the so-called carry-over and carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as contained in section 122 and as were contained in section 710 (c) during the period it was in effect.

Avent, I. M., Post Office Box 16, Lake Zurich, Ill. (1) Total received for quarter, $1,249.31. (2) No particular individual; goods and services, rent and living costs for family of five, traveling expenses, rail, bus, taxi, private auto, hotel, restaurant, service stations, repair shops, etc. (3) Travel and expense incurred in supervision of local club units in cities, towns, and villages of the State (organization, supervision, and advisory management); living costs and maintenance of self and family of five. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Liberalization of State welfare and pensions and age-aid-assistance laws; support and encourage any general

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

welfare legislation, constructive; urging increased allowances for blind assistance and aid-to-dependent-children programs; Townsend plan bill, H. R. 16, national insurance and retirement for all

Babcock, Charles E., Route 3, Box 418, Vienna, Va.; employed by Junior Order, United American Mechanics of the United States, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (1) Received $50 each month for expenses, as needed. (2) To various lunchrooms, etc. (See (3).) (3) For my own personal expenses only, including transportation from Vienna to Washington, meals, hotel rooms, postage, telephone. (4) The Junior American, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 32, Pa. (5) Immigration and free public-school system. (NOTE.—This report delayed because of serious illness.)

Bailey, Fred, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; the National Grange. (1) No money received and none expended under provisions of the act during the first quarter of 1947; my present job does not involve lobbying and the act does not apply to me. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.][1]

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $237.50, at $10 per working day, and $60.82 expenses. (2) Disbursed for taxis, carfare, office supplies, travel, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the basic principles of civil liberties and rights, freedom of speech, opinion, and religion, and the welfare of racial and other minorities.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Money received and expended by registrant during quarter ended March 31, 1947: Received retainer from Hershey Corp., $3,000, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $244.73; expended, $244.73. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Telephone Co. Post office, Jelinek Letter Service Co., Pennsylvania Railroad, Baldwin & Mermey. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, travel, carfares, messenger service, mimeographing, and miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Ballinger, Willis J., 715 Bond Building, Fourteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed by the National Federation of Small Business at $5,000 a year for one-half my time, $416.66 monthly; amount received for first quarter 1947, $1,249.98; management of petty cash account of Washington office of National Federation of Small Business; total disbursements from this account for January, February, and March, $381.45. The rent of the Washington office, all local and long-distance telephone bills, secretary's salary, and purchase of office furnishings are paid by the home office of the federation at San Mateo, Calif. (2) Office supply houses, lithographing work, multigraphing work, carpentry work for building bookcases, postage, etc. (3) All disbursements from the petty cash account of the Washington office of the federation are for office expenses; there are no allowances for entertainment whatsoever. (4) The Washington office of the federation issued a release on Senate bill 110 to the press on February 21, 1947. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I recommend to the federation for support in its monthly publication, the Mandate, legislation or issues which, in my opinion, will further the principles for which the federation stands, the chief one of which is opposition to monopoly in business and finance.

Bannister L. Ward, Equitable Building, Denver 2, Colo.; California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif. (1) Received $227.81, whereof $225 is for professional services and $2.81 to reimburse for telephone expense. (2) The $2.81 to telephone company. (3) As per (5) below. (4) None. (5) Support bills for development of water resources of river basins in West by Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers and oppose development under regional-authority bills.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Expended $410.05. (See statement attached.[1]) (2) (See statement attached.[1]) (3) (See statement attached.[1]) (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) No funds received; March 27, 1947, expense, telephone call to Rochester, N. Y., $4.81. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Not applicable.

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,750.01 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $554.71 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $60.10; hotel and restaurants, $348.30; bookstores and stationers, $40.46; telephone and telegraph, $6.25; gratuities and miscellaneous, $99.60. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Barrere, Claude, 523-B East Eighty-fifth Street, New York 28, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 for services January and February 1947; $359.33 reimbursement for official travel. (2) Railroad fares, hotels (Washington and Toledo), taxies, restaurants. (3) Official travel. (4) None. (5) An agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Beirne, Joseph A., National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $3,985.15. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Bell, John Dickinson, editor and publisher of Unveiling the Universe, post-office box 3214, Washington 10, D. C., and post-office box 943, Scranton, Pa. (1) Received $10, expended $5.50. (2) Notaries $1.50, Unveiling the Universe. (3) For notarizing reports and for copies of the periodical Unveiling the Universe. (4) Unveiling the Universe. (5) To implement the new declaration of independence; to have a righteous commonweal; to enact laws which will more effectively control crime and subversives; to have more equitable labor laws which will prevent racketeering; to enact laws which will effectively control boozeleers and the booze racket; to enact a constitutional amendment which will prevent the election or appointment to any office whatsoever where the person has any control over the lives, the livelihood, the liberty, the land, and/or the property of others; when such become text or cock-tailed or sick or muddled or boozy from smoke or drink, and/or from other venoms that menace commonweal.

Bennett, Harry L., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bennett, Hugh M., 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. (1) Attached exhibit [1] shows amount of money expended by me and not yet reimbursed for. (2) See attached exhibit.[1] (3) To attend meetings of the industry tax committee of the Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (4) None. (5) Jewelry excise tax elimination or revision.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Received salary, March 8 to March 31, $258.75, and expenses, $195.60. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, phone, postage, laundry, pullman and taxi fare. (3) Necessary living and transportation expense. (4) None. (5) Work in connection with opposing S. 670, H. R. 2169, H. R. 2310.

Berckes,[2] Herbert C., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $500. Expended for travel expense, $1,020.18. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berckes,[3] Herbert C., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750. Expended for travel expense, $871.04. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berckes, Herbert C., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750. Expended for travel expense, $1,063.54. (2) [Blank.] (3) Legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berenson,[4] Anna, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Automobile Workers, CIO (International Office, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich.). (1) Received, $980; expended, $1,274.43. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News and Union News Service. (5) All housing and related legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting housing bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing housing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $400; expenses $96.40. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars, Senate and House Restaurants. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel, and lunches. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bernard,[5] William S., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed for third quarter, 1946.

[3] Filed for the fourth quarter, 1946.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

permit the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

Bernard, William S., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Survey Graphic magazine, February issue. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Berns, Karl H., National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) March 1 to April 1, 1947, salary, $520, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $104; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: Hotel, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Beverage, Albion P., associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,350; expenses, $286.13. (2) Various. (3) For attending conferences and meetings out of town; expenses to and from Capitol Hill for interviews, etc.; arranging dinner conferences; speaking. (4) Fellowship magazine. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of our organization, legislation that promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Small Business, Inc., 407–408 Commerce Building, St. Paul 1, Minnesota. (1) None for lobbying; received for actual expenses, $175.69; received for retainer, $225. (2) No one for legislative activities; money paid for travel expenses, postage, printing, phone, telegrams, expenses of incorporating, stenographic services. (3) Stamps, phone service, incorporation of above company, office supplies. (4) St. Paul Pioneer Press, Minneapolis Star Journal, Minneapolis Times Tribune. (5) Legislation affecting taxation of businessmen and especially inequalities in such taxation.

Blohm, George C., News Publishers Association To Amend the Antitrust Laws, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill. (1) News Publishers Association To Amend the Antitrust Laws has received $4,775 in dues and has expended $254.34. The dues thus received as to most members were $25, and did not exceed $100 from any member. Registrant personally received no money and expended none. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 110 or such other or amended proposed legislation as shall be similar to or designed to effect the same purpose as said H. R. 110.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received from National Association Employees, Collectors of Internal Revenue, $900; postage and printing, etc., $52.30. (2) Postage and printing, $52.30. (3) Information for members of association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting employees of collectors' offices only.

Bodfish, Morton, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $335.98. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) None (other than the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade-association periodicals, and in our trade-association bulletins). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership, and particularly helpful to savings-and-loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives, and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration during first quarter, $2,250; money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, and other customary expenses only. (Also see Form B (6) heretofore filed.) (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect production, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Booth, Herman Mack, Jr., Foreman's Association of America, 2405 Chandler Road, Lincoln Park 25, Mich. (1) $137.02 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6. A bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55. A bill in the United States Senate.

Bourg, Clarence J., Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $174.85 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bovillo,[2] Charles J., Barbers Union Local 239, 5 East Hamilton Avenue, Silver Spring, Md. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support.

Bowden, B. E., 267 Robbins Drive, Newark, Ohio; employed by American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill. (1) Salary, $185.90; expense, $126.22. (2) Continental and Hamilton Hotels (necessary change hotels, account limited reservation), taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, postage, laundry and pressing service, meals at various restaurants, and pullman fares. (3) Lodging and actual living expense, transportation, and communication. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimental to existing railway retirement and unemployment laws.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Bibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Statement attached.[1] (2) Statement attached.[1] (3) Part of statement attached.[1] (4) None so far as known. (5) See attached statement.[1]

Boyd, H. B., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $2.45; report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of February 7, 1947. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from employer, United Public Health League, $3,014.21. (2) To the undersigned for salary, $2,048.88; Ralph Torreyson, rent, $225; railroad travel and hotel, $406.33; to others: Subscriptions, secretarial, conferences, telephone and telegraph, postage, $334. (3) All moneys received were expended for salary, rent, travel, office maintenance, telephone and telegraph, postage, conferences. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation at this time.

Boyle, Samuel Eugene, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; employed by Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., for the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Three months' salary (January, February, and March 1947) paid by James S. Tibby, treasurer, Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., $416.66; travel expenses for same period paid by same person, $400; Christian Amendment Movement, trip expenses, $8. (2) Salary used in personal and family living expenses; not reported in detail here. Travel-expense money used for rail and other transportation costs, hotels, food, etc. (See enclosed itemized trip accounts.[1]) (3) See attached reports.[1] (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Covenanter Witness, 1119 Buchanan, Topeka, Kans. (News releases sent to some 800 religious journals regularly, but do not have any editorials or articles published except in the above two papers.) (5) The Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., is organized for the single purpose of introducing in Congress the so-called Christian amendment, which seeks to have inserted in the preamble of the United States Constitution these words: "We the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Savior and King of Nations."

Bream, John H., 22 South Third Street; employed by Pennsylvania Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Box 966, Harrisburg, Pa. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Brewbaker, James M., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; employed by National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forth-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $1,875; expenses reimbursed by employers, $695.45. Expenditures: $695.45. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, and taxicabs. (3) Attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Brightman, M. H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting diary industry.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F., $695.32. (2) American Airlines, $389.84; Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $100.59; Mrs. Gray, public stenographer, $43.30; miscellaneous expense, $161.59. (3) American Airlines, fares from Fort Worth to Washington, D. C.; Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., room; meals and tips, $117; telephone and wires, $7.50; express, $12.34; stationery and supplies, $24.75. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brown, Earle Palmer, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received and expended, $86.02. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) See attached.[1] (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Brown, Edgar G., (director, National Negro Council), 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Membership contributions, $1,200. (2) Printing, $889; $200, traveling expenses, Edgar G. Brown; postage, $400. (3) Printing and postage. (4) News releases to wire services and weekly publications. (5) FEPC, antilynching, poll tax, opposition to seating of T. E. Bilbo, and all rent increases now held to protect workers and veterans under Federal rent control, nondiscriminatory housing and labor acts.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) See registration as counsel for the National Independent Meat Packers Association and answer to (5) below. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during past quarter.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to improvement of status of water carriers. I have not supported or opposed any legislation during past quarter.

Brown, Robert E., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis 4, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $95. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Brown, Russell B., 500 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported, plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $27. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Brylawski, A. Julian, Motion Picture Theater Owners, Metropolitan District of Columbia, 702 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received and expended, $64.87. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $14.87; various others, $50. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) District of Columbia revenue measure, H. R. 2279.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry. Due to absence from Washington and also not having available forms report is 2 days late.

Buck, Elizabeth, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York City. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank]. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Bugbee, George, 18 East Division Street, Chicago 10, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,250; reimbursement of travel expense, $676.21. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Burger, George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Total, $785.20. Expenses: Total, $4,802.02. (2) To vendors of office supplies; for maintenance of office (telephone, rent, telegrams, etc.); for printing and mailing National Independent; for salaries, two paid employees. (3) Expenses incident to maintenance of office and printing of National Independent are self-explanatory. For salaries: Grace M. Connolly (for secretarial and stenographic work), George J. Burger, Jr. (4) National Independent. (5) Specifically, the rubber-tires bill; generally, all legislation affecting small independent business—primarily in the rubber-tire field, secondarily in all fields of enterprise.

Burroughs, J. Edward, Jr., 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Have received $500 as a retainer for the purpose of preparing H. R. 1573 for the relief of Wallaston's Manor Corp. and assembling evidence in support thereof. This is a retainer fee and no part thereof has been expended. (2) None. (4) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1573 is a private bill designed to reimburse Wallaston's Manor Corp. for damage to its property.

Butler, Eugene J., 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,758.96. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr., attorney, law offices of Gall & Lane, Southern Buildings, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. No money received for expenses. (3) For legal research, memoranda, and consultation. (4) None. (5) To support legislation to prevent Federal expenditures in competition with private enterprise.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; employed by Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; expended $379.15, which will be reimbursed. (2) Munsey Real Estate Co., $300; United States Post Office, $15; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $55.40; incidentals, $8.75. (3) Rent, $300; stamps, $15; telephone service, $55.40; transportation and telegrams, $8.75. (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interests.

Carter, Asa L.[1] 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh 16, Pa. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attched.[1] (4) See statement attched.[1] (5) See statement attached.[1]

Carver, Leslie O., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Have supported S. 6, S. 554, and H. R. 1821, by letters only to four Senators and two Representatives.

Case, Ralph H., 22½ Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) January 24, 1947, $500 from Superintendent Ben Reifle, special disbursing agent, by check on United States Treasury, to be disbursed as directed by tribal council, Fort Berthold Reservation. (2) To J. B. Smith, Elbowoods, N. Dak., official delegate, tribal council, Fort Berthold Reservation, per diem, $344; to J. B. Smith, railroad fare, Washington, D. C., to New York and return, $17.69; to Byron S. Adams, Washington, D. C., printing, $126.10; to Ralph H. Case, Washington, D. C., sundries, $5.60. (3) As above stated. (4) None. (5) Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., none pending. Appropriations for construction of Garrison Dam which may be in civil functions, War Department appropriation bill. For Quinaielt Tribe, H. R. 734 and S. 507.

Castiglioni, Paul M., National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $838.98, less withholding and social-security taxes; expenses for quarter, $532.25. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor-vehicle employees of the Post Office Department, covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor-vehicle employees.

Chace, W. E., 610 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; employed by Hill & Knowlton of New York, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,100 salary received from Hill & Knowlton and applied to personal uses, none to lobbying activities. Reimbursed by Hill & Knowlton for out-of-pocket expenses for cab fares and phone calls totaling, approximately, $50. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specified legislation. During preceding quarter worked in general on public relations as to several matters affecting agriculture.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; employed by National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses reimbursed by employers, $1,590.11. Expenditures: $1,590.11. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Chandler, E. L., room 703, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) From American Society of Civil Engineers, $30. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Taxicab fares, $25; postage, $5. (4) None. (5) Amendment to NLRA, stream-pollution control, National Science Foundation, international educational exchange.

Christman, Elisabeth, 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. As secretary-treasurer my duties are much more predominantly administrative than legislative. However, during the past quarter I have participated in activities to further our legislative program. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,499.99, compensation for January, February, and March, 1947. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Postal-rate legislation.

Clott, Herman, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; employed by International Union, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO; suite 1299, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago 6, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,040; taxi fares, $130. (2) Herman Clott. (3) Paid as salary and taxi expenses around Washington. (4) The Union (official organ of the International Union, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO. (5) Support all legislation in favor of membership of above-mentioned union and to oppose all legislation detrimental to said membership and to the welfare of the American people.

Cloward, Donald B., 152 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) Rev. Donald B. Cloward; about $40. (3) Travel, two visits to Washington since October 1946. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation for which we have a Northern Baptist resolution. (See 1946 yearbook of the Northern Baptist convention.)

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of January, February, and March, 1947, are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $7.97; telephone, $14.72; office and miscellaneous expenses, $54.36. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1) above. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) No specific legislation with the exception of immigration. (See original registration statement and (1) above.)

Colborn, Fern M. (Miss), 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, i. e., travel, lodging, food: Salary, $300 annually; travel, $25.30; food, $27.35; lodging, $21. (2) Miss Fern M. Colborn. (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Collett, F. G., P. O. Box 1476, Washington, D. C.; Indians of California, Inc., 2619 Regent Street, Berkeley, Calif. (1) The required report of money received is attached hereto.[1] (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph, postage, transportation, and expenses and maintenance of delegates representing Indians of California, and of other persons (see attached report of expenditures.[1] (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Indians of California.

Coman, Ellis S., 701 Architects Building, 816 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Regular salary of $650 per month as manager of Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. In addition actual traveling and living expenses while in Washington, D. C., and traveling 20 days during past quarter. (2) Ellis S. Coman by the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Extension of Public Law 229.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750, expenses reimbursed by employer, $418.67; expenditures, $418.67. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,175.04, which covers legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Cone, D. C., room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Connett, William C., IV, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.; employed by American Crossarm & Conduit Co., 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received this quarter; $237.85 expended: (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 2422 of Eightieth Congress.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $1,875 for this activity; expended, $18.90. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $13.40; telephone calls, $5.50. (4) An editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; employed by Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) No salary; expenses for travel, hotel, and meals when on official business to Washington for association. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotels, and meals. (See (1) above.) (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $2,681.70 as wages, $200.01 for office rental. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, 233 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.; employed by The National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Received only my regular salary of which you have been previously advised. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Covington, J. Harry, 3d., Arabian American Oil Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $129.90. (2) Various. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, traveling expense to New York, telegrams, and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Covington, J. Harry, 3d, Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $18.93. (2) Various. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status of nonferrous scrap.

Cowan, Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,205; expenses, $988.30. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowling, W. C., National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) Gross back wages due previous to October 1946, $750.60; expenses, $140.84; total, $891.44. (2) Expenses, $140.84—train fare to and from Washington, hotel expenses, meals, taxis, luncheons in Michigan. (3) Consulting with association officials on seaway program. (4) None. (5) St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Bill to create a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security.

Cruse, Donald, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif. (1) Received from Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, $3,412.24; expended, $1,642.92. (2) Various. (3) Support of the Townsend National Recovery Plan. (4) None. (5) The Townsend Plan.

Cunniff,[6] Joseph P., 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh 7, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $540. (2) Joseph P. Cunniff, 4214 Stanley Street, Pittsburgh 7, Pa. (3) For salary and expenses. None of this money was received for lobbying. It was for salary and expenses incurred in duties while traveling and handling affairs of membership. (4) None. (5) The only legislation I lobbied on was the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act proposed by Congressman CROSSER, of Ohio.

Cunniff, J. P., 707 Columbia Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (1) $1,050 at $350 per month salary; $540 at $9 per day expenses. (2) J. P. Cunniff. (3) Salary and expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting membership employed on railroads. No lobbying was done by me this quarter.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association January 1 to March 31, 1947, $5,240.60; expended, $1,668.84. (2) Various. (3) To maintain association activities in California and to defray my personal expenses to and in Washington in connection with my work. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects located in same area.

Dacci,[7] Guy P., Suite 203, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received dues and contributions, $268.10; expended, $75.82. (2) Mrs. Edna V. Keaton, $11.84; reimbursement to Guy P. Dacci for expenses, $63.98. (3) Rent, mimeographing, postage, etc.; charge for cashing money orders. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support the Lemke bill, H. R. 462; oppose legislation to torture dogs in the false name of science.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danaher, John A., 406 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. (1) For appearances before House Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance. Received payment of attorney fees, $2,000; total expenditures, $335.32. (2) January travel, $65.21, February travel, $69.45, March travel, $97.03—paid to Pullman Co. and American Airlines; shorthand and reporting services, Ward & Paul, $31.75; mimeograph services, Henry N. Schroen, $9.60; Congressional Library photostats, $2.45; for Government Printing Office, $34.50; telephone charges to date, $25.33, to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) See answers in (2) preceding. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2404.

Danielian, N. R., National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $4,000 received from National St. Lawrence Association (retainers), which includes $1,000 fee for December 1946; $122.19 for travel and subsistence and other incidental expenses. (2) Railroads for fares, hotel in New York, taxis. (3) Official travel. (4) None. (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries, and waterways of the world. In connection with this object,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

respondent supports the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 2257 Abington Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Received and expended $153.48. (2) Various. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, labor, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing 8, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

D'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE, Washington 3, D. C. (1) Salary, $874.98. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1947, $2,748 (before withholding taxes were deducted); less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Dickerman, John M., 1185 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received for services rendered, $1,750; received $549.06 as expenses. (2) Air lines, railroads, hotels, telegraph company, telephone company, restaurants, etc. (3) Actual expenses for telephone calls, wires, hotels, travel, meals, etc., while away from Washington; also, taxi fares and tips. (4) The Air Line Pilot. (5) Any measures affecting aviation or labor.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 309 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $1,250 for this activity; expended: $19.90. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $13.65; telephone calls, $0.25; luncheon, March 26, $6. (4) Am associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Dickinson, Mrs. LaFell (Lucy J.),[6] 1734 N Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) For October, November, and December 1946, $1,050, travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This expense money is allowed for the president's activities as a whole, but not for the principal purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) General Federation Clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation and asks the organization membership to do likewise when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention. Resolutions attached.

Dickinson, Mrs. LaFell (Lucy J.), employed by General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,275.70 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This expense money is allowed for the president's activities as a whole, but not for the principal purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) See reply to question (1). (3) [Blank.] (4) General Federation Clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation and asks the organization membership to do likewise when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention. Resolutions attached.

Disbrow, Walter L., 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,018.30. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the retirement federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Washington, D. C., $2,466.66; Eastern Magnesia Talc Co., Inc., Burlington, Vt., $1,000; International Talc Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., $1,000; Southern California Minerals Co., Los Angeles, Calif., $1,000; W. H. Loomis Talc Co., Gouverneur, N. Y., $1,000; Ozark Chemical Co., Tulsa, Okla., $2,500.00. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act; percentage depletion tax relief.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; employed by Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $150 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage stamps, Government publications, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty, John E., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $587.70 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $145.50 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, vehicle fares, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $116.30 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $145.50 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1947 for taxicabs, meals, vehicle fares, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dougherty, Robert E., 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $900; expenses, $91.70. Only a part of the amounts concern legislation. (2) Cab drivers, local phone calls, local restaurants. (3) Taxis, tips, incidental lunches, local phone calls. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be favorable to it.

Doyle, E. L., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) No money received except regular salary paid me as brotherhood representative; no money expended in connection with legislative activities; personal travel expense and office expense paid by brotherhood. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees Railway Journal. (5) That directly and indirectly affecting labor.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans.; Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax equality.

Dryden, Mildred L. (Mrs.), 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported of Form B; expenses, $18. (2) Taxicab fare, $18, from office to Capitol and return. (3) Visiting House and Senate offices. (4) None. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Dunbar, Charles E., Jr., care of Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, tenth floor, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Beginning January 1 registrant will be paid a retainer of $1,000 a month. Registrant has received for the period covering this report the sum of $306.30, as stated in Form A, filed herewith.[1] There is due registrant the sum of $6,000, being the balance due for professional services in handling the case of *Fernandez v. Weiner* (326 U. S. 340; 66 S. Ct. 178). (2) See Form A, filed herewith.[1] (3) See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed herewith.[1] (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A, filed herewith.[1]

Dunn, William M., National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $1,892.30. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which was related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Dunton, Arthur C., 407 Westview Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Western Defense Housing Cos., Donald Scott, President, 1041 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,540; expenses, $949.67. (2) Traveling, hotel, incidental, personal maintenance, $949.67. (3) Above. (4) None. (5) Housing.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York 20, N. Y. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,007.72 (not more than $20 of this was directly attributable to congressional expenses). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, grocery stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum or its products, or natural gas.

Dyer, Gus W., 1107 Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) $450 received as salary. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Editorials in News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) No particular legislation but generally to support legislation favorable to maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Eaton,[7] Edna L., 607 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Earle Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 15 Union Square, New York 3, N. Y. (1) $1,300 salary; $376.51 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $63.15 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott,[8] Frank L., care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $466.11 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[1] Not printed. Filed with the Clerk.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[8] Filed with the Secretary only.

A bill in the United States House of Representatives. S. 55. A bill in the United States Senate.

Elliott, John Doyle, 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (1) Advance on commissions against 25 percent of total income from the State of New York to Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. $1,083.85 plus $108 for rent of hall at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; total $1,191.85. Expenditures, $879.33. (2) Various. (3) Traveling to contact Townsend clubs, citizens' groups, organizations, and maintenance of office at 333 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, N. Y. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session; generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (1) Re Arabian-American Oil Co.: None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ely,[6] Myron Ray, Post Office Box 2385, Knoxville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To permit the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

Ely, Myron Ray, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Report as attorney for Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. (1) $2,2 0 of which $150 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses and $2,100 represents legal fees for services in connection with power contracts, tax matters, and departmental business, and such incidental legislative questions as arose in connection therewith. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to January 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on Interior Department appropriation bill (not yet numbered), H. R. 1886, S. 539.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Report as attorney for department of water and power of the city of Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,600 the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, Court of Claims, and other litigation, conferences with Government departments, and legislative matters incidental thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to January 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 83, 727, 728, 1833, 1886, 1977, 2583, 2873, 2874; S. 36, 37, 39, 539.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Report as attorney for Imperial Irrigation District. (1) $2,100 of which the entire amount represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in negotiations with other water and power users, the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to January 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 1848, 2001, Interior Department appropriations bill (not yet numbered); S. 693, 912.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Report as legal representative of Colorado River Board of California and six agency companies. (1) $2,550 of which $150 represents reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, and $2,400 represents legal fees for services relating to legislation and litigation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River, including consultations with Federal departments and others with respect to investigations, plans, and policies relating to reclamation and power. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for periods prior to January 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1349, 1597, 1598, 1615, 1772, 1848, 1886, 1977, 2583, 2873, 2874, Interior Department appropriation bill (not yet numbered); S. 432, 433, 483, 539, 693, 912, 972.

Ely, Northcutt, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. Report as attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California. (1) $1,500 the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, departmental conferences, and legislative matters incidental thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered for period prior to January 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 655, 656, 2052, 2334, Interior Department appropriation bill (not yet numbered); S. Res. 21, S. 66, 912, 972.

Fairbanks, Joseph, attorney at law, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 782 and H. R. 2673, to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Farnham, Diana, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO, 1860 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $715; received expenses, $423.70. (2) George's Radio Co. (office rent), Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., stationers, railroads, cab drivers, and Capital Transit Co. (3) Office and travel expenses. (4) CIO News; Office and Professional News; Staff; Technical America. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 804 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received, $2,124.52; expended, $249.52. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses, including taxi fare, lunch, postage, telephone, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1,200 gross salary received, $170.25 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported on form B, expenses, $58. (2) Taxicab fare, from office to Capitol and return. (3) For the purpose of visiting House and Senate committees and Members of Congress on legislative matters. (4) Natural Gas News. (5) H. R. 2185, H. R. 2235, H. R. 2292, H. R. 2569, S. 734.

Fernbach, Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,025; expenses, $1,033. (2) The salary was paid to the undersigned and the expenses to railroads and air lines, to hotels and restaurants. (3) Expenses were paid for transportation, hotels, and meals. (4) I have distributed printed material on the nature of the proposed bill to editors of the labor press generally. (5) In support of a proposed labor extension service bill which will establish a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received: $168.75 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended: Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $55.48. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached?

Fillius, Maurice W., Puerto Rico Institute, San Juan, P. R., 703 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received retaining fee as reported on form B filed January 7, 1947. No expenditures made for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) As incidental to my duties I am interested in the introduction and passage of legislation which will permit the Federal internal revenue taxes on rum shipped from Puerto Rico to be paid in the United States instead of in Puerto Rico as is done at present.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Floyd, William M., 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Only salary received. See form A for money received and expended by Regular Veterans Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Regular, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (5) Legislation in behalf of veterans.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Not over an average of $30 per week. (2) Self. (3) Hotel and travel

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

expenses when away from my home. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) H. R. 16, a bill to provide every adult citizen of the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age of 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $192; expended, none. (Received from Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington.) (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Foreman, Clark, 127 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C.; Southern Conference for Human Welfare, 808 Perdido Street, New Orleans 12, La. (1) Salary, $2,000; money expended, $320.31. No portion of this total amount was used for lobbying purposes during this quarter. Above amount due me, but all of it has not been paid of this date. (2) Public carriers, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Actual travel and food. (4) None. (5) All legislation to increase the suffrage and improve economic, health, and educational conditions in the South.

Fort, J. Carter, 929 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C. (1) In addition to salary as shown on registration form B, filed December 27, 1946, received no money except $209.20 as reimbursement for traveling expenses, taxi fares in Washington, etc. Both salary and expenses covered all services rendered the Association of American Railroads as set forth in registration and not only services in connection with legislation. (2) Biltmore Hotel, New York; Palmer House, Chicago; and various other hotels, restaurants, taxi drivers, etc., in New York, Chicago, and Detroit; also restaurants and taxi drivers in Washington, D. C. (3) For actual travel expenses while out of Washington and for taxicabs and business lunches in Washington. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad interests, including S. 110 and H. R. 221.

Fox, O. J., 701 Majestic Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Amount received: $569.17. Expense account: Transportation, $113.73; taxicab fare, $26.80; Commodore Hotel bill, $56.50; laundry and cleaning, $8.75; meals, $89.64; stenographic work, $12.50; multigraph work, $21; postage, $140.25; salary, $100. (2) Frisco Railway Co.; Washington, D. C., taxicab; Commodore Hotel; Frisco Railway dining cars and various cafes in Washington, D. C.; salary, O. J. Fox; multigraph work; Truman Ward, Washington, D. C.; public stenographer in Washington, D. C. (3) Transportation, taxicab fare, hotel bill, laundry and cleaning, meals, stenographic work, multigraph work, postage, salary. (4) Welfare News, an old-age pension advocate in Oklahoma. (5) Old-age pension legislation.

Franzen, John T. D., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Zions Herald article: Yearning To Breathe Free. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $164.50; expenses, $164.50. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Taxis and entertainment. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Gall, John C. (firm of Gall & Lane), Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $250 per month, $750 per calendar quarter, received by firm of Gall & Lane from the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. (2) No money received by way of expense allowance or reimbursement during this calendar quarter. (3) Regular monthly retainer for general legal services rendered by firm to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. in accordance with terms of Form B registration filed January 15, 1947. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to labor, taxes, and business practices. Primary function in connection with most legislation is to advise client as to status and progress.

Gann, Glenn,[8] 1286 Fairview, Detroit 14, Mich. (1) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) As per list attached.[8] (3) For lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House; S. 55, a bill in the Senate.

Gannon, Peter J., 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N. J. (1) None. (2) No funds expended. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Shore and beach preservation.

Gardiner, Elizabeth, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $575. (2) Marshall F. Bannell. (3) Press relations and publicity services. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp. we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gentner, Leo F., 311 Colorado Building, Fourteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) To date no contributions have been received and no moneys expended for the purpose of influencing the passage of, or the defeat of, any legislation. (2) None (see (1) above). (3) None (see (1) above). (4) None. (5) None. (Note: The undersigned does not believe he comes under the requirements of the so-called Lobbying Act, but until application of the act has been clarified he has registered and will submit reports.)

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,499.99; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $459.60. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Giddings, Ernest, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,125 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $225 expenses. (2) Self (salary), expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) $1,500 as salary. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) As secretary of Southern States Industrial Council, the general legislative program of the association.

Glazier, William H., 930 F Street NW., Room 800, Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 604 Montgomery Street, San Francisco 11, Calif. (1) $1,140; of this amount $35 per week for 12 weeks' salary and $10 per week expenses. (2) Taxicab companies, railroads, telephone calls, etc. (3) Transportation and communication. (4) ILWU Dispatcher. (5) Support all legislation in the interests of American workers and specifically members of the ILWU. Oppose antidemocratic proposals and legislation.

Glodowski, Agnes, general, Mitchell, S. Dak. (1) Commission; no expense account. (2) Received from Townsend national headquarters, Cleveland, Ohio. (3) For organizational work for Townsend movement. (4) [Blank.] (5) Townsend bill, H. R. 16.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Gorman, William H., 129 Alleghany Street, Clifton Forge, Va. (1) I have not done any legislative work during the last quarter. (2) No money paid out as I have not done any legislative work during the past quarter. (3) None paid out. (4) None paid out. (5) No legislative work during the past quarter.

Goss, Albert S., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Retainer, $3,000. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Gradel, John G., 7149 Ditman Street, Tacony, Philadelphia 35, Pa.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Received $281.25 as salary and $200.30 as expenses, hotel, meals, and transportation, March 6-31, 1947. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Work in connection with opposing S. 670, H. R. 2169, H. R. 2310.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post-office box 2450, Honolulu 4, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation. In the calendar quarter, January 1-March 31, 1947, I have appeared before committees and otherwise expressed myself as in favor of legislation which would confer statehood on Hawaii and legislation to extend sugar controls.

Greenway, J. Cole,[8] 30 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State conference in opposition to St. Lawrence project. No active bill pending.

Grinberg,[7] P. Irving, 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc.; for expenses $61.41. Expended, $61.41. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, The Trader and Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Proposed reduction in appropriation for Treasury Department. Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applying to jewelry.

[8] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[8] Filed with the Secretary only.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[8] Filed with the Secretary only.

Gruver, E. B., 14 South Spruce Street, Lewistown, Pa. (1) Received the sum of $1,114.88. Paid out for expense $511.97. (2) The above sum was paid out for traveling expense while traveling throughout the State of Pennsylvania. This includes automobile expense, meals while away from home, hotel rooms, office supplies, railroad fare, etc. (3) For traveling expense and general expense of office supplies, etc. For interviews and Townsend club meetings. (4) None. (5) To support bill known in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16.

Haas, Frank E., 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill.; Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill.[1] (1) Salary as per registration and reimbursement of expenses by employer in the total amount of $1,010.45. (2) To Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., Congress and Sherman Hotels, Chicago, Ill.; Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.; Hollenden Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio; various other hotels; the Pullman Co.; and various restaurants, taxicab companies, and individuals. (3) Meals, $408.40; lodging, $204.90; Pullman fare, $123.86; railroad fare, taxicab, and local transportation, $101.87; and local and long-distance telephone calls, telegraph, postage, stenographic services, stationery, and supplies, and miscellaneous incidental expenses, $171.37. (4) None. (5) Legislation of mutual interest to western railroads and their employees.

Haas, John A., 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Expended for taxi fares, $13. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,560 in salary and $130 for expenses. About one-tenth should be charged to legislative work. (2) Salary to Hoyt S. Haddock, expenses to various. (3) Salary, taxis, meals, telephones, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which affects members of member unions.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, $119.84; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $123.97. (2) Incidental expenses, streetcar, taxi, etc., $33.60; United States Government Printing Office, $44.32; Franklin T. Baldwin Letter Service, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., $41.92. (3) Various. United States Government Printing Office, copies of S. 637; Franklin T. Baldwin letter. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action; expended nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; employed by Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth 2, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,010; expenses, $300. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Hansen, Harry, 305 Royal Union Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Home Owners Protective League, $428.80; Federated Property Owners Association, $150; Property Owners Association, western Michigan, $50; Carthage Property Owners Association, $25; W. H. Deubener, St. Paul, Minn., $25; Frank Ferguson, San Anonio, $5; Mrs. Carolyn Dixon, $5; Mrs. E. D. Gibson, $1; total, $685.50. (2) Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, $77.17; Willard Hotel, $262.50; typing and printing, $208.30; telegraph and telephoning, $17.91; stamps and stationery, $30.80; living expenses, $190.32; total, $787. (3) Actual expenses in Washington. (4) None. (5) The termination of rent control.

Hanson,[2] Lawrence C. (severed connection on March 15, 1947); 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1116, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, January, February, and half of March, at $625 per month, $1,562.50; expenses, taxis, lunches, etc., January, $13.29; expenses, taxis, lunches, etc., February, $49.24; total, $1,625.03. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, etc. (3) Operating expenses in connection with committee work. (4) Same as first report. (5) Same as first report.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet and both Houses of Congress (*a*) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially, and (*b*) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harper, Ford C., Oklahoma Tax Equality League, 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City 2, Okla. (1) None. No money was received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Harris, Peggy (Mrs.), Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910—Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Harris, Ronald B., 602 T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno 1, Calif.; Irrigation Districts Association of California, Hotel Sacramento, Sacramento, Calif., formerly 932 Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Expenses of trip to Washington, D. C., March 13 to 29, 1947, inclusive: Railroad fare, $256.03; hotel bill, including phone calls, $58.85; hotel, Los Angeles, $5; meals, tips, telegrams, taxis, and incidentals, $111.19; total, $431.07. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Bills amending reclamation laws.

Harris, Winder R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., room 203, Washington 5, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, suite 2501, New York 6, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expenses, $86.72; personal expenses, $137; total, $223.72. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Employment included no support or opposition to legislation during calendar quarter January–March 1947.

Hart, Merwin K., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Received from National Economic Council for expenses, $100, and as salary, $1,666.66. (2) Expended for various expenses, $134.41. (3) Various. (4) National Economic Council Letter, published semimonthly. (5) See attached statement.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1401 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received: $1,500 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $321.09 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $216.67 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $49.98 incidental expenses for months of January, February, and March 1947. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $49.98 incidental expenses for months of January, February, and March 1947, taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hayes, William E., executive representative, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., 601 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) In accordance with the statement filed in his registration relating to his duties as an officer in the executive department of his company, the undersigned estimates that no more than 5 percent of his time during the quarter covered herein was devoted to legislative assignments, and that therefore no more than $130 of his salary is chargeable thereto. (2) No expenditures in connection with legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of his company.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per registration and reimbursement by employer of expense incurred in total amount of $1,420.13. (2) To Mayflower Hotel and Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; to Pullman Co.; to B. & O. Railroad; to Pennsylvania Railroad; to various restaurants, hotels, taxicab companies; to postage, and to various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting railroads operating in western district.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; employed by National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York 1, N. Y. (1) Meals, $302.85; rail and plane transportation, $65.18; hotel, $21.22; taxis, $79.70; miscellaneous, $7.50. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 1111.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.; employed by Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $76.65. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.; president of American Parents' Association, Inc. (without salary); chairman of National Committee Working for Enactment of National School Health Services Act (without salary); 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.) (1) Received $428.94 for traveling expenses from New York to Washington; expended $428.94. (2) Various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, miscellaneous expenses. (4) The Parents' Magazine, School Management, and a news release sent out to a large number of magazines and newspapers. (5) National School Health Services Act, H. R. 1980.

Heckendorn, William; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001-1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington 4, D. C.; employed by National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York 7, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrington, A. B.; National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $1,892.30. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) The Telephone Worker, Weekly News Letter, the Call. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

Herrmann, Louis F., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended for taxi fares $1.20. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Hester, Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) February, salary $416.67; office rent, stenographic service $100; telephone, transportation, etc. $62.50; March, salary $416.67; office rent, stenographic service, and telephone $106.65; transportation and miscellaneous $16.35. (2) Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (3) Office rent, stenographic service, telephone, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Wool legislation.

Hibbard, Lorin F.; R. F. D. No. 1, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $223.53; actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6—A bill in the United States House of Representatives. S. 55—A bill in the United States Senate.

Hines, Lewis G.; American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW. (1) $102. (2) Lewis G. Hines. (3) National legislative representative taxes and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C.; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $185.22; total, $1,435.22. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $185.22. (2) Air lines, railroads, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Aluminum Research Institute. (1) Received none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $18.93. (2) Telephone Co., $13.88; taxicab drivers, $5.05. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status on non-ferrous scrap.

Hiss, Donald, 701 Union Trust Building; Arabian American Oil Co. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarters, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Holman, Charles W., 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Expended for taxi fares, $24.05. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 429 West Jefferson Street, Louisville 2, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 305, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Salary, $300; expenses, $142.55; no expenses other than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, Pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living expenses and transportation and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills affecting the now existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co. and others. (1) Received: None. Expended: $52.69. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, telegrams, postage, copy of opinion in *Miller et al.* v. *United States*, transportation within the District of Columbia and lunches and dinners. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relative to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Howard, Paul, 170[illegible] M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) $2,608.83 from American Library Association. (2) Various. (3) Operation of office; not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) None. (5) None.

Howard, S. H., 1329 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa. (1) Received salary of $181.25 for last half of March and actual expenses of $112.92. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage of defeat of any legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in opposition to bills to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,000 as salary and $119.58 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee-meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to regular Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From January 1, to March 31, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,875 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $540, a total of $2,415. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 133 Watts Street, New York 13, N. Y.; fee, none this quarter; expenses, $76.36. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Hudson, Minor, 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $2,500 received during 3-month period ending March 31, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Minor Hudson. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve officers of the naval services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, of the Reserve which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, A. F. of L., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,880; expenses, $157.40. (2) Taxis, phones, and messengers. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting labor.

Ingles, William, 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Inland Steel Co., $1,200; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $1,150; Fruehauf Trailer Co., $1,500; J. I. Case Co., $900; The Falk Corp., $900; Foremen's League for Education and Association, $8,000; American Mining Congress, $600. Expenditures: Office salaries, $1,491.20; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (no individual expense exceeding $10), $360; office rent, $505; telephone, $153.82; office supplies, $37.40; public stenographer, $41.20; traveling expenses, $510. (2) Agents of the Field Building, Chicago, Ill., and the Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Regularly employed office employees; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Illinois Bell Telephone Co.; M. S. Ginn & Co., Washington, D. C.; secretarial and office services, Washington, D. C. (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) None. (5) S. 70, 866, 889, 55, 105, 133, 360, 984, S. J. Res. 85; H. R. 2625, 2700, 2157, 2423, 1677, 2540, 1874, 515, 1110, H. Res. 164.

Jackson, Robert C., 1406 G Street NW. (formerly 1416 F. Street NW.). (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting to $40.95 that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Local phone calls, $1.60; taxi fares, $29.65; meals for guests, $9.70. (3)

Communication, transportation, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During past quarter have opposed enactment of so-called Flammable Fabrics Acts; have supported certain principles regarding restrictions on labor-union powers; and have supported appropriations for United States Department of Agriculture research funds.

James,[7] Elmer J., route 3, box 595, Portland, Oreg. (1) $315. (2) Elmer J. James. (3) Townsend club organizer. (4) None. (5) Townsend national recovery plan.

Jobe, William T., 1706 L Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,000 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the first calendar quarter of 1947 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirement of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Alfonso, Federal Tax Equality League of Texas, 1101 Commerce Street, Dallas 2, Tex. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) . one. (5) None.

Johnson, Clare A.,[8] room 1027, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) No money was received and expended for work within the scope of Public Law 601. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) The responsibilities of my position are to disseminate information and research to trade associations, chambers of commerce, and other interested organizations. Do not anticipate any appearances or work falling under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (See registration Form B, dated April 16, 1947.)

Johnson, Curtis, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) Salary, $40.50; traveling and incidental expenses, $84.85; total, $125.35. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement of traveling and other expense incident thereto when away from home. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to Great Lakes Shipping.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C (1) January 1947, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Jones, Bascom F.,[6] 930 Broadway, Nashville 3, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No action incident to Federal legislation in last quarter of 1946. See exhibit A to registration.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None; see exhibit A to registration. Registrant made a single trip to Washington during quarter, of 2 days' duration, for interviews with Tennessee Senators in support of S. 110.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Filed with the Secretary only.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City 1, Utah. (1) Salary, $1,500; expense, $1,152.02; total, $2,652.02. (2) Various. (3) The above paid to J. M. Jones as secretary of the National Wool Growers Association for duties in connection with association work. Expenses paid for all work in Washington, D. C., in connection with legislation, work with departments, etc. (4) The National Wool Grower, co-editor, J. M. Jones. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any legislation only as legislation affects the sheep industry. At the present time I am supporting House Joint Resolution 158, H. R. 2401, and S. 814; opposing S. 917 and companion bill in the House, known as the Herter wool bill. This is only a portion of the work done here in Washington, the other work not being of a legislative nature, but the entire expense is indicated.

Jones, Walter J., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Panama Canal Central Labor Union, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $312 salary and actual expenses. I am here temporarily to look after the interests of United States Government employees while the appropriations for Canal Zone activities are being considered. (2) Subsistence, stenographic, taxis, cables, entertainment, gas and oil for car. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the Panama Canal employees.

Joyce, T. L., vice president, Switchmen's Union of North America, 2907 Birney Avenue, Scranton, Pa. (1) No money received except regular salary at rate of $7,404 per year. No money expended in connection with legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and to railway labor in particular.

Kaiser, Herbert G., 2322 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; employed by Government Group Insurance Conference, care of E. C. Mellor (secretary), Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. (1) $450 ($150 a month) from U. S. Treasury Department Beneficial Association as president, duties connected therewith, other than concerning pending legislation. Nothing from Government Group Insurance Conference, of which I am chairman of legislative committee. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any affecting interest of members of the various associations that are confederated in Government Group Insurance Conference.

Kass, Rear Adm. I., post-office box 4037 (Chevy Chase), Washington, D. C. (1) My own initiative and enterprise—about $50 to $100. (2) Post office, printer, copyright office, stationery, travel, public stenographer, travel, and similar incidentals. (3) Mailing, printing, travel, incidentals, and conferences. (4) Pamphlets: At This Late Period in History, the American People, White Supremacy, and My Integrity, and various news items mention. (5) In my own interest I expect congressional action to relent on my very valuable property rights, and on the various damages I sustained since about 1909. Secondly, I intend to defeat all fair employment practice legislation on behalf of the Southern States, and democratic, and republican, liberal government.

Kay, Raymond, National Committee for Fair Taxation, 109 East Twenty-eighth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) The National Committee for Fair Taxation is still in its organizational stages, and as yet no dues or contributions have been received or accepted. Approximately $40 has been advanced by Raymond Kay for postage and stationery. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Attached hereto is a copy of a news release, the contents of which were commented upon by such newspaper columnists as Lee Mortimer and others. (5) Reduction of the cabaret tax from the wartime rate of 20 percent.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,033.32; expenses, $325. (2) Paid to self for salary and expenses. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Washington Report, the Union Review, the Intercollegian. (5) Program attached with form C, October 1946, still is the basis of our work.

Keller, Joseph E., secretary, District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received $1,451.90 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee; $2,856.68 has been expended on behalf of the committee to date. (See schedule A[1] attached for details of expenditures of committee.) (2) See schedule A[1] attached. (3) See schedule A[1] attached. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kennedy, Harold L., 912 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Mid-Continental Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (1) Received monthly salary; amount of salary previously reported in Form B heretofore filed with Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate; expended, $12. (2) See (3) below. (3) Expended $12 for 30 taxi fares, at 40 cents each, to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Ketchum, Omar B.; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary, minus social-security and withholding taxes; $120 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization; the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Keys,[8] Robert H., care of Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $334.23; actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Kieran,[7] James M., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To permit the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

Kimball, Arthur W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $325 salary semimonthly, less withholding tax and security tax; $360 expenses during January, February, and March 1947. (2) Arthur W. Kimball, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (3) Travel, luncheons, taxis, etc. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

King, Joseph T., 1713 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Filed with the Secretary only.

and $242.27 expenses. (2) Expenses paid to Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, hotels, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons. (4) National Affairs Report. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building-supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King, Williford I., room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I have received $150 per week salary during the quarter. (2) I am not a disbursing officer, and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen,[7] C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters, except an article in the yearbook of the Kern Country Potato Growers Association, which discusses legislative needs in a general way to stabilize the potato industry. The weekly letter to members of this association has contained references to the need for adequate appropriations for marketing research and for the administration of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 703 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received, $900; expended, none. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Knowles, Miles H., and Dean, Allen, doing business as Washington Business Services, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received from the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee, 602 Medical Science Building, Washington 5, D. C., $15,135.58. (2) Stenographic and clerical hire, postage, tlephone, telegraph, travel, office stationery and printing, newspapers, and periodicals. (3) For the purpose of research into labor problems. (4) None. (5) Support legislation to obtain true collective-bargaining rights for employers in the light of local conditions and oppose industry- and union-wide bargaining.

Koch,[8] Robert M., 1426 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C., (1) The National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., has only recently established an office in Washington and the registrant engaged in no activities regulated by this act prior to January 1, 1947. The registrant was employed for the ensuing year at a board of director's meeting, held in the evening of January 16, 1947. The registrant has not engaged in any activities regulated by this act from the date of his employment at the above-indicated directors' meeting until the date this form was notarized. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Koch, Robert M., 1426 K Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as Secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $600 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the first quarter of 1947. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $12 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Kocher, Eric, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York City. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Lacques, Paul H., member of firm of Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York 7, N. Y. (1) Received since the date of registration (January 21, 1947) various sums during the quarterly period at various times up to and including March 31, 1947, a total of $729 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, none of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, and meals. (4) None. (5) Indemnification for losses sustained; not yet in the form of bills.

Lamb, Robert K., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,000; expenses, $468.33. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel away from Washington; cab fares in Washington. (4) CIO News, Steel Labor. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 578 Broadway, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer $1,227.57 (old-age benefit and income tax withheld in addition) and $14.12 for telephone calls and telegrams (no expenditures but small sums for postage and taxis); from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $839.15 (old-age benefit and income tax withheld in addition), no expenditures but small sums for postage; Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help, $750 and $150 additional for expenses of trip to Texas meeting at Dallas, Tex., February 3, and conference at Fort Worth, Tex. (2) $375 paid to Marion D. Greer for clerical help (with deduction withheld for old-age benefit and income tax), and $375 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Clerical help, rental, garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are all nonprofit organizations, and I was employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., 1726 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary of $900 received during 3 months' period ending March 31, 1947, used only for personal living expenses. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Personal living expenses. (4) The Voice of the Reserve, the regular monthly publication of Reserve officers of the naval services, which is distributed to the membership of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the national security, the Navy, or the Reserve which Reserve officers of the naval services may decide to support or oppose.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., The National Independent Meat Packers Association, Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) Bulletin, National Independent Meat Packers Association. (5) (1) Termination of export controls on hides; (2) appropriation for Department of Commerce census of meat-packing industry; (3) labor legislation; (4) withholding of slaughter subsidies due meat-packing companies by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Seatrain Lines, Inc., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Clark & Le Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to improvement of status of water carriers. I have not supported or opposed any legislation during past quarter.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, AFL, 936 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence,[9] John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration and expended no money whatsoever for purposes covered by title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) Within the general responsibility for the affairs of the association I am concerned with any bills affecting motor transportation. Thus far, testimony has been given by our general counsel on S. 49, S. 70, and S. 110. We are interested also in H. R. 584, but no testimony has been given.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $16.40. (2) The money was paid primarily to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks or cashiers in lunchrooms. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2) and the money paid to clerks or cashiers was for lunches. (4) None. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I am required, among other duties, to testify on bills affecting the trucking industry. Thus far, testimony has been given by me on one bill only—H. R. 2324—to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I also have in connection with my other duties general supervision over other staff members appearing. Our general counsel has appeared on S. 49, 55, 70, and 110; H. R. 584 (now 2157), 1467, 2109, 8, and 725.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,938.04; reimbursed for expenses, $355.37. (2) Various. (3) Travel, etc. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the action of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $18.93. (2) Telephone company, $13.88; taxicab drivers, $5.05. (3) Long-distance telephone calls and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Legislation to secure continuation of duty-free status of nonferrous scrap.

[7] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.
[9] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

Laylin, John G., Arabian American Oil Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $129.90. (2) Railroad and New York hotels, $86.39; telephone company, $35.59; taxicab drivers, $4.50; Western Union Telegraph Co., $3.42. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, traveling expense to New York, telegrams and transportation within the District of Columbia. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Layton, E. M., 1922 East Apache Street, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) $385 as follows: $335 from the Property Owners Association of Arizona, and $50 from Marvin Smith, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) $104.92 for railroad fare, and all other expenses were under $10 each. (3) Transportation, taxi, telephone, lunch, and similar expenses. (4) None. (5) Oppose OPA.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (Registrant disclaims that Public Law 601 has any application to it but is filing this form in the event that the act may be deemed to be applicable to it.) (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement I. (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leiser, Clara, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None, compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Lemmon, James H., Lemmon, S. D.; National Wool Marketing Corp. as president, 281 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) In Washington as president of the National Wool Marketing Corp. from February 25 to March 5. Most of this time was holding an executive committee meeting. Following the meeting, however, called on some Senators and Congressmen to discuss wool legislation. Have not been back to Washington since and I received only my regular expenses such as railroad fare, pullman, hotel bill, and meals from the National Wool Marketing Corp. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Called on Senators and Congressmen relative to pending legislation for the wool growers.

Leonard, Richard T., International Union, UAW-CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. (1) Salary, $1,884.68; expenses, $1,672.25. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) For living expenses incident to his work and travel expenses. (4) UAW-CIO publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills of aid to the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas 1, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Received my regular salary only, which was previously filed. No money has been received or expended for purposes within scope of Federal regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Letts, David S., 901 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received $1,200 compensation as attorney for the American Transit Association. Expended $107.60, none of which was used for lobbying purposes. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) On bills affecting the transit industry he may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,260 salary for the quarter plus $140 for expenses. One-fourth of salary is for legislative work and three-fourths for research work. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, ACA News, NMU Pilot, ILWU Dispatcher, IFAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer, MCS Voice, and CIO Maritime Committee Washington Newsletter. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Levitan, Selig J., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Joseph Villar, 121 West Seventy-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,161.86; paid for travel expenses to Washington, D. C., $99.10; long-distance telephones, $12.76. (2) Travel expenses, principally railroad fares, air fares, hotel bill. (3) Travel to Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 1021. Employment terminated March 24, 1947.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $163.54. (2) Railroad tickets, $107.64; hotels, $32.06; taxis, porter, telegrams, and miscellaneous, $23.84; total, $163.54. (3) For attending meetings and conferences out of town, speaking trips. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) I support, in pursuance of the purposes of our organization, legislation that promotes peace and oppose legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Linquist, Earl G., general delivery, Topeka, Kans. (1) $562. (2) Expenses, etc., $70. (3) Expenses. (4) None. (5) Townsend national recovery plan.

Linton, Donald H., 250 Stuart Street, Boston 16, Mass. (1) $1,079.59 ($450 compensation and $626.59 expenses). (2) Various. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 2, H. R. 2569, 2185, 2235, 2292; S. 734.

Little, Charles R., executive secretary, Kenwood Road, box 153-M, rural route 508, Cincinnati 27, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Received for expenses, $600; expenses, $409.35. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $173.12; lodging, $96.32; meals, $55.62; tips, $20.07; office expense (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $64.22. (4) None. (5) Any dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Lockwood, Maurice H., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter $800 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News and Fertilizer Review, both published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington 5, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release on H. R. 2494 but do not know what publications may have published it, in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494 and H. R. 869.

Lodge, F. S., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $50 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494 and H. R. 869.

Louchheim, Joseph H., Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $1,500; expenses received, $103.26; total, $1,603.26. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Lucas, James G., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $20.15. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Ariz.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) No salary. A small commission on dues, etc., barely to cover postage and miscellaneous expenses, usually less than $10 per week. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Townsend plan and H. R. 16.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $694.11. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work; all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

McAvoy, Harold, 907 Lormer Street, Brooklyn 22, N. Y.; National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service, Mail Handlers, 160-10 One Hundred and Nineteenth Road, Jamaica 5, N. Y. (1) $1,600 a year. (2) Harold McAvoy. (3) All purposes that will benefit the postal employee. (4) The Mail Handlers Journal. (5) All legislation that will benefit the post office and railway mail service, mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers.

McBride, Don, secretary manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $19,995.27 (see schedule I,[1] attached); total expenditures for period, $20,756.74 (see schedule II,[1] attached). (2) See attached schedules I[1] and II.[1] (3) See attached schedules I[1] and II.[1] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin, attached.[1] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (S. 539 and H. R. 1886) and any other legislation affecting water resources of the 17 Western States. (See sec. 3, purposes, p. 1 of our constitution, attached.[1])

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) For maintenance of office of vice president, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $298.75 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $334.65 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $298.75 was expended by me as expense

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

money, during the first quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division of National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative services, $300. (2) self (salary); expenses: Hotels, railroad, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis 1, Mo. (1) Total expenses in connection with legislative matters, $219.11; reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association, $175. (2) Various. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.

McFarland, Rev. A. J.; the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $625; expenses, $225. (2) Salary to self, for home expenses; expenses paid to railroads, busses, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Employed to support a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows: The preamble shall be amended to read: "We the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of Nations, in order to form a more perfect union. * * *"

McGlue, Arthur F., care of Post Office Building, Lynn, Mass.; National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (1) Expenses, $750. (2) Train fare, hotels, taxis, postage, stationery, entertainment. (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for all postal employees. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published monthly by National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees.

McGough, Richard; Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) Salary as explained in original registration; traveling expenses: Pullman fare, $30.88; meals, taxi fares, and incidentals, $18.70; total, $49.58. (2) Pullman fare to Northern Pacific Railway Co., meals, taxi fares, and incidentals to restaurants, diners, etc. (3) Purposes stated above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, Taxpayers, U. S. A., 626 I Street, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To expend as I see fit, which fitness I consider the taxpayers' (Nation) welfare. (4) Caused to be published for fee, none; submitted for legislative support, innumerable. (5) [Blank.]

McGrath, Tom J., 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates for services rendered, $1,821.25; National Coal Association, $1,200; Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, $1,233.32. (2) No payments made. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2569; also legislation dealing with disposal of so-called Big Inch pipe lines.

McGrath, Tom J., National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 729 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $362.50 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for services; $9.69 received from National St. Lawrence Project Conference for petty cash expenses. (2) United States Post Office, Western Union, restaurants, railroads. (3) Postage, telegrams, meals, travel expense. (4) None. (5) Resolution relating to Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin waterway and power project.

McKenzie, James Chase, room 1000, North Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, 15 Moore Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Operators of taxicabs, street car and bus companies, gasoline station operators, garage repairmen, telephone company, Post Office Department, telegraph companies, clerks in private office of registrant. (3) Necessary expenses in carrying on duties of legislative representative for National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. (4) None. (5) General legislation for the welfare of licensed officers of the United States merchant marine and seamen in general.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) Legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II.

McLaurin, Joseph H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money was received by the undersigned except a part of annual salary of $12,000 as president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, which may be allocable to my issuing three communications to members, together with enclosures; two on proposed fair employment practice legislation and one on general labor legislation, to wit: $33. The expenses to the association for issuing the three communications is estimated at $131. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., Bulletin Service. (5) Later authorized by association executive committee to oppose or support labor legislation and FEPC bill.

McMahon, John A., president of National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center, Boston 24, Mass. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation involving salaries, retirement, and general working conditions which affect the members of the National Association of Postal Supervisors as well as all other supervisors assigned to the field service of the Post Office Department.

McMains, W. H., 1135 National Press Building, Washington D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500, which is in payment for all services rendered, only a part of which deal with legislation. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act.

(2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No specific legislation. Any legislation affecting the interests of the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillian, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D .C. (1) $2,100, with no more than one-fifth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $91.85, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McNaughton,[5] Donald J., 98 Bloomfield Avenue, Buffalo 20, N. Y. (1) $1,200 salary as regional director of Foreman's Association of America (January, February, and March 1947); $282.12 actual expense incurred while lobbying during first quarter 1947. (2) Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C., $59.34; Pennsylvania Central Air lines, $120.78; restaurants (various), $84; local transportation, (cabs, etc.), $18. (3) Hotel room, transportation, meals, tips (waiters, cab drivers, etc.). (4) None. (5) H. R. 8 and S. 55 and any other legislation designed to remove supervisory employees from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act.

[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $999.96; expenses, $228.33. (2) Railroad, postage, office supplies, public stenographer, telephone, and telegraph. (3) Travel, office supplies, and expense. (4) The Independent Woman, publication of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. (5) Merit System in Government; adequate appropriations for the Women's Bureau; equal-rights amendment; the principle that the right to work for compensation shall not be abridged or denied by reason of race, religion, sex, economic, or marital status; opposition to discrimination against women; Federal aid in support of public education with State control of funds; jury service for women; legislation regulating child labor; participation of the United States in the United Nations; and the retention of women's units as component branches of the military services.

McSparron, Joseph P., district 124, International Association of Machinists, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa. (1) Nothing received or expended during the first quarter 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None in first quarter 1947.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $144.16. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $52.50; Secker & Co., $17.70; Mary M. Franks, $15.60; miscellaneous, $74.26. (3) Telephone tolls, $52.50; photostats, $17.50; stenographic service, $15.60; taxis, lunches for officers of American Optometric Association while in Washington, and miscellaneous expenditures, $74.26. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association development fund, I have appeared before a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House, together with officers of the association, in support of amendments to H. R. 1982 and H. R. 1361. I also appeared before the Senate Committee for Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and suggested possible amendments to S. 140 and S. 712. On behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., I have proposed an amendment to the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill, known as H. R. 2436, which amendment would either delete entirely or increase the ceiling price on typewriters purchased by the Government.

Mack, James Edward, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since January 1, 1947, and up to April 1, 1947, I have received the proportionate part of my salary as reported in registration filed October 3, 1946. I have received no money for expenses during this period. (2) No expenses during this period. (3) No expenses during this period. (4) The Property Owner, regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation, the Washington News Digest. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

Mackenzie, James, 6108 Northeast Eighth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1) Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.; 25 percent of all moneys received from Oregon. (2) [Blank.] (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) House bill 16.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection

with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $1,253.49. (2) Railroads, etc., $503.11; hotels and miscellaneous, $750.38. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, Sea-Air Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To obtain the right for American steamship lines to correlate aviation with their surface operations overseas.

Mahoney, C. P., Blythe, Calif. (1) Received regular salary $750 per month, 20 days of which is applicable to legislative work. Received and expended traveling expenses. (2) Railroad, hotels, restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation amending Colorado River Front Act of 1946.

Mann, Charles B., Foreman's Association of America, 438 West Sixtieth Place, Chicago 21, Ill. (1) $195.59; actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Margolin, Olya (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) $800 in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which spent in connection with work; $12.88, received from above, spent for postage and carfare. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark, James, Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From January 1 to March 31, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $540, a total of $2,290. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marsh, Benjamin C., The Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F. Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Total receipts, largest contribution, $50; $3,238.02. Total expenses, $3,459.70; Salaries and wages, $1,400.25; printing and bulletin, $1,298.75; postage, $319.65; rent, $220; social-security and withholding tax, $100.65; Andrew Walker, $22.20; Addressograph Co., $38.26; incidentals, $59.94. (2) Salaries and wages—Benjamin C. Marsh, Arline Ryan, Walter Clyd, Marie McEnaney; printing, Graphic Arts Press; postage, United States Post Office; rent, J. B. Stein; tax collector, Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md.; supplies, A. B. Dick, Andrew Walker, and Addressograph Co. (3) Salaries and wages, for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) Have sent and distributed material to hundreds of papers, magazines, etc., but have not caused any to be published—it was intelligence on their part. (5) Support attached program [1] and oppose that against it.

Marston, R. B., director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,950, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $390 expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens League, Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., post office box 1628, Washington 13, D. C. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947. (See attached supplementary sheet for expenses.[1]) (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have published because of our contacts with them. (See accompanying list.[1]) (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $90. (2) Walter J. Mason. (3) National legislative representative; taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Mecartney, Malcolm, 10 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from protective committee for the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad 6 and 7-percent preferred stock, $875 to apply on account of fees (see note below), and $1,400 for expenses, of which $1,232.82 was expended during the quarter. (NOTE.—Payment of $75 per week on account of fees under conditions stated in (4) of registration Form B was subsequently modified by the committee to $100 per week under same conditions, retroactive to January 1.) (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) None. (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I was employed in 1935 as associate counsel for said committee to represent the interests of the preferred stockholders of the Rock Island Railway in the pending reorganization proceedings. Incident to the protection of such interests, and incident to such general employment, I was asked by the committee to urge the support of legislation (such as S. 1253, 79th Cong.) designed to prevent the unwarranted forfeiture of railroad securities, including Rock Island preferred stock, now imminently threatened in pending reorganization proceedings.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co. and others, 603 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. During the last preceding quarter there was received on account of services performed by registrant in carrying on his lobbying activities as defined by law the amount of $3,200. The total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses during such quarter was $874.12. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., 1110 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for quarter ending March 31, 1947. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Postal legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer,[6] Ross A., post office box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Post Office Custodial News, published monthly by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees.

Messer, Ross A., post office box 1611, Washington 13, D. C.; National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, 525 New Jersey Avenue NW., post office box 1611, Washington 13, D. C. (1) Salary, $383.33; expenses, $230.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Expenses incurred in setting up and maintaining a Washington Office. (4) Post Office Custodial News, published monthly by the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees. (5) All beneficial legislation for all postal employees.

Miles, Clarence R., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $3,750; expenses, $21.80; expended: transportation, $8.80; meals, $13. (2) Taxi companies, restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal pay suits, general labor, census, etc.

Miller, Charles C., 428 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (1) I received during the past quarter from my employer, above indicated, a total of $1,010.13, covering my salary for time spent in legislative activities and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses such as transportation, luncheons, printing, secretarial services, and office, as itemized below. (2) During this period, four expenditures were made in excess of $10: (1) To Miss Genevieve Foreman for stenographic services; (2) to the Federal Lithograph Co. for photo offsetting; (3) to the Charles Goetz Co. for photostating; and (4) to the National Press Club for tickets to an annual dinner. Additional expenditures (for luncheons with guests where costs were less than $10 and including the above-mentioned dinner) aggregated $73.96. Printing and secretarial expenses totaled $108.06; office expense, $119.96; transportation, $41.55; salary, prorated on the basis of time spent in legislative activities, $666.66. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports covering the testimony of rubber-manufacturing industry witnesses before the Armed Services Committee of the House on House Joint Resolutions 77 and 118; and before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 79. (5) Bills pertaining to both long- and short-term legislation on national rubber policy.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Received: $1,500, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, plus $105.20 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; $1,500, plus $434.93 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $1,290.13; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, photographer, florist, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $438; office rent, $375; taxi fares, etc., $140; telephone and telegraph, $89.93; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $88; entertainment and miscellaneous, $159.20. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Presently, legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, and taxes.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

Miskimins, Scott A., 103 Pendleton Street, Independence, Mo. (1) My previous report was for the months of August, September, and October 1946. This report is for November and December 1946, completing my report to the beginning of the first quarter 1947. Total commissions received for November and December, $295.44. (2) The above amount was paid to me by the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc. I, in turn, paid out $65.03 of the above amount to cover travel expenses during the months of November and December 1946. (3) To promote the legislation asked for in the Townsend national recovery plan bill, H. R. 16. (4) None. (5) The Townsend bill, H. R. 16.

Moll, Justus R., Frisco System Board of Adjustment, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation unduly restricting organized labor.

Mollin, F. E., American National Livestock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo. (1) No special receipts for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expenses for this purpose was $930.06; telephone and telegraph, $138; Washington stenographer, $61.70. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine the American Cattle Producer. (5) Legislation to authorize and finance participation of our Bureau of Animal Industry in Mexican campaign against foot-and-mouth disease; appropriation bill for market news service.

Mooney, William W., 414–415 Eagel Building, Spokane 8, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Total money received $1,345.40 in commissions based on voluntary contributions from persons and clubs in the State of Washington to Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, national headquarters. Travel expense, deductible tax, social security, hospitalization, etc., $583.60; leaving $761.60 for salary. (2) William W. Mooney. (3) $382.05 for travel expense, train, bus, auto, taxi, hotel, and incidentals while out of resident city; $201.75 deductible tax, social security, hospitalization, etc., leaving $761.60 for salary. (4) Articles are mailed in at times to be printed in the Townsend National Weekly, located at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio, to be printed as club or State activity news. (5) Supporting Townsend national recovery plan bills, H. R. 16, H. R. 2476, and S. 690, now in Congress.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $168.56. No other expenditures except living expenses. (2) Hotel Annapolis, taxicabs, meals in restaurants, laundry, postage, telephone, etc. (3) All living, transportation, and telephone expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills affecting the now existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morrow,[6] Giles, 225 Colorado Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary as set forth in form B, previously filed, plus reimbursement for certain traveling and incidental expenses no part of which were incurred in connection with purposes described in the Lobbying Act. (2) Nothing expended in connection with activities described in the act. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) Monthly articles in ICC Practitioners' Journal regarding matters of interest to practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act; testified before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in favor of bill S. 110.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary as set forth in Form B, previously filed, plus reimbursement for certain traveling and incidental expenses no part of which were incurred in connection with purposes described in the Lobbying Act. (2) Nothing expended in connection with activities described in the act. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) Articles in ICC Practitioners' Journal regarding matters of interest to practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act; testified before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in favor of bill S. 110, and before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce regarding bills H. R. 2324 and H. R. 2109.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 142 Central Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington 8, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C.; Glen L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) See attached sheet.[1] (4) None. (5) S. 1, S. 3, S. 4, S. 70, H. Res. 48, H. R. 1366, H. R. 2157, and all other legislation affecting aviation.

Mullin,[5] Pat, Foreman's Association of America, Ford Chapter, No. 1, 5746 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich. (1) $1,500 salary as chapter president; $136.90 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington. (2) Various. (3) Salary as chapter president; actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington. (4) The Ford Foreman, official publication of the Ford chapter of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the Senate.

Murdock, Ray R., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Law firm of Seegmiller & Murdock, above address, receives $6,000 for services and $900 for rent and other expenses annually for Washington service, including lobbying. I receive one-half of the fee and reimbursement for actual expense for transportation, telephone and telegraph, printing, duplicating, and postage. No allowance for gifts or entertainment. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting problems of interest to counties. Bills for highway aid, airport aid, public works, payments in lieu of taxes to counties. Specifically at the present S. 959 and H. R. 2725.

Murph, Daniel S., 616 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $300 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 2494 and H. R. 869

Murray, Donald, room 719, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $342.47. None of the above was in connection with activities covered by Lobbying Act except $76, 1 week's salary, from November 14 to November 21. During remainder of quarter registrant was assigned to organizational work for his employer, United Public Workers of America, CIO. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and merchants incident to maintenance of self and family. (3) Living and traveling expenses. The $76 of salary chargeable to activities covered by the Lobbying Act was used exclusively for living expenses. (4) None. (5) To support all legislation favorable to employees of the Federal Government, to members of the teaching profession, or to public employees generally. To oppose legislation which would be unfair or burdensome to the same groups.

Nagel,[6] Jacob, secretary-treasurer, editor and legislative representative, National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees, 238 First Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Salary for quarter ending December 31, 1946, $996.39; expenses, $207—postage, supplies, telegrams, cab fare, legislation, etc. (2) Jacob Nagel by National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees. (3) To promote the welfare of the postal employees in legislation and work with administrative Government officials in the Postal Department. (4) The Postal Mechanic and special bulletins. (5) Support all or any legislation which is beneficial to the postal mechanics and maintenance employees.

Nagel, Jacob, National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Maintenance Employees, 238 First Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) Legislation expenditures for this quarter, $89.85. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cabs, entertainment, etc.; business houses. (3) Legislation, meals, transportation, entertainment, etc. (4) The Postal Mechanic magazine. (5) For postal employees only (mechanics and maintenance employees).

National Tax Relief Coalition,[5] Leslie S. Franklin, Box 184, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Contributions received January, February, and March 1947, $2,790. (2) $1,495.75. Paid automobile upkeep, 500 miles per week, 6 cents per mile, or 3 months, $390; lodging, meals, $8.65 per day, or 3 months, $519; salary, L. S. Franklin, $375; stamps, mailing costs, $125; secretary R. E. Mangus, $15; telephone, $25; mimeographing bulletins, $46.75. (3) Printing, transportation, salary, general and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Nau, Carlton L., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) See attached sheet.[1] (4) None. (5) See attached sheet.[1]

Neal, T. V., 1327 North Alamo, San Antonio 2, Tex. (1) Received from Texas property owners associations: San Antonio, $800; Corpus Christi, $185; Dallas, $90; Houston, $150; Tom Green County (San Angelo), $100; Tyler, $10; Carthage, Mo-Poa, $55; individuals: Etta Blanchard, Dallas, $15; P. Wilson, Miami, Fla; all for expenses only. My time and services are free of charge (January 15 to March 20, 1947). (2) Various. (3) Bills as rendered by hotel, meals, rooms, telegraph and phone, secretarial expense, postage, stationery, miscellaneous, taxis, transportation (plane and railway, from and to San Antonio, Tex., to Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) To end rent control and oppose any extension of same. (Not employed services, free—only expenses paid.)

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $863.48, of which $806 is salary and $57.48 for expenses, including taxicabs, lunches, railroad fare, hotel accommodation, telephone (salary and expenses since registration listed). (2) Expenses paid out in small amounts miscellaneously. (3) Expenses paid out for taxicabs, lunches, railroad fare, hotel accommodation, telephone. (4) None except contributions to NAM News. (5) Legislation to settle portal-to-portal issue, regulation of labor

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter 1946.

unions, tax reduction, economy in Government, ending wartime controls, general promotion of free enterprise system.

Neal, Samuel E., 407 Chandler Building, Washington, 5, D. C.; retained by Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Received: $850 per month; total, $2,550; expended: None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) None received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing anti-labor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson, W. Allen, 23708 Warner Street, Farmington, Mich.; Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barium Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $119.69 transportation and living expenses while in Washington, D. C., for 1 week; $81.25 reimbursement for time lost from regular employment as a foreman at the Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. (2) Various. (3) Transportation and actual expenses incurred while in Washington, D. C.; reimbursement for time lost from regular employment. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the Senate.

Nestor, E. William,[6] 6 Wells Street, Hornell, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $540. (2) No money expended for lobbying purposes. (3) Household expenses and expenses while on the railroad serving as general chairman of District No. 85, International Association of Machinists. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the International Association of Machinists.

Nestor, William E., 6 Wells Street, Hornell, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,200; expenses, $540; (2) No money paid for lobbying purposes. (3) No money paid for lobbying purposes. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the International Association of Machinists.

Newton, R. Wayne,[6] 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (1) See attached.[1] (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) See attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the antifarmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association, or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all National, State, and local small business or other associations, however known, which are subsidized from, or contributors to, the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. (1) See attached.[1] (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) See attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the antifarmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all national, State, and local small business or other associations, however known, which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $650. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, and prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., 1024 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $95.25. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, and luncheons. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) No specific legislation; have taken a position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Affiant spent 3 days in Washington, D. C., to wit, January 28, 29, and 30, 1947, for which he received no money other than his salary, and expended the total sum of $59.50 in amounts less than $10 each. (2) [Blank.] (3) All expenditures were made for personal expenses while in and going to and from Washington, D. C., such as hotel, meals, taxi, and the like. (4) None. (5) The Reed bill, known as S. 110.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None received. Expenditures for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, telegraph, and office expenses, total $76.59. (2) Railroad company, hotels, restaurants, taxi, telephone and telegraph companies, and internal office expenses, $76.59. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxation of domestic corporations doing business in foreign countries.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C.; employed by National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No proposed legislation. (See Form B, filed March 26, 1947.)

Ogg, William Raymond, American Farm Bureau Federation, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Approximately $83.90 expended. (See (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of farm-labor program, farm credit, extension of Commodity Credit Corporation, fertilizer, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, sugar-control extension, wool price support, marketing-agreement amendments, housing, amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act, education, public health, amendments to Reclamation Act, taxation, foreign relief, amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendments to National Labor Relations Act, postal rate increase.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary to treasurer, Colorado Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Oleson, Lloyd F., national commander and national director of legislation, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents.

O'Neal, Edward A., 58 East Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. (1) Approximately $300.82 expended. (See (6) of Form B filed December 1946.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters have been supported or opposed: Extension of farm-labor program, farm credit, extension of Commodity Credit Corporation, fertilizer, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, sugar-control extension, wool-price support, marketing-agreement amendments, housing, amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act, education, public health, amendments to Reclamation Act, taxation, foreign relief, amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendment to National Labor Relations Act, postal-rate increase.

O'Neil, Thomas G., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation—interested in legislation tending toward tax equality.

Oliver, John P., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) January 1947, $625 salary plus $2.90 taxi fare; February 1947, $625 salary plus $12.90 taxi fare; March 1947, $625 salary plus $11.25 taxi fare. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation. Taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development and execution of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $863.46. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Theodor (Mrs.), chairman, Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y. (1) $62.04. (2) Mrs. Theodor Oxholm. (3) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, meals on two trips to Washington, D. C., from New York on business February 23, 24, 25, and to attend a subcommittee meeting of the National Commission on Children and Youth, March 14, 1947. (4) Current status of the national school lunch program. (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Approximately $30 expended. (See (6) of Form B filed December 1946. (2) Taxies. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of farm labor program, farm credit, extension of Commodity Credit Corporation, fertilizer, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, sugar-control extension, wool price support, marketing-agreement amendments, housing, amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act, education, public health, amendments to Reclamation Act, taxation, foreign relief, amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendments to National Labor Relations Act, postal rate increase.

Parry, Thomas W., 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis 2, Mo.; Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. (1) $250 received from Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y., as shown by original registration. (2) $54.06 paid for expenses incurred as hereinafter itemized, the balance amounting to $195.94 retained as compensation for services. (3)

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

The expenses incurred as above stated are as follows: Postage, $1.75; messenger service, $5.95; telegrams, $14.32; photostats $2.04; long-distance telephone (estimated), $30; total, $54.06. (4) None. (5) Retention of controls on sugar. The services for which registrant was employed have been completed and no further quarterly report will be filed.

Paterson,[6] Chat, American Veterans Committee (AVC), 206 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; AVC, 1860 Broadway, New York City. (1) Salary at rate of $6,500 per annum; approximately $50 expenses per month. (2) Chat Paterson. (3) To implement veterans' national and international platforms of AVC. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans' national and internation platforms of AVC.

Paterson, Chat, legislative representative of the American Veterans Committee, Inc., 206 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street, Washington, D. C.; American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1860 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary at rate of $6,500 per annum; approximately $50 per month expenses. (2) Chat Paterson. (3) To implement veterans' national and international platforms of the American Veterans Committee. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans' national and international platforms of AVC.

Paulson,[6] Nathan J., 1307 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $157.19 plus my salary. (2) Taxicab drivers, railroad company, public stenographers, post office, stationers, etc. (3) Transportation, $25.65; telephone, $5.55; stenographic, $85.19; office supplies and post office, $21.15; miscellaneous, $19.65. (4) None, except I write a column for our organization's regular monthly bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting the investor. There was no specific legislation I supported or opposed this quarter.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1307 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Investors League, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York City. (1) $251.79. (2) Taxi drivers, railroads, stenographers, post office, stationers, telephone company, etc. (3) Transportation, $58.35; telephone, $13.35; stenographic and office supplies, $144.74; miscellaneous, $35.35. (4) None except a column in the league's monthly bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting the investor.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Pearson, Robert W., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Pendleton, Norman W., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) $339.82. (2) Self. (3) Hotels and meals. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) Old-age Federal retirement annuity and national prosperity.

Penisch, J. W., Jr., 905 Fifth Street, McKees Rocks, Pa. (1) $400 per month for salary; $250 per month for expenses. (2) Hotels, meals, and other expenses used while traveling. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Pertaining to labor.

Perry, Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Mailing Bilbo brief to 50 Senators at 15 cents each, $7.50; taxi and mimeographing testimony on antifilibuster resolutions to Senate Rules Subcommittee, $1.50; taxi, testimony on rent control, 40 cents; notary public for quarterly lobbying report, 50 cents. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bills, and similar social welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received $2,500 as salary as chief administrative officer of the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. No part of this was received or spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Required to study all legislation affecting business and to advise members concerning the same, whether favorable or otherwise. However, this is only one of many other duties.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Earle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,105. Received $524.98 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $250.99 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Phillips, George C., 7900 Joa Campua, Hamtramck, Mich. (1) $307.94. (2) American Airlines; Pennsylvania Railroad; Continental hotel, Washington, D. C. (3) Travel, accommodation, living expenses, and wages lost. (4) None. (5) Any legislation depriving foremen of protection under the National Labor Relations Act.

Pollitzer, Anita, Miss, 144 B Street NE., Washington 2, D. C. (1) December 10, 1947, for traveling expenses from June 1 through November 31, 1946, $193.49. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope & Ballard, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.; Pope, Ballard & Loos, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) This report relates to the proposed legislation described in the quarterly report filed for the last quarter of 1946. So far as the registrant knows, the proposed legislation in respect of which this statement is filed has not been introduced in either House of Congress. Registrant has engaged in no activities in connection with this matter during the quarter ended March 31, 1947. (This report relates to prior registration and reports involving employment by Inland Steel Co.)

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, $4.35. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) H. R. 452, 1825, 2160; S. 306.

Posner,[6] Stanley I., 213 Standard Oil Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No moneys were received or expended in connection with proposed legislation. (2) As above. (3) As above. (4) None. (5) Legislation in connection with labor relations and wages and hours.

Posner, Stanley I., 213 Standard Oil Building, Washington 1, D. C.; National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association, 333 North Noble Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Linen Supply Association of America, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Linen Supply Association of America, $1,177.02; National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association, $1,904.50. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of the Linen Supply Association; mimeographed bulletins of the National Industrial Launderers and Cleaners Association. (5) Labor legislation.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, Machinist Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Pratt, Edith C., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (1) Salary, $810; expenses, $14.25. (2) To restaurants and cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Expenses connected with work in Washington. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers and by the convention and executive board of the national CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL, room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) As president he receives a monthly salary ($600) minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, AFL, Weekly Federal News Letter and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tinkham & Tinkham, Hammond, Ind. (1) Notary public, $2; taxis, $2.25. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 244, H. R. 1047.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $256.22. (2) Miscellaneous traveling expenses, $138.92; dues, southern secretaries, $7.50; miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $35.15; miscellaneous expenses of visitors, $28.90; miscellaneous dinners, lunches, etc., $35.95; board of trade banquet, $9.80. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers: Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y. (1) From National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $3,611.83; for professional services, $2,250; for out-of-pocket expenses, $1,361.83. (2) Publicity Associates, Inc., for professional services, $2,250; see exhibit A[1] attached for detail of out-of-pocket expenses totaling $1,361.83. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B[1] attached. (5) To support legislation designed to free margarine from unfair taxes and other unfair trade barriers, and to oppose legislation creating such taxes and other trade barriers.

Pullen, Donald D.,[6] 1010 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) Received $1,350.29; all expenses for handling the State taken out of above. (2) No money paid to anyone for services rendered, such as secretary or deputy. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Denver Post. (5) The Townsend plan.

Pullen, Donald D., 1010 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) $1,634.15; all expenses for handling the State taken out of the above, such as office supplies, traveling expenses, car, gas, etc. (2) No money paid to anyone for services rendered, such as secretary or deputy. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) The Townsend plan.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations of the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter 1946.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

(5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Quigley, Frank, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $449. (2) Taxicabs; travel Washington to New York; hotels, meals, and incidental expenses; Pennsylvania Railroad; Plaza Hotel, New York; Wardman Park and others, Washington, D. C. (3) Out-of-pocket business expenses, costs of publications, stenographic services, conferences and generally keeping up to date on information connected with duties of my assignment. (4) None. (5) None.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway New York 23, N. Y. (1) $975; pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None; my job is to keep the membership informed of legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Ramspeck, Robert, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Have received no compensation other than my regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. Specific legislation supported during this quarter: (1) Amendment to the Excise Tax Act of 1947 providing for the exemption from the transportation tax of certain international travel; (2) H. R. 2109, legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to permit the establishment of through service between air carrier and surface carrier without the necessity of joint rates. No legislation opposed.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Roy, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md. (1) Salary, $300. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Read, James M., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, January, February, March 1947, $1,100; travel expense, $187.40. (2) Carfare, $89.64; meals, $19.10; telephone and telegraph, $26.96; miscellaneous, $51.70; total, $187.40. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. In addition, articles have been contributed to two Friends papers—the Friend and the Friends Intelligencer. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and militarization of America.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as counsel and Washington representative of National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. (5) As part of my duties I am employed to support a reduction or elimination of the Federal retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations. This constitutes an infinitesimal portion of my other duties as counsel and Washington representative.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in registration Form B, also reimbursement in amount of $952.60 expended during calendar quarter, of which $742.60 was expended for purposes other than covered in the act. (2) Paid to hotel, various restaurants, taxicabs and automobile, telephone, and postage. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., room 209, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington 10, D. C. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $3.75. (2) Taxi fares to various taxicabs, $3.60; telephone tolls, 15 cents. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Tax Equality Association, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary. No money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Rice,[6] Roland, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration and expended no money whatsoever for purposes covered by title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I am required to testify on bills affecting motor transportation. Thus far, testimony has been given by me on S. 49, S. 70, and S. 110. We are interested also in H. R. 584, but no testimony has been given.

Rice, Roland, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $22.55. (2) The money was paid primarily to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks or cashiers in lunchrooms. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office, as indicated in (2), and the money paid to clerks or cashiers was for lunches. (4) None. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I am required, among other duties, to testify on bills affecting the trucking industry. Thus far, testimony has been given by me on S. 49, S. 55, S. 70, and S. 110; H. R. 584 (now H. R. 2157), H. R. 1467, H. R. 2109, H. R. 8, H, R. 725.

Richardson, John Lloyd, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Since January 6, 1947, up to and including March 31, 1947, I have received the proportionate part of my salary as reported in registration filed with the Clerk in early January 1947. During this period I have spent the sum of $12.80 in connection with legislative matters, for which I am to be reimbursed by the employer. (2) Parking-lot attendants, gasoline-station attendants, and taxi drivers. (3) Parking space for my automobile, gasoline used in connection with legislative matters, and for transportation. (4) The Property Owner, regular publication of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation; the Washington News Digest. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

Richardson, Pearl, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Antidefamation League, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $175. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office telephone. (4) Washington News Letter. (5) Fair employment practice legislation.

Richter, Irving, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,120; expenses, $1,180.08. Above includes salary and expenses for nonlegislative work as well as legislative work. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, cab drivers, laundry, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) CIO News, various UAW-CIO local papers, CIO papers, Wisconsin CIO, Minnesota CIO, Labor Journal, Ammunition, and various labor publications. (5) All legislation supported or opposed by CIO and UAW-CIO, supporting bills to aid the general welfare, and opposing bills harmful to the general welfare.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary for January, February, and March 1947, $1,875 (before withholding taxes were deducted); less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; distributed to national council members. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Rising, E. W., suite 3, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) From Water Conservation Conference, continuing committee, 0; from Western Beet Growers Association (as required to be reported under Lobbying Act), 0. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water rights established under laws of various States; development and control of natural resources; legislation affecting domestic sugarbeet growers.

Ritter,[6] Patricia, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Roark, L. E., 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel; hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Roark, L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses: nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel. Hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, January 7, 1947, to April 1, 1947, $624.99; receipts credited against expense account, as indicated on attached sheets,[1] $262.08. (2) Expenditure of $624.99, salary received from J. S. Tibby as indicated above, was for personal living expenses, hence not accounted here. Expenditures for travel and other expenses as indicated on attached sheets,[1] $267.19. (3) The expenditures of $267.19 which are itemized on attached sheets,[1] were incurred in lecturing in church-

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

es; in interviewing religious leaders; and in interviewing several Members of the United States Congress in their offices. (4) The Covenanter Witness, D. R. Taggart, editor, 1209 Boswell Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; the Christian Patriot, S. E. Boyle, editor, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) An amendment to the Constitution of the United States that will provide for insertion in the preamble of the following words: "Devoutly recognizing the authority and love of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King of nations" (full text of proposed legislation will be found in attached leaflet [1]).

Robbins, Paul H., 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $1,750; and expenses, $350; for January, February, and March, 1947. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Roemer, Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $910; expenses, $134.04. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rogers, James P., Western Woods Employers, 710 Lewis Building, Portland 4, Oreg. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $2,270.26. Only a part of the foregoing amounts concerns legislation. (2) (a) Joe R. Blunt; (b) Frances G. Ratcliff; (c) Emily Benko; (d) Acme Reporting Co.; (e) National Lumber Manufacturers Association; (f) Wardman Park, Statler, Fairfax, and Shoreham Hotels; (g) miscellaneous. (3) In (2) above, respectively: (a) Repayment of express charges, $53.04; (b) and (c) typing, $74.60; (d) transcript, $27.60; (e) telephone calls, $44.45; (f) living expenses, railways tickets, etc., $1,623.53; (g) taxis, tips, incidental meals, stamps, etc., $447.04. Only a part of the foregoing amounts concerns legislation. (4) None. (5) General labor bills and Fair Labor Standards Act amendments.

Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York 5, N. Y.; 910 Seventeenth Street, Washington 6, D. C. (1) $8.21 received as reimbursement for expenditures. (2) To Western Union and New York Telephone Co., $6.94; to United States Post Office Department, $1.27. (3) $6.94 for telegrams and toll charges; $1.27 for postage. Amounts indicated include expenditures for purposes not listed in (5) below and not subject to the act. (4) None. (5) Legislation to extend old-age and survivors' insurance benefits on a permissive basis to school teachers.

Rose, Mary Ethel (Miss), Post Office Box 176, Cumberland, Md.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland 5, Ohio. (1) Received and spent $244.70 including all taxes. (2) Miss Mary Ethel Rose. (3) For expenses such as traveling, hotel, telephone, telegrams, and all local assistance to influence the passage of the bill H. R. 16. (4) None other than local newspapers for news and advertising. (5 Townsend national insurance bill, H. R. 16, for the aged, blind, widow with minor children, and the handicapped.

Rosenman, Samuel I., 165 Broadway, New York 6, N. Y. (1) $10. (2) Carlton Hotel, transportation, telephones. (3) Transportation fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephones, etc. (4) None. (5) The portions of the excise tax of 1947 which related to fur-trimmed cloth coats (Public Law 17, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) approved March 11, 1947. (See letter attached hereto.[1])

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) No money was received by the undersigned during the past quarter for purposes of influencing legislation except (a) $6 paid for taxi fares to the Capitol for obtaining copies of bills introduced in Congress of interest to wholesale grocers; (b) $27 (9 hours' time, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association allocable to the preparation of a total of 18 pages or 9 sheets of information and comments on legislation introduced in Congress, issued to members in the association Washington news-letter service. Cost to association for issuing the information named above, $98.50 (estimated). (2) See answer to (1) attached. (3) See answer to (1) attached. (4) Washington news-letter service of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular; any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair-employment-practice legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Re Arabian American Oil Co.: None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on Form B. (The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A.) (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then, I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., 1417 K Street NW., Washington, 5, D. C. (1) Received $666.66 per month as salary as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) Washington Real Estate Board News, of which I am editor. (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Frank E., National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Hotel and living expenses, $930; stenographer, $200 per month, $600; office supplies, postage, etc., $150; office rent, $105; total, $1,785. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Star Carrier. (5) Legislation of benefit to star-route mail carriers.

Russell, Horace, United States Savings and Loan League, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill. (1) See attached memoranda.[1] (2) See attached memoranda.[1] (3) See attached memoranda.[1] (4) Savings and Loan Shares as Investments, The Investment Dealers' Digest, 150 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y.; contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and cooperative banks.

Ryan, M. O., room 307, Tower Building, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) For quarter, a total of $514.50, representing taxi fares, dinners, phones, etc., of which an insignificant amount involved activities related to lobbying. Salary received during quarter, $3,000. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

Sabin, L. C., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Automobile Dealers Association, which I represent as public contacts counsel, estimates that one-third of my monthly fee is properly chargeable to my congressional duties. This would be a total for the first quarter of 1947 of $1,250. I spent nothing. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation affecting the interests of retail automobile dealers.

Sanders, J. T., The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Transportation, $8.46; meals, $7.75. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) None. (5) General agricultural legislation, labor legislation, and other bills related to agriculture.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington 11, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees Alliance and Bartenders International League of America, AFL, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) Expended $25 for telegrams and telephone. (2) Western Union and telephone company. (3) Seeking the right to be heard before Senate and House Labor Committees. (4) None. (5) Oppose antilabor legislation.

Sanger, Charles D. Jr., National Council of Business Schools, Hill Building, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Compensation of $300 per month (none expended for legislative purposes under act). (2) None paid out for legislative purposes under act. (3) See above. (4) None for legislative purposes under act. (5) There is none pending in Congress at this time to my knowledge.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 1307 H Street, NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $788; expenses: $190. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) My organization supports all legislation to advance the interest of peace, security, democracy, and the general welfare of the working people. We oppose legislation which would defeat these objectives.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer and Josept A. Fanelli, 1744 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters.

Schweiker, Warren L., 1615 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3)

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

None. (4) None. (5) That which would affect the rental and/or sale of Remington Rand tabulating machines.

Scott, John R., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $44.95 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization; the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Scott, Vernon, and Loring A. Schuler, constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. (See attached statement of 12 organizations and addresses.[1]) (1) For money received, see attached statement.[1] No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (See answer to (1).) (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to equalize the taxes borne by various types of business corporations.

Seay, Clant M., (voluntary) Mississippi Independent Business Association, Inc., 203 Walthall Hotel, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

See, Harry, 130 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C. (1) None received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing anti-labor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Seegmiller, Keith L., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Law firm of Seegmiller & Murdock (above address) receives $6,000 for services and $900 for rent and other expenses annually for Washington service including lobbying. I receive one-half of the fee and reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, telephone and telegraph, printing, duplicating, and postage (no allowance for gifts or entertainment.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting problems of interest to counties; bills for highway aid, airport aid, public works, payments in lieu of taxes to counties; specifically at present S. 959 and H. R. 2725.

Selby, Meredith, 155 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To permit the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

Shandros, Geraldine, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, and 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of total salary received and is so reported inasmuch as time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about 50 percent of my working time). Travel expense, $73.12; miscellaneous, $45; total, $398.12. (2) Travel expense—to railroads, air lines, hotels; miscellaneous—taxis, telephones, entertainment for ACA representatives while on 3-day visit to Washington, February 27, 1947. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News and Local 40 News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communications industry and American working men and women generally.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Shaw, Arvin B., Jr., 835 Rowan Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif. (1) Received compensation, $1,500; received and expended traveling expenses, $292.79. (2) Railroad, hotels, restaurants, taxis, public stenographers, etc. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation amending Colorado River Front Act of 1946.

Shealey, R. Preston, 503 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Credit Association, 218 Shell Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) From January 1 to March 31, 1947, $750 plus $134.64 (expense account). (2) Stenographer, $364; rent, Colorado Building, $51; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $35; printing, $5.30; stamps, $15.60; trips, $35; cabs, office supplies, miscellaneous, $12.75; entertainment, $29.95 (conference, legislative committee, National Retail Credit Association). (3) Correspondence, information release, and preparation of statements for hearings before Senate and House Civil Service and Post Office Committees. Trips—(1) Philadelphia, Consumer Credit Conference, University of Pennsylvania; (2) New York City, consultation, chairman, National Retail Credit Association legislative committee. (4) Credit World. (5) This affiant is employed in connection with NRCA Washington problems concerning administration of consumer credit. Has not sponsored introduction of or opposed measures pending in Congress, but has appeared and testified at Senate and House Post Office Committee hearings on postal rates, as has also representative of NRCA before House committee on same subject.

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $11.65; report subject to the qualifications stated in my registration of February 7, 1947. (2) Taxicab drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and food. (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. (1) Re Arabian-American Oil Co.: None received and none expended during previous quarter; except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Sifton, Paul, 3150 Highland Place NW., Washington 8, D. C; (1) National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; (2) Committee for Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 for services to (1) above; $107.94 for expenses (taxis, phones, travel, etc.); $600 for services to (2) above; $52.63 for expenses (travel). (2) None, except as noted above. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. The National Council for a Permanent FEPC has issued one press release endorsing S. 984 and H. R. 2820 and H. R. 2824 and answered inquiries by the press. (5) For (1) support of legislation to insure fair employment, S. 984, H. R. 2820 and H. R. 2824; for (2) support of legislation to establish a labor extension service.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York City 16, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Smart, Elizabeth A. (Miss), 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington 2, D. C.; National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Salary $649.01; expenses paid by me and reimbursed to me, $87.32. (2) Times-Herald, Royal Typewriter Co., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Post Office, Government Printing Office, Ace Letter Service, Western Union, Morrison Paper Co. (3) Subscription, typewriter ribbons, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, telephone service, stamps, Government documents, mimeographing, telegrams, paper. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Anthony W., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment for period since filing registration statement, $10. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News, 718 Jackson Place NW, Washington 6, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation.

Smith,[6] Dudley, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $1,000 a month from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $1,000 a month from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Hilda W., Committee for the extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,599.96; $35 per month allowed for taxi, telephone, etc.; $61 spent this quarter for travel expenses. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Mimeographed news bulletin; pictorial leaflet describing services; occasional articles sent out through labor press associates. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425 Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary as reported on registration Form B, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. during period February 15 to March 31, 1947, as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $97.10 in February and $285.30 in March 1947. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of his work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1336 New York Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $689.87 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone, and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $146.38; hotel and restaurant,

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

$425.84; telephone and telegraph, $33.05; miscellaneous and gratuities, $84.70. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached statement.[1] (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) See attached statement.[1]

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y (1) See attached statement.[1] (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) See attached statement.[1]

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver 16, Colo. (1) Only salary and actual expenses. (2) Various taxicab drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals in course of business. (4) None. (5) All major legislation pending in Congress.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Speek, Valiant Frances (Mrs.), American Association of University Women, national headquarters, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter, $1,020; possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work. (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under (2). (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women, quarterly; AAUW General Director's letter. Issued three or four times a year. Sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) Support Federal aid to public-education legislation; general housing bill, S. 866; continuation of rent control with adequate enforcement until housing shortage is relieved; reciprocal trade agreements program; participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization; establishment of International Trade Organization; UNESCO; adequate appropriations for the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor; equal eligibility of women and men as jurors in Federal courts; status of women bill, H. R. 2007. Oppose so-called equal rights amendment to the Constitution.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) Salary, $99; traveling and incidental expenses, $89.32; total, $188.32. (2) To self, for salary and reimbursement of traveling and other expenses incident thereto when away from home. (3) See question (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to Great Lakes shipping.

Spofford, Charles M., Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 591, amendment of the congressional charter of the American National Red Cross (act of Jan. 5, 1905).

Stein, Margaret I., Committee for the Nation's Health, 914 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National Health Insurance.

Stengle,[6] Charles I., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $18 in taxi fares. (2) Taxi drivers (3) Cabs to and from Capitol (4) None. (5) All civil-service legislation

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington D. C. (1) $36. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Travel expense to Capitol and return. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Federal employees.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary (half-time), $1,500; February, taxi fare, $2.30; March, taxi fare and luncheon guest, $5.60; total, $1,507.90. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $849.98 salary (half-time) and $85.45 for expenses. (2) See attached form.[1] (3) See attached form.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone, Margaret F. (Mrs.), 317 Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) $513.53 salary and occasional taxi fares; no money expended for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own National Women's Trade Union League's monthly publication, Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See attached copy[1] of league's legislative program for 1946–47.

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Received none; expended none. (2) None. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1045 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. (1) Salary January 1 to March 31, 1947, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $809.66; total, $1,634.66. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the Upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the Upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $3.90. (2) Taxi drivers, streetcars. (3) Taxi, streetcar travel. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, 607–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Traveling expenses for January, February, and March 1947, $973.72. (2) Various railroads, air lines, and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and national, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities, and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., assistant director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $600 per month as salary less withholding and social-security taxes; $15.75 incidental expenses for January, February, and March 1947. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, assistant director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary and incidental expenses. (4) The American Legion Magazine, 1 Park Avenue, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,000; expenses reimbursed by employer, $551.22. Expenditures: $551.22. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and so forth. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swomley, John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington 6, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $102.28. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of peacetime conscription.

Tarver, Malcolm C., Dalton, Ga. (1) $500 for railroad fare, meals, and hotel bills; $2,500 as one-half of agreed compensation. (2) Malcolm C. Tarver. (3) For the purposes stated in answering (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to restore depletion credit for barytes provided in section 124, Revenue

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter 1946.

Act of 1943, and which expired December 31, 1946.

Taylor, Col. John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $417.77 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $20.86 reimbursement for traveling expenses during January, February, and March 1947; $23.80 incidental expenses for January, February, and March 1947. (2) Col. John Thomas Taylor. (3) $20.86 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trip to Trenton, N. J.; $23.80 incidental expenses for January, February, and March 1947, carfare, luncheons. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discrimination and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Expended $14.50. (2) Taxicab. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO, room 608, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $80; expenses, $21; hotel, $12; covering a period of 9 weeks. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $3,124.98 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $496.23; (b) for research and technical assistance, $1,041.65; (c) traveling expenses, $77. (2) (a) Landlord, printer, stamps, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council; National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly); Missouri Grocers Bulletin (one time only). (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Thompson, Chester C., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C., $4,500, covering January, February, and March 1947. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $35. (3) Taxicab and streetcar fares. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thomson, Dorothy W. (Mrs.), 300 B Street SE., Washington 3, D. C.; American Parents Association, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. (1) Received $1,173.32, salary; received, $201.55, miscellaneous expenses. (2) To United States Government Printing Office, $143.20; miscellaneous expenditures, $58.35—taxicabs, mimeographing, postage, telephone, luncheon meetings, office supplies. (3) For copies of Government bills, $143.20; for miscellaneous expenses, $58.35—taxicabs, mimeographing, postage, telephone—luncheon meetings, office supplies. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 1980, National School Health Services Act of 1947.

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary: $487.74 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $149.25 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $143.05 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $149.25 was expended by me as expense money, during the first quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) Approximately $70 expended. (See (6) of form B filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters have been supported or opposed; extension of farm labor program, farm credit, extension of Commodity Credit Corporation, fertilizer, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, sugar-control extension, wool-price support, marketing agreement amendments, housing, amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act, education, public health, amendments to Reclamation Act, taxation, foreign relief, amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, amendments to National Labor Relations Act, postal rate increase.

Tone,[6] Joseph M., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for legislative lobbying. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Tone, Joseph M., Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Truitt,[6] Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington 4, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., Insurance Company of North America and the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., relief of Louisa Russell Nipkow, 1317 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 715, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of Louisa Russell Nipkow.

Turnbull,[6] Robert, Foreman's Association of America, 515 Barlum Tower, Detroit 26, Mich. (1) $126.46 actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) The Supervisor, official publication of the Foreman's Association of America. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $1,190; expenses, $784.19. No money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to opposed bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Van Curler,[6] Delivan, Hotel Benedick, 1808 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 18, H R. 198, and H. R. 202, first session, Eightieth Congress.

Van Curler, Delivan, box 2263, Anchorage, Alaska; Committee of Alaska Railroad Labor Organization (see original registration), box 2263, Anchorage, Alaska. (1) Received, $2,600; expended, $1,300. (2) The Hotel Benedick and miscellaneous establishments, Western Union Telegraph Co., local telephone company, and cab hire, subsistence. (3) Living expenses and transportation and necessary out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) Federal employee retirement legislation.

Virkus, Frederick A., chairman, Conference of America Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Ill. (1) Total received as contributions and dues January 1, through April 8, 1947, $36,143.11; total expended for general office expense, printing, salaries, etc., $26,949.63 (same period). (2) Office expense and travel; clerical staff of 10 persons; various vendors for printing, paper, office supplies, etc. (3) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business. (4) Only as come within the scope of our membership as affecting small business. (See attached.[5]). (5) See answer to (3).

Von Morpurgo, Henry, 406 Sutter Street, San Francisco 8, Calif. (1) $572.24 received from Baldwin & Mermey. (2) Retained in the firm for professional services except for the out-of-pocket amount of $72.24. (3) Stamps, messenger service, stationery, stenographic, automobile, mimeographing, telegrams, and long-distance phone calls. (4) San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco News, San Francisco Daily Commercial News, Oakland Tribune. (5) Continuance of sugar controls.

Walker, Dow V., chairman of national finance committee and special legislative assistant to national commander, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents.

Walsh, George, World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine, 1 Gardner Street, Newton, Mass. (1) $50 received, World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine; $50 spent for transportation, hotel expense. (2) New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., fare, $12.55; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., plane fare, $21.17; hotel, $16; car fare, incidentals, $0.28; total, $50. (3) Make application for national charter, H. R. 2104, and to request reintroduction of the Peterson bill for benefits for wartime United States merchant seamen (H. R. 476 and request a companion bill in Senate, S. 429, for the World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine, Boston, Mass.). (4). None. (5) H. R. 2104, H. R. 476, and companion bill in Senate, S. 429.

Walter, Stephen M., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $13,073.89;

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Not printed. Filed the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

expended, $13,498.08. (For detailed statement see exhibit I.[1]) (2) See exhibit II.[1] (3) See exhibit II.[1] (4) None. (5) All pending or proposed Federal legislation affecting the interests of the electric utility industry.

Warfel, George L., The National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary (gross, withholding and social security taxes deducted), $1,250; expenses, $72.19; total, $1,322.19. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To promote the welfare of the special-delivery messengers of the Post Office Department, covering liaison contacts with administrative Government officials, and legislative work. (4) The Special Messenger, Special News—mimeographed bulletins to membership. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to special-delivery messengers.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo 4, Ohio. (1) Received from Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for services rendered in last quarter 1946, $1,500; and $260 expenses. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, hotels, meals, etc. (4) None. (5) Services on behalf of housing, labor, credit, and general legislation on a sound basis and protective of the interests of the policy owners of Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Wasserman, Jack, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Waterfield, Maynard H., Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,814.26; expense, taxi fare, $100.40 (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Close-Up; 'Round Washington; miscellaneous research reports. (5) None. (See previous reports.)

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,040; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) As indicated in attached schedule,[1] and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) Waterways magazine. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Wellington, Beatrice, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Welliver, Edward M., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $18. (2) The money was paid primarily to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks or cashiers in lunchrooms. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2) and the money paid to clerks or cashiers was for lunches. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Werkau, C. W., National Federation of Telephone Workers, 917 G Place NW., Washington 1, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses, $2,437.76. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my position with the National Federation of Telephone Workers, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the National Federation of Telephone Workers or its affiliates.

West, Oscar H., 1001-1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington 4, D. C., National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York 7, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wheeler, S. R., 11 Franklin Road SW., Roanoke, Va. (1) $1,200; expenses when away from home. (2) Spent in maintaining a home and bonds. (3) Keeping family; bonds to retire on. (4) None. (5) Railroad labor.

White, Richard P., 636 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,499.96; expenses reimbursed by employer, $278.48; expenditures, $278.48. (2) Expenses paid to various hotels, taxis, railroads, botanical gardens, boards of trade, restaurants, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and conferences on matters of interest to the nursery industry. (4) News letter. (5) All bills of interest to the nursery industry as determined by the employer from time to time.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,812.48; reimbursement of travel expense, $365.29. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Building Products Institute, 1756 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Fee, $1,500; expenses, $519.24. (2) Telephone and telegraph, $62.58; traveling, $378.41; restaurant, $76.75; notary fee, $1.50; total, $519.24. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Salary, as reported on form B; actual expenses incident to my work as news director, none of which was expended in connection with legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, American Public Welfare Association, 522 Transportation Building, Washington 6, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago 37, Ill. (1) $800 (half time) salary received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) American Public Welfare Association Letter to Members. (5) Any legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Widmar,[2] Rudolph J., 1173 Norwood Road, Cleveland Ohio. (1) $270; actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (2) Various. (3) Actual expenses incurred for lobbying in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) H. R. 8, a bill in the United States House of Representatives; S. 55, a bill in the United States Senate.

Wiley,[2] Harvey W. (Mrs.), chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4.50 for postage; $65.74, travel expense to board meeting, October 1946. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) General Federation Clubwoman, November 1946, copy herewith submitted; pamphlet, the Seventy-ninth Congress and the GFWC, copy herewith submitted. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body. (See pamphlet, Resolutions, attached.[1])

Wiley, Harvey W. (Mrs.), chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. Not employed for pay; appointed chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs; headquarters of organization is 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4.50 for postage; $25, subscription, Congressional Intelligence. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See attached bulletins.[1] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Willard, Charles H., Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 591, amendment of the congressional charter of the American National Red Cross (act of Jan. 5, 1905).

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (1) Received, $300; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williamson,[2] C. J. S., California State Chamber of Commerce, 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities performed January 1 to March 31, 1947, that fall within the regulations of table III. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $81.75 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW National News, VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed for fourth quarter 1946.

[3] Filed with the Secretary only.

Willig,[5] Peter, 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) Salary, $400 monthly, as regional director; expenses, $50 monthly as regional director; actual expenses while in Washington, D. C. (2) As per list attached.[6] (3) To lobby on legislation proposed by the Eightieth Congress. (4) The monthly publication called the Supervisor. (5) Bill H. R. 8, proposed by the House of Representatives; bill S. 55, proposed by the Senate

Wilson, E. Raymond, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington 8, D. C. (1) Gross salary, January, February, and March 1947, $1,375; travel expenses, $200.44. (2) Various (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson,[5] Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $666.67 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purposes of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, Glen S., 102 West Sixteenth Street, Austin, Tex. (1) $650 or 50 percent of receipts from State income. (2) No money paid out to anyone. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Townsend plan.

Wilson, J. B., McKinley, Wyo. (1) Salary, paid by Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500; expenses, paid by National Wool Growers Association, $1,079.37; total, $2,579.37. (2) Various. (3) The above paid to J. B. Wilson as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association as salary for services rendered the association covering all work of the organization and as expenses for work in Washington, D. C., as chairman of the legislative committee of the National Wool Growers Association, which work is only part of the duties of the offices. (4) The Wyoming Wool Grower, editor, J. B. Wilson. (5) At the present time I am supporting House Joint Resolution 158 and S. 814, opposing S. 917 and companion bill in the House, known as the Herter wool bill. This work is carried on in conjunction with other duties.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington 4, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland 15, Ohio. (1) Salary, $640; expenses, $640. (2) To Lacey C. Wilson. (3) For salary and expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison 3, Wis. (1) Received $3.38 in addition to my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving many services unrelated to Federal legislation. Expended $3.38. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Telegrams. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., the National Independent Meat Packers Association, Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) See registration as counsel for the National Independent Meat Packers Association and answer to (5) below. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during past quarter.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Seatrain Lines, Inc., Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to improvement of status of water carriers. I have not supported or opposed any legislation during past quarter.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $617.59; reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association. One round trip, Omaha to Washington, D. C.; one one-way trip, Omaha to Washington, D. C. (2) Railroads, etc., $137.27; hotels and miscellaneous, $284.82; Statler Hotel, $195.50. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals, expenses in connection with showing of motion picture, Operation Big Muddy. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Wisdom, John Minor, care of Wisdom & Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to form A, filed herewith.[1]

Wood, Alexander T., 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodrum, Clifton A., American Plant Food Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., Hotel Roosevelt, Lansing 15, Mich. (1) Twenty-five percent of the gross income from all sources in the State of Michigan. (2) All money spent for living expenses, such as hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, postage, and supplies. I have employed a secretary part time. (3) The only money I have paid out for services to anyone has been to my secretary. Her work has been confined to general secretarial work. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, the Townsend Plan.

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex. (See list attached.[1]) (1) Salary for January and February 1947, $2,000, less railroad-retirement deduction; $438.03 out-of-pocket expense refunded for January and February. (2) See list attached.[1] (3) See list attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Texas railway lines.

Woodul, Walter F., Imperial Sugar Co., Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex. (1) Salary, Imperial Sugar Co., $2,499.93; traveling expenses, $277.16. (2) Pennsylvania Railway, $34.10; Hotel Washington, $118.51; meals, $97.50; telephones, telegrams, taxis, tips, etc., $25.05. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Sugar legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 1039 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,650 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (NOTE.—Foregoing compensation covers increase in annual salary from $9,900 to $12,000, effective March 1, 1947. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Internal Revenue Code amendments relating to wine and brandy production operations (H. R. 1945, 1946, and 1947) and certain possible modifications of Fair Labor Standards Act.

Worley, Harry F., 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington 15, D. C.; National Customs Service Association, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received salary and reimbursement for travel, postage, office supplies, and incidental expenses. No part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Customs Service News, published by the National Customs Service Association; he is editor. It is published monthly and covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and news of personal interest to the membership. (5) He supports legislation which will benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes any legislation which is against their interests; legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the United States Customs Service. His appearance before committees of Congress is incidental to other activities and forms only a small portion of the aggregate.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.; 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District. (1) $642.93 reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph expenses. This includes amount reimbursed to firm of Case & Wozencraft, as well as to me personally. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved; Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) Article submitted to the Texas Bankers Record at its request. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Frank C., Jr., room 802, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C. (1) Impossible to make accurate segregation of income and expenses as between regular association work and legislative work. Of salary, not over $3,000 for this work. Of expenses, not over $2,000 for this purpose, including rent, phone, travel, help, and related expenses. Total salary per month $1,250. (2) Rent, Stoneleigh Court, $453; telephone, $320.15; office help, postage, miscellaneous $806.24; traveling expenses, $264.19, fares, hotels, and meals included. (3) Maintenance of office, telephones, help, travel, and expenses related to serving the industry's interests. (4) Anthracite Institute Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting the mining and distribution of anthracite coal.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $313.37; total, $1,188.37. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $313.37. (2) Air lines, railroads, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: salary, $2,500; expenses, $87.52. Expended: transportation, $41.10; meals, $17.25; telephones, $10.87; entertainment, $18.30. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal-pay suits, general labor, census, etc.

Young, Roslyn D., 15 William Street, New York 5, N. Y. (1) The person above named has not received or expended any money in connection with any congressional matters. As reported on Form B filed by the above-named person, he is president of the Rubber Trade Association and is compensated by such association for his services as such president, and no compensation is paid to him specially with respect to any work done by him in connection with congressional matters. (2) See answer to (1) above. (3) See answer to (1) above. (4) None. (5) The above-named person is not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation. As president of the above-named association, he has occasion to appear only incidentally as such president in any congressional matter of interest to said association.

Ziegler,[6] Vinton E., 147 West Forty-second Street, New York 18, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To permit the United States to admit its fair share of Europe's displaced persons.

Ziegler, Vinton E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York 16, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Zook, John D., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 204 East Kelso Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Expended, $312.42. (2) Various. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, labor, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, give us the faith to believe that the words now spoken, and the yearnings of the hearts now open before Thee, are heard and understood in Thy presence.

We, the members and officers and servants of this body, unite our petitions for Thy blessing, Thy guidance, and Thy help, that we faithfully may do what is best for the people, and what is right in Thy sight, O God. Give to these, Thy servants, the representatives of the people in different parts of our land, the will to work together as a team for the welfare of all our people. Give them courage to withstand the pressure of the selfish, and give to the people the vision to see that sacrifice must be shared by all, that there is no substitute for hard work and no joy in unmerited reward. May we fear nothing, save that, knowing what is right, we fail to do it.

So help us God, in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 12, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 84. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 1179. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947;

H. R. 1203. An act to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1467. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2331. An act to amend section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2573. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 3029. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

---

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[5] Filed with the Secretary only.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may hold hearings until 1 o'clock p. m. today on the Export-Import Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary may meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is operating this morning under a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be submitted on today—Monday, May 12, 1947—as intended to be proposed, to the bill S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the said bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill as amended; that the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the House bill be considered as ordered; and that a vote be then taken upon the final passage of the House bill as amended.

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received, and that after the recess of the Senate today no new amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on the pending legislation. In the first place, I desire to clarify the legislative history of the provisions of the committee bill relating to court review of findings by the National Labor Relations Board, as the legislative history may become very important in case of subsequent court interpretation of this bill, if it shall be enacted into law. So I make these observations.

SCOPE OF REVIEW OF BOARD FINDINGS UNDER S. 1126

The present law provides that the "findings of the Board if supported by evidence shall be conclusive." The committee bill, in section 10 (e) and (f), has changed the language to read that the "findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive."

In his comprehensive statement regarding the provisions of the committee bill the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on April 23—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3839—indicated that two changes had been made with regard to the scope of review of Board findings. He stated that under the present law the rule is "simply that any decision supported by evidence shall be final as to the facts," whereas under the committee bill "the evidence must be substantial" and, moreover, it must be "substantial when viewed in the light of the entire record." I do not differ with the statement that the findings must be supported by substantial evidence and that the determination of substantiality must be made upon the record considered as a whole. My purpose is to point out that while we have used somewhat different language in the committee bill, the intention is that the same rules regarding judicial review shall prevail as to findings of the Board as are provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act. For the information of Senators I should like briefly to review the history of the present provision in the committee bill.

In the committee print of the bill dated April 9, 1947, which is clearly labeled "Tentative only; not approved by the committee," language appears making findings of the Board conclusive "unless contrary to the weight of the evidence." It will be observed that a very significant change was being proposed in this print of the committee bill, namely, authorizing the reviewing courts to determine whether Board findings were in accordance with the weight of the evidence. The effect would have been to adopt an entirely different test of conclusiveness in the case of the National Labor Relations Board as compared with other administrative agencies to which the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are applicable.

A different test of judicial review was proposed in the committee print of April 16, which again was a tentative print which had not been approved by the committee. In this draft of the bill it was proposed that "the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact and law shall be accorded the same degree of conclusiveness as the findings of a United States district court." The effect of this proposal would have been to adopt the so-called clearly erroneous test of judicial review, substantially the same as now provided in rule 52 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governing review of district court findings.

When the committee met to consider the April 16 draft, I objected to the proposed new definition, and urged that the present rule as contained in the Administrative Procedure Act be retained. In other words, it was my suggestion that the findings of the Board be subject to the same scope of review as the findings of other Federal administrative agencies, and I pointed out that the present rule required that agency findings be supported by substantial evidence. I therefore proposed in committee that the bill be changed so as to make Board findings conclusive on review "if supported by substantial evidence." At the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I agreed that the words "on the record reconsidered as a whole" be added. These words are in substance contained in the section of the Administrative Procedure Act defining the scope of review of agency findings.

Section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act provides that the reviewing court shall "hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be unsupported by substantial evidence," and that in "making the foregoing determinations the court shall review the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party." It was my intention—and I am sure the Senator from New York agrees with me—that no different test of review be applied to findings of the National Labor Relations Board than to the findings of other administrative agencies as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act.

I also wish to make clear that no greater latitude of review is intended by the use of the words "with respect to questions of fact," in lieu of the words in the present statute "as to the facts," in describing what findings are reviewable. Although this is a rather minor point, some question has been raised as to the possible significance of the change, and I merely wanted to point out that no change is intended. The fact of the matter is that the words "questions of fact" were contained in the April 16 print of the bill which we had before us at the time I made my suggestion that the substantial-evidence test be retained, and we merely struck out the words directly touching on the scope of review and substituted the words suggested by myself and the Senator from New York.

I wish now to state my voting position on the bill pending before the Senate and the substitute bill. I find myself unable to vote in favor of sending the pending bill to conference because I am convinced that amendments which have been adopted during debate are unsound and will not have the effect of promoting sound labor-management relations. On the contrary, I feel strongly that the amendments will have an opposite effect.

It is not my purpose to argue at length at this time against adoption of the committee bill as amended. I wish to say in passing that I shall also vote against the substitute bill. I shall vote against it primarily because, in my judgment, the substitute bill would not accomplish what I think should be accomplished by the Congress in passing labor legislation at the present session. I do not think it would serve to correct the basic labor abuses which need to be corrected by way of legislation. I think it is a bill that is so mild in its terms that it would not be helpful to a solution of the labor problems which I think must be solved in the public interest.

Likewise, I cannot vote for the bill which will be sent to conference, because I think the Senate has made a grievous mistake in not accepting, with-

out amendment, the bill as it came from the committee. Our committee bill was a workable bill, whereas I am satisfied that the bill which will go to conference will be curative rather than preventive of labor difficulties.

It is not my purpose to argue at this time against the adoption of the committee bill as amended. My arguments have been presented by me in this debate as each one of the amendments was being considered. I reaffirm them now. For the RECORD, and because I entertain deep convictions on this subject, I ask indulgence to summarize very briefly my reasons for voting against the bill as amended.

First, by adopting the amendment making it an unfair labor practice, to be investigated and determined by the National Labor Relations Board, for a union to coerce or restrain employees in the exercise of their self-organizational rights we have laid the legislative foundation for a national police force. I submit that, without warrant in the record before us, we have invaded the legitimate sphere of State and local police regulation.

I want the RECORD to show as clearly as possible, Mr. President, that I hold no brief for coercive tactics on the part of American labor unions, but I believe such coercive tactics should be handled by State law and by State police. I wish to repeat and emphasize that this amendment, so plausibly worded, so worded as to give the impression that those who vote against it are in favor of coercion, is an amendment which can be used and I have no doubt will be used by antilabor employers to block and stymie legitimate organizational drives by workers. Under the amendment antiunion employers can bring a great many false charges against unions, alleging coercion when coercion in fact does not exist, but the very allegations, and the procedures which would have to be followed under the amendment, in determining the truth or falsity of such charges, will slow up legitimate union organizational work and will weaken unions. I submit that employers who want to weaken unions will make effective use of this amendment. Antiunion forces in this country have been strong for this amendment because they see in it a great chance to defeat certification of a union in their plants by the delaying and dilatory tactics made possible by the amendment. They are seeking any legislation of the type of this amendment that will help them litigate unions into a weak position.

Second, again without substantial evidence, and to my mind in complete disregard of the evidence, we have written a legislative straitjacket for union welfare funds. Some proponents of the amendment admitted that we lacked adequate information on the subject matter and acknowledged that the proposal was temporary in nature. But in my view the logical and wise conclusion from these premises should have been rejection of the amendment. Great harm may be done by the adoption of such ill-considered proposals. In any case, it does not seem to me to add to the stature of the greatest deliberative body in the world when we act on the basis of admittedly incomplete information, especially when no showing has been made that action now is imperative. No showing has been made that it would not have been better to submit the matter to further study. Another section of our committee bill provided for an investigation committee, to which this problem could and should have been submitted. In its present form it disrupts the welfare funds of about one and a quarter million workers in this country. It will cause confusion, ill feeling, and trouble in many industries that have worked out to the complete satisfaction of both employers and workers very good welfare fund agreements.

Third, the amendment making certain strikes and boycotts unlawful and authorizing any person, irrespective of the amount of damage done to him, who may be "injured in his business or property" by any violation thereof, to sue the union in Federal court without regard to the amount in controversy, effects a very basic change in the law of labor relations, and, I feel confident, will have the inevitable result of clogging the Federal courts with petty litigation having no objective but that of weakening the labor movement. In my judgment, Mr. President, that amendment alone takes us back at least 25 years in labor relations, and if it becomes the law, it will be found that legitimate union objectives will be greatly harassed and seriously stymied by antilabor employers. It is an amendment which will encourage the antilabor forces of the country to bring many false charges and a multiplicity of suits just to litigate out of existence a union treasury and thereby weaken the union at time of strike.

Furthermore, as I stated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, in my judgment it cannot successfully be denied—and I submit a future Supreme Court decision will bear me out, because further study has convinced me that as a matter of law my legal objection is crystal clear—that under the amendment and the procedure for which it provides, there has been returned to individual employers the right to secure an injunction. To that extent, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is set aside by this amendment. I shall be no party, by my vote, to the enactment of a law that revives in any degree whatsoever the evils of government by injunction which prevailed prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Lastly, I want to point out that the McClellan amendment, adopted by a standing vote in the closing hours of debate last Friday night, constitutes another reason for my decision to vote against the bill as amended. I need not reiterate my opposition to Communists and their beliefs. I shall fight communism with all my energy because it destroys the liberties of freemen. I want to say that communism must be stamped out of the free labor movement of this country, if we are to preserve the rights of free workers and protect the dignity of the individual. But this amendment makes it impossible for any local of a national union to become the lawful bargaining representative of any employees, if one or more of its national officers is a member of the Communist Party or can reasonably be regarded as a member.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the amendment would place in the hands of every antilabor employer in the country another weapon to slow down and prevent legitimate organizational drives, because all he has to do under the amendment is allege that the union has within its officialdom a Communist. Once an employer makes such an allegation, the issue will then have to be tried out before a union can effectively go ahead with an organizational drive. Under the amendment, an employer does not have to recognize the union if he alleges that it has a Communist as an officer until the Board finds to the contrary. Delay, stalling, litigation are the handmaidens of union busting. Employers know that and that is why the pressure is so strong to pass this type of amendment.

This amendment is an open invitation to the Communists to infiltrate into labor unions and thereby make them ineligible to certification. It places a premium on their ability to obtain office and penalizes honest American trade unions and their members in a wholly unjustified manner. I have sufficient faith in American workingmen to believe that they can handle the problem of Communist infiltration if they are not handicapped by legislation which plays directly into the hands of Communists and their sympathizers.

I close, Mr. President, with this statement: I not only shall vote against sending the bill to conference but I shall vote to sustain a veto of the bill when it comes out of conference and is finally passed if the President of the United States has the good judgment to veto it. I shall so vote because I think a veto of this bill is wholly deserved. I deeply regret that the Senate of the United States did not see fit to adopt the very sound bill which came out of committee, a bill on which I worked for weeks and which, in title I, sets forth the amendments to the Wagner Act which I proposed and for which I have fought for a period of years. I say now in the closing moments of the debate, to American labor, that there is no justification for American labor not accepting the type of amendments to the Wagner Act that I wrote into title I of the bill.

I deeply regret that the Senate did not see fit to proceed with labor legislation one issue at a time, by way of one title at a time; but for reasons best known to them, but which for the most part I think were based on partisan politics, the leaders of my party in the Senate decided on a different course of action. They are welcome to stand on their record. I shall have no hesitancy, Mr. President, now or in the future, and particularly in the campaign of 1948, standing on the labor record I have made in the Eightieth Congress on the legislation now pending in the Senate.

I shall not vote for the bill in view of the amendments attached to it because it scuttles the effective enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act as we proposed to modify that act in our committee bill. The amendments which are now attached to the bill strike a serious blow at the legitimate rights of free

workers. They fail to protect the public interest because they constitute unworkable legislation that must be opposed by workers if they are to be protected from union-busting employers.

I hope that before we adjourn this Congress the Republican majority will regain its good judgment and pass the type of sound legislation on labor that I proposed in title I of the committee bill. It is fair, reasonable, constructive, and enforceable.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I believe in collective bargaining and the right to strike. I feel, as I believe the great majority of our fellow citizens feel, that there must be some restriction on the powers exercised by certain labor leaders. Some unions are performing an excellent service under present leaders, but other unions need more democracy and the leadership should be made responsible to the will of their members.

Mr. President, I shall support the committee bill as amended. I rise for the purpose of stating, as briefly as may be, the reasons for my belief that the pending bill will, in a large measure, accomplish this purpose.

THE DESPOTISM OF JOHN L. LEWIS IS UN-AMERICAN

Government operation of the coal mines is soon to end. Then by an arrogant nod of the head, John L. Lewis, a private citizen, has the power to stop the supply of coal, and thereby shut down substantially all industry in this country. When Lewis appeared before the Senate Labor Committee in opposition to any legislation affecting labor, he gave as his solemn opinion that our country "has never yet been discommoded," and "has never yet suffered irreparable injury" by being deprived of coal as the result of a coal strike. He has already forgotten that in 1943, at the time our armies and navies were engaged in a fight to death with enemies all over the world, and at the time our workers were straining every effort of brain and brawn to produce war material, John L. Lewis called strikes in the coal industry on four different occasions. He did this notwithstanding he had entered into a no-strike agreement with the President. Immediately the production of tanks, guns, ships, and other supplies of war needed by our fighting forces declined, and our war industry began to grind to a halt for the lack of coal. Are we asked to believe that no irreparable injury resulted when every day's delay lengthened the war and cost American lives on the field of battle? Only the wartime powers of the Government prevented complete collapse of our national economy. We are now approaching a time when these wartime powers of the Government will no longer be available, and unless Congress acts, John L. Lewis will be able to hold a stop watch on all American industry, shutting it off whenever he likes and permitting it to commence only when his will has been met. By the flick of a majestic finger, this lord of high decision will be able to control the opportunity of millions of men and women to earn a living for themselves and their families. I cannot become a party to that condition.

THE CLOSED SHOP IS UN-AMERICAN

In my own State of Missouri we have come to know this device, and on the whole our acquaintance has not been pleasant.

In a Missouri town a church roof was in need of repair, but it was believed that the church treasury could not afford the expense at that time. Several members of the church, members of a local union, offered to donate their services in performing the work if the church would buy the material. This was done, but when the roof was repaired the union officers notified the church that it would have to pay a sum equal to the labor cost, not to the church members who did the work, but to the union, and if payment were not made the union members who had done the work on the church would be expelled from the union. The money was paid.

In St. Louis, two veterans of World War II were expelled from a union. Their only offense was that they had declined to buy chances in a lottery conducted by the union. Their employer had a contract whereby it was agreed to employ only members of the union in good standing, and the two veterans were accordingly discharged. Suppose that these veterans had declined to contribute funds to the Communist Party, or some other political creed? So far as I can see, there is no difference in principle.

Compulsory unionism is a weapon which good union leaders do not need and which irresponsible union leaders should not have. Unionism is a good cause that can stand on its own bottom. Thomas Jefferson stated that "The minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect and which to violate would be oppression." I oppose the closed shop as un-American. It smacks of totalitarianism of the worst sort. I shall defend the right of the American workingman to work.

BACK TO BED ROCK PRINCIPLES

We should consider the rights and responsibilities of three groups: First, the employees; second, the employers; and, third, the public. The general public is the major victim of a labor dispute. In a democratic society the public welfare and safety is paramount to the rights of any individual or group. There is no natural right to conspire against the public welfare, and there should be none granted by law. To solve this problem, the Senate committee, as I see it, has returned to well-established legal principles.

THE SENATE BILL IS THE BEST SOLUTION SO FAR PRESENTED

It is significant that the presidents of the two major unions, who appeared before the labor committees, offered no suggestions, even though pressed to do so, as to how labor disputes affecting the national interest should be settled other than that no law whatsoever affecting unions should be passed by Congress. I believe the Senate to be unwilling to accept their program.

I am not rash enough to suggest that the proposed legislation is a complete solution, or that all labor disputes affecting the public interest and all abuses against the man who works will be eliminated by its passage. I do say that it is the best solution that has yet been presented. I do say that it is a moderate, restrained, well-considered bill.

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE AVERAGE MAN

The proposed legislation grants to the individual workingman freedom from abuses, by imposing reasonable restrictions and requirements on employers and union. Contrary to statements made by opponents of the bill, all the features of the National Labor Relations Act which grant rights to workingmen are retained. Employees are still granted the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of mutual aid or protection. All the restrictions placed on employers by the National Labor Relations Act are retained. The important features of this legislation and the most beneficial, in my opinion, are the provisions that grant to the man who works, rights and freedoms he has never before possessed. There are many of them, but I shall enumerate only a few.

First. The man who works will not be required to join a union in order to obtain a job, and will not be required to become a member of a union in order to keep his job unless a majority of the employees in the unit desire this requirement.

Second. Members of a union will not be fired from a job upon demand of a union except for nonpayment of dues.

Third. The man who works, if he desires to join a union, will be granted the right to join on the same terms and conditions as any other person.

Fourth. The man who works will be guaranteed the right to be free from restraint or coercion by his employer and also by his union in the exercise of his rights to self-organization, and the selection of his bargaining agent.

Fifth. The man who works may file charges of unfair labor practices against his union for misconduct as well as against his employer, and may be reinstated to his job with back pay if the loss of his job resulted from an unfair labor practice by the employer or by the union.

Sixth. The man who works will be entitled to financial statements of his union and to know exactly how his money is being spent.

THREAT OF A VETO

I have only one more thing to say, Mr. President, and that is in regard to the bugaboo of a veto. It has been suggested on the floor of the Senate and in the cloakrooms that an innocuous labor bill should be passed, because "the President will not sign any other bill." This amounts to an intimation that the Congress should abdicate its constitutional function in favor of the Executive. The people who voted last November expect us to endeavor, first, to restore peace between labor and management; second, to grant individual employees the right to manage their own union; third, to stop

labor racketeering; fourth, to free production from the grip of excessive strikes; and fifth, to protect men who work and their unions from capture by Communists. I know that Congress will make an earnest effort to carry out this mandate. If the President, for political or other reasons, chooses to exercise his right to veto the legislation, let the people decide at the next election who has acted in the public interest.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have heretofore submitted a perfecting amendment intended to be proposed by me. I now offer the amendment in order that we may have an opportunity to vote on it at 12:30.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 24, it is proposed to insert as separate paragraphs, the following:

(a) The term "superintendent" means any individual who, within power directly delegated by an owner, president, or board of directors, directs, controls, and administers a specific institution, plant, or function and is responsible for the successful outcome of the undertaking, and who works through assistants or subordinate foremen.

(b) The term "assistant superintendent" means any individual having authority to regularly assist a superintendent by performing essentially the same duties as the superintendent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not taken part in the discussion involving this proposed legislation to any extent except briefly upon the motion to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions, made several days ago by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I do not rise at this time for the purpose either of delaying a vote or merely indulging a whimsical desire to make a speech; but I entertain certain sentiments and convictions with respect to the pending legislation, and I feel it my duty to give expression to them before the vote is taken. I recognize that the vote which I shall cast will no doubt be misinterpreted by some of those who will disagree with the position I take. That is a penalty which we pay for the honor of representing the people who send us here as Members of this great body.

In what I shall say I shall not impugn either the motives or the sincerity of Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or of any other Senator, no matter what his position may be regarding this proposed legislation.

I had hoped that I might be able to support and vote for a bill attempting to correct some of the inequalities and injustices, and probably some of the mistakes made in the original legislation.

Mr. President, there has been discussion within the Chamber and outside the Chamber as to whether there ought to have been closer cooperation between the Congress and the President of the United States in the initiation of this legislation and in its formulation as the process went along.

It is always desirable that the legislative and executive branches cooperate as fully as possible in the framing of legislation, because the President is just as much a part of the legislative process as is the Congress of the United States. He has the constitutional right to approve or reject legislation, and in my judgment it is a serious mistake for the Congress, or either branch of it, to proceed without due consideration of the convictions of the President on all matters with respect to which his convictions are obtainable—certainly on important legislation such as that which we are considering.

I have no information as to what the President will do regarding any bill that is sent to him. He does not know, nor do I know, the terms of the bill which will finally reach him for his consideration; and very naturally he could not take the initiative, except in the formal recommendations which he made to the Congress in his message on the state of the Union in January. He could not become a lobbyist. He could not seek to create any sort of impression that he was attempting to dictate to the Congress the type of legislation which it might enact.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. President, in my judgment, that the other day the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a distinguished legislator whom I have known and admired for many years, saw fit, in an interview or statement, to dare the President of the United States to exercise his Constitutional right either upon legislation dealing with taxes or legislation dealing with labor. It seems to me that it was a rather peculiar spectacle, before either House had completed legislation upon the subject of taxation or labor regulation, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives should announce that if the President vetoed either of these bills he would have no opportunity thereafter either to approve or veto another bill upon either subject.

The only interpretation that can be placed upon such a statement is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is indulging in a form of intimidation against the President of the United States in daring him to exercise his Constitutional right according to his own conscience and his own judgment.

I do not know what the Prestident will do in regard to this bill, nor do I know what he will do with reference to the tax legislation which may finally reach him. But the founders of our Government and the framers of our Constitution were not dealing in idle verbiage when they authorized and commanded the President of the United States to exercise his own judgment with reference to legislation sent to him by the Congress of the United States.

In his message in January on the state of the Union the President recommended certain legislation. I shall not take the time to read all he said on the subject of labor and labor-management relations, and legislation necessary to accomplish what he thought ought to be done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks that portion of the President's message dealing with labor-management relations, beginning on page 3 of his message and ending at the top of page 6, so that it may be included with my remarks in its entirety.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the President's message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The year just past—like the year after the First World War—was marred by labor-management strife.

Despite the outbreak of economic warfare in 1946, we are today producing goods and services in record volume. Nevertheless, it is essential to improve the methods for reaching agreement between labor and management and to reduce the number of strikes and lock-outs.

We must not, however, adopt punitive legislation. We must not, in order to punish a few labor leaders, pass vindictive laws which will restrict the proper rights of the rank and file of labor. We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

We must remember, in reviewing the record of disputes in 1946, that management shares with labor the responsibility for failure to reach agreements which would have averted strikes. For that reason we must realize that industrial peace cannot be achieved merely by laws directed against labor unions.

During the last decade and a half we have established a national labor policy in this country based upon free collective bargaining as the process for determining wages and working conditions.

This is still the national policy.

It should continue to be the national policy.

But as yet not all of us have learned what it means to bargain freely and fairly. Nor have all of us learned to carry the mutual responsibilities that accompany the right to bargain. There have been abuses and harmful practices which limit the effectiveness of our system of collective bargaining. Furthermore, we have lacked sufficient governmental machinery to aid labor and management in resolving differences.

Certain labor-management problems need attention at once and certain others, by reason of their complexity, need exhaustive investigation and study.

We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

In the light of these considerations, I propose to you and urge your cooperation in effecting the following four-point program to reduce industrial strife:

Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.

First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible.

The National Labor Relations Act provides procedures for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the

law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.

A second unjustifiable practice is the secondary boycott, when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.

Not all secondary boycotts are unjustified. We must judge them on the basis of their objectives. For example, boycotts intended to protect wage rates and working conditions should be distinguished from those in furtherance of jurisdictional disputes. The structure of industry sometimes requires unions, as a matter of self-preservation, to extend the conflict beyond a particular employer. There should be no blanket prohibition against boycotts. The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

A third practice that should be corrected is the use of economic force, by either labor or management, to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of exising contracts.

Collective bargaining agreements, like other contracts, should be faithfully adhered to by both parties. In the most enlightened union-management relationships, disputes over the interpretation of contract terms are settled peacefully by negotiation or arbitration. Legislation should be enacted to provide machinery whereby unsettled disputes concerning the interpretation of an existing agreement may be referred by either party to final and binding arbitration.

Point No. 2 is the extension of the facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining.

One of our difficulties in avoiding labor strife arises from a lack of order in the collective-bargaining process. The parties often do not have a clear understanding of their responsibility for settling disputes through their own negotiations. We constantly see instances where labor or management resorts to economic force without exhausting the possibilities for agreement through the bargaining process. Neither the parties nor the Government have a definite yardstick for determining when and how Government assistance should be invoked. There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

Point No. 3 is the broadening of our program of social legislation to alleviate the causes of workers' insecurity.

On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill, I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor relations but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society. In this connection, for example, the Congress should consider the extension and broadening of our social security system, better housing, a comprehensive national health program, and provision for a fair minimum wage.

Point No. 4 is the appointment of a temporary joint commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relations.

I recommend that the Congress provide for the appointment of a temporary joint commission to undertake this broad study.

The President, the Congress, and management and labor have a continuing responsibility to cooperate in seeking and finding the solution of these problems. I, therefore, recommend that the commission be composed as follows: 12 to be chosen by the Congress from the Members of both parties in the House and the Senate, and 8 representing the public, management, and labor, to be appointed by the President.

The commission should be charged with investigating and making recommendations upon certain major subjects, among others:

First, the special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest. In particular, the commission should examine into the question of how to settle or prevent such strikes without endangering our general democratic freedoms.

Upon a proper solution of this problem may depend the whole industrial future of the United States. The paralyzing effects of a Nation-wide strike in such industries as transportation, coal, oil, steel, or communications can result in national disaster. We have been able to avoid such disaster, in recent years, only by the use of extraordinary war powers. All those powers will soon be gone. In their place there must be created an adequate system and effective machinery in these vital fields. This problem will require careful study and a bold approach, but an approach consistent with the preservation of the rights of our people. The need is pressing. The commission should give this its earliest attention.

Second, the best methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process. This should include the responsibilities of labor and management to negotiate freely and fairly with each other, and to refrain from strikes or lock-outs until all possibilities of negotiation have been exhausted.

Third, the underlying causes of labor-management disputes.

Some of the subjects presented here for investigation involve long-range study. Others can be considered immediately by the commission and its recommendations can be submitted to the Congress in the near future.

I recommend that this commission make its first report, including specific legislative recommendations, not later than March 15, 1947.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President recommended legislation with respect to jurisdictional strikes. He recommended legislation with respect to secondary boycotts. He recommended legislation with respect to other developments in our labor relations laws growing out of the experience in their administration and enforcement. He recommended the creation of a commission to study the cause of strikes and labor disputes. He emphasized the fact that the responsibility for such disagreements, resulting in stoppage of work, cannot be assigned to either side exclusively. Both labor and management must accept their responsibility for the difficulties which have arisen in the adjustment of our labor relations.

Having made those recommendations, which were specific, was it the duty of the President to initiate conferences in order that we might ascertain whether legislation which he could endorse and approve might be brought about by a cooperative effort on the part of both Houses and the Chief Executive; or, having made those recommendations in his formal message, as the Constitution requires, was it the duty of the Congress to seek the President in order to determine whether legislation might be agreed upon which he would sign?

The bill before the Senate, Mr. President, goes far beyond the President's recommendations. It goes far beyond the requirements of our industrial situation, in my judgment. In his message the President recommended that the Labor Department be strengthened and fortified in order that it might more effectively deal with the labor difficulties which have harassed the country. But, Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate not only does not fortify or strengthen the Labor Department but in a sense emasculated it.

I desire to read, if I may without being accused of partisanship, from the platform of the Republican Party in the campaign of 1944 upon which Governor Dewey became the candidate for President and the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] became the candidate for Vice President. The platform was written under the direction of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who, I believe, was chairman of the platform committee of the Republican Convention in 1944, and who is now chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate.

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal—

Says the Republican platform of 1944—

Labor bureaus, agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide in Washington and throughout the country and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor—

Says the platform—

Such labor bureaus as are not performing a substantial and definite service to the interests of labor must be abolished.

Skipping one paragraph and reading another:

The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws.

Mr. President, that is a portion of the Republican platform of 1944 in which it was claimed that the Department of Labor had been emasculated and in which the American people were promised that all agencies and all activities in relation to working conditions of American working men and women should be concentrated under the Secretary of Labor.

During the course of the campaign Governor Dewey endorsed that plank of the Republican platform. More than once Governor Dewey announced his approval. He criticized the dispersion of the agencies for regulating American labor and industrial relationships among independent agencies outside the purview of the Department of Labor. Yet,

Mr. President, notwithstanding that plank in the Republican platform, written under the supervision of the sponsor of this bill, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for whose ability and whose integrity I have the highest respect and for whom personally I have a deep affection—notwithstanding the declaration of the candidate for President in 1944, this bill, in title II, does exactly what the platform in 1944 charged we had done; and Mr. Dewey, as the nominee for President, went all over the country criticizing the Roosevelt administration for the dispersal of these agencies outside the Department of Labor.

The pending legislation takes out entirely from the Department of Labor the Conciliation Service. The Conciliation Service has been in existence ever since the Department of Labor was created under former President Taft, the distinguished father of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. From the time when the Conciliation Service was established until this very hour it has rendered outstanding service to the American people, to labor, and to industry by it fairness, its industry, its comprehension of the problems that face the Nation in its industrial relationships; and there has never been any criticism worthy of serious consideration with regard to the fact that the Conciliation Service was within the Department of Labor or the methods by which it undertook to bring about conciliation and the settlement of disputes between labor and industry.

In the committee hearings William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, testified to the efficiency, the admirable work, and the admirable record of the Conciliation Service from 1913 until the present time. Philip Murray, head of the CIO, did the same. Many businessmen and manufacturers came before the committee and testified not only in behalf of the Conciliation Service, but urged that it be allowed to remain in the Department of Labor as a part of the governmental establishment in the adjustment of disputes among the industrial workers of the United States and their employers. So far as I know, no one came before the committee and urged that the Conciliation Service be removed from the Department of Labor. Yet this bill does precisely what our opponents in the last campaign charged us with doing, in that it emasculates the Department of Labor by separating from it one of its most important divisions and setting it up as an independent division, divorced from the office of the Secretary of Labor, free from any control or coordination, so far as the Secretary of Labor is concerned and so far as the Conciliation Service itself may be concerned.

This part of the bill has not received a great deal of attention during the discussion, but it seems to me that it constitutes one of the fatal difficulties, one of the fatal defects—indeed, if I may use a phrase used by Chief Justice Hughes in the famous "sick chicken" case, in my judgment it constitutes a "fatal infirmity"—in the set-up proposed by legislation which the American people feel ought to be enacted to deal with our industrial relations and our labor problem.

Mr. President, I have here some figures, which I shall not undertake to quote, showing how the Conciliation Service has worked, and showing the number of disputes it has settled, which mount up into the thousands and which have received no attention so far as publicity is concerned.

The number of disputes which the Conciliation Service has been able to adjust, in numbers and in importance outrank, outnumber, and outweigh, over the period of 34 years of its existence, the number of strikes that have not been settled, which did receive publicity in some cases beyond their importance. That is the reason why the American people have not been kept informed about the outstanding work of the Conciliation Service during all this period of years, because it is not news when a dispute is settled without controversy. It is news when a dispute is not settled and when the controversy is not solved—which may result in a strike of the employees in the case of any given institution.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the committee was not justified in undertaking to separate the functions of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. Because I strongly believe that, I find myself unable to support this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, much has been said here about the closed shop and about industry-wide bargaining among employers and employees. The question of the closed shop is not a new problem. Long before I came to Congress, in 1913, the closed shop was an established institution all over the United States. We had no laws upon the subject of labor regulation then, to speak of. In 1914, we did enact, as a part of the Clayton antitrust law, a provision that membership in a labor organization did not constitute a violation of the antitrust law, and that the existence of a labor organization did not constitute a violation of the antitrust law. In that same legislation we placed labor organizations and farmers' organizations upon the same basis, because in that legislation we said that membership in a farmers' cooperative organization, designed to benefit and advance the welfare of American farmers, to enable them to obtain a better price for what they produce out of the ground, and the existence of such farmers' organizations, did not constitute a violation of the antitrust law; and thereby we gave a sort of charter of liberty to laboring organizations and to farmers' organizations, placing both of them on the same basis.

The closed shop was in existence long before I ever ran for office, in the town where I live, in the railroad shops, among the carpenters and joiners and the plumbers and painters. By agreement between employees and employers, they had the closed shop; and it was advantageous to the employers because it gave stability to employment and it enabled them to deal with an organization in an official way. So far as I can recall, none of the great strikes that have disrupted business and brought about shortages or stoppages of work has been produced by the fact that there was a closed shop in any community or throughout the United States in any particular industry.

Yet, Mr. President, in connection with this proposed legislation we are told about the closed shop as if it were a new device, as if it were a new monster that had come upon the American scene, which must be slain by an act of Congress.

The same may be said of industry-wide bargaining, which in my judgment will be severally restricted, if it is not completely abolished, when this proposed legislation reaches the President of the United States.

Of course, I realize that in voting upon a bill which is before the Senate, we probably are wise in voting upon it upon its terms, as it is finally agreed to by the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that it may be materially changed before it reaches final legislative status and before it is presented to the President. In considering how I shall vote upon the pending bill, I am trying to keep in mind what it may be when it finally reaches the President of the United States. The bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives abolished the closed shop. The bill which came from the House abolished and prohibited industry-wide bargaining, notwithstanding the fact that many employers and many industries in the United States prefer industry-wide bargaining to bargaining in each location, in each plant within a system, with those who work for it. I myself am sure, and I am certain the hearings will reveal, that throughout the United States, in the interest of uniform procedure and in the interest of uniformity of wages within a given industry, many industries and employers of labor prefer industry-wide bargaining in order that they may not have to deal separately with every organization and every plant within their industry.

Yet, Mr. President, the bill which came to us from the House of Representatives, and which the conferees on the part of the House will insist upon when this measure goes to conference, abolishes and nullifies and outlaws the closed shop, even by agreement between employer and employees; and even by agreement between employer and employees with respect to industry-wide bargaining, such bargaining would also be outlawed by that bill. The bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives does not even provide, as did the amendment which was adopted in the Senate the other day, that in regard to the administration of welfare funds, there shall be a division of authority. The bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives abolishes welfare funds altogether.

Mr. President, I know the House of Representatives and I know the attitude the conferees on the part of the House frequently assume. They always feel that they must take back some "bacon" to the House of Representatives; and Senators who vote for this bill on the theory that it is as good as we can get, and will be no worse when it comes back

from the conference, are reckoning without their host, because I know, as other Senators know, that this bill will be worse when it comes back to us from the conference that it will be as it passes the Senate of the United States. No one can correctly anticipate that the conferees on the part of the House will fall over one another in their haste to approve the so-called milder bill of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield briefly, but I have only a few moments at my disposal.

Mr. LUCAS. In reference to the point the Senator from Kentucky has made with respect to what will happen to the bill when it goes to conference, and thereafter returns to the Senate in more stringent terms than we now find it, let me inquire what the Senate could do at that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate could reject the conference report, but it will not do so.

Mr. LUCAS. That would be the next parliamentary situation; would it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that would be the next parliamentary situation. When the bill comes back from conference, even though it then includes a prohibition against the closed shop and even though it then prohibits industry-wide bargaining and even though it then prohibits the creation of welfare funds by agreement between employers and employees, the Senate of the United States can only vote it up or down; that is the only thing the Senate will be able to do at that time. So we need not deceive ourselves as to what our final obligation and opportunity with respect to the pending legislation may be.

Mr. LUCAS. I was certain that was correct, and I thought it should be brought out during the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and I thank the Senator for his interruption, which has enabled me to emphasize that point.

Mr. President, I shall not attempt, in the short time at my disposal, to go into the details with respect to the proposed legislation. I wish, however, to comment briefly upon what seems to me to be a mistaken philosophy in connection with the whole subject, not only in this country, but its effect upon the general situation with which we are confronted internationally.

We hear much about communism. The House of Representatives a few days ago reduced the relief bill from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000, largely because of a fear that some nation which was controlled by a Communist government might get relief out of that fund.

We have authorized the expenditure of $400,000,000 in behalf of Greece and Turkey in order to enable those nations to stand up against infiltration, against pressures, against the jitters, against all the outside influences which are seeking to undermine the stability of those Governments. We are doing it on the ground that it is essential that they be allowed sufficient economic stability to create a certain degree of political stability, which is essential to their independence and the peace of Europe and the world.

We have made loans to China, we have made loans to Great Britain for economic reasons, we have made loans to Poland for economic reasons, we have made loans to France and other countries for economic reasons, recognizing that out of economic instability, out of fear and want and hunger and starvation, grow these alien nostrums which are being accepted by millions of people because they are persuaded that nothing can be worse than the conditions under which they live, and therefore any straw offers rescue in time of distress and disaster.

We are justified in those expenditures. Yet, Mr. President, we are undertaking to stabilize all those countries by expenditures out of our Treasury, by contributions from our resources, not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of intelligent self-interest, in order that our institutions, our form of government, our democracy, might be fortified against invasion, either by force or through intellectual deception, by some other ideology which is alien to our traditions and alien to the wishes of our people.

The enactment of punitive and restrictive legislation against the laboring men and women of the United States, in my judgment, would do more to foster communism among the trade-union organizations in all the nations of the world, including our own, than any other thing in which Congress could indulge.

Nicolai Lenin, the great founder, as it is said, of the Soviet Socialist Republic, said in one of his speeches that trade unionism was the focus or school for the propagation of communism. We know that in Europe that has been largely true. We know that in the United States a terrific fight is now going on within the CIO between those who oppose communism and those who are trying to get control of that organization in behalf of communism. I pay tribute to Philip Murray for the fight he is making to save his organization from such an alien theory and to eradicate communism from the CIO.

Not only throughout the labor organizations of Europe, but in the labor movement in the United States, punitive and restrictive and unfair legislation will also form the basis of discontent and contempt for authority which will do more to undermine our institutions, our ideology and our democracy than anything else of which I can conceive.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of its effect upon these international situations, of which we are a part and from which we cannot escape, it seems to me the proposed legislation is lacking in wisdom, lacking in the basic philosophies, lacking in that fairness and that broad outlook which we could have occupied, and from which we might have approached the subject in an endeavor, not to do injustice, but to correct evils which experience had revealed, without attempting to pass legislation to punish somebody because of some conduct of his with which we do not agree.

Mr. President, I have also convinced myself that in the long run punitive legislation, unfairly restrictive legislation, defeats its own purpose. I have only to cite the current labor situation in Australia. I have here a stack of Australian newspapers for the month of March containing articles with respect to the same problem we face.

The current labor situation in Australia has provided a great deal of news in recent weeks for the Australian newspapers. Australia has had very comprehensive legislation regulating labor and management relationships for many years, in fact, since early in the century.

The labor laws of Australia are so definite and so specific that they amount to compulsory arbitration, and they involve a great many legal devices to work out adjustments without strikes. It is all done over there in the framework of the law.

The Australian papers which I have examined cover most of the month of March, and present a clear picture. Notwithstanding their laws, notwithstanding their requirement for compulsory arbitration, notwithstanding that, as a matter of fact and in effect, the Government of Australia becomes a party to every labor dispute and every strike within Australia, let me quote some of the headlines from Australian newspapers for the month of March:

More waterside hold-ups are threatened by seamen, and wharf and wool clerks.

From Melbourne comes this:

Industrial paralysis in Victoria grew worse last night, when the FADFA state executive decided on a power black-out unless the arbitration court granted double time for Sunday work.

That is under a law requiring compulsory arbitration. Yet, unless they were to be given double pay for Sunday work, they were to have a black-out in the city of Melbourne, under their restrictive legislation. I quote another paper:

A shot-firers' and deputies' dispute on the south coast coal fields threatens to stop all New South Wales mines next week.

A union chief was quoted as saying:

The combined mining unions have pledged state-wide support for our fight, which is not with the owners but against the government.

Not a fight between the workers and the owners of the mines, but a fight between the workers and their government, which was a party to the dispute because of the compulsory law enacted in Australia, and which has been on the statute books for many years.

Another story from Melbourne says:

Intensifying the metal-trades dispute, which is crippling industry, unions are calling out another 1,000 ironworkers on strike.

That was in March. Another story says:

Funerals to have been held in the week-end in Sydney were postponed because of the strike of grave diggers and crematorium assistants.

They could not even bury the dead, under the compulsory arbitration law, because the grave diggers and the crematory employees went out on strike, in defiance of the law.

Another story from Sydney reports:

Stop-work meetings of shift workers in all Sydney gasworks today may decide to strike.

The men will discuss Arbitration Court delay in delivering judgment on their demand for weekend penalty rates.

Mr. President, so it is evident that even in Australia, a smaller country than ours, with a much smaller population, and with less complexity of industrial relationship, the government was unable to prevent strikes, notwithstanding the restrictive and punitive legislation in force within the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. President, I deeply regret my inability to support the bill now before the Senate. I had hoped that in the process of legislation we might be able to write a bill which would correct the evils, the injustices, and the inequities which the administration of the wage and hour law and the Labor Relations Act had revealed.

But I cannot support the bill, because in my judgment, it goes far beyond the requirements, because it penalizes innocent men by the thousands or the millions, in order that we may pounce upon somebody who is thought to have been arbitrary and dictatorial in his dealing with employers as well as the employees over whom he may have control or influence. I yet hope, Mr. President, before the Congress shall have adjourned that it may be able to write a law which will meet adequately the situation which has been revealed by our experience, but which will not go so far as to penalize and punish and outlaw and pillory honest and sincere Americans because they exercise rights given to them by a law, which has been upheld and supported by the courts of our country and which was enacted in order to assure them a decent share of our resources and the enjoyment of something more than the bare necessities of life in this age of industrial and financial complexity and difficulty.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I do not know what the fate of the pending legislation will be. The Senator from Ohio has announced that, if the President shall veto the bill, it will be enacted over the veto. It is the privilege of Congress to do that, just as it is the privilege of the President, if he feels it is his duty to do so, to veto the bill and send it back to the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I made no such statement or prediction. I have refused to make any such prediction at any time as to what the Senate would do if the bill were vetoed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I saw a quotation from the Senator in yesterday's newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. That was a mistake.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had seen no denial on the part of the Senator from Ohio of that statement.

Mr. TAFT. I did not see the statement. I refused to predict what the Senate would do in case of a veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. I accept the Senator's word, but I am using the quotation which was attributed to him in Washington newspapers yesterday morning following a discussion over the radio between the Senator from Ohio and the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green.

So, Mr. President, regardless of what the President may do in regard to the pending legislation, about which I make no prediction, because I have no right to make a prediction, I shall be compelled, in the exercise of my judgment and my own conscientious convictions, to vote against the bill. And knowing that, no matter what we do here in the way of amending the bill, either by the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana or by any other process, the bill will more nearly approximate the House bill when it returns to the Senate than it will approximate the Senate bill, I shall vote even against the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana, because I think it would be futile to adopt it if it could be adopted—and it cannot be—because, if it went to the conference, it would be thrown out the window by both the House and Senate conferees and would receive no consideration, and the only real basis on which agreements might then be entered into would be the House bill, which is worse than anything the Senate contemplated or would contemplate.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio and other Senators in allowing me to have this time in which I might express my views regarding the pending measure. I now yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Florida will confine his remarks to about half the remaining time, about 8 minutes, if possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, I would not arise to address myself to the pending bill and to the substitute, at all, except for the fact that it seems to me there has been too little discussion in the debate thus far of what I regard as the dominant interest which Senators are considering in this matter. That is the interest of and the protection of the general public of the United States of America, who have the gravest stake in the pending legislation. I want to remind Senators that, regardless of the fact that we would like to forget it, there are labor leaders in the country who have already shown unequivocally by their action that they are willing, even in time of gravest national emergency, to ignore entirely the public interest. We shall leave them, after June 30, in the precise position where they can most effectively and most fully ignore the public interest, unless we pass the committee bill.

I remind Senators that, during World War II the man who controlled the great coal-mining industry of the Nation called out the coal miners, at a time when the fate of our Nation and literally of the world hung in the balance. It happened that the position which I held at that time brought about the receipt by me of dozens of letters from servicemen of my State, stationed in all parts of the world, expressing the gravest distress and anxiety as to how it could be that anybody at home could visit upon them and the other millions who wore the uniform of their country the bad treatment that was given through the coal strike at that time. Likewise, there were many letters coming also from families of those distressed servicemen.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I regret that I cannot yield, because my time is so limited.

Then, Mr. President, last fall, just as we were approaching the winter season, there was another illustration of exactly how far that particular leader would go in violating and disregarding the public interest. It will be recalled that, but for the existence of that war measure, the Smith-Connally Act, which bears the distinguished name of the honored senior Senator from Texas, this Nation would then have been faced with distressing conditions, simply because of the utter unwillingness of the leader of the coal miners to give proper consideration to the public interest and the public viewpoint. So, without referring to other such distressing incidents which have occurred—and there have been others—I merely want to remind the Senate that unless the pending bill is passed the Nation will be left, and our President will be left, and in particular the general public, including the laboring people, will be left without the protection of any machinery at all under which we may be safeguarded against the devastating and disastrous effects of work stoppages in our basic national industries.

The provisions of the committee bill are none too strong on that point, but they do seek to supply a stopgap, which will give us 80 days of protection in the event the Attorney General of the United States avails himself of the injunction machinery provided in title II of the act—80 days of protection, in which the commission set up by the bill may accentuate its studies in that field, during which time public sentiment may be crystallized, and in which time, if necessary, the Congress can be called back into session, so that the emergency, the critical situation then existing, will be dealt with without visiting upon the Nation the devastating effects of a work stoppage in coal or in any of the other vital industries.

Mr. President, when the substitute measure was offered a few days ago, I read with great interest its provisions, because I hoped there would be something in it which would deal with this, which I think is the major consideration before us, but there is no such provision in the substitute bill; and I regret to say that there is not. I find only two references to the basic industries in the bill; one, submitting those basic industries and a study of them to the tender mercies of the commission which is set up, and advising that that commission should give first consideration, as the President requested in his message on the state of the Union, to that vital field.

The other section, Mr. President, simply allows the Secretary of Labor, if requested by both parties to a dispute in a vital national industry, or if both approve, to set up a little board which, for 30 days, can debate with itself and make a report later, but without any relief meantime or any preservation of the status quo, or anything whatever which would give to our Nation protection against work stoppages in vital industries.

I appreciate the frankness of the Senator from Oregon, who stated this morning what I believe to be the fact, that the substitute measure is so weak on the face of it that he could not support it, even though he expressed disapproval of the stronger measure, the committee measure as amended.

So, Mr. President, I feel that if we wish to leave our Nation and our President with the protection of some machinery to deal with threatened work stoppages—and they already threaten us—after June 30, the day of the expiration of the Smith-Connally Act, the only choice we have is to vote for this measure. I do not like every provision of it and I do not believe there is any Senator on this floor who likes every provision of it, but I do not regard it as a punitive measure. I do not regard it as anything but a measure designed to correct abuses which exist. I think that the members of the committee who worked on the bill, and those who have debated it on the floor, have shown a fair and reasonable attitude in approaching this problem.

I remind you, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, that when the President delivered his state of the Union message in January he fixed March 15 as the date by which he hoped a report would be available. Senators will remember that he asked that the first matter of business be the subject of basic industries and the averting of shutdowns in those industries. If the recommendation made in that message had been strictly carried out we would have had available on March 15, or shortly thereafter, a measure to deal with this particular problem, but we do not have that measure available, and I simply want to say that I think the joint activities of the committee members working together over the 9 weeks' period of time of their deliberations can well be substituted, and we have to substitute their activities, for the activities of the proposed commission, even if it had been set up promptly.

I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate and the President of the Senate that not a single hostile amendment was addressed to title II of the committee bill, which is the title which embraces, among other things, the machinery for dealing with emergency matters in the basic industries of the Nation. So, Mr. President, we do have machinery afforded in the bill after a study which I think is just as good and just as sound a study and which has produced as good results as would have been produced from the studies suggested to be made by the President. I, for one, will not be a party to leaving him, and leaving the general public, including labor itself, without protection on June 30 when we face the dire threats which hang over us at that time.

I close by simply reminding you, Mr. President, and the Members of the Senate, that these shut-downs in vital national industries hit hardest at the people who work. When I ran for the Senate I ran throughout my State on the platform of setting up machinery to avert shut-downs in these basic industries, and I particularly accentuated the point that labor itself was worst hurt by such shut-downs because its pay rolls are cut off when we do not obtain steel or do not obtain coal or do not have transportation.

In the protection of labor itself, in the protection of the Nation, in the protection of the prestige of the Nation which just now is at stake throughout the world, I hope we will vote down the substitute measure and will approve by an overwhelming vote of the Senate the committee bill, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at 12:30 we vote first on the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I believe those amendments should be voted down. I know a majority of the committee has already rejected them in the committee. They propose in effect to provide that foremen may organize separate unions and come in under the National Labor Relations Act. We considered that compromise and found that it was, in our opinion, impossible. Either foremen are unionized or they are not unionized. In my opinion, the amendments should be rejected.

Mr. President, yesterday I filed a motion to reconsider the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] relating to communism, but I shall not call up that motion to reconsider. I doubt if it is in order under the unanimous-consent agreement. In any event, while I do not like that amendment because I think it would be very difficult of administration and enforcement, yet I think it perhaps would again meet with the approval of the Senate as it did the other night when it was adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Well, I do not call it up. It will merely lie on the table without being called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the RECORD, it will be withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has attacked the bill and, as a good many others who have attacked the bill, he seems to a considerable extent to have confused it with what is in the House bill. With due respect to the Senator, we are voting on the Senate bill, and what is in the House bill is wholly immaterial in considering our vote on the Senate bill.

The Senate bill is not a punitive bill. I am sorry the Senator from Kentucky was not present when I delivered the opening speech, because I do not want to repeat what I said then, but after the bill was taken up for consideration by the committee we had 6 weeks of hearings on it, and we listened to every one who wanted to be heard. We listened to every Government department which wished to be heard. Though we have not consulted the President, the President's Secretary of Labor appeared before us twice, and told us what he thought should be done, which was substantially nothing. The National Labor Relations Board appeared before us and testified. We had the Conciliation Division before us for some testimony. Certainly the Administration has been given every opportunity to consult and to criticize the measure which has been pending before the Senate.

The committee did not approach the subject with the idea of recommending or passing a punitive measure. The committee took the proposals which were submitted and analyzed and debated them for weeks. We tried to place in the bill provisions which would be both workable and fair. The whole effort has been to restore equality between employer and employee in their dealings with each other, and to correct the injustices which have arisen, not out of industrial relations themselves, but out of laws which were passed by the Congress, laws which were given, it seems to me, a much broader application than they were ever intended to be given. Out of the National Labor Relations Act, the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act have risen certain obvious injustices, injustices so clearly recognized that in Nation-wide polls two-thirds of the people polled are demanding that those injustices be corrected.

We approached the subject from a legal, scientific point of view. We took each of the abuses which were testified to in the evidence and tried to find a remedial provision which could finally become enacted into law. When we got through, 11 members of the committee signed the report, including Senators who held different views from myself, such as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The committee adopted the bill because we thought it presented a constructive solution for the different problems which were presented. There is nothing in the bill which punishes labor for anything it has done, or punishes anyone except for violation of direct laws which the Senate has debated and approved, approved in every case by an overwhelming majority.

On the floor of the Senate we adopted three amendments of some importance, but I do not think any one of them in any way is punitive, in any way punishes labor for what labor may do. They do no more in every case than try again to place employers and employees on an equal basis. That is the basis of the bill. It is the basis of equality.

The bill does not provide for compulsory arbitration. The cases in Australia cited by the Senator from Kentucky occurred because labor there secured such a stranglehold, if you please, through statutes and otherwise on the economy of Australia, that finally the country was driven to compulsory arbitration, and of course it failed. Our bill does not provide for compulsory arbitration. It seeks to reduce the power of certain unions so that when the parties come to the collective-bargaining table there will be free collective bargaining in which each side will have the right to present its demands, but neither side will present any unreasonable demands on the theory that they have such unreasonable power that they can enforce unreasonable demands.

So, Mr. President, the bill reaffirms the principle of the Wagner Act. It restores in this country the free collective bargaining today which both management and labor groups recognize must be the

basis for satisfactory labor relations between employer and employee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to vote on the amendments offered yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for a vote upon my amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks that his amendments be voted upon en bloc. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have the amendments of the Senator from North Dakota read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end of line 21 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided, That the Board shall not, upon objection by any party to the proceeding, certify as a bargaining representative for supervisors any labor organization if—

(a) it has members who are supervisors and also members who are not supervisors; or

(b) its membership is confined to supervisors but it is affiliated directly or indirectly with another labor organization whose membership is not so confined; or

(c) its membership is confined to supervisors but it is dominated or controlled by another labor organization whose membership is not so confined: *Provided further*, That such disqualification shall not be construed as extending to any labor organization which includes in its membership supervisors in an occupation of a character which under prevailing custom prior to July 1, 1935, was covered by collective-bargaining agreements.

On page 19, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end of line 18 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the Board shall not include in any unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining any supervisor (except any supervisor in an occupation of a character which under prevailing custom prior to July 1, 1935, was covered by collective-bargaining agreements) of any employer who regularly employs fewer than 10 supervisors occupying positions below the status of assistant superintendent.

On page 6, after line 24, it is proposed to insert, as separate paragraphs, the following:

(a) The term "superintendent" means any individual who, within power directly delegated by an owner, president, or board of directors, directs, controls, and administers a specific institution, plant, or function and is responsible for the successful outcome of the undertaking, and who works through assistants or subordinate foremen.

(b) The term "assistant superintendent" means any individual having authority to regularly assist a superintendent by performing essentially the same duties as the superintendent.

On page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the word "a", and in line 5 strike out the word "supervisor" and insert in lieu thereof "an assistant superintendent or superintendent, or any individual occupying a higher supervisory status than assistant superintendent."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which will be voted upon en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The only remaining amendment is the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself and other Senators. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] who is necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 73, as follows:

YEAS—19

Chavez	Lucas	O'Mahoney
Downey	McFarland	Pepper
Green	McGrath	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	
Kilgore	Myers	

NAYS—73

Aiken	Fulbright	O'Conor
Baldwin	George	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Holland	Smith
Bushfield	Ives	Stewart
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tydings
Capehart	Langer	Umstead
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Connally	McCarran	Wagner
Cooper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cordon	McClellan	Wherry
Donnell	McKellar	White
Dworshak	McMahon	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Martin	Wilson
Ellender	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	
Flanders	Morse	

NOT VOTING—3

Overton	Thomas, Utah	Tobey

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. MURRAY on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no further amendment is in order. The third reading of the bill is automatically ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the House bill is considered as being amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill 1126, as amended; and the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the House bill are considered as ordered.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TAFT, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Flanders	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Fulbright	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hatch	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Smith
Bushfield	Holland	Sparkman
Butler	Ives	Stewart
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Kem	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Capper	Lodge	Umstead
Connally	Lucas	Vandenberg
Cooper	McClellan	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Wherry
Donnell	McKellar	White
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Wilson
Ellender	Moore	Young
Ferguson	O'Conor	

NAYS—24

Barkley	Kilgore	Morse
Chavez	Langer	Murray
Downey	McCarran	Myers
Green	McFarland	O'Mahoney
Hayden	McGrath	Pepper
Hill	McMahon	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Malone	Wagner

NOT VOTING—3

Overton	Thomas, Utah	Tobey

So the bill (H. R. 3020) was passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities

for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1126 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just passed be printed showing the amendments of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of the Selective Service registrants of inductible age occupationally deferred by the local boards of the Selective Service System as of March 31, 1947, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 169

"Resolution relating to establishing September 17 as Constitution Day

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States was adopted on September 17, 1787; and

"Whereas the Constitution, as the basic law of our land, has been the greatest single force in creating and shaping our Nation, bringing into being a new type of citizen, a people distinguishable throughout the world by their complete adherence to the tenets of democracy and their unique experience in having actually lived the democratic way of life; and

"Whereas our history shows that wherever the American pioneer went: Beyond the borders of his native State, deep into the wilderness, or far beyond the mountains, the Constitution followed him, binding the new settlements to the old, keeping alive the ideals and traditions so gloriously won and proclaimed by our forefathers; and

"Whereas the benefits derived to the American people under the Constitution of the United States, the establishment of our democratic principles, the free participation in political office and leadership, the great economic opportunities, our Nation-wide system of public schools, the free condition of labor, the rewards of individual enterprise, and the blessings of spiritual freedom and the right to worship according to one's conscience, are all achievements highly to be prized by any people and attained nowhere in the world in such measure as we know them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to fix and declare September 17, Constitution Day, that it may be set aside as a day on which to honor the Constitution of the United States of America as the repository and bulwark of our Nation and our liberties, a day on which to tell again the story of the Constitution, the adoption of the Bill of Rights, and to bring to every citizen of this great land a better understanding of this guarantee of liberty and of the duties and responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship, that we may keep alive the ideals of democracy, the zeal for liberty for all men, to strengthen our democracy and preserve our glorious Nation under the American system which rests upon the United States Constitution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of California in Congress."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 28

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to make available as Hawaiian home lands a certain parcel of lands situate on the island of Maui, T. H.

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, so as to include as available Hawaiian home lands a certain parcel of Government land situate in the district of Wailuku, island and county of Maui, T. H., comprising 12,455 acres of the Ile of Kou and being a portion of the land covered by general lease No. 2286 to Wailuku Sugar Co., Ltd., notwithstanding the fact that said parcel is cultivated sugarcane land, subject, however, to the term of said lease; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 31

"Whereas the cause of statehood for Hawaii has been and is of paramount importance to the Territory of Hawaii and to the Nation; and

"Whereas, the presentation of this cause at the National Capital, to the Congress of the United States; to the various departments thereof; to the several bureaus and agencies of Government; and to the people of our country, is an essential element in carrying the cause of statehood to a successful conclusion; and

"Whereas the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and other officials high in the Government of the United States, have demonstrated their support of statehood and their trust and confidence in the people of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), assembled in the twenty-fourth biennial session of the legislature:

"First, that we express to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, our deep appreciation for his cordial and steadfast support of immediate statehood for Hawaii.

"Second, that we convey our sincere thanks to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable J. A. Krug, for his active and helpful concern for the progress of the people of this Territory within his jurisdiction, and especially because of his recent visit to Hawaii and the Pacific he has made himself personally familiar with the issue of statehood as it affects the Territory and the Pacific.

"Third, that we highly commend the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, for his able, devoted, unflagging, and effective service to the cause of statehood; and his leadership in bringing this vital cause before the Congress and the departments.

"Fourth, that we extend our appreciation to those Members of Congress and of the departments and bureau who have visited Hawaii and the Pacific and studied our needs and desires and recognized our ambition to achieve statehood at the earliest possible moment.

"Fifth, that we urge upon the House of Representatives of the Congress, that speedy action be taken on the unanimous and favorable report on statehood by the House Public Lands Committee; and that we urge upon the Senate that it, too, take early and favorable action so that Hawaii, at this session of the Congress may take its place in the Union as the forty-ninth State; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A petition of the members of the Pasadena Townsend Club, No. 2, Pasadena, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Sisterhood of the Beth Israel Synagogue, of Lebanon, Pa., favoring action by the General Assembly of the United Nations on the plan proposed by the United States in dealing with the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A petition signed by 20 citizens of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SATURDAY LEAVE FOR RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a great many letters relative to Senate bill 547, which was passed a short time ago, providing that rural mail carriers who could not be paid for Saturdays because of a ruling of the Comptroller General should receive relief. There are so many of the letters coming in, and so many are being received by other Senators, that I ask unanimous consent to

place in the RECORD a reply dated May 7, which I wrote to one of the rural carriers. I suggest that if other Senators receive letters relative to Senate bill 547, they can use this letter as a form for reply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 7, 1947.

DEAR FRIEND: On January 24, 1947, the Comptroller General issued a ruling that a rural mail carrier could not be paid for Saturdays when no service was rendered; in other words, rural mail carriers were barred from taking annual or sick leave on Saturdays.

On February 10, I introduced in the Senate S. 547, to provide for annual and sick leave for you. The measure asked that you be treated the same as other civil-service employees. The Post Office Department agreed that there would still be a difference because the basic law states that rural routes must be served 6 days a week. Thomas G. Walters representing the National Association of Letter Carriers, reminded the committee that if the five-tours-of-duty legislation were enacted into law, you would then be on an equal basis with other postal employees insofar as annual and sick leave is concerned.

Mr. Walters suggested an amendment to S. 547, that it be retroactive to February 1, 1947. This amendment was adopted and passed by the Senate.

The legislation was then considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and S. 547 was further amended to provide that Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a lesser number of days (less than the 4 or 5 days as provided in the bill) may at the option of the carrier be charged to this accrued leave and, when so charged, he shall be paid for such absence. This eventually became the law.

I am happy to report to you that the Senate unanimously adopted the amendment. The measure was signed by the President and it is now Public Law 44.

Hoping that you are well and happy, I am,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Senate Civil Service Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 28. A bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 165);

S. 272. A bill to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; with an amendment (Rept. No. 167);

S. 299. A bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 168); and

S. 1020. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 166).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 116. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin; with amendments (Rept. No. 169);

S. 824. A bill for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; with an amendment (Rept. No. 170);

H. R. 384. A bill for the relief of W. H. Baker and Walter Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 171); and

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Isaac B. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 172).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1271. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1272. A bill to fix the amount of the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1273. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1274. A bill confirming the claim of A. B. Learned to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Wilkinson; and

S. 1275. A bill confirming the claim of Miss Lucille Romano to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Warren; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 1276, to provide for the establishment of a National Air Policy Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL AIR POLICY BOARD

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for a national air policy board, which shall deal with the question of our air policy during the next 6 months.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1276) to provide for the establishment of a National Air Policy Board, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CITIZENSHIP FOR INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ALASKA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there has been much discussion relative to the abolishment of the Indian Bureau. Investigation has disclosed that there are 2,000 Indians in the city of Minneapolis, Minn. There are other Indians on the rolls who live in the city of Brooklyn, N. Y. In order to get this matter before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution, which will bring before the Congress the entire Indian matter and make possible a substantial reduction in the appropriations for the Indian Bureau.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should be very happy to join with the Senator in the concurrent resolution, because it is in line with remarks the junior Senator from Oregon made on the floor of the Senate some days ago in introducing an Indian bill, and pointing out that there should come very quickly a time when Indians would become part of our citizenry, and cease to be wards of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

Whereas it is the purpose of the Congress to confer at the earliest possible time upon all Indian wards of the United States full and unqualified citizenship with the protection and privileges thereof and with its corresponding duties and responsibilities; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the Congress to withdraw all supervision by the United States Government over Indians as rapidly as the Indians become capable of assuming full and unqualified citizenship; and

Whereas the status of the various Indian tribes, bands, and groups is such that many are now capable of assuming full and unqualified citizenship while others are not now capable of assuming and discharging full citizenship: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in order to hasten the time of complete emancipation of the Indians of the United States, there is established a joint committee to be composed of two Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Public Lands, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to conduct a study and investigation of the present status of all Indian tribes, bands, and groups in the United States and Alaska for the purpose of determining the capability of the Indians of assuming full and unqualified citizenship. Special consideration shall be given to the following tribes and bands which have been recommended by the Office of Indian Affairs as being presently capable of assuming citizenship: Flathead, Hoopa, Klamath, Menominee, Mission, New York, Osage, Potawatomi, Sacramento, and Turtle Mountain (conditionally). It shall be the further duty of the joint committee to formulate plans for the complete withdrawal of Federal restrictions over the Indians.

(b) The scope of the study and investigation of the joint committee shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following matters—

(1) The effect of withdrawal of Federal supervision upon any claims of the Indians against the United States;

(2) The method of distribution of money and lands held in trust for the Indians;

(3) State legislation, if any, necessary to a complete conferral of the rights and duties of citizenship upon Indians;

(4) Distribution of money and land held in trust for Indians who are minors and for Indians who have been declared incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction;

(5) Distribution of lands of deceased Indians in cases where the heirs of such Indian and the manner of distributing such lands has not been determined;

(6) Disposition of buildings and other property of Government agencies acquired with Indian funds and distribution of the proceeds of such property;

(7) Disposition of uncollected rentals of Indian lands;

(8) Dissolution of organizations formed pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934; and

(9) Federal contributions to the States pending the placing of the lands of the Indians on the tax rolls of the States.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives, together with its recommendations concerning the matters referred to in section 2, not later than the beginning of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on May 5, I submitted amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a statement I have prepared, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments, together with the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments, together with the statement, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, viz: On page 28, in line 25, strike out "sixty-two" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty."

On page 29, in line 3, strike out "sixty-two" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty"; in line 12, strike out "sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty"; and in line 15, strike out "sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty."

On page 29, following line 16, insert a new sentence, as follows: "Should such officer or employee so elect he may receive a deferred annuity beginning at the age of fifty-five years or thereafter, computed as above described, but reduced by one-half of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee is under the age of 60 years when the deferred annuity starts."

On page 29, in line 12, strike out "sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty-two"; and in line 15, strike out "sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty-two."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the bill S. 637, calendar No. 144, the so-called civil service retirement bill, which has been reported from the Senate Committee on Civil Service. I wish to discuss briefly one phase of this proposed legislation.

It is axiomatic in all sound theories of retirement that employees should receive equal treatment for equal service. Our military retirement system, and most private retirement systems, give equal treatment for each year served, once the employee has served the minimum number of years entitling him to an annuity. Not to do so clearly constitutes discrimination; and the Federal Government should not be guilty of discrimination in its treatment of its employees.

Under the bill S. 637, such discrimination and inequity would be created. Employees who might have served exactly the same number of years would receive different retirement benefits depending upon the age at which they completed 10 years or more of service, and whether they are voluntarily or involuntarily separated from the service.

Let me give an example. Assume the case of three Federal employees, each of whom entered the service of the Federal Government in 1937, 10 years ago. Suppose one of those employees is today 60 years old, and that each of the other two is 59. Suppose further that one of the two employees who is 59 is involuntarily separated from the service, because of a reduction in staff, and that the other employee who is 59 finds that because of his wife's health he must leave the Federal service and go to one of the States in the West, which has a more favorable climate. Assuming that the employee who is 60 desires to take advantage of his retirement privileges, we find this situation: The employee who is 60 can retire immediately and begin drawing his retirement benefits immediately. The employee who is 59 and who is involuntarily separated from the service can begin drawing his retirement benefits in 3 years, when he is 62. The employee who is 59 and who retires voluntarily must wait 6 years, until he is 65, before he can begin drawing his retirement benefits.

This is not an equitable situation. Once an employee has served the minimum number of years, he should be entitled to the same rights for each year served, irrespective of whether he is voluntarily or involuntarily separated.

The discrimination I have referred to constitutes a definite advantage for those Government employees who, during the war, left old-line agencies for higher-paying jobs in temporary agencies. This class of workers, who constitute the migrant workers in the Federal service, are now being separated from the service, involuntarily, in large numbers; and when so separated, they receive treatment much more favorable than the executives who remained in the old-line agencies, where their experience and training made them invaluable during the war, and who now wish to leave Government service voluntarily.

Certainly the men who resisted the inducements of higher pay, and stuck to their guns in the agency where they could best serve the Government, are entitled to treatment at least as good as those who followed the lure of higher pay wherever it might lead them.

It is not fair to say to such men, who have proved their loyalty to their agency in each instance, that the Government will now attempt to coerce them to continue in service by denying them their well-earned right to equal treatment for equal work.

There is another element of discrimination involved, one not spelled out in the bill, but inherent in its provisions. In the old-line, established agencies of the Federal Government, an employee whose work has been excellent has virtually no chance to receive an involuntary separation except through connivance with his superiors. The lower grades of Federal employees, clerical help and other low-paid workers, are seldom in a position where such connivance is possible. On the other hand, executive personnel is often apt to be in a position to arrange a separation which will be technically involuntary, and thus avoid the discrimination which S. 637 makes between voluntary and involuntary retirement. Such an inducement to connivance should not be created by legislation, and such an opportunity for inequitable handling of retirement, as between employees in executive positions and those in lower grades, should not be permitted.

We all know that one of the problems in Government service is the slowness of advancement, particularly as an employee works toward the top. This is a discouraging factor, to say the least. An attempt to coerce employees in the higher grades to continue in the Federal service, by creating retirement disadvantages if they do not do so, is by no means a solution to this problem. It would be far more enlightened to encourage employees who have reached the retirement age or who are financially able to retire to do so, thus opening the way for promotions all down the line. Such a course of action would be helpful in opening up higher-paid jobs for our returning veterans, and would certainly be beneficial to the morale of workers in all grades.

There is one other obvious injustice in the bill S. 637, to which I wish to refer. I spoke earlier of the assumed case of a man who found that, because of his wife's bad health, he had to move to another State. Now, suppose that man is only 54 years old. If he had been able to work one more year, he would have been able to pick up a reduced immediate pension at the age of 55. However, under the provisions of S. 637, if he is voluntarily separated from the Federal service, he will have to wait 11 years, until he is 65 years of age, before he can begin to receive his pension. There is nothing fair about that.

The important cost factor in retirement benefits is the age at which employees are to receive annuities, whether current annuities or deferred annuities. The matters of inequity, to which I have called the attention of the Senate, are of minor importance by comparison. When we consider further that the removal of these inequities would result in simplification and much more efficient administration of the law the only possible conclusion is that the inequities in question should be removed. The question of some slight additional cost to the retirement system, in giving equal treatment to both voluntary and involuntary retirement, is one which can only be raised by him who is willing to contend that the Federal Government should treat its employees unfairly in order to save a few dollars. We would not tolerate that kind of a philosophy in a private employer; we should not tolerate it in the Federal Government. The burden of proof is on those who want to coerce employees to remain in the Federal Government at a time when every effort is being made to curtail Government expenditures.

Employees who have worked for the Federal Government under the retirement law approved January 23, 1942, have a vested right to receive their deferred pension at the age of 62, if they voluntarily separate themselves from Government service. This vested right has been recognized in the bill S. 637, section 8 of which continues this right for those persons who have already separated themselves from the service under the provisions of the 1942 legislation. It is neither moral nor ethical for the Federal Government to now raise the age limit of 62 for

those employees who have not left the Federal Government, and who do not do so by the time this pending legislation is enacted. The violation of a covenant does not become either moral or ethical simply because it is done by legislation.

The major purpose of the bill S. 637 is to liberalize retirement benefits. It is incompatible with that purpose to break a covenant already made with employees now working, and take away from them retirement rights which they now have. It would be far more logical to provide for the commencement of retirement benefits at the age of 60, irrespective of whether a person is voluntarily or involuntarily separated from Government service.

I have prepared two proposed amendments to the bill S. 637, which have been printed.

The first of these two amendments would do what I have just proposed: It would substitute the age of 60 years, throughout the bill, as the age at which retirement benefits are to begin. It would also cover the case of an employee who is forced to retire voluntarily at an earlier age than the retirement age, by permitting him to begin drawing a reduced annuity at the age of 55, or thereafter, computed on an actuarial basis.

I think this amendment is entirely equitable, and I should be glad to see it adopted. However, I do not intend to press it. Speaking frankly, I have been told that the offering of any amendments to this bill would result in defeating the bill, and I should not wish to be responsible for such an eventuation.

The second amendment which I sent to the desk, and which has been printed, was not intended to be offered unless the first amendment should have been defeated. Since I have decided not to press the first amendment, neither shall I press the second.

This second amendment treats only with the discrimination and equity between voluntary and involuntary retirement; and its sole effect would be to provide that an employee who has served the number of years entitling him to receive retirement benefits can begin to receive those benefits at the age of 62, regardless of whether his retirement is voluntary or involuntary.

Employees who left their jobs with old-line Government agencies, during the time when OPA and other war agency staffs were being recruited, and took positions with the newer agencies at salary increases ranging from one-third to 40 or even 50 percent above the salaries they were previously receiving, and who now face involuntary separation from the service as the wartime agencies are liquidated, are actually getting a special bonus when their agency ceases to exist, by being allowed the full deferred annuity at the age of 62, while those who stayed on the job in the old-line agencies are told they cannot receive a deferred annuity until they reach the age of 65. The migrant workers got higher salaries all during the war years, and they will get higher retirement benefits because of those higher salaries.

Both voluntary and involuntary separation, except for cause, should receive the same treatment in the Government's retirement system. No logical argument to the contrary can be offered, and no such argument was offered at the hearings on the bill S. 637.

I have made this statement to the Senate because I had already sent forward these two amendments, and they had been printed at my request; and I felt the Senate was entitled to an explanation of why I had prepared these amendments and what they were designed to accomplish. I felt, also, that the Senate was entitled to notice that I have decided not to press these amendments.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 84. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 1467. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; and

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2331. An act to amend section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1179. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 1203. An act to provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; and

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3029. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2181. An act relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans; and

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes; and

H. R. 2573. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to produce and sell copies of aerial or other photographs and mosaics, and photographic or photostatic reproductions of records, on a reimbursement of appropriations basis; to the Committee on Public Lands.

LABOR LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of labor legislation delivered by him on May 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PLACE OF THE UNITED STATES IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the place of the United States in international relations, delivered by Senator HATCH, at the University of North Carolina, May 8, 1947, under the auspices of the International Relations Club of the University, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE ADVERTISEMENTS—STATEMENT OF DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to Senate bill 265, prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, made by Dr. Clinton N. Howard before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For the Sake of Peace and Safety," published in the Chicago Herald-American of May 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IS CONGRESS ANTILABOR?—EDITORIAL FROM MAGAZINE AMERICA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Congress Antilabor?" from the magazine America, for April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S BROADCAST TO RUSSIA—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Henry Wallace Affair," by John Crosby, published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "People's Presidents," published in the Boston Herald of May 12 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY — EDITORIAL FROM UNION (MANCHESTER, N. H.)

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Union (Manchester, N. H.), which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to be absent from the Senate for a period of 1 week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent for the remainder of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, having been called to my State by the Governor of my State for a conference pertaining to State welfare, I ask to be excused from attendance on the Senate for the next 2 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate for a few days beginning this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration may be authorized to hold a session this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

CLAIMS BILL OF LOUISE S. PAGE, AND STATEMENT OF PRECEDENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am the chairman, I desire to make a brief statement in connection with our consideration of Senate bill 676, "For the relief of Louise S. Page," which was referred to the Judiciary Committee on February 21, 1947. This is a claim bill arising in tort, and the cause of action arose on April 30, 1945.

I made a point of order against consideration of the bill in the committee for the following reasons:

Section 131 of Public Law 601 provides that—

No private bill or resolution * * * authorizing or directing (1) the payment of money for property damages, for personal injuries or death for which suit may be instituted under the Federal Tort Claims Act * * * shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Section 410 (a) provides—

Subject to the provisions of this title, the United States district court for the district wherein the plaintiff is resident or wherein the act or omission complained of occurred, * * * shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on any claim against the United States, for money only, accruing on and after January 1, 1945 * * * on account of personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment.

This bill seeks to compensate Mrs. Louise S. Page, of Columbus, Ga., in the amount of $11,114.56, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and hospital and medical expenses incurred by her as a result of an accident which occurred when she attempted to prevent her grandson from being dragged across a highway by a parachute attached to a United States Army paratrooper who was landing from a jump, at the municipal airport, Columbus, Ga., on April 30, 1945.

The basis for submission of the bill, contrary to the specific language of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, cited above, seems to be that the War Department denies that the injuries to Mrs. Page occurred as the result of any negligence on the part of any officer, agent, or employee of the United States.

The committee is of the belief that it is not within the jurisdiction of either the War Department or the committee to make this determination. The law plainly provides that the United States district court "shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on any claim against the United States, for money only, accruing on and after January 1, 1945."

The committee has, therefore, voted to postpone indefinitely any further consideration of this bill; and I wish to state to the Senators that it is my belief that this action establishes a committee precedent, and that in the future any bills introduced which fall within the limitation of the point of order made by me will not be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, House Joint Resolution 153, and I ask that the joint resolution be read by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance for countries devastated by war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $350,000,000 for the provision of relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, such relief assistance to be limited to the following: Food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed.

SEC. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948, and except that not more than 6 percent of the amount herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used for the procurement of supplies outside the United States and its Territorial possessions.

(b) In carrying out this joint resolution, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the providing of such relief assistance, including expenses of or incident to the procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment of supplies transferred under subsection (a) or of supplies purchased from credits established under subsection (a).

(c) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to this joint resolution may be allocated for any of the purposes of this joint resolution to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, or independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(d) When any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government receives request from the government of any country for which credits have been established under subsection (a) and receives, from credits so established, advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses, it may furnish, or procure and furnish (if advancements are made), supplies within the category of relief assistance as defined in section 1 and may use sums so received for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section. When any such reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

SEC. 3. No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such

country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnished promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution; and (h) all supplies transferred pursuant to this joint resolution or acquired through the use of credits established pursuant to this joint resolution and any articles processed from such supplies, or the containers of such supplies or articles, shall, to the extent practicable, be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled in a conspicuous place or legibly, indelibly, and permanently as the nature of such supplies, articles, or containers will permit in such maner as to indicate to the ultimate consumer in such country that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance; or if such supplies, articles, or containers are incapable of being so marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, that all practicable steps are taken to inform the ultimate consumers thereof that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance.

SEC. 4. When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, and (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3.

With respect to the furnishing of relief assistance to the countries in Europe pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an administrator who shall direct the supervision in Europe of such relief assistance. Such administrator shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any necessary expenses, as the President shall determine. He shall act in accordance with the instructions of the President.

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines (1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by thi joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out, (3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country, or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

(b) Relief assistance to the people of any country, under this joint resolution, shall, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

SEC. 6. To the extent that relief supplies procured with funds appropriated pursuant to this joint resolution are not furnished on terms of repayment in dollars, they shall be furnished only upon condition that the government of the receiving country agree that when it sells such relief supplies for local currency (a) the amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account; (b) such account will be used within such country, as a revolving fund, until June 30, 1948, only upon the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States, for relief and work relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief; and (c) any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1948, will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as the United States Government, pursuant to act or joint resolution of the Congress, may determine.

SEC. 7. The authority of the President under sections 2, 3, and 4 may, to the extent the President directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 8. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities under authority of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Doing Our Part," from the New Haven Journal-Courier of Monday, May 5. In view of the measure the Senate is about to consider, I think it appropriate that this editorial be in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOING OUR PART

In the displaced persons camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy are existing some 850,000 former nationals of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Polish Ukraine, and Czechoslovakia. In large part, they continue in cheerless barracks that formerly housed Hitler's SS troops or other makeshift quarters, as "men without a country," because they are antitotalitarians who cannot go home without risk of firing squad or prison. They represent a great living challenge to the announced purposes of the United Nations: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person."

Regarding these unfortunate people, who are victims of ideological rather than shooting war, President Truman has erred in understatement, if anything, when he said: "I do not think that the United States has done its part." We must all admit, with considerable shame, that our fortunate country has done much less than its part. In fact, we have done practically nothing. On several occasions, in fact, we have appeared in a hypocritical light when we have officially urged upon other countries the duty of receiving DP's to whom we have so far shown the cold shoulder.

By the Immigration Act of 1924, immigration to this country, on the quota plan, is limited to 153,929 aliens a year. Great Britain never uses her full quota of 65,000, Germany and Austria are allowed 26,000, and the remainder is distributed among some 60 countries. The quotas are not cumulative, but expire at the end of each year. The number of unused quotas has exceeded 100,000 in every year except one since 1931.

The President has asked Congress to show some leadership in the form of new legislation which would admit a reasonable number of displaced persons. Large numbers of them have industrial, agricultural, and other skills which could be highly useful here. All of them, it may be assumed, have that independence of spirit and appreciation of democracy which should make them good members of a democratic society.

UNRRA, which is to terminate in less than 2 months, has administered the DP camps, the International Refugee Organization is not yet a going concern as only 11 of the required 15 nations have joined and its budget is therefore not yet provided. Even after IRO begins to function, it can do nothing for resettlement of the DP's unless friendly nations are willing to open their doors.

Senator MCMAHON is to be commended for his interest and leadership in this urgent matter. He has introduced two bills, one of which would make available unused portions of German quotas to nationals of countries overrun by German troops. The other would make effective the unused quotas of the war years in 10 percent installments in each of the next 10 years. Other proposals which lie buried in congressional committees include the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 DP's over a 4-year period and the Ives and Javits bills to admit DP war orphans of 14 years and younger.

There is no question involved of letting down immigration bars to a flood of immigrants such as poured in annually in the half-century preceding passage of the existing Immigration Act. No honest thinker can doubt that we could absorb with ease—and profit to our economic and civic life—the modest numbers proposed in the bills filed by Senator MCMAHON and others. The example of opening our doors to a fair share of these unsettled and desirable people would be the best possible way of influencing other countries to accept some new settlers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall present the case for the joint resolution with great brevity. It should require no salesmanship. Its necessity speaks for itself. It is indispensable to the helpless lives of millions of war victims who can look only to America for even the minimums of relief which we here provide. It is indispensable to any hope or any plan for a democratic postwar world. Without it, famine and disease and disaster will stalk a desperate European countryside during the immediate months to come. These are the inevitable elements of revolution. These are the sinister agents of physical, moral, social, and finally political disintegration. The joint resolution is an assault on disintegration at its source.

It therefore not only irresistibly appeals to our humanities, an appeal to which traditional America never yet has turned a deaf ear, but it also irresistibly appeals to the logic and the hard-headed common sense with which American foreign policy pursues security and peace in a free world of free men.

There, in a nutshell, Senators, is the challenge in this relief measure.

As long ago as last January Secretary of State Marshall put this relief measure down as No. 1 on his list of 27 legislative proposals in the area of foreign relations. It is that important as a matter of American public policy, entirely aside from its overriding American appeal.

This is May. The last UNRRA shipment has left our shores. New harvests are not available over yonder until late fall. There are deadly zero hours and zero days ahead. Make no mistake, they

can be dangerous also for us. Surely, Senators will agree that it must not be said of what we now do, "Too little and too late."

Without this measure there is no use in trying to save Greece, as both Houses of Congress have voted overwhelmingly to do, because this relief is specifically at the base of our Greek plan. Without this measure there is no use in professing our Italian friendship, because this relief is specifically fundamental to Italy's destiny, whether we write peace treaties or not. Indeed, without this measure hunger will substitute for statesmanship in setting the grim pattern for tomorrow over these and other areas, to an incalculable extent; and that is what the joint resolution is about.

Mr. President, I believe these are axioms. I shall let them stand as such. But I want my colleagues to have all possible information regarding the details of the joint resolution. I shall now confine myself to these explanations, and I shall be very glad to be interrupted at any time, as I proceed briefly to discuss the measure itself.

Mr. President, all Senators probably are mindful of the fact that the joint resolution, which has already passed the House of Representatives, in amended form, by an overwhelming majority, deals with a situation which we inherit when UNRRA goes out of business. It is written to meet not only the responsibilities which we inherit in the aftermath of UNRRA, but it is written in the light of our experience with UNRRA, deliberately and specifically to avoid all those things which happened under UNRRA, to the great dissatisfaction of large elements of Congress and the country.

When the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations met, the question arose fundamentally as to what should be done by way of meeting the relief necessities which still remain to be confronted in the aftermath of the war. There were those who insisted that UNRRA, in one form or another, should be extended and expanded. It was the position of the delegation of the United States that there would be no further life given to UNRRA; on the contrary, that hereafter the major governments of the world which have the capacity to help in the relief field should act on their own responsibility, with integrated advice, through the central functioning of the United Nations, but each major nation acting on its own.

As one of the American delegation at New York in the Second General Assembly, I, with others, strongly took the position that I felt very sure it was the attitude of the American Congress that UNRRA must end, and that there must be no request, no quest of any nation, for a renewal of UNRRA, so far as the Congress of the United States was concerned. I based that appeal, among other things, on the fact that the last time an UNRRA measure passed this body, I gave my Senatorial colleagues my own word that never again would I ask for another UNRRA bill.

Mr. President, there was much controversy in the General Assembly over precisely what course should be followed, but the General Assembly finally decided that the procedure as favored by the Government of the United States should be followed, and, as a result, a general survey committee was appointed, solely for the purpose of assessing the remaining needs which had to be confronted during 1947, up to New Year's of 1948, in the area of relief; in the war liberated areas, particularly of Europe, with some reference to China. Mr. President, it is as a result of that decision that the pending measure presents itself to the Congress.

I challenge particularly the attention of my colleagues to the fact, as I proceed, that I think they will find every criticism which has ever been made against UNRRA categorically answered in the text of the pending measure. That has been the effort not only of the House committee but of the Senate committee in writing the joint resolution.

When the survey was made to find out what the war-relief needs, which it is necessary to meet, would probably amount to for the calendar year 1947, very careful on-the-spot surveys were made by the agricultural and economic experts attached to the United States Embassies abroad. There were also available the calculations of a committee of experts established by the United Nations. There were also data gathered by a subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council, which toured the devastated areas. There were also the findings of a number of FAO survey missions. There was also the great fund of information available in the United States Department of Agriculture. As a result of this accumulation of information and material, using all the data, and applying a severe test of criteria, which takes into account—and I emphasize this statement—only the most elementary necessities, it was concluded that minimum relief needs in Austria, China, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and Trieste, during 1947, would be roughly $600,000,000. Recovery in other countries has proceeded to the point where, as to the basic necessities involved in the joint resolution and within its contemplation, it is believed that they can take care of themselves. Other countries cannot take care of themselves, either as a matter of the humanities or as a matter of fundamental governmental stabilities which flow as a matter of course, under the circumstances.

The United Nations Expert Committee therefore estimated the needs for 1947, exclusive of China, at $583,000,000. The pending joint resolution, it is indicated in its text, includes China; so that Senators confront a need represented by the round figure of $600,000,000. These needs, I repeat, were figured on a basis of bare subsistence, in order to feed people at a level of from 2,000 to 2,200 calories a day, and only to prevent retrogression that would threaten a supply of the basic essentials of life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the latter observation, and I should like to ask a further question. Is there to be found anywhere in the House report or hearings any testimony or evidence justifying the sum of $610,000,000, which was suggested by United Nations, and which, according to my understanding, is the basis of the $350,000,000 allocation requested by the President?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senate committee held no public hearings on the bill, because the House hearings were so extensive. We confined our hearings essentially to a discussion of the technical problems involved, with the technical experts from the Government departments, and particularly we gave our attention to a considerable series of consultations with ex-President Herbert Hoover, who had recently returned, as the Senator knows, from a survey in Europe. The $600,000,000, I can only repeat to the Senator, which is a few dollars larger than the actual figure, is the figure reported by the technical committee of experts raised by United Nations. I think the Senator will find testimony respecting its justification in the House hearings. I cannot give him the reference at the moment, but I shall undertake to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not find the Hoover report in the House hearings.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose the Senator lets me come to a discussion of our share of the $600,000,000; because I can be more definite about that. The question arose of course, immediately, as to what our share of the $600,000,000 would be. Senators are familiar with the fact that, under UNRRA, for the past 2 years we have contributed a total of $2,700,000,000 in relief. It is rather difficult to divide that specifically into calendar years, but, speaking not too roughly, indeed, rather accurately, as a matter of fact, our expenditures for 2 years have been approximately $1,300,000,000, perhaps $1,350,000,000, a year. That has been 72 percent of the total expenditure of UNRRA.

I call attention to the fact, therefore, that when we accept for ourselves an assessment of 58 percent instead of 72 percent of $600,000,000, we find ourselves accepting in round figures a contribution of $350,000,000 which compares with $1,350,000,000 of last year; so that the first definite point I want to leave very clear in the minds of the Senate is the fact that, under the alternative method which we have insisted should be followed, and in the light of bettered circumstances which exist in many of the previously stricken areas in Europe, we find ourselves confronting a request for $350,000,000 instead of $1,300,000,000.

Coming back to the question of the Senator from Nebraska, the justification of our $350,000,000 becomes a justification of our 58 percent, as against 72 percent for the year previous. That is a matter quite beyond any yardstick that can be demonstrated to be equitable. At best it is an educated guess as to what our share should be. I can only say that in the opinion of ex-President Hoover, the figure in our bill should be $350,000,000, even though he feels that there are economies that can be effected. That is indicated by his definite and specific recommendation. The recommendation of his chief expert, Dr. Fitzgerald,

which is in the record, is a further categorical justification of the estimates.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. To my mind that is the justification. I could not find the report in the House hearings, nor did I find it mentioned, nor could I find the figures in either the Senate report or the House report on the bill. I am speaking now about the information received from ex-President Hoover and Dr. Fitzgerald, the expert who went to the various countries with Mr. Hoover, to assist in his examination of the situation. Getting back to the figures the distinguished Senator gave in the justification, I also gathered, from what was said by Mr. Clayton, of the State Department, in his attempt to support his figures, that he justified UNRRA. Of course, as I understand, our proportion of the total amount provided for UNRRA was about two and one-half billion dollars. Is that not correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That was our part.

Mr. WHERRY. That was our contribution. It is my understanding that the $350,000,000 proposed to be authorized shall be expended solely for food——

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. WHERRY. And medicine and fertilizer and several other items. UNRRA's distributions went beyond food. As I recall, about half of all its expenditures went for food, and the remainder went for machinery and equipment and materials to help rehabilitate devastated countries. In other words, to me it is difficult to see where the justification has been made by the State Department. I certainly feel, and I want the distinguished Senator to know, that the justification made by former President Hoover is necessary in helping me to make up my mind. I am glad to have the statement made by the Senator from Michigan, for I could not find the figures anywhere in the record.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figure suggested by the General Assembly was $650,000,000, was it not?

Mr. WHERRY. $610,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think so.

Mr. FERGUSON. When they debated the subject did they include any other items than food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seeds, which are the items at present in the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so.

Mr. FERGUSON. So when we consider the total amount provided for UNRRA, many other items were included for distribution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; there is no doubt about that.

I think perhaps if Senators will permit me to proceed with a description of the various methods which we have embraced in an effort to tie down this particular appropriation they will be better satisfied with my explanation and perhaps I shall anticipate some of their points of view.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want my colleague to understand clearly that my questions do not imply any criticism of the measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that, and I want to say again that I wish to be interrupted at any moment, because if I can answer any questions I desire to answer them.

Mr. WHERRY. I also want the Senator to know that the questions I asked were not asked in the spirit of criticism.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure of that.

Mr. WHERRY. I intend to support the joint resolution. I feel that direct relief is the way in which to proceed; I concur wholeheartedly in the recommendations which are made for the spending of this money in a direct manner; but I am very much interested in the restrictions, and so forth, which the Senator is about to explain to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want particularly to emphasize, because I think it goes to the question of the integrity of the figure. No one can lay down a rule of thumb to justify the figure. It must be justified by the precautions which are required to make sure that its integrity is protected, and so I emphasize the precautions as my chief answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely want to have one matter clarified. As I understood the Senator a few moments ago he said that during the past 2 years we spent $1,350,000,000 on UNRRA. Is that amount for each year?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Averaging that each year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For 2 years?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That makes $2,700,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. It is for a little more than 2 years, but speaking roughly it can be allocated in that fashion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I merely wanted to confirm, if any words of mine could confirm, a statement of the Senator from Michigan, that while Mr. Hoover was before the committee he repeatedly made it clear to the members of the committee that he had no objection whatsoever to the total amount of expenditure which we authorize. He did have some suggestion to make as to the purposes for which the expenditures should be made, and he specifically made suggestions as to limitations upon where the money might be spent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand from the report accompanying the joint resolution, that other countries will probably be asked to contribute, or perhaps already have stated that they would advance certain funds for relief purposes. Will the funds and supplies furnished by the United States be administered solely and wholly by an agency created under this joint resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Entirely, solely, exclusively, conclusively, and in no other way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator able to state how the supplies furnished by other countries will be distributed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the same fashion, with coordination in the field.

Mr. ELLENDER. So as to prevent duplication?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the House measure, as I understand, the various countries to be afforded aid were named.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator withhold that phase of the discussion for a moment until I can finish the particular part of it on which we are now engaged, because the Senator refers to a very important phase, and I want to discuss it by itself in a moment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason I asked the question at this time is that I will be obliged to leave the floor of the Senate in a short while, but it is perfectly agreeable to me that the Senator proceed as he suggested.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Whenever the Senator must leave, if I have not already reached that point, if he then will direct his question to me I shall detour for the purpose of answering it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I particularly want to answer in consecutive detail if I can, the fundamental inquiry submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska, repeating for myself that I think the schedule of our precautions is the eloquent answer to the question, rather than an effort to try to figure out mathematically what our precise share of things is.

I do not need to recount the bases of criticism from which have arisen the very definite congressional antipathy for any further life for UNRRA. We are all familiar with them. I want to say that in spite of those criticisms, in spite of the bad spots in the UNRRA record, it certainly must be said that UNRRA, nevertheless, served the high humanities in a desperately essential way, and has many very great credit marks upon its record which must not be overlooked when we rather concentrate our case at the moment on the things we do not like in the record. There are many things we do not like. There are infinitely many more things which are well worthy of praise and justification. But it is the things we do not like and it is the criticisms which are so totally legitimate against the things that happened under UNRRA which are, I repeat, at the base of the effort which has been made by the committees, both in the House and Senate, to put the resolution on such a basis that Congress can be content with the prospectus.

In the first place, as the Senator has already indicated, relief under this measure is absolutely confined to food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seeds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me add one more sentence. There is no opportunity for the latitudes which were available to UNRRA in its administration, latitudes which of themselves were largely responsible for many of the difficulties and criticisms which arose.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are no restrictions in the joint resolution as to where these supplies are to come from, are there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I shall reach that point in just a moment.

Let me call attention to the specific protections in the joint resolution which have been put in for the reason I have indicated, to make absolutely sure that we were meeting every criticism which Congress has heretofore raised in respect to the administration of foreign relief.

In the first place, there will be no discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief in the distribution of relief supplies in the recipient countries. That is a general rule of conduct upon which we would all insist.

Secondly, United States officials and representatives of the press and radio will be permitted to observe freely and report fully regarding the use of relief supplies. In other words, from start to finish, this process must be in the full light of day, and open to the total scrutiny of the American press and any other American inquiry which seeks to pursue it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the joint resolution provide that the United States shall retain ownership in the food until it reaches the local level, or are we to distribute it as UNRRA distributed it, to the boundary line of the recipient country?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall reach that point in just a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will permit another observation, that point seems to me to be highly important, in view of the statement just made with respect to one of the safeguards, that United States officials and representatives of the press and radio shall be permitted to observe freely and report fully regarding the use of relief supplies. They should be permitted to go into the recipient countries and there check the food supplies, the needs, and also the distribution. With that statement in mind, having myself been in the territories involved, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if he feels that we shall be able to observe freely if we lose control of the ownership of the food at the boundary line of the recipient country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe that under the requirements which I have already read, and those which are still to follow, it will be possible to have, perhaps not 100 percent success in a venture of this sort, but as complete and effective control as it is humanly possible to provide.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before any distribution of the supplies is made will any steps be taken by the Commission, or whoever is to handle the allocation, to determine into what countries food and material are to be sent, and on what basis? It may be possible that only a few countries will receive the bulk of this relief unless a survey is made in advance of the needs of all countries concerned. I am wondering the extent to which our Government will go into that question before making any distribution whatever.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The survey has been made. Before I finish I shall give the Senator the specific allocations, in dollars and cents, to the countries which are to receive the relief.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom was the survey made?

Mr. VANDENBERG. By all the various authorities to which I have referred, including most recently the Hoover survey, but including also reports of agricultural and economic experts attached to United States embassies abroad; the calculations of the Committee of Experts established by the United Nations; the data gathered by a subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council which toured the devastated areas; the findings of a number of FAO survey missions; and the general fund of information which has been collected on the subject by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any countries which were not surveyed, and in which funds may be allocated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. When we get through with the specific commitments to various countries, there is a latitude of $15,000,000 out of $350,000,000 for unallocated, unanticipated necessities. While this latitude is not written into the joint resolution, it is written in the bond. I might as well discuss countries with the Senator. I see that that is what he wishes to talk about.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know specifically in what countries these surveys have been made, unless the Senator has already mentioned them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will be patient enough to let me detour from his questions, I shall come to the question raised by the Senator from Louisiana, although I am sorry that I cannot first lay the total foundation, because to me the total foundation is so impressive, when we confront the entire framework of the precautions and protections which have been erected, that really the ultimate minutiae of the situation become highly secondary, I am sure, in the mind of every man when the whole story is laid before him.

Mr. ELLENDER I suggest to the Senator that he proceed in his own way and not take a detour at this moment to satisfy me. I believe that this subject is of sufficient importance for me to cancel the engagement which I had previously made and I will listen to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator very much. I want the Senator to have all the information he asked for, and I intend to give it to him.

I was discussing the things which are categorically and textually required before any relief is granted. These things are required continuously throughout the administration of the relief.

I had just finished mentioning the fact that representatives of the Government of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States must have absolute freedom of observation and report in connection with the entire operation. That has a substantial bearing upon what happens in some of the countries which may be involved, because there can be no "iron curtain" between this relief and our information with respect to it.

In order further to emphasize that point, the joint resolution provides that—

> Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

So not only is the operation itself wholly and totally disclosed by way of protection, but for the first time the people in the areas receiving the supplies are guaranteed information as to where they come from. There must be continuous information available to them as to whence this relief comes, instead of some of the very unhappy and unfortunate situations which we know existed under UNRRA.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the food is sold to the recipient country, as it now is——

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will wait a moment, I shall reach that point in a moment. If I have succeeded in answering the Senator's questions up to date, I shall move on.

Mr. WHERRY. Not quite.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then let me continue. I have just discussed the necessity for full and continuous publicity. The next provision in the joint resolution is as follows:

> If food, medical supplies, fertilizers, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues.

In other words, we are not going to compete with an export market in respect to the things which we are furnishing by way of relief.

The next requirement is that "such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who determines that condition?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That provision is somewhat nebulous, but it is an injunction to good faith on the part of those to whom we are giving the relief, and an instruction to our own administrators that if they do not find reason-

able good faith in that aspect, relief should not be given.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it contemplated to force compliance with such a requirement before relief is granted? It seems to me that that would probably be the case under clause (e) on page 11 which the Senator has adverted to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Everything I am saying to the Senate is required by way of assurance before any relief is granted whatever. I refer to the first sentence of section 3 on page 10——

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be up to the agency of our Government which makes the distribution to see to it that such steps are taken?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And if such steps are not taken relief can and will be refused?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us say that there is a government which is dominated by Russia and that the policy of the officials of that country is dictated by Russia. How is it known that there will be such distribution of food? Let me give an illustration. The distinguished Senator well knows, and certainly Mr. Hoover well knows, that UNRRA supplies were furnished to countries which took ownership at the border and then diverted food supplies thus obtained to the armies of Russia. They did more than that. Puppet officials, carrying out the orders of Russia, took the indigenous food supply which should have been used for local relief, and diverted it to the armies of Russia. So UNRRA had to step in and supplement that food. I hope the distinguished Senator will answer this question, which I think is very important. There is a difference between what the House did and what the Senate did, and I am asking for the justification for it. I think that if we are to supply food to the people who need it and should have it we must control the food at the local level and not release it at the boundaries and distribute it as it has been distributed in the past.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I answer the question now.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that the Senator read section 4 of the bill, which I have not yet reached. I am afraid that my explanations are proceeding too slowly. Section 4 reads as follows:

When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution—

Mind you, this is another series of protections in addition to those which I had started to read and which I have not even yet had an opportunity to conclude. These are additional protections. I am coming to the question of the Senator, because I want him to be happy about it. I read further from section 4:

When supplies are transferred or otherwise made available to any country pursuant to this joint resolution, the President shall cause representatives of the Government of the United States (1) to supervise the distribution of such supplies among the people of such country, (2) to observe and report with respect to the carrying out of the assurances given to the President pursuant to section 3.

It is impossible for us to set up a relief organization which follows the food to the mouth of the final recipient. It would require an army of administrators that would certainly be totally unwelcome to a Congress which is undertaking to demobilize similar institutions in the United States. The relief, however, in its final phases is distributed through the agents of the government in the country involved. Every moment down to that final second when it goes to the final consumer, it is under the mandate of this joint resolution, to be under the supervision, observation, and report of representatives of the Government of the United States.

I submit to the Senator that that is about as far as we can go in writing the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator be patient with me and permit me to ask another question, which I hope will not "detour" him?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the understanding that representatives of the government will administer this relief as UNRRA has administered relief, namely, that the food shall be sold to local units within the Government who will in turn redistribute it to the local grocery stores and then to the people? Is that the object of the joint resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will answer that question. That is covered by still another section of the bill to which I will jump in order to keep abreast of my friend's questions.

It is the expectation that perhaps from 15 to 20 percent of the relief supplied through this joint resolution will have to go to indigents from whom no payment of any nature will be received, although it is hoped that some sort of work-relief formula may be established even in connection with that matter. With regard to the remainder, which would constitute 80 or 85 percent of the supplies, it is to be distributed by the instrumentalities of local governments through the regular channels of distribution for local currency; and we are advised by those who know and in whom we have a right to place our confidence that the necessity, up to perhaps 80 percent of these needs, is not a lack of local currency to pay for the supplies; it is the impossibility of getting the supplies at all. The Senator will realize that when this process proceeds there is immediately a revenue from the sale of the relief supplies. Heretofore that has been another point at which there has been even more dangerous maladministration.

What happens under this joint resolution? There has to be an agreement before the relief process starts. In fact, the relief is furnished only upon condition that the government of the receiving country agrees that when it sells such relief supplies for local currency—and this applies to about 80 percent—

(a) The amounts of such local currency will be deposited by it in a special account.

That is something new.

(b) Such account shall be used within such country, as a revolving fund, until June 30, 1948, only upon the approval of the duly authorized representative of the United States, for relief and work-relief purposes, including local currency expenses of the United States incident to the furnishing of relief.

In other words, those funds can be used up to the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1948, as a revolving fund under our administration for further relief purposes and for the payment of our administrative expenditures. But the funds are constantly under the control of the Government of the United States, and at the end of the fiscal year any unencumbered balance remaining in such account, namely, the account that is to cover 80 percent of this distribution, "will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as the United States Government, pursuant to act or joint resolution of the Congress, may determine."

I submit to the able Senator from Nebraska that I have read him something new by way of detailed and persistent effort to surround the operation of this relief system with adequate protection to the very last second of the operation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. In addition to what the Senator has already said, is it not true that the President is authorized at any time when he finds conditions to be justifiable, to stop all relief given to any country whenever he finds, as I say, that the terms and conditions under which the relief was given are not being met?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is true. That is in a section of the joint resolution to which I shall return in order to complete my answer to the original question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point which has been made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. WHITE] that the President has the right to terminate this relief if it is found that the conditions over there are not as they should be, is new. I think that is a good provision in the joint resolution. It is different from UNRRA, because we will now be in control of our own distribution, and if the food does not get to where it is intended the President can terminate relief. I think that is an excellent provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator, when he parallels this resolution and the program of UNRRA at any point or in any part, will say that this is not only an improvement, but a total answer to the criticisms which have heretofore been leveled at the method of distribution.

Mr. WHERRY. It is, indeed, a decided improvement; and that is one of the reasons why I am supporting the joint resolution. But I should like to point out

to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the method of distribution provided by the joint resolution is practically the same as that used for UNRRA supplies in the countries I visited. In other words, they had a pool, for example, in Austria, where there is an American sector or an American occupied territory, and the pool is used to help stabilize the currency.

However, the point I make is that the minute the food reaches the boundary of that country, the country buys the food—please understand that—and then it is distributed through the wholesaler to the small groceryman, who in turn holds the cards which the consumers use in getting their supplies. While it is true that 15 or 20 percent of the food goes to people who are on relief and have little white cards which entitle them to food amounting to a certain number of calories, and they get it, yet, as the distinguished Senator has already pointed out, 80 percent of the food is sold to help the local governments. I am not complaining of that; I think it is a good thing. But I point out that the moment the food reaches the boundary lines, the country assumes control of the food.

I can point out to the Senator instances in which, time and again, in occupied Austria the indigenous food supply was taken away from the people of that country, with the result that supplemental feeding by UNRRA was required. Of course, at that time no check was made, whereas under the provisions of this joint resolution we are supposed to have absolute freedom to go into that country and see that the food reaches the places it should reach; and that will be a decided improvement. When the food changes hands at the boundary, rather than at the local level in the cases I observed, and from the testimony adduced at the hearings which I attended, it seems that the food goes to the governments, instead of to the people who need it for relief.

A few minutes ago I talked on the floor of the Senate to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]; and, as I recall, he showed me a press dispatch from the Des Moines Register, calling attention to the fact that Rumania had diverted 400 carloads of flour to a puppet Russian Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; it was to Russia itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; what is the difference?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is worse.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the distinguished Senator put the release in the RECORD, because I am asking the Senator—and that was the reason for my original question—how the food supply will be controlled if it is released at the boundary line, and what assurance there will be that in regard to the countries we are trying to help—and I understand that one is Poland and another is Hungary; that they will receive supplies, or at least that is the supposition—the old system under UNRRA will not be used, and the food will go for the purpose we intend it to go when we appropriate the $350,000,000?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator now?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and I hope I have made myself clear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes; but I shall start over again.

We have put into this measure one provision after another placing upon our American administrators the responsibility of protecting the integrity of this distribution down to its finality. In the last analysis, we are at the mercy of a human element in Government, no matter what department of it we inspect.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no way to write a law which will make even the office force of a United States Senator operate in the way the Senator wishes it to operate. I submit that all we can do is to do what has been provided for; and in doing that we shall be doing things which, I repeat, have never been done before. There is no question, as I think I demonstrated unequivocally some time ago, that under this measure there will be no chance for such a thing to happen as the diversion of flour out of Rumania, for the benefit of Russia, to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred. That would instantly stop the entire process with respect to Rumania, although I point out that Rumania is not on this particular list. If anything of that sort were to happen anywhere, it would instantly suspend the entire operation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is so under the categorical requirements of this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there are many more protections—I simply wish to keep the Senator from Louisiana in suspense to that extent—there are many other protections which we have provided, and to which I shall refer, if I ever get around to referring to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the method of distribution, it will be somewhat similar to that utilized by Great Britain when we sent lend-lease supplies to that country. The food was received by the British Government for which we were given an I O U and it was sold to the wholesale stores, and the wholesale stores in turn sold the supplies to the retail stores who in turn sold the supplies to the consuming public. The British Government was paid for those goods by the wholesalers at the same prices charged by our Government and profits were made by the wholesalers and the retailers, and also, of course, by the British Government. I should like to ask the Senator whether there will be any restrictions as to which stores will handle the food. Will the stores be supervised by the government of the country in which the food will be distributed, or just exactly what will be done after the food reaches that country? I refer to the 80 percent of the food that I understand may be so distributed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to answer the Senator's question, except as I know the local method of food distribution in each particular country. Whatever the food distribution system is, it will be used, insofar as anyone has the ways and means to pay for the relief. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would wish it paid for, if there is any possibility of having it paid for.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that; but——

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, let me say that the difference between the situation under the pending measure and the one which was described as occurring in the past is the precise difference that we tried to cover in the final formula I read to the Senator regarding the handling of the credits which result from the sale; and we are doing the precise thing which we are trying to do here because of the experience which the Senator describes in regard to what happened yesterday, and we are taking these steps in the hope that that will not be repeated.

But I ask the Senator to consider that the fact that it happened before now should not rob us of confidence in this measure, when our purpose is to see that the very thing the Senator has mentioned shall not happen again.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the fact remains that the American people, as well as the Congress, wish to provide relief to those who need it, and if we send this food abroad and if it is to be distributed by the wholesalers and retailers in Greece and in Turkey, and wherever else it is to be allocated, profits will be made in that process, but if there is no control as to how much the food will be sold for it may be that much of the food will not find its way into the hands of those who most need it. It may be used in black markets. Those better able to buy it may get all the benefits.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I repeatedly read to the Senator the provisions which require the representatives of the relief administration of the United States to follow the administration of this aid right down to its finality; I have read him the provisions which require total publicity respecting the total distribution down to the finality; I have read him the requirements that there shall be no discrimination in respect to its distribution down to the finality; I have read him the provisions which require American newspaper reporters to be entitled to follow it down to its finality; and I have read him the requirements which put the American relief administrators under the obligation of protecting this system against the things concerning which the Senator has complained.

I submit to the Senator that that is all anyone can do in the text of a relief bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question that it is a decided improvement. But let us not call it a relief bill because much of the food is not going to find its way to the people who really need it—people who cannot buy it because they do not have the funds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have said to the Senator that that portion of the population which cannot buy is to be served by an allocation for which they do not have to pay.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is only 15 to 20 percent of the entire amount.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the estimate of all that is required for those purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means from reports made?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not so bad as I thought it was.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, there is one very difficult problem of administration, and, after all, with the explanation the distinguished Senator has made, the question comes down to this: It will be just as good as the administration, and that puts terrific responsibility upon the Government officials to see that the funds are properly administered. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I underwrite that 100 percent. In the same connection, I wish to say that Senators are catechising me on this measure as though I owned the preferred stock in this corporation, or something of the kind. I submit that there are some limitations upon what can be put down in black and white by way of a warrant to meet all the suspicions and highly justified criticisms which the Senator has respecting previous relief adventures. But I will ask the Senator to read page after page after page of the new precautions in the proposed legislation, against the record of yesterday and the day before.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I appreciate very much his answers to the many questions asked. I think that in making the record the distinguished Senator wants all the membership of the Senate to know the purposes for which the $350,000,000 is being appopriated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that any constructive criticism some of us might make with the idea of getting explanations and interpretations in the RECORD would be most illuminating, in the event, for instance, of an occurrence in a country getting the relief such as that mentioned in the Des Moines newspaper to which I referred. I am sure the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the event such a thing happened, would agree that the President has authority to terminate immediately any relief to that country. It seems to me that the pending measure goes a long way toward the proper distribution of foodstuffs to people in continental Europe. It represents a radical departure from our relief experiences in Europe under UNRA.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with that.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to pay the Senator a high compliment, inasmuch as apparently he has accepted presidency of this organization for the purpose of castigation. I think anything that can be done to place the administration of the proposed fund and the distribution of the food on the local level is very desirable.

Let me proceed for a moment with an observation which points to the very thing the Senator from Louisiana was discussing. I found in Wiener Neustadt, which is in Russian-occupied Austria, that some persons carried a small white card which entitled them to what we call direct relief, but they were getting calories away below what they should have been given, because the burgomaster in that particular area had the power to say what one particular person should get, what another should get, and so on. In fact, there are three cards, running from a low-calorie ration on up to those given to persons who work satisfactorily for the Russian Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish the statement, then I shall be glad to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan to let me yield to the Senator from Maine.

The point is that, after all, what we are attempting to do is to get relief to starving people. That is the basis of the measure before us. I do not object to the food being distributed through regular channels; in many respects that is less expensive. On the other hand, I wish to point out to the Senator from Michigan, and to the administration that is providing the relief, that it is highly important, in the administration of the law, that we have representatives in the countries to which the relief is sent, who will go down to the local level and see that the people who need relief get it, and, if possible, straighten out the differences in the cards, so that all people can live on the calories which the pending measure is supposed to provide for those who are starving.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I agree with him, of course, that we should get the relief down, as nearly as possible, to the places where it is needed, under United States supervision, but we cannot exclude participation by the local authorities, of the Greek Government, because if we did, there would be all sorts of complaints that we were interfering, intervening, and doing this, that, and the other, not by the Greeks, perhaps, but by others. So I think there should be cooperation between our inspectors on the ground and the local authorities of the respective governments.

Let me say to the Senator, furthermore, since he made a comparison a moment ago about the way he hoped the relief would be distributed and the procedures under UNRRA, that while we contributed 72 percent to UNRRA, we did not control it. The control was in the hands of many foreigners, who mismanaged and mishandled the funds, and squandered them in many places. For instance, they gave $400,000,000 to Yugoslavia, and the return we got for it was to have our airplanes shot down, and to have the Yugoslavs very bitter, and denouncing us every time they opened their mouths.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I shall reclaim the floor in a moment. I am trying to present a consecutive story. I have wanted to be interrupted, and I continue so to desire, but I do not want to get too far off the track.

I continue to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not want to get the distinguished Senator away off the track.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am speaking about further interruptions.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the main track is that we want to get the relief to the local level, to the people who need the relief.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said about UNRRA. In fact, a few moments ago I made a similar statement. I agree with him in toto. But I think that when we lose control of the ownership of food at the boundary line of a country, we will have to have representatives of the American Government immediately check the relief down to the local level, if we expect to accomplish what the Senator from Louisiana has asked the senior Senator from Michigan about relative to feeding the starving people of Europe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In a moment. I wish to say again that that for which the Senator from Nebraska asks is required by the proposed legislation. In the first place, the relief must be followed to its ultimate destination, under the obligation the relief administration takes under the terms of the joint resolution. In the second place, it must be followed by complete publicity from start to finish. It must be followed, not only by governmental publicity, but by access afforded American newspapermen and American radio commentators. It must be done from start to finish in the full light of day, and it must be done under specifications which require total protection against any maladministration, insofar as it is humanly possible to provide it. I submit that, under the circumstances, the joint resolution has gone as far as it is possible to put things down in black and white

There are some further precautions which, if I may be allowed to reclaim the floor for a moment, I should like to discuss, in addition to all the other precautions to which reference has been made.

The importance of the point made by the senior Senator from Texas is not to be overlooked, that when we compare the UNRRA operation with the operation under the proposed legislation, we find that the UNRRA operation was one in which we were substantially at the mercy of foreign governments in the distribution of the relief. It is because of that precise situation that we refused to continue the UNRRA method, and insisted upon taking our own responsibility for our own relief distribution. That, fundamentally, is the continuous, overriding protection of the new system, which is a terrifically important factor, I submit to all Senators, in comparing the relief experience under UNRRA with the relief experience which is contemplated under the pending measure.

Let me continue a moment. I had read a dozen or so of the specific protections which are required in connection with the operation of the relief. Now I wish to read some more. I refer to page 11:

(f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country.

In other words, in order to be sure we are not the subjects of exploitation, we are entitled to ask for total information, not only regarding our own relief distribution in these countries, but also regarding all the other native resources. Reading further:

(g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country—

"The people of such country"—

of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution;

And then, of grave importance, subsection (h)—and this is an amendment which was proposed by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and which finds its way into the pending measure:

(h) all supplies transferred pursuant to this joint resolution or acquired through the use of credits established pursuant to this joint resolution and any articles processed from such supplies, or the containers of such supplies or articles, shall, to the extent practicable, be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled in a conspicuous place as legibly, indelibly, and permanently as the nature of such supplies, articles, or containers will permit in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate consumer in such country that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance; or if such supplies, articles, or containers are incapable of being so marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, that all practicable steps are taken to inform the ultimate consumers thereof that such supplies or articles have been furnished by the United States of America for relief assistance.

In other words, this is a categorical response to the unhappy and unfortunate experience which we too often had under UNRRA, where our largess was exploited by others in their own behalf, and the generosities of the United States were not only totally ignored but were deliberately blacked out, so that those who were the beneficiaries of our assistance often were kept in ignorance of the fact that the United States of America was the source of the relief. We do not propose to have anything of that sort happen again. We were very happy to accept the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the chairman and the committee on writing a bill and surrounding it with all the reasonable safeguards which the conditions we have in mind will permit. I would like to ask the Senator a question. The proposed law seems to be very ample. The restrictions on the powers and the checks and balances of the bill seem to me to be ample to do this work in a highly creditable and a highly efficient manner. But, as I look at the situation, the success of the undertaking is going to depend in no small degree on the man who is the head of it, in Greece or Turkey or wherever it may be; and while I am not privy to the President's thoughts on the matter, it seems to me that the Administrator ought before everything else to be a businessman. We ought to go into this on a business and systematic basis. Secondly, he ought to have some knowledge of or contact with foreign governments. He ought to have had some experience in the foreign field. Thirdly, his objective ought not to be to spend money or to give it away so that he can get rid of the appropriation; but, if he finds that half will suffice—which I doubt very much—then he ought to stop there. In other words, the funds should be administered the same as if the official were administering his own individual fortune or property.

The success of this undertaking will depend on the administrator catching the spirit of the pending joint resolution, with all the safeguards written around it, and who executes it accordingly in the country to which the relief is directed. I sincerely hope, as one legislator who intends to support the measure, that the President will look very carefully, because, with a good administrator, what the Senator from Michigan hopes will be accomplished will largely come to pass. That is the keystone in the whole arch of the pending joint resolution, in my opinion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course I entirely agree with the able Senator from Maryland. He has reiterated the same thought that was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska that, in the final analysis, no matter how much we try to write the formula, we are finally at the mercy of the personnel of administration. We have provided in the joint resolution, of course, that the administrator of European relief must be confirmed by the Senate; and I would expect the Senate to apply all the acute tests the Senator from Maryland has in mind to the confirmation of the administrator, although I think we should be very fortunate if we can find an administrator who possesses all the qualifications which the able Senator from Maryland indicates.

I desire particularly to refer to the fact that the Senator from Maryland emphasized the importance of stopping this relief at any time when it is no longer needed, and I point out that there, again, the pending measure undertakes to provide protections which never heretofore have been available, because we categorically commit the President to the necessity of terminating the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines—

(1) that, by reason of changed conditions, the provision of relief assistance of the character authorized by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, (2) that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out—

That is, all the requirements for publicity, and so forth, that I have recited—

(3) that an excessive amount of any supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or of similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, is being used to assist in the maintenance of armed forces in such country—

It cannot be diverted to armed forces. If an extraordinarily heavy proportion of the local supplies were being used for armed forces, the country might become ineligible, as a result of this administrative authority—

or (4) that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

If anybody's imagination can think of any additional proscriptions to write into the bill for the purpose of legitimate protection, I should like to know what they are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering how that can be prevented.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator wonders how what can be prevented?

Mr. ELLENDER. Selling to all those who offer to buy. In short, so that soldiers in the armed forces of a country could not obtain the supplies.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is not what it says.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator a moment ago, he said that 85 percent of the supplies would be distributed through the regular distribution channels of the country selected to receive such supplies. Suppose that in Rumania, Turkey, or Bulgaria, the methods of distribution are——

Mr. VANDENBERG. We do not go into any one of the three. These supplies do not go into any of those countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely supposing. This is a supposition.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well, I will suppose with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us make it Italy. I suppose Italy is going to be allocated a lot of these supplies. Suppose the supplies are sold to wholesale establishments in various parts of Italy. Then the wholesale establishments will sell to the retail stores. How can those goods be followed through in the way the Senator from Michigan indicated a moment ago? These supplies will be in various stores in Italy and they will be for sale to whoever has the money to pay for them. Is that not true?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but is not what I have stated true?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have explained to the Senator as well as I can, and several times, that the distribution locally

is determined by the standard method of local distribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which may be——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a minute please.

Mr. ELLENDER. But which, in all probability, is along the lines I just suggested?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Which may be along the lines the Senator has suggested or along the lines that any Senator might suggest, and in none of those events do I know whether the Senators are discussing what is going to happen or not I do not know what the methods of distribution are, and I have not thought that it was necessary for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to try to invade the final details of merchandising in order to establish an obligation upon American administrators to follow the relief to its finality and see that it is distributed under the requirements of this measure. Now if the Senator asks me how Luigi or Antonio or some of his neighbors in Naples are going to be dealt with by their corner grocer, I cannot tell him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but Luigi or Antonio, as the Senator has just said, may become rich by selling some of these goods at unconscionable prices.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What would the Senator do to prevent it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know at the moment. I expect to explore possibilities, if I should be afforded the opportunity. I am just seeking for information. As I understood from the beginning, this $350,000,000 appropriation was to be used to feed the hungry people in the various countries in which surveys have been made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are coming to that in a minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator has indicated that the report shows that of this huge amount, only 15 percent——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Or 20 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would be used to help the indigent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Fifteen or 20 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; 15 or 20 percent of this huge amount. In other words, there would be only from 15 to 20 percent given away, and the rest of the supplies will be sold to the wholesale establishments, and in turn, the retail establishments in these various countries and sold to whoever wants to buy them, I presume. Am I wrong in that statement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us go over that question for the third or fourth time, and I do not say that critically.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I have misstated the plan of distribution, I wish the Senator would say so, because that is the way I understand it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's statement is correct in part and invites what I would think was an entirely erroneous conclusion from what he said.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the Senator give us the erroneous part.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would rather give the Senator the correct part. These relief supplies, to the extent of about 80 percent, will be distributed through the use of whatever the local distributing system for the distribution of food is in the receiving countries, as there is no other way to distribute except as we are going to have an enormous free-for-all give-away to the entire population, which would be the last thing on earth in which the Senator from Louisiana would be interested or in which the Senator from Michigan would be interested.

Now what happens? Under the direct administration and responsibility of the American administrators, who must follow the relief down to its finality under the terms of these obligations, this distribution is made through whatever is the local food-distributing system. It is paid for to the extent of about 80 percent, because 80 percent of the people, according to all the reports, have the local currency with which to pay. It is not the local currency they lack; it is the food they lack, and we are providing the food. They pay in local currency. At this point I repeat, the system is utterly unique. Under the terms of this bill, for the first time the precaution is provided that local currency goes into a special trust fund under the control and direction of the Government of the United States, and it stays there under our control and direction, and the use of the balance at the end of the next fiscal year will be determined by the Congress of the United States. If there is any better way to protect the system I do not know what it is. That is the only explanation I can make, if I make it 50 times. That is satisfactory, I hope, to the Senator, for whose opinion I have great respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has stated exactly what I tried to say a while ago, and we seem to be in accord as to how the supplies will be distributed under the terms of the pending resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask my colleague if this measure does not purport to authorize our President to enter into an executive agreement with other nations to provide for establishing the trust fund and distributing the food under the restrictions placed in the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that we will have something upon the basis of which the executive branch can operate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is totally correct. I thank him for his observation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The statement was made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Michigan that relief funds would not go to certain countries. In the House measure appropriations were authorized to make relief available to Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China, and that provision was stricken by the Senate committee? Am I correct now in assuming that where the money goes will be left to the discretion of the State Department?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, that is the other half of the problem before the Senate. If we have finished with the first half, I should like to make a statement regarding the second half.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not finished with the first half.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has not finished with the first half. Very well. We will revert to it again.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is any limitation provided on the expenses of administering the fund?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think not.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator think there should be any limitation placed on the administrative expense?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know how that could be done. If we are going to trust administrators with other obligations and responsibilities, then inasmuch as the whole procedure is under the requirement of constant and complete publicity, the Senator from Michigan is willing, as is the usual American administrative custom in such matters, to trust to the good faith of the administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would this expense item come out of the $350,000,000?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would come out of that sum?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; the joint resolution specifically provides that out of the trust fund which is created through the deposit of local currency received from the sale of relief supplies the administrative expense may be paid, so that, in the final analysis, we may expect to be reimbursed for the administrative expense.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should think it would be a deterrent to excessive administration costs if the expense is to come out of the funds which are actually to be used to feed the people of the various countries. I think that would be a guard against any excessive expenditures and the employment of more persons than necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that in the past the money which the Government has made out of the sale of food was used to finance the local government? Is that not true?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my observation, and I think most of those who have visited the countries which received relief will agree with me. I think this proposal is a decided improvement. I believe it will result in avoidance of what has been done in the past, which is that the money derived from the sale of food was used to finance the local government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. These funds are under the constant control of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand, and I think that is a decided improvement. That is what I told the distinguished Senator. But I think it should be pointed out to the Members of the Senate that what is made out of the distribution or sale of food does not come back to the United States. When we appropriate this $350,000,000 for relief there is to be no repayment of it. At least, that is the way I interpret it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no question in the world about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I made that observation because there might be some confusion arising from the expectation that because the supplies were sold and the money went into a fund, eventually the supplies would be paid for.

I should like to ask a further question. Is it proposed that direct relief be distributed in Hungary?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to make a statement about the countries, I shall appreciate it. I have not yet had an opportunity even to present the question of where relief is to be afforded, and I should like to make a very brief statement about the countries, and then I shall be very happy to be torn to pieces.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves the general question of the propriety of the action?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I ask the Senator if anyone questions the fact that Europe needs food, clothing, and medicine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not heard it questioned.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does any informed man question the fact that if Europe does not get help from some source there is more than a probability of anarchy or communism existing in Europe this winter? Whether it be called anarchy or communism, I refer to a state of lawlessness and a departure from democratic principles.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I not only completely agree with the able Senator from Virginia, but I should like to say to him, by way of demonstration of that fact, that in my opening statement, when the able Senator was not present, I summed up my view on that question by saying that unless this relief is provided hunger instead of statesmanship will write the pattern of Europe hereafter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think that in addition to being impelled by principles of humanitarianism, we also are being influenced by enlightened self-interest, to see that Europe does not fall a victim to communism or something worse in the coming months.

Is it not true that notwithstanding the fact that the destruction of World War I was far less than that of World War II, we made large public and private loans to countries for rehabilitation after World War I? It is my recollection—and the Senator may have more accurate figures—that we made public loans after the war of approximately $7,000,000,000 and private loans of approximately $5,000,000,000. It might have been the other way around, but it is my recollection that the total amount of loans made for the stabilization of the postwar world was approximately $12,000,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is generally correct, without checking the details.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I think that is substantially the fact. As the Senator has previously stated on the floor, we have spent about $300,000,000,000 to win a war, and we have not yet won the peace. The Senator is now proposing to make some further investments, in keeping with our ability to spend, to win the peace.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I notice on page 8 of the joint resolution, in the first part of the printed resolution which itemizes the articles which will be provided, food, medical supplies, processed and unprocessed materials for clothing, fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed. The report states that there is no provision for machinery and tools or equipment for rehabilitation purposes. I wonder how that is consistent with the fact that we are furnishing fertilizer, pesticides, and seed. Those items are not worth much to the people who need relief unless they have machinery with which they can use them. Those items are not food and clothing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question as to whether or not those people have the necessary tools and equipment to use the fertilizer. I assume they have, or the joint resolution would not be written as it is. At any rate, they will not get any machinery. Undoubtedly they have been helped by UNRRA in the fashion the Senator has in mind, but there are no shipments of that character involved in the joint resolution.

Inasmuch as the Senator has called attention to this particular section of the bill, I am reminded of another question which was asked me, which I am afraid I ignored in the course of our general conversation. The question was asked as to where the supplies are to be purchased, and what proportion is to be purchased from the United States. I invite attention to the fact that the answer to that question is found at the bottom of page 8 and the top of page 9:

SEC. 2. (a) Under the direction of the President, such relief assistance shall be provided in the form of transfers of supplies, or the establishment in this country of credits subject to the control of the President, in such quantities and on such terms as the President may determine; except that no such transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made after June 30, 1948—

This is the important part—

and except that not more than 6 percent of the amount herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used for the procurement of supplies outside the United States and its Territorial possessions.

At that point the House uses the figure of 10 percent instead of 6 percent. I should like to state for the RECORD why we chose the figure of 6 percent, because it has some bearing on the question asked by the able senior Senator from Nebraska.

So far as possible, of course, we wish to have these credits expended in the United States, for obvious reasons. On the other hand, since two of the things fundamentally required are coal and fertilizer, and since the coal obviously must be obtained abroad because the transportation charge from here would be prohibitive, and since we want to husband all our own fertilizers to the last possible degree, it was the opinion of the committee that the amount contemplated for expenditure for coal and fertilizer, which would be about 5 percent of the total, should be exempted from this requirement; and we added 1 percent for latitude. That is the reason for the 6 percent.

Mr. President, I am taking much more time than I even remotely anticipated, but I wish to come to the question of what countries are to receive this relief. Considerable anxiety has been expressed in the Senate—and it is obvious from the text of the House language—that the countries for which the relief is intended should be identified in the text of the joint resolution so that there would be no doubt not only about where the relief should go, but where it should not go, which is of even more importance to many of us.

It has been the attitude of the Department and the President that it would be inadvisable to name specific countries in the joint resolution, because we are anxious to avoid, if possible, anything that could be construed as a statutory obligation on our part in respect to any particular country; and in order to avoid any expectation in those countries that they have a hard and fast commitment from us, and that therefore they do not have to pay too much attention to all the requirements which we are setting up by way of qualification before they get any relief at all, instead of identifying the countries in the text of the Senate committee amendment, as the House language does, and instead of excluding any specific countries by text in the Senate committee amendment, as the House language does, and as an amendment suggested by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would do, we have sought to achieve this result in a different fashion.

I call attention to the letter of the Secretary of State which begins at the bottom of page 4 of the committee report. I shall read it carefully, because Senators will agree that this is not only complete information to the Senate as to where the money goes, but is also complete assurance that it will not go somewhere else. I read the very brief letter signed by George C. Marshall, which is addressed to me, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: In connection with the proposed legislation authorizing an appropriation of $350,000,000 for relief assistance (H. J. Res. 153), I wish to advise you that the Department of State, if given responsibility for determining the beneficiary countries, would not approve the

expenditure of more than $15,000,000 of this amount for relief in any other countries or territories than Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Trieste, and China. It is felt that not more than $15,000,000 should be available to meet emergencies which, while they are not now foreseen, might arise in other countries to which we might wish to render assistance.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. President, when the Secretary of State presented the matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations we asked him categorically if he considered this letter to be a commitment, and he said without reservation that he did. Under the circumstances knowing the complete confidence which Congress has in the integrity of the Secretary of State, I think we should be satisfied to rest upon this categorical, unequivocal written statement of the Secretary regarding the countries which are involved in the program included in this resolution; and under those circumstances, I would hope that we might be able to avoid what could too easily become the embarrassment of identifying the countries in the text of the resolution itself through unwittingly creating the appearance of a vested interest in behalf of the named countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the answer to my question is that the Senate committee amendment does not specifically designate the countries to which relief assistance will be furnished, but it is practically left up to the State Department to make the selection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The answer is yes; but I hardly think that the answer is complete, because the Senator's question might leave the inference that it is just a blank check. I insist that if we name the countries in the text of the resolution itself we would have no greater assurance than we have when the Secretary of State guarantees that this is his prospectus.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question. Does the distinguished Senator have any apprehension that the State Department might designate a country to which relief would be granted and where the people would be required to pay reparation to Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The one country where that situation might arise, I suppose, would be Hungary. I certainly would be completely unwilling to cut the brave people of Hngary off from all relief because their Government, perchance, may have been caught in the paws of the Russian bear in some current relief situation. I would think that since hunger knows no international boundaries, it would be to our interest to encourage those majorities in Hungary which thus far have been able to maintain what for them is a very substantial democracy against all the external pressures to which they have been submitted. I would weigh the great value of sustaining and encouraging that resistance among the people of Hungary against any unhappiness I would have over the fact that reparations might be going out of Hungary in some degree at the same time. I very much wish we could say that no relief goes anywhere where reparations are currently going out, because it is so easy to argue, and with great truth, that the net of that situation is that the reparations are synthetically coming from us. But since Hungary is the country involved, since Hungary is at the heart, center, and core of this problem of democratic stability in Central Europe at the moment, and since Hungary does have what seems to be a majority of the people who are very courageously clinging to their own ideas of their own independence, I think it would be most unfortunate—and I speak only for myself—if we should put the people of Hungary under any particular prohibition in connection with the distribution of relief.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that I want personally to thank him for the explanations and answers he has made to the questions which I have propounded to him. I should like to make one further observation. I shall vote for this appropriation because I believe the principle of direct relief is sound. I want to emphasize the fact that it seems to me we are going a pretty long way in allowing the State Department to determine where relief is to be given, and furthermore, how the resolution is to be administered. I certainly hope that in designating the countries the State Department will take recognition of the record made this afternoon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to go further than that, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, because I now propose to put into the RECORD figures which heretofore have not been made public, showing the allocation of the money as contemplated by the State Department. I want it all to be written in the bond insofar as it is humanly possible to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the insertion which the Senator is about to make. It is one of the points in which I have been very much interested. It helps me considerably. I should like to conclude with the statement that in the administration of $350,000,000 of relief we certainly want to get an administrator who will administer the fund as efficiently and as judiciously as possible. Certainly our past experience has been one of maladministration rather than administration, when it came to distribution of the funds by UNRRA.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I appreciate what the Senator says, and I thank him very much for his very generous comment that I have at least approximated answers to the questions which he has raised.

I want to conclude the particular part of the record to which I referred in our last colloquy, before I yield further, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The relative estimate of needs as between the various countries are set down in the final and conclusive statement of the State Department. This is the allocation of the total need of $596,000,000, and from them we can make our own calculations and see what our contemplations are: Austria, $148,000,000; Greece, $60,000,000; Hungary, $33,000,000; Italy, $158,000,000; Poland, $117,000,000; Trieste, $20,000,000; and China, $60,000,000.

I again call attention to the fact in passing that the $60,000,000 for Greece is what I think lawyers call a sine qua non in respect to our Greek relief program which both the House and the Senate have recently approved. Except as we can proceed with this program, the other program is perfectly futile.

I call attention to the fact that it involves substantial aid for Italy; and while there is some division of opinion as to whether the Italian peace treaties as drawn should be ratified, certainly all those who have the slightest interest in the destiny and welfare of Italy must recognize the fact that except as this resolution be passed we need not worry about any peace treaties or anything else, because this is the fundament, the basis of life in those areas for the next few months.

So, Mr. President, that is my statement regarding where the money goes. I have made what I hope is a complete statement in regard to how the money goes. There only remains for me to point out finally, very briefly, the differences between the joint resolution as passed by the House and the joint resolution as it has been reported in amended form to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I regret that I was compelled to miss the earlier explanation made by the able Senator from Michigan. I simply wish to ask several questions, if I may do so.

First, has the ascertainment of need been made with respect to the situation all over the world? Have we looked at the world, regardless of the politics of the country where the help is to be bestowed, and have we ascertained what the human appeal is, and have we assessed on that basis our determination to supply that need?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question accurately without having some definitions, because human needs and aspirations, and so forth are rather broad concepts.

Mr. PEPPER. I assume there was some basis for the decision which was arrived at.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. It must have been the number of dollars necessary to bring up to a certain level the number of calories to be supplied to each human being, in accordance with need; or there must have been some criterion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say that I am 100 percent in favor of passage of the joint resolution; but I wish to have it understood that I am in favor of giving

the relief to human beings the world over, on the same standard and the same basis, namely, human need, without any political considerations or political preferences entering into the administration of humane assistance on the basis of need. I wish to know whether that is the policy. I base that inquiry upon the limited number of countries that are covered by the provisions of the joint resolution, and the fact that only $60,000,000 of the fund is offered for China, which has more than 400,000,000 people. Moreover, I have not heard anything said about India, and yet we hear that millions of the people of India die every year from starvation, nor have I heard anything about some other countries where starvation is prevalent.

If my country is going to provide relief, as it should do, on the basis of meeting the Christian challenge of need, as the good Samaritan did on the road to Jericho, I wish to have that made plain, because I think that is only Christian charity.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no idea that such a broad concept is behind this $350,000,000 measure. I do not think there has been any concept of discrimination in the writing of the joint resolution or in the arrangement of the budget in connection with it; but, on the contrary, the antidiscrimination concept for which the Senator from Florida speaks is specifically asserted in the joint resolution itself as the principle to which it is addressed.

The study of the needs to be served by the joint resolution was, as I understand, essentially and necessarily confined to the liberated areas and the reconstruction areas growing out of the war responsibilities, primarily in Europe with some attention to Asia. I have previously stated in great detail the studies on the basis of which the figures were arrived at, and I have stated what agencies were involved in making the estimates. They include agricultural and economic experts attached to our United States embassies abroad; they include the calculations of a committee of experts established by the United Nations; they include the data gathered by a subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council which toured the devastated areas; they include the findings of a number of Food and Agriculture Organization survey misisons; and they include the fund of information mobilized from all those areas by the United States Department of Agriculture. Using all of that data and applying a severe test and a severe criterion in respect to needs, because the contemplated subsistence is to be supplied on a level of only approximately from 2,000 to 2,200 calories, as a result of that entire computation and conception, the figures are arrived at on the authority of the United Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Are there any countries who obtained relief from UNRRA, but are not included within this program?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator recall the names of those countries?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I recall one, for instance; I recall Yugoslavia. When I inquired why Yugoslavia is not on the list, the answer was that it is the opinion of our experts that Yugoslavia can be self-sustaining, without any question, from now until the new year, on the basis of her own resources.

Mr. PEPPER. The decision had nothing to do with the political situation in Yugoslavia, as we judge it there; did it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is my understanding; and I suggest to the Senator, by way of collateral evidence on the subject, that the presence of Poland within the list might give him some reassurance in that respect.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason I raise this question is that I am afraid an impression is being created in the world that money can be obtained from the United States by those who are on the right side politically. That may be all right when a political loan is under consideration; but I do not want anyone to say that when my country is administering to the relief of human suffering, when we are feeding children and furnishing medicine to the ill and furnishing clothing to those who have no apparel, we are letting any other than humane and Christian considerations enter into our decision. I think it is terrifically important for the good name and the honor and the Christian reputation of the United States that that fact be kept absolutely clear in connection with what we do in this matter.

I am a little distressed to find only $60,000,000 provided for China, for example. I imagine that an accurate survey of conditions in that tragic country would show that millions of children are on the verge of starvation, and that a similar survey will show a corresponding condition in India, and that a similar survey will show a corresponding condition in the Middle East and in many other parts of the world.

I do not want us to play favorites when we are dealing with human beings, Mr. President, because I have always understood that the dignity of man had no consideration for geography or political party.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to get back to my statement in regard to the joint resolution, if I may do so.

Mr. SMITH rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to make a few remarks when the Senator from Michigan has concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. I hope that will be soon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. First, I want to thank the able Senator from Michigan and also the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee for the consideration given to the amendment which was submitted by the able Senator from North Dakota and me.

I have listened to the Senator from Michigan very attentively, trying to understand why the other amendment which I submitted—an amendment with respect to excluding certain countries from receiving any of the benefits provided by this joint resolution—was not acceptable to the committee.

I have also listened with some interest to the statement just made by the able Senator from Florida. Apparently he wants this Government to give our charity to all countries and peoples alike irrespective of any political consideration.

Mr. President, I voted for the Greek-Turkish relief bill a few days ago rather reluctantly. I regretted that it was necessary for us to call on the American people to finance military assistance to countries on the border of some of the nations whose peoples we now propose to give relief to, while at the same time one of the countries which is applying the pressure on these smaller and weaker nations is spending $13,000,000,000 this year for war purposes.

The time has come for us with our limited resources—and our resources are not unlimited—the time has come when we should go down either on one side or the street or the other. We cannot carry the burden of both sides. So far as I am concerned I am unwilling to vote a dollar to those countries which are spending money in possibly preparing for another war. I am unwilling to vote our taxpayers' money to help feed the people abroad, when they could, if they would, reduce their military appropriations, as it is proposed we shall reduce ours, and thus have money to feed their people and not expect us to continue to finance their relief needs. Our people want to make contributions and want to help, and want to see the hungry fed and assistance given, but they do not want to assist them in one nation in that way and at the same time have to finance military assistance in another country to resist the pressure from the one to whom we are providing relief aid. There should be some consistency in the policies of this government and in the way we spend taxpayer's money which has come from the sweat and toil and struggle of the citizenship of this Nation.

I remember when the UNRRA bill was before us in February 1944, when we passed the bill creating UNRRA, I said we should limit the authorization to half a billion dollars instead of making it a billion and a half or a billion three hundred and seventy-five million. I felt we could spend a half a billion dollars and gain the experience and know how effectively, how fairly and how justly the money was going to be distributed. I stated at the time that I did not like the idea of our putting up about 70 percent of the money and turning control of it over to a committee controlled by other governments who were not putting one dollar into the relief fund.

Now we know what happened. We hear the criticisms made of UNRRA to-

day. How poorly it was administered. We are paying now for the mistake. We have spent the money, and it was not effective. We got little, if any, credit for our great contribution to that cause. Now we are asked to play both sides against the middle again.

Mr. President, I am not willing to do that. I am willing to put up some money for relief, but I want us to absolutely control its expenditure. I wish to compliment the committee on the good work it has done on this bill, for the restrictions and safeguards they have written into it. That is the way it should be handled, and with the amendment the committee was kind enough to incorporate in the joint resolution designating that every package, every item, should be labeled and stamped and identified, insofar as possible, so that the recipient of it might know that it came from the United States of America, and that it is our Government that is their benefactor, that it is the United States that is alleviating their hunger and distress.

Often in the past it was our dollars and our goods and our benevolence that saved the lives of people, that fed and clothed them, while some dictator got the credit for it. Some government foreign to our ideology was given the credit. The people who got the assistance and help we provided had to be subservient to a totalitarian ruler—a dictator, if you please—and he got the credit for the relief and assistance we gave. I am unwilling to squander and waste the substance of this Nation and our tax money in any such fashion. I appreciate the hedging and the restrictions in this joint resolution. We are going to get much better results by handling this relief program ourselves. We will then know where our money goes, what for, and who gets it.

Again I say, we cannot pay both bills, on the one hand to feed the starving, on the other to build up military armaments in other countries to resist pressure that is coming from those very countries whose people we are trying to feed and keep from starving.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad to have yielded to the Senator, and in reply may say that in my view I think the joint resolution falls squarely within the definitions he has mentioned.

I was about to conclude by calling attention categorically to the eight points of difference between the House measure and the Senate committee measure, but I think it will suffice for me to call attention to the fact that the subject is fully covered in the Appendix of the committee report.

I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that the differences between the House joint resolution and the Senate committee measure largely involve the question of the allocation of the funds. The House measure cuts the total to $200,000,000. From the viewpoint of the Senate committee, from the viewpoint of Mr. Hoover's mission, and from the viewpoint of the departments, that would be totally and utterly inadequate.

Upon the fixing of the final total sum depends the question of whether or not it is going to be practical to earmark any portion of the money for the so-called children's fund. So I do not see how we can settle these detailed allocations in debate on the floor of the Senate. I am afraid they will have to be settled in conference.

Since these are the only essential differences between the two measures, and since there seems to be little or no disposition on the part of the Senate to retreat from this desperately essential undertaking, I am very hopeful that the Senate will permit us very promptly to go to conference with the joint resolution, so that we can produce the finished product before the end of the week.

The need for haste is obvious. The last UNRRA shipment has gone abroad, I repeat. The program is needed in its major requirements in the immediately approaching period, before the European harvest comes in. We have precious little time to wait to get under way in order to make effective the things which our hearts recommend to us that we do.

Therefore, Mr. President, in conclusion, and thanking all the Senators who have joined in this catechism—and I hope I have displayed no impatience in connection with it—I shall yield the floor, again expressing the hope that we may very promptly take the joint resolution to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I inquire as to whether or not the Senator will press for a vote this afternoon?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like very much to get a vote this afternoon. I know of only one amendment that is pending.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the joint resolution go over, if possible, until tomorrow, as I should like to study it. I have not had that opportunity. I am concerned about whether or not the proposal is really and truly a relief measure. It had been my impression, from reading the press and from listening to radio commentators on the subject, that the authorization was in the nature of a relief proposal in aid of hungry people, but as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has stated, only 15 or 20 percent of the entire sum to be appropriated will be used for the indigent, and the rest of the goods, materials, and supplies will be channeled through the regular commercial trade in the countries where the goods and supplies will be made available. Let us not overlook the fact that these supplies are in the nature of gifts from the American people to those in need and under no circumstances should they be used to make the rich more potent. My fear is that these goods will be sold in the black market and those really in need and for whose benefit we are willing to make the sacrifice will never be able to obtain them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to interrupt the Senator again on that point. I cannot conceive that the only definition of relief is service to those who are utterly indigent and penniless. If the Statler Hotel is on fire, it is quite as much relief to take from the eighth floor and put in a place of safety somebody who can pay for his room as it is to put in a place of safety somebody who is sleeping in the back alley. I submit that relief is not necessarily service solely to the indigent. On the contrary, I submit that when an entire nation finds itself cut off from sources of fundamental food supplies it is not a question of whether one can or cannot pay for food; the question is that nobody can get food; and under those circumstances relief is just as important for one citizen as it is for another.

It seems to me the misconception under which the Senator labors is that because the joint resolution does not contemplate relief solely for those who are in poorhouses it ceases to be a relief measure. I cannot agree to that concept at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg to differ with the distinguished Senator. I believe that the American people themselves are of the opinion and are under the impression, at any rate, that since we are donating, as it were, $350,000,000 in supplies, it is in the nature of a gift to those who are needy as I have previously stated. But from what I have been able to learn this afternoon, the greater portion of the supplies will be distributed through wholesale and retail establishments, where profits will be the motive and few, if any, of these supplies will hit the mark. I am wondering if there is not some way by which we could make it possible to trace the goods and see to it that they are made available to the needy at a fair price. As I have indicated, I am quite certain that the American people are supporting us in our efforts in making the funds available, because they are of the view that the money and supplies should be utilized in feeding and supplying the hungry and needy. I simply ask that the bill go over so that I may study it overnight and determine if something cannot be done to amend the bill so as to give assurance that the funds and the supplies will find their way to the people who are really in need of them and for whom we are attempting to provide.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator now reiterates that he wants the relief to feed the hungry. I assert that there is nothing in this measure to feed anybody except the hungry. But I also insist that a person can be hungry without being indigent. I also insist that the only civilization to be saved on this earth is not the civilization of the gutter; the higher forms of civilization must be saved, too.

Mr. President, I should like to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana insofar as I can, but it seems to me, and I respectfully suggest to my able friend, it is hardly fair to ask that the entire enterprise shall be suspended for his further study, in view of the fact that the joint resolution has at least the partial approval of the House of Representatives; in view of the fact that we have

got to have a rather extensive conference ultimately to conclude the measure in its finality; and in view of the fact that every day is of pressing importance in behalf of the very thing that my able friend wants to do; namely, to feed the hungry. I suggest to him that I would like to proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not desire to unduly delay the passage of the resolution, but, as the Senator knows, this body has been busy for the past 3 weeks with the labor bill. I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and I have devoted much of my time to the labor bill. I want to be frank in saying that I have not had the opportunity to study the pending bill. It is only from questions put to the able Senator from Michigan this afternoon that certain information was elicited which I had not previously possessed. While I know the Senator does not agree with me, I believe, as I said, that it might be possible to find some way to assure that the supplies will find their way into the hands of people who are really in need, not only as indigents, but who have some funds with which to purchase them. That is why I would like to examine the joint resolution and study it, if but for a few hours. That is all I am asking. I think I am entitled to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was wondering if, under the circumstances, the Senator from Louisiana, or any other Senator, would have objection to a unanimous-consent agreement that we vote tomorrow at 2 o'clock on any pending amendments, and on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would have no objection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I submit the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to such a unanimous-consent agreement, of course, but since I was not able to be present at all the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the pending measure, having been engaged in the Finance Committee's hearings on the tax bill, I should like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee whether it was indicated that any further appropriation for relief in 1947 was contemplated for any of the war-devastated countries, or for any other country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have heard no suggestion whatever regarding any appropriations or requests beyond the pending measure; except, the Senator will recall, there is a project for a children's fund which has not yet come down to the Congress. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the United Nations set up a children's fund.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am familiar with that; but I meant general appropriations for relief of war-devastated countries. If I understand it correctly, the joint resolution applies only to countries that were devastated by the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. And it is for the year 1947?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Is any further appropriation contemplated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid to answer the Senator categorically, because there are so many different kinds of bills being discussed. Does the Senator have in mind the program for the rehabilitation of Korea? I hear some discussion about a rehabilitation program for Korea, in respect to our occupational areas there, I know nothing about it, except the general information on the subject. I would not think that was the kind of thing the Senator had in mind.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not. I had in contemplation appropriations for relief. This is not a measure for rehabilitation at all, as I understand it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. It is specifically otherwise.

Mr. GEORGE. It is a measure for relief, and it is strictly confined to relief purposes?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Within war-devastated areas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I wished to know if there was any indication that the Congress would be asked to make any further appropriations of that character for the current year, at least. I suppose no one in the hearings could see beyond this year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have heard nothing of the sort. I will ask the Senator from Texas if he has heard of anything.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I know of no general relief proposals. Of course, a number of countries have made applications for loans to the Import-Export Bank.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not speaking of loans.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator refers to appropriations similar to the pending measure?

Mr. GEORGE. I refer to similar relief appropriations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know of none.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of none.

Mr. GEORGE. I inquired, because if there is not a limitation in some way on commitment of our Government to general relief all over the earth, which certain of the Senators in the discussion this afternoon have seemed to endorse, then we are headed toward a program that I do not think we could live up to, at all.

It must be remembered that appropriations of this character reduce the actual wealth of the Nation. They are bound to reduce the actual wealth of our economy. It does not make any difference whether our producers, on the farm, in the factory, or in the mine, get back the dollars for the production; if nothing is brought back from the countries abroad we are becoming poorer every time we make appropriations of this sort. Ultimately that course would lead to bankruptcy.

I think it highly important that it be made clear in the record that so far as the committee is advised at least, no further like appropriations for relief are contemplated for the current year. I think it also should be made explicit and clear, as indeed the language of he bill itself indicates, that this is not a mandatory requirement for an appropriation of $350,000,000. It is simply an authorization for an appropriation not to exceed that amount, and the discretion is still within the appropriating committees of the two Houses.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 9, line 3, appears the date when transfers of supplies or establishment of credits shall cease. That date is June 30, 1948.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the senior Senator from Michigan assure us that investigations will be made continuously in the countries to which relief is given, so that after the harvests this year a recapitulation may be made of what is available, so that perhaps appropriations might be reduced?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that under the terms of the joint resolution the Appropriations Committee itself would have the right to demand that information, because certainly the resolution itself contemplates such a result.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what was the ruling with respect to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think a definite hour should be fixed. I think there are no further speeches to be made on the subject, except several brief ones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] desires to speak on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is plenty of time. I want the Senator from New Jersey to speak on the subject. I should like to have the ultimate time for voting on the measure fixed now, if that can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has made a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote at an hour certain on the pending measure. The request cannot be agreed to until the presence of a quorum has been established.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to be heard on the subject tomorrow at some convenient time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think there will be plenty of time for everyone who wishes to speak. I believe the Senator from New Jersey will complete what he has to say this afternoon.

Mr. KEM. I simply did not want a unanimous-consent agreement to be entered into which did not contemplate an opportunity for me to be heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it necessary that the presence of a quorum be established in connection with a request for unani-

mous consent to fix an hour upon which a joint resolution or a bill shall be voted on for final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was just going to ask whether there was objection to the waiving of the call of the roll to establish a quorum. Is there objection to the waiving of the roll? The Chair hears none.

The question, then, is on the unanimous-consent request made by the senior Senator from Michigan to fix the hour for a vote upon the measure at 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the hour of 2 p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan suggests that the hour for voting be 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under whose control will the time be between now and then?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know with whom to divide the time. I do not know who is opposed to the joint resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I want to determine. I should probably like to speak for a little while on the measure and perhaps offer an amendment, but I do not want to consume a great deal of time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me assure the Senator from Arkansas that he will be recognized tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is all I wanted to be certain of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Michigan that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending measure at 2 o'clock p. m. tomorrow? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the committee amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; and immediately thereafter upon the committee amendment, whether amended or not, and upon the final passage of the joint resolution as amended.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the subject at hand in order to elaborate slightly on what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I take this occasion to commend most highly the splendid presentation which the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has made of this matter. Having had some experience in the First World War with relief work, having participated in the relief work in Belgium, with which all the people of our country were familiar, I think in our committee meetings we have worked out the answer to every one of the objections made this afternoon on the floor and particularly the objections—I shall not say objections, but questions raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I can say to him from practical experience that it is necessary to feed wealthy people as well as poor people when they do not have food, and when payment can be secured from wealthy people in the local currency of the country in which the dealings are made, a revolving fund is provided to help everyone over and over again. In our Belgian experience we were able by that means not only to take care of all the indigent poor people, but the entire population, and there was left finally a considerable sum which was placed in an educational fund with which the Senator from Louisiana is familiar, which has done much good in promoting business and other relations between America and Belgium.

There is no reason why we should use the funds provided under this measure only for the purpose of feeding the poor, because when there is no food in a country everyone in it is poor. The people do not have American dollars with which to pay for food. Everyone pays in local currency, and under the bill the money paid is placed in a special fund which is used as a revolving fund, in order to take care of increasing relief needs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish merely to associate myself with what the Senator from New Jersey has stated, and with what the Senator from Michigan has outlined in his very fine presentation. All of us regret the necessity for appropriating funds for a purpose of this sort, although we recognize that there is a necessity for it, and that in doing so we are undertaking to conserve some degree of economic stability and contentment among people upon whose contentment and stability world peace may depend.

I feel very happy over the broad-minded approach to this subject by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which resulted in the report on the pending legislation, as well as on all the subjects that have come before that committee on an international basis, including the report on the Greek-Turkish loans, and the unanimous report of the committee on the Italian and other treaties made the other day.

I think we all recognize that there has been forced upon our Government and our people, due to causes which we all understand, a leadership, not simply in a political sense but in an economic sense, which we cannot avoid. We cannot escape it without running the great risk of contributing to world disorder, which will involve us no less than the nations we are trying to help.

Not only do I appreciate the very able statesmanship exhibited by the Senator from Michigan in connection with the joint resolution before the Senate, but I want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, without regard to politics, for having approached this subject and dealt with it in a statesmanlike way, however, unpleasant it may be. There are many things which are good which we must do as individuals and as a nation, which are not altogether pleasant for us to do, but when we face the duty and the obligation I think we have the courage and the foresight and the good judgment to do the thing that is essential, not only for the benefit of suffering people but indirectly, if not directly in our own behalf, as a part of a world which must rely upon cooperation and upon economic and political stability if the peace is to be maintained.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments.

Mr. President, I have been waiting for some time to speak for about 10 minutes on the pending joint resolution. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] told me that he had a matter to present. He wishes to catch a train, and I do not desire to delay matters. I should like to get through so that the Senator from Wisconsin may catch his train. However, he has been so courteous to me that if it is necessary for him to speak for a few minutes now in order to make his train, I shall be glad to yield to him, if I may have the floor as soon as he has finished.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few minutes. I shall be glad to wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said. I do not believe that I need to elaborate further on the crisis in the world and the need for this relief.

I notice that the House has reduced the amount from the $350,000,000 originally asked for in the estimates of the State Department as our share of this relief, to $200,000,000. I should like to go on record as urging the Senate to restore the $350,000,000 figure in order that that figure may be in conference and we may try to maintain it in our dealings with the conferees on the part of the House.

I should like to call attention to two questions relating to this subject, which I believe belong in the RECORD as a part of this discussion. The first has already been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. It has to do with the so-called Children's International Emergency Fund of the United Nations. That fund has been established. We have theoretical participation in that fund to the extent of 50 percent of the total. It was my hope, if we could get the $350,000,000 appropriation, that $50,000,000 could be earmarked as our share of the children's fund. I was prepared to offer an amendment to that effect, which would be in line with the language in the House version of the joint resolution. However, because of the fact that the House passed the joint resolution authorizing only $200,000,000, and that we must confer as to the amount, I shall not offer my amendment now. I merely wish to go on record as

favoring the use of the fund to provide our share of the children's international emergency relief, and I hope that the total authorization which emerges from the conference will be adequate to take care of it.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] indicated a few minutes ago that he does not feel it would be proper for any further requests for relief of this kind to come before the Congress this year. If that should be the case, and if the children's fund should not be taken care of, I wish to make it clear that that particular character of relief cannot be continued because those in charge of it will be unable to continue their work unless they have the necessary funds. So either the necessary provision should appear in the joint resolution as it finally comes from conference, so that the children's fund will be taken care of and our commitment to the United Nations will be fulfilled, or there must be an attempt to obtain a further appropriation, which I think would be very difficult under the existing circumstances.

There is one further matter about which I wish to speak before I take my seat. It has to do with the entire relief program. In this connection, I shall offer a minor amendment.

I have had called to my attention by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies Engaged in Shipping Relief Supplies Abroad the fact that during the 9 months from April 1 to December 1, 1946, this group of voluntary agencies, headed by the American Friends Service Committee, and including a number of other agencies, the names of which I shall place in the RECORD, has furnished food to the amount of $38,000,000. I have further figures showing that in the first quarter of 1947 the same group of voluntary organizations furnished food, in cash or in kind, through voluntary contributions, amounting to more than $39,000,000.

This group has come to us to ask for assistance along a certain line. What these agencies do is to obtain supplies in kind. They obtain donations from producers and processors of food. What they lack is the cash for transportation. They have asked our committee and the State Department if they would be willing to make an allotment of $5,000,000 in order to pay transportation costs of foodstuffs, in order to increase the outpouring of gifts to the nationals of various countries.

I have spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to the amendment, and I have taken it up with the State Department. I shall send the amendment to the desk, but first I wish to read it for the RECORD.

On page 10, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following subsection:

(e) In order to supplement the general relief assistance made available under the terms of section 1, and to effect the economical and expanded use of American voluntary relief contributions, funds appropriated pursuant to this joint resolution, not to exceed $5,000,000, may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the ocean transportation of supplies donated to or purchased by American voluntary and non-profit relief agencies, and in such quantities and kinds and for such purposes as the President may determine to be essential supplements to the supplies provided for such general relief assistance.

The purpose of offering the amendment is to give assistance to those voluntary agencies, and to indicate to them that we are enthusiastic about the work they are doing, the appeals they are making, and the spirit of cooperation in the relief work being done all over the United States, and to give the agencies our blessing, so to speak, in the work they are doing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator indicate to me, first, speaking generally, what $5,000,000 in transportation charges would represent in value of delivered relief?

Mr. SMITH. Those agencies have advised me that for every dollar of transportation charge they feel that they can deliver $10 in relief. In other words, it is a ten-for-one proposal in furnishing help.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact which I mentioned a moment ago, that already, in the first quarter of 1947, these agencies have furnished, in cash or commodities sent abroad, $39,000,000. It would require only a little more to bring the amount up to $50,000,000, which would represent a ratio of 10 to 1 as compared with the $5,000,000 transportation charges called for by the suggested allocation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Are these voluntary relief organizations already coordinated and working through one organized center?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. The organized center is known as the American Council of Voluntary Agencies Engaged in Shipping Relief Supplies Abroad. If the Senator desires, I can read the names of the various agencies. I propose to place the list in the RECORD, showing the supplies which they furnished in 1946 and the supplies they are furnishing in 1947, and the countries to which they have sent supplies, indicating the amount of cash and commodities in all cases.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish the Senator would place that information in the RECORD. I can think of nothing more logical or rational than to use $5,000,000 of this appropriation—assuming that the total appropriation is available—to produce $38,000,000 or $40,000,000 worth of relief. That is my idea of a bargain. So far as I am concerned, if the Senator will offer his amendment, personally I shall be very glad to urge that it be accepted and taken to conference, where we can give it the more intimate study which the Foreign Relations Committee itself was unable to give it.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I am very glad to offer my amendment and send it to the desk.

In closing, I should like to read a brief statement which was presented to me by this group of relief organization with regard to this important question. The statement is as follows:

Memorandum from: Robertson M. Fort, of Church World Service, and Edward O'Connor, of War Relief Services of National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.

Subject: Amendment to House Joint Resolution 153 (providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war) making available free ocean freight for the relief supplies of private agencies.

One of the greatest problems facing the American voluntary agencies is the excessive outlay of funds to cover ocean freight for relief supplies shipped abroad. The American public has become increasingly responsive to campaigns for gifts-in-kind. These campaigns have produced large volumes of supplies, such as food, clothing, medicines, seeds. Commercial firms, processors of food and clothing, are coming forward with offers to donate their products for the succor of the needy abroad. Thus H. J. Heinz Co. contributed some three million cans of baby food to the American Friends Service Committee and donated as many more as were bought by the public between April 7 and 12. Textile firms have similar offers under consideration. The limiting factor in campaigning for and securing a greater volume of contributed supplies has been the lack of sufficient funds to cover ocean freight. For example, one agency was offered a thousand cars of grain; but it would have cost a million dollars to ship the grain abroad. For lack of funds to pay the ocean freight, the offer had to be refused.

For every dollar of free freight, $10 worth of critically needed supplies could be made available for foreign relief.

I may say that that statement answers the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

There is now being organized among the American voluntary agencies with large constituencies in rural areas an agency known as Rural Overseas Relief. The first purpose of this agency is to secure larger contributions in kind of such items as grain, flour, cereals, cotton, seeds, and livestock. If ocean freight were guaranteed for contributions from this source the flow of voluntary relief would be greatly swelled.

It is the earnest hope of all the agencies represented in the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service that this provision could be made without in any way reducing the full appropriation of $350,000,000 so desperately needed for relief abroad. In their opinion, this amendment would result in a substantially increased measure of relief to these stricken peoples.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Michigan has said, it seems to me that it is a kind of encouragement that we give to those groups who continue the wonderful work which they have been doing, to encourage them to help their nationals.

In closing, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two tables, one of which shows the relief shipments made by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies in the period from April 1 to December 31, 1946, a period of 9 months, approximating a total of $38,000,000. The other table shows what was shipped by the same group in the first quarter of 1947, showing a total in commodities and in cash of some $39,000,000.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dollar value of relief sent abroad during March 1947 by American agencies voluntarily recorded with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid [1]

Country	Total cash and commodities sent abroad	
	During March	1947—First quarter
Europe:		
Belgium	$286,390	$572,108
Bulgaria	13,475	31,120
Czechoslovakia	295,219	1,330,321
Denmark	91,034	105,400
Finland	153,259	424,327
France	866,891	1,738,192
Greece	392,398	1,756,672
Hungary	1,287,735	3,664,268
Italy	445,814	3,254,979
Latvia	27	44
Lithuania		16
Luxemburg	4,952	4,952
Malta	29	29
Netherlands	71,377	253,007
Norway	17,029	168,625
Poland	208,206	4,623,367
Portugal	5,199	39,249
Russia	237,837	784,713
Rumania	1,751,661	3,052,436
Spain		31,280
Sweden	56,800	95,502
Switzerland	30,238	86,334
United Kingdom	69,071	201,977
Yugoslavia	421,601	452,385
Europe—General [2]	260,067	699,137
Occupied areas:		
Austria	996,779	2,670,937
Germany [3]	2,888,501	9,007,308
Japan	179,601	461,761
Korea		4,552
Far East:		
Burma	203	50,322
China	534,597	1,608,100
India	195,465	566,887
Indonesia		2,304
Malaya		7,093
Netherlands East Indies	1,909	38,138
Philippines	100,870	213,908
Siam		4,668
Asia—General [3]		1,901
Near East:		
Iran	2,740	16,506
Lebanon and Syria	8,240	68,487
Palestine	1,172,027	1,739,144
Turkey	611	6,218
Central and South America:		
Argentina	844	2,512
Bolivia	156	408
Brazil	728	2,935
Chile	707	3,232
Colombia		301
Mexico	7,788	15,217
Paraguay	18,577	21,977
Uruguay	917	1,705
Venezuela		101
Central and South America—general [3]	16,105	73,364
Africa:		
Algiers	2,199	2,228
Egypt	8,136	11,136
Ethiopia	2,744	10,996
Libya	2,551	2,551
Tunis	219	558
Africa—general	2,384	41,757
West Indies:		
Cuba	899	899
Haiti	890	890
Jamaica	1,696	1,846
Puerto Rico	3,279	4,035
SUMMARY		
Europe	$6,966,309	$22,370,441
Occupied areas	4,064,881	12,144,558
Far East	833,044	2,493,321
Near East	1,183,618	1,830,355
Central and South America	45,822	121,812
Africa	18,233	69,226
West Indies	6,764	7,670
Grand total	13,118,671	39,037,383

[1] Report does not include cash transferred or goods shipped by American Art Federation, American Friends of France, Save the Children Federation, and the Church World Service, from whom no reports or incomplete reports were received.

[2] Transferred to agencies' general stock piles allocations to specific countries to be made later.

[3] For benefit of German nationals and displaced persons in Germany.

Members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies engaged in shipping relief supplies abroad (not limited to one country)

Agency	Period covered	Expenditure for relief	
		Purchased goods	Goods in kind
American Friends Service Committee	Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	$4,164,343	$1,094,155
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.	do	13,669,750	1,340,291
Brethren Service Committee	Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	136,000	50,000
Church World Service, Inc.	May 1 to Dec. 31, 1946		2,304,932
Committee on Christian Science Wartime Activities of Mother Church	Apr. 1 to Dec. 31 1946	62,783	575,527
International Committee of YWCA	do	106,853	219,775
International Rescue and Relief Committee, Inc.	do	107,951	29,528
Lutheran World Relief, Inc.	do	5,000	1,710,940
Mennonite Central Committee	Apr. 1 to Nov. 30, 1946	174,277	1,166,900
Near East Foundation	Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946		441,605
Salvation Army	do	42,502	172,062
Save the Children Federation, Inc.	do	257,928	887,461
Unitarian Service Committee	do	78,013	455,518
War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference	do	409,684	8,811,168
World Student Service Fund	do		
Total		19,215,084	18,939,862

NOTE.—9 months equals approximately $38,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(e) In order to supplement the general relief assistance made available under the terms of section 1, and to effect the economical and expanded use of American voluntary relief contributions, funds appropriated pursuant to this joint resolution, not to exceed $5,000,000, may be used to pay necessary expenses related to the ocean transportation of supplies donated to or purchased by American voluntary and nonprofit relief agencies, and in such quantities and kinds and for such purposes as the President may determine to be essential supplements to the supplies provided for such general relief assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the Chair following the rule of the Senate with reference to recognizing the Senator who first addresses the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the Senator from Wisconsin had the floor. He yielded to the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from Wisconsin was on his feet, and that is the reason that the Chair recognized him.

Mr. MORSE. I accept the explanation of the Presiding Officer; but from now on in, for the duration of the Eightieth Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon will always object to recognizing Members on the basis of any list the Presiding Officer may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say for the information of the Senator from Oregon that it was understood that the Senator from Wisconsin must catch a train, and he yielded to the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey asked the Senator from Wisconsin if he cared to speak, and the Senator from Wisconsin said that he would delay his speech for a few minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I shall always be willing myself to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin under those circumstances.

SUGAR CONTROL

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall not address the Senate on the resolution which it has been considering and which is in charge of the able Senator from Michigan. I did not plan to speak until after the vote on the pending resolution; but since it has been agreed that a vote will not be taken before tomorrow at 2 o'clock, and since apparently no Senators desire to speak on the resolution at this time, I should like to address the Senate briefly.

The President of the United States has recently been talking much about the necessity of cutting down the high cost of living. I should like to point out that one of the branches of the executive departments over which the President has absolute control is doing everything possible to increase the high cost of living to a great mass of people in the lower-income brackets, especially those with large families. I refer to the Sugar Rationing Division of the Department of Agriculture.

In this connection I should like to read a few brief excerpts from some news stories. The first one which I shall read is an Associated Press story published on May 10, as follows:

The Evening Sun stated today: "A survey of the port shows a glut of approximately 10,000,000 pounds of sugar in Baltimore warehouses and an acute shortage of storage space."

I continue the quotation:

"The port of Baltimore is bulging at the seams with sugar."

On April 18, the New York Times carried a story to the effect that sugar distributors were selling sugar at as much as 25 cents a hundred pounds below the Department of Agriculture's price ceiling, and that the principal reason for the price cut-back is the backing up of supplies in the hands of industrial users.

On the 28th day of April, the Journal of Commerce carried a story to the effect that one large wholesaler, Sucrest Corp. by name, had reduced its price to $7.95,

with the statement that the sugar-control agencies were shipping sugar into the United States in greater quantities than were being consumed, with the consequent severe shortage in the storage space at sugar refineries.

On the 31st day of March 1947 the Senate passed a bill extending sugar controls to October 31 of this year. The original bill extended controls to March 31, 1948. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the junior Senator from Wisconson, the present speaker, submitted an amendment to end controls on the 31st of October. That amendment was adopted by the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio and I submitted this amendment as a compromise only after we were convinced that it would be impossible to get through the Senate our bill to end all sugar controls immediately. We felt at that time and urged upon the Senate the necessity and wisdom of immediately doing away with all sugar controls except inventory controls. At that time we submitted facts to show that there was far more sugar available for consumption in the United States during the year 1947 than there ever had been during any previous year.

At that time, however, the harvesting of the Cuban sugar crop, which is our principal source of supply, had not been completed and apparently some of the Senators felt that the predictions as to the Cuban crop were overly optimistic. At that time apparently a number of Senators felt that if we would give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to ration sugar and to end sugar controls when they were no longer necessary, that he would exercise this power wisely. Since that time, however, the harvesting of the Cuban crop has progressed to the point that there can be very little question that it will exceed the 6,137,000 tons which I predicted on the floor of the Senate at the time I urged that either we completely decontrol sugar or at least provide a definite, substantial increase of canning sugar for the housewife.

On May 1 of this year Cuba had already processed more than 5,000,000 tons of sugar. At that time only 13 of the 180 mills in Cuba had finished processing sugar. Today I know of no one who predicts less than 6,000,000 tons of Cuban sugar. Some statisticians estimate a Cuban crop of approximately 6,300,000 tons.

In addition to the above, there is available to Cuba 340,000 tons for home consumption, plus 300,000 tons of sugar listed as "export free"—in other words, sugar which Cuba may sell where and how she pleases. I point out particularly that as of today, Cuba can find no buyers for this sugar. Originally Mexico had indicated that she was taking 100,000 tons of this export-free sugar, but recently Mexico has stated that she will take no part of the 100,000 tons, and furthermore, that she herself has sugar for sale.

In regard to this Cuban export-free sugar, let me read briefly from a report of H. L. Horm, sugar brokers, dated May 2:

Here are 300,000 tons going begging for a buyer.

Let me also read from an article in the New York Times of May 7, 1947:

RISING SUGAR TIDE WORRIES BROKERS—EXTRA RATIONS ALLOTMENT AT ONCE FOR INDUSTRIES URGED AT RECENT WASHINGTON PARLEY

Completely reversing the acute sugar shortage situation of the war and postwar period, sugar men are now seeking all possible ways to stimulate the sale of the product, it was reported yesterday. Price resistance by industrial and consumer users and excellent prospects for the record Cuban crop that is now coming into the country have presented sugar men with at least a temporary surplus problem, it was stated.

A meeting was called by Government officials in Washington quietly 2 days ago, sugar brokers said, to ask beet sugar and sugar refiners for suggestions on how to increase the sale of sugar.

Mr. President, let me repeat that:

A meeting was called by Government officials in Washington quietly 2 days ago, sugar brokers said, to ask beet sugar and sugar refiners for suggestions on how to increase the sale of sugar.

Incidentally, Mr. President, those are the same Government officials who, 2 months ago, were telling us that it would be nothing short of a catastrophe if we ended sugar rationing.

I continue to read from the article:

Two suggestions were made, but no action has been taken on them, says the statement.

Refiners facing warehouse congestion and added costs of overstocked holdings are anxious to obtain either form of relief.

Sugar men stated that foreign countries, members of the International Emergency Food Council, are not taking up their present allotments of sugar, because they are unwilling to pay present prices or because they do not have the necessary dollar exchange. This buyer resistance, they added, also is contributing to the present sugar-surplus problem.

Mr. President, ridiculous as it may sound, after the arguments that experts and so-called experts presented to us several months ago, I call attention to the fact that at this time the newspapers and the sugar brokers are referring to the sugar-surplus problem, while sugar is still being rationed.

It, therefore, becomes clear, Mr. President, that sugar rationing, as presently being handled, is an incredibly fantastic farce. While President Truman claims that he is attempting to reduce the cost of living, his administration is, in effect, increasing the cost of living by denying the housewife adequate sugar for use in canning fruits and berries for her family's use, thereby forcing her to buy those items at a higher cost. He is, in effect, saying to her, "We have plenty of sugar—so much that the sugar brokers are referring to it as the 'problem of the sugar surplus,' but for some reason, known only to my bureaucrats, we refuse to let the housewife get sufficient sugar to preserve food." While he is giving lip service to reducing the cost of living, he is sanctioning the actions of the Sugar Rationing Division of the Agriculture Department, which will cause the wastage of tremendous amounts of food on the farm.

I, therefore, call upon the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to tell this Congress why they insist on refusing to allow sugar to the housewife, at a time when warehouses—in the words of the Associated Press report—are "bulging at the seams with sugar"—at a time when sugar brokers are referring to "the problem of the sugar surplus." Mr. President, the whole idea of spending millions of dollars this year to ration a product, when there is a surplus is unbelievable; but what is even more unbelievable is that sugar is rationed in such a fashion as to pile up tremendous surpluses, while the average farmer's wife and many other housewives are begging for sugar so that the food which they ordinarily preserve will not go to waste.

To those so-called experts who, a short time ago, were predicting that if sugar rationing ended the price would skyrocket to 20 cents or 30 cents a pound, I call attention to the fact that sugar brokerage houses are now offering sugar at 10¾ cents per pound, if and when rationing ends. In other words, a number of sugar brokerage houses are attempting to make contracts to supply sugar, if and when sugar rationing ends, at 10¾ cents a pound—which completely negatives the testimony of all the experts or so-called experts who told us that sugar would skyrocket to 20 or 30 cents a pound if and when Congress decontrolled sugar.

I know that my good friends, the very able junior Senator from Vermont, and the able junior Senator from New Hampshire, who opposed decontrol at the time when the sugar control bill was being argued, felt that if the rationing powers were placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, he would use these powers wisely and well. I do not question that they were justified in so believing at that time. However, today it is so obvious that the Sugar Rationing Division of the Agriculture Department is participating in planned scarcity, so far as sugar is concerned, and planned wastage so far as the fruits and berries on the farm are concerned, that I earnestly request them to join with me at this time in demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture either end sugar controls immediately—which power we gave him in the event sugar controls should become unnecessary—or that at least he immediately make available all the canning sugar the housewife wants.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What is the factor which controls the production of any commodity in the United States? Is it free competition, or is it some planned control? In other words, what would induce a greater domestic production in the United States to supply the market?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the junior Senator from Nevada that all the evidence presently available indicates that not only do we have sufficient sugar to supply all the needs in the United States, but the sugar brokers and wholesalers are commencing to wrestle with what they term "the sugar surplus problem." So I do not believe we need to be concerned at this time about any scarcity.

I might predict that before this session of Congress ends, undoubtedly there will be before this body suggestions that the Congress limit the intake of sugar from Cuba, because of the tremendous glut of sugar on the American market.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. I had intended my question to imply that, if controls were ended, perhaps there would be a greater effort on the part of our domestic cane- and beet-sugar producers, and that if such controls were ended, it would result in more sugar and not less sugar.

Mr. McCARTHY. I might say, in that connection, that I think the Senator is absolutely correct, and the Cuban growers took the same position. They ran full-page ads in a vast number of papers in this country at the time we were considering decontrol. They urged that we not decontrol sugar, and one of the reasons they gave in advertisements in American newspapers for their opposition to the ending of sugar controls was that if sugar were decontrolled, it might act as a stimulus to the production of continental cane and beet sugar, and might rob foreign producers of some of their market.

Mr. MALONE. What is our objective in this country? What should it be? Should it be free production of as many of the necessities, such as sugar, as possible? Or is there a long-term objective by the administration to hold production down so that we will have to have price control? What are we leading to—a completely controlled economy, or should we try to get back to competitive production, so that price control would be unnecessary?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that Congress is aiming at an entirely different result from the aims of those presently controlling the executive branch of the Government, the various executive departments. When we look at what is being done with the tremendous surplus of sugar, and see the planning to reduce the high cost of living, there is something fantastic about the whole thing, so that it is hard for us to ascertain what those in charge are driving at.

Mr. MALONE. Congress, in fixing the decontrol date as of October 31, indicated it believed the junior Senator from Wisconsin when he said there was at least an additional supply of sugar, and more sugar would be imported and more would be available than the figures showed. Would it not be a good idea, if the status quo is maintained for another month or two without action through the administrative branch of the Government, for Congress again to consider advancing the date of decontrol?

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily agree with the Senator. I might say, however—and I think the Senator will agree with me—that at the time we considered the sugar decontrol bill, at the time the junior Senator from Ohio and I offered an amendment changing the proposed date for ending sugar control from March 31, 1948, to October 31 of this year, that was done only as a compromise. We felt that sugar should be completely decontrolled. However, some of the Senators very honestly and sincerely felt that if we would say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "We will give you the power to decontrol sugar at any date between now and October 31," then, when there was a surplus of sugar, which some of us were sure there would be, he would use common, ordinary, horse sense, and decontrol.

However, I point out that at the time we were considering the decontrol bill, the President made widely publicized statements to the effect that it was absolutely necessary to have sugar control until March 31, 1948, and I assume, in view of those widely publicized statements on the part of the Chief Executive, that perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture, serving under the President, may feel that he has to save the President's face, and for that reason cannot decontrol now, even though, as a question of ordinary intelligence, he should decontrol.

Mr. MALONE. Is not the entire principle of control wrong, in the first place, when a dire emergency, such as war, exists? The war was over a year and a half ago. Is not the entire principle of continuing controls contrary to the theory that there should be maximum production, to which they all give lip service?

Let us consider the CPA, which retains rationing on builders, for instance. In my State alone there are many unemployed workers, both in the northern and southern areas of the State, the unemployment being brought about entirely by the CPA controlling the supply of materials, when the materials are there under their noses. They do not understand the situation. If we are to reach maximum production, either in the building of houses, or in any other line of endeavor, is it not time that we abolished all controls?

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily agree with the Senator. The Senator refers to CPA. I think CPA should be abolished, but while we often abuse incompetent bureaucrats, I should like to point out that in my opinion Mr. Creedon, who has something to do with CPA, is one of the better and higher type of men in the bureaus. I have much respect for what he is at least attempting to do, even though it has been apparently impossible for him to do a good job because of the tremendous mess the department was in when he took over.

Mr. MALONE. Is not the situation impossible in peacetime, to start with?

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily agree with the Senator.

Mr MALONE. I talked with Mr. Creedon only this morning about a job a contractor in my State is trying to complete that has to do with veterans' housing, and the contractor told me there was equipment in Richmond, Calif., which he needed, on which he was not even allowed to bid.

Is not sugar only one of the things about which we are worried? If we take off some of the controls, and let men who understand, for instance, the building situation like the contractors, operate as usual, business can go forward. Or if the beet farmers or the cane farmers in America, men who understand the situation, can get started, is not that what will bring sugar to the housewives of America and to the soft drink manufacturers, and make it possible for these products, as well as building materials, to be made available to our people?

Is it not time we did away with the surplus of controls and the personnel involved? About the time the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations gets started cutting down some governmental expenses, we hear it said it is such a horrible thing that 10,000 people are going to be laid off. What are we talking about? Are we talking about trying to keep people on the pay roll, or are we trying to get production to supply the people who are working and supporting themselves.

I know that Mr. Creedon is a good man, and he can get along any place. Let us abolish CPA and give him a chance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator that the people last fall voted for an uncontrolled economy, and I believe we should give it to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to associate myself with the Senator in his suggestion and demand that sugar rationing be removed, because from all the figures which have developed since we previously debated the matter, it seems obvious that there is more sugar than ever, and that there is no further reason for continuing the controls that were urged on us when we extended the sugar-control law.

Mr. McCARTHY. While the Senator is undoubtedly aware of the fact, I may repeat that I stated that there is presently in Cuba a tremendous amount of sugar which is going begging for buyers.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the foreign nations to whom it was allotted are not taking it, and that the American housewife is not buying in many cases more than from hand to mouth, where there is no canning, and that the sugar is backed up in all the warehouses.

Mr. McCARTHY. I might also say that since I started my remarks today I received two notes in regard to action the Department of Agriculture has taken. I might say, in that connection, that I released my talk to the press last night, and today the Department of Agriculture has issued an order—I am not vouching for this; I got it in a note from my office—announcing that there will be no 30-day limitation on industry inventory. At the same time they announce that the housewife can get her July 1 ration of sugar on June 1. I quote from the release:

> The Department warns, however, that housewives must make the sugar last until October 31, the date originally set for use of the next rationing stamp.

As I understand, the Agricultural Department is saying to industry: "We are taking off the 30-day limitation on your supply of sugar," and they are saying to the housewife, "You get no relief whatsoever except that you can get your sugar earlier, but you get no more for canning." I believe the opinion was unanimous on the floor of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, when we passed the extension of sugar controls, that the

housewife should get consideration before anyone else.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin believe it to be a fact that when we reach the point the sugar situation has obviously reached, and the building-material industry has obviously reached, and which many other manufacturers of products have obviously reached, a control, a holding down of the price in the beginning, prevents the very supply being produced which we need, and in the end results in the necessity of further controls?

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may interrupt the Senator from Nevada, I think that if there were actually a shortage of sugar controls would be justified. But, as I argued on the floor of the Senate 2½ or 3 months ago—and as I tell Senators today—the things that 2 months ago many of us predicted would occur have actually occurred, and we find that there is a tremendous surplus of sugar. So it is inconceivable and unbelievable that we should have control, no matter how a person may feel about controls generally.

Mr. MALONE. Why should there be quotas and, in addition thereto, a price ceiling? That is to say, why should we try to hold down the prices and limit production at the same time. Is it consistent?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not believe that quotas are in effect at the present time. In fact, we are paying a support price of $14 a ton for sugar beets, I believe. That, incidentally, has increased, or has apparently increased, the sugar-beet acreage in the United States by, I believe, 27,000 acres. That is the estimate furnished by the Department of Agriculture. The figures may not be correct.

Mr. MALONE. We have quotas on imports. One further statement. In my own State, for 6 months an organization of dairy farmers has been trying to get an allocation of sugar, in order to convert some of their dairy products into ice cream for the purpose of selling it. They have been held up and denied the opportunity of doing that. They simply want to expand the market for their products, in the hope of being able to show a profit on their entire operation. It is things of that sort that appear to me not to be consistent with the situation as it exists today. As the junior Senator from Wisconsin says, it was advocated by himself and others in the course of debate. Is it not time that controls be lifted, to allow people to get into business so they can make a living through the production of the things they are able to produce, and to supply the goods and products the people need?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I will join with the junior Senator from Nevada at any time in doing away with any and all controls.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. At the time the Congress was considering the necessity of the extension of sugar controls, the President made a widely publicized statement to the effect that controls must be extended to March 31, 1948. After the Senate adopted the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Wisconsin, some Democratic leaders—not all of them—predicted results just short of a national calamity because the bureaucrats were not given control over sugar to extend into the year 1948. In order to save face for the President and solely for political reasons, the Secretary of Agriculture may feel that it is necessary for him to continue this farce of sugar rationing, even though this Congress gave him the power to end controls when they become unnecessary. Unless the Sugar Rationing Division of the Department of Agriculture immediately makes available to the housewife sufficient sugar to prevent the threatened tremendous wastage of food, I intend to introduce legislation which will either force him to do so or end all sugar controls immediately. I sincerely hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will join with me in that attempt.

AWARD OF AMERICAN LEGION'S DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO SENATOR MARTIN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on May 5, 1947, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] made an outstanding address in Indianapolis, Ind., before the American Legion's national executive committee. This address was placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2089. I especially invite attention to this address because I consider it the formula for the preservation of our American way of life.

On May 6, 1947, the same committee announced the award of the Legion's distinguished service medal for 1947 to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, of Detroit, and the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky. The award, which is given for outstanding service to the United States, will be presented at the Legion's twenty-ninth annual convention in New York City next August.

I am sure that all the colleagues of the Senator from Pennsylvania in the United States Senate, as well as his thousands of friends elsewhere, are proud of the merited distinction conferred upon him, since only 31 of the distinguished service awards have been given previous to this date.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. DEAN ACHESON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on May 8, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, delivered a very significant speech before the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss. Mr. Acheson is one of the ablest public servants we have in the Government today and is one of the few top-level men with a long experience in international affairs. I regret that he finds it necessary to leave the Government service. I believe his leaving is a serious loss to this country. To me, one of the most discouraging aspects of our Government is the difficulty that we have in attracting and retaining the services of men of experience and inherent ability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Acheson's speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, because I think it is important that every member of the Senate have an opportunity to read his speech in full.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REQUIREMENTS OF RECONSTRUCTION

You who live and work in this rich agricultural region, whose daily lives are concerned with the growth and marketing of cotton and corn and other agricultural products, must derive a certain satisfaction from the fact that the greatest affairs of state never get very far from the soil.

When Secretary of State Marshall returned from the recent meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow he did not talk to us about ideologies or armies. He talked about food and fuel and their relation to industrial production, and the relation of industrial production to the organization of Europe, and the relation of the organization of Europe to the peace of the world.

The devastation of war has brought us back to elementals, to the point where we see clearly how short is the distance from food and fuel either to peace or to anarchy.

Here are some of the basic facts of life with which we are primarily concerned today in the conduct of foreign relations:

The first is that most of the countries of Europe and Asia are today in a state of physical destruction or economic dislocation, or both. Planned, scientific destruction of the enemy's resources carried out by both sides during the war has left factories destroyed, fields impoverished and without fertilizer or machinery to get them back in shape, transportation systems wrecked, populations scattered and on the borderline or starvation, and long-established business and trading connections disrupted.

Another grim fact of international life is that two of the greatest workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon whose production Europe and Asia were to an important degree dependent before the war, have hardly been able even to begin the process of reconstruction because of the lack of a peace settlement. As we have seen, recent efforts at Moscow to make progress toward a settlement for Germany and Austria have ended with little accomplishment. Meanwhile, political instability in some degree retards revival in nearly every country of Europe and Asia.

A third factor is that unforeseen disasters—what the lawyers call "acts of God"—have occurred to the crops of Europe. For two successive years unusually severe droughts have cut down food production. And during the past winter storms and floods and excessive cold unprecedented in recent years have swept northern Europe and England with enormous damage to agricultural and fuel production. These disasters have slowed down the already slow pace of reconstruction, have impeded recovery of exports, and have obliged many countries to draw down irreplaceable reserves of gold and foreign exchange, which had been earmarked for the importation of reconstruction materials, for the purchase of food and fuel for subsistence.

The accumulation of these grim developments has produced a disparity between production in the United States and production in the rest of the world that is staggering in its proportions. The United States has been spared physical destruction during the war. Moreover, we have been favored with unusually bountiful agricultural crops in recent years. Production in this country is today running at the annual rate of $210,000,000,000.

Responding to this highly abnormal relationship between production in the United States and production in the rest of the world, the United States Government has already authorized and is carrying out an extensive program of relief and reconstruction. We have contributed nearly $3,000,000,000 to foreign relief. We have taken the lead in the organization of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, and have subscribed to these two institutions to the extent of almost $6,000,000,000. We have increased the capacity of the Export-Import Bank to make loans abroad by almost $3,000,000,000. We have made a direct loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain. We are proposing this year to contribute $500,000,000 for relief and reconstruction in the Philippines, and $1,000,000,000 to relief in occupied areas. The President's recommendations for aid to Greece and Turkey to the extent of $400,000,000 and for post-UNRRA relief to the extent of $350,000,000 are still under consideration by Congress. And there are a few other smaller items.

These measures of relief and reconstruction have been only in part suggested by humanitarianism. Your Congress has authorized and your Government is carrying out a policy of relief and reconstruction today chiefly as a matter of national self-interest. For it is generally agreed that until the various countries of the world get on their feet and become self-supporting there can be no political or economic stability in the world, and no lasting peace or prosperity for any of us. Without outside aid, the process of recovery in many countries would take so long as to give rise to hopelessness and despair. In these conditions freedom and democracy and the independence of nations could not long survive, for hopeless and hungry people often resort to desperate measures. The war will not be over until the people of the world can again feed and clothe themselves and face the future with some degree of confidence.

The contribution of the United States toward world livelihood and reconstruction is best measured today not in terms of money but in terms of the commodities which we ship abroad. It is commodities—food, clothing, coal, steel, machinery—that the world needs, and it is commodities that we must concentrate our attention upon.

Our exports of goods and services to the rest of the world during the current year, 1947, are estimated to total $16,000,000,000, an all-time peacetime high. Before the war our exports of goods and services fluctuated around $4,000,000,000 annually.

It is difficult to imagine $16,000,000,000 worth of commodities. This represents 1 month's work for each man and woman in the United States, 1 month's output from every farm, factory, and mine.

Let me give you another indication of the extent of our exports. The volume of commodities now moving out of east coast and gulf ports of the United States is twice as great as the peak volume which moved out of those ports during the war when we were transporting and supplying not only our own huge armies abroad but a tremendous volume of lend-lease supplies.

Our exports this year are perhaps the maximum, in quantity, that is likely to be exported abroad in the next few years. At the same time these exports are probably the minimum that we should make available to the world.

It is extremely difficult under present circumstances to increase the volume of our exports further. For in this country, too, there is a great demand for commodities, and foreign customers must compete with American customers. The character and composition of our exports will probably change, with lesser quantities of food, fuel, and raw materials being exported and increased amounts of steel, machinery, and other manufactured products going abroad. But the total volume of exports is not likely to increase substantially until the world gets soundly on its feet and a genuine world prosperity may carry a healthy multilateral trade to higher levels.

In return for the commodities and services which we expect to furnish the world this year, we estimate that we will receive commodities and services from abroad to the value of about $8,000,000,000. This is just about half as much as we are exporting. This volume of imports is equal to about 2 weeks' work of all the factories, farms, mines, and laborers of the United States, and consists largely of things which are not produced in this country in sufficient quantity. We wish that the imports were larger, but the war-devastated world is just not able to supply more.

The difference between the value of the goods and services which foreign countries must buy from the United States this year and the value of the goods and services they are able to supply to us this year will therefore amount to the huge sum of about $8,000,000,000.

How are foreigners going to get the United States dollars necessary to cover this huge difference? And how are they going to get the United States dollars to cover a likely difference of nearly the same amount next year? These are some of the most important questions in international relations today.

Of this year's difference between imports and exports, more than $5,000,000,000 is being financed by loans and grants-in-aid from the United States Government, through such instruments as direct relief, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the International Fund, and the loan to Great Britain. Funds for this purpose have already been authorized by Congress. The remainder of this year's deficit will be covered by private investments, remittances of American citizens abroad, and by drawing down the extremely limited foreign reserves of gold and foreign exchange.

But what of next year, and the year after that? Continued political instability and acts of God are retarding recovery to a greater degree than had been anticipated. The extreme need for foreign countries for American products is likely, therefore, to continue undiminished in 1948, while the capacity of foreign countries to pay in commodities will probably be only slightly increased. Under existing authorizations, considerable sums will be available to offset next year's deficit. But these funds will taper off rapidly during the latter part of 1948. The need, however, will decline very little if at all.

This is not a bright picture. But we must face up to the facts on the rate of world recovery. It has been widely overlooked that after the First World War it was only in 1925 that the world arrived at the 1914 level of economic activity. And World War II was many times more destructive than World War I. In the late war nations planned on a vast scale and executed with new and tremendously improved weapons the destruction of the enemies' economic resources, with enormous success. Recovery will therefore be correspondingly slow.

One more thing to be considered is that as great as is our supply of commodities and services to the world during the current year, it is still far short of what the people of the world need if they are to eat enough to maintain their physical strength and at the same time carry on essential measures of reconstruction and become self-supporting. This will be true until the other workshops and granaries of the world are back in full production.

What do these facts of international life mean for the United States and for United States foreign policy?

They mean, first, that we in the United States must take as large a volume of imports as possible from abroad in order that the financial gap between what the world needs and what it can pay for can be narrowed. There is no charity involved in this. It is simply common sense and good business. We are today obliged from considerations of self-interest and humanitarianism to finance a huge deficit in the world's budget. The only sound way to end this deficit financing is by accepting increased quantities of goods from abroad. There can never be any stability or security in the world for any of us until foreign countries are able to pay in commodities and services for what they need to import and to finance their equipment needs from more normal sources of investment.

Today in Geneva our negotiators are meeting with representatives of 17 other countries in an effort to negotiate a mutual reduction in trade barriers and an agreement upon fair rules to govern international trade. This is one of the ways in which we are attempting to face up to the realities of international life. The Geneva Conference must succeed. The International Trade Organization must be established.

The Geneva Conference must succeed not only because of the emergency supply and financial situation that exists today, but also because our position as the world's greatest producer and creditor nation demands that for a long period to come we accept an ever larger volume of imports. When the process of reconversion at home is completed, we are going to find ourselves far more dependent upon exports than before the war to maintain levels of business activity to which our economy has become accustomed.

The facts of international life also mean that the United States is going to have to undertake further emergency financing of foreign purchases if foreign countries are to continue to buy in 1948 and 1949 the commodities which they need to sustain life and at the same time rebuild their economies. Requests for further United States aid may reach us through the International Bank, or through the Export-Import Bank, or they may be of a type which existing national and international institutions are not equipped to handle and therefore may be made directly through diplomatic channels. But we know now that further financing beyond existing authorizations, is going to be needed. No other country is able to bridge the gap in commodities or dollars.

This leads directly to a third imperative for our foreign policy. Since world demand exceeds our ability to supply, we are going to have to concentrate our emergency assistance in areas where it will be most effective in building world political and economic stability, in promoting human freedom and democratic institutions, in fostering liberal trading policies, and in strengthening the authority of the United Nations.

This is merely common sense and sound practice. It is in keeping with the policy announced by President Truman in his special message to Congress on March 12 on aid to Greece and Turkey. Free peoples who are seeking to preserve their independence and democratic institutions and human freedoms against totalitarian pressures, either internal or external, will receive top priority for American reconstruction aid. This is no more than frank recognition as President Truman said, "that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States."

The fourth thing we must do in the present situation is to push ahead with the reconstruction of those two great workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon which the ultimate recovery of the two continents so largely depends. This is what Secretary Marshall meant when he reported to the Nation on April 28 that action on behalf of European recovery cannot await

"compromise through exhaustion," and that we must take whatever action is possible immediately, even without full Four Power agreement, to effect a larger measure of European, including German, recovery. European recovery cannot be complete until the various parts of Europe's economy are working together in a harmonious whole. And the achievement of a coordinated European economy remains a fundamental objective of our foreign policy.

Finally, in order to carry out an economical and effective policy of relief and reconstruction along the foregoing lines, your Government is going to need the extension by Congress of certain Executive powers over the domestic sale, transportation, and exportation of a limited list of commodities. Such controls have been in effect during the war and are still in effect under the President's war powers, but are due to expire June 30 of this year.

It is vitally important that these controls be renewed. It is commodities that are needed in critical areas abroad, not just money. It is wheat and coal and steel that are urgently required to stave off economic collapse, not just dollar credits.

Your Government must therefore be able to insure equitable distribution of supplies as between the domestic economy and the export demand. This requires the extension of allocation powers with respect to a limited list of commodities certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as critical to the foreign economic policy of the United States. Powers to assign priorities directly to producing firms will be necessary for a still more restricted list of items. At the same time, a continuation of export controls is required in order to direct exports where we want them to go and to cut down unnecessary and undesirable foreign buying in the domestic market.

Power to assign priorities on transportation are also needed. This power is needed in order to insure the efficient use of transportation facilities, particularly freight cars. Without such authority it will be difficult to move bulkly export commodities such as coal and grain in the required quantities.

Finally, certain legislation which would enable the Maritime Commission to insure maximum availability and efficient use of shipping is required in order to insure the success of our export programs with respect to bulky items such as coal and grain.

Legislative proposals of this nature have been presented to Congress, or will be presented in the near future. It is of the greatest importance to the foreign economic policy of this country, and thus to the security and well-being of the Nation, that these powers be granted.

There is a story going the rounds about a man, who, after listening to an extended lecture on the grave financial and economic difficulties of northern Europe and Great Britain, remarked, "And just think, all the trouble was caused by a blizzard."

I think we will all agree that something more than a blizzard has caused Europe's current difficulties. But last winter's blizzard did show up the extremely narrow margins of human and national subsistence which prevail in the world today, margins so narrow that a blizzard can threaten populations with starvation and nations with bankruptcy and loss of independence.

Not only do human beings and nations exist in narrow economic margins, but also human dignity, human freedom, and democratic institutions.

It is one of the principal aims of our foreign policy today to use our economic and financial resources to widen these margins. It is necessary if we are to preserve our own freedoms and our own democratic institutions. It is necessary for our national security. And it is our duty and our privilege as human beings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will be noted that the Under Secretary's speech draws attention to the conditions that are developing in Europe and Japan, in very plain terms. Among other things he points out that if the disintegration of Europe and Asia is to be stopped and rehabilitation started we must in some manner revive the two workshops of Europe and Asia, Germany and Japan.

I wish to read two paragraphs of Mr. Acheson's speech, emphasizing this point. Under Secretary Acheson, in his speech, said:

The facts of international life also mean that the United States is going to have to undertake further emergency financing of foreign purchases if foreign countries are to continue to buy in 1948 and 1949 the commodities which they need to sustain life and at the same time rebuild their economies. Requests for further United States aid may reach us through the International Bank, or through the Export-Import Bank, or they may be a type which existing national and international institutions are not equipped to handle and therefore may be made directly through diplomatic channels. But we know now that further financing, beyond existing authorizations, is going to be needed. No other country is able to bridge the gap in commodities or dollars.

I want particularly to draw attention to that sentence. It has some relation to an inquiry made a few moment ago by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in connection with the relief bill as to what are the plans for further relief. Here in this statement, while it is not dealing with relief, the Under Secretary of State, who certainly is as well informed, if not better informed, than anyone in our Government, states positively that further financing will be needed.

I quote further:

This leads directly to a third imperative for our foreign policy. Since world demand exceeds our ability to supply, we are going to have to concentrate our emergency assistance in areas where it will be most effective in building world political and economic stability, in promoting human freedom and democratic institutions, in fostering liberal trading policies, and in strengthening the authority of the United Nations.

* * * * *

The fourth thing we must do in the present situation is to push ahead with the reconstruction of those two great workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon which the ultimate recovery of the two continents so largely depends. This is what Secretary Marshall ment when he reported to the Nation on April 28 that action on behalf of European recovery cannot await compromise through exhaustion, and that we must take whatever action is possible immediately, even without full Four Power agreement, to effect a larger measure of European, including German, recovery. European recovery cannot be complete until the various parts of Europe's economy are working together in a harmonious whole. And the achievement of a coordinated European economy remains a fundamental objective of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, on April 7 I discussed at some length in this Chamber the resolution, Senate Resolution 10, submitted by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, which provides that Congress approves and favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the United Nations. Even though there has been little apparent response to that proposal by Members of this Body, I am glad to report that there has been a favorable and widespread reaction to it in the press. If the proposal is eventually accepted, it will not be the first time in our history that the Senate has followed rather than led public opinion in a matter of vital importance.

When I discussed the resolution on April 7, the Moscow Conference was still in progress. It was not at that time certain that nothing could be achieved at the conference, although few expected anything of importance would come of it. Now that we know the results, it surely is high time that we begin to develop our own policy in an affirmative and positive manner. If our resourcefulness is limited to a repetition of sterile conferences with Mr. Molotov, I can see little hope for a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. President, although the Under Secretary does not directly mention a Federation of Europe, he does emphasize the necessity of the reconstruction of Germany's and Europe's productive capacity and, again, I submit that a federation of Europe's bankrupt states offers the best possible way to bring about such reconstruction. As I said before, unless Germany is merged into a larger unity which she cannot dominate, we run the risk of a revival of a militaristic Germany, a risk which I do not think the rest of Europe will or should take.

Mr. President, I believe it is well worth the time of the Senate to consider the views of the editors of many of our newspapers because there is a tendency for us to think that the people back home are not seriously interested in our foreign relations. In my opinion, these editorials prove that many of our thinking citizens and editors do not look upon the proposal to bring Europe together as an idle dream. They know that whether or not it may be called utopian, it is essential to any reconstruction of a decent and peaceful world.

I have here several editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD in the order in which I shall hand them to the official reporter, because they all relate to the same problem. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read them all, although I think they make a very clear case in favor of the resolution, and what is particularly significant is that they come from divers parts of the country. However, I wish to read a few excerpts from some of the more significant editorials. I wish to begin with one from the Post-Dispatch of St. Louis, Mo., of April 28. I am sure all Senators are familiar with this newspaper. It is one of the leading and most influential newspapers in the country. The editorial is entitled "Why the Opposition?" It is, in part, as follows:

The State Department seems to be turning its back on the movement for a United States of Europe as a means of rationalizing the European economy and setting up a barrier to the further spread of communism on the Continent. This idea has gained wide acceptance in Britain and in Europe,

and in recent weeks has gained momentum in the United States.

* * * * *

Walter Lippmann has declared that "no less than an economic union" is necessary to prevent the spread of chaos in Europe. In his column today, Edgar Ansel Mowrer says:

"If our aim is to be the containing of Soviet expansion, then the unification of Europe is a sovereign instrument. That is perhaps why President Truman recently approved the idea of a European federation in an interview with George Creel."

Then I skip down to the last paragraph:

By providing for the free flow of trade and the interchange of resources, a United States of Europe should lift the Continent from the economic despair which would make it an easy victim of Communist expansionism. But the fine dream of the United Europe too long antedates Lenin and Stalin to be termed simply an anti-Communist scheme. It is a plan to save western civilization from the age-long curse of nationalistic wars, and that is the historic perspective in which the State Department should see it.

I have two other editorials from the same newspaper developing the thought involved in the resolution, which I also wish to submit for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 28, 1947]

WHY THE OPPOSITION?

The State Department seems to be turning its back on the movement for a United States of Europe as a means of rationalizing the European economy and setting up a barrier to the further spread of communism on the Continent. This idea has gained wide acceptance in Britain and in Europe, and in recent weeks has gained momentum in the United States.

Many Congressmen have spoken out for the resolution, introduced in the Senate by Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, for a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations. Many newspapers have indorsed the plan editorially, among them the New York Times, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the Chicago Daily News, and the New Orleans Item.

Walter Lippmann has declared that "no less than an economic union" is necessary to prevent the spread of chaos in Europe. In his column today, Edgar Ansel Mowrer says:

"If our aim is to be the containing of Soviet expansion, then the unification of Europe is a sovereign instrument. That is perhaps why President Truman recently approved the idea of a European federation in an interview with George Creel."

Yet the attitude of the State Department is such that Richard L. Stokes could write in yesterday's Post-Dispatch that the proposals of Winston Churchill and John Foster Dulles for a united Europe have "alarmed administration (State Department) officials, who regard them as expedients of last resort, in case Russia hopelessly blocks peace settlement efforts."

At a time when the President of the United States has openly, before all the world, accepted the challenge of ideological warfare with Russia, this seems inconsistent and unreal.

Today American battleships parade in Turkish waters. To Turkey and Greece we are sending both economic and military assistance with the object of restraining Soviet expansion.

If it is a draw-back that a United States of Europe would offend Russia, then evidently our whole policy toward Greece and Turkey is hopelessly ill-advised on the same grounds.

By providing for the free flow of trade and the interchange of resources, a United States of Europe should lift the continent from the economic despair which would make it an easy victim of Cummunist expansion. But the fine dream of the united Europe too long antedates Lenin and Stalin to be termed simply an anti-Communist scheme. It is a plan to save western civilization from the age-long curse of nationalistic wars, and that is the historic perspective in which the State Department should see it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 1, 1947]

EUROPE'S HOPE

At the close of the First World War, Woodrow Wilson did not see the necessity of economic unity in Europe. He even made matters worse than they were before by carving large and relatively prosperous states like the Austro-Hungarian Empire into numerous small states without either the military strength or the economic resources necessary to sustain life.

All this was understood and elaborated upon at length by historians and economists—and newspaper editors—in the period between the two world wars. Yet for all this the architects of the present "peace" are repeating the same tragic error.

In his report to the Nation of the Moscow meeting, Secretary Marshall had much to say of the necessity to "establish workable boundaries" in Europe, by which he must mean in the main, the reestablishment of the old boundaries, with no major changes except those forced in eastern Europe by the hard fist of the Russian realists.

Yet conditions have changed since Wilson's time so as to make the need for unity in Europe far greater than it was before. The preponderant strength Great Britain boasted between the wars is dissipated and France has sunk to the level of a second-rate power. They no longer offer their old protection to the small nations of the continent. And where before there was only the nightmare of a revived German power, there is now also the worse threat of Soviet absorption.

The economic need for unity also is more compelling than ever before. The riches of the overseas colonies are diminished or gone. A substitute must be found in the increased wealth that will come from the free flow of trade and cheap mass production serving the needs of a large population not divided by economic boundaries.

The United States of Europe offers the continent the hope of rescue from poverty which is needed to counter the appeal of communism.

What Aristide Briand said about a United States of Europe in 1930 applies with even greater force in 1947:

"It appeals to people's good sense and reason. It appears perfectly natural as a necessity for all the peoples of those countries which have been most nearly ruined by war, and which have suffered most. It is they who should be the first to listen.

"It is our misfortune to inhabit a continent which has been scourged by many wars, and which is just recovering from the most recent conflagration. Its sufferings still are far from being healed. Its material difficulties still are far from being resolved. A heavy heritage weighs upon us."

The traditional British policy was to seek British security in a divided Europe. Today if western Europe remains divided, and quarreling, and poverty-stricken, it is an invitation for communism to dominate the continent. British and American security lie today not in a divided Europe, but in a Europe united to the edge of the "iron curtain" and extending an invitation and an example to the nations behind it.

Is it too much to expect American statesmen to respond to this opportunity to remedy the great error of those who remade the map of Europe after the First World War? Do we not reflect on our ability to learn from history if we repeat the palpable, fateful error of Wilson, Clemenceau, and Lloyd George?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 9, 1947]

A SICK CONTINENT

What has happened to the 17-word resolution introduced in the House and Senate 7 weeks ago calling for a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations?

Secretary of State Marshall has been called upon to express his views about the resolution but has given no answer. Senator VANDENBERG, asked to set the resolution down for a hearing before his Foreign Relations Committee, has replied that he sees no possibility of a hearing on it in the immediate future. President Truman, although he had expressed a friendliness to the plan before the resolution was introduced, has been silent since.

Meanwhile both the need and the opportunity for the creation of a European confederation becomes each day more apparent. The economic recovery of Europe is so slow and halting that John J. McCloy, the new head of the World Bank, practically warns that what we had hoped to advance in the form of loans to stimulate the continent's economy must be considered as outright gifts. Neither the American banking community nor the World Bank will advance the money; the United States Government will have to do it without any real expectation that the debt will be repaid.

The total will run into billions, and the question arises of what return we may expect on the investment. Walter Lippmann suggests that the loans should be made not to individual countries but to a collective entity as an inducement for the unification of Europe.

Mr. Lippmann, along with Dorothy Thompson and Edgar Ansel Mowrer, has sharply criticized the State Department for overlooking the necessity of achieving the unification of western Europe to give the area the combined resources and production required for economic and political stability.

The hard truth is that Europe is an industrial continent, and Germany is its industrial heart. Until a way is found to put the great German coal, steel and chemical industries to work for Europe, the Continent is likely to remain a poorhouse.

Yet no one would propose—least of all this newspaper—that German industry be revived under old-time German control. It must be revived, but revived in a framework which will guarantee that it is never again perverted to military conquest. This can be achieved if Germany is reduced to its various states, which are controlled by making them members of a European federation.

Psychologically the time is ripe to press for European unity. In France the Ramadier government has purged itself of Communist members, who would have opposed European confederation because Russia opposes it. In Britain Prime Minister Attlee was a strong advocate of a United States of Europe in the 1930's and Winston Churchill, leader of the opposition, has been an eloquent champion of the movement for 20 years. It is one project on which American influence might be expected to bring British Laborites and Conservatives together.

America has the political and economic influence to sponsor the unification of western Europe, and also the military strength to guard the movement against intimidation by

Russia, the only considerable power likely to oppose it.

Secretary Marshall and Senator VANDENBERG apparently have been so absorbed in the details of treaty negotiations that they have not had time to study the full implications of the Fulbright-Thomas resolution for a United States of Europe. But they should take time, for it is a design that can change the course of history. If it is worth the serious attention of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Attlee it is worth the attention of Mr. Marshall and Mr. VANDENBERG—and of President Truman.

In his report on the Moscow Conference, Mr. Marshall spoke of the necessity of the "economic unity of Germany." The economic unity of Germany is secondary; it is the economic unity of Europe that counts.

The State Department should reexamine its goals and raise its sights. It is the continent of Europe that deserves and demands rehabilitation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also have an editorial from the New York Times of April 18, referring to unification of Europe, and I wish to read a short excerpt from it, as follows:

It can begin only by efforts to integrate a federation of German states into a larger federation of as many European states as possible on the basis of ultimate equality. For only in this way would it be possible to enlist all Europe's energies in the reconstruction and protection of the Continent, while preventing a German predominance within the federation by the numerical superiority of the non-German states. In this project France must take the lead.

Until recently, French official policy, torn between foreign political necessities and domestic party maneuverings, has provided little hope for that. But there are encouraging signs of a change. As if voicing a warning to Foreign Minister Bideault, Maurice Half, economic director of the French zone in Germany, declares that while France must fear a strong Germany, she must fear even more a disorderly Germany, made so by economic oppression and looking to the east for salvation. Moreover, as demonstrated at the Moscow Conference, France is turning away from the unprofitable Russian orientation and is now so close to the views of the United States and Britain that full agreement with them is in sight. It is to be hoped that this will include support of a United States of Europe. For it is only too true, as statesmen have said so often in one way or another, that Europe must federate or perish.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

While the deadlock between Russia and the western world continues at Moscow, a resolution to rally American support for a project which is the logical answer to that deadlock has been introduced in both Houses of Congress by Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS. In a short but weighty 20 words it would notify the world "that the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

As Mr. BOGGS declared, this proposal is neither novel nor utopian. In one form or another it has been advocated over a long period of years by such eminent minds as Victor Hugo, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann; and it is supported today by such practical world statesmen as Prime Minister Attlee, President Auriol of France, Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Smuts and, unofficially, by President Truman. Behind them stands a growing mass of public opinion in Europe itself, as expressed in a recent poll of Europe's parliaments undertaken by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, long an exponent of a European Union.

It goes without saying that a United States of Europe can be created only by Europe itself. As Senator FULBRIGHT stated, the resolution does not mean that we shall undertake to impose on the Old World the kind of federation which has worked so well in the New. That would be a futile and dangerous undertaking. But it does mean that the United States would pledge support to the forces already at work to make the dream a reality. Such support, adding another positive element to President Truman's policy of aiding the free nations of the world, would give a mighty impetus to a plan which holds out the best hope not only of putting an end to the nationalistic anarchy which has twice plunged us into world wars but also of bringing about a renaissance of west European civilization.

At best the federation of Europe would be a long and laborious process, as shown by the many practical problems involved in forming a mere customs union between the kindred Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. But if it is to come about at all, it must start, as Mr. Churchill clearly saw, with a new deal between France and Germany. That deal cannot begin with either the enforced dismemberment of Germany, as originally demanded by French official policy, or, in the words of Mr. Hoover, with keeping Germany in economic chains, which would also keep Europe in rags. It can begin only by efforts to integrate a federation of German states into a larger federation of as many European states as possible on the basis of ultimate equality. For only in this way would it be possible to enlist all Europe's energies in the reconstruction and protection of the continent, while preventing a German predominance within the federation by the numerical superiority of the non-German states. In this project France must take the lead.

Until recently, French official policy, torn between foreign political necessities and domestic party maneuverings, has provided little hope for that. But there are encouraging signs of a change. As if voicing a warning to Foreign Minister Bidault, Maurice Half, economic director of the French zone in Germany, declares that while France must fear a strong Germany, she must fear even more a disorderly Germany, made so by economic oppression and looking to the East for salvation. Moreover, as demonstrated at the Moscow Conference, France is turning away from the unprofitable Russian orientation and is now so close to the views of the United States and Britain that full agreement with them is in sight. It is to be hoped that this will include support of a United States of Europe. For it is only too true, as statesmen have said so often in one way or another, that Europe must federate or perish.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD various editorials which I shall not read. One is from the Texarkana Gazette of March 30. Another is from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 21. One is from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of March 22. Some are from other sections of the country.

There is an editorial from the Hartford, Conn., Times of April 21, 1947; an editorial from the Dallas, Tex., News of April 20, 1947; and an editorial from the Knickerbocker News, of Albany, N. Y., of April 24, 1947.

It will be noticed that these newspapers do not represent any particular party. The editorials come from all parts of the United States, from both Republican and Democratic newspapers, again giving evidence of the success of the nonpartisan approach to foreign policy.

There is an editorial from the Miami, Fla., Herald of March 27, 1947; and an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Federation—'An Impelling Necessity'?" written by William H. Stringer.

There is an editorial from the Star-Telegram of Fort Worth (Tex.) of May 1, 1947; an editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of March 23, 1947; an editorial from the Lincoln (Nebr.) State Journal of March 26, 1947; an editorial from the Roanoke (Va.) Times of March 25, 1947; an editorial from the Washington Post of April 8, 1947; an editorial from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 25, 1948; and an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) News, which was republished in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Texarkana Gazette of March 30, 1947]

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas the other day introduced a concurrent resolution that the Congress favor the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

However, visionary that resolution might sound, when one surveys the miserable condition in which Great Britain and the continent of Europe now find themselves, it is not difficult to see that without some plan of federation there is little hope the nations across the sea will ever be able to achieve the degree of economic stability necessary for the preservation of peace.

We have stated in this column before that peace cannot come to the world in anything more than a temporary status until the nations of Europe are able to provide a much improved standard of living for the majority of their people.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, discussing a federated Europe, puts it in more classical language:

"Communism's great ally in Europe today is not the cold, abstruse materialism of the Marxian doctrine; it is 'balloon belly' in Germany and the Balkans, toothless children in France and Britain, and everywhere, from the crumbling cliffs of Dover to the Black Sea, scurvy and rickets and a door closed against a comfortable and decent human existence."

There is no doubt about it, the bringing together of the nations of Europe into a federation for their economical, political and social salvation would be a monumental task but to say that it cannot be done is to admit that man has not achieved a degree of civilization sufficient to forestall an orgy of blood-letting every 25 or 30 years.

World crises like the present one demand more than practicality; more than a holding up of the hands in the frustration that naturally comes with a survey of all of the old political, racial, and ideological differences that exist in Europe.

Situations such as that in which the world now finds itself call for vision, imagination and heroic boldness.

The stage for the organization of a United States of Europe is better set today than ever before for the simple reason that one of its great opponents, Great Britain, is in no condition economically and in no mood mentally to do anything other than to lend a helping hand.

Many statesmen of the world have done more than toy with the idea that Europe could be federalized to the extent that the strangling economic barriers that have held it back through the ages can be torn away.

The Post-Dispatch recalls that Victor Hugo championed the idea at the International Peace Congress in Paris in 1849. He said: "A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of Europe and the United States of America, shall be seen placed in the presence of each other, extending the hand of fellowship across the ocean exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator and uniting, for the good of all, those two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of men and the power of God."

Practically every move for unity in the past, however, has been frustrated by Great Britain whose theme of empire was "divide and rule."

Men in high place even in Britain today have seen the error of her ways. Prime Minister Attlee has said, "Europe must federate or perish." Winston Churchill has said: "If, in this interval, we can revive the life and unity of Europe and Christendom, and with this new reinforcement build high and commanding a world structure of peace which no one will dare challenge, the most awful crisis of history will have passed away and the highroad of history will again become open."

No, the federation of Europe is not original with Mr. FULBRIGHT, but if such an eventuality should stem from the resolution he introduced in Congress the other day he would assume a stature in history comparable to those of Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson.

The framework is here in the United Nations, but we must have a better demonstration of statesmanship in Washington and in the world before the United States of Europe can indeed become more than a dream of men of vision.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 21, 1947]

FINE ACT OF STATESMANSHIP

The centuries-old dream of a United States of Europe, outlined at length in a Post-Dispatch editorial of last Sunday, entitled "In Clio's Womb," has received strong impetus in Congress. This impetus takes the form of a resolution, introduced today in the House by Representative BOGGS of Louisiana and in the Senate by Messrs. FULBRIGHT and THOMAS.

Short and pithy, the resolution is reminiscent of the now famous one-sentence resolution of Mr. FULBRIGHT, passed by the House in 1943, expressing approval of American participation in a postwar international organization. The Fulbright resolution was a forerunner to establishment of the United Nations. The present resolution is equally simple. It reads:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The idea of a federated Europe has recently been advanced by Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Attlee, Prime Minister Smuts, of South Africa, and John Foster Dulles, adviser to General Marshall at Moscow. But it has long been a favorite topic of speculation by statesmen and philosophers.

An idea for a united Europe was advanced by Henry IV in his Great Design of the seventeenth century. Nearly 100 years ago, in a famous speech, Victor Hugo eloquently pleaded for it. Former Prime Minister Briand, of France, urged the idea before the old League of Nations.

What gives the idea new force is the devastation which Europe is suffering today, and the realization, brought tragically home by the second world war, that something fundamental must be done if European civilization is to survive. A federated Europe, even if it were limited to the elimination of customs barriers, would be of immense benefit to the suffering peoples of Europe.

There are, of course, a thousand obstacles to a United States of Europe—old hatreds, old rivalries, differences of language and of race, economic jealousies, and what not. To say these cannot be overcome is, perhaps, to be practical, but the urgency of the times is such that statesmen must transcend mere practicality.

Representative BOGGS and Senators FULBRIGHT and THOMAS have started a movement in Congress which may have a profound effect upon the future of Europe and, hence, the future of the world. What they have done is to start a discussion which may well be the prelude to action.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 22, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

A resolution introduced in the House by BOGGS of Louisiana and in the Senate by FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, calls for congressional approval of the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

The proposal, which has great merit, is not new. Senator FULBRIGHT has made the recommendation previously. Winston Churchill urged it long ago, and is still working for it. General Smuts of the Union of South Africa is an ardent federationist, and so are Leon Blum and Edouard Herriot, of France; General de Gaulle's friends say he approves. Prime Minister Attlee once said that "Europe must federate or perish." President Truman has all but given his full approval, and John Foster Dulles recently caused an international stir by advocating it.

A poll of 3,913 members of European parliaments by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, a federationist, has elicited to date 624 replies, and only 12 were adverse. Among the 86 members of the French Parliament who replied in the affirmative, is Vincent Auriol, President of the Republic.

So, the idea is not new nor is it lacking in emphatic support by world figures.

A federation of Europe's nations is a dream that should come true. It is the common sense, simple solution of the manifold problems that have combined to keep the Continent in almost continuous turmoil for centuries. It has its parallel in the United States, where 48 States geographically contiguous but differing from each other in attitudes of many kinds, have joined in a federation of States with an over-all government in which State's rights are carefully protected.

We are so accustomed to the workable arrangement whereby Texas oil and gas, Kansas wheat, Montana copper, California fruit, Wisconsin cheese, Pennsylvania coal are distributed Nation-wide without regard for borders and without serious dispute over tariffs, that we cannot see why the nations of Europe cannot set up similar machinery of federation.

Europe, of course, presents problems concerned with language and customs differences, variations of political ideology, rivalries centuries old, but those same differences in lesser proportions were present when the Thirteen Colonies united, and later as the Nation expanded westward. It is an idle dream to believe that there will ever be an European melting pot, that the French will ever cease to be French, Greeks ever cease being Greeks, etc., but it is not wishful thinking to believe that nationalism can still be vigorous but at the same time amenable to some form of over-all authority for the common good of all the peoples.

But that day is far distant. It is scarcely possible that at this time of confusion and turbulence, a working arrangement can be forged under the framework of the United Nations, or by any other method. Because it should be done does not mean that it can be done—now. The United Nations has yet to prove its potency in the broad field of world security. Its efforts within the restricted field of European federation would certainly be nil at this moment, with full knowledge that a United States of Europe would automatically reduce its task immeasurably in the international theater.

Nothing can be lost by congressional support of the Boggs-Fulbright resolution. But contrawise, nothing will be gained except that a laudable precedent will be set. Some day, all of us hope, there will be a United States of Europe. George Washington so hoped and believed. Writing to General Lafayette, he said: "We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere on earth. One day, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded the United States of Europe." Today such a union appears as remote as when Washington wrote, but we can still hope.

It may be argued that the Boggs-Fulbright resolution would place America in the role of an intruder in the internal affairs of foreign governments. Events of the past few weeks make such argument less than pertinent.

[From the Hartford Times of April 21, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Eighty-one prominent Americans have issued an eloquent appeal for popular support for a United States of Europe. Official endorsement of such a proposal is sought in a resolution now before Congress. The plan is under discussion in England. It is certain to come before the United Nations.

Obviously, it is a proposal that can become a reality only if it has the backing of the peoples and governments of Europe itself. But it is a matter for discussion and decision here also. As the American committee says, Europe's future involves our future; Europe's peace, our peace; Europe's prosperity, our prosperity, and Europe's freedom, our freedom." Two world wars have taught us the truth of all this. It is, incredibly, not certain they have taught Europe that tariff barriers, standing armies, and political anagtonisms are luxuries the continent can no longer afford.

Likewise, the world can no longer afford to permit a divided Europe to menace its peace. The federation of European states is not a matter to be settled entirely by themselves. The proposal is in harmony with the United Nations, which the American committee calls the "cradle and framework of a United States of Europe." It is a concept especially appealing to this country which long ago showed the world that an area of diverse interests and widely varying conditions could be united if there was a will toward unity among its people. Whatever we can do, officially and privately, to build that unity in Europe is a service to ourselves as well as to the world.

[From the Dallas News of April 20, 1947]

PARLIAMENT FOR EUROPE

"This summer," announced a professor of history at a meeting last month in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel (New York), "the first congress of European members of parliament will meet." The speaker was Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, of the New York University faculty, editor of Paneuropa, president of the Pan-European Union, formerly with the University of Vienna, and author of a large number of books and articles.

Professor Coudenhove-Kalergi addressed letters to 3,913 members of the respective Parliaments of France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Greece, Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and received 624 replies. Six hundred and twelve of these favored the

establishment of a European federation within the framework of the United Nations.

The congress at Geneva will have one delegate (each delegate a member of his own national parliament) for each million of population in his particular country. "These 184 delegates shall constitute the first preliminary parliament of Europe," the professor explains, "entirely free in its program and decisions; free to invite other European parliaments to cooperate. For some of the parliamentary pioneers of European federation insist upon the inclusion of the Soviet Union. It will be up to these delegates to present their case, although I have some doubts whether the Soviets would be inclined to respect a European bill of rights or to accept pan-European control of their foreign, economic, and military policy."

It is noted that "all this work of the European Congress will aim at a regional union within the framework of the United Nations, according to article 52 of its Charter which provides for such regional agreements and agencies," but the ultimate goal is a United States of Europe.

Here is something to watch. It could come to nothing, and then again it could amount to something very big and beneficial.

[From the Albany Knickerbocker News of April 24, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Eighty-one prominent Americans have issued an eloquent appeal for popular support for a United States of Europe. Official endorsement of such a proposal is sought in a resolution now before Congress. The plan is under discussion in England. It is certain to come before the United Nations.

Obviously, it is a proposal that can become a reality only if it has the backing of the peoples and governments of Europe itself. But it is a matter for discussion and decision here also. As the American committee says, "Europe's future involves our future, Europe's peace our peace, Europe's prosperity our prosperity, and Europe's freedom our freedom." Two world wars have taught us the truth of all this. It is, incredibly, not certain they have taught Europe that tariff barriers, standing armies, and political antagonisms are luxuries the Continent can no longer afford.

Likewise, the world can no longer afford to permit a divided Europe to menace its peace. The federation of European states is not a matter to be settled entirely by themselves. The proposal is in harmony with the United Nations, which the American committee calls the "cradle and framework of a United States of Europe." It is a concept especially appealing to this country which long ago showed the world that an area of diverse interests and widely varying conditions could be united if there was a will toward unity among its people. Whatever we can do, officially and privately, to build that unity in Europe is a service to ourselves as well as to the world.

[From the Miami Herald of March 27, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

This resolution was introduced in Congress Saturday by Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, one of the youngest Members.

Its counterpart is sponsored in the Senate by Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and THOMAS of Utah.

We predict that American political thinking will turn more and more to the support of this idea. It is an old idea with new support. It has been recently advocated by Winston Churchill in Great Britain. It was the subject of a recent address in Chicago by John Foster Dulles.

A United States of Europe today would mean a federation of western Europe. Russians resent it as something hostile and alien to themselves. It would not necessarily be hostile, but it would be alien to the Communist system. The customs unions and other devices through which it would probably operate in the beginning would be a less rigid system than the closed economy that Russia has established in eastern Europe in the sphere of its influence. It would always be open to any other European state that wished to join and could qualify.

It could be the means of restoring a decent living economy to the part of Europe which represents the civilization of which we are a part.

It may prove to be the only means.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

FEDERATION—"AN IMPELLING NECESSITY"?

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—A deal of American thinking, both realistic and unrealistic, is being devoted today to the subject of European federation—to the prospect of building a United States of Europe.

This comes at a critical, and propitious, moment. Between Henry Wallace's unjelled proposals for a European New Deal replete with a $15,000,000,000 loan to Russia, on the one hand, and the apprehensions of others that the Greek-aid program, without an over-all European policy, will be so much money down the drain, a United States of Europe looms suddenly as something meriting the closest attention of our policy-makers.

It might—just might—so the thinking goes, be an admirable goal toward which American lending, spending, and political counselling vis-à-vis Europe could be bent.

Lately, scholarly Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah, and war-veteran Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana have launched a resolution in Congress to make European federation a cardinal objective of United States foreign policy. John Foster Dulles, Walter Lippmann, Sumner Welles, and Dorothy Thompson have similarly endorsed the concept.

These thinkers recognize that nationalism is still strong and strutting in Europe. They are aware that the Communist regimes of eastern Europe and the powerful Communist minorities in France, Italy, and elsewhere are willing to denounce, at the drop of a hammer-and-sickle, any and all federation projects as aimed directly at Russia, and as intending to build a new cordon sanitaire around the Soviet Union (because proposed federations would embrace chiefly western Europe, excluding Russia).

Admitting these obstacles, sponsors take one look at Europe's "Balkanized" customs barriers and trade restrictions, its polyglot currencies and transport, its nations with unbalanced and unbalanceable economies like Austria. They visualize how this vast domain of 2,000,000 square miles and 200,000,000 inhabitants—this cradle of western civilization with its dynamo, the Ruhr, its great manufacturing cities, its plains of grain, its mines and foreign markets—could become a well-integrated and prosperous economy if the trade walls and spite walls came down.

And having perceived all this, they reiterate Clement Attlee's phrase: "Europe must federate or perish."

Obviously, the campaign is not peculiarly American, nor ever was. In 1922 Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, the Austrian, proposed a pan-Europe. Hitler tried in vain to unify Europe by force. In September 1946 at Zurich Winston Churchill delivered his strong plea for unification, and a British Committee for a United Europe has since been established under his chairmanship. A movement known as European Action has been inaugurated at Paris under Professor Brugmans, a Dutch resistance leader.

Most important of all, perhaps, is the recent evidence that elements of the British Labor Party, including some of its left-wing factions, are embracing the concept of a political and economic union of western Europe, with Britain included. These Laborites would do everything possible to persuade Russia that such a United States of Europe would not be directed against the Soviet. They would make the union "open-end," so that eastern European states like Poland and Czechoslovakia could join up if so wishing.

They see the establishment of a Socialist (not Communist) Commonwealth of Europe as the hope of all those middle-sized nations of the west which would avoid being swept into either the American or the Russian orbit.

Russia would probably oppose a federation, despite any assurances. This does not wholly destroy its chances. Belgium and Holland are embarking on a kind of customs union. Scandinavia has long considered amalgamation. For its part, the United States could hardly impose federation on Europe, but it could counsel. It could call attention to the success of its own federation. It could mold its lending and occupation policies toward upbuilding a single continental economy. The subject could be thoroughly aired in the United Nations.

[From the Star-Telegram of Fort Worth, May 1, 1947]

FEDERATED EUROPE MAY BE KEY TO PEACE

A little more than 6 months ago, in a speech at Zurich, Switzerland, Winston Churchill revived and strongly urged the idea of a United States of Europe, terming it the only road to economic salvation and permanent peace for the war-weakened smaller nations of the Continent. The word "revived" is used because the idea of a federation of European countries is far from new. It was foreseen by George Washington and by Victor Hugo, the latter looking forward to the day when "two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic."

When Mr. Churchill advanced the proposal anew, it was greeted either as a dream impossible of fulfillment or with the objection that it was designed to build up a western anti-Soviet bloc in Europe and therefore was nothing more than an intended instrument of traditional power politics. The latter view, of course, was the one taken by Russia.

That objection, at least so far as this country is concerned, now has been wiped out by the United States open avowal of active resistance to Russian expansionism and the spread of communism in Europe. A revived and stable economy in western Europe would form the most effective barrier to communism, and without the necessity for a continuous funneling of funds into the area from this country.

Recent experience has given weight to Mr. Churchill's assertion that federalization is the key to stability in western Europe. A higher level of postwar industry than previously contemplated will be necessary if Germany ever is to become self-sustaining, and certainly if it is to pay reparations on any such scale as is demanded by Russia. The foreign ministers at Moscow were confronted with the problem posed by the dependence of Europe upon a strong German industry and the danger that an industrially revived Germany again will become a menace to the peace of the world. It seems clear that as a member of a European confederation Germany could do more to sustain and less to

endanger neighboring countries than if allowed to go its separate way.

From first-hand observation, Clayton Fritchey, editor of the New Orleans Item, is convinced that federation offers the only promise of permanent solution of the problem of Germany and western Europe. Recently returned from a tour of Europe, he writes:

"It goes without saying that to rescue Europe by federation will be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible. The nations of western Europe have reached the same crisis that once faced the 13 original American States—they can hang together or they can hang separately."

This statement and the realities in Europe argue strongly for adoption of a joint resolution introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana, which reads that "the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 23, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Congress now has before it a brief but pregnant proposal that reads as follows: "Resolved that the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The resolution was put before the House by Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana. In the Senate it carried the names of Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and THOMAS of Utah. All three men are Democrats.

Thus is projected a matter that carries great promise, that has been considered and favored by many of the world's keenest thinkers, and is now of larger potential value than it has ever been.

Western Europe ought to be in the mood to ponder the possibility of economic and political unity with no less than prayerful attention. It may well spell the difference between democratic liberty and Communist oppression.

It has long been obvious that western Europe could not logically hope to compete with the great single powers economically and industrially unless it pooled its resources on some basis of easier access. There is no single nation in that area that can come anywhere near sustaining itself, but operating as a whole the area could do well.

It is clear as crystal, too, that Western Europe must present some sort of a united front if it hopes to maintain a system of free governments. Soviet Russia has engulfed Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It is so placed as to exert powerful influences on Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. It is a question whether it can be held away from Greece, Turkey, and China. Yugoslavia and Poland are its willing puppets.

The purpose of the Communists to take over western Europe as well cannot be doubted. Germany, Austria, France, and the Netherlands are either prostrate or gravely debilitated by the war. Great Britain is in dire straits, living on borrowed money and faced by the speedy dismemberment of the Empire.

In short, Europe must gain the strength that lies in union. It has neither present strength nor logical hope for the near future. Time is of the essence. The process of forming a working United States of Europe would be costly and difficult, but perhaps insignificant for this Nation and Europe by comparison with the alternative.

A European union could operate within the framework and purposes of the United Nations as appropriately as our own sisterhood of States, the Union of South Africa, and others.

The basic idea seems sound and, if the nations concerned can grasp the meaning of current omens and portents and put their real rather than their traditional interests first, it could be made to work.

[From the State Journal of Lincoln (Nebr.), March 26, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Now before Congress is a resolution favoring creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

Such a state has been a dream of statesmen and philosophers for three centuries. It was advocated by Henry IV in the seventeenth century, by Victor Hugo 100 years ago, and by former Premier Briand, of France, who urged it on the League of Nations. Latest proponents are Churchill and Attlee, of Britain, Prime Minister Smuts, of South Africa, and John Foster Dulles, General Marshall's adviser in Moscow.

There are still a thousand obstacles, to be sure, yet the idea of a federated Europe takes new force from the devastation ruling that continent today, from the realization that fundamental action must be forthcoming if Europe is to survive. If it did nothing more than eliminate customs barriers, such a federation would be of immense benefit.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of March 25, 1947]

FULBRIGHT-BOGGS RESOLUTION

Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas) has joined Representative BOGGS (Democrat, Louisiana) in sponsoring a declaration that: *"Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The Fulbright-Boggs resolution represents the feeling of a group of legislators that it is urgent and essential to set forth an affirmative goal for Europe instead of pursuing merely a negative policy of opposing Soviet Russia and international communism.

Both Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS have announced that they expect to support President's Truman's program to combat the spread of Communist influence. The argument advanced by the Arkansas Senator for the resolution which he is supporting in conjunction with the young World War II veteran from Louisiana is that it answers the question he hears most frequently in discussion of the President's program: "After this, what?"

Senator FULBRIGHT admits that he is merely offering a plan that has already been suggested by Winston Churchill and John Foster Dulles. But he is not so much interested in pride of authorship as in getting something started toward settling Europe's problems and ending the disputes and quarrels which have resulted in a bloody war at least every 25 years and end by leaving Europe a pauper continent and a drain on the world's resources.

[From the Washington Post, April 8, 1947]

EUROPEAN UNION

The prospect of failure at Moscow to achieve any meeting of Russo-western minds on the German future puts the onus upon this country to leave Europe in no uncertainty about our American policy. All the conditions are favorable for the achievement of a western agreement over Germany. British and Americans have already come to a working arrangement in the amalgamation of their zones in Germany. The French, to be sure, are still absent from it. But the French would enter our system in Germany tomorrow if we were to apply their common sense to the problem of the Ruhr. An international regime in the Ruhr would make the French our copartners. And it would bring about a solution of the non-Ruhr problem of Germany by sheer attraction.

The Ruhr is so vital to all Europe, indeed, that its internationalization would make visible the community of Europe. Now the political manifestation of community is federation—a way out for Europe to which many of its public men have been converted as the answer to chaos and communism. The philosopher Lecky says that the success of any opinion depends much less upon the force of arguments, or upon the ability of its advocates, than upon the predisposition of society to receive it. In our opinion there is now a predisposition in Europe for federation. It has acquired momentum in Britain and France from their economic difficulties. The Monnet plan in France, it is recognized, cannot succeed except in a larger context of population and resources. So Monnet's visit to London resulted in an organized exploration of the Blum bid for a Franco-British tie. Under the pressure of events more and more leaders in Britain are losing the duality of mind which persuaded Mr. Churchill at Zurich to advocate union for continental Europe and freedom of action for Britain. But the most significant step seems to have been made in the low countries. Dutch-Belgian negotiations looking to the setting up of a customs union have been successful. What has been the most formidable hurdle has been fear of Russian opposition; no country and no people in Europe are free from it. Yet that fear would be removed in an instant by American backing and financing of federation, and must be.

It is the logic of the Truman doctrine no less than the logic of failure in Moscow to demonstrate this backing on Secretary Marshall's return. The doctrine is pro-freedom. But it would lead to our national bankruptcy if we were to limit its application to nations only as their independence comes under the shadow of extinguishment. We cannot wait to bail nations out, nor have we the money to do it. The moral of the Truman policy is that we shall prevent these emergencies. This can be done by throwing all our energies into the task of making as much as possible of Europe into a going concern—first by political encouragement of federation and then by an American survey on the spot, coupled with consultations with the European commission, of what reconstruction will require. The alternative is chaos, a Russian-subjugated Europe, or a Europe located like an old man of the sea on America's back.

A verbal investment in such a program is already before Congress sponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS. Their 28-word resolution says that "the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations." Passage of this resolution would have an electric effect upon Europe if it were pushed and followed up by the State Department. It has already been given enough lip service to warrant action. Last year President Truman, in an interview with George Creel, applauded a United States of Europe. And Secretary Marshall came close to indorsement in Moscow when he said "We are not in favor of a Europe divided against itself," as it would be, in Senator FULBRIGHT's words, as a congeries of fragmented sovereignties. The Secretary's negative requires to be completed with a positive, for an impasse in Moscow would leave a dangerous diplomatic void in Europe and accentuate fear in Europe of being squeezed between Russia and America.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 25, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

European federation is as old as the western state system and as new as a resolution

in the Eightieth Congress. Thus, the leap from Hugo Grotius, the father of international law, to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, is a matter of more than three centuries. Little has happened in the interim which would lend practical encouragement to Senator FULBRIGHT's device for a United States of Europe.

However, nothing in the record will daunt the Arkansan and his colleague in the House, Representative BOGGS of Louisiana, who is the co-sponsor of the federation resolution. Mr. BOGGS suggests that this is the structure for an affirmative foreign policy toward Europe. Mr. FULBRIGHT believes that if there is ever to be peace, or ever to be an end to the expenditure of these vast sums in foreign lands (Greece, Turkey, etc.), a federation of Europe is one of the essential conditions.

Of course, the interim record is full of heavy endorsement. That gentle Quaker, William Penn, propounded European federation in his "Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe" (1693). Rousseau was seized with the same notion, and Jeremy Bentham (who, by the way, seems to have invented the word "international") followed in his footsteps. Mr. FULBRIGHT can marshal Kant, Briand, Stresemann, Smuts, Churchill, and Attlee to his cause. The list is impressive except for Briand, who got as far as addressing a "Memorandum on the Organization of a System of European Federal Union" to 26 members of the League of Nations. The stuff was too strong for them even in heady 1929.

But these are not idle dreams. The Europe of our dark day is sick and lost. It is wandering in a wilderness of jealous and meaningless national sovereignties where the wolves are howling war. Would a resolution in the Congress of the United States mean anything if that Congress itself was not willing to join a larger federation of well-intentioned mankind subordinating selfish interests to universal law?

But it is worth proposing and worth trying. It was in 1625. It is even more in 1947. Time is no longer measured by the hour glass of mannerly diplomacy but rather by the brisk ticking of the bomb.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 3, 1947]

THE CASE FOR A EUROPEAN FEDERATION

Europe's great need is "united action beyond capacity of tired governments," editorial says; praises congressional resoluton for United States of Europe; sees it as a positive American policy; says unity in West is the best answer to Russia's expansion in East.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News]

"Representative BOGGS of Louisiana and Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas have introduced in Congress on of the shortest joint resolutions in the history of that body. It states simply: 'Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.'

"It is no accident that the Boggs-Fulbright resolution hits congressional hoppers on the heels of the President's message on the Greek crisis. It is intended to touch off a congressional debate that will clarify the new, aggressive foreign policy outlined by Mr. Truman. Its single sentence makes its sponsors' point that mere opposition to Russian expansion is essentially a negative and, therefore, a futile policy.

"The great need in Europe is for positive and united action—action beyond the capacity of the tired governments now struggling to rebuild a score of shattered nations. Russia is offering, or thrusting upon the nations within her orbit, a new political and economic unity to replace the costly divisions of the past. In the view of Representative BOGGS and Senator FULBRIGHT the Russian drive in the East can only be counteracted by comparable unification in the West.

"The concept of a United States of Europe is not new. George Washington predicted its ultimate organization in a letter to General Lafayette. Victor Hugo foresaw the day when 'two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic.'

"A variety of contemporary statesmen have supported the idea—Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Attlee, Charles de Gaulle, Leon Blum, General Smuts, and John Foster Dulles among others. In a recent survey of European parliaments more than 600 members in a dozen countries were found to favor federalization; only 12 voiced opposition.

"History has now lifted the theory out of the realm of the abstract. It offers, Messrs. BOGGS and FULBRIGHT believe, a practical solution to the most urgent problem of the postwar world, the German peace settlement.

"The Foreign Ministers at Moscow are hung on the horns of a dilemma—the need to rebuild German industry to sustain the economy of Europe, and the danger of future aggression if that historically irresponsible nation ever regains her industrial strength. Only as one of the United States of Europe could a strong Germany sustain, without endangering the nations of western Europe.

"When the U. S. E. plan was revived by Winston Churchill more than a year ago it made a little stir in the United States. There were valid objections on the ground that such a federation of European states was designed primarily as a barrier against the spread of communism and, as such was an instrument of power politics incompatible with the concepts of the United Nations.

"Those objections, in the light of Mr. Truman's statement of foreign policy, are now meaningless. American support of a United Nations of Europe is a logical extension of the effort to halt Russian expansion, to which Mr. Truman would commit the nation.

"Clayton Fritchey, editor of the New Orleans Item who returned not long ago from an inspection of Europe, stated the case for federation in the strongest terms:

"'A federated Europe may once have seemed an idle dream, but today it is idle to dream of any other solution. It goes without saying that to rescue Europe by federation will be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible. The nations of western Europe have reached the same crisis that once faced the 13 original American States—they can hang together or they can hang separately.'

"If we accept Mr. Truman's recommendation for unilateral action in Europe we shall automatically suspend the operating theories of the United Nations. Certainly there can be no greater danger in supporting a democratic federation of Europ n states in opposition to Russia than there will be in supporting the doubtful regimes now in power in most of the states concerned.

"The choice underlined by the Boggs-Fulbright resolution is between risking war to preserve a doubtful status quo, and taking the same risk to establish a new and vital European federation which will share our own ideals and aspirations."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also have several articles by columnists and other writers, well known to all of us. There is one from the Washington Post of May 13, 1947, by Walter Lippmann, a part of which I should like to read. I shall not read it all. He is referring to the significance, in the first instance, of the Voice of America program and its importance, and the necessity of a revival of Europe under the leadership of Great Britain and France. Referring to an over-all settlement of European affairs, he sums it up in this way:

Such a settlement is, I believe, ultimately attainable because it reflects the actual balance of power, which neither can alter radically—

He is referring to a unified Europe—

between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Red Army is deep into Europe. The settlement calls for its withdrawal to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We cannot compel it to withdraw. On the other hand, we can prevent it from advancing farther because of our ability to strike at the vitals of Russia. The settlement would recognize the military deadlock.

To this settlement the United States would contribute financial support, large by peacetime standards, but insignificant by wartime standards. This assistance would ransom Europe from the armies of occupation, would revive the most highly civilized continent in the world, would enable Russia to obtain help in her own reconstruction which she can obtain in no other way, would enable this country to avoid a chronic depression caused by unsalable surpluses of goods.

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded and advocated by the United States Government, be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject.

The Voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

I also submit an article by former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, published in the New York Post of April 29, 1947, on the same subject; also an article written by Raymond J. Blair and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1947; also a news article from the New York Herald Tribune of April 23, 1947, which describes a meeting in New York; also another article by Mr. Lippmann, entitled "Marshall and Dulles," which contains further material.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Though money for radio broadcasts and printing is needed so that the Voice of America may be heard in foreign lands, our greatest need is to have something definite, clear, and convincing for that voice to say. There would be little opposition in Congress to an appropriation if it were not for the feeling that the men who conduct our propaganda have little to do with the making of our policy, and that the sales department of the Government is, so to speak, writing advertisements about goods for which the production engineers have just begun to make the first blueprints.

As for the customers abroad, they are undoubtedly confused and suspicious, partly no doubt because the rival firm misrepresents us but chiefly because we sound so hot and bothered when, as a great power, they expect us to be cool and definite. Mr. Benton's difficulties with Congress and with the opposition abroad will diminish when his chief, Secretary Marshall, has had time to form and to organize a concrete American program for the settlement of the war.

The elements of such a program have, I believe, gradually emerged from the vast and intricate debates, and can be formulated now as the basis for further discussion. They

could, I think, be stated in some such way as this:

1. The division of the world into two great coalitions—one with its center in Moscow and the other with its center in Washington—is only apparent. The world cannot be divided in this way. The coalitions cannot be organized. The nations of Europe will resist the idea that they are the satellites of the two non-European great powers, and that their continent is the predestined theater of a Soviet-American conflict. Insofar as the Truman doctrine consciously or unconsciously treats Europe in this fashion, it is an obstacle to the making of peace and is destructive of American influence on the making of peace.

2. The revival of Europe under the leadership of Great Britain and France, now the principal European powers, is necessary. There can be no German settlement except within the framework of a European settlement. The political and economic unification of Germany is neither possible nor safe except within the framework of a European economic union, and of enough European political union to provide the primary guaranties of the German settlement. The Russian and American guaranties of German good behavior will have to be secondary to the European guaranty.

3. Though in the end the unity of Europe must comprehend the whole of Europe, a partial unity is better than none at all. The unity of western Europe alone cannot be self-supporting and solvent. It will require official support from the Western Hemisphere, principally from the United States. But if the support is given on conditions which promote and induce unification, the partial union of western Europe will exert immense attraction upon eastern Europe.

4. These considerations enable us to state the definite terms u, on which we could propose to settle the Soviet-American conflict. Our object is the revival of Europe as an independent power in the world. To attain this object we shall have to provide the equivalent of lend-lease for a term of years as the necessary working capital, obtainable nowhere else, for a European economic union.

The Russian contribution will have to be the military evacuation, simultaneously with a British, French, and American military evacuation, of the continent. The armies must go home, leaving behind them only token forces in Germany and at sensitive and unsettled points such as Trieste and the Greek frontier. The military evacuation of Europe would have to be followed by agreement that all European states may enter the European economic union.

In return for that, we could afford to finance some German reparation payments, and to provide some credit, to the Soviets.

5. In the Middle East we should propose a new treaty covering the Dardanelles, the borders of Greece and Turkey, the port of Saloniki, and the oil concessions of Iran.

Such a settlement is, I believe, ultimately attainable because it reflects the actual balance of power, which neither can alter radically, between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Red Army is deep into Europe. The settlement calls for its withdrawal to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We cannot compel it to withdraw. On the other hand, we can prevent it from advancing farther because of our ability to strike at the vital centers of Russia. The settlement would recognize the military deadlock.

To this settlement the United States would contribute financial support, large by pescetime standards but insignificant by wartime standards. This assistance would ransom Europe from the armies of occupation, would revive the most highly civilized continent in the world, would enable Russia to obtain help in her own reconstruction which she can obtain in no other way, would enable this country to avoid a chronic depression caused by unsalable surpluses of goods.

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded and advocated by the United States Government be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject.

The Voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

[From the New York Post of April 29, 1947]

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

The world peace that we began to talk about even before the war ended is under an oxygen tent. The longer the learned doctors from all over the world deliberate, the sicker the patient seems to become. Dr. James F. Byrnes consulted weightily with Dr. Molotov and Dr. Attlee at both Paris and London. Dr. George C. Marshall thrust his clinical thermometer under the tongue of the patient in Moscow. Unless the doctors can make up their minds pretty soon what medicine to prescribe there will not be anything left to do except to perform an autopsy.

And if world peace is sick almost unto death, Europe is in still more desperate straits. So far as Europe is concerned, the doctors in consultation at Moscow might have written a prescription calling for a United States of Europe.

This has been a recurring suggestion since the days of William Penn and Victor Hugo. Such men as Prime Minister Attlee, Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Smuts, President Auriol, and Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi are supporting it. It is thought that President Truman is not unsympathetic. Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, and Congressman BOGGS, of Louisiana, have introduced in their respective Chambers a resolution declaring that "the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

It might be just as true of Europe as it is of the United States that "in union there is strength." Let us imagine for a moment that the disunity of Europe has spread to the United States. Montana would have the copper, Minnesota the iron ore, Pennsylvania the coal, and Texas the oil with New York the commercial center. Imagine each of these countries with a separate army, and some with navies, each jealous and covetous of the riches of the other. Imagine also the endless controversies over customs, and boundaries, and the wrangling about treaties. Consider the power politics that would be played. And what would happen if New York and Texas started from separate corners, bent on imperialism.

The countries of Europe have common objectives just as the 13 original American colonies had—peace, the end of trade barriers, a higher standard of living, and freedom under law.

Divided, the nations of Europe will have increasing difficulty in maintaining actual independence. So long as they lumber along singly, selfishly, and even belligerently, just so long will they be in danger of being squeezed too tightly by the Russian Bear. United, but within the United Nations, they would have a better chance to survive. The conclusion is inescapable. Europe must federate, or perish.

We, in the United States, are partly responsible for the present-day situation in Europe. Generally, our foreign policy has been spotty and inconsistent. When a country anywhere in the world trembles in the shadow of Russia, we are urged to rush in with our dollars as blood plasma. But how long can we dissipate our own resources in palliatives? Last fall it was Iran. Now comes Greece. And Turkey. Will Korea be next? We may be sure that more nations will follow.

A United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations, would be a sturdy foundation for world peace. At the same time, it would be an assurance of individual and collective security for the nations of Europe. Thinking people in every European country are coming to recognize the desirability of such a union. A recent poll of the parliaments of several European nations indicated a tide of public opinion in support of it.

Leadership is available. Perhaps, with the support of the Congress of the United States, such men as Attlee, Churchill, Smuts, Auriol, De Gaulle, and Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, would be moved to say to their propaganda-drugged peoples, "This is our one last hope. Let us not fail in its realization."

The proposal of Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS would express the sympathetic understanding of the United States. It should be enthusiastically adopted.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1947]

VISION OF EUROPEAN FEDERATION APPEARS IN CONGRESS RESOLUTION

(By Raymond J. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Back in the early days of the American Republic George Washington once said in a letter to General Lafayette: "One day, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded the United States of Europe."

The idea was not new even then. Henry IV had advocated a federation of European states. Such a state had existed for several centuries under the Roman Empire, and later, in the ninth century, under Charlemagne, who united all Europe from the Elbe River to Spain.

Victor Hugo, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, Aristide Briand, Gustav Stresemann, Jan Smuts, Winston Churchill, and, most recently, John Foster Dulles have seen a United States of Europe as a means of ending Europe's continual strife.

A United States Senator has decided to do something about the idea. He introduced in the Senate this 28-word resolution:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The Senator is 41-year-old J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, former Rhodes scholar, law instructor at George Washington University and the University of Arkansas, and president of the latter university.

His proposal was supported in the Senate by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah. A companion resolution was introduced in the House by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana.

Senator FULBRIGHT asserts that both world wars have grown out of what he calls the fragmented sovereignties of Europe. "So long as the senseless conglomeration of separate political and economic entities exists, there is little hope for the prosperity and peace of the world," he says.

"It's no startling panacea," the Senator admits. "But it's something I thought ought to be considered."

The proposal has been referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator FULBRIGHT admittedly has little hope that it will receive early consideration in view of other, more pressing problems.

"It'll have to soak a little," he says.

Senator FULBRIGHT feels a United States of Europe is a progressive way of going at the problems posed by the plight of Greece and, incidentally, he argues, it would save the United States money. He said in a statement accompanying the bill:

"It is appropriate for the Congress and the people to consider it for the same reasons that we are called upon to spend millions of dollars in Germany, in Greece, in Turkey, and to lend billions to other lands.

"If there is ever to be peace, or ever to be an end to the expenditures of these vast sums in foreign lands, I believe a federation of Europe is one of the essential conditions."

Creation of a United States of Europe would not be contrary to the United Nations principle, according to Senator FULBRIGHT, because article 52 of the UN Charter provides for regional organizations within the UN.

As visualized by Senator FULBRIGHT, a United States of Europe would have limited central powers but probably a central military force to which member nations would contribute.

The Arkansas Senator emphasizes that adoption of his resolution would not mean that the United States would be seeking to impose federation upon Europe. It would merely encourage those forces at work abroad "striving to bring an end to the suspicion, the hatred and the confusion that have for so many years torn that unhappy land," he states.

"People probably can think of a thousand objections why this can't be done," the Senator admits. "But the alternative is suicide."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 23, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE SEEN A REALITY WITHIN 2 YEARS—COUDENHOVE-KALERGI SAYS IT WILL BEGIN ON ECONOMIC LINES AT FALL PARLEY

Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, visiting professor of public affairs and regional studies at New York University, who has been working for a federation of European states for more than 20 years, said yesterday he believed that project would be a reality within 2 years. It has "ceased to be utopian," he said, "and has become a question of practical policy."

Mr. Coudenhove-Kalergi, who will leave Saturday on the *Queen Elizabeth* to assist in organizing a congress of representatives from European parliaments to meet in September or October in Montreux, Switzerland, to organize such a federation, discussed its possibilities in a press conference at the New York University Faculty Club, 22 Washington Square North.

Although he made it clear he would have no voice in that meeting, Mr. Coudenhove-Kalergi envisioned its result as a "loose federation something like that of the United States before its Constitution," with eventual incorporation of "some kind of bill of rights," a common European currency, a federal court, and police force—the latter three elements might not, he confided, be immediate. "The first practical step," he said, "will be in the economic field. I think that will start probably next year."

He polled 3,913 members of parliaments of Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland last year. Of 660 who replied, only 14 opposed federation. On the basis of those who favored the plan, Mr. Coudenhove-Kalergi said it was apparently a revolution of the younger group against the older.

"Those who may have fought in the fox holes of this war," he said, "apparently think more of being spared another world war than of national sovereignty."

The delegates to the Montreux Congress, one for each million people in the nation they represent, would determine what other European parliaments would be invited to join, draft a charter, recommend to the European governments practical steps to bring about political and economic union, and elect a council of Europe to serve as a permanent advisory body to the governments and the United Nations.

While in Europe, Mr. Coudenhove-Kalergi will also attend the five hundredth anniversary ceremonies of the University of Bordeaux, France, as a representative of New York University.

[From the Washington Post]

MARSHALL AND DULLES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary Marshall's account of the arguments at Moscow ended with the statement that Europe "is sinking while the doctors deliberate" and that therefore "action cannot await compromise through exhaustion." At this point Mr. Dulles, speaking the next evening, began to tell that part of the story which Secretary Marshall, for the best of reasons, omitted. The two speeches have to be read together, the Marshall speech for a sober objective account of the arguments in the conference, the Dulles speech for a broad indication of how American policy is shaping up.

American policy has, however, not yet taken shape. It is only shaping up. We must take, said Mr. Marshall, without delay "whatever action is possible" to meet the "pressing problems" of European "disintegration." But since we are not yet clear about what action is possible, Secretary Marshall, who must take the action, abjured all the large generalizations and rhetorical promises which have so often in the past served as a counterfeit for a policy, a plan, and a program of action.

The heart of the difficulty is that western Europe is a highly industrialized area which cannot in itself become self-supporting and solvent. Though we may be able, as Senator VANDENBERG suggests, to agree on a political settlement with the western countries, and have "a peace program which at least unites those who can agree," the economy of western Europe, including western Germany, can be kept going only as long as the Western Hemisphere is able and willing to meet the international deficit of all of western Europe.

This could be done for a while, but not forever. It will have to be done until the Soviet Union assents to a general European settlement, which permits eastern Europe—not merely eastern Germany—to reunite with western Europe. It will have to be done in order to induce, and in some measure to compel, the Soviet Union to agree to a general European settlement. But it is plain that our delegation has come back from Moscow without any illusions as to how difficult, how costly, and perhaps how dangerous such a policy is bound to be.

In working out this policy of action that "cannot await compromise through exhaustion," the spirit and purpose which animates the administration and Congress are of paramount importance. If it is undertaken in the spirit of an anti-Communist crusade, and for the purpose of uniting the democratic states against the totalitarian, the chances of success are negligible. The resistance generated, not only in Moscow but all over Europe, will defeat us.

If, on the other hand, we act in the spirit which Marshall and Dulles reflect, our action in western Europe can be designed to unite rather than to divide the whole of Europe, for we have the resources to stimulate such a revival of western Europe that the profit and advantage of collaborating with it will be manifest and even compelling in Prague, Warsaw, and Moscow.

We are already at the point where we must consider extraordinary measures of assistance to the United Kingdom, to France, to Italy, to western Germany, and to many of the smaller western European countries. If we are wise, we shall not wait until the collapse, which is clearly in sight within the next 18 months, is upon us.

In acting to forestall this collapse, we can afford to have no illusions. The deficit of the western European countries cannot be met, as Mr. McCloy's recent address makes clear, by the World Bank, or by the American banking community. The sums needed are too large. The transactions are abnormal and altogether outside ordinary private finance. Nor can the deficit be met by Government loans because in fact these sums cannot be paid back. They will have to be contributed as a national investment in peace and prosperity. That will mean the revival in some form or other of what was known in wartime as lend-lease. A different name for it may be invented. But that in fact is what it will have to be.

Now as we face up to the realities of the burden, our prime consideration must necessarily be, not how to get the money back, but how to make that money promote peace and prosperity. It will not do that, I believe, if we allocate our contributions to each European government separately. That will merely put them all on the dole, whereas what is needed is a reorganization of the bankrupt economy of Europe, and then, to make the reorganization succeed, a large contribution from America of working capital.

So after we have discussed the separate needs of Britain, France, Italy, and the rest, we should suggest to them that they meet together, agree on a general European program of production and exchange of imports and exports to the outer world, and that they arrive at an estimate of the consolidated deficit for as much of Europe as can agree to a common plan. Such a consolidated deficit will be smaller than the sum of the separate national deficits. Moreover, from our point of view it would be a refreshing innovation to make our contribution not to many separate governments but to Europe—if not to all of it at first, then at least to a very large part of it.

In some such way as this the contribution which we must inevitably make would serve not merely to relieve suffering but as a premium and inducement to the unification of Europe. Treated in this way, our financial intervention in Europe would almost certainly be purged of the suggestion that we were treating Europe as a satellite continent in our contest with the Soviets, and even in Moscow our real intentions would surely become clearer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have one or two additional articles and excerpts, together with a letter relating to what is being done and thought in Europe today about this question. I have a letter which contains in it the statement of a resolution which was recently introduced in the House of Commons. I believe it was introduced on January 30. The resolution is as follows:

That in order to raise the standard of living of the peoples of the world and to maintain world peace, this House requests His Majesty's Government to affirm Britain's readiness to federate with any other nation willing to do so on the basis of a federal constitution to be agreed by a representative constituent assembly.

That resolution is now pending, and I understand that considerable interest has been aroused, and that quite a large number of Members of the House of Commons have committed themselves to it.

I have before me also an article from the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1947, containing an interview with the former Hungarian leader, Eckhardt, stating his views as to the attitude of the people of Hungary and central Eu-

rope toward the proposal for a United States of Europe. At one time or another he has held important positions in the Government of Hungary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECKHARDT SAYS UNITED EUROPE CAN AVERT WAR—FORMER HUNGARIAN LEADER BACKS TRUMAN ON GREEK AID AT FORDHAM DINNER

Unification of Europe is the only way to avoid a new war and bring about a lasting peace, Tibor Eckhardt, former leader of the Small Holders Party in Hungary, said last night at a dinner of the Burke Society of Fordham University, held in Keating Hall on the university campus.

"Continental Europeans properly organized will always be able to contain Germany within its boundaries and stave off any aggressive power such as has arisen in Soviet Russia," Mr. Eckhardt said, adding that a united Europe can achieve the two main purposes of all civilized human communities—security and prosperity.

Mr. Eckhardt, a self-exiled former member of the Hungarian Parliament, came to the United States in 1941 as the head of a "Movement for an Independent Hungary," which failed to win the support of all exiled Hungarians. Last night's dinner concluded a 2-day conference on the world crisis in political society, which was sponsored by the Burke Society. Mr. Eckhardt was introduced by the Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, president of Fordham University.

Pointing out that a partitioned Europe must necessarily become a burden to the English-speaking powers, or else fall prey to some aggressive major power, Mr. Eckhardt said he had always been a fervent adherent of Winston Churchill's policy on European unity.

Referring to President Truman's pronouncements on aiding Greece and Turkey, Mr. Eckhardt declared: "I fully understand the shock which every reasonable American must have felt when he learned that the policing of the eastern Mediterranean had become an American responsibility. It is more shocking because no other alternative exists for the time being."

Then terming the present situation an inevitable consequence of the distintegration of Europe, Mr. Eckhardt indicated that the American burden in Europe and the Middle East could be eased by a unified and reconstructed Europe.

Speaking at the afternoon session of the conference on the International Trade Organization's role in economic pacification, Dr. Harold W. Davey, director of the Institute of Economic Affairs, New York University, declared that the practical effectiveness of the ITO will be in direct ratio to the success of the United States in maintaining full employment.

"In the eyes of other nations the studied planlessness of our present domestic economic policy is certain to end in depression," Dr. Davey asserted, adding: "Most other nations have turned to a qualified or complete form of state socialism with extensive public planning of their internal economies. They are not sanguine about the possibilities of unregulated free enterprise."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a similar article from an Associated Press story of April 19 by Irene Simon, giving the views of one Kurt Schmidt, the leader of the Social Democratic Party in Germany, which is said to be the largest party now existing, certainly in our part of Germany. The article deals with the subject of a federation of Europe.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISTS WANT UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

(By Irene Simon)

BERLIN, April 19.—Political enlightenment officers of Germany's Social Democratic Party (SPD) are plugging for a United States of Europe.

Reputedly the largest political group in Germany today, the new party line was laid down at a policy meeting by 34-year-old Kurt Schmidt, the political adviser responsible for the party's educational work.

"We don't expect much from Moscow," he said, referring to the Foreign Ministers' Conference. "In reality we know very well that the fate of Germany is not the issue (in Moscow) but that two great power groups are struggling hard to draw their political, strategic, and economic lines.

"These two groups no longer have the slightest confidence in each other and the chances for gaining confidence are as slim as our diets," he told the policy group. "Our part in this big play of power politics is to realize the idea of making the Socialist Parties of Europe the third independent power group in order to avoid a front.

"The aim of the Social Democratic Party of Germany is to create a United States of Europe with a mutual traffic economy and culture, and mutual use of energy and raw material resources."

BROADER VIEWPOINT

Schmidt, expounding the party line to rank-and-file members, says that the party aims eventually to educate the German people so that they feel not like Germans but Europeans.

Schmidt says the most disturbing element in dealing with the Russians is their strong mistrust, but once they gain confidence in you it is without limit.

"The United States," he says, "seems to want to leave us alone. That's good. However, it's difficult dealing with Americans because one group is anti-Russian, another pro, one group liberal, and another conservative. It's difficult to know just where you stand.

"The British, on the other hand, are a bit too much interested in us. They want to educate us too much, to make of us a small Great Britain.

"The French understand us best of all. They'll be the first to achieve real contact with us, because they have been close enough to know us as we are."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have also an editorial entitled "Unite or Perish?" published in the Dallas (Tex.) News of May 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITE OR PERISH?

Henry Sowerby, assistant foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor, notes that several important movements toward creation of a United States of Europe have been under way for some time. One is sponsored by Winston Churchill; another by Prof. A. Brugmans, Dutch savant; with another former premier, Paul von Zeeland of Belgium, is associated; and the president of the Pan American Union, Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, recently issued an appeal for American support of a European federation, a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

We must unite or perish, some of the most outspoken advocates of federation in Europe say. They point to the example of the United States of America, where millions of citizens of many racial stocks have been able to live in amity these many years, to share such prosperity as modern Europeans have never known. They argue that unity in Europe, with trade barriers removed and commerce moving freely, would insure economic restoration and lasting peace.

The inability of the foreign ministers to reach agreement thus far on major problems born of the war will lend new strength to these several movements toward federation. The chief obstacle, admittedly, is Russian fear that any organization is designed to create a western bloc against her. It is the urgent task of statesmanship to convince the Soviet leaders that efforts to insure unity through agreement are designed solely to promote and maintain peace in Europe and throughout the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a few statements which I have collected from various works, which I did not cover in my first speech. At that time I submitted statements from such people of the past as William Penn, Immanuel Kant, Clement Attlee, and others, regarding this subject.

I have a few more, simply to illustrate the wide attention which this subject has received—I do not mean since the introduction of the resolution here, but in the recent past, and before the introduction of the resolution.

Here is a sentence from the book entitled "Strategy for Democracy," published in 1942, by Kingsley and Petegorsky:

Europe must unite. Peace on the European Continent can be made a stable affair only through some process of federalization.

William Bullitt, in a speech at the Pan-American Conference at New York University, as reported in the New York Times of March 28, 1943, stated:

The world needs a strong, integrated, democratic Europe. A loosely-held-together agglomeration of weakness is not strength. Such a Europe might slip rapidly into another uneasy balance of power or, if it should not be armed, into another uneasy balance of impotence and fall prey to internal and external pressures.

Here is a quotation from the book Revolt of the Masses, by Ortega and Gasset:

The real situation of Europe would, then, appear to be this: Its long and splendid past has brought it to a new stage of existence where everything has increased; but at the same time the institutions surviving from the past are dwarfed and have become an obstacle to expansion. Europe has been built up in the form of small nations. In a way the idea and the sentiment of nationality have been her most characteristic invention. And now she finds herself obliged to exceed herself. This is the outline of the enormous drama to be staged in the coming years. Will she be able to shake off these survivals, or will she remain forever their prisoner? Because it has already happened once before in history that a great civilization has died through not being able to adopt a substitute for its traditional idea of the state.

Here is a further statement from page 159 of the same book:

To my mind, the feeling of shrinkage, of impotency, which undoubtedly lies heavy on the vitality of Europe in these times, is nourished on that disproportion between the great potentialities of Europe and the form of political organization within which they have to act.

Here is an interesting quotation from a book by Mr. Trotsky entitled "The Revolution Betrayed," written in 1937. I read from page 233 of the book, as follows:

> The decline of Europe is caused by the very fact that it is economically split up among almost 40 quasi-national states which, with their customs, passports, money systems, and monstrous armies in defense of national particularism, have become a gigantic obstacle on the road of the economic and cultural development of mankind.

Here is a further interesting statement from page 78 of Max Werner, in Kingsley and Petegorsky:

> Twenty-seven European states with their national sovereignties, their armies, and their rivalries formed a panier de crabes (to use the French term).

I quote from Friedman's book entitled "Crisis of the National State," published in 1943:

> The abhorrence of the destructive and tyrannic purposes, in the service of which the Nazis have put this new integrated European economy, should not obscure the fact that they have given expression and form to tendencies long inherent in European developments. The complementary character of German and French industry, or the dependence of Balkan agriculture on the market of industrial Europe, has not been invented by the Nazis.

These are older editorials. They are not current as the ones referred to before. I wish to read just a few sentences stated in 1945 and 1946. I now read from a New York Times editorial dated May 13, 1945, as follows:

> And those ideas of regressive totalitarianism (such as nazism) spring from the same chaotic conditions and frustrations as those that confronts Europe now. (Raymond Daniell, New York Times magazine, May 13, 1945.)

Dorothy Thompson, on December 6, 1943, said this:

> For no peace can be made without Europe, which happens to contain 350,000,000 people. The crux of the whole peace is the reconstruction of Europe. But so far not a single basis in principle or in action has been laid for that reconstruction.

The London Times of July 13, 1945, said this:

> In the British view almost anything that prevents the division of Europe—whether it is more frequent and fuller consultation, or freer access (which alone can increase understanding) or special arrangements—is a step in the right direction.

Of course, Churchill, in his speech at Zurich on December 19, 1946, had much to say about this subject, and I want to quote just a few lines from his statement:

> I am now going to say something which will astonish you. The first step in the recreation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany.
>
> In this way only can France recover the moral and cultural leadership of Europe.
>
> There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany.

I may say for the record that I have a great many other statements here, but I simply wish to reinforce the views expressed, and I offer them as further evidence of the universality of the approval of the idea of a federation of Europe. I want again to emphasize the point that keeps cropping up here as to how much this country will be asked to do, both for relief, under the pending joint resolution, and for assistance to Greece for which we recently voted.

I noticed in yesterday's newspaper a statement to the effect that Secretary of State Marshall is contemplating bringing a proposal to the Congress asking for as much as $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 for Korea.

I think the time has arrived when the administration should begin to go over the estimate of what we are expected to provide, what is necessary to provide for the reconstruction of other countries and, as a result, what hope we can have that the expenditure of these funds will result in the creation of an economic and political organization which would be self-sufficient. This question arose the other day on the floor in the discussion of the fertilizer shortage in this country. We can see that the situation in Europe and the so-called level of production policy in Germany are beginning to impinge upon our economy in all sorts of ways. While I have supported in the past, as I recall, practically every measure, beginning with the original resolution in the House of Representatives, looking toward the creation of the United Nations, and, I think, every subsequent measure which has come before the Senate seeking to create an effective United Nations, I confess that I am beginning to arrive at the point where there is a serious question in my mind whether we are doing a wise thing in continuing to expend large sums of money without any plan or without any idea that we are going to create in Europe, especially, an organization which will be self-sufficient and which can support itself without any further relief or without any further loans. I realize that this cannot be brought about immediately, but it seems to me that if we have no idea of any organization in Europe other than the re-creation of the same conglomerate mass of independent sovereignties already existing, there is no hope whatever that they will be a good risk, that they can ever repay loans, or that the relief we give them will be anything other than temporary relief and that there will be a recurrent demand every year. That is what brings to my mind so strongly the same thought which was expressed a moment ago by the Senator from Georgia with reference to relief. There is a limit to what any country can do in that regard, and there is a limit to what this country can do.

I again urge consideration by the State Department and by the administration of measures to encourage the countries of Europe to create a sensible and workable order in Europe itself. I cannot but believe that Europe could become as prosperous, relatively, as this country has become, through the adoption of the principle of free trade among themselves, which necessarily means an economic and political union of some sort. In the first place, I do not think that the central government should have any greater power than is necessary to accomplish an economic union. There should be a very great degree of what we call State rights. I think that is certainly within the realm of reason.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to state that in several of the articles which I have submitted for the consideration of the Senate there will be found the recurring thought, "This is an excellent idea, but now is not the time to do it, because today conditions are too upset; these are difficult times, and we must proceed to conclude the treaties and handle the other matters that soon will come before the Senate." I think that is an entirely incorrect interpretation of the present situation. If we assume, as is proved by practically all the evidence, that there is an almost universal endorsement of the validity of the idea of a unification or a federation of Europe, then I submit that the very best and, in fact, the only practical opportunity for bringing it about is under the conditions which now exist. If we proceed to adopt treaties and again tie down the existing boundaries and existing national states in Europe, I think the opportunity for taking any forward step will have passed. It is the unsettled conditions and, we might say, the dire necessity of the peoples of those various countries that present us with the opportunity to take a forward step at this time. An examination of history, I think will reveal that it is very seldom that any people or any nation has taken a forward step except under the pressure of great necessity. I think the present distress in Europe is the indispensable factor to bringing about progress. Unfortunately, people are not so rational as we like to assume they are, and they respond much more to the stimulus of necessity and hard times and such conditions as now exist, to do something to remedy the existing order and to bring about a better situation, than they do when prosperity is restored and when normal conditions exist.

Of course, I may say that I doubt seriously that any real degree of prosperity and stability can be established in Europe so long as Europe is split up into various small nations, none of which really can hope to enjoy any degree of prosperity when limited by the trade restrictions, customs restrictions, regulations on travel and the freedom of movement, and so forth, which for many years have characterized that very unhappy Continent.

So I think there can never be a better time to promote to the limit of our ability the idea that the establishment of a United States of Europe is the real solution of the difficulties of Europe and, incidentally, of our own difficulties, of course, because that is really our fundamental interest. We need not labor the point that unless some reasonable order can be established in Europe, we shall again be involved in the difficulties which arise out of European troubles.

So again I urge our Government to consider seriously the proposal to which I have referred, and proceed, if not along the line I have suggested, at least along some line which will give us hope that we may create a system which will bring about an orderly Europe.

I wish to submit a further item which relates to this matter, and which appeals

very much to me. It also has some bearing upon the significance of the relief measure which the Senate now has before it. First, I wish to read one paragraph of an editorial published in the Oakland Tribune, of Oakland, Calif., dealing with the proposal of a United States of Europe:

The standing of the United States of America, their rapid growth, development, and rise to international leadership under our system of government should be an incentive to all other nations, yet the human element as represented by centuries of history shows that Europe is, and has been, the chief breeding place of political isms and causes for war and through the centuries every effort to advance peace has been nullified by the attitude of the leadership and governments of the European countries.

Only a miracle, engineered by power on high, could change, in our humble opinion, their ages-long lust for dissension, quarreling, and bloodshed. It would be a tremendous task to give the diverse populations of Europe an understanding of the advantages of a country based on those principles that have made America good and great.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the assumption which the writer makes in that paragraph is that European people are in some way inherently different from Americans, in that, as he says, they have an "ages-long lust for dissension, quarreling, and bloodshed." That seems to me to be a completely erroneous evaluation of their situation. I do not for a moment believe that the people of Europe have an inherent "lust for dissension, quarreling, and bloodshed." In fact, if we consider the ordinary citizens of the countries of Europe, I think we realize that those people dislike the whole business as much as we do. I think they are just as anxious as anyone in the United States is to bring about a reasonable order in which they can live a decent life.

In contrast to that attitude toward the people of Europe, who, after all, have common ancestors with most of the people of the United States—and the attitude expressed in that article is, to my mind, quite an unrealistic one to take—let me say that I have received a letter, which I have taken out of my files, from a citizen of Berlin. All Senators are familiar with the service offered by the organization CARE, which, upon receipt of $10, sends to some person in Europe a package of Army food which has been left in Europe by the Army. I had such a package sent some time ago. That organization simply undertakes to make delivery of such packages, which consist altogether of Army rations, which we think are sufficient to sustain life, but are not something about which the average American would become excited. I ordered the package at Christmastime, and I understand that it was worth $10. I read this letter only to indicate an example of the extremities to which the people of Germany have been reduced:

[Translation]

BERLIN, *March 20, 1947.*

WILHELM FULLBRECHT,
Berlin NW., 40 Thomasiusstrasse 27,
Court 2, Stairs to the left.

HIGHLY RESPECTED, DEAR SENATOR: March 18, 1947, we were able to collect the CARE package sent by you December 18, 1946. You can hardly imagine our joy on seeing the many wonderful things of which we in Germany knew only by hearsay for many years. We stood before the contents of the package with shining eyes, like children who have received rich gifts stand in front of the table with their gifts under the Christmas tree. I am especially glad that my wife, whose lungs are diseased, who suffered very much physically and mentally from the inhuman conditions in which we were forced to spend this severe and long winter, can get a little stronger thanks to your kind readiness to help. I hope she will recover and regain her strength again from the supply of additional calories you sent.

We feel deeply indebted to you and express our deep gratitude again to you, Senator, for the kind help given to us. May God reward you for it. We shall not forget you.

We have a dreadful winter behind us, which brought us suffering which we formerly believed no person could bear. Now, God be praised, it is over, although there is still no indication of any alleviation of the conditions of daily life. We hope that the statesmen meeting in Moscow will find a peace settlement for the world which turns out to be a blessing for all nations, mine too. Out of the darkness into the light.

Your statement in Congress, about which I read in my newspaper, comes from the heart and it is my ardent wish to live to see a United States of Europe, in order to prevent further wars and thus the destruction of the western world.

I wish you personally only the best. I gratefully shake your hand and remain, with best regards.

Your sincere, devoted,
W. FULLBRECHT.

P. S.—I hope that you have received my letter in which I acknowledged receipt of yours of December 18, 1946.

That letter almost makes one ashamed for having done so little, in view of the abject poverty and extremely difficult conditions of those people.

To say, as is said in the editorial to which I have referred, that the people of Europe have a "lust for dissention, quarreling and bloodshed" seems to me to indicate a complete misapprehension of the actual conditions. The people of Europe are actually no different inherently from the people of other lands. The trouble is that they have no governmental institution which enables them to work together and to live amicably with other people. All of us remember that it was not very long ago that we in the United States had quite a quarrel among ourselves; and, to me, it was a miracle that we overcame it. Fundamentally, our Constitution is what has held this country together, and I do not think we should assume a critical attitude toward all other peoples who have not been so fortunate in their political heritage.

This writer enclosed a statement from a Berlin paper referring merely to the submission of the resolution in the Congress. I repeat the last paragraph of the letter:

Your statement in Congress, about which I read in my newspaper, comes from the heart and it is my ardent wish to live to see a United States of Europe in order to prevent further wars and thus the destruction of the western world.

So that even a starving man in the gutters of Berlin is quite as conscious of the significance of the creation of a reasonable order in Europe as are we in this country.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, various editorials relative to the proposal for a United States of Europe.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 7, 1947]

THE TIME IS FAVORABLE

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in an eloquent article in the Post-Dispatch yesterday, called on America to look beyond patchwork accommodations in the international field and strive for a solution which will relieve us of the economic and military burdens of a disorganized Europe.

In the next 15 months the United States is expected to spend $7,000,000,000 on its international commitments, some $700,000,000 going to the support of our defeated enemy, Germany. "As a practical people," Senator FULBRIGHT says, "we may well ask ourselves, How do we finally work out from under these obligations?" Then he answers his own question:

"In the Near East and in Europe a prerequisite to the revival of trade and industry is a United States of Europe. * * * With the federalization of Europe would come freedom of commerce, the free movement of persons, a common currency, and efficient transportation. The result would be a rising standard of living and a cowering of the political rivalries and economic tensions generating war."

Senator FULBRIGHT points out that Europe desperately needs, for its rehabilitation, the full production of German industry. But because Europe is not organized in such a way as to protect itself from a possible revival of German militarism, it is planned to let Germany manufacture less than a third of its prewar production of steel, less than half of its rated capacity of fertilizer, and other goods in proportion.

Senator FULBRIGHT would have Germany broken up into the separate states which composed the Reich and then organize these with other continental countries into a European federation. So divided, the Germans could not dominate a European federation.

The Senator takes it for granted, of course, that European federation would have to be achieved over Russian opposition. He thinks it should be clear to us by now that Russia does not intend, if she can help it, to permit the rehabilitation of any European country, except under the aegis of the Communist Party. It is up to the western powers to see that Europe is rehabilitated, instead, under democratic auspices. He would have the United States extend encouragement for the calling of a constitutional convention to unite at least western Europe.

He admits the great complexity of the problem but adds: "The most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval leaving it in an unstable and fluid state."

The western powers would do well to commit this statement to memory. The men in the Kremlin know it and it is their guiding principle at the moment. If the western powers forget it, they do so at their peril.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 24, 1947]

FOR FEDERAL UNION

A concurrent resolution has been introduced in the House by Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana and in the upper branch by Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and THOMAS of Utah which says:

"The Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The first though which enters the mind of an American interested in the federation idea is the question Priscilla put to John Alden: "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?"

In other words, if we believe that a federation of the western European democracies is a "positive solution to an important source of trouble in the world," then how much vital and inspiring is a federation in which the United States is a member.

The United States of Europe has been an ideal which has caught the imagination of far-sighted men over the years. The great design of King Henry the Fourth of France was conceived in the era of intense nationalism and was put forward as the antidote to that nationalism which kept Europe constantly at war.

Victor Hugo, whose wide-ranging mind encompassed so many subjects, said at the International Peace Congress at Paris in 1849:

"A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, shall be seen placed in the presence of each other, extending the hand of fellowship across the ocean, exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator, and uniting, for the good of all, these two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of men and the power of God."

In the 1920's, Aristide Briand, that man of good will, devoted the full strength of his last years to the idea of the United States of Europe in which Germany of the Republic would play an important part and by the absorption of Prussianized Germany into the western sphere of ideas and culture would end the menace of war. The coming of Hitler to power, with his accent upon a heated nationalism, destroyed the dream of Briand.

All great ideas, like the United States of Europe, comes to fruition by the compelling imperatives of necessity. There is not one argument, outside of the proud but poor appeal to national sovereignty, which can stand up in the face of federation. To pool the brains, skill, and resources of Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland into a federation, working for the tremendous end of peace, would be to create a power that these nations individually do not have in themselves.

The best and clearest minds in Europe see that to resist the pressure of international communism there must be a union of the western democracies. Prime Minister Attlee, of Great Britain, said: "Europe must federate or perish." Winston Churchill, who politically is diametrically opposed to the socialism of Attlee yet who is today the foremost proponent of federation in Europe, has said:

"If, in this interval, we can revive the life and unity of Europe and Christendom, and with this new reinforcement build high and commanding a world structure of peace which no one will dare challenge, the most awful crisis of history will have passed away and the highroad of history will again become open."

This, remember, is not the talk of theorists or academicians. In the lowest period of French history, when the Republic was on the verge of being overtaken by the men of Vichy, Winston Churchill offered to the French Nation a federation, with common citizenship and a union of purpose.

We are at present embarked upon the leadership of the world through our responsibility to keep high and alive the principles of democracy and liberty. The foremost and extremely intelligent apologists for the United Nations cannot disguise the fact that in a critical pinch, such as has been brought about in Greece and Turkey, the United Nations was not able to handle it. The United States has been forced to take command.

Frankly, we have a guilty conscience about going into this business alone, unilaterally. We are losing confidence in the United Nations. Yet we are committed as much as any nation can be to international organization as the great remedy against war. If the United Nations cannot be relied upon then we must be thinking in terms of alternatives.

The one alternative that we have is the idea of federal union with the nations whose minds run on a parallel course with ours. The United States of Europe is a magnificent but incomplete idea. The union of the United States of Europe and the United States of America would be, by its very strength, the guarantor of universal peace.

We do endorse, with the three Members of Congress, the union of western European democracies. But we wish that they had taken the next and logical step to work for a federal union to include the United States. That is the direction in which our minds should be going.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch of May 6, 1947]

DO WE HAVE A PLAN?

Europe is slipping into chaos while nothing is accomplished on the peace treaty with Germany, the American people were told by Secretary of State Marshall in his radio report after returning from the fruitless Moscow Conference. Yet at the same time Secretary Marshall gave only a counsel of "Patience, patience." If the State Department has any other proposal up its sleeve, none has been disclosed.

Yet many students of world problems, both in Europe and the United States, have a plan. It calls for a union of western Europe states, predominantly economic but also to some extent political, into what has come to be known as a United States of Europe. Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas, Senator THOMAS, Democrat, Utah, and Representative BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana, have introduced in Congress a resolution reading in full:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

It is no new idea. Disregarding such early advocates as Henry IV, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, and Victor Hugo, the proposal was pushed after World War I by so practical a statesman as Aristide Briand, 10 times premier of France, and is now supported by hard-bitten Winston Churchill.

In fact, under Briand's instigation the 27 European states that were members of the League of Nations met in Geneva in 1930 to discuss ways and means of creating a United States of Europe. The conference got nowhere fast. The delegates praised the principle, disagreed violently on how to achieve it. Some objected that a body outside the League would weaken the League. Others disagreed with the Briand thesis that political should precede economic unification. Others saw an attempt at economic and financial rivalry with the United States.

It will be noted that the Soviet Union was not represented. Some of the delegates at Geneva in 1930 thought it futile to project a United States of Europe with the largest and most populous European state left outside. Others even saw in the 1930 conference another attempt to strengthen the existing "cordon sanitaire" against Moscow.

At all events, any move to create a United States of Europe in 1947 would in effect be an anti-Soviet move. The great difference would be that in 1930 the Soviet Union was on the defensive, in 1947 it is on the offensive. The move today would be an attempt to avert the chaos which is threatened by the Soviet tactics in international affairs and which the Soviet Union is widely suspected of actually desiring. If objection is raised that a union of western Europe now would create two worlds instead of the one world visualized by the United Nations charter, the answer would be that in actuality Europe is already divided into two worlds.

Many Americans observe blithely: "If the Thirteen States could create a Federal union in 1789, why can't the countries of Europe, at least of western Europe, create their own United States in 1947?" But the problem isn't so simple as that.

In 1789 the former British Colonies had recently been united in war and had much the same attitude toward all foreign nations. In the war recently ended, Italy, Germany, and Austria were on the losing side; Spain was pro-Axis; Portugal, Switzerland, and Sweden remained neutral; and certain of the western European states harbor pro-Soviet minorities which are powerful both politically and economically.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald of March 27, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

There is before the Senate a resolution giving an official American blessing to a United States of Europe to be created under the auspices of the United Nations. Such a development would be as great a contribution toward the economic welfare of the nations involved as it would be to world peace. But it is a dream with no likelihood of reality.

One of the great paradoxes of modern history is that, while everyone believes in the establishment of a United States of Europe, wars constantly are breaking out in dispute over how it is to be evolved. Napoleon, by his own lights, was trying to create a United States of Europe. So was Kaiser Wilhelm II. Later Hitler had a serious shot at it. Today there is excellent evidence Stalin has the same ambition in the back of his mind.

Round and round it goes and where it stops nobody knows. The ideal of the subordination of nations into one big and peaceful community remains, but it never comes even as close as just around the corner. First there is a period in which the nations prove unable to consolidate themselves voluntarily. Then a period in which they join to oppose whichever one of them at the moment is trying to bring about the consolidation. It is a divine jest grimly underlined by the millions of lives it takes once a generation in the shooting debate on the proposition.

[From the Atlanta Journal of March 29, 1947]

A FEDERATED EMPIRE

The resolution introduced in the Congress by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas and Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana represents an age-old dream in western civilization, a United States of Europe. That it can be called a dream does not argue against it, particularly in 1947 when such a federation would enhance the world's security. But, alas, in 1947 the immediate realization of such a project remains indeed a dream.

There is no concrete plan for a federal Europe, whether Winston Churchill's, John Foster Dulles', or Field Marshal Smuts', which does not constitute, in the view of Soviet Russia, a western bloc aimed at her security. Europe, as Mr. Dulles has argued, can get along without Russia's help in building a federation of the nations signatory to the UN Charter with the addition of Italy and Austria. But neither the European powers nor Britain nor the United States can without Russia's cooperation solve one great problem, the problem of Germany. And a Europe united on a line west of Stettin and Trieste would not be a united Europe.

The key to European reconstruction is Germany; that is merely a fact of economics. It is a fact fraught with dangerous signifi-

cance, as Secretary Marshall warned in reminding the Council of Foreign Ministers the other day how building Germany after 1918 in order to get reparations from the country ended by building the Nazi war machine. And yet leaving Germany as a drain on the United States and Britain and, more importantly, as a chaotic vortex in the midst of Europe, would delay forever the reconstruction of Europe. The middle road is hard to find.

There is sentiment in Europe and in the councils of the United Nations for an integrated approach to the reconstruction of Europe's economy. Soviet Russia, after a long delay, has agreed in the UN Economic and Social Council to the establishment of a joint European economic commission.

If the work of such a commission can be accomplished, which ultimately depends upon the joint creation by the Big Four of a sound and peaceful Germany, a United States of Europe may become more than a noble dream.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EATON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JONKMAN, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EFFECTS OF REDUCED APPROPRIATIONS ON THE RECLAMATION AND POWER PROJECTS OF THE WEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak at some length on the effect of reclamation and power projects of the West of reductions made by the House of Representatives in the appropriations carried in the Interior Department appropriation bill. In view of the lateness of the hour, and because of my desire to have my remarks appear in the RECORD in continuity, without unnecessary interruptions, I shall decline to yield during the course of the discussion. These remarks I contemplate having reprinted and distributed in considerable quantities throughout the Pacific Northwest, and I desire to have them in treatise form.

I desire to point out, Mr. President, that already I have spoken several times on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the very drastic cuts in the appropriations for the western projects made by the House of Representatives. I told my colleagues in the Senate immediately after the cuts were made that they would arouse a considerable amount of critical opposition in the Western States, because the people of the West familiar with the problems involved in these great wealth-creating projects well know that the cuts cannot be justified.

I have listened with close attention from time to time to the comments of some of the spokesmen for the Republican majority in the Congress who have attempted to rationalize the cuts, but I can assure my colleagues that their rationalizations are not acceptable to the West, for the simple reason that the facts will not support their statements.

The matter has reached such serious proportions that I understand the governors of 11 States will appear this week before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having charge of the Interior Department appropriations, because those governors of States in the West, thoroughly familiar with the problems of the western projects and their vital importance to the economy of the West and of the entire country, know that the cuts which have been made by the House action cannot be justified on the basis of the facts.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have endeavored to point out, in my discussions heretofore, that these projects are self-liquidating in character, and when appropriations upon which they are dependent are reduced to the extent the House has reduced them, I do not propose to let the Congress forget that they are self-liquidating. The people of the West are being told that one reason for the action taken by the House of Representatives is that the Federal budget is a mixed budget. In my judgment, it is a very unsound budget set-up. I believe that in the Federal budget appropriations for what may be called capital investments, which will produce returns and tax dollars in the future, should be separated from the appropriations for the operating expenditures of the Government.

I called upon the Bureau of the Budget to prepare for me certain material which will enable me to point out in the future how unwise and unsound it is, from a budgetary policy standpoint, for us to mix in the budget of administrative or operating costs of the Government capital investments which result in the creation of new wealth, out of which tax dollars can flow, to the great benefit of the Nation.

I repeat, Mr. President, these are self-liquidating projects about which I am speaking, and I say that in view of the great need for them it is false economy for the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress to cut these items in such an amount as the House of Representatives has cut them in the appropriation bill.

I know that the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations having charge of the Interior Department bill is going to do its very best to restore the appropriations and make good as much of the loss suffered because of the House cuts as it can. But here again, Mr. President, we must be realists, and I think we can take notice of the fact that once the House cuts appropriations to the degree it has cut them in this instance, it is not to be expected that in conference the Senate conferees, no matter how strongly the Senate votes to restore the appropriations, can succeed in making the final figure equal to the budget estimates and adequate to carry on the absolutely essential work.

I know that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations considering Interior Department appropriations, can be counted upon to see to it that the Senate subcommittee will have placed before it all the available facts justifying the restoration of the full amount that was cut by the House. In fact, the entire Oregon delegation can be counted upon to give to the senior Senator its unanimous backing to this end.

I intend to speak about the issue on the floor of the Senate in order to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and thus make available to every Member of the Senate facts and figures having to do with the great reclamation and power projects of the West. I propose to keep myself in a position where I can at all times say to my party, on behalf of the people of my State, "I gave you the facts in regard to this problem, and the people had the right to expect you to act on the basis of the facts."

Mr. President, the resource development activities of the Department of the Interior are of vital importance to the economy of the entire country and, particularly, to the economic well-being of the West. I have, therefore, studied with great care the report of the House Appropriations Committee on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I have analyzed carefully the debate on the House floor, and have read the editorial comments of our newspapers and columns.

I am convinced from my study of the matter that the subject has been thoroughly confused; that the House Appropriations Committee unwittingly did things which it did not intend to do; that questions were raised in the course of the House debate which were never answered and which, consequently, tend to confuse further the issues involved. Out of this confusion has come an action by the House which drastically curtails the power and reclamation projects of the West; which deprives the country of the urgently needed benefits of the potential resources of the West. What is needed to clear away the mists that shroud Senate consideration of these vital programs is a factual analysis which answers the questions that have been raised and clears up the confusion by which the House did one thing when I suspect it probably in many respects intended to do another.

Inasmuch as the greatest confusion exists with respect to the reclamation and power projects of the West, and it appears that these programs were damaged more than any others by the House action, I shall, for the time being, confine myself to the presentation of what I believe the facts to be with respect to these projects. This is not to deny or slight in any way the vital importance of the mineral exploration, range management, forest management, and other programs which have been adversely affected by the House action.

The following are some of the specific questions which were raised during the House debate and which require definitive answers:

First. It is charged that the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration have substantial unexpended balances which will carry over into the fiscal year 1948 and that, when

added to the moneys appropriated by the House for these programs, these agencies will have as much or more to spend in 1948 than they had in 1947.

Second. It is charged that the freeze order on new construction issued by the President in August 1946 imposed limitations on the reclamation and power programs, and that the House cuts are merely consistent with the President's program.

Third. It is charged that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration have never used all the moneys requested of, and granted by, Congress; that they have consistently overestimated their rates of expenditure, and that Congress is merely cutting them down to the amounts of money which can reasonably be spent in the next fiscal year.

Fourth. It is argued that reclamation and power projects, the investment in which is repaid to the Government, should not be undertaken in a period of high costs; that to undertake them at present cost levels would saddle the users of the project with unreasonable repayment costs; that they should be deferred until costs are lower.

I intend not only to answer these charges I have just enumerated, but I intend to go further and demonstrate that the power and reclamation projects will be crippled even more by booby-trap provisions inserted in the appropriation language.

Now let us take up charge No. 1, that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration have large unexpended balances which will carry over into the fiscal year 1948 which would, when added to the moneys appropriated by the House, provided them with as much or more than they had to spend in 1947.

Specifically, the House Appropriations Committee reported that the Bureau of Reclamation had an unexpended balance available for expenditure in 1948 of $85,826,767. The Appropriations Committee thereupon recommended $55,258,600, which when added to the amounts to be carried over into 1948 provided a total of $141,085,367. When there is added to the amount recommended by the House Appropriations Committee the additional amount inserted by amendment on the floor of the House, we find that the House intended to make available $146,505,367 for the Bureau of Reclamation's program in 1947.

Despite their intentions, however, they did not do this. Instead, they provided only $105,410,273 for 1948.

It is perfectly true that the Bureau of Reclamation estimates that it will have on hand as of June 30, 1947, unexpended construction funds of $85,826,767. It is not true, however, and it is misleading to assume, that this total may be added to the amounts recommended for construction by the House to show the Bureau of Reclamation's construction program for fiscal year 1948. It is not true because $33,951,971 of that $85,826,767 is pledged and must be reserved to pay for construction work performed in 1947. It is not available for 1948. It is not true because an additional $7,143,123 of that $85,826,767 is specifically reserved to pay for completing drainage and other work after 1948.

So while it is true that we can talk about an unexpended balance of $85,826,767, it also is true that if you want to arrive at the amount which will be available for construction work to be performed during 1948, only $44,731,673 of that amount may be added to the amounts of new money allowed for construction by the House.

Failure to distinguish between the unexpended balances required to pay for construction performed in 1947 and that part of these balances which are available for 1948 construction results in a misstatement of the Bureau's position as it goes into 1948.

All this means simply—

First. That the Bureau will carry over into 1948 unobligated funds for the 1948 construction program of only $44,731,673.

Second. That if you add this $44,731,673 to the construction amounts as approved by the House, the Bureau has available for its 1948 construction program only $105,410,273 and not the $141,085,367 as reported to the House, or the $146,505,367 the House evidently had intended to make available to the Bureau for the 1948 program.

Third. That the $105,410,273 which will be available for the 1948 construction program compares with a 1947 construction program of $157,777,644, or substantially less than the 1947 program. Action by the House makes it impossible to maintain the 1947 rate of construction during 1948 and results instead in a material curtailment of the 1947 rate of progress.

Fourth. That the 1948 construction program contemplated by the Budget estimate of $175,673,673 is short an apparent $70,263,400 as a result of the action by the House. The actual shortage is $70,863,400 because the House added $600,000 for two items not in the President's budget program.

This confusion between unexpended funds and unobligated funds in the minds of the House Appropriations Committee members has produced even more startling results as applied to the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee report indicates that there will be a carry-over of $11,755,000 of unexpended funds into fiscal year 1948. The committee recommended an additional appropriation of $6,907,800 to provide funds totaling $18,662,800 for 1948.

Thus while the House Appropriations Committee intended to provide Bonneville with $18,662,800 for 1948 they only provided $6,907,800 because the entire carry-over of funds has already been obligated for material and equipment purchased and services performed in 1947. The $6,907,800 actually provided compares with the $26,278,000 requested in the President's budget so that Bonneville could provide the services required of it by the expanding economy of the Pacific Northwest. Unless this confusion is cleared up by Congress, then I say Congress will unwittingly destroy the operating ability of an electric utility upon which the Pacific Northwest is vitally dependent.

I digress here to say, Mr. President, that I think it is unfortunately true that there are forces in the country which would still like to destroy the effectiveness and the efficiency of great public-power projects, such as the Bonneville Administration, but I think they, too, although they may stop for awhile the forward movement in the development of cheap power, are not in the long run, going to be successful, because no combination of wealth in this country and no alinement of political forces can for long prevent the will of the people that the great resources of the streams shall be harnessed in the interest of the people and not in the interest of the forces of business, which want to make profits out of the property belonging to all the people, at the expense of the users of the electricity generated from the water of streams.

I want to say to their credit that it is not the attitude of the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest to prevent the development of these great projects in the interests of all the people. I think the Tacoma agreement of February of this year, participated in by all the major private utilities of that section, shows very clearly how correct I am in that assertion. No; it is financial forces not to be found in the West that would like to slow up the development of the people's interests in the great streams of the Pacific Northwest.

It is very interesting to look at some of their advertisements, Mr. President, published since the House action. I have in my hand, for example, an advertisement seeking to sell seven outstanding utility stocks, and in the sales talk contained in the leaflet we find such language as this:

> There are three reasons why utility stocks offer unusual opportunities for profitable investment today: (1) Indispensable product—depression-proof industry; (2) consistent growth with expansion in earnings; (3) share prices low in relation to stocks of similar investment caliber. * * * Here is a group driven down to unbelievably low levels by antagonistic Government policies.

What do they mean by "antagonistic Government policies"? A reading of the entire leaflet will disclose what is meant. By "antagonistic Government policies" they mean the building during the past few years by the Government of such great wealth-producing projects as Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and some for which we are pleading in connection with McNary and Foster Creek and Hungry Horse and the other dams needed on the great Columbia and the Snake Rivers. To this type of broker who seeks to sell private utility stocks, it is an antagonistic governmental policy to have the Government, in the interest of the people, build that kind of wealth-creating project. The leaflet goes on to say:

> Government competition diminishing: Appropriations for public-power projects in 1947 represent only one-half of amount requested.

Let me say, Mr. President, that if the Eightieth Congress should finally make the drastic cuts in the appropriations for these great projects of the West that the House has already passed, there will be great joy in the ranks of the financial groups in the country represented by the promulgators of the leaflet from which

I have just read, who want certain powerful financial forces to obtain a monopolistic control of the streams of America, and set back for a good many years their development in the interest of the people, by way of producing cheap electric power and thus raising more rapidly the standard of living of those in a position to use it. But the forces to which I have referred will be successful only, Mr. President, if those of us who are raising the voice of protest, as I am raising it here this afternoon, are unsuccessful in getting the voters to see quickly enough exactly what the game is. I am satisfied that once the voters come to understand what the movement is on the part of selfish interests which believe that they ought to be given control over great natural resources which belong to all the people and should not be permitted to become the property of a few, they will stem the tide of the type of attack that was made in the House by the drastic cuts in the appropriation for these great projects of the West.

The second charge I indicated has been made is that the House appropriations cuts are consistent with the President's freeze order on new construction, issued last August, and that the House Appropriations Committee was merely carrying out the policy suggested by the President in cutting substantially the budgets of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Bureau administration.

Mr. President, I want to say that I did not approve of the President's cut-back order. I protested it on the floor of the Senate at the time, and pointed out what some of the undesirable results of that cut-back order would be. But I am not one who believes that it is ever good addition, Mr. President, to add one wrong to another in order to create a summation of two wrongs. We cannot rectify the wrong which was done to the people of the Pacific Northwest by the President's cut-back order of last year by now dealing them a second blow and, in effect, giving them a congressional cut-back order by way of such drastic reductions in the appropriations for these projects as the House has already made. What those who use that argument are saying in essence is, "Well, what we purpose to do is simply to postpone for another year what the people of the Pacific Northwest should have had in full last year without the President's cut-back order."

I may say another thing about an argument which is being used, I am sorry to say by some spokesmen even within my own party, by way of an alibi for the House action. It is being said on some of the public platforms of America by some gentleman, "Of course you know the House always cuts more than it really expects the final amount to be, because it simply takes it for granted that when the appropriation bills reach the Senate the Senate will see to it that the appropriations are increased at least to somewhere near a reasonable amount, so that we can have a pretty fair final adjustment in conference of the differences between the House and the Senate."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but I have already announced that I would not yield, for a reason which I have already given. Ordinarily I would; but the hour is too late for me to do so this afternoon, because if I get into a running debate on this subject we shall be here until midnight. In other words, I am "loaded for bear."

Mr. President, I regret that any of my colleagues use that argument, because I say that that is not the way to pass legislation in the Congress of the United States. No Member of the House, for political purposes or any other purpose, has any right to pass the buck to the Senate, and we in the Senate have no right to pass the buck to a conference committee, either. As I look upon our obligation, when it comes to voting upon legislation it is our solemn oblig tion to vote upon it in accordance with what we think it ought to contain; and if it does not contain what we think ought to be in it, then we ought to vote against it. If some Members of the House who are now finding the political heat a little scorching because of the action which was taken in the Appropriations Committee think they are going to be able to alibi out of their uncomfortable position by saying, "We expected the Senate, after all, to raise the appropriations to a more equitable amount," I believe that they are misjuding the thinking of the American voter, because, in my opinion, the American voter wants, and has the right to expect, Members of the Congress in both branches to vote on a piece of legislation in accordance with its inherent merits, and not on the basis of any prospective or projected political compromise that might be made in a subsequent conference committee.

Mr. President, the continuous references to the so-called Presidential freeze orders have served to create considerable confusion. Statements have been made, for example, in the course of House debate, that would imply that the amount allowed in the bill for the Bureau of Reclamation for the fiscal year 1948 would provide $11,000,000 more for expenditure for construction in the fiscal year 1948 than the President allowed to be spent in the fiscal year 1947. I have also noted confusion on the part of some of my colleagues in the Senate who are under the impression that there is still a Presidential limit on reclamation expenditures of $85,000,000 in 1947 and 1948. This is not so. The actual Presidential limitation of $159,100,000 for the fiscal year 1948 is completely consistent with the Bureau's budget request.

Let us look at the facts. Apparently the $11,000,000 referred to is obtained by comparing the amount of approximately $141,000,000 as shown on page 5 of the House report and $130,000,000, the actual limitation figure in the so-called freeze order on cash expenditures during 1947. I have already shown that even after the House added $5,420,000 to the construction amounts reported by the committee, the amount available for construction work during 1948 is only $105,410,273. I have already shown also that the committee erred in adding together new amounts recommended for appropriation and cash balances, because parts of the cash balance had been pledged and must be reserved to pay for construction carried out in 1947.

Even if this latter figure were comparable with the 1947 freeze order of $130,000,000, however, the allowance by the House is short some $24,500,000 of meeting such a limitation. But the $130,000,000 is established on a cash-withdrawal basis. On page 50 of part 3 of the House hearings, there appears a tabulation summarizing and comparing the cash withdrawal basis and the obligation basis for 1947. That tabulation clearly shows that within the Presidential cash withdrawal limitation of $130,000,000, obligations to be incurred in 1947 total $157,777,644. So the plain fact is that the Bureau's 1947 obligation program which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget is based on a construction rate of $158,000,000, requiring cash withdrawals, together with the payment of prior year unpaid obligations, of $130,000,000.

Now, let us look at 1948. True, the Bureau of the Budget's letter of January 10, 1947, appearing on page 44 of part 3 of the House hearings states: "expenditures from appropriated funds for all purposes by the Bureau of Reclamation during fiscal year 1948 should not exceed $177,400,000," of which one hundred and fifty-nine million one hundred thousand covers cash expenditures for construction work.

What does it mean?

It is an estimate of the amount needed on a cash-withdrawal basis to cover the entire 1948 obligation program that is proposed by the President and provided for by the budget estimate. The budget estimate of 175.6 millions for construction and the President's limit of 159.1 million are completely related. They have been correlated, and the 159.1 million has been determined on the basis of the full construction program recommended by the President. Stated another way, the difference between the President's budget program for 1948 and the President's cash-withdrawal limitation is not a program difference, as only one program has been submitted by the President, and that is the program in the budget estimates. It is rather a difference that is inevitable and inherent in any comparison of an obligation basis and a cash-withdrawal basis. The very nature of obligating funds as related to subsequent payment suggests a time-lag and the probability that the obligation program conceivably might be substantially larger than out-of-pocket cash needed to meet the obligations as they mature.

The President's budget-estimate program for construction for 1948 is $175,673,673, and I repeat that if Congress approved the funds recommended by the budget estimates it will be possible for the Bureau to carry out this program, and in addition pay all the 1947 unpaid obligations, and do it while using only 159.1 of the 177.4-million-dollar cash-withdrawal limitation.

It is clear from these figures that the President's limitation is not restrictive; that, in fact, it only measures the cash requirements for financing in 1948 that

part of the obligations of the President's 1948 program which mature during the fiscal year. As the President recommended to the Congress only one program and proposed appropriations necessary to finance that program, it is plain that there is no conflict between the recommended program and the cash-withdrawal limitation. They are complementary and have been integrated and completely correlated. One is program and obligations. One is checks issued by the Treasury of the United States. There exists no discrepancies in the basis of computing each requirement. The check-issued basis measures the 1948 demands on the Treasury in financing the President's 1948 budget program.

Now what are the facts with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration? The Presidential freeze order of August 2, 1946, established for the fiscal year 1947 a cash-withdrawal ceiling of $15,600,000 for Bonneville, of which $11,310,000 applied to construction projects, but it did not limit the amounts of obligations that could be incurred. This freeze order did not affect the progress on any active projects, since material delivery schedules were already dropping behind. It did not in any way prevent the letting of contracts, many of which were consummated.

The instructions that all deferrable work be postponed did cause temporary delays on four projects. Three of these were later reinstated and the other has been deferred until 1949.

The 1948 budget request submitted by the Bonneville Power Administration is of course within the limits of the President's program as established by the freeze order. As in the case of the Bureau of Reclamation, the budget request would provide for the obligation of funds and construction authorizations in excess of the actual amount of cash withdrawals during 1948. The cash withdrawal limitation has been set at twenty million, which is ample to finance the requested obligations program of twenty-six million three hundred thousand. Certainly the six million nine hundred thousand appropriated by the House for Bonneville has no relation either to the twenty million cash withdrawal limitation established by the President or the obligations program of twenty-six million three hundred thousand submitted in the President's budget request.

Before leaving this charge in regard to the effects of the President's freeze order, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I sent on November 8, 1946, to Hon. John R. Steelman, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, pointing out the effects of the freeze order on certain flood-control projects in my State, particularly the Willamette River flood-control project, and also pointing out its effects upon other projects in the western development program. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 8, 1946.

Hon. JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: Enclosed is an editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., bearing on the President's cut-back order as it affects the construction of flood-control projects in Oregon. I am in complete agreement with the contents of the editorial.

As you know, I have previously made representations on this matter and it is my sincere hope that the President's cut-back order will be reviewed and reconsidered at an early date insofar as it relates to various flood-control projects throughout the entire Nation. There is no economy in saving appropriated money at the expense of tremendous loss of property and danger to lives. I think the cut-back order wherever it has stopped construction on urgently needed projects in Oregon for which funds have been appropriated by the Congress, such as Meridian, Dorena, Detroit, McKenzie, and Cottage Grove Dams and Reservoirs and Willamette River bank protection, is absolutely indefensible. In addition to these flood-control projects, proceeding with the construction of McNary Dam as a power and navigation project is of the utmost importance to the people in the eastern part of the State

I refuse to believe that the President would insist upon stopping work on those projects if he knew all the facts. For example, within a few square miles of Eugene, Oreg., last winter 6 percent of all the flood damage in the United States for last year was done by a flood of the Willamette River. The Army engineers point out that there is a very serious danger that the town of Springfield, across the river from Eugene, may be wiped out with tremendous loss of life if the river this next winter should break through at a bend about 2 miles south of the town. They also point out that the immediate construction of Meridian Dam is the only way that we can possibly save the Springfield area from increasing flood damage each year.

The people of that entire section of Oregon are up in arms because of the grossly unjust and unfair effects of the President's cut-back order. They see themselves paying heavy Federal taxes each year and at the same time they see millions of dollars' worth of their property being damaged by floods which can be controlled if the Federal Government will make haste in building the dams which already have been approved by the Congress and for which money has been appropriated. It doesn't make sense to them, nor to anyone else who knows the facts, that these Oregon property owners should be sentenced to further financial loss as a result of the delay in construction of the needed dams, caused by the President's cut-back order.

I have investigated the effect which construction of these dams would have on the housing program, and I find that the effect would be nil, so far as impairing the housing program is concerned. In fact, there is a great need for heavy construction work in Oregon, as shown by the enclosed copy of a telegram I have received from Mr. Lee Stoll, chairman of the Portland Labor-Management Committee. Members of that committee pointed out to me this summer, when I was in Oregon, that it appears that the administration is overlooking the fact that if the housing program is to go forward at a maximum rate, it must be correlated with a heavy-construction program as well, because the building industry is an interrelated industry so far as various types of construction are concerned. As far as I can find out, that is the uniform opinion of construction experts throughout this country.

When it comes to stopping construction on such needed dams as those I have mentioned in this letter, I do not feel that the order can be justified on the grounds of economy. Rather the order is a penny-wise and pound-foolish order as to these projects because the annual loss to property suffered from the floods that will be prevented when the dams are built more than offsets any benefit that can be derived from the type of paper economy that will result from the cut-back order.

Floods on the Willamette River do not occur several years apart; they are annual affairs and they are increasing in intensity as a result of the cutting off during the war of thousands of acres of timber along the tributaries to the Willamette. As a result of denuding the mountainsides, there is nothing to hold back the water, and as lumber cutting continues the flood danger is going to increase. I am perfectly willing to have you, or any committee the President wants to appoint, go out to Oregon and make an investigation of the facts and present them to the President. I am satisfied that if he had the facts which would result from such an investigation he would not waste any time in modifying his order, insofar as these projects are concerned.

I appreciate the fact that in your position you hear from various Senators and Representatives many cries of wolf-wolf, and therefore there is a danger that the White House may minimize the seriousness of such pleas as I am making in this instance. However, this is no cry of wolf-wolf. Rather, I am giving the White House, through you, due warning of a serious emergency situation which has been created as a result of a too strict application of the cut-back order. I am simply asking that you investigate the facts; and on the basis of that fair proposition I am satisfied that some immediate relief will be provided the people in the Oregon flood areas by a release of additional funds to the Army engineers so they can go ahead with the work on these dams.

I recognize that at this late hour nothing effective can be done about preventing the floods this year, but work should start immediately on the projects in order to reduce the flood danger for next year, and the next year, and the year after, because we are going to have to pay in millions of dollars of property damage each year from floods until these dams are built.

On the basis of a thorough investigation which Senator CORDON and I have made of this situation, we know of not a single argument that can justify the rigid application of the President's cut-back order to such a serious emergency as exists in the Oregon flood area. I sincerely hope that you will give this matter your personal attention and that you will take the matter up with the President. I am authorized to inform you that Senator CORDON joins me in the views expressed in this letter.

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I should also like to have published at this point in the RECORD the answer which I received on December 13 from Mr. Steelman, which, I think, shows very clearly that the President did not, when he first issued the order, contemplate all of the effects which were produced. It shows also the basis and the theory upon which the President issued the order in the first place. Primarily, of course, his theory was to use the order

to check inflation and to make available scarce materials for the housing program which he feared otherwise might go into these western projects. But, as I pointed out in my letter to Mr. Steelman on November 8, the type of material which was needed would not in fact be in competition with the housing program. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1946.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your letter of November 8, 1946, copy of a telegram from Mr. L. C. Stoll, chairman of the labor-management committee of the heavy-construction industry for Oregon, and editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal, urging that funds be released so that work may proceed on Oregon flood-control projects and the McNary Dam power and navigation project. We regret that our reply has been held up so long awaiting a decision on this question which has been under consideration since the receipt of your message.

In order to reduce Federal contributions to purchasing power at a time when inflationary pressures are strong, the President is curtailing Federal expenditures wherever reductions can be made without prejudice to the national welfare. However, the stoppage of work under contract and the deferral of new projects and maintenance activities which are urgently needed have not been contemplated. A recent survey of the Corps of Engineers' civil-works program indicated the need for additional funds to meet commitments entered prior to August 2, 1946, and to undertake necessary maintenance and advance planning. Consequently, the ceiling on expenditures has been increased by a total of $105,000,000. The limit of $90,000,000 for rivers and harbors projects has now been raised to $105,000,000, and the limit of $95,000,000 for flood control has been raised by two successive actions to $185,000,000. The revised ceilings will permit work to go forward on all projects which have been started and on emergency flood control and snagging and clearing to the extent authorized by law and provided for in appropriations. Provision was previously made for approving especially urgent new flood-control projects which will require expenditures during fiscal year 1947 over and above the $185,000,000 ceiling.

The new flood-control-expenditures ceiling will permit work to go forward on the Dorena and Detroit Dams and on bank protection. Planning can proceed on other projects in the Willamette Valley, including McKenzie (Quartz Creek) Dam.

The McNary Dam is classified as a new rivers and harbors project. I am advised by the Corps of Engineers that the Bureau of the Budget's expenditures limitation on rivers and harbors projects will not permit any new construction except that which is necessary to complete projects which are already under way.

The exact status of Meridian Dam has not yet been determined, but it is expected that funds will be available for starting construction during the late spring. In any event, it is anticipated that the dam will be under way within 6 or 7 months. Cottage Grove Dam is practically completed except for minor tourist and safety features.

We greatly appreciate your detailed comments on the situation in the Willamette Valley. The facts which you called to my attention and your comments have been most helpful to me in the extensive review of expenditure ceilings which preceded the decision to make the increases which I have described. I share your concern over floods in the Willamette River Valley, and I hope that within a few years when the projected dams are completed the possibility of disastrous floods will be largely eliminated.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Director.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I wrote, under date of February 18, 1947, to Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, dealing with the program of flood control in the Benton-Linn County area in Oregon, in which letter I raised certain questions as to what relief, if any, the Army engineers could give to the farmers along the banks of the river at that point from the great damage they were suffering from the annual floods of the river, again raising the question as to whether the real problem, after all, was not the problem of appropriation rather than any plans of the Army engineers to bring relief just as soon as appropriations were made available to the Army engineers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1947.

Lt. Gen. RAYMOND A. WHEELER,
Chief of Engineers,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL WHEELER: Recently when I was in Oregon I was asked to attend a meeting at the Benton Hotel in Corvallis, Oreg., on the night of January 31 on the subject of Willamette Valley flood-control problems. The group consisted of a very large committee, called the joint Benton-Linn County flood committee, and the chairman is Mr. A. Havercamp.

About 60 people, most of them farmers owning farms along the Willamette River and its various creek tributaries, attended the meeting and presented to me their views on the terrific losses they are suffering from floods. I am sure it is unnecessary for me to relate to you an account of the type of evidence they presented to me. It is very familiar to you, including their accounts of valuable topsoil washed away, acres of rich farm land covered with gravel, river embankments giving away, as well as damage caused to fences, buildings and livestock.

They pointed out that the situation is particularly critical around the Corvallis-Albany area because Fern Ridge Dam doesn't provide any flood-control protection from Monroe, Oreg., north. Rightly or wrongly, these farmers took the position at the meeting that the Army engineers are not taking care of their problems as expeditiously or adequately as should have been the case. I think I succeeded in correcting their impression on that point because I pointed out that the problem is basically one of securing appropriations and that the Army engineers can't do anything about getting appropriations from Congress. I explained to them that the Oregon delegation in Congress is doing everything within its power to secure the necessary funds for the completion of the entire Willamette Valley flood-control project.

However, they raised the question as to whether or not the Army engineers shouldn't give priority to some flood-control work in the Corvallis-Albany area. I told them that upon my return to Washington I would make inquiry of the engineers as to their findings on the particular flood-control problems confronting the farmers in that area. I also told them that I would endeavor to find out what are the plans of the engineers, so far as priority is concerned, in doing whatever needs to be done to give any flood-control relief to the farmers in that area.

Any information you can give me that will be at all helpful in explaining the factual situation to this group of farmers will be very much appreciated. There is no doubt about the fact that they are "about fed up," as they put it, with the Government's long delay in giving them flood-control protection. Neither is there any doubt about the fact that the Oregon delegation in Congress is going to have to make very clear to these people why they are not securing the necessary protection from floods. I talked to them at great length about our budgetary problem and about my opposition to cuts in the budget that will postpone the most rapid possible completion of the Willamette Valley flood-control work.

This committee of 60 represents a much larger number of farmers in that area of the State, and, therefore, I think it is important that the Army engineers prepare for me a factual memorandum that I can use in answering the mail I am receiving, not only from members of that committee but from other farmers in the area, as to the plans of the engineers regarding providing flood-control relief in the Corvallis-Albany area if and when, or as soon as, funds are made available. Several times during the meeting criticism was made of the present failure of the Army engineers to do any dredging in this area. The farmers seemed to think that when the dredging of the river in this section of the State was discontinued losses from floods increased.

Any information you can give me about the reasons for discontinuing dredging on the river, that I can use in replying to these constituents, will be very helpful to me. For instance, one of the speakers at the meeting said that the dredges used to operate as far south as Harrisburg, Oreg.; but that the dredging work was discontinued because of alleged opposition by the Southern Pacific Railway. This speaker seemed to think that land transportation interests had something to do with not continuing the dredging because they didn't desire to make the river navigable for water transportation. However, my particular concern with the dredging issue is its relationship, if any, to flood control on the river.

There are enclosed some disturbing flood pictures of that area, and I shall greatly appreciate any information you can give me that will help in my answering the many letters of complaint and protest I am receiving on this whole matter.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point General Wheeler's reply, under date of April 9, 1947, which bears out the suppositions which I made in my letter to him and which points out very clearly that it is a matter of appropriations. In fact, Mr. President, from my very intensive study of this problem—and because of its vital importance to the people of my State I have made an intensive study of it since I have been in the Senate—I believe that the devastating damage which is being done to the farmers of

the State of Oregon along the Willamette River, for example, and the great loss, mounting into millions upon millions of dollars each year, from floods in my State, can be prevented. When I say "prevented," I mean that the loss can be stopped if the Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to make it possible for the Army engineers to go through with their program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, April 9, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Further reference is made to your letter of February 18, 1947, relative to the flood and erosion problem along the Willamette River in the Corvallis-Albany area of Oregon, and the possibility of undertaking work in this reach of the river to provide flood relief. In the letter from this office of March 3, 1947, it was stated that additional information concerning this matter was being obtained from Col. Orville E. Walsh, our district engineer at Portland. His report and the comments of Col. Theron D. Weaver, division engineer of our north Pacific division, have been received.

The importance of flood protection throughout the Willamette Valley is fully recognized by the Corps of Engineers and every effort is being made to construct the authorized projects in that valley at the earliest practicable date consistent with the availability of funds appropriated by Congress for that purpose. On behalf of the corps, I wish to express our appreciation for your explanation to local valley residents concerning the dependence of the corps on appropriations by Congress in providing adequate flood protection for the valley.

The demands of local citizens for flood protection on the Willamette River in the Corvallis-Albany area cannot be met until the watersheds of the Row River the McKenzie River, and the Middle Fork of the Willamette River have been adequately controlled through the construction of dam and reservoir projects in those basins. This was made evident by the flood of December 1946 which originated in those watersheds. The Fern Ridge Reservoir on the Long Tom River could have no appreciable effect on the December 1946 flood in this area since the storm producing that flood centered over the Row, McKenzie, and Middle Fork watersheds. In this connection, I am pleased to state that a contract for construction of the Dorena Dam on the Row River was awarded in March. A contract also has been awarded to initiate relocation of the Southern Pacific Railroad in the Lookout Point (Meridian) Reservoir area on the Middle Fork and alternate reservoir storage for the authorized Quartz Creek Dam on the McKenzie River is in the planning stage.

The Portland district office has had the flood and erosion problems in the Corvallis-Albany area under surveillance for a considerable period of time and that office reports that the need for bank stabilization in this reach of the Willamette River is apparent at this time. Relief of the flood and erosion problem in the suburban home area east of Corvallis may be accomplished by clearing the point bar on the right bank of the river, constructing a pilot channel through the bar, removing the mid-channel island located downstream from the point bar and clearing timber and brush from the river banks. The cost of this work would be approximately $50,000, and is eligible for accomplishment under section 2 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, as amended. At the present time there are no funds available to the Corps of Engineers for snagging and clearing work pursuant to section 2 of the 1937 act. You may be assured, however, that careful consideration will be given to accomplishment of the improvement proposed by the district engineer at an early date after funds for work of that type are again available. Although snagging and clearing of the river channel in the Corvallis area will not entirely eliminate continued erosion at this point, I may mention that the Portland district is now making its annual inspection throughout the length of the Willamette River in order to establish a program of the most critically required bank-stabilization work to be performed during the coming fiscal year, provided funds for that purpose are appropriated by Congress. The bank-protection work would be undertaken as a part of the authorized bank-stabilization project for the Willamette River and you may be assured that the erosion problem near Corvallis will receive full consideration in establishing the priority of locations proposed for protection during the fiscal year 1948.

With regard to the statements by local interests that dredging would aid in solution of the flood problem in the Corvallis-Albany area, I may mention that this is a rather unfortunate impression since dredging in the interest of navigation is accomplished in only a very minor portion of the river flood plain and would necessarily have an insignificant effect on the major floods which occur in the Willamette River Valley. The authorized navigation project for the Willamette River provides for maintaining a 2.5- to 3.5-foot channel from Albany to Corvallis. Above Corvallis, the project provides only for the removal of snags from the navigation channel. Excavation of the 3.5-foot channel for navigation to Corvallis was begun in 1945 with funds appropriated by Congress for that purpose. The project was adequately maintained in 1946 when some 80,000 cubic yards of material were removed in this reach. Sufficient funds are available to the Portland district to accomplish ordinary maintenance of this channel during the 1947 low-water season. The points at which dredging is to be accomplished are now being determined through surveys.

Colonel Walsh informs me that the current review investigation and report on flood protection for the Willamette River and its tributaries will include a recommendation that additional authorization be granted for bank stabilization work on the main stem of the Willamette River and on several of its tributaries. The report on the Willamette River review study is expected to be submitted to this office by Colonel Walsh and Colonel Weaver on or about August 1, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I wrote to Mr. Claude E. Ingalls, editor of the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times, under date of April 16, 1947. The letter deals with the problem of appropriations needed for Willamette flood control and other projects so vital to the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 16, 1947.

MR. CLAUDE E. INGALLS,
Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oreg.

DEAR MR. INGALLS: When I was in Corvallis in February I met with approximately 60 farmers from Benton and Linn Counties who made representations to me in regard to flood conditions on the Willamette, particularly in the Corvallis-Albany area. I explained to the group my understanding of the problem, pointing out that the essence of the problem, insofar as flood-control developments are concerned, is one of appropriations. However, I assured the group that on my return to Washington, I would do what I could to secure from the Army engineers a full statement of the facts about the matter.

Hence, on February 16 I wrote a letter to Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers in the War Department, explaining to him the position taken by the farmers at the Corvallis meeting. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to General Wheeler. I sent copies of this letter to Col. Ralph A. Tudor, district engineer with the United States Army engineers in Portland, and I am enclosing a copy of the letter of transmittal which I sent to Colonel Tudor.

On March 3 General Wheeler replied that he had called upon Col. Orville E. Walsh, district engineer at Portland, Oreg., to give him a report on the points raised in my letter of February 18. I am enclosing a copy of his letter.

On March 12 I received a letter from Colonel Walsh, a copy of which is enclosed, informing me that he had furnished the Chief of Engineers (General Wheeler) with the information requested in my letter of February 18 and that I would receive a reply from the Office of the Chief of Engineers. In that letter, as you will note, Colonel Walsh pointed out that "The relief of the residents of the Corvallis-Albany area cannot be attained until the reservoirs on the upper tributaries of the Willamette River are completed."

On April 19 General Wheeler wrote a letter to me which I have just received, setting forth his answers to the points which I raised in my letter of February 18. I am enclosing a copy of that letter because I think you probably will want to base a newspaper story upon it in view of the fact that so many residents living along the Willamette River will be interested in the contents of General Wheeler's letter.

The letter verifies the main point which I made in my discussion with the committee of farmers at the Corvallis meeting in February, namely, that adequate relief from damage caused to their property through floods on the Willamette River cannot be obtained until the Army engineers are given adequate appropriations to complete the entire Willamette flood control program. I intend to continue to do everything I can to urge this session of Congress to appropriate the full amount necessary to complete the Willamette flood control project just as rapidly as the engineers can complete it. I think it is not only false economy but an outright waste of money not to appropriate this year whatever amount of money is necessary to complete the project.

I say that for two reasons: first, because I am satisfied that the Army engineers will not be able to proceed with the project with a maximum of efficiency and economy until they first have absolute assurance that the money is going to be made available to them for the final completion of the project. I know of no better way to give them that assurance than to appropriate the money. Second, I believe that proceeding with the project on a piecemeal basis has resulted already, and will continue to result, in a considerable amount of waste and inefficiency. I think that is particularly true in regard to bank repair work and channel clearance work so necessary as a preventive of erosion. However, experience has shown that a considerable portion of the money already spent for such purposes has in effect been washed away by subsequent floods. I believe that much of such expenditures will continue to be washed away, so to speak, until the Army engineers are given the funds necessary to build the essential control dams.

I do not mean that the Army engineers should not go ahead with bank-repair work concurrently with building the dams, because there is no doubt about the fact that the flood damage caused each year would be much worse if it were not for the bank-repair and erosion work carried on by the Army engineers. Nevertheless, it must be admitted, I believe, that such work will not provide any permanent protection to the farmers along the Willamette River in the absence of constructing the necessary dams which are the essential part of the Willamette flood-control project.

Although I think it is sound economy to appropriate the funds necessary to complete the Willamette River flood-control project now through continuous construction operations by the Army engineers without interruption on any part of the project because of lack of funds, nevertheless I believe it would be a great mistake for me in my office, or for anyone else for that matter, to raise any hopes in the farmers along the Willamette Valley that the Eightieth Congress will appropriate all of the funds needed to complete the project. I am sure that the Oregon delegation will do its very best to secure an appropriation of the greatest possible sum that can be obtained from the Eightieth Congress.

However, we are confronted with realities back here in Washington, rather than with theories, on such issues as this one. The reality is that the Eightieth Congress is so economy-minded and, in some respects, so false-economy-minded that I believe that we will fall considerably short of getting the necessary funds which ought to be appropriated if we are to prevent in the quickest possible time the great loss that is suffered each year through flood damage along the Willamette. In this respect our Oregon projects will not suffer any more than projects elsewhere in the country, but I am afraid that in spite of everything we can do by way of presenting a factually sound case in support of appropriations for not only the Willamette flood-control project but for other needed wealth-preserving and wealth-creating projects in Oregon, the appropriations voted by this Congress will fall very short of our needs.

I agree with my colleagues in the Senate who take the position that we must reduce Government expenditures wherever possible in the interests of economy and a balanced budget, but I differ with them when they cut out of the budget funds needed to prevent the loss of national wealth such as the country suffers from flood losses, soil erosion, and the other losses which result from a failure on the part of Congress to support an adequate conservation program.

I am presenting my position on this matter to you and to some other editors in Oregon because I think the people of the State are entitled to know my reasons for opposing the proposed slashes in the reclamation budget and the other parts of the budget which involve money needed for the flood control, reclamation, and power development projects, not only in the Pacific Northwest but in other parts of the Nation as well. I don't think that this problem should be considered alone from the standpoint of our regional interests in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. It affects the entire economy of the country, and is one which should be looked upon from the standpoint of its relation to our national wealth. Failure to appropriate money for these projects, as well illustrated by the Willamette Valley flood-control project, is as I have said several times on the floor of the Senate, a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy. It will not save the American taxpayers a single cent in the long run, but on the contrary, will cost them, through loss of natural resources, many times the cost of the projects.

I am not asking for agreement with my point of view because I am perfectly willing to stand upon the merits of my position. I believe that as the individual citizens come to understand my reason for opposing drastic cuts in the reclamation budget a large majority of them will agree with my position.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. It will require a very powerful argument, Mr. President, to convince me that there is any basis for supporting the reduction in the appropriations for these western projects if by appropriating the money estimated to be needed we can prevent the loss the farmers suffer in amounts in excess of the cost of the projects.

If a Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress wants to adopt such a program of false economy and such a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy as to deny the necessary funds for these self-liquidating projects which were started to prevent losses mounting into many millions of dollars each year, then I give them the job of trying to explain to the voters of the Pacific Northwest why that type of Republican program should receive their endorsement.

It is because of my devotion to the basic principles of the Republican Party, which I think need to be revived and put into practice, that I feel so badly regarding the many mistakes which my party is making in the Eightieth Congress. This is another serious one. Earlier today we helped to scuttle the effective administration of the National Labor Relations Act to the great detriment of free workers of the United States; and if we go through with this fiscal program I think the party will do great damage to hundreds of thousands of people who have the right to be protected from the type of damage which would be inflicted upon them if the appropriations program of the party thus far advanced in the Eightieth Congress were consummated.

Therefore, as a Republican and because I think my views, contrary to the opinion of some of the Republican leaders in the Eightieth Congress, more nearly represent the views of the great majority of Republicans in the Nation, even if I have to do it as a lone wolf, I intend to continue to try to point out what I think are the sad mistakes which the Republican majority is making in connection with both the labor program and now the fiscal policy. I want to see the Republican Party come into full power in 1948. I intend to do what I can to help put it into power, but I shall not misrepresent the facts to the people in the 1948 campaign. If they ask me to justify this type of a fiscal program I shall truthfully and honestly say that I do not think it can be justified. I hope that even yet such effective and constructive action will be taken by the Congress that, in spite of mistakes, I can still make an honest plea for a Republican administration.

The third charge that has been made is that the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration have not been able to accomplish the construction programs contemplated by the funds appropriated and made available by the Congress; that they have consistently overestimated their rate of expenditure; and that Congress is merely cutting them down to the amounts of money that can be reasonably spent in the next fiscal year. First, let us look at the reclamation program.

Without adoption of extraordinary and expensive means of expediting, habitually adopted by American industry in the production of wartime required industrial plants, shipyards, and military impedimenta, the accelerated reclamation program requires considerable time and a carefully prepared plan for execution. It is not economy to try to plan for only a year at a time. We must have a long-range program, if we are going to make the most efficient and economical expenditure of the taxpayers' money in connection with a reclamation program. In the months that have stretched now to almost 2 years since VJ-day, the Bureau of Reclamation, through its project-planning facilities, its design facilities, and its construction organization, has been filling the construction pipe line. While the Bureau of Reclamation has not reached the construction peak which it had previously indicated could be accomplished, those goals are within reach at this time and can be accomplished if the widespread organization of technicians and administrators is not decimated by restrictive congressional action now.

Specifically, the carry-overs that individuals have in mind when they charge that the Bureau of Reclamation has been unable to accomplish the construction programs contemplated by the funds appropriated and made available by Congress are the sixty-seven and five-tenths millions, representing the unobligated balance at the end of the fiscal year 1943; the sixty-two and four-tenths millions, representing the unobligated balance at the end of the fiscal year 1944; and the one hundred and ten million unobligated balance at the end of the fiscal year 1946.

There are adequate and reasonable explanations for these carry-overs, however. The carry-over during the war years 1943–44 resulted from stop orders issued by the War Production Board, limitation orders, restrictions on equipment purchases, such as turbines for the Grand Coulee project, and all of the other controls which were designed to minimize construction except that which was most immediately essential to the war program. Congress intended that the construction program be kept at a minimum during those periods, and the amount of the unobligated funds at the end of each of the war years represented a contribution that the Bureau of Reclamation had in effect made to other war activities.

The $110,000,000 unobligated at the end of the fiscal year 1946 was the result of the special appropriation made by Congress late in that fiscal year to accelerate the reclamation program. Congress understood, when it appropriated the additional $87,000,000 that there would be a substantial carry-over into the next fiscal year.

With respect to Bonneville Power Administration, Congress made construction appropriations in 1942 and 1943 totalling about $70,000,000. Those funds were made available in excess of any 1 year's requirements, at the request of the

War Production Board, so that delays might be avoided in meeting the wartime power needs of the Pacific Northwest. The rate at which projects were to be undertaken was controlled by the War Production Board.

Substantial balances of those war appropriations remained in 1944, 1945, and 1946, and were used to defray costs of operation and to carry on necessary construction work. By the end of 1947, all unobligated funds will be exhausted, the remainder of the unexpended funds being pledged to pay outstanding bills for materials on order and services rendered.

As I have indicated, the argument has been made that reclamation and power projects should be deferred now, when costs are high, because they will have to be repaid at a time when prices are low, and that projects ought to be constructed during a period of low costs.

Those who argue for deferment of reclamation and power projects on these grounds fail to distinguish between the several kinds of public works. Certain public works, like some public buildings, may be deferred, and built when costs are low and when it is necessary to stimulate the economy and increase employment. I think those are suitable and proper public-works projects to resort to in times of depression; but I do not accept the argument, Mr. President, that in the case of the great western wealth-creating projects we should wait for a depression before we begin to build them. I offer these projects, and the people of the Pacific Northwest offer them, as one of the vital steps which should be taken in order to prevent a depression. I do not wish to wait for a depression. I wish to see industrialization spread and expand in the West. I wish to see the economy of that section of the country become an ever-expanding economy, because we are certain, as a matter of economic law, it seems to me, to find ourselves going into a depression if we ever let American production become restrictive. It must not be other than an expanding production, if we are really going to prevent a depression. I think the building of these projects is one of the most important things we can do to keep our economy an ever-expanding one, and I think it is one of the best safeguards we have against a depression.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am very sorry, but I have already given my reasons for not yielding during the presentation of this speech.

Mr. HATCH. I was not here when the Senator made that statement, and I am sorry to interrupt him.

Mr MORSE. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, I am ordinarily very happy to yield. But I have so much material to place in the RECORD tonight that we would be here until a late hour if I should begin to allow interruptions in my speech.

Mr. President, other types of public works, as, for example, some of the reclamation projects, are built over a long period of time; and as a consequence, part of the construction is usually undertaken during periods of high cost and part of the construction is carried on during periods of low cost. Finally, there are some public works which represent service activities of the Government on which the public depends, and these must be built when the services are needed, regardless of high or low price levels. Examples of this type of public works include the Alaska Railroad and western power projects, transmission lines, and substations.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in the case of these western projects, provision for most of the substations has been cut out of the appropriation bill by the House of Representatives.

At this point, in connection with that matter, I should like to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Andrew J. Naterlin, president of the board of directors of the Central Lincoln Peoples Utility District, Power and Light, at Newport, Oreg. His letter is a fairly good exhibit to offer in regard to the effects on that power district alone of the appropriation cuts made by the House.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LINCOLN PEOPLES
UTILITY DISTRICT,
Newport, Oreg., April 30, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you most sincerely for your splendid telegram of April 11 in reply to the request of the Central Lincoln Peoples Utility District for assistance in connection with the congressional appropriation for Bonneville transmission lines and substations to be used in service to this district and the Coos Bay area. It is indeed satisfying to us to know that you are actively and energetically opposing the proposed cuts in appropriations for such wealth-creating projects as the McNary, Hungry Horse, Foster Creek power plants, and the necessary transmission lines and substations to deliver power generated at such projects to the various communities of the Pacific Northwest.

I wish at this time to call your attention to a situation which the House has created by its action in regard to the Bonneville appropriations for the Eugene-Mapleton-Florence-Reedsport-Coos Bay areas.

Bonneville had proposed to alleviate the rapidly developing power shortage at Eugene by constructing a 230,000-volt line from Goldendale in south-central Washington to Eugene by way of Detroit Dam. As the Portland and southwestern Washington areas absorb all of the Bonneville supply it is necessary to bring additional power into Eugene from Grand Coulee and eventually McNary. Money which Bonneville requested to start the Goldendale-Detroit project was eliminated entirely by the House. The Detroit-Eugene appropriation was cut from a request of $567,000 to $130,400.

To relieve the present very critical power shortage in the Mapleton-Florence-Reedsport-Coos Bay area Bonneville had proposed construction of a 115,000-volt line from Eugene to Coos Bay with substations at Mapleton and Reedsport for delivery of power to our district. The requested amount of appropriation for this line was $1,408,300. The House reduced the amount to $866,000.

The reduced appropriation would be insufficient to finance the Eugene-Mapleton section of the line together with connection facilities at Eugene and the step-down substation at Mapleton. In order for the district to take power at Mapleton we would be forced to install our own substation. Bonneville had estimated the cost of this substation at approximately $260,000.

Further, Bonneville has informed us that if the House appropriations stand for the Eugene-Coos Bay facilities, delivery of power to us at Reedsport is likely to be delayed from 18 to 30 months. The power-supply situation in the Reedsport area is now so critical that we just can't stand that delay which would incur large additional expense in temporary arrangements.

As you know, the Mapleton, Florence, and Reedsport areas are expanding rapidly as forest-products centers. These areas are now seriously deficient in power. As present industries diversify and new forest industries are established, such as plywood plants, wallboard plants, charcoal plants, furniture factories, and possibly a pulp and paper plant the demand for low-cost power will increase rapidly. In addition the present operations whose power supply is obtained from Diesel plants or from the burning of waste wood have indicated to us the need for power to replace their present supply. A very large market for additional power is developing in these areas.

Bonneville has established the policy of delivering power at the various community-load centers of the Pacific Northwest through substations owned and maintained by the Federal Government. To change this policy as the House proposes in the Mapleton-Florance-Reedsport and Coos Bay areas is highly discriminatory against these areas. In effect such a policy increases our power cost and makes us less able to compete with other areas of the Pacific Northwest for new industrial establishments. Such a policy saddles the people of these areas with higher power costs than paid by industry and general consumers in other areas of the Pacific Northwest now receiving power from the Federal plants on the Columbia River.

While we are most concerned about our own problems of power supply we are aware also that the House action in regard to the Bonneville Administration appropriation generally would seriously retard the economic development of the Pacific Northwest. It is our hope that through your efforts in the Senate and through the efforts of the other Senate Members who are cognizant of the benefits to be derived from the Federal power and reclamation program of this region the Bonneville appropriation can be restored to a level adequate to meet our needs.

In regard to our own situation most certainly the Goldendale-Detroit-Eugene line should be commenced now, as Bonneville has proposed so that power requirements of the Upper Willamette Valley may be satisfied. Further, Bonneville should receive sufficient appropriations to install the Mapleton substation and proceed with the line from Mapleton to Coos Bay and the Reedsport substation as rapidly as possible.

We are certainly counting on your assistance in the restoration of Bonneville funds.

Respectfully yours,
ANDREW J. NATERLIN,
President, Board of Directors.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but I have already declined to yield when several Senators have requested that I yield to them.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask one question.

Mr. MORSE. I must decline to answer questions at this time. When I conclude my speech, I shall be glad to answer questions; but at this time I cannot make an exception for the Senator from Utah, without doing the same for other Senators.

Mr. President, the Federal power business produces revenues through public service in the same way that private electric, gas, and water companies do. It must provide service upon which millions of people depend. The power projects are self-liquidating from the annual revenues. They charge rates that are planned to cover costs of improvements and additions made over a period of years—during high and low prices. They cannot operate by cutting down additions during good times and building them during bad times. They have to provide additions to service during all times in order to meet their public obligations. Too many people depend on these power projects for their jobs and for recovery of their own private investments.

The Bonneville Power Administration, providing half of the power used in Oregon and Washington, is responsible for sustaining at least half of the employment in farms and industries in that region. All over the Northwest people expect Bonneville to continue to provide power, and these people are investing today in farms, lumber mills, grocery stores, and aluminum plants on the assumption that Bonneville will deliver the power to the region. For example, the Permanente Metals Corp. has committed itself this year to an investment of $4,000,000 in an aluminum plant at Tacoma, Wash., which will employ directly about 400 men, and indirectly will stimulate the employment of hundreds of other workers in aluminum-fabrication and service industries throughout the entire Nation. But this plant cannot open this year unless additional generators are installed on schedule at Grand Coulee Dam and unless the entire Federal power system obtains sufficient appropriations to operate without breakdown. At Spokane, Wash., one-sixth of an aluminum plant is idle, and 200 workers are waiting to work in the plant, in addition to a few hundred who are awaiting jobs in dependent industries. But that portion of the plant will not open unless Bonneville obtains additional power through congressional appropriations.

The power shortage is so severe in the Northwest that it is estimated to be holding back, in all fields of employment, 15,000 persons in 1947, and threatening the jobs of 30,000 in 1948, and over 50,000 by 1949. Already there are 135,000 unemployed in the Northwest. As I have said heretofore on the floor of the Senate, we already have our unemployment problem in the Pacific Northwest. The western projects for which I am pleading this afternoon offer us great hope for the solution of our unemployment problem.

If Congress does not provide Bonneville with the means of meeting its obligations to serve the public, there will result the loss of at least $30,000,000 in pay rolls during 1947, the loss of taxes to State and local governments, and the reduction to the Federal Government of revenues from both the income tax and from power sales. The 1-year delay in generator installations at Coulee Dam, which I understand will result from the cuts imposed by the House on the Bureau of Reclamation, will reduce the Bonneville revenues by $7,462,500 a year. This will in turn result in a reduction of revenues to power distributors of $22,500,000 a year. Possibly $25,000,000 in products will be lost by the denial of power to new industries. All of these losses to the Nation will have multiplying effects so that the total business of the country will undoubtedly be reduced by over $100,000,000 in a 12-month period.

The privately owned portion of the utility industry understands its obligation to the public both in periods of low prices and high prices and is expanding this year because its services are required this year. The Securities and Exchange Commission reports that the electric and gas utility systems of the country are planning to spend $1,690,000,000 in 1947, as against $1,040,000,000 in 1946 for new construction and equipment. The utility systems will do this and recover the costs out of their established rates for service.

The Bonneville Power Administration should be allowed by Congress to do the same. It operates a power system that was built up over the years from 1934 to the present and which will be added to gradually over the future. Portions of this system were built during periods of low prices and portions during high prices. Rates for the sale of power were established to pay the Treasury for the costs of the system over a 50-year period assuming an average level of costs of construction, maintenance and operation. The House Appropriations Committee has received evidence that the Bonneville power investment will pay out in an audit report by an outstanding firm of public accountants, Arthur Andersen & Co.

I think this evidence was contained in a very able speech delivered in the House of Representatives by my distinguished colleague in the House, Mr. HOMER D. ANGELL, Representative from the Multnomah County district, in which the city of Portland is located.

This report is titled, "Report on Repayment of Operating Expenses and Construction of the Bonneville Power Administration, Bonneville Dam Project and Columbia Basin Project." The chart on page 4 of this report shows that over the 50-year period, the construction costs allocated to power amount to only 28.89 percent of the total revenues. Therefore, the costs of construction during 1948 or any one year are a relatively small part of the total costs.

That is why present high prices will not interfere with the financial soundness of the Bonneville program and why the appropriations should be restored to meet the needs of businessmen and farmers all over the Northwest.

In the case of the Bureau of Reclamation repayment studies have been made based on the higher construction costs of prewar estimates. The Bureau of Reclamation is insisting that its water users assume their proper share of these higher costs. Water users organizations are being required to furnish resolutions indicating their agreements either to pay the higher costs within their present repayment period or over a greater period of time—subject to congressional ratification—depending on the repayment ability of the particular area. Repayment ability determinations take into account fully the possibility of lower prices in subsequent years.

Power revenues within the 50-year repayment period will also absorb their share of the increased costs. Inasmuch as water flows to the sea regardless of congressional actions, there is no point in delaying the completion of construction of a partly finished power plant and denying to the United States the benefits of its revenues.

In fact, that is one of the points the people of my section of the country make over and over again, their complete inability to understand the basis for the Congress assuming that there is any economy involved in the postponement of projects when the record clearly shows that the earliest possible completion of those projects will start revenues flowing into the Treasury of the United States in repayment, in the payment of interest, and in the form of new tax dollars which will result from the expanding production brought about by the building of these projects.

The following tabulation shows some of the costs to the Government and to the people of the West of the delay in maintaining the reclamation program on the schedule proposed by the President's budget:

Loss of power revenues to Bureau of Reclamation due to delay in completing generator installations and building lines	$13,290,000
Loss of the Bureau of Reclamation's share of the power revenues of Bonneville Power Administration due to delay in completing generator installations at Coulee Dam	2,000,000
Loss of irrigation revenue (O & M plus some construction charges) due to delay in placing lands under irrigation	1,620,000
Value of crops lost to farmers on lands for which water delivery has been postponed	78,000,000
Total loss	94,910,000

During the course of the debate, as it develops in the weeks to come, I should like to have the spokesman for the cuts in these appropriations justify, on the ground of any sound economic program, a saving of $70,782,400 at the expense of a loss of $94,910,000. Yet it is that type of a false economy that characterizes the action which has been taken by the House in this particular appropriation.

When intangible items are also considered, the unrealistic action of the House is further evident. These intangible items are the cost of shutting down a project, with the dismemberment of an active organization and its subsequent recruitment if the project is resumed; the maintenance of a custodial staff during the shut-down period; the loss in tax revenues accruing to the community, the State, and the Nation; and the loss in purchasing power, with its depressing effect on the surrounding area.

While this tabulation speaks for itself, it is predicated on a resumption of a more or less normal program in fiscal year 1949. If the second session of the Eightieth Congress should hold the construction program to a subnormal level,

as this one apparently is going to do, then the effect would become cumulative, and the loss to the Nation would grow to even higher figures.

By crippling reclamation and power projects now, the House does injury to the industries, farms, and population of the Western States, depriving them of the water they urgently need and the electric power which is the means of unlocking the great potential resources of the West.

The House action does injury to the entire country by holding back production, employment, and industry in the West, thereby hurting business in other sections. It will deprive the manufacturers of the East and Middle West of the western resources they need for fabrication. Finally, it will waste funds already invested by Congress in uncompleted power and reclamation projects. By failing to permit the completion of these projects on schedule, the House action would leave idle millions of dollars of power and reclamation facilities, would cause expensive settlements of contractors' claims, would force the discharge of technical staff that must be rehired later to complete these facilities, and would reduce substantially the volume of revenues which these western power projects are expected to return to the Treasury. Surely the House bill must be regarded as a budget of waste instead of a budget of economy.

But in addition to the waste, the House action will place in jeopardy our national security. The House removed all of the advance survey and industrial development funds of Bonneville and eliminated 95 percent of the advance survey funds of the Bureau of Reclamation. But these are the funds that create the designs and plans and programs for future power and reclamation projects that keep the Nation constantly prepared to build more dams, powerhouses, transmission lines, and substations.

It was the existence of such plans in 1940 and 1941 that enabled the West to provide quickly the power to produce half of the national output of aluminum for our Air Forces and the atomic project at Hanford. Without such advance planning before 1941, our power supply would have been much smaller and the war would have been prolonged and made more costly. No one today would suggest that we go back to 1938 and strike out all of the planning of Bonneville and the Bureau of Reclamation in order to leave the country unprepared in 1941. But that is exactly what would have been the case, had the Congress in 1938 followed the same principle that the House proposes to follow in the present instance, in regard to the planning program of Bonneville and the Bureau of Reclamation. Why should we say today that in 1948 all planning funds shall be eliminated, leaving the country with an empty shelf of power projects for the national defense in 1951?

I am sure that these consequences were not deliberately sought by the House. They result from indiscriminate axe wielding in order to execute a blanket policy of drastic budget cuts. They demonstrate the need for thorough reconsideration by the Congress of the Interior budget in the interest of achieving for the Nation maximum business opportunities, income, employment, and revenues.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Action by the House on the 1948 construction budget for Bonneville Power Administration reduced the funds for continuing work on authorized projects, withheld approval of several new projects, denied funds for construction of substation facilities, and turned down a request for authorization to order in advance materials on which delivery periods now run as high as 36 months. The following is the effect of the House action on specific Benneville projects.

GRAND COULEE-SNOHOMISH TRANSMISSION LINE CIRCUITS 1 AND 2

The Grand Coulee-Snohomish circuits are required to connect Grand Coulee Dam with the West Coast of Washington and to supply the Arlington-Bellingham-Seattle-Olympic Peninsula areas with their new power requirements by the fall of 1949.

Work on the first circuit of this line was begun in 1946. By June 30, 1947, a total of $2,679,000 will have been obligated for the line and for the Snohomish substation, where the connection with the Seattle system will be made. Of the remaining cost, $6,000,000 was scheduled for 1948 and $1,121,000 for 1949.

The second circuit will be essential by the fall of 1950 to carry at least 60,000 kilowatts, and will be needed as stand-by capacity in the fall of 1949. By stringing both circuits at one time, at least $250,000 can be saved in construction costs. For these reasons, the 1948 estimates requested $769,900 for contract authorizations to order materials so that they would be delivered in sufficient time for the double-circuit towers to be strung concurrently. But the money must be on hand before orders can be placed.

The House reduced the allowance for circuit No. 1 from $5,103,000 to $1,000,000. This action will make it impossible to supply the power needed in western Washington during the fall peak period of 1949. If the action of the House is approved by the Senate, the people of western Washington must be made to understand that fact. The House denied contract authorizations of $769,900 for circuit No. 2. This action will prevent its use for reserve capacity in 1949 and for supplying power in the fall peak in 1950. If that becomes final, then the people of that district must be told who is responsible for the action. It will also prevent the saving of $250,000 in construction costs.

The House denied $897,000 for the Snohomish substation. This action will prevent installation of over $1,000,000 worth of substation equipment already on order for the station and will leave the equipment lying idle.

I am informed, Mr. President, however, that it is being suggested, if this happens, then the equipment which has already been ordered and is available for installation when the funds are made available, might be turned over or sold to a private utility. But I have a rather clear idea that, if that becomes the play, then the people who want to see that power developed in the interests of the people will certainly make their voices heard in protest against that type of juggling in the Eightieth Congress. This action will actually reduce the power available in the Seattle area in 1949 by 35,000 kilowatts by requiring operation of generators on the Skagit River at lower than designed voltage. This would deny a total of 95,000 kilowatts to the Seattle area and would reduce potential revenues to the Treasury by $1,500,000. It would take power away from private enterprise and cause losses of jobs, income, and taxes far greater than these losses in direct revenue.

COVINGTON-OLYMPIA TRANSMISSION LINE

These facilities are needed to complete a transmission loop connecting Covington, Chehalis, and Olympia with 230-kilowatt service. They would provide larger amounts of power for use on the Olympic Peninsula by the fall of 1951.

The 1948 request included $51,000 for initial work on surveys, design, and right-of-way acquisiton, together wth contract authorizations of $650,000 to cover the placing of orders for materials and necessary equipment.

The House eliminated this project. The result is to weaken the entire power system by 1951, reducing the ability to deliver power to meet demands in the Portland and Olympic Peninsula area. The net effect will be to curtail seriously the amount of power sold by Bonneville and to reduce the revenues to the Treasury. If that becomes the final policy of the Congress, then the people of that section of the country must be made to understand who is responsible for it.

OLYMPIA-SHELTON TRANSMISSION CIRCUIT NO. 2

This second circuit is needed to carry power to the rapidly growing industries of the Olympic Peninsula. It will be urgently needed in the fall of 1949. It consists of a 19-mile line between the stations at Olympia and Shelton. It was to have been built in 1948 and 1949 at an estimated cost of $426,000 of which $127,000 in funds and contract authorization were requested for 1948.

The House eliminated funds and authorizations for this line and substation connections. The result is to restrict the amount of power which can be delivered to customers to the capacity of the existing Olympia-Shelton line. It will force the Bonneville Administration to withdraw from its current commitments for power to new industrial customers—including Simpson-Rayonier Corp., Shelton, Wash.; and Simpson Logging Co., McCleary, Wash.—and it will require that they abandon their plans for expansion or else install expensive steam plants. Private industry may be curtailed and Bonneville revenues will be reduced.

SUBSTATIONS

The House eliminated provisions for substation work amounting to $1,799,000 in connection with new projects, without regard to the necessity for the individual items.

This action will prevent work which any properly managed power system must do. This includes the installation of standard devices intended to protect the service, to provide a means for prearranging outages needed for mainte-

nance work, and to localize line failures. Engineering work on substations at 17 towns was eliminated.

I have already included in the record a letter which I have received from the president of a public utility in Florence, Oreg., which points out the effect of this cut upon that district. There are many more in exactly the same category.

There is a feeling, Mr. President, that back of this cutting out of the substations is, of course, an attempt to discourage the public ownership of power. It happens to be my position in the State of Oregon that I believe that both public power and private power can exist side by side, and I believe one is a very good check upon the other. I believe that the people of the various districts of the State of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest should exercise the privilege of determining whether or not they want power to be distributed through private utilities or through public power districts, and I think that when they decide upon a public power district the private utilities are entitled to 100 cents return for every dollar of value they lose as the result of the condemnation proceedings by a particular district instituting public power. But I shall not be a party, Mr. President, to any effort which seeks so to restrict the Bonneville appropriation that it cannot go ahead with its substation program and with its transmission-line program, because I believe that we ought to make that power generated at Bonneville available to the people of the various districts, to be distributed as they decide to have it distributed, and if they vote for a public power district, then I want to see Bonneville in a position so that it can supply them with the power from its generators for a public power district.

Ten millions of dollars of materials are now on order and are being manufactured for the following substations and related transmission lines: Chehalis, Olympia, Columbia, Shelton, Potlatch, Port Angeles, Cosmopolis, and Reedsport.

The House action makes it impossible to install this equipment upon delivery. The result will be the tremendous waste of millions of dollars of idle equipment. At the same time, the power system will be weakened and its revenues reduced. If that becomes the final action of the Congress, then, Mr. President, I want the people of those districts to know who is responsible for the action.

The House recommended that customers provide all future substation facilities. This would create impossible problems of managing the power system.

First. Central control is now maintained by Bonneville, but it would no longer be possible, since carrier current telephone service owned by the Federal Government could not legally be extended into privately owned stations.

Second. A substation often serves many customers, but it would be impossible for them to jointly own and operate area switching stations and multiple-voltage transformation stations. The intent of the House could not be carried out in practice.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

The Administration requested approval for contract authorizations totaling $6,000,000 in order to adjust for the time required for manufacture and delivery of high-voltage electrical equipment and materials. Current bids on transformers provide for as much as 27 months of delivery time, oil circuit breakers 17 months, and heavy conductors 10 months. In other words, it calls for very careful and long-range planning in order to take care of the type of project for which I am pleading tonight. Ordinary business management requires that this situation be taken into account in maintaining the power system. The House denied this request. The result is to defer the following projects until appropriations are made available, with effects as follows:

PROJECT, YEAR ENERGIZATION NEEDED BY, AND EFFECT

McN ry-La Grande transmission line; 1950; power supplies in Union and Baker Counties, Oreg., are now being imported temporarily from Idaho. By 1950, the power deficiency will cause brown-out conditions and require rationing unless this line is on schedule.

Goldendale-Detroit transmission line; 1951; growing power loads in northwestern Oregon will overload the capacity of the 115-kilovolt system by 1951. The market for all 115-kilovolt power from Bonneville Dam will exist in Portland by 1951. It will be necessary to ration power if additional power is not made available. Sawmill expansion will be impossible unless wasteful wood-burning steam plants are installed. This line is needed to prevent these results.

Eugene-Roseburg transmission line; 1950; power needs of the Roseburg area are supplied by the California-Oregon Power Co. which will have peaking capacity of only 86,000 kilowatts in 1950 to apply against loads expected to exceed 156,000 kilowatts. This line is needed to prevent the power shortage.

Idaho Panhandle transmission line; 1950; this line will be required to meet power needs arising from activity in lumbering, sawmills, mines, farms, and recreational areas. The REA systems in the area are experiencing load growth which cannot be met without new sources of power supply and they will be forced to ration power and refuse new customers unless additional power is made available by this line.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 25, contains numerous references from both sides of the aisle as to the arrangements which have been made. These references aroused my curiosity, and as a consequence, I scrutinized the RECORD in detail. I found there were four committee amendments offered with respect to the following reclamation projects:

First. Colorado-Big Thompson, adding $2,000,000 to the committee recommendations.

Second. Boise project, Anderson Ranch Dam, adding $1,000,000 to the committee recommendations.

Third. Columbia Basin project, adding $2,000,000 to the committee recommendations.

Fourth. Missouri River Basin project, adding $175,000 to the committee recommendations.

The increase represented by these committee amendments total $5,175,000.

These are rather interesting additions, Mr. President, but I am sure that the people of the Pacific Northwest will want to know why these additions are made, and why cuts are made in other projects equally deserving. They will want to know, and I think they will have a perfect right to know, why there should not be uniformity of treatment in the case of all these projects, rather than some being singled out for preferential treatment.

On page 4088 of the RECORD of April 25 can be found the statement to the effect that funds for these amendments were to be obtained from the revenue suspense account of the Bonneville Power Administration. The meaning of this action, as I interpret it, is that funds to cover these amendments were intended to be taken from the pay-out components of the Bonneville Power Administration. In other words, Bonneville revenues were to be used for construction in other States.

I am heartily in favor of the construction of projects in other States, but I want to say here and now that I think it is grossly unfair to build such projects out of Bonneville funds when the Bonneville funds are needed in full amount for the development of the projects directly served by Bonneville, in the building of the substation eliminated by the House committee, in the building of the transmission lines needed by the districts to which I have already alluded. I want to say that although I am in favor of projects for which the amendments seek to secure funds, I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is even politically "cricket" to try to do it by taking the funds away from Bonneville. I am willing to vote for a full appropriation for the building of these projects, but I think they ought to come out of a direct appropriation by the Congress, and the Bonneville funds should be used to build the substations and the transmission lines and develop the power which is needed in the areas served by Bonneville.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an analysis of the program for the development of these projects as it affects the Klamath project, the McNary-La Grande line, the Detroit-Eugene line, the Goldendale-Detroit line, the Eugene-Reedsport line, the Reedsport-Coos Bay line, the Eugene-Roseburg line, the North Bonneville-Troutdale line, the Grand Coulee-Snohomish line No. 1, and the other lines to which I have already alluded. The analysis or statement prepared by me shows the effect on these lines of the action which has been taken, unless we rectify those effects by proper action in the Senate.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KLAMATH (CALIFORNIA-OREGON)

The 1948 program for the Klamath project, as provided for in the President's budget, included initiation of construction on Boundary Dam which is needed to provide storage for the Tule Lake division. The program also provides for continuation of work on the pumping plants, lateral system, drainage system, and flood-protection facilities of the Tule Lake division. This project which is nearing completion will ultimately serve 197,000 acres of exceptionally fertile land. The action of the House in reducing the

budget estimate from $2,000,000 to $1,800,000 will necessitate postponement of construction on flood-protection facilities which are needed to prevent damage to completed works and to many acres of valuable crops.

M'NARY-LA GRANDE LINE

The initial purpose of this project is to serve Union County, Oreg., which is now supplied by the California-Pacific Utilities Co. The system of this company located in Union County is being acquired by the Union County Peoples Utility District and the Union County Electric Cooperative. The generating capacity is less than the load and the difference is currently being supplied by an interconnection with the Idaho Power Co. This method of operation will be adequate until 1950 at which time it is estimated the load will outstrip the supply.

To avoid a power black-out at that time construction of the McNary-La Grande line has been started. In order to complete the line by 1950 orders for material must be placed in 1948 amounting to $228,000. If this item is cut from the budget the line will be delayed at least a year. The line has the further purposes of delivering power to the phosphate fertilizer industry in Idaho and delay in line construction will mean a corresponding delay in getting these fertilizer plants in operation.

DETROIT-EUGENE LINE

Curtailment of funds for this line will prevent a large area in southern Oregon from receiving the benefits of Bonneville-Grand Coulee power which, up until now, they have not been privileged to receive. Even if the budget item for this line is approved the earliest date that power can be brought to the area is 1950. At that time an initial amount of 60,000 kilowatts could be delivered whereas the demand is estimated at 135,000 kilowatts. This is the best that can be done if Congress makes available the appropriations. The plans are being made now because of the great length of time needed to obtain the materials—it take 2 years after the order is placed to get delivery of the aluminum transmission wires. The $130,400 allowed by the House for this project is sufficient only to perform part of the design and land acquisition. Lack of the full budget amount will delay the ordering of materials and cause a year's delay in putting the line into service and meeting area loads.

GOLDENDALE-DETROIT LINE

This line will supply the heavy demands in southern Oregon by connecting with the Detroit-Eugene line. Orders for materials must be placed as soon as possible because delivery time for the line wire, circuit breakers, and switches runs from 14 to 24 months. The need for this line to serve southern Oregon is covered under the item, Detroit-Eugene line.

EUGENE-REEDSPORT LINE

This line serves the territory in southwest Oregon and is the No. 1 priority job on the Bonneville construction schedule, as this area has suffered and is suffering from a serious shortage of power. The House has recognized this need in part by allowing $797,000 for the work. It has disallowed, however, $164,000 plus $368,000 for contract authorizations. The items disallowed represent switches and transformers needed to connect the line to the rest of the system at Eugene and to the customers at Reedsport. The line is useless without these connections, and the disallowance was based on error in evaluating substation effects on physical operation and on power rates.

REEDSPORT-COOS BAY LINE

The House approved funds for the bare line but cut out the facilities to connect it to the rest of the system at Reedsport. Obviously the line is dead if disconnected from the main transmission system, and this omission is no doubt an unintentional error. The amount for the connection is $5,000. The House further deleted the substation at Coos Bay which steps down the line voltage to a voltage usable by the customers. This is standard practice throughout the country and nowhere are small customers expected to purchase power at the high transmission voltages. The Coos Bay substation item is $5,000, making a total cut of $10,000 which must be restored to make the line workable. Eliminating substations is an indirect method of elevating power rates.

EUGENE-ROSEBURG LINE

Elimination of the $88,000 item for contract authorization will delay placing of long-time delivery order for material with a consequent year's delay in meeting the power needs of Roseburg. An unsupplied demand of 74,000 kilowatts is estimated by December 1950 which is the earliest date the line could be put into service. This demand can be met only if full appropriations are made.

NORTH BONNEVILLE-TROUTDALE LINE

This project if slowed up, would result in a full year's delay in providing this additional capacity for the Portland area. If the line is not completed as scheduled, there will be very low-grade service in the Portland-Vancouver area, and any outage on existing facilities would immediately overload the remaining circuit beyond its capacity, causing serious disruption to the entire grid system. By 1949 the load at Troutdale will be 240,000 kilowatts which is the capacity of this line. If the line were not built the Portland area would be short this amount. This is a serious situation for a city the size of Portland.

GRAND COULEE-SNOHOMISH LINE NO. 1

This line will serve the city of Seattle, the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., the area north of Seattle, and industrial loads in the Puget Sound region. This line will follow a route past the Foster Creek dam site thence over the Cascade Mountains to Snohomish, which is north of Seattle. This route was chosen to avoid congestion of the existing route to the south of Seattle at Covington, and to deliver power to the northern part of the city of Seattle, where the need is now more acute. It is half of a double-circuit line, the other half being designated line No. 2. Failure to construct the line on schedule will cause a major power shortage in the area which is the heaviest user of power in the Northwest. The line will transmit the output of new generators now being installed at Grand Coulee Dam. Lack of the line would interfere with the marketing of this badly needed new supply of power. The line, together with line No. 2, is planned to meet a shortage of 60,000 kilowatts in the fall of 1949. The delay in constructing this line will result in a power shortage in the north metropolitan Seattle area.

CHEHALIS-OLYMPIA LINE—WASHINGTON STATE

This project brings power to Olympia, Wash., from which point lines will radiate to Thurston, Grays Harbor, Mason, Kitsap, Jefferson, and Clallam Counties.

The House has allowed the portion of this item representing the line only but has cut off the terminal facilities in the amount of $65,000 for connecting the line to the Chehalis substation. This cut was probably made in the belief that this was a facility normally built by a customer. The opposite is true as the Chehalis substation is on the sending end of the line, not receiving end, and is solely for the purpose of connecting the line to the transmission grid. Without this connection the line would be inoperative.

OLYMPIA-SHELTON-POTLACH-FAIRMONT-PORT ANGELES LINE

The House has recognized and approved the delivery of power to the areas covered by this line by its action in passing appropriations for the line facilities. But at the same time it has rendered the line useless by cutting out the funds for the substation facilities at the terminal points. At Shelton, a substation is needed to tie together the Bonneville system lines from Olympia, Bremerton and Port Angeles. At Port Angeles a 50,000-kva transformer bank and a 20,000-kva synchronous condenser are required to step down the line voltage and keep it within reasonable limits for the use of the customers. Without the Port Angeles substation, customers would have to buy the power at 110,000 volts and process it themselves. Such a procedure is decidedly not in accordance with utility practice and would have the effect of discriminating against these particular customers in favor of those already being served through substations at other points on the Bonneville system. The cost of the substation is well within the pay-out ability of Bonneville. This is another case of indirect rate elevation.

OLYMPIA-COSMOPOLIS LINE

The 110,000-volt Olympia-Cosmopolis line will serve the Grays Harbor area which is even now short of transmission capacity. The House has deleted the substations at both ends of this line and has approved only the line itself. The substation at the Olympia end is an essential system addition tying in the line with the main grid at this point. The Cosmopolis substation connects the 110,000-volt line to the 23,000-volt Bonneville system now in operation at Cosmopolis. This connection is made by means of a 30,000-kva transformer without which it would be impossible to make use of the Olympia-Cosmopolis line. This action creates an unworkable lay-out, created for purposes of elevating rates.

GRAND COULEE-SNOHOMISH LINE NO. 2

This line will be placed on the same structures that will carry Grand Coulee-Snohomish line No. 1. Both lines will be needed by the fall of 1949 to market power from the three generators now on order which will be installed in the right powerhouse at Grand Coulee. The effect of eliminating this line would be to cause a deficiency of 60,000 kilowatts of power in the Seattle area. By building both No. 1 and No. 2 lines simultaneously a substantial saving can be made in construction costs. This represents a saving of $250,000 over the method proposed by the House Committee. This line traverses the same route as Snohomish route No. 1.

COVINGTON-OLYMPIA LINE

This line will feed power from Covington, Wash., to Olympia and relieve the Covington-Chehalis line by supplying an additional route for power flow to the Chehalis, Wash., area. It will also relieve the existing overload on the transformer bank at Chehalis which is an acute bottleneck on the Bonneville system. It will be a prime source of power for Port Angeles, Fairmont, Potlatch, Shelton, Bremerton, Allyn, Cosmopolis, and Raymond areas. The needs for these areas are covered under the lines serving each specific area. Its elimination would nullify the foregoing benefits.

OLYMPIA-SHELTON LINE NO. 2

Olympia-Shelton line No. 1 is now under construction together with the Shelton-Allyn line for relieving the city of Tacoma of the transfer of power from its system at Allyn. This transfer was begun during the war as an emergency measure to supply the Puget Sound Navy Yard. The city of Tacoma can no longer spare this power and is therefore being relieved by the Olympia-Shelton-Allyn line. Olympia-Shelton line No. 2 is to serve Potlatch, Fairmont, and Port Angeles in the Olympic Peninsula territory. The need for this line is explained under the heading Olympia - Shelton - Potlatch - Fairmont-Port Angeles line. Olympia-Shelton line No. 2 has been completely disallowed by the House. Unless this line is built the Olympia-Shelton Line No. 1 will be required to carry both the Olympia Peninsula load and the navy yard.

A bottleneck will result endangering both of these services.

COLUMBIA SUBSTATION ADDITIONS

The Columbia Substation is below the Rock Island Dam on the Columbia River. It is a major junction point on the 230,000 volt grid. A transformer bank is being added to this substation together with switches for outgoing lines. The major part of the material for this work is due to be delivered shortly and the $141,000 budgeted for this station is mainly for work of completing the installation of equipment already purchased. Elimination of this item would prevent the use of the investment already made on this construction. $965,000 was obligated in 1946, $173,000 will be obligated in 1947, $141,000 is needed in 1948 and $15,000 in 1949 to complete the job. The Columbia substation will serve Douglas and Kittitas Counties.

IDAHO PANHANDLE

This item has been entirely removed by the House. Its deletion will deny power to an area of about 2,000 square miles in northern Idaho. This area to date has enjoyed only a few crumbs of Bonneville-Grand Coulee power. Throughout the war it has had to wait because of material shortages. The area extends from Kooskia and Lewiston at the south to Bonners Ferry and Troy at the north. The whole area is now extremely short of power. Available sources of power are being used to the limit. At Troy, the O'Neill Lumber Co. is generating power with waste wood as fuel. At Bonners Ferry an isolated hydro plant is running at over capacity. The most urgent need is that of the northern Idaho REA which serves Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint, and Bayview. This portion of the line would be built first. The second step in construction would be from Lewiston to Cora which is also short of power. REA's in this region have asked for power to supplement their inadequate facilities. Following is a list of customers to be served from this line. All these are small users. This line might be termed a small-business line.

1. Northern Idaho Rural Electric Administration.
2. J. Neils Lumber Co.
3. City of Bonners Ferry.
4. Pend Oreille County Public Utility District
5. City of Sandpoint.
6. City of Priest River.
7. Kootenai County Rural Electric Administration.
8. Farragut College.
9. Clearwater Valley Light & Power Association.
10. Village of Harrison.
11. Village of Plummer.
12. Idaho County Light & Power Association.
13. Industrial (pulp and paper).

CUSTOMER SERVICE FACILITIES

No funds at all are provided by the House to supply the power requirements to at least 30 priority and industrial customers, including completion of customer service projects now under way, as follows:

1. The Spirit Metaline Falls project.
2. Tillamook substation and Tillamook line.
3. The Dalles-Goldendale project.
4. Milton substation.
5. Warren substation.
6. Mossy Rock-Morton project.
7. Holcomb-Naselle project.
8. Aims substation.
9. Pomeroy substation.
10. Kennewick substation.
11. Cottage Grove—drain project.

On the above projects material in most instances has already been ordered but no funds are appropriated to put the materials and equipment in place.

These delays will postpone the delivery of low-cost electrical energy to power shortage areas, and will seriously affect the growth and economy of the communities involved.

Elimination of customer service funds is false economy as the basic grid system investment cannot be made to produce maximum return unless the necessary sales outlets are provided. There is no point in constructing transmission lines unless means are also provided at the terminals for the marketing of the power.

OTHER CAPITAL ADDITIONS

The request for funds in this category included amounts for additions to transformer banks to relieve already overloaded substation facilities, static capacitors to maintain system voltage conditions within barely commercial limits, oil circuit breakers to relieve system operating hazards resulting from the continued cascading of fault interrupting duties and other additions to relieve bottlenecks and adverse operation conditions. Failure to provide funds in this category will defer work on these critically needed system improvements and will necessitate postponement of the following work now under way.

1. Installation of second 30,000 kilovolt-ampere transformer bank at Salem to relieve transmission bottlenecks resulting from greatly accelerated increases in power demands from several customers in that area.
2. Installation of static capacitors at Longview, Cowlitz, Chehalis, and Eugene substations to ameliorate voltage conditions which would otherwise be intolerable.
3. Installation of additional AC network analyzer equipment required for speeding up the work performed with this equipment.
4. Installation of crane at Chehalis substation for handling heavy substation equipment.
5. Installation of lightning protective devices on Coulee-Covington No. 1 line.
6. Installation of 6,000 kilovolt-ampere transformer at McMinnville, required to relieve overloaded facilities and avoid power curtailment.
7. Replacement of Walla Walla transformer bank to relieve transmission bottleneck.

GENERAL STRUCTURES

Under this cut-back it would be necessary to eliminate all work on the construction of the dispatcher's headquarters and Spokane shop and equipment buildings. These buildings have already been delayed beyond need because of war conditions and past material shortages. In addition, lack of funds will prevent completion of urgently needed housing facilities at the Midway substation. The temporary housing now being used is on loan from the United States Army, and its early return to the Hanford project has been requested.

ADVANCE SURVEYS AND DESIGN

Elimination of funds for this activity will automatically postpone for at least 1 year the preliminary work on projects which must be started as early as possible in order to meet power supply bottlenecks expected to occur within the next 3 years. These include:

1. Spokane-Hungry Horse line.
2. Covington-Coulee No. 3 and No. 4 line.
3. La Grande-Ontario-Southern Idaho facilities.
4. Roseburg-Ashland line.

The Spokane-Hungry Horse line is scheduled for completion in 1951 at the same time power is scheduled to be delivered from Hungry Horse Dam. This line will coordinate and integrate the operation of Hungry Horse Dam with the Grand Coulee and Bonneville plants and thus achieve a maximum of prime power for the system at the lowest cost.

Covington-Coulee lines No. 3 and No. 4, will parallel the present two Covington-Coulee lines and help deliver the power from additional generators scheduled for operation at Grand Coulee in 1950.

The La Grande-Ontario-Southern Idaho line is planned to run initially from LaGrande to Ontario and from Scriver Creek to Caldwell. The major development in this area is the phosphate fertilizer load.

The Roseburg-Ashland line would extend to a new territory in the extreme southern portions of Oregon not now served with Bonneville power.

TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT

The effect of cutting to one-fifth the budget request for tools and equipment would be to force inefficient methods of construction and operation. The $500,000 needed is allocated as follows:

Passenger automobiles	$32,600
Aircraft	7,500
Trucks, tractors, cranes, trailers	320,000
Pumps, compressors, lathes, tools	110,000
Laboratory equipment	10,000
Office and stores equipment	19,900
Total	500,000

Much of the equipment on hand has outlived its economically useful life and is now being used at high maintenance expense. It is simply good business to replace this equipment and thereby achieve a net financial saving to the Government.

OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, MARKETING, AND ADMINISTRATION

Reduction of this work from $4,700,000 to $2,500,000 would seriously affect all phases of the work of the Administration. The operating allowance of $2,500,000 is roughly comparable to 1943, when $1,700,000 was allowed, but this would be about $2,500,000 when adjusted upward for increased salaries, wages, and material costs. However, there has been substantial growth since 1943. The following comparative data indicate the inadequacy of the 1948 allowance:

	1943	1948
Gross revenues	$12,051,000	$22,500,000
Structure miles of line in operation	2,194	3,258
Electric-plant investment	$70,146,000	$113,731,000
Kilovolt-ampere substation capacity	2,020,474	2,716,533

The reduced operating allowance is not warranted by the estimated financial results of operations in 1948. Revenues of $22,200,000 will leave a net income of about $4,300,000 after paying all costs of operation and maintenance, interest on the investment, and provisions for depreciation. This refers to the expenses, interest, and depreciation on the power investment at the two dams, as well as the transmission system.

ENGINEERING

The engineering operating crews would have to be reduced with resulting substandard service to customers. Long outages would mean loss of good will and revenue and increased repair costs. All guards would have to be eliminated making it impossible to protect Government property. Routine inspection of substations and lines would be curtailed resulting in failure of equipment which protects the large power transformers and transmission lines. Temporary labor employed in keeping transmission lines clear of brush and dangerous trees would be entirely cut out. This would cause outages due to trees falling into the line and brush growing up to the line wires. Carrier current maintenance work would be cut making it impossible to keep the intricate system of relays coordinated and resulting in black-outs of the whole Northwest power pool at times of heavy load. Telephone service over Bonneville systems would be down graded thus hindering power dispatchers from getting the system back into operation following outages. Standards of customer metering would be lowered thereby risking loss of revenue and customer good will. Technical studies on high-voltage transmission would be stopped. These studies have already saved the Government

millions of dollars by the discovery of new techniques permitting more power to be carried over the existing transmission system. Investigation of line-wire vibration will be stopped. This work prevents the breaking of line wires by discovering points where vibration is excessive and installing preventive devices.

ACCOUNTING

Accounting activities would be cut to such an extent that legal requirements could not be met, and minimum accounting standards could not be maintained. Specific effects of the cut-back on accounting would be as follows:

1. Elimination of the annual audit required by the Bonneville Act.

2. Elimination of property accountability reports. The general ledger would no longer be supported by accountable property records.

3. Fixed capital unit records could no longer be maintained.

4. Elimination of depreciation accrual by Federal Power Commission plant accounts. This would necessitate use of a monthly depreciation accrual estimate for general ledger purposes and for estimating the value of property retired.

5. Elimination of work on pay-out studies in connection with future dams.

6. Elimination of IBM statistical work for use in maintaining effective management.

7. Delayed preparation of or elimination of financial reports required by law.

8. Delayed payment of purchase vouchers and per diem vouchers.

9. Elimination of analytical budget reports.

10. Less careful vertification of figures appearing in reports.

11. Elimination of audit of accounting media received from the field.

LAND

Adequate management of Administration-owned land would be impossible. The Administration has about 2,100 miles of right-of-way amounting to over 42,000 acres and, in addition, 150 tracts at substation sites involving 1,630 acres. Land management, therefore, is an important operating activity involving the issuance of permits and the granting of franchises and special rights involved in pole contracts, encroachments, crossings by roads and railroads, etc., and the handling of complaints and recurring title problems.

SERVICES

Elimination of the library as a source of useful reference material. Only one employee possible on a part-time basis would be available to keep the legal and reference libraries in a useful order.

Procurement activities would be reduced below the level required for efficient operation. The mail, files, and messenger services would be reduced below minimum requirements. Janitor-watchman services would be reduced to a bare minimum to meet janitorial needs. Administration occupied buildings would be left unguarded from midnight to 8 a. m. daily and over Sundays and holidays. This would mean that valuable records of the Administration would be left without protection against fire and theft.

POWER MANAGEMENT

There is a widespread belief that the function of this branch is purely power sales. The fact is that power sales represent only a small part of the work. Among the varied responsibilities of this branch are rates, load estimating, power resources, and contract service. Curtailment of this branch would permit only the most cursory control of both wholesale and resale rates. This work is mandatory under the Bonneville Act. The work of load estimating which is the basis for transmission and generation planning could be performed only superficially and would result in an expensive waste of future Government investment. A reduction in power-resources work would make the Administration dependent on outside sources for data on system capability of its customers, which is a prime factor in determining power bills. Planning of future hydroelectric-plan developments would be virtually stopped. Surveys of optimum use of water storage and river flows could not be made, thus stopping the savings through these avenues. Reduction of the contract-service staff would hinder the negotiation of contracts with power users and thus prevent the interests of the Government from being protected.

With regard to market surveys, although the present output of Grand Coulee and Bonneville is sold, there is no guarantee that this favorable position will always exist. It is therefore unwise to cut out entirely market surveys and industrial analysis, as proposed by the House. Specific projects that would be cut out are the phosphate, phosphorus and fertilizer program, forest products, light metals, mineral resources, county surveys, industrial power market studies, transportation-cost studies, and railroad-electrification studies. It sometimes takes several years between the time studies are started on an industry and the time power is delivered to the completed plant. It is therefore short-sighted to rest on the fact that all power is sold at the moment.

WASHINGTON OFFICE

Curtailment of the limitation account for this office would compel moving of four of the six members of the staff to the Portland office where business with the Army, Navy, Federal Power Commission, Rural Electrification Administration, War Assets Administration and General Accounting Office would have to be transacted by mail, telegram, long distance telephone and periodic trips to Washington. Instead of a saving to the Government, the expense under the overall appropriation would be increased as these activities can in no way be cut out.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table dealing with the projects referred to and relating to the analysis which I have submitted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Analysis of action by House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on estimates of the Bonneville Power Administration

	1948 budget estimates					House committee recommendation		
	Lines	Stations	Total	Contract authorization [1]	Total request	Lines	Stations	Total
1. State of Oregon:								
McNary-LaGrande				228,000	228,000			0
Detroit-Eugene	130,400	14,000	144,400	422,600	567,000	130,400		130,400
Goldendale-Detroit				602,000	602,000			0
Eugene-Reedsport	797,000	164,300	961,300	368,000	329,300	797,000		797,000
Reedsport-Coos Bay	69,000	10,000	79,000		79,000	69,000		69,000
Eugene-Roseburg				88,000	88,000			0
North Bonneville-Troutdale	24,600	5,000	29,600	352,000	381,600	24,600		24,600
Subtota	1,021,000	193,300	1,214,300	2,060,600	3,274,900	1,021,000		1,021,000
2. State of Washington:								
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 1	5,103,000	897,000	6,000,000		6,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000
Snohomish-Arlington-Bellingham-Blaine	12,000		12,000		12,000	12,000		12,000
Chehalis-Olympia	231,000	65,000	296,000		296,000	231,000		231,000
Olympia-Shelton-Potlatch-Fairmont-Port Angeles	1,266,800	1,215,200	2,482,000	208,200	2,690,200	1,266,800		1,266,800
McNary-Pasco [2]	137,000	27,000	164,000		164,000	137,000	27,000	164,000
Olympia-Cosmopolis	376,000	185,000	561,000		561,000	376,000		376,000
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 2				769,900	769,900			0
Covington-Olympia	51,000		51,000	650,000	701,000			0
Olympia-Shelton No. 2	31,700	3,000	34,700	92,300	127,000			0
Subtotal	7,208,500	2,392,200	9,600,700	1,720,400	11,321,100	3,022,800	27,000	3,049,800
3. Other items, unclassified:								
Columbia substation additions		141,000	141,000		141,000			0
Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam	212,000	25,000	237,000		237,000	212,000	25,000	237,000
Idaho Panhandle				489,000	489,000			0
Customers' service facilities			1,730,000	1,000,000	2,730,000			0
Other capital additions			1,270,000	730,000	2,000,000			0
General structures			350,000		350,000			0
Advance surveys and design			535,000		535,000			0
Tools and equipment			500,000		500,000			100,000
Subtotal	212,000	166,000	4,763,000	2,219,000	6,982,000	212,000	25,000	337,000
Operation, maintenance, marketing, and administration					4,700,000			2,800,000
Total	8,441,500	2,751,500	15,578,000	6,000,000	26,278,000	4,255,800	52,000	6,907,800

[1] No contract authorization was recommended.
[2] Construction power for McNary Dam at Umatilla, Oreg.

TRUE STATUS OF WESTERN PROJECTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate will soon be confronted with appropriation and legislative bills covering public works. There seem to be indications that in order to secure governmental economy, it will be necessary to eliminate the major portion of the Federal Works program.

A good many of the points which I am now about to make have already been amply covered on the House side by my distinguished colleague, Mr. ANGELL, from Portland, Oreg.; but for the RECORD, and because I want it available for ready reference, I shall cover the material here, too. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I intend to have this discussion reprinted and distributed in considerable quantities throughout the Pacific Northwest. I wish to bring to the attention of the people of that area of the country the points which I now wish to make.

Before any decision can be adequately made in this matter it will be necessary to consider the full facts as to each type of public works, as well as the type inherent to each section of the country. Such a factual analysis is being presented, covering western projects. This analysis, when made on a comparative basis, will demonstrate that the West is more than paying its own way in covering the cost of its internal public works program.

Early last February identical bills, S. 539 and H. R. 1886, were introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and Representative ROCKWELL to amend or rewrite sections 9 (a), 9 (c), 9 (d), and 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. It is understood that these bills were introduced at the request of the National Reclamation Association. The two principal objectives of the bills were (a) to provide a new formula of power rate-making known as the "alternate competitive plant method," and (b) revision of housekeeping and bookkeeping operating practices. Since S. 539 has not been considered by the Senate Public Lands Committee, this discussion will not attempt to prejudge the merits of S. 539.

However, hearings on H. R. 1886 were started before the House committee early last February. During the House hearings, the rate-making provisions of H. R. 1886 were vigorously attacked by western House Members on the grounds that the alternate-plant theory was an artificial rate-elevating proposal. The intended application of this theory to Columbia Basin has since been denied by the officials of the association. However, the ambiguity of section 1–e–5 and paragraph 2 of H. R. 1886, covering rates, was so evident that the chairman of the House subcommittee recently indicated that H. R. 1886 would be withdrawn. Substitute bills, H. R. 2873 and H. R. 2874, have been offered. These substitutes do not contain any rate provisions and are entirely housekeeping proposals.

During the course of the hearings on H. R. 1886, the extraneous but unfortunate issue of East versus the West was introduced, and the implication was drawn that the western reclamation and power projects were being subsidized by eastern taxpayers. The sectional issue should never be raised in such matters, but in justice to the West, the comparative facts should be fully developed in order to show that the West is more than paying its way and is not existing on taxpayers' subsidies. This and this alone is the present purpose of this comparative presentation.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Congress first authorized and appropriated for internal improvements or public works nearly a century and a quarter ago. The major portion of these initial works consisted of navigation projects. Applying to such projects the precedent was early established by Congress that appropriations for these works were to be on a nonreimbursable basis. These early actions were later extended to flood control projects and public roads, also on a nonreimbursable basis. However, all western reclamation project appropriations carried with them the obligation to fully repay principal on the irrigation components and further specified that the sale of power from such projects should be at rates to insure full reimbursability to the Federal Treasury. Western multipurpose power projects like Bonneville were authorized on the basis of complete return of the power investment, including interest, operation and replacement costs, to the Federal Treasury, as well as fully amortizing the power investment. The large bulk of western water control projects, therefore, represent wealth-creating investments which are in no sense a burden on the general taxpayer, but rather a type which, in addition to creating an expanded economy, make a direct return to the Treasury. In this respect the West compares most favorably with other sections. This general statement is made, based on the working of the reclamation fund, which receives fund accretions from the sale of public lands, repayments, oil royalties and grazing fees.

TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES

From 1824 to the calendar year 1945 the combined Federal public works expenditures total in round numbers about $12,500,000,000. Of this total about 32 percent was expended on rivers and harbors, 33 percent went to public roads, 21 percent to projects authorized under the NIRA Act of 1933, 5 percent to the TVA, 7 percent to western reclamation, and the balance to western multipurpose power and miscellaneous projects. Therefore, the 17 Western States, with over 49 percent of the total land area of the United States, have received only a small portion of the total Federal public works outlay. The largest part of these western expenditures was made on a reimbursable basis, whereas the bulk of similar expenditures in other sections was made on a nonreimbursable basis.

I particularly want my colleagues from the East to keep that in mind when they come to pass judgment upon the self-liquidating western projects involved in the appropriation bill soon to be before the Senate.

From such a comparison it can be seen that the 17 Western States have more than carried their proportionate share of the burden of public works.

FEDERAL WATER CONTROL EXPENDITURES

An expenditure comparison based on water control projects, demonstrates that the West has paid its way more than any other section of the country. Included in this category are such works as Rivers and Harbors navigation projects, flood-control projects, reclamation, and multipurpose power installations, all connected with the control and use of water. The total Federal expenditures in this classification from 1824 to 1945 are in round numbers about $5,600,000,000, of which amount about $1,770,000,000, or 32 percent of the total was expended in the 17 Western States. Fifty-two percent of the one and seventy-seven hundredths billion expenditure represents western reimbursable items.

The bulk of the nonreimbursable projects in these Western States represents navigation improvements along the Pacific coast and the Fort Peck flood and navigation control project in Montana. The major benefits of the Fort Peck project accrued to the down-river States of the Missouri-Mississippi system, rather than to the State of Montana, in which the project is located.

In order to demonstrate the full effect of western reimbursability, a better period comparison can be made on the basis of nine inland Western States with nine Eastern States and nine States along the Ohio-Mississippi River system. The expenditures for water controls in these three groups totals about $2,776,600,000, of which $1,578,300,000 went to the Ohio-Mississippi system, $738,600,000 to the Atlantic Seaboard States, and $459,700,000 to the nine inland Western States. In this category, for every dollar spent in these Western States, $3.45 was spent on the Ohio-Mississippi system and $1.61 on the Atlantic seaboard. In addition, about 82 percent of these western expenditures were reimbursable, whereas no direct return was made to the Treasury for the cited expenditures in the other two sections.

I hope, Mr. President, that these figures will be studied by the Members of the Senate, and will end once and for all the false claim that the West is seeking to profit at the expense of the East. I am not deploring expenditures in the East. I am stating as a fact that when it comes to getting the better of the deal it has all been in favor of the East, comparatively speaking, rather than the West, because it has been the East which has received the benefit of nonreimbursable expenditures in public works, whereas it has been the West which for the most part has entered into projects on the basis of the reimbursement principle.

Western States like the Dakotas, Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming, are for practical comparative purposes, returning to the Treasury the full principal amounts of their public works appropriations, whereas rich States like Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey are not returning directly one cent to cover such expenditures.

The West has no complaint on the workings of this long-established precedent, but one the basis of such comparison this section feels that equity demands that full appreciation be given

to the consideration of its public works allotments. All that the West asks is to be given the equal opportunity to expand and grow through the beneficial use of its own natural resources, and not to be kept in a colonial status by arbitrary, unrealistic processes.

I ask, Mr. President, what could be fairer than for the West, taking into account the huge sums which have been spent in the East on a nonreimbursable basis, now to say to the Eightieth Congress, "All we ask is that you give us appropriations sufficient to enable us to proceed immediately and complete in the shortest possible time the self-liquidating public works program of the West which is so vital to the prosperity and the expanding economy of the western section of the country."

In the West are located the remaining major metallic resources of the Nation. Modern technology and commerce demand that such metals be processed into the basic materials through electro processes. To do this on an effective commercial basis requires the coupling of the mineral resources to low cost hydro power. Therefore, these types of western developments are bound to spread pay-roll-producing benefits to other sections of the country. The fabrication of these basic products occurs largely in the East and Midwest. In addition the types of western construction require substantial expenditures for finished products like steel and machinery. These products used in the West are largely purchased in the East and Midwest. Therefore, while the appropriation expenditures for western projects in this analysis are charged against the Western States, a substantial part of the cash outlay goes to eastern and midwestern manufacturers.

It is clearly a false notion, Mr. President, that the East is not going to profit from the building of these great projects in the West because of the contribution of the projects to the economy of the Nation as a whole. Manufacturers in the East will reap great benefits and great profits from the building of these projects, because out of the projects there will develop a great many fabrication industries located in the East.

A material purchase analysis covering the Boulder and Grand Coulee projects has been previously presented to the Senate Appropriation Committee. This analysis definitely shows the locations where the western project purchasing dollar landed. The East and Midwest sections of this country have largely fabricated the heavy mechanical parts of all the western projects.

CONCLUSION

This analysis definitely shows that the development of western projects does not constitute a burden on the rest of the country. Furthermore, the record shows that the West is, comparatively speaking, more than carrying its load, and is not being unduly subsidized by other sections.

The basic data used in this analysis has been taken from official sources. The expenditure tables prepared by the Interior Department and submitted to the House Public Lands Committee by Secretary Krug have been analyzed, rearranged, and combined with other official data to form the foundation for the conclusions stated herein.

I ask, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point a series of tables and tabulations setting forth the comparative analysis which I have discussed during the course of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—*Federal expenditures on water conservation and control projects, 1824 to 1945*

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Repayable (investment) [1]	Nonrepayable (contribution)
Alabama	$242.55	$86.09	$156.46
Arizona	123.79	111.23	12.57
Arkansas	217.37	24.30	193.07
California	346.81	124.73	222.08
Colorado	47.24	34.23	13.02
Connecticut	23.71	0	23.71
Delaware	35.04	0	35.04
Florida	107.78	0	107.78
Georgia	46.20	11.75	34.45
Idaho	60.82	59.03	1.80
Illinois	209.07	0	209.07
Indiana	56.42	0	56.42
Iowa	81.70	0	81.70
Kansas	27.54	.34	27.19
Kentucky	212.48	49.99	162.49
Louisiana	360.19	0	360.19
Maine	11.10	0	11.10
Maryland	42.93	0	42.93
Massachusetts	86.24	0	86.24
Michigan	144.96	0	144.96
Minnesota	35.10	0	35.10
Mississippi	167.79	.72	167.06
Missouri	229.83	0	229.83
Montana	146.68	25.56	121.13
Nebraska	39.69	10.72	28.98
Nevada	80.13	67.63	12.50
New Hampshire	10.47	0	10.47
New Jersey	100.49	0	100.49
New Mexico	32.69	18.93	13.76
New York	197.22	0	197.22
North Carolina	62.89	19.21	43.68
North Dakota	4.80	3.44	1.36
Ohio	150.31	0	150.31
Oklahoma	48.90	30.08	18.82
Oregon	156.49	43.71	112.78
Pennsylvania	196.41	0	196.41
Rhode Island	12.98	0	12.98
South Carolina	27.12	0	27.12
South Dakota	6.78	4.94	1.84
Tennessee	468.34	307.11	161.24
Texas	192.16	47.14	145.03
Utah	21.67	21.67	0
Vermont	8.84	0	8.84
Virginia	45.60	0	45.60
Washington	384.91	266.58	118.32
West Virginia	117.24	0	117.24
Wisconsin	101.83	0	101.83
Wyoming	49.14	49.14	0
Total	5,580.44	1,418.26	4,162.21

[1] Includes Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville, Fort Peck, and Southern Power Projects.

TABLE B.—*Total public works expenditures, 1824 to 1945*

Type of project	Total expenditures (in millions)	Percent of total
Rivers and harbors and flood control	$3,996.61	32.2
Reclamation	870.11	7.0
Tennessee Valley Authority	640.35	5.2
Public roads	4,104.46	33.3
PWA projects	2,646.41	21.4
Bonneville Power Administration (total appropriation)	113.98	.9
Total	12,371.92	100.0

TABLE C–1.—*Expenditures for water conservation and control projects covering 9 selected States, 1824 to 1945*

I. MISSISSIPPI—OHIO RIVER SYSTEM

[In millions]

State	Total expenditures	Repayable expenditures	Nonrepayable expenditures
Illinois	$209.1	$0	$209.1
Indiana	56.4		56.4
Iowa	81.7		81.7
Kentucky [1]	162.6		162.6
Louisiana	360.2		360.2
Mississippi	167.0		167.0
Missouri	229.8		229.8
Ohio	150.3		150.3
Tennessee [1]	161.2		161.2
Total	1,578.3		1,578.3

II. ATLANTIC SEABOARD

Connecticut	$23.7		$23.7
Delaware	35.0		35.0
Maine	11.1		11.1
Maryland	42.9		42.9
Massachusetts	86.2		86.2
New Jersey	100.5		100.5
New York	197.2		197.2
Pennsylvania	196.4		196.4
Virginia	45.6		45.6
Total	738.6		738.6

III. WESTERN STATES

Arizona	$123.7	$111.2	$12.5
Colorado	47.2	34.2	13.0
Idaho	60.8	49.0	11.8
Nebraska	39.6	10.7	28.9
Nevada	80.1	67.6	12.5
New Mexico	32.7	18.9	13.8
North Dakota	4.8	3.4	1.4
Utah	21.7	21.7	0
Wyoming	49.1	49.1	0
Total	459.7	375.8	83.9

[1] Excluding TVA power projects.

81.8 percent of the public works (water) expenditures to the above States were fully reimbursable as to principal.

TABLE D.—*Expenditures on water control projects—17 Western States—up to 1945*

[In millions of dollars]

State	Total	Repayable	Nonrepayable
Arizona	123.79	111.23	12.56
California	346.81	124.73	222.08
Colorado	47.24	34.23	13.01
Idaho	60.82	59.03	1.79
Kansas [1]	27.54	.34	27.20
Montana	146.68	25.56	121.12
Nebraska	39.69	10.72	28.97
Nevada	80.13	67.63	12.50
New Mexico	32.69	18.93	13.76
North Dakota	4.80	3.44	1.36
Oklahoma	48.90	30.08	18.82
Oregon	156.49	43.71	112.78
South Dakota	6.78	4.94	1.84
Texas	192.16	47.14	145.02
Utah	21.70	21.70	0
Washington	384.90	266.58	118.32
Wyoming	49.14	49.14	0
Total	1,770.26	919.13	851.13

[1] Although a part of Kansas is in the seventh reclamation district and is classified as a reclamation State, most of the expenditures in this State have fallen in the nonarid section and represent types of projects represented by navigation and flood control.

Percent reimbursable, 52.

Above classification includes navigation, flood control, reclamation, and water-power works.

Mr. President, what about the relation of the Federal Government and water control?

I. FEDERAL AUTHORITY OVER WATER COURSES

The authority of the Federal Government covering navigable water courses

has long been established by law and precedents and stems from article I, section 8 of the Federal Constitution. The meaning and application of this authority was first given in the opinion of Chief Justice John Marshall in the case of Gibbons against Ogdon. Since this original decision, the Supreme Court has greatly extended the congressional authority, including the late sweeping decision in the so-called New River case. On public lands, this authority stems from article 4, section 3 of the Federal Constitution. Flood-control authority originally grew out of the requirements of navigation.

II. EXERCISE OF FEDERAL CONTROL OVER WATER

Albert Gallatin, while Secretary of the Treasury under President Jefferson, in 1808, first recommended that Congress initiate a comprehensive program of internal improvements by public works. Following the Gallatin report, Congress authorized a number of early investigations, among which were the first authorizations for surveys on the Mississippi in 1819. The first direct appropriations for public works came under this category in 1824. In the early period following the initial appropriations of 1824, navigation was the sole consideration, because of its importance resulting from the then scattered population. Other water uses were not considered in the early legislation for the reason that the then occupied land areas comprised regions of abundant rainfall. Also electricity had not been placed in practical application and the only water powers were the early direct drive mills along the eastern seaboard.

With the settlement of the Western States, other water users assumed increasing importance. The first congressional recognition of other uses of water on navigable streams was carried in the act of 1866 which initially authorized acquisition of water rights for agriculture, mining and other purposes. The 1866 act was extended in 1870 when Congress legislated on vested rights on public lands applying to irrigation, canals, and so forth. In 1884 and during the following years, Congress exercised in a broad way its authority over navigable streams. National reclamation policy was initiated by the Newlands Act of 1902.

The first flood-control legislation was included in the act of 1879 creating the Mississippi River Commission. While this act clearly established the principle of Federal flood control, the early commission interpreted the law to the effect that this policy only applied as an adjunct of navigation. Therefore, Federal flood-control judisdiction developed slowly. It was not until the act of March 1, 1917, that Congress adopted an independent flood-control program.

Water power came into the legislative picture as "byproduct Federal property" resulting from the development of constitutional navigation, flood control and reclamation dams.

The congressional appropriation history, therefore, had its start in 1824, and covered the type of projects covered in the Gallatin recommendations. All of the navigation and flood-control appropriations since 1824 have been on a nonrepayable basis. Repayment provisions were initially included in the 1902 reclamation act. I think it is most important that the Senate give consideration to the history of the development of Federal interest in our waters, in flood control, in the development of navigation, and in the development of rivers and harbors, because these western wealth-creating projects for which I am pleading, and for which money is needed in order that they may be completed in the shortest period of time, stem directly from this historical type of appropriations.

III. SOURCE OF APPROPRIATION DATA

The Interior Department, being charged with the responsibility of administrating western resources, has investigated in this connection all types of public works. As a part of this program, about 2 years ago work was started on a compilation of public-works expenditures since 1824. The base data of this investigation has been supplied by Secretary Krug in connection with House bill 1886, in the Eightieth Congress, to the House Committee on Public Lands. The compilation of appropriation data contained in this analysis was abstracted and calculated from this official base data. Mr. President, I recognize that much of the data I have put into the RECORD during the last 30 minutes has been used elsewhere in connection with legislation on this subject. Some of it has been referred to in the House debates; some of it has been submitted before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the western projects. But I have sought here to bring it together in one ready-reference source.

EFFECT OF CURTAILMENT OF WESTERN PROJECTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to a point which I have already made, but which I desire to discuss in more detail. I refer to the effect of curtailment of western projects on the national security.

In the current drive to secure fiscal economy, security principles are evidently being forgotten. From this viewpoint it is impossible to classify all types of public works into one category for purposes of budget balancing. This is especially true of the outstanding western water and power projects. To clearly bring this point to a proper focus, it is necessary to recite a few facts developed during the past 7 years.

When the national emergency was declared in 1940, this country was not prepared to fight a modern war, because of its lack of industrial plant capacity for producing the so-called modern electric metals and chemicals. The old conventional fuel-furnace type of metal processing has become obsolete in the field of modern metal production. The only way to secure metals permitting requisite strength for high speeds and lightness is through the use of the electric furnace or the electric cell. This type of process requires large supplies of firm low-cost hydro power. Steam power, due to its cost and inherent characteristics, cannot be successfully used in this field. Fortunately for the country in the last war, a small group in Congress had the vision to early provide sufficient and proper hydroelectric capacity to support such types of industries.

In 1940, this country was short of such plant capacity, because the Nation was short of an adequate supply of low-cost hydro power. During the period between 1940 and 1943, officials of OPM and WPB repeatedly stated this fact to the former Truman committee and to other congressional committees. The record shows that this situation was called to the attention of the first defense committee a few weeks after its organization in 1940, by the late Senator Charles L. McNary and a few of his colleagues.

Following Pearl Harbor, OPM officials in desperation actually requested the RFC to finance and subsidize the large Shipshaw power and metal development in Canada, on terms that were equivalent to about 80 percent of the existing Federal power rates in the Pacific Northwest. That action involving foreign subsidy was taken, instead of using the completed dams already provided by Congress, and accelerating generating installations at those dams.

We must never lose sight of the fact that a large quantity of low-cost firm hydro-power is indispensable for the production of defense metals and chemicals. Explosives in modern form, aluminum, magnesium, and ferro alloys, are nothing more than frozen kilowatts. From the security standpoint, all of these materials are closely tied to the effective use of the atom bomb.

Mr. President, ignoring for the moment the value of these projects insofar as expanding the economy of the United States is concerned, ignoring for the moment their value insofar as checking great damage from floods is concerned, and ignoring their value insofar as providing cheap power for the individual farmer consumers of the Pacific Northwest is concerned, I say that the money I am pleading for by way of appropriations by the Congress for these projects can be justified solely on the ground of security. In view of the unsettled international conditions which now confront a very much disturbed world, we cannot take any chances with our national security. I am sure it is no news to the President to point out that even in regard to the contemplated supersonic projects, no matter where they are located—assuming that one of them is located in the Pacific Northwest, as I believe it should be, because of the great power resources of that section and because of the potentialities of the streams in that part of the United States for the development of cheap power—one of those supersonic projects alone, I am reliably informed, would take more power than could be developed by Grand Coulee if all the turbines were in it. That gives us some small idea of some of the thinking that is being done in regard to future security problems which may face the United States in the eventuality of another war.

We cannot afford to recess when it comes to taking the necessary steps to protect the security of our country. The Eightieth Congress—I care not what its motives, political or otherwise—cannot

justify a recess when it comes to protecting the security of the 140,000,000 American people. When I use the word "recess" in this connection I have in mind that it would be taking a recess insofar as fulfilling our fiscal obligations to the people of the United States are concerned, insofar as security protection is involved, for the Congress not to appropriate the funds necessary for the completion of these projects in the shortest period of time.

Once again I say that if we do not appropriate the necessary funds, then I think the people of the United States must know who will be responsible for not taking the necessary steps to assure security safeguards for our people in the eventuality of another war. When we can combine national security with the development of an expanding production, in the way that these projects will combine those two elements, then I say there is no sound reason at all for not correcting the unfortunate action taken by the House of Representatives, and restoring the full amounts cut from the budget by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I desire to repeat that here is one Senator on the Republican side of the aisle who believes that there are some items in our national budget which should not be cut; there are some items which should be increased. I think the items that pertain to self-liquidating projects, such as the western projects that will create new wealth, are the items which should be increased.

I am not interested in compromising this issue because I say that any compromise of the issue, I care not in what amount, is not in the interest of the public welfare. Hence, I shall continue to take my position that there should be no cuts at all, because it is a sound economy to proceed to restore the full amount cut from the budget by the House insofar as these projects are concerned.

Returning to the security argument, in many sections of the country where power costs are high, resulting from the natural order of things, such war plants have been shut down or have been converted to other uses, as private industry cannot afford to operate such plants under these conditions in a field controlled by world metal markets. The metal industry is now dependent, I am reliably informed, upon cheap hydroelectric power. The only exception to this general trend is in the Pacific Northwest where low-cost hydro power was available. The shut-down of such plant capacity has meant a drastic reduction in our resource base and the resulting military potential of the Nation. An examination of the hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee shows that the American magnesium industry has now shrunk to only 3 percent of the war capacity, and the aluminum-plant capacity to 63 percent. Meanwhile the research divisions of our armed forces are planning to use more light metals than previously. The redesign of all military weapons, tanks, and vehicles are now progressing so that such equipment can be used by future air-borne divisions. In addition, industrial and commercial demands for such metals are nearly three times the prewar level.

While demands are increasing for more electric metals, this branch of private industry cannot secure sufficient quantities of low-cost hydro power to warrant expansion on a basis needed to meet foreign competition. In the Northwest this type of industry has made requests for additional Federal power capacity and has been turned down, due to the retarded generator installations at the Grand Coulee Dam.

In fact, one of the most discouraging things to industry in the Pacific Northwest now is that week by week it is being turned down in its effort to buy power so that it can expand its production. That certainly is not a sound economy. We certainly cannot justify that situation in the name of economy.

Hydro power can be developed in Canada, South America, and Norway, due to favorable natural conditions, at a level about one-quarter of the cost obtainable in the best American steam plants, and slightly under the reimbursable Columbia River rates. One mill per kilowatt-hour differential in power rates adds 1 cent per pound to the cost of the finished metal.

Last year the House Committee on Appropriations when reporting on H. R. 6335, second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, stated the following in its report on the Interior supply bill dated May 7, 1946:

> The Bonneville Power Administration is charged with the duty of distributing power generated at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams on the Columbia River. During the war this organization performed an outstanding service to the Nation in providing continuous power essential in connection with atomic-bomb production operations in the Hanford area, adjacent to the Columbia River in Washington. During the fiscal year 1945 plants in the Northwest produced one-third of the Nation's aluminum output, and during that same year war industries served directly by the Bonneville Power Administration accounted for an over-all consumption of 5,546,227,000 kilowatt-hours of Columbia River energy.

Yet, today, according to reports, this same committee is preparing to sharply curtail or stop further western developments which fall in this category. According to these reports, one of the motivating reasons for such action is an alleged controversy over the elevation of power rates. It is to be hoped that these reports turn out to be incorrect when the House bill is released within the next 10 days.

The record of last year's House hearings does not disclose any evidence showing the inadequacy of the Columbia River power rates from the standpoint of complete reimbursability. As a matter of fact, submissions showing complete reimbursability have never been successfully challenged.

However, if such western developments are curtailed, we will have started a cycle which will ultimately result in the removal of a substantial part of our American light-metal plant capacity to foreign lands, where large supplies of low-cost hydro power can be obtained.

It is well known that this type of industry is needed for an independent air arm. If we force such removal to foreign lands, we will be giving away a potential resource without which the atomic bomb can never be completely effective. It is inconceivable at this time, when this country is increasing its responsibility in world affairs, that we would attempt any action reducing our security and resource potentials to a point where our voice and our position will not be respected.

Under these conditions it is unbelievable that these western developments so closely tied to our resource base and our defense position will be stopped by congressional action, when the burden to the taxpayer will not be increased by favorable action. This Nation spent billions of dollars in making up for its light metal and chemical deficiency between 1940 and 1945. Irrespective of security, from a business standpoint can we allow this Federal plant investment to be denied to private enterprise, because of short-sighted ideas of an unsound relation of economy and power policy.

The question before the Congress will be, Will this country turn its back on the experience gained between 1940 and 1945? If we do, we will hamper the development of a type of modern industry absolutely needed for a successful air program. The air arm and electro industry are so closely tied to the atomic bomb, that the talk of holding atom security is meaningless if we so act as to lose our light metal and electro process independence.

The preservation of our resource base, security, and world position require the exercise of foresight in such matters.

Mr. President, I am sure that if I were to rise in my place and read a news dispatch that half of the coal mines of Pennsylvania had been flooded and permanently ruined, you, my colleagues, would be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the disaster. Or if I were suddenly to announce that one-half the oil wells of Texas were enveloped in flames and hopelessly lost to production, you would be staggered by the tragedy. Yet today, through neglect and lack of foresight, we are wasting that immense quantity of vital energy along the undeveloped water-power sites of the Columbia River.

I hardly need remind Senators that energy—whether coal, oil, or hydroelectric power—is the basic foundation of enduring prosperity and peace. Power production and coal mining have been traditional indexes of our business activity. Upon their maintenance at a high level our industrial activity is dependent. Otherwise we slip back to a frontier economy of suppliers of raw materials. Lowest standards of living are always found in those countries which have failed to develop their fuel resources: China, India, and so forth.

It is almost a truism that avoidance of uncontrolled inflation can be achieved only by efficient production. As a corollary we must achieve maximum utilization of fuel resources to multiply the output of human labor. Every new electric motor installed is an addition to our productive capacity, a step toward a higher standard of living for the man who works in front of it, and the people who will buy the products it produces.

But the issue goes beyond our own borders. In a world not yet disarmed,

we must vigilantly maintain our ability to produce—to produce from energy sources within our own Nation. In fact, I think the winning of the peace depends in no small measure upon an expanding American economy, because only to the extent that we have an expanding American economy, an ever-increasing production, can we ward off the danger of depression.

Once we go into a depression, I hate to think what world economic conditions will then become. I say that we must protect ourselves from a depression in order to protect ourselves from leftist ideologies, that are seeking to take over the minds of millions of people in other parts of the world. We must demonstrate without fail the superiority of our private-property economy, which rests upon an ever-expanding economy, an ever-increasing production. That is why I repeat that I do not propose to wait until a depression is upon us. I am making a plea for planning in the Eightieth Congress that will make it possible for us to avoid a depression. I offer the western projects as a constructive preventive of depression.

The fuel crisis experienced during the war must not be forgotten; brown-outs and conservation were the watchword. Thousands of lives were sacrificed in getting tankers through to fuel-deficient areas and allies. Only by allotting huge quantities of precious steel to the construction of the Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines could the necessary quantities of petroleum be transported.

Yet our coal problem today, serious though it is, is mild compared to the critical situations abroad. We have just witnessed the amazing spectacle of Britain literally brought to her knees by the combination of blizzard and fuel shortage. Coal, once the solid rock of her industrial achievement, is today her Achilles heel, the vulnerable spot in her desperate effort to win back her prewar status. And, make no mistake about it, she is making a desperate effort. Nationalization of her coal mines is no doctrinaire bit of politics. It is a solution which crisis has forced upon her. For Britain realizes she cannot compete in a modern world with a sick and failing coal industry. William M. Batt has pointedly observed that even if England's coal mines are modernized with all possible speed, they will be inadequate for many years to come. I think her plight should be studied carefully, and weighed in the light of our own fuel problems.

It is not England alone, however, who faces this crisis. Today coal is at the heart of the Ruhr dispute; it largely accounts for France's determined effort to control those rich fuel deposits. Similarly, Italy has felt the pinch of the fuel shortage, and her political instability may be attributed largely to her inability to set her industrial wheels turning once again. The limited production capacity of the occupied nations is traceable directly to their own coal and fuel problems. Because of work stoppages in our coal fields, we have been unable to fulfill the commitments we have made abroad. The resulting delay in placing Europe on a self-sustaining basis merely prolongs the period during which American taxpayers must continue the burden of feeding tens of millions of people of other nations. The pending piece of legislation, the relief measure, is a perfect example of the thing to which I allude in this part of my remarks.

The recurring crises in the soft-coal industry are so far-reaching in their effects, that ordinary good judgment should dictate the maximum development of our other—and more dependable—sources of energy. I believe we have reached the stage in our national economy when we must mobilize all available sources of energy, and utilize them intelligently for the insurance of maximum, and uninterrupted, production. We cannot afford the dubious luxury of another, and still another, brown-out and black-out, as an ailing industry spreads its sickness like a virulent epidemic.

No single industry more immediately affects our entire economic life than the production of electric power. And today 60 percent of the Nation's electric energy is produced from coal. Another 4 percent from petroleum and natural gas. About 36 percent is developed from water power. That percentage should be doubled, Mr. President. The appropriations for which I am pleading will help increase that percentage at a rapid rate, to the great economic benefit of the entire Nation.

Hydroelectric energy naturally will never supplant steam-generated power, for we do not begin to have enough waterpower sites. But certainly hydro power can supplant steam power most effectively, and provide the minimum essential services in critical periods such as we have just gone through. Almost annually we are extending the distance which electrical energy can be economically transmitted. As new inventions are perfected, I am told by scientists in this field that we can greatly extend the distances to which electric energy can be economically transmitted. As we do so, we increase the value of hydroelectric power to alleviate brown-outs and black-outs in other areas. The current practice of utilities of displacing power from one region to another also extends the area into which hydroelectric energy can come to the rescue of a people beleaguered by coal shortages.

I wish to emphasize that I have not set up hydroelectric power as a competitor with energy generated from coal or oil or gas. It is rather a supplementary source of energy—but a vital supplement, especially in time of crisis. When we are confronted with internal fuel problems, or the even more disturbing problems of national security, then we begin to appreciate and give thanks for the availability of hydroelectric energy.

I wish to remind my colleagues that the splendid contribution made by the Pacific Northwest to victory in the last war can be traced directly to the water power from our great dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. If we wish to be assured that the Northwest will ever be available as an arsenal of democracy—as a producer of aluminum and aircraft, plutonium and shipping—we must not deprive her of her primary source of energy—hydroelectric power.

For in the Northwest every other form of fuel must be imported. It is as vital to Northwest industry as coal is to Pennsylvania and oil to Texas. Without the power of the Columbia River we could never have produced the plutonium that made the atomic bomb possible. We could not have produced the aluminum that built one out of every three of our fighting planes, nor the miracle of shipbuilding that outstripped all production records.

Last year our Columbia River dams produced almost 7,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—over 50 percent of energy consumed in the States of Oregon and Washington. The availability of these large quantities of water power from our Federal dams saved the Nation more than 5,000,000 barrels of precious oil during the critical years of 1944–45—oil that could be poured into planes and cruisers and tanks instead of burnt under the boilers of Northwest power plants. I might go on to calculate the freight trains and tankers which were saved for other uses through the availability of Columbia River power. For virtually every drop of oil must be imported into our region.

Our coal mines in Oregon and Washington have extremely limited production. In the State of Washington, for example, coal production dropped from 4,000,000 tons in 1910 to less than 1,000,000 tons today. Coal mining costs in our area in 1939 were 65 percent above the national average, according to the Bureau of the Census. And in 1944 the value of coal at the mine averaged $5 a ton in the Pacific Northwest compared to a national average of about $3 per ton.

So you can readily see why the Northwest literally cries for the development of her water power. Yet I am not pleading for something to be given the Northwest, for certified audits of Arthur Anderson & Co. show that every dollar invested in power facilities by the Federal Government will be returned to the Federal Treasury, with interest, and with a surplus on top of that interest. Nor am I even asking for these appropriations as loans to the region.

For the power of the Columbia, gentlemen, is of even more importance to the Nation than it is to my region. Those idle horsepower hours now wasting down the river at Umatilla and Foster Creek, yes, and even at Grand Coulee Dam itself for lack of sufficient turbines—may some day be measured in terms of American lives and American blood, when we look at the security facet of this argument. The undeveloped power of the Columbia River and its tributaries today is equal to more than 70,000,000 tons of coal a year—almost a sixth of America's entire production. No other nation could afford to neglect the development of its hydroelectric resources.

Today we are spending literally hundreds of millions of dollars to develop oil in Arabia and South America. We know how vital that fuel is to our national security as well as national growth. We are aware of the limitation of our own oil reserves. Yet we continue shipping large quantities of oil into

the Northwest instead of using the endless water power available to us. We burn up our precious wood wastes and coal, instead of converting them into vital chemicals, gasoline, and other more valuable products

Today Grand Coulee Dam is waiting for appropriations for nine generators, a total of a million horsepower of electric energy: the equivalent of 16,000,000 barrels of fuel oil a year, of 4,000,000 tons of coal. Yet some of my colleagues in the Eightieth Congress talk about economy. What kind of economy? If that type of waste of oil and coal is economy, then let me say to the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress that what it is selling the people is false economy. If the Republican majority goes through with that fiscal program, I think that it will rue the day when the voters of the country understand what it is proposed to do and they become aware of the waste involved, as indicated by the figures I have just stated.

Private utility companies as well as public agencies have joined in asking Congress for development of over 2,000,000 more horsepower of generation and transmission capacity than have been scheduled.

These dams, these generators and power lines, are not gifts to a region. They are sound business investments, and, of even greater importance, they are a tremendous reservoir of strength in this far corner of our country. Yes, Grand Coulee Dam is big. But it is not big enough. The Northwest is strong, but not strong enough. Already our generators, our power lines, our substations are being dangerously overloaded to meet existing, peace-time needs. They could not possibly meet the needs of a new war should such an unhappy day befall us. Aluminum production cannot be expanded because of power limitations. Sawmills and plywood plants have had their operations curtailed because of power shortages. Earlier in my remarks today I pointed out that in some instances those mills cannot be started because they cannot make arrangements for the purchase of power. Today we do not have the power surplus in the Northwest which proved a tower of strength at the time of Pearl Harbor. Instead of a power surplus we have a power shortage. That, I submit, is neither economy nor preparedness.

During each 15 minutes I have been talking nearly 2,000,000 kilowatt-hours of undeveloped hydroelectric power have churned down the Columbia River unused, wasted, lost forever. Between now and July 1—when the Nation will face another coal crisis—the Columbia River will waste energy equivalent to 10,000,000 tons of coal. Some day, I pray it will not be too late, we will wake up to the great value of the hydroelectric power resources of the Columbia which we are permitting to be wasted today, and which thus far in the Eightieth Congress every indication is being given that a short-sighted policy of false economy will permit a continuation of the waste for another year, until at last the people can be heard from as to their reaction to such an unsound economic program. Instead of developing our wasting hydroelectric power, we have let it run wastefully to the sea.

Were I statistically minded I might calculate the number of tons of aluminum which might have been produced by the wasted energy of the Columbia, the armada of ships which might have been built, the ghost squadrons of planes which never will fly. Solely as a matter of national safety, we should develop the Columbia's power resources to the limit; use any surplus energy to build up our stock pile of aluminum—a stock pile which today is being depleted at an alarming rate instead of being replenished.

America can be only as strong as the energy she can muster. In almost every other nation on the globe plans are going ahead at full speed for the development of hydroelectric resources. A constant stream of engineers from foreign nations visit Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams—and then go back to build their own projects, in 1 case almost 10 times as large. From every country they come: India, China, Peru, Sweden, Russia, Palestine, Brazil. They are impressed by what we have done, by our know-how, by our resources. But they cannot understand why we have failed to develop America's greatest power stream to the limit of its amazing capacity. In a world that cries out for power, we deliberately turn our backs on the Nation's greatest potential power reservoir. We ignore the endless, inexhaustible power of our mightiest rivers, and instead we go to the far corners of the world to develop fuels that may be cut off at a moment's notice. While we are spending hundreds of millions overseas, we are imprudently denying the expenditures of funds for the development of our own self-replenishing power resources.

I am not objecting to the money which we are appropriating for overseas. I supported the Greco-Turkish loan proposal. I think it was sound from the standpoint of national security, and I am perfectly willing to stand on the speeches which I made on the floor of the Senate in support of that loan. But, Mr. President, the people of the Northwest take note of the fact that incorporated within that loan there is a considerable sum for the development of reclamation projects in Greece and Turkey. I think they have the right to ask the Eightieth Congress why they should receive less beneficial treatment than the people of Greece and Turkey in the development of reclamation projects over there.

I believe in consistency. I believe that the Eightieth Congress will not be consistent unless it appropriates funds on a self-liquidating, reimbursable basis to projects in the Northwest so that the people of the Northwest, our own fellow citizens, may enjoy the benefits of such appropriation.

If one reads the newspapers, one understands that it is contemplated that a substantial loan may be made to Mexico. On the basis of such facts, as I know about it, I do not think I shall be opposed to the loan, although I shall want to study it and take it under advisement before I make a final decision. But I understand, Mr. President, that it is contemplated to use a part of the loan for reclamation and power development in Mexico. Mexico sees the need of the development of her resources for the prosperity of her people. Again, Mr. President, the people of the Northwest will raise, and rightly so, the question: "If we have money to make available to other countries on loan, or in some instances 'on a loan basis,' certainly the Eightieth Congress ought to have money available to appropriate for the completion of these projects on a self-liquidating reimbursable basis." I believe that there are many people in America who will raise the question of consistency if we go forward with the fiscal program which the House has outlined and cut, to the drastic extent the House has done, the appropriations for these great projects of the West. While we are spending hundreds of millions overseas, we are imprudently denying the expenditures of funds for the development of our own self-replenishing power resources.

That, I submit is neither sound economy nor good foresight. To use an old but timely phrase, it is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The $20,000,000 the Department of the Interior is asking for the minimum orderly development of Columbia River power is less than half the cost of a modern battleship. But unlike other weapons, the dams and power lines and substations will not rapidly become obsolescent and insufficient. On the contrary, they will constantly add to our strength in times of peace or war. A single pound of aluminum, for example, requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electric energy. Installation of one more generator at Grand Coulee Dam, for example, will increase our aluminum capacity by 110,000,000 pounds a year. And with the development of our guided-missiles program we shall doubtless require unprecedented quantities of aluminum. Who of us here today is willing to stand up and say that in the event of another war we can afford to wait 18 to 24 months before reaching requisite aerial strength? Let us never again have the accusing phrase flung at us: "Too little and too late."

Finally, Mr. President, in considering the appropriations for the Columbia River development, I ask that Senators distinguish them from ordinary expenditures and regard them as an investment that will be repaid, dollar for dollar in power revenues, and many times over in national strength and security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table under the heading "Amounts required to restore reductions in Bureau of Reclamation's construction program"; also a table entitled "Analysis of Action by House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on Estimates of the Bonneville Power Administration."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amounts required to restore House reductions in Bureau of Reclamation's construction program

State	Project	Total estimated cost	Balance of total estimated cost to complete project	Budget estimate submitted to Congress	Amount passed by House	Estimated unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1948	Total available for 1948 on basis House allowance	Balance required to restore House reductions
Arizona	Gila	$44,179,100	$34,586,150	$2,500,000	$1,000,000		$1,000,000	$1,500,000
Arizona-California	Parker Dam power	16,624,400	328,000			$117,000	117,000	
Arizona-Nevada	Davis Dam	76,661,900	70,588,329	18,000,000	6,200,000		6,200,000	11,820,000
California	Central Valley	384,314,000	217,393,220	20,000,000	6,900,000	10,722,162	17,622,162	13,100,000
	Kings River			100,000	100,000		100,000	
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson	128,110,120	101,649,809	14,000,000	6,815,000	112,365	6,927,365	7,185,000
	Pine River	3,475,000	200,366	175,000	175,000		175,000	
	San Luis Valley	28,451,900	28,126,835			1,639,452	1,639,452	
Idaho	Boise-Payette division	13,020,347	7,673,967	897,000	897,000	2,065,486	2,962,486	
	Boise-Anderson ranch	26,264,000	8,393,324	4,136,000	3,874,000		3,874,000	262,000
	Minidoka	34,486,101	11,378,017			674,299	674,299	
	Palisades	29,746,000	29,446,850	2,629,000	876,000	1,076,000	1,952,000	1,753,000
Montana	Hungry Horse	48,319,000	48,132,193	4,500,000	1,550,000	358,588	1,908,588	2,950,000
	Sun River	9,500,000	200,100			43,600	43,600	
New Mexico	Carlsbad	2,600,000	55,747	21,000	21,000		21,000	
	Tucumcari	14,852,000	5,334,400			1,117,728	1,117,728	
New Mexico-Texas	Rio Grande	13,074,545	2,779,680	755,000	755,000	78,071	833,071	
Oklahoma	Lugert-Altus	11,902,780	5,124,314			2,003,530	2,003,530	
Oregon	Deschutes	11,327,000	4,623,217	1,526,000	1,626,000	1,494,500	3,120,500	
	Owyhee	18,825,000	334,515			157,007	157,007	
Oregon-California	Klamath	14,135,500	7,168,371	2,000,000	1,800,000	947,410	2,747,410	200,000
Texas	Colorado River	23,983,600	114,800					
Utah	Ogden River	4,492,009	132,007	30,000	30,000	35,007	65,007	
	Provo River	23,174,176	11,550,427	1,430,000	1,000,000	1,883,576	2,883,576	430,000
Washington	Columbia Basin	582,839,000	394,149,030	27,500,000	411,435,000	1,084,000	12,519,000	16,065,000
	Yakima-Roza division	19,662,500	4,579,639			1,095,728	1,095,728	
Wyoming	Kendrick	21,445,000	2,873,549			1,421,169	1,421,169	
	Riverton	11,658,000	5,212,000			3,653,350	3,653,350	
	Shoshone-Heart Mountain division							
	Shoshone-Willwood division	13,640,081	5,113,573	443,000	443,000	2,542,855	2,985,855	
	Shoshone-Power division							
	Colorado River Dam fund:							
California	All-American Canal	70,161,000	33,061,947	4,000,000	3,245,000	2,056,132	5,301,132	755,000
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon	152,000,000	15,317,553	800,000	400,000	797,713	1,197,713	400,000
All	Water conservation and utility projects	18,003,989	[1] 8,967,896			1,639,578	1,639,578	
Montana	Fort Peck	12,487,857	11,629,028	2,500,000	1,250,000	999,767	2,249,767	1,250,000
Texas	Valley gravity canal and storage	100,937,252	100,398,236			400,000	400,000	
Several	Missouri River Basin	808,301,924	803,374,116	23,000,000	9,786,600	4,815,000	4,601,600	13,213,400
	Lewiston Orchards	1,466,000	1,436,000		500,000		500,000	
Total		2,794,121,772	1,981,427,205	130,942,000	60,678,600	44,731,673	105,410,273	70,863,400

[1] Bureau costs only.

Analysis of action by House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on estimates of the Bonneville Power Administration

	Estimated total cost	Unobligated funds available June 30, 1947	1948 budget estimates					House committee recommendation			Restoration requested	
			Lines	Stations	Total	Contract authorization [1]	Total request	Lines	Stations	Total	Appropriation	Contract authorization
1. Transmission system facilities for which funds have been previously appropriated:												
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 1	$9,800,000	0	$5,103,000	$897,000	$6,000,000		$6,000,000	$1,000,000		$1,000,000	$5,000,000	
Snohomish-Arlington-Bellingham-Blaine	5,500,000	0	12,000		12,000		12,000	12,000		12,000		
Chehalis-Olympia	779,000	0	231,000	65,000	296,000		296,000	231,000		231,000	65,000	
McNary-LaGrande	1,573,000	0				$228,000	228,000			0		$228,000
Columbia substation additions	1,294,000	0		141,000	141,000		141,000			0	141,000	
Olympia-Shelton-Potlatch-Fairmont-Port Angeles	4,394,000	0	1,266,800	1,215,200	2,482,000	208,200	2,690,200	1,266,800		1,266,800	1,215,200	208,200
McNary-Pasco [2]	994,000	0	137,000	27,000	164,000		164,000	137,000	$27,000	164,000		
Olympia-Cosmopolis	1,204,000	0	376,000	185,000	561,000		561,000	376,000		376,000	185,000	
Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam	1,574,000	0	212,000	25,000	237,000		237,000	212,000	25,000	237,000		
Subtotal			7,337,800	2,555,200	9,893,000	436,200	10,329,200	3,234,800	52,000	3,286,800	6,606,200	436,200
2. Transmission system facilities for which funds have not been previously provided:												
Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 2	2,006,000	0				769,900	769,900			0		769,900
Detroit-Eugene	4,420,000	0	130,400	14,000	144,400	422,600	567,000	130,400		130,400	14,000	422,600
Goldendale-Detroit	6,588,000	0				602,000	602,000			0		602,000
Eugene-Reedsport	2,433,000	0	797,000	−164,300	961,300	368,000	1,329,300	797,000		797,000	164,300	368,000
Reedsport-Coos Bay	913,000	0	69,000	10,000	79,000		79,000	69,000		69,000	10,000	
Eugene-Roseburg	3,662,000	0				88,000	88,000			0		38,000
Idaho Panhandle	5,885,000	0				489,000	489,000			0		489,000
Covington-Olympia	4,377,000	0	51,000		51,000	650,000	701,000			0	51,000	650,000
Olympia-Shelton No. 2	426,000	0	31,700	3,000	34,700	92,300	127,000			0	34,700	92,300
N. Bonneville Troutdale	1,073,000	0	24,600	5,000	29,600	352,000	381,600	24,600		24,600	5,000	352,000
Customers' service facilities		0			1,730,000	1,000,000	2,730,000			0	1,730,000	1,000,000
Other capital additions		0			1,270,000	730,000	2,000,000			0	1,270,000	730,000
General structures		0			350,000		350,000			0	350,000	
Advance surveys and design		0			535,000		535,000			0	535,000	
Tools and equipment		0			500,000		500,000			100,000	400,000	
Subtotal		0	1,103,700	196,300	5,685,000	5,563,800	11,248,800	1,021,000		1,121,000	4,564,000	5,563,800
3. Operation, maintenance, marketing and administration		0					4,700,000			2,500,000	2,200,000	
Total		0	8,441,500	2,751,500	15,578,000	6,000,000	26,278,000	4,255,800	52,000	6,907,800	13,370,200	6,000,000

[1] No contract authorization was recommended.

[2] Construction power for McNary Dam at Umatilla, Oreg.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Industrial Northwest," published in the New York Times of May 11, 1947. I recommend a reading of this editorial to my fellow Senators. A great newspaper in the East has really caught the vision as to the economic importance of these projects to the economy of the entire country, and has very clearly demonstrated the desirability of keeping the East-West issue out of this fight for adequate appropriations for these projects because, after all, they are vital to the welfare of all our people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDUSTRIAL NORTHWEST

In 5 years the Pacific Northwest, which means Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana, has been transformed by electric power. Where once the lumberman's ax rang and farmers raised crops on irrigated soil there are now huge plants that produce aluminum, magnesium, ferro-alloys, heavy chemicals, airplanes, ships, and plutonium. It is safe to say that had it not been for Bonneville and Grand Coulee we could not have met the war demand for some of these materials. On the basis of energy deliveries the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system is the third largest in the country. Yet the Northwest is so hungry for power that it is clamoring for more. What this means, Ivan Bloch, of the Bonneville Power Administration recently told the Chicago Electrochemical Society.

When it was first projected the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system was regarded as an enterprise that could hardly pay for itself in decades. There was some reason for this pessimism. By a stroke of good luck the more important power plants were ready by the time we were preparing to enter the war. Instead of falling off with the arrival of peace, the demand for aluminum, magnesium and ferro-alloys is actually increasing, so that the Northwest is bound to grow industrially. The Niagara Falls plants cannot be expanded; TVA has about reached the limit of its hydropower possibilities; the St. Lawrence project may not offer much relief because of the rapid expansion of nonindustrial power requirements of this State. As Mr. Bloch sees it, the West remains the one great source of hydroelectric energy.

It is gratifying to learn that the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system has been a profitable investment. As of June 30, 1946, the Bonneville Power Administration has returned to the United States Treasury some $80,000,000—about one-fourth of the investment so far made, including interest. This financial showing is all the more remarkable because the 36,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours sold since 1938 have averaged 2.55 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those who proclaim the dawn of a new industrial day, now that a uranium pile may be substituted for coal or oil, may well ponder these figures. Nuclear fission cannot compete with falling water, which costs nothing. Whatever may happen in other parts of the world, the Northwest will rely on the Columbia River and its tributaries. A potential of some 25,000,000 kilowatts remains to be developed. There is more gold in the water of the Columbia than there is in any of the hills of the far West. Horace Greeley's advice to young men is still good.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum entitled "Appropriations for Power Activities."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR POWER ACTIVITIES

POLICY

It has been the consistent policy of the Congress (1) to require the development of hydroelectric power at multiple-purpose projects for the full conservation of our national resources; (2) to require that the rates for power reflect the full costs of the power development; (3) to give preference to public agencies and farmers' cooperatives in the disposal of this power; (4) to make these preferences effective and provide a sound business basis for power disposal by preventing monopolization of power benefits at a project by providing transmission lines and substations that make the power widely available to more than a single customer. (See TVA, Bonneville, Fort Peck, Reclamation, and Flood Control Acts.)

Current efforts to change these policies would halt development of multiple-purpose projects by curtailing essential appropriations for construction and administration of these developments. Thus the appropriation cuts provide a short cut to congressional consideration of such measures as the Thomas, Moore, and Dondero bills which would reverse present congressional policy by requiring power to be sold at dam site at higher rates and with ineffective provision for safeguarding public and cooperative power users.

POWER SUPPLY

Power consumption is today double that of 1938. Power use is a measure of full production and employment, and full production cannot be sustained without adequate power supplies. The tremendous increase in power supplies at Federal multiple-purpose projects since 1938 has made possible the greatly increased industrial employment in these 10 years.

The Nation is today operating its power plants, public and private, at near capacity and above the wartime peaks. At peak load this January, there were less than 7 percent reserves, a dangerous condition. Public agencies and private utilities alike are dependent upon projects now under construction for their purpose supplies. This is especially true in the Northwest, on the Pacific coast and in Arizona. Delays in getting power equipment will result in industrial curtailments and will put people out of work.

The installed capacity of Interior agencies has increased as follows:

Agency	1938	1946	Under construction [1]	Total 1952
	Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*	*Kilowatts*	*Kilowatts*
Bureau of Reclamation [2]	492,600	1,462,000	2,100,000	3,562,000
Bonneville Power Administration [3]	86,400	1,258,000	2,310,000	3,568,000
Southwestern Power Administration [4]	0	70,000	320,000	390,000
Eastern United States [5]	0	0	601,000	601,000
Total	579,000	2,790,000	5,331,000	8,121,000

[1] Projects authorized or under construction to be completed before 1952.
[2] Includes Fort Peck but excludes Grand Coulee.
[3] Includes Grand Coulee, McNary, Detroit, and Snake River.
[4] Includes 70,000 for doubling Norfork and Denison, and Bull Shoals, Blakely Mountain, Fort Gibson, Narrows, and Whitney.
[5] Buggs Island, Clarks Hill, Allatoona, Center Hill, Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow.

The total investment in power facilities for which the Department has responsibility for pay-out is $500,000,000. Construction underway by the Bureau of Reclamation and War Department will bring this investment figure to at least one and one-half billion by 1952. The return of this investment to the Government is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

APPROPRIATION CUTS

Division of power: The committee provided the Secretary of the Interior no funds for the supervision of the tremendous power responsibilities of the Department and specifically stated that he may use none of the funds for the division of power. Thus he may have no staff of experts to supervise and review rate determinations, cost allocations, operating practices, or contracts involving more than $30,000,000 of revenue annually to the Government. The division budget is less than $132,000, for this purpose; and $32,000 for marketing power from War Department projects east of the Mississippi.

No provision has been made for handling the sale of power from these eastern projects which will total over 600,000 kilowatts by 1952. The $32,000 of the Division's appropriation requested for this purpose is required for handling Cumberland River, Buggs Island, Clark Hill, and Allatoona power. It is evident that without adequate marketing work this power from these projects under construction will be wasted or will be monopolized at the dam site by a single utility purchaser at his own terms. If power is wasted at these projects because of delays in making arrangements for the transmission and sale of power, the loss to the Government would be on the order of $10,000 per day, or $3,770,000 per year.

Power sales agencies: The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration all were heavily cut:

Agency	Budget estimates	Recommended	Decrease
Southwestern Power Administration	$3,925,000	$1,371,000	$2,554,000
Bonneville Power Administration	26,278,000	[1] 6,907,800	19,370,000
Reclamation [2]	145,952,200	62,717,600	83,234,600

[1] Includes 6,000,000 contract authorization.
[2] Figures for entire agency; power items cannot be separated.

The Southwestern Power Administration appropriation will provide only for completion of the tie lines between Norfork and Denison and little funds for substations or feeder lines and excludes a connection to Tulsa.

The Bonneville Power Administration appropriation cut will cause serious difficulties in meeting the critical power shortages in the Northwest. Lines and substations necessary to take power to be developed at Grand Coulee have been eliminated. The operation and maintenance item for Bonneville has been cut in half; this will seriously jeopardize this public property in the Northwest.

Power items suffered the heaviest cuts in the reclamation program, especially in Central Valley, Fort Peck, and Davis Dam items. Only $260,000 have been allowed for transmission of commercial power in Central Valley.

Significant is the fact that in all these agencies transmission-line items have been

cut and substations eliminated. The committee suggests that the customers build substations, an unworkable arrangement in most cases and one that will increase power costs.

Force account has been specifically eliminated in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Fred A. Lothrop, department commander of the American Legion, at Portland, Oreg., in which he points out the objection of veterans to the provision found in the House bill, which would require that Bonneville hereafter contract its construction; that it shall not be allowed, as every private utility in the country makes a practice of doing, to build its high-voltage lines, for example. That is common practice among private utilities. Under the House action, and in the name of economy, it is proposed that Bonneville shall be required to contract for the construction of such lines. We can take judicial notice of the fact that that provision itself is not economical. It would increase the cost of construction of such lines. That has been clearly demonstrated. The main reason why Bonneville has been constructing those lines on its own account is that it can be done more cheaply in that way.

The House action will have another effect—and this is what Mr. Lothrop, department commander of the American Legion in Portland, is objecting to: It will destroy the employment preference which the veterans now enjoy in working for Bonneville in its construction department, because private contractors are not subject to such veterans' preference arrangements. So the provisions of the House bill would prove not only to be uneconomical, but would also prove to be to the disadvantage of veterans now employed in the Bonneville construction department.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., April 28, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Oregon American Legion places itself on record as strongly objecting to that part of the Interior Appropriation bill dealing with Bonneville Power Administration which contains a proviso "That no part of the appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis."

Such a proviso would constitute gross discrimination against veterans. It would deprive at least 166 employees who constitute about 64 percent of the construction crew of their preferential rights to employment as veterans and could only lead to additional increased unemployment for the veterans throughout the State.

We urge upon you that you bend every effort to defeat such a provision from the appropriation bill. Your cooperation will be very much appreciated by the Department of the American Legion of this State.

With kindest personal regards.

Respectfully yours,
FRED A. LOTHROP,
Department Commander.

P. S.—This thought has nothing to do with the amount of the total appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very fine editorial entitled "Killing the Goose," published in the Oregonian of May 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KILLING THE GOOSE

Among the departments the House Appropriations Committee considered superfluous in reporting out the Interior Department bill was the Division of Industrial and Resources Development of the Bonneville Power Administration. While the Senate is studying the drastic House reductions in the budgets for western power and reclamation, it is timely to consider the record of the industries and resources division of BPA and the case for its maintenance.

The division, headed by able Ivan Bloch, has been spending from $200,000 to $250,000 a year to develop industrial power markets. This is less than 2 percent of BPA's present revenues of $13,000,000 a year from industrial customers. Utilities customarily spend at least twice that much for all kinds of sales promotion. The division's budget for the next fiscal year, entirely eliminated by House action, was $300,000. What are the Northwest and the Nation getting in return for such expenditures?

This division had the major part in locating in the Northwest and in arranging for peacetime operation of those which are war babies of the following electroprocess plants, new plants, not transplanted eastern facilities; Aluminum Co. of America, Vancouver; Reynolds Metals company, Longview; Tacoma aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Kaiser; Troutdale aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Reynolds; Spokane aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Kaiser; Spokane aluminum rolling mill, now operated by Kaiser; Spokane magnesium plant; Wenatchee ferrosilicon alloy plants; Pacific Carbide & Alloys corporation's calcium carbide plant, Portland; Penn Salt company, Portland; Electrometallurgical plant for ferro-alloys and calcium carbide, Portland; Salem alumina plant, now producing fertilizer material.

These Bonneville customers have a total plant and equipment value of $160,000,000. Federal, State, and local Governments have collected more than $60,000,000 in taxes from them since their establishment. The total value of products manufactured by them is $475,000,000. They have provided direct employment to 7,500 persons, and indirect employment in mining, transportation, remanufacture, fabrication, and service industries to other thousands.

But the division does not limit its activities to establishment of industries served solely by Bonneville power. It was responsible, to a great extent, for these other plants: Oregon Electric Steel Co., Portland; Ohio Ferro-Alloys, Tacoma; and Tacoma Powdered Metal Co. It assisted in establishing the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. at Springfield, Oreg.; plants for manufacture of synthetic resin, and shipment of high-purity limestone for chemical purposes from Alaska. Samuel Moment of the division was chiefly responsible for Federal policies which saved the wartime aluminum plants of the Northwest for peacetime operation.

The division now is negotiating with important industrial concerns for the manufacture in the Northwest of phosphorus and phosphate fertilizer from the Idaho-Montana beds, hydrogen peroxide, silicon carbide, exothermic alloys, zinc, lithium, additional calcium carbide, rayon, acetic acid, aluminum fabricating such as wire and cable. The surveys, charts, and files of information compiled by the division and made available in reports which gained national attention and have been of invaluable assistance to industrialists and to communities seeking industries are exhaustive and authoritative.

Bonneville's industrial and resources development program, which means jobs and profits for the Northwest, markets for the rest of the Nation, and national strength if war comes again, is just entering a period of great productivity. It is beyond comprehension that Congress, if it has the facts, will finally decide to knock this wealth-producing agency on the head. A $300,000 investment—fully repaid out of earnings—is hardly a risk when measured by performance in creating hundreds of millions in new wealth.

Mr. MORSE. In this editorial the publisher, who is one of the best informed men in the Pacific Northwest on the subject of power development and reclamation, points out, as I have endeavored to point out to the Senate this afternoon, what an unsound program the Republican majority is really seeking to follow in this Congress by proposing any such fiscal cuts as the House adopted in its action on these western projects.

Mr. President, while I realize I have taken considerable time, I do not intend to apologize for doing so, because I need not apologize for fighting for the best interests of the people of the Pacific Northwest, and for the economic welfare of the entire country, and I think I have inconvenienced very few. I want to thank the Presiding Officer for his patient indulgence, and to thank the majority leader for his kindness in hearing me through.

I set out to make my record on these cuts. I have made the record, Mr. President, and I am willing to stand on it. I shall take the record to the Pacific Northwest. I shall fight until final action is taken in the Senate for the restoration of every dollar that can be restored to the budget of the Interior Department. I do not think it is possible for us to restore all that should be restored because of the action already taken by the House. That is the responsibility of the House. I say I do not think it is possible, because the history of appropriation legislation shows that after the House has cut appropriations and the Senate has restored what it can restore, there is always a compromise in the conference committee, and the compromise is usually somewhere between the House cut and the Senate restoration.

So I say, in closing, Mr. President, I am afraid that much of the damage has already been done. But that is no justification for my giving up the fight. I shall do everything I can to repair the damage. I wish to assure the Republicans in the Senate that, so far as I am concerned, I shall in all honesty do the best I can to explain to the people of the Northwest exactly what happened in the Eightieth Congress. I may say to the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress that it is not too late for them to rectify a great wrong which I think has been committed by the action of the House. I think the people of the Pacific Northwest, for the reasons which I have advanced in this long speech today, are entitled to a restoration of the full amount. I hope we can certainly restore a substantial amount, and that in the next session of the Congress we will think before we act—think the problem

through so thoroughly that we shall not repeat the great mistake which I think has already been made in regard to the western projects. If we do that, I believe the people of the Northwest will be patient and understanding. But of one thing I am certain, namely, that they have no intention of letting down in their determination to have these self-liquidating projects built in the shortest period of time and in the interest not only of their economy and that of the entire country, but in the interest of the security and welfare of the Nation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia;

Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general;

Charles H. Derry, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general;

Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr., of Pennsylvania, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

Richard D. Gatewood and sundry other persons to be consuls;

Charles R. Burrows and sundry other persons now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls;

William Bruce Lockling and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

William M. Bates and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

William K. Ailshie and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service; and

Paul H. Alling and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service.

STANTON GRIFFIS, AMBASSADOR TO POLAND

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland. In connection with the report, I request consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a series of letters relating to the appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the statement of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and series of letters relating to the appointment will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE NOMINATION OF STANTON GRIFFIS TO BE AMBASSADOR TO POLAND

The attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been directed to statements alleged to have been made prior to the entry of the United States into the war by Mr. Stanton Griffis whose nomination as Ambassador to Poland is under consideration by the Senate. Mr. Griffis is alleged to have made statements complimentary to Hitler and in admiration of Nazi principles.

In view of the importance of the post to which Mr. Griffis has been nominated and in order that the people of the United States might be assured that they will be represented by a man of American ideals the committee has carefully investigated the reported incident.

At the request of the committee persons who were present when the alleged remarks were made appeared before the committee. The testimony of these witnesses indicated a definite conflict in fact as to what was actually said.

The committee further received statements from five distinguished Americans in behalf of Mr. Griffis' character. Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, the Honorable Basil O'Connor, Chairman of the American Red Cross, and President Edmund E. Day of Cornell University, all of who have known Mr. Griffis over a long period of years, are unanimously of the opinion that he is a man of ability, honesty, and integrity and one who is admirably suited for the position for which he has been proposed.

In the light of Mr. Griffis' outstanding qualifications, the conflict in fact among witnesses as to statements attributed to Mr. Griffis in regard to Hitler and the unqualified endorsement by prominent Americans, the committee concludes that Mr. Stanton Griffis should be confirmed for the post to which he has been nominated.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 17, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: My acquaintance with Stanton Griffis is extended over 30 years. It has included both business and personal relationships.

I know him to be a man of capacity and ability, with deep faith and conviction in the principles upon which our Government is founded, of excellent character and of high patriotism.

From every standpoint he is qualified to serve his country, as he did, with considerable sacrifice, during the war.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1947.

Mr. DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.:

From my observation of Mr. Stanton Griffis as Commissioner, American Red Cross, Pacific Ocean areas, during the past war, I consider him a person of honor and integrity. I know of no reason why he should not be nominated and confirmed as United States Ambassador to Poland.

C. W. NIMITZ,
Fleet Admiral, U. S. Navy.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 16, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I should like to be recorded in favor of Stanton Griffis to be Ambassador to Poland.

I have been acquainted with Mr. Griffis for the past 4 years, due to work in prosecution of the war. I first met him when he was in charge of a branch of the Office of War Information.

In 1944 he undertook a mission to Sweden, for the purpose of reducing the economic assistance furnished by Sweden to Germany. I was familiar with the problems involved, which were intricate and difficult, and I had a number of meetings with Mr. Griffis in connection with this mission. He performed the work with marked success.

In the latter part of the war he served as director of Red Cross operations in the Pacific. His services in this capacity were also of outstanding merit

From my acquaintance with him and with his work during the war, I am convinced that he is of excellent character and of first-rate ability. I regard him as thoroughly qualified for the post.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman, Senate Committee
on Foreign Relations,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: The Acting Secretary of State has indicated that the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations would be interested in hearing from those acquainted with Mr. Stanton Griffis as to his character, loyalty, and ability.

I have known Stanton Griffis for 27 years. I have worked for him as a lawyer. I have worked with him in business and in social, educational, and humanitarian activities. He has worked for me as chairman of the American Red Cross. Sometimes one knows another for 27 years and knows very little about that other, but this is not true so far as Stanton Griffis and I are concerned. I have seen him on innumerable occasions—business-wise and social-wise—and I have had ample opportunity from the discussions I have had with him over this long period of time to form a seasoned judgment with respect to him.

Shortly after I became chairman of the American Red Cross and when I needed very badly a commissioner of the Red Cross in the Pacific, I turned to Stanton Griffis and at a great personal sacrifice he accepted that position at my urging and he rendered to the Red Cross and through the Red Cross to the American people a service for which he was quite properly awarded the Medal of Merit by the President of the United States of America.

The character of Stanton Griffis has never been questioned. Both his character and ability have been demonstrated over a period of some 40 years in New York City where, I think, I may say both character and ability are put to the most severe test. He has always had and still has the respect and admiration of the community in which he has been active, namely, New York City, during the 32 years that I have been there.

To me it is inconceivable that anyone would question the loyalty of Stanton Griffis to the United States of America. I know from my long acquaintance with him and my many contacts with him that no one could do so with any semblance of justice. Stanton Griffis represents the best of the American way of living and I am positive that he could harbor no thoughts except those involving devotion and gratitude to our way of living.

I have no reservation in saying to you, sir, that anyone who would indicate that Stanton Griffis at any time ever harbored pro-Nazi ideas has a disease of the mind easily recognized by well-trained physicians.

Faithfully yours,

BASIL O'CONNOR,
Chairman.

THE UNIVERSITY CLUB,
April 17, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I am told that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wishes to secure informed opinions regarding the qualifications of Mr. Stanton Griffis for the Ambassadorship to Poland. Since I have known Mr. Griffis well for the past several years, I venture to let you know what I think of him for this exacting appointment.

My acquaintance with Mr. Griffis dates from 1937. It was at that time that I assumed the presidency of Cornell University. Mr. Griffis was then, as he still is, a member of the University Board of Trustees and chairman of the Board's important Finance Committee. Inevitably he and I were thrown into many working contacts. This close association has continued since without interruption except for certain periods when he has been out of the country.

I have always deemed it a privilege to work with Mr. Griffis. Not that we have always seen eye to eye. As a matter of fact we have not infrequently disagreed decidedly. But these disagreements have not kept us from working together effectively nor have they lessened my respect for his capacity and integrity.

Mr. Griffis is a man of extraordinary ability. To a remarkable degree he is forthright, astute, courageous and constructive. He gets results. He is given to working for good causes and is essentially liberal in outlook. To charge him with being pro-Nazi, as I understand has been done, is absurd and wholly inconsistent with his known record.

For the important and difficult post for which he has been nominated, there is no one in my acquaintance who would seem to me better qualified.

Respectfully yours,

EDMUND E. DAY,
President, Cornell University.

P. S.—This is sent to you while I am on the road.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock in the forenoon of tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received May 13 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry W. Moursund, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice William R. Smith, Jr., resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(* Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT

*Awtrey, Hugh R.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Hoch, James E.
Leroy, James M.
Murray, Budd M.

ENSIGNS

Anderson, Albert A.
Armstrong, Francis L.
Beam, Jay K.
Brambilla, Marius G., Jr.
Branch, Henry S., Jr.
Brown, Barry W.
Casler, James B.
Cromer, Morris H.
Deatherage, Benjamin C.
DeBlanc, Albert C.
English, Thomas J.
Epps, Charles W.
Featherstone, Thomas A.
Foltz, Robert L.
*Foster, John P.
Franetovich, Francis L.
Gaines, Donald M.
Gibbs, James T.
*Gullette, George L.
Halford, James A., Jr.
Hall, Ozni D.
Hansen, John B.
Harris, Donald W.
Hawley, Edward R.
*Hazelett, Samuel E.
Howe, Thomas
Huling, Harold E.
Johnson, Arnol, Jr.
Johnson, Carl M.
Johnson, Donald W.
Johnston, Floyd M.
Jones, Alfred H.
Juhnke, Lyle A.
Keeman, Raymond J., Jr.
Kennedy, Henry G.
Kimpflen, Joseph F.
Knoche, John H.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Kuhns, Paul S.
Kujawa, Edwin A.
Langfur, Joshua A.
*Larkin, Murl A.
Leary, Lauris J.
Lewis, Asa H.
Liebmann, Howard F.
Maguire, Paul H.
Matthews, William D.
McConnell, James H.
McNeal, Cecil L.
*Moloney, Ralph T.
Newman, Hubert F.
O'Dougherty, Edwin
Plowman, Edwin L.
Poynter, Drexel E.
Ramsey, William B.
Reardon, Francis P.
Richardson, Dean C.
Rider, Richard G.
Robertson, Jack M.
Robertson, John A., Jr.
Robinson, Marvin K.
Roe, Charles R.
Rumsey, James F.
Sampson, Richard A.
Savage, Vann E.
Scoggin, John L.
*Seifert, Jerry R.
Sheridan, Martin J.
Smith, Richard F.
Snider, Alfred C.
Sorenson, Richard C.
Spencer, Erwin J.
Stearns, Theodore H.
Stern, Eugene "J", Jr.
Sutton, James C., Jr.
Tarpey, John F.
Thompson, Harold R.
Tillen, Frank J., Jr.
Tkoch, Walter
Tuggle, Charles M., Jr.
Twaddell, Miles E.
Wasco, Michael F.
Weekley, Eugene K.
Wheless, John C.
Yarbrough, John D.
Ziegler, William F.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Callaway, Raymond R.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Gard, Perry W.

ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Hague, James D.
Losner, Irving
Mattison, William L.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Appleby, Charles A.
Cryer, William E.
Ragland, Thomas W.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Abrams, Bernard
Bateman, Roger I.
Bollens, Alfred P.
Brown, Lowell E.
Burnham, William W.
Butchart, Robert L.
Claussenius, Richard
Hatton, Roy E.
Healy, Robert N.
Hobkirk, Carl N.
Hoffman, Rex V.
Keller, Bruce W.
Kennedy, Patrick F.
Kenyon, Floyd O.
Kiss, Richard C.
Krukow, Max E.
Lux, Donald A.
McGuire, Henry W.
Sylvester, Nelson J.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Gazda, Theodore E.
Locke, Harry A.
Timberlake, Lewis G.
Hobson, Harold E.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Hattendorf, Derwood F.
Sheppard, John R.
Smith, Roland C.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAIN

Crocker, Ralph J.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Harman, Walter E.
Lawrence, Oscar O.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Alsey, Howard M.
Camp, Jack E.
Gaumer, Chester T.
Hackett, Arthur E.
Rosier, Warren "W"
Yarbrough, Paschal R.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

LeCompte, James W.
McMullen, Alton R.
Myles, Clyde W.
Phillips, William R.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Grozier, Gaylord L.
Hesson, James F.
Orcutt, Lyle F.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Davis, George S.
Harley, Douglas M.
Howerton, Vance B.
Hunt, Joe H.
Judash, Joseph
Smith, Frank M.

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERKS

Daniel, Horace H.
Eads, Lyle W.
McClure, Philip A.
Olasky, Charles

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Williams, Lindley

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Bender, Merle D.
Dunning, Gordon
Lucas, Frank J.
Mattila, Martti
Patton, William A.
Reinhold, Edgar D.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 729, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Peter W. Adams, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Ezra H. Arkland, a citizen of New York.
Albert F. Belbusti, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Cothran, a citizen of California.
James W. Epley, a citizen of Illinois.
Jesus R. Flores, a citizen of Texas.
Harold D. Fredericks, a citizen of New York.
Cullen O. Henry, a citizen of New York.
Forest J. Hunt, a citizen of California.
Robert E. Izzo, a citizen of Ohio.
George C. Kliefoth, a citizen of Wisconsin.
Arthur F. Larievy, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.
Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Otto L. Marx, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Anthony V. Messina, a citizen of California.

Bromley Palamountain, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Martin Pearson, a citizen of Illinois.
Robert H. Rea, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Parks H. Simpson, a citizen of Texas.
Carl H. Smith, Jr., a citizen of Michigan.
Robert E. Steed, a citizen of North Carolina.
Joseph M. Vosmik, a citizen of Ohio.
David W. Walsh, a citizen of Massachusetts.
John J. Walsh, a citizen of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William S. McArthur, Ashford, Ala., in place of M. B. Wells, resigned.
George W. Carroll, Ozark, Ala., in place of Dan Carroll, transferred.

ALASKA

Maurice L. Briggs, Kodiak, Alaska, in place of Alexander King, resigned.

ARIZONA

Edith C. Ryan, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of P. D. Ryan, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Van Tyson, Atkins, Ark., in place of O. H. McCollum, deceased.
Clarence N. Wood, Colt, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
George W. Henderson, Waldron, Ark., in place of Theo Money, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Everett C. Ulrich, Livingston, Calif., in place of G. S. Butler, resigned.
Nellie J. Stonebarger, Los Olivos, Calif., in place of R. P. Lansing, resigned.
Joseph M. Queirolo, San Andreas, Calif., in place of G. H. Treat, retired.
Margaret M. Hale, Snelling, Calif., in place of D. H. Stout, resigned.

DELAWARE

Albert Bradford Carter, Camden, Del., in place of B. C. Dunn, resigned.

FLORIDA

Hazen M. Benson, Bunnell, Fla., in place of A. M. McDaniel, resigned.
Stanton M. Gideons, Webster, Fla., in place of P. A. Tompkins, resigned.

GEORGIA

Raymond T. Sills, Brookhaven, Ga., in place of L. D. Woodall, resigned.
William C. Griffin, Tunnel Hill, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ILLINOIS

Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office become Presidential July 1, 1945.
Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Fredrickson, transferred.
James P. McGannon, Flora, Ill., in place of C. H. Greenwood, deceased.
Ada J. Ulrich, Thomasboro, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

INDIANA

Cleophas F. Henderson, Bloomfield, Ind., in place of J. R. Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Robert L. Williams, Daleville, Ind., in place so E. C. Stewart, retired.

IOWA

J. Edward McDermott, Jamaica, Iowa, in place of J. E. Garrity, retired.
Frederick G. Nicklaus, Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of J. R. Strickland, retired.
George B. Kook, Wilton Junction, Iowa, in place of O. A. Burrows, resigned.

KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma, Kans., in place of Louie Haller, removed.

KENTUCKY

Harry Medlock, Annville, Ky., in place of E. A. Teague, retired.
William S. T. Johnson, Lawrenceburg, Ky., in place of R. E. Johnson, resigned.

MARYLAND

Frank A. Beachley, Braddock Heights, Md., in place of V. B. Remsburg, resigned.
E. Raymond Bounds, Ocean City, Md., in place of L. D. Lynch, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Albert O. Bullard, Jr., Sterling Junction, Mass., in place of J. H. O'Toole, retired.

MICHIGAN

George A. Stahl, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of J. K. Torrey, resigned.
Henry A. Torretti, Iron Mountain, Mich., in place of C. M. Dillon, retired.
Aloise B. Cherven, Roscommon, Mich., in place of R. K. Bresnahan, removed.

MINNESOTA

Clarence T. Nelson, Geneva, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Mayme W. Gustason, Winton, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

MISSOURI

Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Robert W. Rodgers, Hornersville, Mo., in place of C. C. Wilkins, deceased.

MONTANA

Clifford A. Brown, Dixon, Mont., in place of O. C. Clute, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.
Adeline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.

NEW YORK

Frederick J. Phillips, Fairport, N. Y., in place of J. J. Finnegan, resigned.
Arthur J. Walsh, Fishers Island, N. Y., in place of H. C. Hansen, retired.
Euclid A. Ganson, Haverstraw, N. Y., in place of J. L. Stecz, deceased.
Rodney G. Pownall, Pike, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bascom W. Rutherford, Enka, N. C., in place of R. A. Crowell, resigned.
Clarissa M. McDaniel, Garland, N. C., in place of T. L. Rich, transferred.
Frank M. Hood, Selma, N. C., in place of H. E. Earp, resigned.
Margaret A. Segroves, Varina, N. C., in place of J. B. Stephens, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

OHIO

Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.
Hobart E. Morehead, Rushville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OKLAHOMA

Glenn H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.
Edward P. Souligny, Ponca City, Okla., in place of W. B. Lucas, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William James Carey, Ardmore, Pa., in place of J. A. Barnes, deceased.
George Wesley Fordney, Enola, Pa., in place of L. E. Rich, resigned.
Lillie E. Armstrong, King of Prussia, Pa., in place of L. H. Morrison, resigned.
James C. Smith, Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of S. A. Bodkin, retired.
Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Maude E. Pemberton, Lancing, Tenn., in place of R. B. Quinn, transferred.
Gray D. Sands, Old Hickory, Tenn., in place of D. H. Ensley, removed.

TEXAS

Melvin E. Johnson, Cookville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Volna Ogden, Lefors, Tex., in place of G. C. Wolfe, retired.

VIRGINIA

Minnie C. Banton, Colony, Va., in place of Muncie Hill, resigned.
Clarence P. Noel, Jr., Mineral, Va., in place of F. J. Safley, retired.
Richard T. Thompson, Verona, Va., in place of J. H. Craig, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Longacre, W. Va., in place of J. C. Keesey resigned.

WISCONSIN

Florence E. Dexter, Trevor, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Thy testimonies are wonderful; therefore let our souls keep them; do Thou order our steps and let not iniquity have dominion over them. We pray for understanding hearts and discerning minds that by our endeavors all ranks of citizens may be advanced and that our whole duty may be revealed unto us. O spare our people from all false judgments and redeem our country from enmities at home and abroad, and teach us that the lasting treasure of life is the presence of Him who quiets alarms and stills the soul. We beseech Thee to substitute Thy power for our weakness, Thy righteousness for our sin, and Thy loyalty for our rebellion.

O bless and sanctify all homes and renew a right spirit within them; remember the little children who are growing into the years. We pray that Thy spirit may fan into a glowing flame the embers of purity and happiness on every hearthstone and make it a throne of whiteness and its life a temple of love.

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AID TO GREECE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the debate in this House on H. R. 2616, the so-called Greek-Turkish aid bill, must have reminded the Members of some ancient history. History repeats itself, even though sometimes the characters are reversed. The incident to which I refer occurred at the siege of Troy, when the Greeks sought to capture the city by siege and failed to do so. So they resorted to a ruse. They built an enormous wooden horse outside the city. In the dead of night they filled it with soldiers and moved it to the city gates. Then the Greek Army withdraw out of sight of the city, as if permanently retiring. The Trojans argued about

whether they should bring the horse in or not. One Sinon, in lengthy and effective oratory, claimed that for the welfare of the Trojans the horse should be brought in, but Laocoön argued against it. Shortly after Laocoön and his two sons were killed by serpents. This was regarded as a great omen that the gates should be opened and the horse brought in. So the horse was brought in. The Greek soldiers rushed out, opened the gates of Troy, and the remainder of their army rushed in and conquered the city.

Remember how, during the argument on H. R. 2616, some Members claimed the enormous foreign-built horse known as the Truman doctrine must be adopted by us as a necessity to our own welfare, while others urged us to beware of it as dangerous?

Of what I particularly want to remind our Members, Mr. Speaker, is that famous line from the second book of Virgil's Aeneid, in which Aeneas tells Dido the sad story of the capture of Troy, and where Laocoön says, "Quicquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." As you know, Mr. Speaker, a fair translation is: "Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even bearing gifts."

If the United States energetically follows the policy announced by the State Department at the hearings and contained in the committee report on H. R. 2616, to attain the proclaimed objectives, the Greeks may invent a phrase for it, and some day in the future some patriotic Greek may rise and say, "Whatever it is, I fear the Americans even bearing gifts."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

SEIZED GERMAN ASSETS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, upon the outbreak of the war emergency, the Alien Property Custodian seized and now has in his possession alien-owned properties of a value ranging from $600,000,000 to $8,000,000,000, according to different estimates. Pursuant to other legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury has seized millions upon millions of dollars which he is holding in his possession and under his control. The victorious American troops while marching through Germany came upon, and thereupon seized, millions of dollars of gold and other valuable assets; war prizes, so they are called.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds upon hundreds of American citizens have suffered tremendous losses as a consequence of enemy war action, yet their claims up to this time have not been satisfied, and no steps have been taken by the Congress to provide a procedure by which they may be asserted. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution, the Government of the United States not yet having a declared policy in reference to the disposition of alien enemy property or the judgment of the claims of American citizens arising out of enemy war action, which would set up a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee and a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which together would constitute a select committee of the Congress to ascertain the facts and, in the light of the facts, to recommend to this Congress legislation which will determine the policy of the United States in reference to this legislative subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to the favorable consideration of the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today in committee and to include certain charts, maps, and a report by investigators on the CAA.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Sam Pettingill on the subject What Russia Got So Far.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Minden Herald of May 9.

RESEARCH FOR COTTON

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I arise in the interest of an adequate appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural research program enacted in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I represent one of the largest cotton-producing districts in the United States. I come from the alluvial valley of Arkansas, which has continuously been at the top in cotton production for many years past. We are worried, and rightly so, about our cotton's future. You have but to look at the record of our cotton exports to appreciate the situation in which cotton finds itself.

In the years 1927–28, 9,000,000 bales of cotton were exported. In the years 1942–43, only 1,400,000 bales were shipped abroad. Not only is the cotton farmer losing his foreign markets, but he faces increased competition at home from paper, jute and, most especially, synthetics. Synthetics have appeared in the American markets to such an extent that the competition from these sources equals 1,500,000 bales of cotton at the present time.

It is absolutely necessary that new uses be found for cotton. The cotton industry has done everything possible to expand into new fields of domestic consumption. The National Cotton Council is spending a goodly sum of money annually on research, but the small amount this organization has available for this purpose is infinitesimal. Research is needed in order to improve the fiber itself, and methods of ginning and handling, spinning, weaving, finishing, and, most important, the finding of new uses and new markets for this commodity.

More money is spent for research on rayon, alone, than on all agricultural commodities combined.

A cotton garment is whiter. It is easy to launder. It holds its shape better and is as hard to wear out, yet in spite of all these fine qualities, rayon and nylon are fast encroaching upon our domestic distribution outlets, and if research funds are not made available, the future for cotton is very dark indeed.

More people earn a livelihood in connection with the planting, cultivation, harvesting, processing, and distribution of cotton than on any other agricultural commodity. I trust that an adequate appropriation will be speedily made available for agricultural research.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Dean Acheson as Under Secretary of State represents more than the loss of a good public servant. It should dramatize the failure of Congress to make provision for adequate salaries for those in the top executive, scientific, and professional service of the Government. Since I see my dear friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] looking at me rather skeptically, may I say that I think we can get the money by saving millions of dollars through the policies of capable men in these responsible jobs. It would be good business for us, in my opinion, to pay the executives enough money to keep private industry from taking them out of the public service.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I may say that I am willing to pay good men good salaries, but the thing I do not like about Dean Acheson is his trying to have these reciprocal trade agreements put over on the American people because he is thereby doing more for foreign countries than for America.

Mr. HAYS. I know the gentleman's convictions on that point, although I do not agree with him. We can agree, I

think, that we should not let good men be taken from the Government by private industry.

Mr. Acheson was an able public official. As understudy to several Secretaries of State, he brought to the State Department talent and ability that certainly could not be measured in terms of the salary paid to him. He resigned, as have so many other able men, because he could not afford to remain in the State Department, however challenging and interesting the job might be, at such a tremendous financial sacrifice.

He is returning to his old law firm in Washington and undoubtedly his unquestioned ability will enable him to earn several times the amount which he received with the Government. As much as we regret his resignation, we cannot fail to recognize that he was forced into taking such a step by a short-sighted policy that prevents us from making Federal service attractive to the type of men we need to run this gigantic governmental business of ours.

The truth of the matter is that Government salaries in the top brackets, where policy is made and executed, are much too low. We must recognize the fact that the Government is now competing with private industry in securing professional and executive brains and while the Government can never pay as much as private industry we can, at least, do a much better job than we have done in attracting able men to Government service and retaining them.

Jerry Kluttz, in his column, the Federal Diary, emphasized this problem on May 4. He said:

A top Federal official confided in me recently that every single top executive in his department, with the exception of three chiefs, had sought to resign because they could no longer afford to pay for the privilege of working for Uncle Sam. But just as tragic, he thought, is the fact that young and able people are getting out of Federal service—they can't see government as a career. And one of these days we'll all pay through the nose for this let-'em-eat-cake attitude. We won't have trained executives to carry on.

As I have said, the resignation of Mr. Acheson is only the latest in a series of resignations of able Government executives because of the salary limitations we have placed on Government career jobs.

The late Harold D. Smith, former Director of the Budget, was another example. As Director of the Budget, he supervised the greatest fiscal operation in the history of the country. Private industry did not have a comparable job. And yet for directing this great activity on a 12-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week basis, he received only $10,000. Because of his love for Government service he remained as Budget Director, in face of many offers from private industry at salaries several times what he was earning, until he was forced to resign for personal reasons.

These are not isolated cases. During a 3-month period last year more than 250 officials of the $5,000-and-up positions quit the Government, largely because they were underpaid.

The Christian Science Monitor recently called for a "fresh consideration of the whole question of Federal pay scales in the higher brackets to enable the Government to get good men and to benefit the country with better administration. To accomplish this is not an extravagence, but an economy."

It is imperative that we adjust salaries in the higher brackets. The only group of Federal workers—and perhaps in private industry, too—whose salaries have not been raised since before the war are the Cabinet, sub-Cabinet, heads of agencies, members of the boards, commissions, and so forth. Some of these men are paid only $9,000 a year, a pittance in comparison with equivalent positions in private business.

As far as rank-and-file employees are concerned, the recent 14-percent increase and the across-the-board raise for postal workers equalized many of the inequities in the Federal pay scale. It is time, I believe, for us to recognize the existence of even more apparent inequities in the pay scale for the higher-bracket employees and to take appropriate action.

In the first place, the $10,000 limitation on Government salaries should be removed and a ceiling more in line with conditions of today and the demands of public service substituted. As I have said, we cannot hope or expect to bring top Federal salaries into line with those in private industry but we can certainly reduce the wide margin which separates them today.

This wide discrepancy was emphasized by Mr. Kluttz in his column. He said the annual statement of a company operating a chain of 5-and-10-cent stores—and this is not an isolated case—revealed that six people last year were paid over $100,000, ranging from $113,000 to $330,000. In the next highest pay group between $50,000 and $100,000, were 59 employees. In this third group, 233 employees made between $20,000 and $50,000.

How many people in Government service, outside the President, could be placed in any of those salary groups?

International organizations have recognized the fact that to obtain the caliber of men necessary to make those agencies function the salary must be made attractive. For instance, the United Nations has set up this salary scale: Secretary General, $20,000; Assistant Secretary General—eight, $13,500; director of department, $10,000; section chief, $6,000–$8,400; intermediate officers, $4,700–$6,000.

In addition, each of the higher officials is granted a liberal expense account.

Another example is the World Bank as compared with the Export-Import Bank, a Government agency. The President and the Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank receive $15,000 a year while comparable officials of the World Bank receive $30,000—tax exempt. Members of the Board of the Export-Import Bank receive $12,000 a year while comparable officials of the World Bank receive $17,000—tax exempt.

Shortly before his death, Mr. Smith spoke strongly in favor of lifting the $10,000 ceiling on salaries, pointing out that President Truman had been unsuccessful in recruiting many able men to Government service because of their sheer inability to accept posts under the ceiling. He declared:

Yet, it may be ventured, there has never been a time in the history of this Nation when it had greater need for managerial talent. When the wise management of a program involving the expenditures of billions of dollars is of paramount importance the compensation paid executives would not seem to be a material issue. The question is not whether the Federal Government can afford to bid against private enterprise for managerial ability, but whether it can afford to do so.

I was pleased to learn from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that the Committee on Civil Service will probably consider several proposals for correcting this situation. It was apparent in last year's debate over the salary adjustment bill that the salaries to be paid top executive and professional officials involved a basic governmental policy rather than an adjustment problem. It was generally recognized that this problem could not be considered in connection with a cost-of-living factor. This policy decision was, therefore, postponed, but it should now receive the earnest attention of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

APPROPRIATION FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to announce for the information of Members, many of whom have made inquiry, that at the proper time in the consideration of the appropriation bill that will come up before the House today, I expect to offer an amendment to restore $4,849,000 to the Commerce Department appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the purpose of operating air-traffic control towers across the Nation.

A number of inquiries have been made and I expect to offer that amendment at the proper time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a decision rendered by the Supreme Court on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report he made on

forestry before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pursuant to the order granted at the time of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, that I may be permitted to extend my remarks at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a copy of a resolution adopted by the twenty-fifth national convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Portland, Oreg., on the 5th day of September 1946, relating to national defense, and in the other an article appearing in the publication known as Our Town, Minneapolis, Minn., April 19, by Joseph P. Polowsky, a very interesting recital of an incident occurring on the Elbe at the close of the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon notwithstanding the fact that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, any doubt as to the character of the so-called loan to Turkey which this House recently voted has been dispelled by Turkish President İnönü's announcement of yesterday that the $100,000,000 American loan would be used for strictly military purposes. Moreover, Turkish officials at Istanbul have brazenly announced their expectation that the so-called loan would be a grant, in the form of military materials.

Mr. Speaker, not only are we allying ourselves with the most reactionary and despotic governments in Europe, but we are granting them outright subsidies, pouring hard-earned American dollars down a drain from which we have no intention of ever retrieving them.

Mr. Speaker, this aid has been called a loan to deceive our own citizens, but the greedy Turks have stripped off the mask of deception from our aid bill and have shamelessly described it for what it is—a plain hand-out from American taxpayers who are indebted to Turkey for absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, it is simple hypocrisy for the Turkish President to declare there is no Armenian problem in Turkey, where Christians are still deprived of elementary civil rights, where they live in fear, remembering the terrible slaughter of Greeks and Armenians after World War I, even if we have forgotten it. Let me read to you a cable from the Armenian National Council of Egypt to the Speaker of this House. I quote:

> We wonder why American citizens should financially and morally support the country, which, under power of profitable neutrality, backed Nazi Germany during the war while Armenian soldiers together with Americans profusely shed their blood for freedom and democracy.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that he will report to the House this week a bill authorizing the appropriation and expenditure of $35,000,000 to complete the suspended construction of housing facilities for veterans in the various university and school towns and cities of the country. This measure will be supported, in my opinion, by a unanimous vote of the House.

The University of Tennessee is bursting at the seams with GI students. The housing facilities in the city of Knoxville are wholly inadequate to take care of them. Many of them are married and are living in trailers and other crowded quarters with their wives and children. This $35,000,000 will afford them quick relief. They have more than earned the right to an education and to adequate and comfortable housing facilities. Along with my colleagues, I shall gladly support this measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast in which she participated.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cumberland News.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue during the remainder of the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and myself.

Mr. ROONEY. That is agreeable to this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with my general statement I wish to take this opportunity to personally thank the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, Mr. ROBERT JONES, of Ohio; Mr. WALT HORAN, of Washington; Mr. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York; Mr. J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia; Mr. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois.

I wish to state I had unusual cooperation from these fine statesmen, who have given much of their valuable time in going into the many phases of this very important bill, which makes appropriations for four of the very important departments of our Government.

I cannot help but commend the work of our executive secretary, Mr. Orescan,

for the unusual and efficient work he performed both during the hearings and in writing the reports and for the assistance he rendered to each member of this committee.

The pending appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Federal judiciary is in line with the record of this Congress to reduce the price of government.

The price of government has advanced by leaps and bounds during the last decade. Along with the necessary rise to win the war, there has been a steady expansion of nonwar projects entailing more personnel, more office space, more money from the taxpayers.

The mounting cost of bureaucracy is an inflation breeder no less than other factors in the private affairs of the people. It all adds to the cost of living. Passage of this bill will help reverse the unwholesome trend. That is what the country is demanding.

The Appropriations Committee, during the short time at its disposal, has been able to scratch only the surface of needless expenditures. But we have seen enough to leave no doubt that with continued careful scrutiny, greater reduction in the price of government can be made.

There has been no reckless swinging of a meat ax by the committee, as some of the vested interests in the executive branch of the Government would have the country believe. That would not be wise economy. We aim for efficiency at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers for the necessary functions of government.

The pending State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 provides a total of $535,728,008. That is $162,893,515 less than President Truman recommended. It is 23.5 percent less than what he asked.

The President has said it would be false economy to cut his budget substantially. The committee, upon careful examination of his recommendation for the agencies covered by this bill, found places to lop off expenditures in the interest of less costly and better government.

The amount carried in the bill is a paper increase of $26,948,330 over the $508,779,678 that was appropriated for fiscal year 1947. I say "paper increase" because there is an item of $50,000,000 for the State Department in connection with acquisition of diplomatic quarters abroad that will be reimbursed to the Federal Treasury when circuitous deals under lend-lease settlements are completed. Therefore, in reality, the pending measure provides $23,051,670 less than was allowed for the present fiscal year.

I also want to point out that there are some new activities, such as projects connected with the United Nations, that had to be provided for in this bill. And there is the substantial item of $32,500,000 for the Nation-wide airports program that Congress has authorized.

Although hostilities in the war are over and it is axiomatic that Government expenditures should drop tremendously, the Truman administration had the audacity to ask for funds that actually would add to the present swollen Federal pay roll.

In the four departments covered by this bill there are now about 86,200 employees. Under the Budget Bureau estimates, that number of Government employees would be increased to about 98,550, or 12,350 more than they have now. Under the bill, there will be a substantial reduction in the present number of Government employees.

I want to direct the attention of the House and the country especially to the Departments of State and Commerce. These departments have strayed far from the path of true economy in Government. Sweeping reorganization and modernization are imperative. It is a job that cannot be done overnight. It should be started now.

The State Department has become an uncoordinated series of offices, divisions, and sundry offshoots. It has become the repository of a variety of functions with a variety of missions to perform.

The committee believes that it is getting into fields of Government far removed from the historic conception of the State Department as the diplomatic arm of the Government.

In recent years there have been frequent changes in the holder of the office of Secretary of State. The new Secretaries barely had time to familiarize themselves with major problems in international relations before they were succeeded by others.

Meanwhile, it is evident that the mass of subdivisions and offshoots in the Department went their separate ways without someone to coordinate the coordinators.

This is a situation we hope that Secretary Marshall will handle as soon as possible. It is a situation that makes for inefficiency and ultimately in a higher price for government.

When there is related to the total amount recommended in this bill for 1948 the urgent need for economy in government for the relief of the taxpayers and as a buttress against threatening inflation, it should become obvious that the four departments encompassed in this bill have been adequately provided for. I realize, as I am sure other thoughtful Members of Congress do also, that it is not always practicable in discussing appropriation bills to refer to a prewar level, just as it was not practicable to refer to a prewar level when appropriation bills for the fiscal years immediately following the First World War were discussed.

The world has traveled far since 1939, and this Nation, in order to retain its relative position in the world, also must travel. I am not too sure that one can always properly suggest a return to normalcy. It is merely a relative term connected with the various phases of our historical development.

The matter that seems to be giving the most concern to the Committee on Appropriations, however, and which has concerned me individually as chairman of the subcommittee responsible for providing funds for the four increasingly responsible agencies of the Government, is the extent to which some of these agencies have been reluctant to let go of war-created functions. They cannot understand that the war is over, and even the United States cannot afford the debatable luxury of an overstaffed, sprawling bureaucracy.

Furthermore, none of the officials of these agencies who appeared before the committee has taken more than a casual interest in the fiscal situation of this Nation. The further impression received by individual members of the committee in the course of the hearings is that the various officials in control of the activities of the departments and of the bureaus of these departments have not, as yet, taken any cognizance of the existing wave of opposition that is sweeping the country to the existing high costs of running the Federal Government, together with the feeling that perhaps the Nation is being overgoverned.

The concept of the purpose of government has, as we all know, altered considerably in the last 13 or 14 years. The voters last November indicated definitely that they had enough of the concept of government that had developed in Washington over recent years. This Congress, I am sure, will do everything in its power to comply with the people's mandate.

Absolutely no assistance has been rendered this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations by the officials of these departments in the attainment of this goal. Perhaps it is the fault of the budgetary system under which we operate, and, if so, I, for one, think it should be changed. The job of governing, and governing efficiently and economically, is the responsibility of both the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government. These branches should work jointly in the interests of the people. Lack of cooperation results in inefficiency and poor government and waste in the expenditure of public funds.

Despite this lack of cooperation on the part of the officials in the executive departments that appeared before the committee, and despite their strong contentions, with the exception of Ambassador Austin, who appeared in behalf of the appropriation for our participation in United Nations and who voluntarily suggested a reduction, that every dollar requested was needed, the committee was enabled to effect some savings.

The majority of the committee is convinced that the reductions that have been made will in no way impair the necessary operations of the departments covered by this bill.

Now, I will go more into detail, first taking up the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

This Department has expanded from a total of 5,420 employees and $17,000,000 in 1939, to 9,760 employees and $53,000,000 in 1944, or at the peak of the war, and 24,560 and almost $180,000,000 in the current year. The total request for 1948 is 25,760 regular employees and almost $280,000,000. As is explained in the committee report, however, adjusting factors reduce the 1948 allowance to about $62,000,000 for comparison with 1939. Even then the amount is nearly 400 percent of what it was before the war.

The Department has grown too rapidly. It is not sufficiently compact and co-

ordinated effectively to meet the needs of present-day problems. The Department is attempting to do too much outside the sphere of direct international relations.

The committee is recommending a little over $219,000,000, a reduction of about $60,400,000 under the budget estimates. This compares with an appropriation of about $181,500,000 for the current fiscal year.

I have dealt with appropriations of the Department of State for many years. Through these years of association with the Department and its activities, I have arrived at certain conclusions concerning this important branch of our Federal establishment which, if the House will bear with me briefly, I should like to summarize at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is discussing a proposition to enable the Members to determine whether we are going to appropriate money to send abroad or for our own folks at home and I think the Members ought to hear it. I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Allen, Calif.	Fellows	O'Hara
Barden	Flannagan	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Fletcher	Patterson
Bennett, Mo.	Fuller	Pfeifer
Bland	Fulton	Philbin
Bloom	Gifford	Ploeser
Boggs, La.	Granger	Plumley
Boykin	Gregory	Potts
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Rabin
Buffett	Holifield	Rains
Butler	Jarman	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Canfield	Kearney	Richlman
Celler	Kearns	Sabath
Chapman	Kelley	Scott, Hardie
Clements	Keogh	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Clippinger	Kilburn	Shafer
Coffin	King	Smith, Maine
Combs	Klein	Smith, Ohio
Cooley	Lane	Somers
Coudert	Latham	Stigler
D'Alesandro	LeFevre	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Lemke	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Thomason
Delaney	McDowell	Vinson
Dirksen	McGarvey	Vorys
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Tex.	Welchel
Donohue	Marcantonio	West
Ellis	Merrow	Wolcott
Elsaesser	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Elston	Mitchell	
Fallon	Nodar	
Feighan	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 328 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] will proceed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I think the membership will be interested to know that the Senate has just passed the labor bill by a vote of 68 to 24. That is nearly 74 percent, about the same as the percentage in the House. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Foreign Service representatives, in this country and in the embassies and consulates throughout the world, have a single criterion of action. They must get as much as they can honorably get for their own country. Our American ambassadors and their staffs hold their posts from the United States Government. They must be wholeheartedly for that Government. They must always put the interests of that Government first.

The Foreign Service officer may be of material assistance to the nationals of the country in which he serves the United States. The American diplomat may even be in a position to aid in world understanding. Yet, his first—his only—loyalty belongs to this Republic. Compared to this, all else is incidental.

This loyalty begins at home. It begins with honorable dealings between the Department and Congress. It entails the praiseworthy purpose of obtaining appropriations with full disclosure to Congress of the uses to which they are to be put. It involves the prompt, regular, and complete reports to Congress of financial transactions pertaining to claims, trade and transportation concessions, and cultural relations agreements, affecting this and other countries, entered into by the Department's representatives abroad.

A long and continuous record of honesty in these and similar transactions would, indeed, go far to facilitate swift and sympathetic consideration of matters in which the Department requires legislative approval.

Conversely, ignoring Congress or keeping Congress only partially aware of the over-all aims and the daily activities of the Department of State would have effect of thrusting a wedge between two branches of Government which should work together as a team. The importance of establishing a relationship between Congress and the Department of State in which each mutually respects the integrity of the other is not to be exaggerated.

In considering appropriations for the Department of State, a paucity of information on policies governing the various divisions and even the Department as a whole was apparent. Witness after witness from the Department, when asked the policy under which he was operating—information considered necessary in arriving at the necessary amount of funds—said that he did not know the policy. It seems that the policy changes in some fields from day to day. Plainly, there is need for action on this matter by the Secretary of State.

Before I refer to some of the individual items of appropriation for the Department, I would like to say a few words concerning the information and cultural program of the Department. As has already been reported in the press, and as many Members of Congress have been informed several days preceding the official reporting of this bill, the amount of $31,381,220 requested for this program is denied by the committee. The reason I comment on this now is because the cost of this program is distributed among several items of appropriation and accordingly, must be treated as a specific project.

The reasons for the committee's action are several. In the first place, the activity is not authorized by the Congress. This is considerably more than a "technicality" as erroneously described by certain individuals, who apparently are not wholly informed on the legislative processes of their Government. The committee feels that such a radical departure in the methods of conducting our foreign relations should have the approval of the people through their Representatives in the Congress. Much less vital problems, both domestic and international, are almost daily receiving the consideration of the Congress.

Secondly, it is felt that a Government-sponsored program is out of tune with American precedents and American principles, and even though the news and other programs are as objective as represented, this committee, at least, does not feel that our Government should further remain in the news business.

In the third place, inquiry by the committee has shown that the program is not efficiently administered.

While some of the radio news broadcasts appear to some persons to be of some value, most of the remaining programs do not even come close to fulfilling the desire for information which may exist in the minds of the people abroad.

A list of books presented to the committee and headed "Books sent to the cultural centers in the other American Republics July 1, 1946—February 1, 1947," with the total list and net—after discount—cost indicated, and signed by the Acting Chief of the Division of Libraries and Institutes, contained at least one book unworthy of any public activity. Purchase of this book was denied by Mr. Benton.

With respect to the art program, I am not in a position to say whether the selection of modern art pictures being distributed abroad represent good or poor art. Mr. Benton, himself, had no opinion in the matter inasmuch as he could not even distinguish the subject matter of a half-dozen or so pictures included in the group that was purchased by the Department.

However, the committee could not remain unmindful of the many hundreds of letters received in protest to this program. If we are going abroad to impress people, we should try to impress the average individual rather than a certain segment of the art colony.

We have UNESCO, a United Nations undertaking in which much interest

is developing, and which, as established, will truly represent the views of the American people. Further, let us encourage private enterprise to a greater international activity through international efforts to eliminate the red tape presently involved in travel and exchange of commodities. Let us develop greater cooperation between the Department of State and private media of information for a proper presentation of American life abroad.

Our forebears planted on this soil the seed of liberty and freedom, which, if properly nurtured, should outgrow our boundaries and reach out into the rest of the world; not through a centralized disseminating agency but through the force of its own dynamics.

I feel that the dire results predicted for the future of this Nation if this program is eliminated are tremendously exaggerated. It was testified that prior to the war, there were six short-wave broadcasting stations beaming news and other programs to the rest of the world. I also want to quote from a statement issued recently by the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation:

"A false impression has been created in the last few days that if the State Department should lose its appropriation to continue Government-sponsored short-wave broadcasts, all radio voices from America to people abroad would be cut off. This is entirely misleading and erroneous," according to Walter S. Lemmon, president and founder of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation, which built up daily broadcasts over the powerful short-wave radio station WRUL in Boston. * * *

"The accurate dissemination of information and American culture to all parts of Europe and Latin America by radio was successfully carried on through widespread public support, long before the wartime OWI and its OIC successor in the State Department was set up," Mr. Lemmon added. "Our foundation, in active operation since 1935, was broadcasting in 24 different languages authentic information of American life and culture, in cooperation with Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia, and other institutions. This work was temporarily suspended during the war and is now being resumed and expanded. * * *

"Letters from listeners all over Europe and the Middle East now being received by the foundation attest that its nongovernmental programs are being eagerly received. We will continue to broadcast over WRUL and its associated transmitters, in 10 languages to all parts of Europe, during the best evening hours when people there can listen," Mr. Lemmon said today in a statement issued from the New York office of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation, at 598 Madison Avenue. * * *

"The work of this nonprofit organization in the fields of international education, and the fostering of world understanding by radio, was started 12 years ago with grants from the Rockefeller Foundation. Since that time, the basis of support has been broadened to include annual contributions from the several thousand public-spirited citizens and American corporations, eager to preserve and spread a knowledge of the American way of life with truly democratic freedom of expression. * * *

"Last year WRUL conducted a successful fight before Congress to preserve freedom of radio, when Assistant Secretary of State William Benton tried to force the station to lease all of its radio time to the Government, without leaving any hours for nongovernmental programs from America. This action was forestalled by Senator BALL's amendment to the State Department appropriation bill which prevents such monopoly of broadcasting from being created by any Government bureau. * * *

"If any portion of the appropriation requested by Mr. Benton for the next fiscal year is finally approved by Congress," Mr. Lemmon stated, "we are convinced that if these funds were to be spent in leasing certain blocks of radio time, and assisting the foreign language program staffs of the existing American international radio stations, the effectiveness of the broadcasts furthering our foreign policy would be markedly increased, and considerable economy in the use of public funds would be achieved. I strongly recommend that such a procedure be followed. * * *

"Our Government is now fostering the reestablishment after the war of America's overseas aviation and transoceanic shipping, by helping to rebuild private enterprise in these fields, without trying to force them into Government monopoly controls. However, it seems to be Mr. Benton's purpose in radio to perpetuate and enlarge the wartime OWI type of bureau, and to stifle private initiative and enterprise, through monopoly measures, in this important field of disseminating ideas from America," Mr. Lemmon concluded.

In concluding my comments on this item, I should like to repeat what I told Assistant Secretary of State William Benton in answer to his statement in which he referred to our pending aid to Greece and Turkey:

All I know is that there is a bill in our Congress asking taxpayers of the United States to send $400,000,000 as a starter to Greece and Turkey, because the British are no longer to stay there and that they are leaving, and in some way we are to take their place to help Greece and Turkey from the inroads being made by the Communists. But, I still feel that food is more important for Europe today than words of any kind. It is too late for words so far as hungry men, women, and children are concerned, and there are millions of them over there with hands outstretched asking for something to eat.

The bill includes $23,400,000 for so-called domestic activities of the Department, of which amount $2,650,000 is for surplus property disposal to which I will refer a little later. The amount of $20,000,000 is included for departmental salaries and expenses.

When it is recalled that all items included in the item "Salaries and expenses," totaled $2,728,347 in 1940, $3,453,000 in 1941, $4,377,105 in 1942, $5,986,800 in 1943, and even up to something over $13,000,000 in 1946, it was extremely difficult for this committee, during this period of need for economy, to reconcile itself to a need in excess of $18,000,000 for the regular activities. There is no doubt but what if world conditions were somewhat less disturbing than at present a greater reduction in funds would have been made.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

The disposition of surplus property abroad imposed on the State Department by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and for which $2,650,000 is included in the bill is really not a function of the Department of State. This activity appears to be conducted rather efficiently under the direction of Gen. Donald H. Connolly.

It is reported that as of March 1, 1947, approximately $7,790,000,000 in surplus property had been disposed of during the 18 months in which declarations were made by the owning agencies. The remaining inventory balance is estimated at $1,336,000,000 with $1,850,000,000 of declarations definitely in view, or a total of approximately $2,500,000,000 worth of property to be disposed of during fiscal year 1948. The total in cash, credit, and local currencies realized on the property disposed of as of March 1, 1947, is $1,691,000,000, or 23.3 percent of the original cost. Of this total, $400,000,000 is in cash.

Credits and local currencies are used for the sending of American students abroad under the Fulbright Act, and the purchase of property under the Foreign Service Buildings Act. The largest portion of the assets—over and above the cash—represents long-term credits to, as of February 28, 1947, 30 countries and 5 private entities.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

For the Foreign Service, the bill includes $119,670,000. This item also has grown tremendously since 1939—from 3,730 employees to almost 12,000 in 1947, and a requested 14,540 in 1948. The elimination of the information program eliminates something over 2,000 from the total requested. The same comments I just made to the Department as a whole also apply to this service—that is, that it still might be too large for efficient performance. I hope that Secretary Marshall will soon make an analysis of the entire Department with the idea of pulling in the loose ends and making it a more compact and harder-hitting organization.

During this time, when we are carefully scrutinizing every item of expenditure, and are intent on cutting to the bone all unnecessary governmental waste, it is not proposed that we do without adequate official representation abroad. What we are trying to do is to get the most for the American taxpayers' money—and the best.

In these comments on the Foreign Service, it would be impossible not to consider the relationship of our diplomacy and our diplomats to the newly formed United Nations. To have men dealing with the representatives of the United Nations who are not completely American in their point of view would be to invite disaster to our country and to the United Nations.

Nowadays, the diplomat is beset at every turn by propaganda perils. He must not fail in keeping his Government informed as to all trends in order that it may not be taken in by a surprise move. For this, we need men on the spot well versed in diplomatic methods and language, who know what sort of information to look for, where to find it, and how to appraise its value when he does get it.

What we have come to call diplomacy in the last several years has failed to achieve beneficial results and has led us into all too many disasters. But, what we have had to call diplomacy was not the real diplomacy. It was the assumption of responsible diplomatic functions

by star-gazers and inexperienced amateurs. It was evidenced in the method of having the negotiation of infinitely complicated world problems by tyros and adventurers. It was the forcing on the world in critical times of new and untried methods. It has often consisted of mere publicity stunts. The result has contributed to world-wide chaos.

It is my considered opinion that through embarking on a continuing campaign of close cooperation and frank interchange of ideas with Congress, with establishing as the paramount ideal of the service, the devotion to this country and this country alone, and by the proper choice and payment of personnel, that real diplomacy can be restored to this Republic.

The aims, purposes, and activities of this restored American diplomacy must and shall be directed toward making this country strong at home and understood and respected abroad. Restored diplomacy is, indeed, our first line of defense, our major bulwark against war in this atomic age.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

I want to say a word about the representation allowances for which the committee has recommended $500,000, a reduction of $618,000 under the budget estimates and $300,000 under the current year's appropriation.

This appropriation has climbed steadily from $125,000 in 1938 to the requested $1,118,000 for 1948. The average allotment per chief of mission has increased from approximately $2,000 in 1938 to $5,130 in 1947 and $5,627 proposed for 1948. In this connection, I point out that under Public Law 724 each chief of mission is also entitled to a maintenance-of-residence allowance ranging, as proposed in the estimates, from $2,500 to $20,000 annually. Representation allowances for ranking subordinates and other officers of the Foreign Service have likewise increased tremendously since 1938.

A review of copies of vouchers on file in the State Department very definitely indicates that there is too much entertaining for other than absolutely necessary purposes. In one instance, the same individual gave a reception each day for approximately 3 weeks.

These vouchers further disclosed the fact that the Foreign Service officers are spending considerable sums of money in entertaining each other.

This is not the purpose for which this type of allowance was originated. The committee felt that it has been more than liberal in providing the sum recommended in the bill and wishes to inform the State Department that a continued review of these expenditures will be made by the committee for its information in connection with future requests.

FOREIGN-PROPERTY PURCHASES

It should be explained that the $50,000,000 item appearing in appropriations for the Department of State Foreign Building Office is not an appropriation of new funds.

The properties which this sum is intended to cover are, as you know, being secured through the operations of Public Law 547, which authorizes the Department to secure needed properties in return for credits due on obligations from foreign governments. Most of the properties we are coming into possession of are through lend-lease settlements, or sales of surplus materials all over the world, or as credits on account of reparations.

Public Law 547 is the authorizing legislation under which advantage can be taken of these foreign obligations, but, nevertheless, all amounts involved should follow regular appropriation channels. It is merely a bookkeeping transaction.

When a piece of property valuable for this Government is located, the Foreign Building Office negotiates with the owner, and when an equitable valuation is reached the property is deeded to this Government, and the amount involved is credited to the foreign government on any obligations it may have running to the United States. The sum requested is not new money to be expended, but merely an appropriation into the Treasury for accounting purposes.

For the several items under the heading "International obligations," the committee has included in the bill the amount of $76,000,000. Of this amount, $45,000,000 is recommended for the Philippine rehabilitation program, for which activity there was appropriated, during the current year, almost $48,000,000. However, it was disclosed in the hearings that the total amount of the current appropriation that remained unobligated as of February 28 of this year was nearly $40,000,000. This amount will be available for expenditure and obligation in the fiscal year 1948.

Another item under this general heading is the International Boundary and Water Commission, for which nearly $5,000,000 is recommended. The situation here, as with the Philippine rehabilitation program, is that large unencumbered balances which will be available in the ensuing fiscal year made it unnecessary for the committee to appropriate the full amount of the request. It was testified that approximately $6,250,000 is estimated to be unobligated as of June 30 of this year, which, together with what has been appropriated, will give this activity approximately $1,000,000 more than it presently has available.

With respect to the cooperation program with the other American republics, the committee allowed $3,000,000, which is $2,375,000 under the current year's appropriation and $2,820,000 below the budget estimates. It was the thought of the committee in making this reduction that while this program has, in the past, contributed somewhat to a better understanding among the peoples of this hemisphere, much of the money previously appropriated has not been wisely spent. I am sure that our South American neighbors, realizing that this Congress is economy-minded, will go along with us in our attempt to reduce expenses and thus strengthen the position of this Nation for its increasingly important role in the Western Hemisphere.

The full amounts for our participation in United Nations and UNESCO were allowed, approximately $12,580,000 for the former and $3,700,000 for the latter activity. It was felt that on both of these organizations lies the major responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world, and the committee wishes to give them every opportunity for success.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For the Department of Justice, the bill includes something over $108,000,000 and represents a reduction of over $1,000,000 under the current appropriations. This department is, by its very nature, primarily a service organization and, with but few exceptions, renders services either imposed upon it by other agencies of the Government or specifically outlined for it by statute.

The total number of employees has not varied to any appreciable extent in this Department during the past 6 or 7 years. In 1941, it had something over 19,600 with a wartime high in 1944 of almost 29,000 employees. Appropriations recommended will permit the average employment of approximately 23,000 employees in 1948.

The greatest increase that has taken place in employment in this department during the last few years has been in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, to some extent, in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

With respect to the legal activities and general administration, or the law offices of the Department, the committee made no appreciable deductions in the budget estimates except in a few instances where it was thought that additional economies could be effected.

The largest single increase over the current year allowed was for the Antitrust Division. However, of the $280,900 increase allowed, $250,000 is for railroad reparations cases. This division was recently requested by the Army, the Navy, and the Bureau of the Budget to attempt to recapture for the Government money paid the railroads for the hauling of freight during the war period, alleged to be in excess of the fair and proper rates.

The Lands Division, for which approximately $2,500,000 is included in the bill, continues to be weighted down with cases resulting from the Government's acquisition of land for war purposes. The disturbing feature of the activities of this division is that both the Army and the Navy, as well as other agencies of the Government, are, on the one hand, continuing to acquire through condemnation, purchase, or otherwise, many tracts of land throughout the United States, whereas, on the other hand, they are declaring a great number of tracts as surplus.

I believe that this is costing the taxpayers of this Nation a tremendous amount of money and I am of the definite opinion that someone in the Bureau of the Budget, or elsewhere in the executive branch of the Government, should take hold of this matter with the idea of restricting the further acquisition of land in this country, unless it is determined to be absolutely vital to the needs of the agencies involved.

THE FBI

Turning to the Federal Bureau of Investigation we, of course, all know the

record of accomplishments of this agency under the leadership of its Director, John Edgar Hoover. I believe that the committee was unanimous in granting Mr. Hoover the full amount of his request, or $35,000,000.

This agency carried a heavy burden during the war period. However, it continues to carry heavy responsibility during this critical period in our history when the situation throughout the world is not as we should like to have it. Director Hoover testified before the committee that the investigative work of his bureau continues to be exceedingly heavy.

The printed testimony shows that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had more than 63,000 investigative matters pending on January 1, of this year, as compared with approximately 58,000 cases as of January 1, last year.

We must remember that during the last decade we have placed many additional responsibilities on this agency. For example, during the last seven fiscal years the Congress has placed on the statute books no less than 50 additional statutes increasing the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A number of bills have been introduced in the present Congress which will further increase the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if they are favorably acted upon.

In addition, as we all know, crime has increased throughout the country. I earnestly recommend that all of my colleagues carefully read Mr. Hoover's testimony given before the committee concerning the present crime problem facing our country today. Mr. Hoover reported that during the calendar year 1946 major crimes committed throughout the country increased 7 percent over 1945.

The regular criminal work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reflects a dangerous increase—kidnaping and bank robbery are increasing. There is an increase in auto thefts and thefts from interstate shipments involving dangerous hijacking gangs.

The criminal element must be served with notice that we, the Members of Congress, intended to insure a continued virile law enforcement to control their activities. It is in this way, and in this way only, that we can give to our children and our children's children the birthright of a free and unfettered life.

The committee allowed the Immigration and Naturalization Service approximately $27,500,000, a reduction of $1,500,000 under the budget estimates. The cost of this service has increased steadily from approximately $9,690,000 in 1938 to the $28,945,000 requested for 1948. In reviewing the activities of this organization, the committee received the impression that this service was doing more detailed work in connection with immigration and naturalization than would seem to be implied in the laws under which it is operating. Otherwise, there is no accounting for the tremendous increase in the cost of operating this organization.

Some additional work has been imposed on the service through the displaced persons program. Also, there has been additional work through the increase in the number of visitors that have been arriving since the war period, together with an increase of nonimmigrant aliens which, however, has been partially offset by the decline in the number of quota aliens that have been admitted during the war and immediately following the war.

Even then, it seems to me, and it was the thought of most of the members of the committee, that the increased operating costs are somewhat out of proportion to the increased workload as reflected in the statistics furnished the committee.

With respect to the Federal Prison System under this Department, the committee is advised that the prison population is expected to remain about the same as the current year or approximately 19,000 inmates. Food and other costs have gone up somewhat and a slight increase has been allowed penal and correctional institutions. Reductions were made in requests for major plant additions and extensions of capital equipment. In general, the total of all appropriations allowed for this service approximates that allowed for the current year.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Now we come to the Department of Commerce. The greatest reduction effected by the committee is in this Department. I strongly believe in an efficient and well operated Department to serve the Nation's economy, but I do not believe in continuing war-born activities nor in the expenditure of public funds in nursing American business and supplying it information not altogether vital to its needs, either through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Bureau of Standards, or the Census Bureau.

It also was rather evident to the committee that especially since the days of Henry Wallace, layer upon layer of additional authority seems to have been created both at the Bureau level and at the top or secretary level. This Department, if it is to serve business and industry, should be operated on a more business-like basis.

In the fiscal year 1941, this Department, including the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, since transferred out of the Department, was operated with a total personnel of 14,030. The total employment as of February, 28,1947, was 36,270 employees of which about 5,800 are part-time employees. The request for 1948 is for 41,637 employees of which about 4,700 would be of a temporary or part-time nature.

When there is excluded from this comparison the personnel from the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Bureau of Marine Inspection, which is no longer in the Department, the 1941 personnel is 7,300, as compared with a proposed personnel for 1948 of approximately 13,700.

Further, excluding these items from the total appropriations, the comparison is about $41,500,000 in the fiscal year 1941 as compared with $97,000,000 requested for 1948.

A good illustration of what has been going on is the Office of Technical Services under the Office of the Secretary. This activity is an outgrowth of the National Inventor's Council created during the war for the purpose of screening inventions that might prove useful in the war effort. This organization as such was created immediately following the war for the purpose of acquiring German technological information for dissemination to American industry. Some useful work was done.

However, the Department now desires to continue this unit and expand its activities to the extent that it would become just another scientific and research organization in the Federal Government.

The committee is recommending that the unfinished portion of the work of this unit be transferred to the Bureau of Standards or the Patent Office, or both, and that the activity as such be abolished.

For the Census Bureau, the bill includes $10,500,000, a reduction of $8,705,000 under the estimates.

The feeling of the committee in this matter is that many of the continuing censuses are neither authorized or necessary, and I, for one, feel that the economy of the country will not be any worse off for the lack of some of these statistics.

For instance, the amount of $130,000 was requested for the census of electrical industries covering, among other things, telephone, telegraph, and local transit industries.

I am informed that nearly all of this information is available in the Interstate Commerce Commission and in the industries themselves. As a matter of fact, I was informed that most of the information is secured from the industries.

It seems ridiculous to me to go to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. for information as to the number of existing or needed telephones, and then hand it back to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in the form of a Government report.

The committee felt that the item of census of manufactures is justified. However, it reduced the amount from $5,000,000 to $4,000,000 on information that much of the information was already available through the taking of current census statistics.

I personally am unable to visualize the eventual annual cost of maintaining and operating our Federal airways system. The appropriations for this activity have climbed from $10,878,500 in 1938 to a budget estimate for 1948 of almost $190,000,000. Excluding from this budget estimate the amount of $65,000,000 proposed for the Federal aid airport program, the balance of $125,000,000, as will be seen, is still approximately 1,200 percent of the 1938 appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, what concerns me most in this matter of cost,

however, is the predictions made almost daily by individuals connected with the air industry that this is only the beginning, and that great increases in the number of airplanes and in personnel in the air industry generally are ahead of us.

As an indication of how this industry has grown, I might point out that the number of domestic civil aircraft produced in 1941 was a little over 8,000. It is estimated at 50,000 in 1948. The total registered aircraft in 1941 was 22,500 and estimated at 171,000 in 1948. The number of certificated pilots and student pilots' certificates issued yearly have increased proportionately.

The total revenue passenger-miles was 1,300,000,000 in 1938 and estimated at 7,500,000,000 in 1948. It seems obvious to me that the Federal Government cannot afford to continue to increase appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration in proportion to the increased air activity.

The administration is requesting a total of 19,324 positions for 1948 for the discharging of the Government's responsibilities under the various laws enacted by the Congress. Think of it, almost 20,000 persons to operate and maintain a Federal airways system, for an estimated 1,200 scheduled air-carrier aircraft and an estimated 8,000 nonscheduled air-carrier operators.

I refer to these two types of operations because it is for them primarily that the Federal airways system exists. Very little, if any, use can be made of our Federal airways system by the private flier.

It has been contended and it is, of course, true, that these carriers pay into the United States Treasury in the form of taxes, a portion of the cost of the Federal airways system. Other industries pay taxes, also, and I am wondering how far we should go and can go in subsidizing a particular industry so that we may be able to say, "Well we do get a certain portion of it back."

To make matters worse, the administration has interpreted much too liberally the general laws under which it operates. It has for years done things for the industry which the industry would prefer to do for itself. I believe that the perspective, insofar as Federal participation in the aviation industry is concerned, either has been warped by the war or lost completely. We just must stop long enough to analyze our position and to determine the direction in which we are heading.

The committee is recommending $119,507,000 for this activity including the Washington National Airport. Of the reduction of something over $70,000,000 approximately $18,000,000 is in the item "Salaries and expenses" and is based on factual information in the hands of the committee as a result of an investigation it made of the Civil Aeronautics Administration operations. The details of this reduction are explained in the report in greater detail.

However, I might say here that the reduction includes the amount of $4,849,000 for air-traffic-control towers. This committee eliminated fund for control towers when it reported out the fiscal year 1947 bill.

It is now more than ever convinced that these towers should be operated by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derive the benefit from the traffic of the airports. Last year, the funds for these towers were restored on the floor of the House on the pretex that safety was involved.

I can say unequivocally that with the transfer of the cost of operating these towers the safety factor is in no way affected. The towers would continue to be operated by Civil Aeronautics Administration personnel and under CAA standards, and the cities and municipalities would merely reimburse the $25,000 or $35,000 each annually for the operation of the towers.

The actual maintenance of these towers, that is, installing equipment and keeping it in first-class condition, would continue to be a responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and funds are provided for that purpose.

With regard to the establishment of air navigation facilities, the committee is recommending $17,638,000, which, together with $9,050,000 estimated to be carried over from the current year's appropriation, will give the Civil Aeronautics Administration approximately $26,700,000 for this purpose. There are so many new types of equipment presently being developed that the committee in its report has strongly urged the Civil Aeronautics Administration to have the entire airways system studied by a board of disinterested radio and electronics experts.

I want to say here that this committee has been very favorable to the development of aviation in this country. It is as much concerned with safety in aviation as, perhaps, any group connected with aviation. Our safety record for 1946 stands as the best in the history of aviation. Of the accidents that have been reported during the years that statistics have been maintained, it is estimated that approximately 70 percent of the accidents have been the result of human errors. Devices alone cannot insure safety. Sound and far-sighted administration is more important.

With respect to the Federal aid airport program, the bill includes $32,500,000 or one-half of the total requested. The House membership should be informed that the Civil Aeronautics Administration will carry over into the succeeding fiscal year approximately $41,000,000 of the current appropriation of $45,000,000 for this purpose. The committee does not feel that the program as a whole will be in any way endangered by this reduction.

I want to comment just briefly on the operation of the Washington National Airport, for which the amount of $1,236,000 is included in the bill. The yearly passenger traffic at this airport exceeded 1,250,000 in the calendar year 1946. The indications are that this total will be exceeded in 1947. This activity is nearly self-sustaining, with revenues expected to exceed $1,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948. This revenue will be further increased following the expiration of some of the long-term agreements with concessionaires made by former officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The bill includes $2,535,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Board. As with other activities connected with aviation, the work of this organization has also increased. As of the end of 1941, the Board had certificated 107,300 miles. At the end of 1946 there were 207,400 miles. It is estimated that at the end of 1948 there will be nearly 300,000 certificated route-miles.

The committee has included in the bill the amount of $9,550,000 for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. This organization is doing important work in the promotion of safe navigation on the sea and in the air, as well as establishing geodetic controls necessary for public construction, especially dams, flood-control work, and airports.

Among other things that this organization does is prepare air maps for distribution to the Federal Government and private industry. It is hoped that the making of maps for the use of the private air industry can be disposed of, and that private air map makers be given an opportunity to reestablish themselves in the business which seems to have been concentrated in the Federal Government during the war.

With respect to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the committee has included in the bill the amount of $7,000,000. I want to inform the membership, however, that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce exists in theory only, its work having been divided into five separate offices, the head of each responsible to the Under Secretary. This Bureau was operated as a bureau and rendered efficient service economically—that is, until the advent of Mr. Henry Wallace.

The year after he became Secretary of Commerce, appropriations jumped from about $2,838,000 to $10,550,000, which is the appropriation for the current fiscal year. It is very doubtful that the country has been in any way benefited by the expenditure of this increased amount of money.

The present organizational structure of the Bureau is, to my mind, not only costly but impractical. The committee has recommended in its report that the Bureau be reestablished on the former basis until such time as the Congress sees fit to amend the enabling legislation.

I do not know that I can tell you too much about the Patent Office, except that it is daily accumulating a greater backlog in the issuance of patents, designs, and trademarks. While I admit that patents have, perhaps, increased in complexity and require more detailed research in the processing of applications, there still seems to be great room for improvement in the operation of that office.

I also realize that the efficiency of this office was impaired during the war because of the lack of qualified personnel and because of split operations. However, looking to the future, the estimated productivity, as detailed in the hearings, is somewhat alarming. This office has always had available more funds than it could spend. Still, it is daily getting behind in its work.

It is not amiss to suggest that the management and planning groups in this office, and in the Department generally, might step aside long enough to have the patent situation studied by a group of disinterested experts. It is obviously very detrimental to the economy of the country for a patent applicant to wait anywhere from 26 to 34 months to receive final action on his patent.

The committee was quite concerned with what seems to be a continuation into the postwar period, of work that was both initiated by and imposed on the Bureau of Standards during the war. There is in this organization, as in one or two other bureaus in the Department of Commerce, a tendency to compete with industry in research, and a reluctance to dispense with some of the activities that were initiated in the interest of the war effort.

Of course, many of the research and testing projects have a definite postwar value, but I do not think that the Bureau of Standards should be embarking on many of these projects before it is definitely determined what private industry itself is doing along the same lines.

It seems to me that there is plenty of room for improvement in the development of greater cooperation between this Bureau and private research and testing organizations. Accordingly, the committee allowed for this item $7,415,000, a reduction of $3,205,000 in the budget estimates. Of the amount allowed $6,000,000 is for research and testing, which is more than three times the prewar appropriation.

The price of weather predictions, in line with other commodities, has increased within the last few years. The cost is high, regardless of the type—good weather or bad weather.

This, of course, is a vital service to the economy of this country and should be developed to better serve the Nation, but this organization, as other Federal institutions, must retrench and eliminate some of the less vital functions in which it has been engaged. It was felt that an allowance of $21,000,000, which is almost three times the prewar appropriation, should be more than adequate to enable the Bureau to continue to render efficient service.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY

For the entire Federal judiciary system, including the Supreme Court, the committee is recommending almost $17,200,000. The personnel of the Supreme Court remains about the same as in preceding years. Included in the amount recommended is approximately $1,270,000, which represents salary increases for judges, provided by the act of July 31, 1946.

I should like to call to the attention of the membership the action of the commitee with respect to two items which were considered. The first is the item of "Miscellaneous salaries," which covers the compensation of law clerks and secretaries to the Federal judges. The language, as proposed by the judiciary, was not authorized by the Congress, and for that reason the item is eliminated from the bill.

The officials of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the judges themselves, have been aware for some time that legislation was needed. While legislation exists for the employment of law clerks, at a maximum salary of $2,750 for district judges and $3,000 for circuit judges, none exists for the employment of secretaries. Legislation should be sought immediately to provide for the services of these employees at salaries determined to be necessary.

The committee allowed the amount of $700,000 of $1,430,000 requested to reduce the number of existing referees in bankruptcy, all of whom are on a fee basis at the present time, and to place 117 referees on a salary basis ranging from $7,000 to $10,000 per annum.

This item was included in the bill in conformity with the provisions of Public Law 464, approved June 28, 1946. It was testified that it would take approximately 20,000 bankruptcy cases per year to make this service self-sustaining. The total of bankruptcy cases filed in the year 1946 was 10,196. The 40-year average is something over 38,000 cases per year, indicating a substantial yearly return to the Federal Government over a period of years, and at the same time improving the administration of our bankruptcy laws.

If there are questions, I shall be very happy to answer them at this time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have listened with great interest to the gentleman. May I ask him if he has any specific information on the proposed construction of new airports?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have in mind my own home county, Broome County, N. Y., the board of supervisors of which has authorized an appropriation to be matched with Federal Government funds. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me about that.

Mr. STEFAN. The Congress last year under an authorization appropriated $45,000,000 as a start for a Federal airport program to aid the States. Most of that money was to be used for class 1, 2, and 3 airports and much has already been allocated to the various States. The allocation made to the States will not be lost to them. The 1948 money was to be used for class 4 or larger airports.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman. In connection with the gentleman's remarks about the foreign radio broadcasting conducted under the auspices of the State Department, has the gentleman any information as to what benefits there have been thus far by that program?

Mr. STEFAN. We recently started a station in Munich in Bavaria which is being heard in Russia.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have read considerably about it. I wonder what the gentleman's opinion is and whether he feels that this type of broadcasting has been of any use in furthering the republican form of government such as we have here in America and just what the effect of it is in foreign countries.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is too early to really discuss the results or effects at this time for the reason that we have only recently started broadcasting in Russian to Russia from Munich.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. One further question regarding the item of entertainment of foreign diplomats and so forth. As I understand it, there has been a considerable cut in that appropriation of nearly one-half. Perhaps the gentleman covered it in his remarks, but it occurs to me that with the high degree of intelligence of our men in the State Department certainly it is not necessary to ply the other foreign diplomats with spirituous beverages. It seems to me that in view of their ability they do not need such great amounts of money for entertainment in order to accomplish the purposes and objectives that they are sent out to accomplish.

Mr. STEFAN. As long as we have had foreign missions we have had representation allowances or prestige allowances. This committee is not opposed to that, if the funds are modest and used for purposes originally intended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman give the committee some picture of the way these representation allowances have been used?

Mr. STEFAN. I think I covered that in my general statement.

Mr. TABER. Do they entertain the Foreign Service itself or rather do they entertain foreigners?

Mr. STEFAN. The reason the committee cut the appropriations is that we felt the entire funds should be reviewed because we found in some cases there was some misuse of the funds.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEFAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. How many cases of misuse were found?

Mr. STEFAN. A large number of them.

Mrs. BOLTON. What ratio?

Mr. STEFAN. Do you want the percentages? I have not gone over the vouchers for every mission in the world. I do not know the ratio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask concerning the principle upon which the cuts were made? Were they made on the basis of misuse or on the basis of the need for adequate funds for proper representation?

Mr. STEFAN. They were made on the basis of need and misuse both. We think the amount requested is too high.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I say in conclusion I agree entirely with the gentleman in the position that he has taken. I think our State Department with the bright, intelligent men who are supposed to be working in it could certainly do their work and accomplish their objectives without the use of some of these spirituous beverages we hear so much talk about.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to return, if I may, to the airport-control-tower provision of this bill. As I understand it, the committee saw fit to

strike out all Federal control of the control towers throughout the entire United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, no. Safety matters are not concerned at all. All we struck out was the salaries of the tower employees. The cities and States are not busted. Certainly, when the Government builds airports for them, can they not pay the salaries of a few men who are up in those towers? We furnish the equipment and the safety aids and the Federal airways. Why can they not participate a little in the payment of this huge expense? We have 134 of these operated by the Government. We have several hundred that want the same service and we cannot give it. There is no extent to the amount the Government would have to pay if you paid the salaries of control-tower operators at all the airports now requesting this subsidy.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am one of those Representatives who is interested in a field that is not receiving Federal funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course not. St. Joseph, Mo., is paying their own control operations. A town close by is being paid for out of the Federal Treasury. All we are asking you to do is to pay for your own operators to operate the towers. The entire program should be reviewed by the legislative committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There are funds in this bill to replace equipment as it becomes necessary to replace it? All except the payment of salaries?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think if you have uniform control throughout the United States it would be a big safety factor?

Mr. STEFAN. It does not enter the question at all. Uniformity remains.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Coming back to the Voice of America, I only know what I have read in the papers about it, but it brings up a situation that has developed every year since I have been a Member of this House. I am willing to vote "yes" or "no" on legislation that comes from the Foreign Affairs Committee. I would not want to state at this moment how I would vote because I have not heard the story. But in case the committee brings in an unfavorable report or does not offer any legislation, it has always been the practice that after bills leave the House they go to another body and then they come back and they have money tacked on them for things that are not authorized by law. I would like to have the gentleman explain that.

Mr. STEFAN. The committee left this item out because it is not authorized by law. General Marshall and Gen. Bedell Smith, who is Ambassador to Russia, made quite an impression on some of us. They both think we need some counterpropaganda. Russia and some of the satellite countries are saying things about the United States that are not absolutely true. They think some modest and effective counterpropaganda should be continued. But the people's representatives in Congress should have something to say about it. There should be some law. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] knows that in his town of Boston, Mass., the Voice of America has never been stilled. Fifty percent of the broadcasting being done now is being done by private industry, including the station in the home of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Perhaps private industry can do more of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield is that I was interested in his observation that it was not authorized by law. The gentleman is of the opinion that proper propaganda work should be engaged in?

Mr. STEFAN. A certain amount more effective and less expensive. Some of the informational work that has been done does not meet the approval of the American people.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is in agreement with that?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. PRIEST. Just one question. I appreciate the splendid statement of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. In response to a question asked by the gentleman from Missouri in reference to whether the safety factor was involved in the operation of air-traffic controls, the report of the committee states that they feel these powers should be operated by CAA personnel. There is nothing in the bill, however, that would require that the towers be operated by CAA personnel.

Mr. STEFAN. There are towers right now being operated by CAA personnel paid by local municipalities.

Mr. PRIEST. But there is nothing that requires that it should be done uniformly throughout the country. There is no law requiring it.

Mr. STEFAN. No law that I know of.

Mr. PRIEST. It appears to me that the question of safety is a very vital factor.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think the gentleman will have cause for worry, for Congress is anxious to have CAA supervision in order that they may have a uniform operation of control towers. We are for safety.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the House subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments authorized to investigate publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies intends to scrutinize the activities of the Interior Department employees on the west coast. Information now before my committee indicates that employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have been attending public meetings, urging that appropriation slashes be restored to carry out programs of public power projects sponsored by the Interior Department, and asking that new items be included.

The committee will check to determine whether or not Federal laws prohibiting the use of public funds for propaganda purposes to influence Congress have been violated. I refer particularly to section 201 of title 18 of the Federal statutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOLGER. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset and before this House I wish to pay my sincere respects to the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this important appropriation bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. The hearings on this appropriation bill began the first part of February, and through the many, many weeks that followed in the course of the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska was most patient and tolerant of the other members of the committee and their ideas, and was eminently fair and just in each of the decisions he was called upon to make. I say on behalf of the minority members of the committee that it was a genuine pleasure to have served under the chairmanship of such a fine gentleman as the gentleman from Nebraska. The same applies to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. They are all fine hard-working intelligent gentlemen.

However, I do not want you to gain the impression that we agreed on all the items in this appropriation bill, because once again the minority Appropriations Committee members found themselves confronted with a situation where the reduction of amounts by the majority was the usual meat-ax slashing that has been so familiar since we first started on the appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year.

In a number of instances the majority members of the Appropriations Committee have hidden behind points of order. They always raise points of order except when they apply to certain items in which they are politically interested. The opposite prevails on other occasions. Barely 2 weeks ago when we had before the House the Interior Department appropriation bill the House Committee on Appropriations under strict command of the majority went to the Rules Committee and obtained a rule waiving

a point of order with regard to the location of an anthracite research laboratory so as to effectuate a transfer of the plans of the Interior Department to build it at Hazleton, Pa., to a cross-roads town I never heard of before, called Schuylkill Haven. It was all right in that instance for the majority to go to the Rules Committee and obtain a rule waiving the point of order. But why did not the majority in the Committee on Appropriations go to the Rules Committee on this bill and obtain a rule waiving points of order with reference to the foreign information and cultural program of the State Department, which the chairman of this committee says he is in favor of? Why did they not go to the Rules Committee and obtain a rule which would have permitted an item in this bill entitled "Miscellaneous salaries"—the judiciary—which they took out of the bill in the entire amount of $1,833,500? Do you know what that item means? That item supplies the law secretaries and law clerks and certain librarians, even some building custodians, for the Federal judiciary throughout this Nation. It has been in this appropriation bill for years. The majority at no time heretofore raised the question on this appropriation or sought to reduce the amount of it.

I say that insofar as this particular appropriation bill is concerned, the committee like the mountain labored and brought forth an economy mouse.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the RECORD ought to be clear on this point-of-order proposition. We know that the majority of the Appropriations Committee could have included an appropriation for the Voice of America and for our radio activities abroad; they could have gone to the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. That has been done very frequently and, as the gentleman said, it was done recently when there was an attempt by one group of Republicans to take a project from another Member of the House. These were Republican Members of the House. They put it in the bill, went to the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving the point of order. So this idea they cannot include an item in this appropriation bill because it is not authorized by law, of course, is not correct, because they could have done it, then got a rule from the Rules Committee waiving the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the gentleman knows there was an authorization for that anthracite laboratory.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; there was an authorization for the anthracite laboratory but I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania ever saw an appropriation bill previously which directed the department to locate a project, such as the building of a laboratory, in a particular cross-roads town of a particular State.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania only did that when it was a gross violation of the enacting legislation that made the laboratory possible.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I appreciate what the gentleman says, but I cannot agree with him.

Mr. FENTON. I just wanted to point out to the gentleman that there is no comparison in the two instances that he just quoted.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, that is only the contention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is not my idea. I think the situations are thoroughly analogous.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield, with the hope that shortly thereafter I may be permitted to continue with my remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely it is the same situation. In that case there was no authority in law for the Committee on Appropriations to take the action it did. The majority put it in the bill and they went to the Rules Committee, waiving points of order, and the same thing here. If the majority of the committee wanted to put in an appropriation for the Voice of America, it could have been done. They could have gone to the Committee on Rules waiving points of order and a majority of the House, adopting that rule, no Member could have raised the point of order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am a little surprised at the distinguished majority whip taking the position he does today. He advises this committee to violate the rules of the House, which he has always sacredly respected, on the floor at least. He well knows that under the rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction to report legislation, and that every time the Committee on Rules, since I have been in the House, brought in a rule violating the rules of the House that they apologized for so doing, and they invariably said that they would not do it again. Yet the gentleman now advises the House to pay no attention to the Committee on Appropriations, to pay no attention to the rules of the House, to pay no attention to the law, because it is not only law it is a rule of the House under the Reorganization Act, and I am shocked and surprised, and last, but not least, grieved that the political exigencies of the occasion are such that my distinguished and sincere friend will advocate such disregard and such disrespect for law.

Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is shocked, but I yielded for a question rather than a speech. As long as the gentleman from Michigan has brought up this particular subject about points of order and legislation on appropriation bills, I refer him to page 9 of this bill, lines 21, 22, and 23, where the language is subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. This was written into this bill in the meeting of the full Appropriations Committee by the majority members of that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is amazing to hear the remarks made by my distinguished friend from Michigan. Why, he brought in rules repeatedly waiving points of order, and he has voted for them; at least, he voted for them in the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on rules only the other day brought in a rule waiving a point of order. You did that on the school-luncheon program, and the gentleman's own observation, having in mind what his own committee did only a few days ago, is the best answer for him. Furthermore, you have a rule up there now trying to waive a point of order on this wool legislation, on this 50-percent import fee, and it will be very interesting to see what the Republican members of the Committee on Rules do on that.

Mr. ROONEY. I have a grave suspicion about what they will do.

Let me say this: After virtually wrecking our State and Commerce Departments at the most critical time in our Nation's history; after abolishing in toto and with one fell swoop our propaganda program and Radio Voice of America, so vitally necessary to present our superior way of life and just doctrines to the peoples of the world, including, particularly, the slave population of Communist Russia; after destroying our Census Bureau, so important to the American businessman, both large and small; after ruining our aeronautics administration, the Federal-aid airport program, technical development of aviation, and preventing establishment of air-navigation facilities; after demolishing the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and precluding the proper functioning of our Federal courts, the total cut made by the majority members of this committee covering the entire bill now before us, is $25,000,000, less than one-half of 1 percent of President Truman's total budget estimate of $37,500,000,000 for the coming fiscal year.

After their devastating destruction of these vital departments of our Government, the total cut of $162,893,515 is not much more than 2½ percent of the billions they assured the American people they would cut from the budget.

No wonder the Republican legislative budget has disappeared. Where is it? Does anyone know? It must have evaporated into thin air. We have not heard a word about this legislative budget since the 15th of February, when it was supposed to have been completed.

I shall now address myself to one of the items mentioned near the conclusion of his address by my distinguished friend from Nebraska, the chairman of the committee [Mr. STEFAN], and that is the

subject of air traffic control towers. I say to the House now that I am prepared to offer an amendment when the bill is read for amendment tomorrow to restore the money for these vitally necessary air traffic control towers.

The proposed cut of $4,849,000 for air traffic-control towers means that air safety in the United States will be deliberately jeopardized.

I think the Members of the House ought to realize, before they vote on this bill, the importance of the airport traffic-control tower. Because this is a human service rendered to pilots in times of emergency, mostly brought on by bad weather conditions, it is probably the most fundamental and important of the aids which the Nation has created to promote safety in the air. Just as these towers stand out physically at every airport—and all of us have seen hundreds of them—so the service which they render in bringing in air travelers to safe landing, stands out among the aids provided by the CAA.

Foremost in our consideration must be the question of the uniformity in tower operation and the high quality of the personnel employed. We must have the same sort of control all over the airways, and that means that the same organization which trains and supervises the man who operates the tower at Pocatello, Idaho, must be in charge of the operators at Chicago.

Let me say here too, that the airport traffic tower at Pocatello is just about as important as that at Chicago, or Cleveland, or Detroit. It is an integral part of the safety aids of our airway system.

Yet, the majority of this committee recommends that these traffic-control towers should be financed by the municipalities and States. On the face of it, this is a preposterous and unworkable condition and threatens to close down all of the 148 airport traffic-control towers with the exception of the one in Washington.

Among these 148 cities, there would be five possible actions, four of them highly disruptive of the present smooth-working system which daily saves lives.

Some cities, undoubtedly, will stand up and provide the funds to operate their towers under CAA supervision. These will be the larger cities, like New York, Chicago, Atlanta, New Orleans, and Kansas City where the importance of air travel already is established, and where a large volume of air traffic flows through their ports. Local needs, added to national needs, will influence them.

Others will arbitrarily refuse to provide the money and the towers will be closed. Some local officials will be unimpressed with the necessity for continued operation of their tower in the whole Federal airways scheme of things.

Other communities, and there are many of them all over the country, are unable to bear this expense. Minimum cost for operation of a tower averages about $30,000 a year. Put this item into the budget of such towns as Burlington, Vt., Cheyenne, Wyo., Albuquerque, N. Mex., Lynchburg, Va., Great Falls, Mont., San Juan, P. R., and all the relatively small towns in Alaska, and consider the results. In these and many other towns also, this may be an impossible financial burden. It means the towers at those places will be closed. And that means adding hazards to flying.

There will be a fourth category of towns among these 148 who will agree to operate the towers, but with strings attached. This, from the point of view of uniformity on the airways, is unthinkable.

Even with complete agreement among these 148 cities to take over the expense of operating the towers, there would be a period of confusion and neglect while the action is processed through the 148 city councils and local governments.

We have a duty to look closely at the consequences of this kind of economy, gentlemen. The lack of traffic control towers can mean death to air travelers. At Columbus, Ga., recently two planes were approaching the airport. One carried 8 pilots and officials of one of our important air lines. The other was flown by a private pilot, flying for pleasure around the field. Due, all experts agree, to the absence of a control tower at that field, the small plane clipped the tail surfaces from the air-line plane and 9 men burned to death on the runway before the very eyes of the spectators, tragically unable to be of any help. This sort of thing can happen anywhere, under similar conditions, but with control operators on duty they can be avoided.

I say that we are tempting fate through this effort to save the amount of less than $5,000,000 which comparatively is a mere pittance to what is expended on less important projects. We are denying to our people who buy tickets on the air lines, and to our nonschedule fliers carrying passengers and freight, and even to our private fliers, the benefits of a Federal service which never yet has failed them, and the absence of which we can be morally certain will lead to new and horrifying air accidents.

I shall insert a list of airport traffic control towers and Aeronautical Administration communication stations which will be entirely eliminated under the provisions of this present appropriation bill. I shall also insert a list of 39 field offices for businessmen of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and a list of 48 field offices of the Bureau of the Census which will be eliminated because of the cuts made by the committee which reported this bill. I am going to insert, with the permission of the House, a list of the cities in this Nation which will be affected by curtailment of the retail and service trades census, as well as of the very high frequency radio ranges, instrument landing systems, high intensity approach light lanes and ground controlled approach radar systems, which will not be established as the result of the actions of the majority of this committee; also a statement or list of the places affected by the proposed budget reductions on aviation weather stations.

Permit me to call your attention to the list of Federal airport projects which will be affected by the provisions of this bill as written by the Republican members of the committee. In Arizona it will be necessary to cut out the projects shown in the list of class 4 and larger airports submitted to the Congress on February 28, 1947, for Kingman, Douglas, Winslow, Prescott, and Nogales. In addition, it will be necessary to reduce the Phoenix project by $346,000.

Arkansas: They will have to drop Little Rock, Texarkana, and El Dorado projects, and reduce Fort Smith by $71,000.

In California it will be necessary to drop completely the Federal airport projects at Palmdale, Hawthorne, Visalia, Palm Springs, Porterville, Oxnard, Ontario, Marysville, Concord, Little River, Bakersfield, Crescent City, Montague, Banning, Hayward, Napa, Bishop, Santa Rosa, Santa Monica, Oakland, and San Diego, and to reduce the Los Angeles project by $759,000.

In the State of Colorado it will be necessary to drop completely the airport projects proposed for La Junta and Colorado Springs, and reduce Denver airport by $568,000.

In Connecticut—and I trust the gentlemen from Connecticut will listen to me—it will be necessary to drop the proposed Federal airport projects at Groton and Windsor Locks, and to reduce Bridgeport airport project by $76,000.

In Florida it will be necessary to drop Gainesville and Jacksonville No. 1, and reduce Lakeland by $20,000.

In Georgia it will be necessary to drop Macon and Valdosta, and reduce Atlanta airport by $567,000.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. In just a moment. I will get to Washington as soon as I can.

In Idaho—and I trust the gentlemen from Idaho will hear me when I say it will be necessary to reduce the proposed airport project at Coeur d'Alene by $85,000.

In Illinois it will be necessary to eliminate completely the projects at Champaign, Decatur, Springfield, and Quincy, and to reduce the Chicago airport project by $1,080,000.

In Indiana it will be necessary to eliminate completely Seymour, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute, and Richmond, and reduce Indianapolis airport by $186,000.

In Iowa it becomes necessary to eliminate completely the projects at Sioux City, Waterloo, Ottumwa, and Dubuque, and to reduce the Davenport-Moline airport project by $580,000.

In Kansas, eliminate completely Great Bend, Hays-Walker, Herington, Pratt, Liberal, Dodge City, Garden City, Jetmore, Kansas City, Winfield, Arkansas City, Coffeyville and Hutchinson airport project, and to reduce the Wichita airport project by $101,000.

In Kentucky, eliminate the project at Covington and reduce the Louisville project by $32,000.

In Louisiana, drop Lafayette, Alexandria, Mansfield, Opelousas, Baton Rouge, New Orleans (Alvin Callender) and Monroe projects, and reduces the New Orleans (Moisant International) airport by $104,000.

Over here in Maryland it becomes necessary to reduce the moneys which this Congress voted in the last session; we authorized these projects only in June of last year——

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at this time. I am sorry.

Mr. HORAN. But this is the very point at which I wish the gentleman to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not yield at this time.

In Maryland they reduce the Baltimore airport project by almost half a million dollars.

In the State of Massachusetts it will be necessary to eliminate the proposals for Beverly and Orange, and to reduce the Boston airport project by $606,000.

In the State of Michigan, this bill eliminates completely the projects at Muskegon, Traverse City, Lansing, Flint, Battle Creek, and Saginaw—Tri-City—and reduces the Grand Rapids airport project by $326,000.

In Minnesota, it eliminates completely Alexandria, Bemidji, Duluth, Rochester, and reduces the Minneapolis project by $375,000.

In Missouri it eliminates Malden, Kansas City, Springfield and St. Joseph; and reduces the St. Louis airport project by almost a million dollars.

In Montana, it eliminates Glasgow, Missoula, Miles City, Great Falls, Lewistown, and Cut Bank; and reduces Billings Airport by $161,000.

In Nebraska, it eliminates completely the projects at McCook, Harvard, Scribner, Fairmont, Bruning, Norfolk, Alliance, Ainsworth, Grand Island, Scottsbluff, and North Platte; and reduces the Omaha Airport by $206,000.

In New Jersey, this bill takes $498,000 away from the Newark Airport, one of the most important in the country.

In New Mexico, they reduce the Albuquerque Airport by $24,000.

In my State of New York the majority of this committee eliminates completely airports in a number of up-State towns and cities, including Schenectady, Watertown, Plattsburg, Islip—that is on Long Island—White Plains, Syracuse, and Rochester; and reduces the La-Guardia Field project by $630,000.

In North Dakota, they eliminated Jamestown, Grand Forks, and Minot projects; and reduce Bismarck Airport by $83,000.

In Ohio, they eliminate completely Zanesville, Springfield, Mansfield, and Columbus; and reduce the Youngstown Airport by $142,000.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at this time.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. I would like to make an observation at this point.

Mr. ROONEY. I will yield after I have finished my list, but I cannot yield now.

In Oklahoma, they eliminate completely Hobart, Cushing, Stillwater, Woodward, Ada, Enid, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City projects, and reduce the Ponca City Airport project by $29,000.

In the State of Oregon, they eliminate completely proposed projects at Denmark, Tillamook, Pendleton, Astoria, Eugene, Newport, The Dalles, North Bend, Medford, Troutdale, and Corvallis; and reduce the Portland Airport, one of the most important in the Northwest, by $57,000.

In Pennsylvania, they eliminate the projects for Reading, Wilkes-Barre, Scranton; and reduce the Pittsburgh Airport project by $525,000.

In Rhode Island $115,000 is taken away from the Providence Airport.

In South Dakota $28,000 is taken from the Sioux Falls Airport.

In Tennessee, the bill eliminates Knoxville, Nashville, and Memphis projects, and reduces the Chattanooga Airport by $408,000.

In Texas it eliminates El Paso, Olney, San Antonio, Palacios, College Station, Temple, Alice, Tyler, Sweetwater, Waco, Brownwood, Brownsville, San Antonio—Alamo Field, San Angelo, Corpus Christi, and Austin, and reduces the Fort Worth Airport, a very important airport, by $183,000.

In Vermont, $75,000 is taken away from the airport at Burlington.

In Virginia, this bill reduces the Norfolk Airport by $231,000 and eliminates entirely the project at Danville.

In the State of Washington it eliminates completely Port Angeles, Bremerton, Renton, Ellensburg, Olympia, Yakima, Everett, Bellingham, Aberdeen-Hoquiam, and Pullman, and reduces the Seattle Airport project by $335,000.

In the State of West Virginia it eliminates Martinsburg and Wheeling, and reduces the Charleston Airport by $261,000.

In the State of Wisconsin the majority of this committee eliminated completely the airport projects at Oshkosh, Madison, Janesville-Beloit, and La Crosse, and reduced the Milwaukee Airport by $155,000.

So much for the devastating damage that has been done to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

A while ago I mentioned an item that has been cut out of this bill, an item that has been carried in it for years, an item that the present majority members of this committee voted for last year, the year before and the year before that. I refer to the item regarding miscellaneous salaries for the judiciary. This is for the employment of law clerks, judges' secretaries, certain librarians, and building custodians. Last year the Congress voted $1,750,000 for this item. Add to this the money under Public Law 390, which is mandatory, in the amount of $83,500. You have a total amount of $1,833,500. There was not a nickel requested beyond the amount received last year by the Federal judges throughout this Nation for their secretaries and for their clerks. If you ever heard of the headless horsemen of economy continuing to ride, they sure did on this item.

There are 113 Federal judges who have law clerks. The Federal judges' clerk system is patterned after a system such as we have here for clerk hire for Members of Congress. They have a $6,500 allowance for running their offices. There are a few exceptions in the cases of senior circuit court and senior district court judges who are allowed $7,500 per annum for this purpose. We all know how much each Member of Congress is allowed for his office. These Federal judges in places such as New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, and the other large cities of the country, where they work and work hard, have a greater volume of work to perform. I do not say they work any harder or are any better lawyers than in any other part of the country, but there is a larger volume of work in these large cities. It is absolutely imperative that they have a law clerk and a law secretary. This item, after having been in this bill for years, is now being cut out completely. Why? To make up the $6,000,000,000 that has been proposed to be cut from the budget? Why, it is only like a 5-cent piece, this item, when compared with $6,000,000,000. But as the result of its elimination you cripple the functioning of 113 Federal courts throughout the Nation.

Now, I would like to discuss the matter of referees in bankruptcy, another item in this bill which had been completely eliminated in the subcommittee, but inserted in the full Committee on Appropriations to the extent of approximately half of the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for referees in bankruptcy.

It was only on the 28th of June 1946—last June, less than a year ago—that this Congress voted and the members of the subcommittee and the full committee who were here in the Seventy-ninth Congress voted for Public Law 465, which was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. It proposed to change a vicious system which has existed for many years, wherein referees in bankruptcy are paid by the litigants out of the proceeds of the litigation; wherein referees in bankruptcy were remunerated very handsomely by the amount of increased litigation which came before them. So a system was devised by the gentleman from Alabama, Judge HOBBS, wherein the litigants would pay into the Federal court and thence into the Federal Treasury certain fees which would be sufficient to pay the salaries of these referees in bankruptcy. It was provided that if it was found that there was not sufficient money to pay the salaries fixed, that the fees to be paid by the litigants would be increased, so that there would be no moneys drawn from the Federal Treasury for this item.

Pursuant to the decision of this Congress, the mandate, if you please, of this Congress, issued as recently as the 28th of June 1946, they are now ready to inaugurate the new sensible system. They ask for the amount $755,000 to pay for 49 full-time and 117 part-time referees in bankruptcy and the amount $675,000 to pay for 137 full-time and 78 part-time clerks. These amounts which I have just mentioned, requested by the Bureau of the Budget, provide for approximately half of the number of referees that you now have operating or officiating as referees in bankruptcy.

As of January 1, 1947, we had 330 referees in bankruptcy. Under the new system, which is sensible economy, not penny-wise and pound-foolish economy such as this appropriation bill contains,

the number of referees will be reduced to 166. Each referee then becomes an impartial judge. He is not beholden to either of the litigants or any of the litigants or their attorneys. He operates fairly and impartially and it will not make any difference to him whether the bankrupt estate is $500 or $5,000,000, yet the Republican majority destroy this plan before it can be started.

I now want to discuss a cut made to the extent of $1,500,000 in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The amount of $342,000, covering 131 positions, was voluntarily deducted by this bureau before the matter came to the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

There are in the course of a year 75,000,000 border crossings. There are 702,620 applications pending for citizenship. In 1946 it became necessary to deport 116,330 people, as compared with the insignificant number of 17,792 in 1939. In the first 6 months of the present fiscal year, that is, beginning July 1, 1946, there were 73,372 people deported. Also, in the first 6 months of the present fiscal year 249,039 alien seamen entered the United States. Is it sensible economy to cut viciously a bureau which protects the citizens of this country, and which will see that those alien seamen return to their ships as they should not enter the country illegally? Is it not necessary to deport the people convicted of serious crimes, dope peddlers, sex offenders, counterfeiters, and others who have no regard at all for our Government, who have been convicted of serious crimes, and who are not citizens of this country? Or do you want those people to stay here? I cannot for the life of me see why the majority of this committee slashes a bureau which gives a real service to the American people in keeping our homes and our country inviolate.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Does the gentleman suppose the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations insofar as referees in bankruptcy are concerned was made because the Republicans realized that we are going into a period of unprecedented business prosperity and they think, therefore, we do not need referees in bankruptcy?

Mr. ROONEY. I am at a loss to figure them out, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the list of airports the gentleman read I noted the gentleman did not include the Territories. Have they been covered in the deliberations of the committee?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will find the particulars in the matter which I will cause to be inserted in the RECORD.

LIST OF AIRPORT TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS AND AERONAUTICAL COMMUNICATION STATIONS ELIMINATED

AIRPORT TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS, 148

Abilene, Tex.; Akron, Ohio; Albany, N. Y.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Anchorage, Alaska; Annette, Alaska; Atlanta, Ga.; Augusta, Ga.; Austin, Tex.; Bakersfield, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Bangor, Maine; Baton Rouge, La.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Big Spring, Tex.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Billings, Mont.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boise, Idaho; Boston, Mass.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Bristol, Tenn.; Brownsville, Tex.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Burbank, Calif.; Burlington, Vt.; Charleston, S. C.; Charlotte, N. C.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Chicago (Douglas), Ill.; Chicago (Municipal), Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbia, S. C.; Columbus, Ohio; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Covington, Ky.; Dallas, Tex.; Dayton, Ohio; Daytona Beach, Fla.; Des Moines, Iowa; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; El Paso, Tex.; Erie, Pa.; Evansville, Ind.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Fargo, N. Dak.; Flint, Mich.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Fresno, Calif.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Great Falls, Mont.; Greensboro, N. C.; Greenville, S. C.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Hartford, Conn.; Helena, Mont.; Honolulu, T. H.; Houston, Tex.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jackson, Miss.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Juneau, Alaska; Kansas City, Mo.; Kansas City, Kans.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Lansing, Mich.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Little Rock, Ark.; Long Beach, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Lynchburg, Va.; Medford, Oreg.; Memphis, Tenn.; Miami, Fla.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Mobile, Ala.; Montgomery, Ala.; Nashville, Tenn.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; New York (Floyd Bennett), N. Y.; New York (LaGuardia), N. Y.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Norfolk, Va.; Oakland, Calif.; Ogden, Utah; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Omaha, Nebr.; Orlando, Fla.; Palm Springs, Calif.; Pendleton, Oreg.; Peoria, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Pocatello, Idaho; Portland, Maine; Portland, Oreg.; Presque Isle, Maine; Providence, R. I.; Raleigh, N. C.; Reading, Pa.; Red Bluff, Calif.; Reno, Nev.; Richmond, Va.; Roanoke, Va.; Rochester, Minn.; Rochester, N. Y.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Antonio, Tex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; San Juan, P. R.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Savannah, Ga.; Seattle, Wash.; Shreveport, La.; Sioux City, Iowa; South Bend, Ind.; Spokane, Wash.; St. Louis, Mo.; Spartanburg, S. C.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Texarkana, Tex.; Toledo, Ohio; Topeka, Kans.; Tucson, Ariz.; Tulsa, Okla.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; Wichita, Kans.; Wichita Falls, Tex.; Williamsport, Pa.; Winslow, Ariz.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Yakima, Wash.; Yakutat, Alaska; Youngstown, Ohio.

AERONAUTICAL COMMUNICATIONS STATIONS, 59

Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Alice, Tex.; Anderson, S. C.; Anniston, Ala.; Anthony, Kans.; Anton Chico, N. Mex.; Ardmore, Okla.; Arlington, Oreg.; Ashley, N. Dak.; Atlantic, Iowa; Brookville, Pa.; Cadillac, Mich.; Cherry Fork, Ohio; Chillicothe, Mo.; Clarendon, Tex.; Crestview, Fla.; Custer, Mont.; Dansville, N. Y.; Dunkirk, N. Y.; Easton, Wash.; Evergeen, Ala.; Fallon, Nev.; Findlay; Ohio, Flint, Mich.; Gabbs, Nev.; Gladwin, Mich.; Glens Falls, N. Y.; Golva, N. Dak.; Gooding, Idaho; Greenville, S. C.; Houlton, Maine; Iowa City, Iowa; La Grange, Oreg.; Lebanon, N. H.; Malad City, Idaho; Milroy, Ind.; Montpelier, Vt.; New Florence, Mo.; Oceanside, Calif.; Ontario, Oreg.; Overton, Nebr.; Palacios, Tex.; Perry, Ohio; Philip, S. Dak.; Providence, R. I.; Saginaw, Mich.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Sidney, Nebr.; Socorro, N. Mex.; Strevell, Idaho; Sulphur Springs, Tex.; Sunbury, Pa.; Tonopah, Nev.; Trona, Calif.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Tylertown, Miss.; Vicksburg, Miss.; Yoakum, Tex.; Zanesville, Ohio.

FIELD OFFICES—BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The proposed reduction in appropriations for fiscal 1948 will require the abandonment of Department of Commerce Field Offices in the following cities:

Alabama: Birmingham; Arizona: Phoenix; Arkansas: Little Rock; California: San Diego; Connecticut: New Haven; Idaho: Boise; Illinois: Peoria; Indiana: Evansville; Iowa: Des Moines; Kansas: Wichita; Maine: Portland; Massachusetts: Worcester; Michigan: Grand Rapids; Minnesota: Duluth; Mississippi: Jackson; Montana: Butte; Nebraska: Fremont; Nevada: Reno; New Hampshire: Manchester; New Mexico: Albuquerque; New York: Albany, Rochester, Syracuse; North Dakota: Fargo; Ohio: Columbus, Toledo; Pennsylvania: Erie, Scranton; South Dakota: Sioux Falls; Tennessee: Chattanooga, Nashville; Texas, San Antonio, Texarkana; Utah: Salt Lake City; Vermont: Burlington; Virginia: Norfolk; Washington: Spokane; West Virginia: Charleston; Wyoming, Cheyenne.

FIELD OFFICES—BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The field offices of the Bureau of the Census are used for direct canvass of population and establishments to insure efficient, prompt, and reliable census returns. A reduction in appropriation requires that the following 48 Bureau of the Census field offices be eliminated:

Alabama: Clanton, Montgomery; Arkansas: El Dorado, Jonesboro; California: Madera; Connecticut: New Haven; Georgia: Cochran; Illinois: Pittsfield, Taylorsville; Indiana: Bloomfield; Kentucky: Hopkinsville, Louisville; Louisiana: New Iberia, New Orleans; Maine: Presque Isle; Michigan; Boyne City; Minnesota: Duluth, St. Paul; Missouri: Fredericktown, Maryville; Nebraska: Scottsbluff; New York: Elmira; North Carolina: Charlotte, Rocky Mount; North Dakota: Fargo; Ohio: Chillicothe, Eaton, Lima, Portsmouth, Youngstown; Oklahoma: Poteau, Tulsa; Oregon: La Grande, Portland; Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie; South Dakota: Wessington Springs; Tennessee: Johnson City; Texas: Gilmer, Houston, Livingston; Vermont: Barre; Virginia: Hopewell; Washington: Yakima; West Virginia: Lewisburg, Welch, Wheeling; Wisconsin: Fond du Lac.

RETAIL AND SERVICE TRADES CENSUS

Under the proposed appropriation cuts, it will be impossible to extend the present current retail- and service-trade reports program to the 24 cities having 100,000 or more inhabitants which are not now covered by the program Consequently, there will be no reports for these cities for the retail and service trades showing the trend in business as measured by percentage change in sales or receipts from the preceding month and the preceding year by individual kinds of business. The following cities are affected by this elimination of proposed program:

Bridgeport, Conn.; Miami, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Peoria, Ill.; South Bend, Ind.; Des Moines, Iowa; Fall River, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.; Flint, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Omaha, Nebr.; Trenton, N. J.; Albany, N. Y.; Utica, N. Y.; Canton, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Reading, Pa.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Spokane, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.

LIST OF VERY HIGH FREQUENCY RADIO RANGES, INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS, HIGH-INTENSITY APPROACH LIGHT LANES, AND GROUND-CONTROLLED APPROACH RADAR SYSTEMS WHICH WILL NOT BE ESTABLISHED

VHF RADIO RANGES, 42

Arlie, Tex.; Augusta, Maine; Bangor, Maine; Barre-Montpelier, Vt.; Bowie, Tex.; Burlington, Vt.; Concord, N. H.; Cross City, Fla.; Dawson, N. Mex.; Dodge City, Kans.; Dunnellon, Fla.; Engle, N. Mex.; Garden City, Kans.; Glens Falls, N. Y.; Greenville, Ky.; Holly, Colo.; Houlton, Maine; Hutchinson, Kans.; La Junta, Colo.; Las Cruces, N. Mex.; Las Vegas, N. Mex.; Lawrence, Mass.; Lewiston, Maine; Luray, Mo.; Manchester, N. H.; Millinocket, Maine; Mt. Vernon, Ill.; New Hackensack, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Ottumwa, Iowa; Portland, Maine; Presque Isle, Maine; Quincy, Ill.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Socorro, N. Mex.; Stafford, Kans.; St. Croix, Ind.; Trinidad, Colo.; Vernon, Tex.; Waterville, Maine; White River Junction, Vt.; Wichita, Falls, Tex.

INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEMS, 38

Abilene, Tex.; Albany, N. Y.; Augusta, Ga.; Austin, Tex.; Burlington, Vt.; Chicago (Park Ridge), Ill.; Columbia, S. C.; Deming, N. Mex.; Elkins, W. Va.; Evansville, Ind.; Florence, S. C.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Garden City, Kans.; Huntington, W. Va.; Hutchinson, Kans.; Lancaster, Pa.; Laredo, Tex.; Las Vegas, N. Mex.; Lewiston, Mont.; Lubbock, Tex.; Macon, Ga.; Miles City, Mont.; Missoula, Mont.; Montgomery, Ala.; Ottumwa, Iowa; Pocatello, Idaho; Pueblo, Colo.; Quincy, Ill.; Roanoke, Va.; Salem, Oreg.; Scranton, Pa.; Sioux City, Iowa; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Texarkana, Ark.; Tri-City, Tenn.; Watertown, S. Dak.; Wenatchee, Wash.

HIGH INTENSITY APPROACH LIGHT LANES, 38

Akron, Ohio; Albany, N. Y.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Baltimore, Md.; Billings, Mont.; Brownsville, Tex.; Charleston, S. C.; Charlotte, N. C.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; El Paso, Tex.; Eugene, Oreg.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Louisville, Ky.; Memphis, Tenn.; Meridian, Miss.; Miami, Fla.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Norfolk, Va.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Omaha, Nebr.; Raleigh, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Rochester, Minn.; Rochester, N. Y.; San Antonio, Tex.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Tucson, Ariz.; White Plains, N. Y.; Wichita, Kans.; Windsor Locks, Conn.

SURVEILLANCE RADAR UNITS AND GROUND CONTROLLED APPROACH RADAR INSTALLATIONS, 16

Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Atlanta, Ga.; Cincinnati, Ohio (Covington); Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colo.; Kansas City, Mo.; Memphis, Tenn.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Francisco, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED BUDGET REDUCTIONS ON AVIATION WEATHER STATIONS

1. International aviation weather service stations in Central America and the Caribbean which cannot be established:

Balboa, C. Z.; Benedict Field, V. I.; Bluefield, Nicaragua; Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic; Mana ua, Nicaragua; Parrita, Costa Rica; Rey Island, Panama; Roseau, Dominica; San Jose, Guatemala; St. Vincent, St. Thomas.

2. Airport weather service stations in the United States which cannot be established:

Aspermont, Tex.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Clewiston, Fla.; Colorado Springs, Colo.; East Portal, Colo; El Dorado, Ark.; Fayetteville, Ark.; Greenfield, Tenn.; Gurdon, Ark.; Huntsville, Ala.; Kerrville, Tex.; Logan, Utah; Lubbock, Tex.; Midland, Tex.; Moffat, Colo.; Monroeville, Ala.; Nogales, Ariz.; Payson, Ariz.; Pine Bluff, Ark.; Rifle, Colo.; Roanoke, Va.; Sarasota, Fla., Suffolk, Long Island, N. Y.

3. Aviation weather service in Alaska which cannot be established:

Big Delta, Alaska; Gustavus, Alaska; Kokrines, Alaska; Moses Point, Alaska; Naknek, Alaska; Nulato, Alaska; Nunivak, Alaska; Unalakleet, Alaska.

4. International aviation weather service stations which can only be partially implemented:

Honolulu, T. H.; Houston, Tex.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Newark, N. J.; New Orleans, La.; San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the merits or rather the demerits of this bill I desire to pay my respects to the able and distinguished chairman of our subcommittee the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. KARL STEFAN, who has labored without ceasing for months in its preparation. His experience acquired during the many years he has served as a member of the committee was invaluable in our deliberations. He showed familiarity with the innermost workings of the various departments and withal he presided with absolute fairness, exhibiting at all times the utmost impartiality and courtesy to the minority members of his committee.

I also desire to express my appreciation of the services of Mr. Orescan, the highly efficient clerk of the committee, who worked with patience, diligence, and understanding at all times, and who has contributed immeasurably to the accomplishments of the committee.

I appeared before the House several weeks ago advocating the passage of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, which was framed by a subcommittee of which I also had the privilege of being a member. Our committee agreed unanimously on the provisions of that bill, and I fought with the majority Members in resisting amendments offered on the floor of the House. I would that the same situation prevailed with reference to this bill, as I would much prefer to cooperate with the majority in support of the measure. I campaigned for office last fall on a platform of reducing governmental expenditures and it is a little awkward for me to be placed in the role of opposing reductions in the budget at this time. I shall redeem my pledge to the people by voting for all decreases which, in my judgment, will not interfere with the proper functioning of our Government, but I cannot sit idly by and see the foreign program of our State Department sabotaged and small business crucified on a cross of false economy without lifting my voice in protest.

Frankness compels me to say that I believe the subcommittee might have agreed on the bill but for the remote control which was exercised over the majority members. At the very beginning of our hearings, before any witnesses from the Departments of State and Commerce had testified, the chairman of the full committee announced in the public press that the appropriations of the State Department would be severely slashed and that the Department of Commerce would be cut $100,000,000. My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] suggested to the chairman of our subcommittee that he thought it was useless for us to waste our time by proceeding with the hearings if the Republican leadership had already determined the final action on the bill. We did proceed, however, for weeks and went very minutely into every detail of the operation of the four departments covered by the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND THE JUDICIARY

We substantially agreed on the appropriations for the Department of Justice and the Judiciary. There are several items in each with which the minority members are not in complete accord. For example, it appears to us that we might have appropriated the full amount requested for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, because it is a known fact that we purposely suspended to some extent the operations of that Division during the war, whereas in the postwar era vigilance is needed to prevent operations in restraint of trade which will seriously affect our national economy. The reduction, however, made by the committee was only $100,000 which is relatively small, and will be accepted, but with reluctance on our part.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Department of State appropriations, on the other hand, have been slashed beyond all reason and unless a substantial portion of the funds are restored, I fear that much which has been accomplished toward the establishment of international cooperation and world peace will be lost. We are facing the most critical period of international relations in all history. The State Department is the arm of the Government charged with the duty of handling our foreign affairs and of representing our interests in the epoch-making world conferences which are in almost continuous session.

The recent appointment of General Marshall as Secretary of State was received with great satisfaction throughout the Nation. He assumed his new duties with the support of both political parties and the confidence of the people. It is unthinkable that we will now tie his hands and subject him to embarrassment in the delicate negotiations in which he is engaged by denying him sufficient funds to finance an adequate program.

There are some duplications of services in the Department of State, but one of General Marshall's first official acts as Secretary was the appointment of a special assistant to study the organization of the Department, and this assistant has been given full authority to reorganize the Department and to make such changes in personnel as efficiency and economy may demand. This survey is in progress, and it has already accomplished gratifying results.

INADEQUATE PERSONNEL

General Marshall pointed out in his testimony before our committee that the activities of the Department had necessarily expanded greatly, because of the tremendous international problems which we now face. He stated that one of the greatest handicaps which confronted him in China was the lack of adequate personnel in that field and that the State Department had been able to remedy the situation only by the transfer of personnel from other fields where they were greatly needed. He asked for increased personnel in the Foreign Service to meet the pressing demands on the Department. In this bill his force is materially reduced. He asked for bread, the committee gave him a stone.

Let us glance briefly at the figures for the entire State Department. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 were $181,535,706. The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948 were $279,537,623. The committee recommended $219,128,-

058, which is ostensibly an increase of $37,592,352 over 1947. Actually, however, included in the recommendations for 1948 is an item of $50,000,000 which will revert to the Treasury to the credit of surplus property and lend-lease accounts and represents merely a bookkeeping transaction resulting from the acquisition of properties for our foreign missions and consulates in exchange for surplus property and in settling our lend-lease accounts. Eliminating this item, the Department, notwithstanding its steadily increasing activities, will receive $12,400,000 less in 1948 than it had available in 1947.

The salaries and expenses of the Secretary's office and the other activities within the United States have been reduced from $47,000,000 to $20,000,000, a decrease of almost 60 percent, whereas the salaries and expenses of the Foreign Service have been decreased from $58,670,000 to $46,830,000, a decrease of approximately $12,000,000.

INFORMATION AND CULTURAL PROGRAM

Included in these reductions are appropriations for the information and cultural program which have been entirely eliminated. This program is the lone Voice of America in the babble of tongues which are spreading propaganda throughout the world today. The conflict of arms has at least temporarily ended, but we are now engaged in a conflict of ideologies. In that conflict between democracy and totalitarianism words and ideas are as vitally important as were bullets and bombs in the former conflict.

We believe in the American way of life and we have fought for it on numerous fields of battle. It may not be perfect, but under it our Nation has made faster and greater progress than any nation in all history. We are a peace-loving people, but there are certain things that we hold dearer than peace. Nearly two centuries ago the patriot, Patrick Henry, from the pew of a small church in my native city, sounded the keynote of this Republic with the immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death." The spirit portrayed by that expression has become the heritage of our people and we will defend our liberties with our lives whenever and wherever they are in jeopardy. Let no one within the confines of the United States or outside of it doubt that fact.

But, Mr. Chairman, war is an unsatisfactory and horrible way to settle controversies and in this atomic age it is a constant threat to civilization. Other means of settling our international disputes can and must be found. When he appeared before our committee, Secretary Marshall testified that he was continuing to advocate measures to remove conditions which lead to war and he was asked by our chairman to enumerate some of those conditions.

Of course—

Said the Secretary—

the two primary conditions, I would say, are a combination of complete mistrust on all sides of the motives that are behind each proposition, and then the uncertainty as to what the aspirations are of the nations concerned.

He then stated:

It is amazing the degree of misrepresentation and misunderstanding and misconception that is had of the United States, its people, and the purposes of this country.

We know that this misunderstanding is due largely to false propaganda circulated by other countries. Our entire information and cultural program is designed to counteract this propaganda and to create a better understanding abroad. It utilizes every available means of communication to dissiminate to all parts of the world the true facts about the United States, our people, our policies, and our purposes. Information staffs attached to United States missions are maintained in 76 countries. The Office of OIC assembles accurate news and other factual material for publication in available foreign newspapers and periodicals and for the information of our foreign personnel. It distributes widely foreign-language magazines published by it in countries where other circulation facilities are not available. It prepares and exhibits documentary and informative motion pictures. It sponsors a program providing for the exchange of students, scholars, and technical experts with other countries. It maintains information libraries at strategic points abroad and has promoted several art exhibits.

ART EXHIBITS

The art exhibits were arranged in response to criticism frequently made of the United States abroad that our people are materialistic and devoid of culture. They are also used as window dressing to attract visitors to American centers where they are given other information. I fully realize that there has been criticism of some of the modernistic paintings contained in the exhibits. Some of the paintings have been lent to the Government by private owners; some have been purchased by the Government. I certainly would not select some of these paintings as works of art, but I profess complete ignorance in the field of modern art, and I must admit that they do not differ in characteristics from some that I have seen in our best museums. Moreover, immediately following our exhibit in Prague, the Soviet Government hurried a Russian exhibit of 86 paintings to Prague to counteract the favorable impression which had been created. A Russian plane flew over the city dropping free tickets and advertising the exhibit. It does not appear, therefore, that the program is entirely ineffective.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Last, but by no means least, is the short-wave-broadcast program which beams the Voice of America in 25 languages to all corners of the earth in various programs totaling 58 hours each day. This voice overleaps the barriers of censorship and carries the truth about America to remote places where it would be impossible for it to penetrate otherwise. The International Board of Control recognizes the rights of the United States to certain frequencies on the short-wave-broadcast band for international broadcasting. These frequencies are in great demand and if our broadcasting program is discontinued other nations would ask for and receive these frequencies so that we would be unable to reclaim them if in the future we should desire to resume the program. This in itself would be a serious loss which we cannot afford to hazard.

In our recent discussions on relief measures, the Members of this House have insisted that wide publicity accompany the distribution of our bounty so that the recipients may know whence it comes and the motives which prompt our generosity. The only means at our disposal of disseminating this information is the OIC.

I fully recognize that I am in no sense an expert on international affairs, but on this question I have sought information from those who, in my judgment, were best qualified to provide it. When Secretary of State Marshall appeared before our committee, he told us:

One effective way to promote peace is to dispel misunderstanding, fear, and ignorance. Foreign peoples should know the nature and objectives of our foreign policy. They should have a true understanding of American life. This is the purpose of the information and cultural-relations program. * * * I regard this program as an intergral and essential part of the conduct of foreign relations. In China I observed at first-hand the consequences of misrepresentation and lack of understanding of the facts about the United States and its policies.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman appeared before our committee to testify on another subject, but realizing that he had represented this Nation as Ambassador in Moscow and in London, where he had an opportunity to observe this program, I asked him for his opinion of its effectiveness. I wish that every Member of this House would read his reply on page 1063 of the Department of State hearings. Time does not permit me to quote him at length, but he said in part:

In our national interest, I know of no single service that I place higher, in importance to our country, than the development of the State Department Information Service And I want to talk about it from both the positive and the negative side. Every other country—substantial country—has this type of service. Some of them are spending very large amounts of money and energy in spreading misinformation about us, attempting to break down our prestige and our reputation. I don't want to repeat what has been told this committee before, but I know the character of the propaganda that is being indulged in. Unless that is monitored and we know what is being said about us and unless steps are taken, not to answer the misstatements, but to get out real facts about American life, objectives, and policies, it is sure to have a very deep effect on our relations with other countries of the world.

At another point in his discussion, Secretary Harriman stated:

My observation is that the service is so directed that there is virtually no competition. I am ready to stand back of that statement from my own observation. * * * I am frank to say that I couldn't have functioned properly in either post without having that information about America.

He concluded his testimony with these remarks:

To me it is the most profitable investment that we can make in terms of protecting our interests, commercial, as well as political, and if it is abandoned I feel so deeply about it that I don't think there would be anything more fatal, a more fatal blow to the prestige of the United States in general world opinion. I don't see any other means by which the true American story can be gotten over and I do sincerely and earnestly hope that you will find it possible to support this program with the funds that have been requested.

Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, who had resigned as Ambassador to Poland and had just returned to this country, appeared before our committee and reported on the conditions in Poland. I asked his opinion of the information and cultural program, and while it is to be regretted that practically his entire testimony was off the record and does not appear in the report of the hearings, I can say to you that he was lavish in his praise and expressed the view that it was an essential and important part of our foreign-relations program.

This view is shared by the leaders connected with the radio industry. I personally have heard a number of them express the opinion that the broadcasting program is essential, that it should be continued, that it cannot be financed by private funds and, therefore, must be financed by the Federal Government. Numerous organizations, including the American Legion, have endorsed the program.

Mr. Chairman, how we could even contemplate for one moment the abandonment of the information and cultural program of the State Department at this particular time is beyond my comprehension.

INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

The bill appropriates $2,490,000 for the intelligence program of the State Department, which is a reduction of $2,313,000 under the budget estimates and $1,240,456 below the 1947 appropriation. It will be necessary, therefore, to seriously curtail this program. In this connection, I merely quote the statement of Secretary Marshall which appears on page 9 of the record:

For our day-to-day as well as long-range decisions on the conduct of foreign affairs we must have complete, timely, and objective knowledge of facts. The intelligence program provides a centralized service within the Department to acquire and analyze objectively all foreign political and economic information. We cannot afford to be without full and accurate intelligence. * * * Only when we are fully informed of the acts and intentions of others can we avoid fatal miscalculation of their future policies and objectives.

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Even the good-neighbor policy which has been so successfully conducted by the State Department during the last decade and a half is threatened by this bill. We appropriated $5,375,000 for cooperation with the American Republics in 1947. The budget carried approximately one-half million dollars more for 1948. This bill provides an appropriation of $3,000,000, which is $2,375,000 less than the 1947 appropriation and nearly $3,000,000 less than the budget request.

The fact that during World War II the Americas presented an almost solid front against the aggression of fascism shows that our program has not been in vain. Moreover, our neighbors to the south are lending their cooperation to our present efforts to promote world peace. We recently had a demonstration of beneficial results of the good-neighbor policy in the exchange of visits by President Truman and President Aleman, of Mexico.

We cannot afford to take the chance of losing the good will which our program of cooperation with the American Republics has created. When this matter was discussed in the full committee, I was asked the question if I thought that you could buy good will. I do not think that good will is subject to purchase. Neither can you buy a wife in this enlightened era. Every sophisticated swain knows, however, that the resistance of a prospective consort may be weakened by gifts of flowers and candy and the bestowal of other well-directed attentions.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The slashes in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce have been even more severe and equally as indiscriminate as in the Department of State. At the conclusion of World War II, we viewed with great apprehension the problem of absorbing in our peacetime program the millions of boys who were being released from the armed forces. There were few of us who did not anticipate a period of recession and unemployment. The Department of Commerce undertook the task of providing aids to stimulate business so as to minimize this condition. The work has been decentralized by the establishment of field offices throughout the United States to provide information and assistance to veterans and business, both large and small.

Large business is more able to provide research and to acquire information than small enterprises, which rely almost entirely upon the information and assistance of the Department of Commerce. Frankly, I must confess that I think there has been some overexpansion in the Department of Commerce and that some reductions can properly be made in its appropriations. I regard it as extremely dangerous, however, to cut the appropriations as drastically as has been done in this bill. Experts are predicting a rescission of business activities within a short time. In view of our present postwar fiscal condition and our staggering Federal debt, a depression would be disastrous to our national economy.

The total appropriations for the Department of Commerce for 1947 were approximately $200,000,000. The budget estimates for 1948 were $287,000,000. The bill recommends $191,000,000, which is $9,000,000 less than the appropriations for 1947, and $96,000,000 less than the budget estimates.

The appropriations for the Secretary's Office have been cut $2,250,000 below the appropriations for 1947, and over $3,000,000 below the budget estimates. This reduction will substantially curtail the administrative activities of the Department.

OFFICE OF TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICES

Included in the Secretary's Office is the Office of Technical and Scientific Services. For the first time in history we are attempting to collect reparations in scientific knowledge. Our investigators traveled with the vanguard of the Army of Occupation in Germany for the purpose of acquiring all scientific information available. The Office of Technical and Scientific Services has expended approximately $1,500,000 in the collection of German industrial technology. American business concerns cooperating with the Office have furnished 600 investigators whose travel, salaries, and expenses in acquiring the scientific discoveries of Germany were paid by their private employers. This industry cooperation has been conservatively estimated at $3,000,000, which is twice the Government contribution. The collections are approaching termination, but the distribution to American science and industry has hardly begun. If funds are withheld, the industrial knowledge which Government and industry have striven so hard to collect will gather dust in Government files and never reach the business community. The funds which have already been expended will, therefore, be largely wasted.

The Office of Technical and Scientific Services does not engage in research, but it contracts for research in competent university and private laboratories, which is a striking reversal of the trend to centralize research in Federal laboratories and with Federal personnel. We are striving to avoid expansion of the Government structure. Here is a program consistent with our philosophy which arranges research in nongovernmental laboratories selected by industry and upon projects which the industry has specifically endorsed. This type of Government-industry cooperation insures that there is no duplication of research effort between Government and industry. Let me stress a vital aspect. The research is carried on in State universities and private laboratories most competent to do the work. Industry has advanced approximately $250,000 in funds and facilities to supplement the Government's contribution of $750,000 to date. This is sound evidence that industry wants the program and wants it done under the Office of Technical Services' research program. This is one of the few offices that asked for less for 1948 than it had available in 1947. The committee, however, recommends only $1,700,000 for the Office, which is a 50-percent cut in the budget estimate and 52 percent less than the appropriations for 1947.

THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a total decrease of 45 percent in the amount requested for the Bureau of the Census. The appropriation for current census statistics has been chopped from $11,500,000 to $5,000,-

000—a reduction of over 56 percent. Secretary Harriman has stated that—

The proposed cut would result in a dimout of the light that business and Government require to make sound decisions. It would be a return to the dark ages of business knowledge at a time when more enlightenment is certainly needed to deal intelligently with the critical problems of today.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which includes the field office service, and the office recently established for the aid of small business, has been allowed only $7,000,000, which is $4,500,000 less than the budget estimates and $3,500,000 less than the appropriation for 1947. This will necessitate the closing of a number of the field offices in various parts of the United States and will be a severe blow to small business and those veterans who are attempting to establish themselves in business enterprises.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the program to reduce expenditures to the greatest extent consistent with sound governmental policies. I am constrained to believe, however, that in this bill, insofar as the Departments of State and Commerce are concerned, the committee has adopted a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, which would cripple the work of those Departments and seriously affect our foreign relations and our domestic prosperity. I cannot, therefore, support the bill without substantial modifications.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated, and I listened very carefully to the address which he has just concluded, both at the beginning and the close of his address that he is a firm believer in economy in government and stated that he was elected on that platform last fall.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct and I make no apologies for it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate whether or not there is any reduction in this bill that he approves of, and, if so, what?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir, there is, and I doubt very seriously whether the gentleman will support it. I approve of eliminating from the bill the control towers of the CAA. I wonder if the gentleman will support me in that. It will eliminate $5,000,000 from the bill, and in addition to that it will save this Government an expense of at least $100,000,000 annually in my opinion in the years to come.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, the gentleman is in disagreement with the ranking minority member of the committee on that item?

Mr. GARY. I do disagree with the ranking minority member of the committee on that item.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman agree with any other cuts made by the committee, may I ask?

Mr. GARY. I think I covered that in my remarks when I said I thought some cuts could be made but I do not think there should be slashes which will interfere with the workings of these Departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Was not the gentleman from Virginia also in favor of a substantial reduction in the representation allowances?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. And there were any number of other items, were there not?

Mr. GARY. There were a number of items. We agreed to most of the cuts in the Department of Justice and in the Judiciary. I thought they were reasonable. But when it came to the State Department and to the Department of Commerce, I thought we had slashed the appropriation for those departments to the point where we were destroying the effectiveness of their work. I am not willing to do that in the present state of affairs, particularly with reference to our foreign relations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that there were possibly 40 items in this bill in which all members of the committee were unanimous?

Mr. GARY. I think that is correct, and all of those items carried cuts in the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument is that he is arguing against false economy as distinguished from real economy.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. False economy that will destroy the very foundations of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the debate on appropriations bills that have come to the House so far this year, it occurs to me that my friends on the right of the aisle all start their addresses by saying they are for economy, and they close them with the same expression of hope for economy but they apparently are going to let the Republicans vote the economy.

I have a very high regard for the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and the committee that has reported this bill to us. I do not think any Member of the House has done more for civil aviation in this country than has the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], but my high regard for the majority members of that committee rose rapidly this afternoon as I heard the gentleman from New York read the long list of airports whose construction had either been postponed or eliminated. I could hardly believe that any subcommittee could strike so much "pork" out of one appropriation bill in such a short period of time.

The gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY] for some reason particularly expressed the hope that the Members from Connecticut would note that two airports in that State would not receive any further funds for their completion. The taxpayers of the State of Connecticut are well aware that they could much better afford to build their own airports than they can to carry on the airport-building program as it has been passed by previous Congresses.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I might also say that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] took particular delight in stating, and laid emphasis on the fact, that this bill will deprive the Oshkosh Airport: completely obliterate it. Now, that indicates the character of the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], because he knows not whereof he speaks. The fact of the matter is it is the Winnebago County Airport. It is fully completed except the installation of lighting, and the amount of Federal funds involved is $20,000. The County of Winnebago, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who is out for spending every dollar he can see in sight, is perfectly able to spend $40,000 to put lighting on an airport that has cost nearly $1,000,000, and is completed, and will not be obliterated, regardless of the action that has been taken.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield briefly. I have only 10 minutes, but I want to be fair.

Mr. ROONEY. Those remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin remind me of a quotation from the Merchant of Venice.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, I do not have time to yield for Shakespeare. We can take him up some other time.

I want to make clear that I agree absolutely with the objectives of this subcommittee to turn over to the owners of airports and to the municipalities, the staffing of control towers. I believe that this Congress is faced with a serious problem to determine just how much of the airway equipment should be paid for out of the Federal Treasury. I do, however, disagree with the action of the committee in striking out the appropriation for control-tower staffs at this particular time, or until such time as a legislative committee can bring us legislation dealing with this whole subject of providing equipment for our airways and staffing the control towers.

Four years ago an effort was made to create in this House a special committee to deal with legislation relating to civil aviation. In the wisdom of the House that suggestion was turned down, although I felt strongly then and feel more strongly now that there is enough important legislation awaiting consideration and enactment by this House dealing with the subject of aviation to take the full time of one of our standing committees. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee very early in this session started to conduct hearings on air line safety here in the United States. Contrary to the impression one might get from reading the newspapers, we have here in the United States the finest system of airways found anywhere in the world.

In 1946, notwithstanding the unfortunate crashes that occurred near the end of the year, we had the best year in our history as far as airplane crashes were concerned. But that committee wanted to find out if there was anything further that Congress could do to make the airways safer, and a great deal of interesting testimony was presented to the committee on the subject of the equipment of our air lines. There was a good deal of testimony as to whether the CAA erred in installing ILS instead of the Army-Navy-approved equipment known as GCA, but it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that they should supply perhaps both ILS and GCA operated from airport control towers. It was thought that may be the real answer. That committee has not completed its investigation and until such time as they can complete that study and bring legislation to the floor I think it would be the better part of wisdom for the Congress to provide funds to operate these control towers under a uniform system such as the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe it was, pointed out this afternoon.

There is nothing in this bill—we cannot put anything in the bill—that would make it mandatory for the owners of these separate airports to accept the expense and obligation and responsibility of staffing the control towers. After all, our municipalities have budgets to think of, and here just in the middle of May we are passing this bill, which is the first notice cities have had that they are going to have to add to their budget about $30,000 per control tower. I believe they are entitled to more notice than that and I think we will work out a much better system if the House will reinsert the item of slightly less than $5,000,000 and permit control towers to be operated as they are with the definite understanding that Congress will give attention in the next year and before the Eightieth Congress adjourns not only to determine who will finance the cost of operating control towers but also who is going to pay for the cost of so-called airway equipment.

I believe that every possible safety device should be put on our airways, but I do not believe it is the responsibility of the American taxpayers to put it on all of our airways. As I see it, it is the responsibility of the Government to have a sound system of airways across and throughout our Nation with necessary safety equipment, but when we add additional equipment to make it possible for the air lines to fly at 300-, 400-, and 500-foot ceilings instead of the old 800- and 1,000-foot ceilings, what we are doing is simply increasing the revenues of the airlines. The fewer the cancellations the greater their revenues. I believe that either through a system of landing fees or increased rentals they should buy this additional equipment, a lot of which although referred to as safety equipment is not actually necessary to the safe operation of aircraft. A private flier cannot land at LaGuardia Field unless he has engine trouble or some emergency condition. The more we set aside these large airports equipped and paid for with taxpayers' money and turn them over to the commercial air lines, the more we increase their revenues. They are not made available for private fliers although the private fliers are taxpayers, too. The result is that if this program is not modified to make the commercial air lines bear more of the cost the result will be a splendid system of tax-supported airports for the special use of the commercial air lines, and the private fliers will have to make their landings in cow pastures as they did 25 years ago.

I agree fully with the committee that it is time the Congress assumed its full responsibility, but until we get some basic legislation I feel that the best possible solution to the problem of air safety is a continuation of the operation as it has been carried out until our legislative committee acts on it, because only in that way can we call to the attention of the House the seriousness of this proposition. I wish I had time to go into some of the testimony that has been presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on ILS and GCA and other equipment of that kind.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chariman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. On behalf of the committee I want to tell the gentleman how deeply we appreciate his remarks and his approval of our action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. It was because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was making an exhaustive study of all phases of that proposition following the recent accidents that the committee, in taking action on the CAA appropriations, left everything in the bill so far as safety devices are concerned, including GCA, ILS, and many other things. I know what the gentleman means when he says there is some question whether ILS, so favored by the CAA, is going to be effective and whether or not GCA will take over ILS or whether something else has been found whereby air safety will be almost certain. ILS, in my opinion, has to be continued until GCA proves itself or until this other radar equipment proves itself, or some of the other things the gentleman has seen himself.

The gentleman is a famous flier, he is a pilot, he wants safety in the air. He knows more about safety and aid to aviation than many of those who pretend to talk about aviation. I thank him very much for his approval because we did not come to a decision on these funds, Mr. Chairman, just because one or two of us knew something about flying. We had expert investigators go into the offices of CAA. I merely rise to thank the gentleman for his commendation of the committee because we have been working on this thing ever since last December. We are following the hearings and the reports of the gentleman's committee in order to guide us in making our decision for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope the gentleman does not misunderstand me. I said I approved wholeheartedly the objective of the committee, but I make the plea that for this year you permit this appropriation to be reinserted in the bill for the operation of the control towers for the very reason the gentleman has himself enunciated.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought the gentleman's committee would make an exhaustive, thorough study.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We are; and I may say to the gentleman that study is still going on. It was interrupted to make possible hearings on the American-flag ship proposition, but we are getting testimony day after day on aviation. This matter of control towers ties right in with the operation of GCA. It is the hope of the CAA that they can put this in the control tower and that it can be operated with not more than a two-man crew instead of the six-man crew used by the Army.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I have heard from my area and everything I have heard corroborates what the gentleman said today. For this reason I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether or not, in view of what has been said here, he thinks the cut at this time may be premature? I have heard from the city of Denver. We do not have an opportunity to adjust our budget at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. The same action was taken last year. We thought 1 year's time would be plenty notice to give these people. We cannot afford to pay out any more. Too many are asking for the same thing.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The difficulty is there has been no legislation on our statute books to guide the cities.

Mr. STEFAN. We have control towers being operated by CAA and by municipalities.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In emergency cases.

Mr. STEFAN. We have many of them now being paid for by the Federal Government. We have applications ahead and we cannot meet all of them.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the CAA is not able to do it, it will result in considerable confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable, if not alarming, that the committee has seen fit to deduct the amount of $4,800,000, the estimated cost of operating the air traffic control towers in 1948. The committee did this, I am sure, in a sincere desire to cut down Federal expenditures which is generally a very laudable desire, but I fear, in this instance, not well founded.

Last year I discussed with the city council of the largest city in my district, Corpus Christi, both the advisability and possibility of assuming the expense of operating the traffic-control tower of the municipal airport. We considered the Federal expenditures, the universal desire to decrease them, and the advantages accruing from municipal operation. We found it quite impossible for the city at that time to assume this expense.

I feel sure that when the air industry grows up we may look forward to the time when such expenses will be borne by the air lines themselves, or, perhaps, a joint operation of cities and air lines, and certainly with such control towers operated by CAA personnel and under CAA standards, safety factors would be in no way involved. But we are dealing with an industry which is unquestionably in its infancy, and with municipalities that are being more than pressed to finance their police protection, sanitation, and public works.

For example, my home city has grown by such leaps and bounds that it is accommodating a population from three to four times that which was anticipated with its public works. I assure you that insofar as I speak for my people, we are not inclined to ask from the Federal Government that which we could provide for ourselves.

The commercial air lines of America are a strong link in our national defense. There is no other medium through which we could better serve our people than the operation of air traffic control towers with the ensuing safety that they provide.

Cutting off Federal funds at this time for the operation of such control towers would mean, in an alarming number of cases, the loss of that vital service. Surely all of you agree with me that this would be most unfortunate and is certainly not the intention of this body.

I have helped you and will continue to help you reduce the expenses of this Government, but I cannot in a case which involves so very much, such as this. I sincerely trust that the membership will favor an amendment to restore these funds for the ensuing year. You may do so with the knowledge that they will be well spent in the interest of our people and our country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point for a brief comment?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In answer to my most gracious and kind colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and his statement a few minutes ago about being for spending and spending and spending, I say to him that he knows that that is not so; he knows that I have been one of the leading advocates of economy on the Committee on Appropriations. But I stand for sensible economy, not the penny-wise pound-foolish kind of false economy. I am not a self-confessed piddler. I had in mind a while ago when he made one of his usual wild statements about me a quotation from the Merchant of Venice:

> Gratiano talks an infinite deal of nothing, more so than any man in Venice. His reasons are like 2 grains of wheat in 2 bushels of chaff; you search all day until you find them, and when you find them they're not worth the search.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I arise to speak today to call to the attention of the membership of this body the fact that the Appropriations Committee has eliminated the funds for the operation of the air-control towers at the airports throughout the Nation.

This is not the first time effort has been made to eliminate this vital appropriation.

I have been one of the critics of the air lines when, in my opinion, they were operating negligently and when it appeared to me unnecessary and needless risks were being taken in the operation of flights during dangerous weather conditions. I likewise criticized the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration for their passive attitude in strictly enforcing the rules and regulations pursuant to the law of the land.

I now come to the criticism of my own body in eliminating funds for the operation of control towers at airports where both private and commercial ships land and take off. This borders onto criminal negligence.

Last year, in my address to the House on this vital matter, I called attention to the fact that the control tower is the nerve, heart, and sinew between the airplane and the ground. The control tower is the traffic policeman controlling the safety of all planes operating at an air base. The control tower flashes air conditions and weather conditions to the pilot groping in rain, sleet, snow, and darkness, as well as in sunshine.

Within the air control tower must sit a man well schooled and well experienced in the job of guiding planes in their landing and in their take-off, a responsible man who is directly under the control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is charged with the responsibility of insuring the performance of regulations and mandates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It has been said that the municipalities and other public bodies owning and operating air bases should maintain the control towers. I say to you that it is not the function of the local people to maintain a facility so vital as this. Its operation transcends and goes far beyond a locality—its operation required the closest direction of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Its operation is interstate commerce in its essence and in its fullest.

The cost of the operation of air lines is astronomically expensive. The weight of one four-motored air liner loaded is $80,000 pounds. The cost of such a liner exceeds a half million dollars. The cargo of such a liner is precious and beyond the scope of pecuniary evaluation.

Unlike trains and busses, air-line crashes generally wipe out the entire passenger list, as well as the pilots and other necessary personnel. So expensive is the operation of air lines the American taxpayer is compelled to expend heavy subsidies to keep their wings aloft and their ships in operation.

It follows necessarily, therefore, that safely guiding these precious treasures to and from the ground is our business and our function

If we fail to provide the funds to maintain the control towers, countless cities of this Nation will be black-outs. Countless precious lives will be endangered. The blood of some helpless person will be on our hands.

We have just authorized over $400,000,000 to protect, assist, and rehabilitate the Greeks and Turks. We have loaned Britain, France, and many other nations billions for their own people. How frugal we will be indeed to cast a sympathetic and friendly eye to our own people in maintaining an economy never approximated by any civilization since the beginning of the world.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Am I correct in interpreting the gentleman's remarks as indicating that he believes the Federal Government at all times should finance the control towers?

Mr. RIVERS. I believe the gentleman is exactly right, and I favor legislation to that effect. So long as we have the Civil Aeronautics Board telling the communities who can come in and who can take off, they cannot maintain these bases. Big cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, where countless thousands of planes come in, might be able to operate them, but a little city is at the mercy of a cold-blooded board such as the Civil Aeronautics Board. If the Federal Government does not help them, God help them.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Would the gentleman further advocate that the maintenance of all safety equipment, for instance, on a railroad, which carries as many people, possibly, is a proper function of the Federal Government?

Mr. RIVERS. Would the gentleman compare the subsidy of railroads to that of air lines?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think we will eventually have to face that question.

Mr. RIVERS. Unless you maintain the air lines of today, we will not have any tomorrow.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy we have had this discussion of our air pattern this afternoon, because it is not news to anybody that we are on the threshold, we are in fact into the program of a very extensive air pattern for the United States. We on the Committee on Appropriations who have watched that appropriation grow through the years are aware of the fact that we are at the place where we have to make certain fundamental distinctions in allocations of funds and revenues therefrom. We have to find out how far the responsibility of the Federal Government goes, and we have to know what are the responsibilities of municipalities. Just where are the air-line companies in this picture?

It is high time we took a look at the sun. We on the Committee on Appropriations have been reluctant to go ahead with the program that appeared to be going no place and otherwise did not have any guidance.

There was a great deal said about appropriations for Federal aid to airports. Last fall the House adjourned after appropriating $45,000,000 for Federal aid to airports on a 7-year program. The President of the United States soon after we adjourned, froze about $41,000,000 of those funds.

I direct your attention to page 27 of the committee report. Quoting from the report:

> It should also be called to the attention of the House that the President through a recent order has frozen approximately $41,000,000 of the current appropriation of $45,000,000.

That is, for the fiscal year 1947 on which we are operating. The report reads further:

> While most of this $41,000,000 has been allocated on paper for specific projects, it has actually not been obligated through written agreements and contracts. This money will remain available for expenditure during the year 1948.

By simple arithmetic, if you add $32,500,000 to $41,000,000 you will get $73,500,000 for Federal aid to airports. I trust you will be fair with the committee who are trying to do a fundamental job in this appropriation bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The Congress appropriated this $45,000,000 last year and the President froze $41,000,000 of those funds so that they were not available for expenditure.

Mr. HORAN. That is right; and the funds are still frozen.

Mr. KEEFE. The funds are still frozen, are they not? The President has it within his power to accelerate the airport program by releasing the funds and permitting them to be extended as Congress intended when it appropriated the money.

Mr. HORAN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. The amount you have appropriated in this bill for the same purpose will make the total amount available for expenditure, if the $41,000,000 is allowed to be expended by the President, of $73,500,000, and that will take care of the present allocations; will it not?

Mr. HORAN. It will unless somebody stirs up the pork barrel some more.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. On what date will this money become available?

Mr. HORAN. I refer the gentleman to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. On June 30, 1947.

Mr. HARRIS. That means about 6 weeks from now. Is it not true that all but approximately $3,005,000 of the apportionment to the States has been allocated?

Mr. HORAN. It has been allocated on paper, but not actually obligated.

Mr. STEFAN. How much did the gentleman say?

Mr. HORAN. All but $3,000,000 of the amount apportioned to the States.

Mr. STEFAN. No definite contracts have been made—not one cent has been paid out. No definite contract was made. But about $35,000,000 has been allocated. About $41,000,000 of 1947 funds will go to class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that; but is it not true that the allocation of this amount of money made available to the States has been made for class 1, 2, and 3 airports?

Mr. STEFAN. It has been earmarked for each State.

Mr. HARRIS. That is, for class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and thus far there has been no allocation made at all for class 4 and larger airports. Is that not true?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right; because all of your 1948 money was originally earmarked and specified to be spent for class 4 airports and airports higher than that. Here is your story on your airports. Will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] yield so that I might answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. We have a 7-year program on Federal-aid airports of $500,000,000. The CAA started out to set up plans and specifications. The municipalities objected to the original plans so they destroyed those. Then they set up new plans. They are working under the new plans now, but policies changed. They originally decided to earmark the $45,000,000 for the 1947 fiscal year for the smaller airports. The idea was to help the small airports. The President froze $41,000,000 of that 1947 money. The CAA has about $4,000,000 in a discretionary fund which they are using, some of it, for administration purposes. They asked for $65,000,000 to implement the 7-year program for the fiscal year 1948. They wanted $65,000,000. This was to be used for larger airports. We sent experts into the CAA, people who knew something about budgets and aviation. We had the advice of private fliers, commercial people. We had the advice of the private industry. So we cut one-half of the $65,000,000 asked for airports for 1948, and asked the CAA to review the program, because they decided themselves to study it for fiscal 1949. But before the committee brought this bill to the floor, when they found the committee had recommended a cut of one-half of the $65,000,000 for 1948, they sent out word to the country that they could start using the 1947 money beginning on June 30 for class 4 or larger airports. They changed their policy before they knew what Congress would do with this appropriation bill. They are now causing confusion all over the country. Yet they will have about $75,000,000 or $100,000,000 on hand, and not one cent has yet been spent. They have plenty of funds on hand. Much of this money cannot be matched for a long time, if ever.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill, and I am happy we are discussing at length this air problem that is before Congress, because the chairman of this subcommittee is absolutely right. There is a fundamental job to be done, and one that should not be relegated to the Appropriations Committee. We need the cooperation of this House in doing our work. This House has to face this tremendous air pattern problem that is before us, and get down to brass tacks and find out who is going to pay for what.

But this bill covers other things than air transportation in the Department of Commerce. One of the things that has been mentioned quite often this afternoon is the Cultural and Information Service, which presumes to represent America in its true phase to the people of other countries.

Mr. Chairman, since I made the point of order against the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs in the State Department that has brought that program squarely into focus, I am happy to have this opportunity to talk with you about that program and in that connection of that particular problem before our Nation.

One of our weekly magazines has said that the OIC program was "waving the bull at the red flag." I make no comment. I merely state that there is a job to be done, and to be financed. That is our problem, and you and I as representatives of 140,000,000 productive and progressive Americans have a duty to perform.

My first reason for objecting to the inclusion of this $31,000,000 item in the present appropriation bill is the very simple and wholly American one that there is no legal authorization for the activity in question. I am sure the Members fully realize that our committee is enjoined by the rules of this House from approving appropriations for any activity or agency of the Government that has not been specifically provided for by legislation in the proper committees and both Houses of the Congress. This rule, I might add, was properly restated and reaffirmed in the reorganization bill. But there was a second reason that was more compelling to me than the first (and yet it is closely associated with the first reason), for the very wise reasoning behind that rule is that the administration should not be given sums of money amounting to as much as $30,000,000 to spend for activities which have not

been reviewed by the representatives of the people serving on the appropriate committees of this body which is directly answerable to those who have to foot the bill. To some people, Mr. Chairman, that may be a mere technicality, but to me and to the vast majority of you, I am sure, it is a sacred duty we owe to our constituents and to our country. It comes with poor grace, I hold, for avowed advocates of our American representative Republic to suggest the continuation of this bypassing of Congress. It has indeed gone on too long already.

Mr. Chairman, there are at the present time at least two bills pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs dealing with this subject. They would provide for the establishment of an authorized program to carry out the mission of the present OIC. They may not be perfect, but that is unimportant since they are, of course, subject to modification and amendment by the committee and the Congress. I sincerely hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee will give due attention to these proposals, will conduct full hearings to bring out all the several approaches which have been suggested for this problem and will come forth into this Chamber with a unified proposal which will fully reflect the desires of all of the American people and will mobilize the total cultural talents of this great country in the work ahead. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Eightieth Congress is an exceptionally able committee with splendid leadership. How fortunate we are. How natural to suggest that they be about the consideration of this problem now.

It appears that I must take this purely elementary approach to the question, Mr. Chairman, because it has been quite evident that many of the critics of our subcommittee's action either have been ignorant of the proper legislative procedure in such matters or have become so thoroughly accustomed to the wartime policy of acting upon expediency that they are impatient with waiting for an expression of the people's will before carrying out the plans they have so enthusiastically devised for the people's benefit. If the Voice of America is to prevail, certainly it should reflect the best attitudes of all of our people, acting through their regularly elected representatives. There is indeed grave danger when our foreign policy is subject to design and origin by a small group in a department or bureau. We cannot hide behind any assumed indifference on the part of our constituencies. There is not any indifference. Our people are alert. They cry for a leadership to help them act wisely and effectively.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we owe this to the whole of our American people because the hearings on this activity held before our subcommittee brought out very emphatically that the designers and planners of the OIC program have not paid sufficient attention to the fundamentals of the way in which American government has traditionally operated and the way in which American people do things.

The leaders of the propaganda program under discussion were directed to carry out two objectives, according to the statement in hearings made by its director, Assistant Secretary Benton. The program was intended, first, to present a full and fair picture of the American people and the life of the American people.

The second objective, in the words of Mr. Benton, was to present the aims and objectives of United States policy.

Mr. Chairman, after many weeks of studying this program and questioning its directors, I have come to the conclusion that the program itself belies the first of those objectives because it is questionable that it was constituted in a manner reflective of the American people or their traditional way of doing things. I have also been forced to conclude that it cannot possibly carry out the second objective because no one connected with the program, from the Secretary of State on down, who appeared before our subcommittee, could or would give us a satisfactory explanation of just what United States foreign policy is. Despite much breast beating during the Greek debates, it was not announced or defined recently by any Member of Congress. May I here refer you particularly to pages 25, 27, 416, and 608 of the hearings to illustrate how vague and nebulous these folks' concept of our foreign policy is. Yet we directly need an expressed policy. How are we going to prove the grandeur of our foreign policy to the distraught peoples of the world if we cannot define them ourselves? I feel that they can—and should be expressed.

In this connection, I liked Walter Lippmann's column this morning, and I would like to read to you the opening and closing paragraphs of his column:

Though money for radio broadcasts and printing is needed so that the voice of America may be heard in foreign lands, our greatest need is to have something definite, clear, and convincing for that voice to say. There would be little opposition in Congress to an appropriation if it were not for the feeling that the men who conduct our propaganda have little to do with the making of our policy, and that the sales department of the Government is, so to speak, writing advertisements about goods for which the production engineers have just begun to make the first blueprints.

And, his closing paragraph:

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement, would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded and advocated by the United States Government, be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject. The voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

What went in the middle in Mr. Lippmann's column this morning is his own idea. I do not know whether I agree with it or not, but I do suggest that it is entirely worth while for it is a constructive suggestion. The point is that certainly I should not say what the American policy is; not even such a student as Walter Lippmann should dictate the American policy. But it is entirely worth while to consider an approach that would enable you and I, Mr. Lippmann, and every other constructive American a chance to add his voice to the sum total of the Voice of America.

In order to properly present Mr. Lippmann's voice, I shall, when the Committee rises and we go back into the House, ask permission for his complete column to be added to the RECORD, following my remarks here.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it high time that this entire subject be fully explored by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Specifically, a complete study is most necessary so that the best possible information program may be devised. It should be in complete accordance with the terms of the foreign policy which those two committees are charged with the responsibility for formulating. I have a feeling that the best program need not be the most expensive program and that, thus, we may by group action on a national basis meet our strenuous fiscal problem at home and the challenges of an ideological warfare abroad with wisdom plus economy.

Now I have said that the program at present is not constituted in a manner reflective of the American people or their traditional way of doing things. By that statement I mean that we have been confronted with the paradox of a Government bureau entering into a field which always has been predominantly the domain of private enterprise—a bureau telling the world about the glories of the private-enterprise system which it has replaced. Nor is there evidence to prove that this costly substitute is justified.

My reaction to this fact is best expressed in the words used in the subcommittee report on the bill, page 7:

Our forebears planted on this soil the seed of liberty and social freedom which, if properly nurtured, should outgrow our boundaries and radiate its influence to the rest of the world, not through a centralized disseminating agency but through the force of its own dynamics.

"Nebulous," you say? All dreams, all hopes, all worthy objectives can be called "nebulous." That makes their eventual achievement all the more worthy.

That statement is a credit to its author, Mr. Corhal Orescan, clerk of our subcommittee. It is all the more creditable because it expresses an American hope that individual liberty and the resultant social freedom may by the mere force of its example transform a state of global chaos into an atmosphere of interdependent purpose wherein all men may become important each to the other and, through a full and restraining realization of that interdependence, work together peacefully, that perhaps the sweat of purposeful work in peace might achieve the same unities that have been effected by the tears of war. That is the American hope. It breaks like a sunrise—to whom? To the thoughtful immigrant who emerges from the shackles of social tradition abroad and is welcomed in this land so uniquely founded by the genius of Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jay, and that host of immortals who founded this country. These immigrants see it. They see it with a clearer vision than we of more ancient migration.

Mr. Chairman, there is a job to do. I insist that it be done in the best tradition of our America. To better understand our present position, let me review the basic steps that find us where we are. Then let me suggest the materials we possess for a constructive solution.

The days of the shooting war are over. Looking back we can see now that, although they were days of hectic hurry, violence, despair, tragedy, and triumph, they were not, in some ways, too difficult.

They were days of total effort. Everyone was out to win the war, win it quickly. We cast aside many of our individual privileges. Top secret, and national security, and national purpose beclouded, for the duration, our clear rights to freedom of choice, of speech and of redress in the courts of public opinion.

In the tangled realms of fiscal policy, too, we placed achievement first and the saner values as dictated by the competitive market second.

We won the war at all costs. And it was at all costs. Costs in lives, costs in the draining away of our natural resources, costs in actual money. It was expedient and expensive.

But, looking back, we can see the powers that accrue to a people who are convinced and dedicated to a singleness of purpose.

The record of the final overpowering of the total governments of the Axis, the presumed triumph of the Allies and ourselves over a form of government incompatible with our own, was worth, we thought, the digressions we ourselves had been forced to make.

Even a representative republic must detour from its broad avenues of purpose in war times. Its goal of destiny demands that certain decisions be made by small and trusted groups. To do this, we passed war powers and gave them to the President. When expediency required that quick decisions be made, we accepted them in the form of directives. Yet we knew, and we now know, that government by directives approaches the executive form of government and that the distrusted total form of government is but a step beyond.

America's sons and daughters, her resources and her riches, all were made available to be used and be spent for just one purpose, victory.

The enemy, with his cannons and his planned blitzkrieg, is vanquished.

We can be both thankful and, I hope, humble in that fact.

We can be united in a determination that our total effort must now be bent to keep the scourge of war from returning to our world. This purpose we owe to the white crosses that punctuate the sentences of recent history. Our debt is to the lives they might otherwise have lived.

The days of shooting war, I have said, are over. But the challenge to our capitalistic western civilization looms just as large as ever. Certainly, now, if our freedoms were worth fighting for at Dunkirk, El Alamein, Normandy, across the broad Pacific, and all over the world, then those same freedoms are worth fighting for now. And the responsibility should not be delegated, without authorization, to a small group in a department or bureau.

I believe with fervent firmness that our total talent can and should be mobilized—openly and with announced purpose—to fight America's battles in the ideological warfare that, today, menaces our present hard-won peace.

That this assembling of ability can be achieved without conscription, on a voluntary basis, is all the more in its favor.

Our total talent? Does anyone here today know what a tremendous wealth of talent we have which could be utilized in telling our story to the world?

Mr. Chairman, the popular conception of the so-called Voice of America is that it consists solely of a few radio stations, built by the Government, and a handful of men in the State Department putting out a campaign of propaganda as a countermeasure to an ever stronger campaign of propaganda being put out by other countries.

In my conception, Mr. Chairman, the real Voice of America is sounded in 140,000,000 throats and is a blending of many different tones.

I would like to refer this Committee to pages 422–436, inclusive, of the subcommittee hearings on this bill. I made a sincere attempt to discover in full what the sum total of talents available in this campaign might be. The answers to my questions found there are not too acceptable—but they do give some idea of the extent of our total talent resources which might be used in this ideological conflict.

Reference is made in those hearings to our greatest single power for good will in the field of international relations—the free, Christian church and its missionaries. Nothing we do, governmentally, should undermine nor dilute the clear glory of their work.

There are references made to our American educational institutions—both at home and abroad. There are hundreds of schools in far-off countries maintained by American wealth and thousands of foreign students brought here annually to receive the benefits of our own universities. Also, we send vast numbers of our educators across the seas—to learn for themselves and to spread their own knowledge to others. I would suggest to the State Department that much better use could be made of these educators and students than is now being done.

Our newspapers and periodical journals have correspondents in nearly every foreign country, and their product in this postwar year is more widely distributed in foreign markets than ever before. Some of them publish in English, with great success; others in the languages of their distribution area. Certainly we can encourage and make greater use of these media.

We can also do much to encourage a wider circulation of American music and musical talent through extension of private publishing firms and concert agencies and facilitating of copyright clearances.

My questioning in those hearings revealed that no exact information has been gathered to determine how many American firms there are which have representation abroad. It was admitted in the hearings that some 22,000 American firms are engaged in export-import trade. It also was brought out that, so far, no full-scale attempt has been made to use these advance guards of individualistic America as local demonstrators of what American capitalism is and should be.

But I need not further review the total of our talent. You know them—our missionaries, our journalists, our educators, our philanthropists, our businessmen—our ordinary individual Americans—all fired with a desire to help in the problem before us.

Our talent for Americanism is tremendous.

We have a duty. We have a responsibility. We must cease "waving the bull at the red flag." We must use our every facility to present America. That is our job.

The future will record our success.

I submit that it is not a job for a small group of bureaucrats.

It is a job for all who believe in America and America's future. Every American who goes abroad should feel a personal responsibility as to our relations with other countries, where one thoughtless individual by a reckless word or act could, and has, undone the patient work of legions of laborers in the vineyards of good will. And all 140,000,000 of us have a right and a duty to participate in performing that task.

Without necessarily agreeing with Mr. Lippmann's suggestions herein made, I do feel that the column below is thoughtful and analytical. It has a definite place in any search for the "voice" and the "words" in America's foreign policy.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Though money for radio broadcasts and printing is needed so that the Voice of America may be heard in foreign lands, our greatest need is to have something definite, clear, and convincing for that voice to say. There would be little opposition in Congress to an appropriation if it were not for the feeling that the men who conduct our propaganda have little to do with the making of our policy, and that the sales department of the Government is, so to speak, writing advertisements about goods for which the production engineers have just begun to make the first blueprints.

As for the customers abroad, they are undoubtedly confused and suspicious, partly no doubt because the rival firm misrepresents us, but chiefly because we sound so hot and bothered when, as a great power, they expect us to be cool and definite. Mr. Benton's difficulties with Congress and with the opposition abroad will diminish when his Chief, Secretary Marshall, has had time to form and to organize a concrete American program for the settlement of the war.

The elements of such a program have, I believe, gradually emerged from the vast and intricate debates, and can be formulated now as the basis for further discussion. They could, I think, be stated in some such way as this:

1. The division of the world into two great coalitions—one with its center in Moscow and the other with its center in Washington—is only apparent. The world cannot be divided

in this way. The coalitions cannot be organized. The nations of Europe will resist the idea that they are the satellites of the two non-European great powers, and that their continent is the predestined theater of a Soviet-American conflict. Insofar as the Truman doctrine consciously or unconsciously treats Europe in this fashion, it is an obstacle to the making of peace and is destructive of American influence on the making of peace.

2. The revival of Europe under the leadership of Great Britain and France, now the principal European powers, is necessary. There can be no German settlement except within the framework of a European settlement. The political and economic unification of Germany is neither possible nor safe except within the framework of a European economic union, and of enough European political union to provide the primary guaranties of the German settlement. The Russian and American guaranties of German good behavior will have to be secondary to the European guaranty.

3. Though in the end the unity of Europe must comprehend the whole of Europe, a partial unity is better than none at all. The unity of western Europe alone cannot be self-suporting and solvent. It will require official support from the Western Hemisphere, principally from the United States. But if the support is given on conditions which promote and induce unification, the partial union of western Europe will exert immense attraction upon eastern Europe.

4. These considerations enable us to state the definite terms upon which we could propose to settle the Soviet-American conflict. Our object is the revival of Europe as an independent power in the world. To attain this object we shall have to provide the equivalent of lend-lease for a term of years as the necessary working capital, obtainable nowhere else, for a European economic union.

The Russian contribution will have to be the military evacuation, simultaneously with a British, French, and American military evacuation, of the Continent. The armies must go home, leaving behind them only token forces in Germany and at sensitive and unsettled points such as Trieste and the Greek frontier. The military evacuation of Europe would have to be followed by agreement that all European states may enter the European economic union.

In return for that, we could afford to finance some German reparation payments, and to provide some credit, to the Soviets.

5. In the middle east we should propose a new treaty covering the Dardanelles, the borders of Greece and Turkey, the port of Saloniki, and the oil concessions of Iran.

Such a settlement is, I believe, ultimately attainable because it reflects the actual balance of power, which neither can alter radically, between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Red Army is deep into Europe. The settlement calls for its withdrawal to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We cannot compel it to withdraw. On the other hand, we can prevent it from advancing farther because of our ability to strike at the vital centers of Russia. The settlement would recognize the military deadlock.

To this settlement the United States would contribute financial support, large by peacetime standards but insignificant by wartime standards. This assistance would ransom Europe from the armies of occupation, would revive the most highly civilized continent in the world, would enable Russia to obtain help in her own reconstruction which she can obtain in no other way, would enable this country to avoid a chronic depression caused by unsalable surpluses of goods.

A program of this kind, proposing a concrete settlement, would, if it were persistently, patiently, and thoroughly expounded and advocated by the United States Government, be very hard to misrepresent, and very hard to reject.

The Voice of America would begin to speak a language that the weary, the hungry, and the frightened are longing to hear.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loan bill last week I said that this $400,000,000 was only the beginning. I said that the Truman doctrine was a doctrine of pouring American dollars into every reactionary government in the world in an attempt to keep them in power. I said that the attempt by the Truman administration to sell this bill to the people of the United States as a relief measure was the rankest kind of hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that what one says is confirmed so immediately and so conclusively. I want to call the attention of the House to the three-column headline on the front page of the Washington Post of this morning. It reads, and I quote:

Turks to use United States loan for military purposes; to ask bank aid also.

A dispatch by the United Press announces, and I quote:

President Gen. Ismet Inönü, of Turkey, announced today that Turkey will use the $100,000,000 American loan for military purposes and will seek a loan from the International Bank for economic development.

In a direct answer to the question: "Can you say now how you would use the money which the United States proposes to advance, that is, whether for economic or military development?" Inönü replied: "The aid to be given by the United States will be used for military purposes. For the purpose of economic development a loan will be requested from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development."

There, Mr. Chairman, is the blunt answer to those who said that this was a relief measure. We are pouring a first installment of $100,000,000 into Turkey to keep a repressive dictatorship in power.

I notice also, Mr. Chairman, that even the supporters of this measure are already beginning to get a little restive about it. In an editorial on Greek amnesty in this morning's Washington Post the editors say:

The Greek Government is acting as if the sole purpose of our aid were to enable it to stay in power.

I include the entire editorial in the RECORD:

GREEK AMNESTY

It is clear that there can be no peace in Greece until there is a fairly general political amnesty. It is becoming equally clear that such an amnesty is not likely to be offered by the present Greek Government on its own initiative. For the Greek leaders seem to have interpreted the promise of American aid as a mandate to continue the status quo. Not only has nothing been done to bring about the amnesty that was promised the Republican generals a year ago, but George Patandreous, the Minister of the Interior, has come out publicly against an amnesty on the ground that it would offend Greek pride and infringe on Greek sovereignty. In other words, the Greek Government is acting as if the sole purpose of our aid were to enable it to stay in power.

This is not a point on which diplomatic niceties need be involved. The talk about an amnesty offending Greek pride is just so much balderdash. The only pride that would be injured would be that of the semi-Fascists who hope to use the aid program for their own corrupt purposes. Since the Greek Government applied for the aid, we, as the donor, have an unquestioned right to insist in this minimum assurance that our help will be used for the aims intended. As we embark on a new phase of foreign policy, we ought to make it abundantly evident that the policy is designed to protect independent governments from outside aggression, and not merely to shore up reaction.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the task that has confronted the Committee on Appropriations. Sometimes it seems rather unkind when a committee has worked as diligently and as sincerely as the Committee on Appropriations has to criticize some of their efforts. But I am sure they realize that the criticisms are directed with a view to bringing about improvements rather than for any other reason. I might say I am not wholly in discord with the bill because there is certainly one feature of the bill which I thoroughly approve. I might say I not only approve of it but am quite sure that all the Members of the House from New York City approve that portion of it which provides in connection with the census statistics section that on and after October 1, 1947, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign-trade statistics shall be performed in New York and of the foregoing amount $1,200,000 shall be available exclusively for this purpose.

I might say that the thanks of the people working in customs statistics in New York are due and are given to the chairman of the committee, Mr. TABER, and to Mr. ROONEY, of Brooklyn, for their efforts in endeavoring to retain and for retaining the Customs Statistics Service in New York City. It had been there for many years but some effort was made on the part of the Department to remove it to Washington for no apparent purpose. Those who are working in that section in New York were able to bring to the attention of Mr. ROONEY and Mr. TABER the fact that by remaining in New York there would be a saving to the Government of approximately $200,000. Needless to say, both Mr. ROONEY and Mr. TABER were anxious to save that money for the Government and have thus provided in this bill for the retention of Customs Statistics Service in New York. Again I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for their efforts in that behalf.

I desire to speak, however, particularly in connection with the establishment of air-navigation facilities.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that conferees may be named on the Greek-Turkish loan legislation, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938, an act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. EATON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JONKMAN, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE.

THE SCANDALOUS TURKISH-GREEK DEAL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the scandalous Turkish-Greek deal at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, apparently President Truman and the State Department have paid some little attention to what the Senate and the House had to say about the scandalous Turkish-Greek deal because our Government has suggested a general amnesty for the Greek rebels. In the news report of May 10, the United Press states the following—and I quote:

The Minister of Public Order, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, and Deputy Prime Minister Stylianos Gonatas, rightists, were extremely angry at American intervention, according to another Cabinet Minister who attended last night's meeting of the political council.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of this article appear in my remarks at this point.

ATHENS NEGOTIATES ON AMNESTY PLAN—NOTE TO UNITED STATES ENVOY ACCEPTS IN EFFECT OUTSIDE SUPERVISION BUT BARS UN PROPOSAL

ATHENS, May 10.—The Greek Government agreed tonight in substance to the American suggestion of an internationally supervised general amnesty for Greece's estimated 15,000 guerrillas.

But the agreement, contained a note to the United States Ambassador Lincoln MacVeagh, was based on the condition that a pending recommendation of the United Nations Balkans Investigating Commission for United Nations supervision of the amnesty be withdrawn.

The note followed a 1½-hour meeting this morning between Mr. MacVeagh and Constantin Tsaldaris, Deputy Premier and Foreign Minister, who sought clarification of the American proposal for a genuine amnesty. The American reply is expected early next week.

It was understood that the American proposal, presented as a suggestion and backed by an implied threat to withhold American assistance to Greece, is that the Greek Government move faster than the United Nations Balkans Commission and request several smaller states to supervise the amnesty.

TSALDARIS' QUESTIONS CITED

Mr. Tsaldaris was understood to have asked Mr. MacVeagh just who precisely would benefit by the amnesty, what should be done to men accused of common law crimes and what the United States would suggest for the methods and qualifications for the supervisory mission.

Meanwhile, the extreme right and the extreme left here reacted alike to the American proposals for foreign supervision of the amnesty and a broadening of the Government.

Both sides accused the United States of intervening in Greece's internal affairs. The Minister of Public Order, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, and Deputy Prime Minister Stylianos Gonatas, rightists, were extremely angry at American intervention, according to another Cabinet Minister who attended last night's meeting of the political council.

The Communist newspaper Rizopastis expressed a similar feeling and carried blaring headlines on "American Intervention."

The government of Premier Demtrios Maximos has an amnesty program, but it is not trusted by the guerrillas. The plan provides that only those accused of major crimes such as murder will be punished severely. Yet, 10 men and 1 woman were shot at Lamia in central Thessaly yesterday for collaborating with or enlisting recruits for the guerrillas.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, when the United Nations proposes amnesty to the present Greek Government, the Nazi collaborationist, General Zervas, who today is in charge of the Greek Army and the Greek policy, became extremely angry. This is a perfect illustration as to why the Greek Government needs to be reorganized. It is a perfect illustration to the point that political democracy is the only basis on which economic rehabilitation and an end to the civil war in Greece can be obtained.

I wish to call the attention of the House to a Washington Post article of Monday, May 12, which states the following:

Actually, this Government has not moved a finger in any constructive direction since President Truman's speech 2 months ago.

The vicious reactionary monarchial government existing in Greece assumes that we are going to pour out money to maintain them in office by force of American arms. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article in the Washington Post appear in my remarks at this point:

UNITED STATES AMNESTY PLAN HELD UNAUTHORIZED—RECALCITRANT GREEK GOVERNMENT SEEKS TO PROVE MAC VEAGH, ETHRIDGE ACTED ON OWN

(By Seymour Friedin)

ATHENS, GREECE, May 11.—The recalcitrant Greek Government, more unwilling than ever to accept a plan of an internationally supervised amnesty, sought today to prove that a chasm of difference existed between Washington and United States representatives in Athens and Geneva.

Employing a State Department denial in Washington that Ambassador Lincoln MacVeagh had been instructed to enter the negotiations, Government officials blithely accepted their own interpretation of the statement. They suggested strongly that neither MacVeagh, here, nor Mark Ethridge, in Geneva, had official American blessings to make suggestions of any kind.

Government quarters even suggested that MacVeagh might be recalled because, according to their version, he acted on his own initiative in proffering suggestions. Some American representatives may have been staggered by the Government's eager search for loopholes to avoid responsibility, but this is just the beginning.

George Patandreou today became the first minister to place himself on record publicly against the amnesty proposals. The Minister of the Interior asserted in his newspaper today that acceptance of the amnesty proposal would offend Greek pride and infringe on Greek sovereignty.

This was the same attitude taken without attribution by most of the members of the Government. Opposition Center Party sources, however, insist the real reason for the Cabinet's refusal to accept the amnesty suggestion is the fear that it means recognition of the Royalists' failure to ameliorate conditions.

Actually, this Government has not moved a finger in any constructive direction since President Truman's speech 2 months ago. The attitude is simply to wait for the American mission to arrive. This Government apparently will not make a definite move unless it can give the appearance of being ordered by an interested power.

Nevertheless the Government persists in launching new offensives which so far have done little more than increase the guerrillas' activities. It was learned today that another campaign has been initiated in northwest Thebes and Lavadia. The operation indicates that the guerrillas apparently have been moving slowly south toward the capital. Communist leadership among the rebels is known to seek a bold feat, like appearing near Athens, to prove the strength of their movement.

Political discussions toward the new complexion of the Government are expected to be important this week.

The aged Themistocles Sofoulis, Liberal Party leader, again today reiterated that he will not enter the Government unless he becomes Premier and his party can undertake the responsibility alone of restoring peace in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, I think that our State Department and Mr. Truman should understand that at least some of us in the Congress intend to follow with the closest attention the development of the Greek-Turkish policy and to call the attention of the House and of the country to any failures that occur.

Mr. Speaker, for my part, and I believe I can speak for a number of other Congressmen, the State Department and the President of the United States can consider that the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end. We are at peace; the President of the United States has proposed a policy which stabs the United Nations in the back; he has proposed a policy which puts military power first; economic reconstruction second, and political stability last. Obviously, the policy is a complete error; obviously, we should establish political stability first, economic reconstruction second, and thereby eliminate the need for military coercion. Obviously, the policy, instead of being decided by us and paid for by us alone, should begin with the United Nations, and should be decided by the United Nations.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the entire Truman doctrine is an abortive, ill-conceived policy of military aggrandizement which isolates America from the world, guarantees its own defeat because it begins at the wrong place.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end and because the Truman policy does not represent a

policy to maintain the national security of America, it violates our commitments to the United Nations and begins to work for war instead of peace. The bipartisan policy therefore is dead, and deserves to be dead.

The foreign policy has become, Mr. Speaker, an issue in the 1948 campaign. Whether we like it or not, Mr. Truman has decided to run for President on a basis of the Truman doctrine, and thereby in my opinion has guaranteed his own defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that as we move along through the year the vast and endless ramifications of the Truman doctrine will be brought home to the Congress. The Washington Post of Monday had an article from which I wish to quote from London. This article states: "The Conservative Party published today an election program accepting substantially all objectives of the Socialist program, with some differences in method and asking for a new, bigger, and more generous loan from the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this article appear in my remarks at this point.

TORIES SEEK BIGGER UNITED STATES LOAN, ENDORSE SOCIALIST OBJECTIVES

LONDON, May 11.—The Conservative Party published today an election platform accepting substantially all objectives of the Socialist program, with some differences in method, and asking for a new, bigger, and more generous loan from the United States.

The statement said in effect that if elected the Tories will carry out practically the whole Socialist program, with more efficiency, more individual freedom, and less red tape.

The Tories predicted an economic crisis for Britain in 1948, saying the American and Canadian loans would be exhausted by the middle of that year. They said Britain could not scale down its empire-preference tariff structure—as required in the current loan agreement with the United States—unless "other countries" offered adequate reductions in their own trade barriers.

"Concessions hedged around with escape clauses," the statement added, referring to the same loan agreement, "are of no use to us."

For the next few years the volume of world trade will depend on the amount of help the United States gives to war-stricken countries like Britain, which cannot afford to pay for their imports, the statement continued. If the United States is willing to lend money to other countries and accept their goods in payment of interest, world trade will expand and Britain will secure a large enough share of it to pay for her own vital imports, the statement said.

"If the United States is not willing to follow this policy, we shall have to make the best of the avenues of trade at our disposal," the Tories wrote.

The statement accepts all the Socialists' main ideas. The Tories agree that Britain's economic life should be planned by the government for the benefit of the nation. They agree that government planning should insure full employment at all times; allocate materials and manpower to the industries where they are most needed; give top priority to the capital re-equipment of industry, the export drive, power, transport, and housing; continue rationing and price controls as long as the necessities of life are scarce; and guarantee the farmers' market and prices.

The Tories accept the nationalization of the coal mines, railroads, and the Bank of England without protest, and most of their fiscal policy is identical with that of Hugh Dalton, Socialist Chancelor of the Exchequer. But they promise to free part of the road-trucking and civil aviation industries from national ownership, and they oppose the nationalization of iron and steel. They also contend that the Government is spending too much money and encouraging inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will note that the Conservative Party is asking for a bigger and more generous loan from the United States. In this connection, Mr. Stewart Alsop, who writes the very interesting and able column entitled "Matter of Fact," in the first of three articles summarizing his experiences in England argues that the Greek crisis in retrospect will look like a teapot tempest. He points out that the British are facing an enormous world-wide crisis from which the United States alone can rescue them. Mr. Speaker, I request that Mr. Alsop's column on British-American partnership be included in my remarks at this point:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

CAN WE DO THE JOB?—THE BRITISH PARTNERSHIP

The infinite boredom in a little room which trans-Atlantic plane travel provides leaves the returning traveler little alternative to thought. To one who has seen, however briefly, something of the contest between the Soviet Union and the West now in progress throughout the Near and Middle East, the likeliest subject with which to while away the long hours is simply this: Can we do the job?

Certainly the effort which has already started to checkmate Soviet expension by promoting political and economic stability in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world, will not be an easy job. Yet given certain conditions, it can be done.

One condition is painfully obvious. That is that Great Britain remain a major world power. American policy in the Middle East is based squarely on the assumption that Great Britain remain a good long-term bet. This is so, simply because a total British economic collapse, or a wholesale withdrawal of British influence (or what is more likely, both together) would leave a vast vacuum far more easily filled by the Soviet Union than by the United States. The question is therefore pertinent: "How good a bet is Great Britain?"

To that question you can find in England an infinite variety of answers. "You can write us off," one prominent Tory remarked to this reporter, with that intense pleasure in the lugubrious sometimes attributed to the unadmirable English weather.

Glance at the coal cuts for this summer, glance at the export figures, and stop fooling yourselves. England will never make it. A dwindling number of enthusiastic Socialists see the Socialist millennium ushered in within a couple of years or so, with plenty for all and dancing on the village green. What appear to be the most sensible and informed observers place the answer somewhere between these extremes. Their mood is one of guarded optimism. They are betting on England, but they have their fingers crossed.

There are all sorts of reasons why no sensible man would dare to uncross his fingers in the near future. Coal is one. Coal is at the heart of the British economic crisis; if coal production were suddenly and miraculously to equal prewar, the whole country would be out of the woods tomorrow. Yet, this month the hours of work at the coal face have been reduced to 35, and played-out Welsh mines, their seams almost run out, are still being worked, while rich, new, unexploited mines in Yorkshire are badly undermanned. The problem is partly human and partly political. The miners exhibit the same curious lethargy which characterizes many workers in many industries in postwar Britain. The Government has no carrot in the form of consumption goods to offer them, and since it is politically dependent on their good will, it dares not use a stick. Yet there are signs that the meaning of the terrible coal crisis of the winter has struck home, and that nationalization has provided a morale boost. Despite wildcat strikes, the production curve is gently up.

Another symptom of the reason why fingers remain crossed may be found in the simple fact that during the recent Easter recess of Parliament most of the members of the Cabinet took to their beds in utter exhaustion. They were on the verge of total collapse simply because of the desperate shortage of efficient personnel to manage the immense business of transforming Britain into a semisocial state. One high Labor Party official remarked to this reporter that before the war he and his friends had always imagined that the greatest obstacle to successful socialism would be the bitter intransigeance of the ruling class, but they had found that the real trouble was not barricades in the streets but getting good men to run the show. The transfer of the basic economic power into the hands of the state presupposes men with the technical training to manage this vast power. Such men have too often been lacking, and the result has not infrequently been something close to total administrative break-down, but here, too, are signs of improvement.

Yet the plain fact is that whatever government were in power—and the Tory leaders in private conversation thank their lucky stars that they were beaten in 1945—Great Britain would inevitably be sailing perilously close to the wind in these postwar years. British economists, when they go to bed at night, must pray for the return of the world buyers' market in food. When that time comes, not only will Britain be able to buy the food at lower prices to keep 49,000,000 people alive, but the strength of the British economic position as the world's great market will again be restored. But until that time comes the British economy will drop along from crisis to crisis, now showing signs of recovery, now seemingly about to sink without trace.

If and when it becomes clear that the British economy is in fact faced with total collapse, the United States will be confronted with a crisis of foreign policy which will make the Greek crisis seem in retrospect a mere teapot tempest. It is the certainty that an economic collapse is on the way, and that such a collapse will force the Labor government to cut its world commitments, to divorce its policy from that of the United States, and to appease the Soviet Union; that gives the Labor rebels their perfect confidence that they will win in the end.

In this prospect, the United States can do more than cross its fingers. Among both American and British policy makers there is a growing conviction that some sort of overall agreement on the parts both nations must play in the coming few years is essential. Such an agreement would be specifically designed to take some of the heavy and disproportionate load off British shoulders while Britain fights for her economic life. For Britain, it would be a form of life insurance against the economic storms looming visibly on the British horizon. For the United States, such an agreement would also be life insurance; insurance against the unthinkable catastrophe of the loss of the only dependable ally in the effort to contain Soviet expansion and reach a true world settlement.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, when we consider that the French Government is now depending on us, and when we examine the economic situation in France and Japan and discover that we will be asked to rebuild these economies, we began to understand the enormous commitments to which the Truman doctrine has bound us.

Japan alone will take one hundred or one hundred and fifty millions of dollars. Mr. Alfred Friendly, writing for the Washington Post of this past Sunday, states, and I quote:

A large segment of the Japanese Nation has relaxed into complacent dependency on American largesse.

Our State Department is demanding seventy-five or one hundred and seventy-five millions for Korea. Now we discover that we are going to have to carry Japan on our backs for another three or four hundred millions each year. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. Friendly's article on Japan appear in my remarks at this point.

REPARATIONS - OUT - OF - PRODUCTION IDEA STUDIED—UNITED STATES PLANS "HYPO" FOR LAGGING JAPAN

(By Alfred Friendly)

Weary of pouring American money down a bottomless pit, State Department experts are deliberating a new plan involving a "cranking up" of the Japanese economy, the Washington Post learned last week.

It involves rehabilitation of Japanese trade and industry to the point where it can support itself and pay its war reparations out of its current production.

The plan is still only in the discussion and exploratory stages. Its general outlines, however, have been talked over with persons high on the staff of General MacArthur, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.

The United States is pumping $225,000,000 a year into Japan in the form of food and supplies. This is a minimum "antidisease and unrest" necessity. This relief payment is supposed to end after 1948, but unless the Japanese economy improves materially the need for continuing payments will still be compelling.

But the Japanese economy shows no signs of improvement. On the contrary, it has deteriorated notably ever since November.

A second necessity, intimately connected with the first, is that of helping solve the economic difficulties of the countries of the Far East which fought Japan. As long as Japan continues to live only by virtue of an economic oxygen tent provided by the United States, its neighboring countries—China, the Philippines, Korea, the Netherlands East Indies, French Indochina, etc.—have no hope of obtaining reparations from her to help restore their own economies.

OWN BOOTSTRAPS POLICY

Accordingly, the State Department has about reached the conclusion that two basic policies which we have followed since VJ-day must be subjected to a considerable overhauling.

The first policy relates to Japanese economic recovery. The directives on this matter have said, in effect, "You got yourself into this jam; now it's up to you to get yourself out as best you can, by your own efforts."

The second policy calls for the Japanese payment of reparations out of its capital, in the form of plant, equipment, reserves, and other physical and financial assets. Though the Potsdam Declaration did not close the door to a system of reparations out of current production, it did not direct that method to be undertaken.

These two policies, certain State Department officials believe, are not working out. In the first place, Japan shows no signs of getting herself out of the jam. It is on the brink of starvation. Mass unrest, particularly in the urban centers, provides a sterile field in which to plant the seeds of democracy.

In the second place, it is becoming increasingly clear that transferring Japanese industrial equipment, placement or en gross, to its neighbors as reparations is not very successful.

Much of Japan's industrial equipment is obsolescent, was undermaintained during the war, and has deteriorated since. It is difficult and uneconomical to move (it's pretty hard and fairly futile to pick up and move a blast furnace, for example). Besides, it takes much technical skill for a neighboring nation to absorb the equipment into its own economy.

It is questionable whether China, for instance, would have the technical ability to take over a large part of Japan's steel plant, or whether the Philippines could absorb the erstwhile Japanese aluminum industry.

There are, however, many items which Japan could produce with its present equipment which would be inordinately useful to the countries ravaged by war. China needs coastal and river vessels which could be produced in Japanese shipyards. Railroad equipment, textile and food-processing machinery and plants could also be turned out in Japan to fill urgent needs of nearby lands.

Is it possible, then, to modify the policies we have followed as regards Japan, and reorient Japanese industry? Can it be made to develop surplus as well as maintain its own economic life?

CAN'T BOOST SUBSIDY

State Department groups worrying about the problem hope that the answers to both questions will be in the affirmative. But they admit the presence of several extremely difficult problems and conditioning factors:

1. No additional financing of the new plan can be counted on from the American Government. As a practical matter, it is felt that Congress would not agree to a subsidy larger than the present annual two hundred and twenty-five million.

2. The countries of the Far East are not going to be particularly happy to see us help build up the Japanese economy while their own economies are in such a sad state. Yet these countries must cooperate in the plan if it is to be a success.

Accordingly, the United States must be able to demonstrate that the plan will be to their benefit. It is at this point that the scheme of reparations out of current production comes into the picture. The prospect of reparations payments may serve to make the rehabilitation plan palatable to Japan's neighbors and to enlist their tangible help in the form of financing.

3. A large segment of the Japanese nation has relaxed into complacent dependency on American largesse. It will be difficult to reorganize its industry, and its psychology, to produce on a higher level and to export the surplus. Much pressure will be needed to force Japan to produce under a rational system. Up to this point the pressure that MacArthur has exerted has been less than successful.

4. Success of the plan depends on securing a much larger supply of imported raw materials than Japan has been receiving. Although production facilities are ample for a much higher rate of industrial activity—enough to produce large exports of finished goods—Japan stands desperately in need of coal, raw cotton, and many other commodities.

5. To obtain these raw materials, and for other purposes, considerable financing is needed, over and above the $225,000,000 a year supplied by the United States. The hope is that some of this financing can be done by private industry, interested in imports from Japan, and some by neighboring countries, in the hope that initial outlays will produce ultimate reparations.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION GAP

State Department economists calculate that some $800,000,000 will be needed to do the job in 1948. Of this, Japan is assured the two hundred and twenty-five million and can make up about three hundred million from the sale of her increased exports. This leaves a deficit of about two hundred and seventy-five million.

To make this up, there is some one hundred and fifty million in gold and silver owned by Japan. The remaining one hundred and twenty-five million, it is hoped, can be provided by trade credits, by nearby countries and by private business interests.

Far Eastern experts admit the enormous difficulties in the proposed program, and concede that their plans are still tentative, far from adoption. But, they insist, this plan or some other must replace a present system which holds in it precisely the same promise as does pouring sand down a rat hole.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that in my opinion the bipartisan foreign policy is at an end. I believe that the Truman administration will argue for heavier and heavier expenditures, for universal military conscription on the basis of the Truman doctrine. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that the kind of naval diplomatic thinking which characterizes the Greek-Turkish business will come in for rough sledding whenever it raises its head in the future. Admirals seem to have a fascination for islands and for peninsulas and for straits. They love to hang around the perimeters of great continental masses with their warships. They love to have long lines of communications. They love to mess in Greece when the main fight is in the heart of Europe in Germany. For three centuries the British naval diplomacy and naval thinking has built up island bases and dependencies and lines of naval communication throughout the world. It is a wonderful thing for admirals to have battleships and islands and bases and little peninsulas and long lines of communication, but 90 percent of it is waste; 90 percent is useless and 90 percent is a handicap rather than a help in actual warfare. Perhaps if the Navy could be excused from participating in the formulation of policy, when the Truman doctrine is to be expanded there would be less discussion and less trouble about the whole business.

I believe that the Truman administration will be well advised to understand now that the bipartisan foreign policy, so far as the large group of Republicans in the House is concerned, is a dead duck, and we intend to fight for a genuine American peace policy based solidly on the UN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a newspaper article with reference to a meeting of eight western governors in the city of Seattle on May 7 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point two telegrams, one from the mayor of San Francisco, Mr. Roger D. Lapham, and one from Mr. Mike Doolin, manager, San Francisco Airport, with reference to the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 9, 1947.*

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from Commerce Department appropriation bill funds for operation of San Francisco Airport air traffic control tower.

While we naturally protest imposition of this financial burden on our local government, we are more principally concerned because of firm feeling that all traffic control tower men should be hired and controlled by one agency, necessarily Federal, in interests of uniform control in all airports and resulting standardization of safety for benefit of all pilots as well as passengers. It is unthinkable that national and international air commerce and lives of countless thousands of passengers should be jeopardized.

I personally oppose centralization of government in Federal hands as matter of broad principle but feel that air commerce which knows no State boundaries and few international ones is type of operation so fast moving and broad that centralization in Federal agency of safety control and supervision is only answer in this particular case.

San Francisco now spending twenty millions to make airport one of world's finest. Many other cities also modernizing airports for safety and convenience. All this would be undermined if uniform safety standards of air traffic control tower men sidetracked by Federal Government.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,
Mayor.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 12, 1947.*

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. This association composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on airline or any other aircraft.

Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

MIKE DOOLIN,
Manager, San Francisco Airport.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Congress relative to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain quotations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks that I made today while the House was in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and include a number of tables and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, the State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary appropriation bill, fiscal year 1948, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] has 2 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of this House whether we must purchase Government economy with the lives of our citizens—men, women, and children who are entrusting their safety to the air lines of America.

Do you remember the black headlines in December and January, when it seemed as if each day brought another terrible airplane accident? Did you read the casualty lists, fearing that a friend, or even a beloved relative, might have perished?

The Congress, shocked at the air accidents, began independent investigations into air safety. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, held long hearings into the causes of these accidents.

And what did both these committees find? Both committees, investigating independently, recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration install modern navigation aids along the airways to save the lives of our citizens.

Let me quote from the preliminary report of our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dated February 19, 1947:

It appears, however, that there has been a certain number of accidents recently which might have been prevented had certain facilities been available. * * * It is the committee's opinion that the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible. * * * Your committee is encouraged to note the development of air aids to navigation, including aids to landing and take-offs that have been advanced in development during the war, but is concerned by the delay in installation of such equipment caused by the war, and urges acceleration in the provision of the necessary funds so that these aids may be made fully available as soon as possible.

Now let me quote from the interim report of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, investigating air safety:

The members of the subcommittee stress the urgency of the installation of all possible navigational aids as far as feasible before the winter of 1947-48. It is recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration plan this present program for completion within a period not exceeding 18 months.

In accordance with these recommendations by committees of both the House and Senate, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has asked for $36,308,000 to buy and install the equipment needed to assure the safety of American air passengers through the storms and bad weather of the coming winter.

Instead of providing for this emergency need as recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both Houses—instead of providing the funds so that our air passengers can ride in safety and security—the House Appropriations Committee proposes that we slash this request by more than 50 percent.

If this cut is made, it will mean elimination of 42 very high-frequency radio ranges, 38 instrument-landing systems, 38 high-intensity approach lights, and all the low-frequency high-powered omnidirectional radio ranges planned for the continental United States. In addition, it will mean a drastic reduction in the program for installing ground-controlled approach radar necessary to bring our planes in safely through fog and rain. And it will mean a sharp reduction in surveillance radar equipment needed to prevent collisions in midair over our airports.

Last year 12,500,000 Americans rode on our domestic air lines. This year the number may well be 15,000,000 people whose lives depend on adequate facilities for bad-weather travel.

Can we tell the people of the United States that their lives, and the lives of their families, mean so little to us that we will not appropriate the funds necessary to make air travel safe? Is this the economy which the people of the United States are seeking?

Let me say, insofar as New York is concerned, the tower controls will cost the city, I am told, something between $250,000 and $500,000 per annum for La-Guardia and Floyd Bennett Fields if their maintenance of operation are not continued by the Federal Government as in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], I fully realize the difficult tasks of the hard-working subcommittee in trying to effect economies so much desired by all of us. I dislike to be in disagreement with the committee, but I am also interested in air safety and in effective foreign relations. At this point I shall speak only of the latter.

Mr. Chairman, I am gravely disturbed by the proposed cut in the budget of the Foreign Service of the United States.

The account which General Marshall brought us of the Moscow Conference should convince that last doubter that we are living in a dangerous world. We are not at war, but we are not at peace. After the end of the fighting, no man can say how or when the peace treaties with our principal enemies will ever be signed. We cannot make the peace because relations between the principal allies in the struggle are not peaceful.

Two years ago, with high hopes, we drew the plan and raised the walls of what was to be the citadel of peace. No more comprehensive well-balanced international organization has ever been created than the United Nations, and none gave greater promise or faced a more crucial destiny; none has faced graver troubles so soon after its beginning. Ten times the will of the majority has been brought to nothing by the veto of the Soviet Union. The armed forces which were to enforce the collective will are now seen to be limited to the size needed to browbeat small nations, and over all hangs the vast insecurity caused by the failure to agree on any plan to harness the terrors of the atom bomb.

If the United Nations is to be saved all nations must come before its bar as "sovereign equals." If the United States is to be saved it must not allow the sovereign equality of its brother democracies to go down before pressures from without and Communists boring from within.

The Nation must save itself by its own exertions. This is what the Truman doctrine means. It means that the United States must go into the field to fight a campaign for peace.

At the same time that this decision to take the field was being considered, another decision was being made here in Washington. It was decided to inaugurate this campaign by cutting down on supplies and equipment of our first field force—the Foreign Service of the United States.

When General Marshall asked us for tens of billions of dollars to prosecute the war we had full and complete confidence in him, and I am certain that I speak for every Member of this House in saying that not one of us begrudge a single penny of the funds we thus placed at his disposal.

Today the United States is indeed fortunate in having General Marshall as Secretary of State and as the President's principal assistant in leading the battle for peace. If we deny him the funds which he in his considered judgment is asking for the Foreign Service of the United States we will not only be hampering him in his campaign for peace but also be showing a surprising lack of confidence in the judgment of a man to whom we entrusted without question tens of billions of dollars and who more than justified the trust we placed in him.

I am certain that we will find it most difficult to satisfy our consciences that we have done everything possible to protect the interests of the United States if we hamper the efforts of our Secretary of State to secure peace by refusing him the tools he needs for this task.

The United States was formerly in a most advantageous strategic position. Its frontiers were protected by two broad oceans. The events of Hiroshima and Nagasaki show clearly that oceans or other geographic or man-made lines of defense have become practically useless.

The Foreign Service has often been called our first line of defense and with the new methods of warfare and the resultant decrease in the protection which our geographic position affords us, the importance of this first line looms even greater.

Secretary Marshall has explained in great detail why he requests these appropriations for the Foreign Service. As we all have this material I do not wish to take your time to go over the same ground.

My earnest plea to you is to give the Secretary in toto the comparatively small sum he judges indispensable for the Foreign Service, both as a direct means of assisting him in his labor for peace and to strengthen the first line of defense of the United States.

During the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] asked General Marshall if he felt he needed to have the full amount requested for major activities of the State Department. General Marshall replied very emphatically that the requests were conservative and he told the subcommittee that it is very important that there be no cut in Foreign Service personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest most vigorously the action of the committee in eliminating Federal funds for the operation of control towers in important airfields. As the Members of Congress are no doubt aware, Baltimore is one of the largest aviation centers in this country and we are vitally interested in doing everything possible to promote aviation with the greatest possible amount of safety. In my opinion the elimination at this time of Federal funds for the operation of control towers would vitally affect my district and would have a tremendous effect upon the safe operation of airplanes throughout the country. I think that the committee in their consideration of aviation has forgotten the tremendous advances which are being made and which must continue to be made in this country so that we may have in America the most modern airplanes and airports in the entire world.

I find it impossible to condone the recommended cut by our Appropriations Committee whereby half of the large airports scheduled for improvement under the Federal aid airport program would have to be scrapped. I ask you gentlemen how can we maintain our present eminent position in the field of world aviation if this reduction of funds from $65,000,000 to $32,500,000 is made?

Airports are not only the very foundation of our aviation industry but the hope of our aviation future. Without continuous development our country will find itself in the unenviable position of falling behind in the march of aviation progress. You and I cannot afford, at the price of so-called economy, to wreck a program designed not only to keep abreast of the rapid pace set by civilian aviation since the war but as insurance for national defense itself.

I strongly believe that economy of this kind is false economy. Let there be economy where we can afford it but let us not plunge blindly into a situation that will have dire effects on our newest and fastest growing industry—aviation. It was largely through this industry that we were able to defeat our recent enemies—let us not strangle it now that peace has come. We must let it expand. We must go even further than that—we must give it a helping hand.

Think of the drastic effect these contemplated cuts would have on the Nation. Over 300 of our great cities have been singled out on a strict priority basis for airport improvement during the fiscal year 1948. The $65,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would have taken care of these necessary improvements. Now we find that figure chopped in half. That means that perhaps 150 of our important cities may be unable to proceed with the necessary improvements on their airport facilities—and at a time when air commerce has reached an all-time high—and furthermore at a time when other nations are leaving no stone unturned to take over our leading place in aviation.

A year ago the Congress of the United States recognized the urgent need for airport development and authorized the expenditure of $500,000,000 in Federal funds over a 7-year period to assure us of a well balanced system of airports. The cities and towns were led to believe that they would have true Federal aid in constructing or improving their airports. We will be breaking faith if we withdraw with one hand that which we have already offered with the other. Sharp cuts like those recommended by our Appropriations Committee report will throw our whole airport-building program completely out of balance. We must not let this happen. The appropriation of but half of the requested $65,000,000 may damage for some time to come the air service of our scheduled airlines, which are willing and anxious to schedule flights into cities that do not now have adequate airport facilities, but which would have if the full $65,000,000 is appropriated.

There is great need of speed in this airport-building program. The life of the act which makes it possible is but for 7 years. Any delay by us at this time in meeting our obligations to the people of the country means time lost—time that it will not be possible to make up in the 7 years of the bill. At the rate recommended for this 1948 airport building,

less than 50 percent of the proposed program will be accomplished by 1953. That may mean large expenditures at a later date while the great aviation industry stands still.

Can we afford such a situation in these unsettled times? I for one am convinced that we cannot and I sincerely hope that you gentlemen will join me in seeing to it that the original request is restored.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, within the time allotted to me, I could not cover this entire bill. However, I should like to discuss the effects of the proposed reductions upon small business.

Within the past few months we have heard much about reducing Government expenditures and almost in every instance it has been contended by those advocating the cuts that essential Government services were not to be disturbed. It is not working out this way.

When a department does not have sufficient funds to function, it cannot operate effectively and in many instances if the proposed reductions are made they will result in discontinuance of many essential Government services entirely. I believe we will find this to be true in the pending bill.

The cuts proposed by the Appropriations Committee in the Department of Commerce budget are a blow to American business in general. More specifically, they constitute a severe injury to small business.

All of us believe that competition is the blood and bone of the free-enterprise system. And all of us know that competition is threatened by the rapidly increasing concentration of wealth and industrial power. One way to check the growth of monopoly and to encourage competition is to provide the small businessman with the tools he needs.

To compete successfully with larger firms, the small businessman must have business facts. He must know the markets for his product in his area. He must know about the growth of other businesses in his own field. And he must have access to technical information to help him solve his production problems. The proposed cuts for the Department of Commerce will hamper the Department in its attempts to raise the standards of management in small business.

The big businessman can pay for this kind of assistance. He can hire a private expert or firm to analyze his market and keep him informed of production trends in his own industry. He can hire efficiency experts and engineers to break his production bottlenecks. But the small businessman cannot afford these services. He must depend in large part on his Government.

If the proposed cuts are approved by this Congress, the small businessman is going to discover that his Government cannot give him the kind of service he got in the past. In many cities the businessman who will have occasion to go to a Commerce Department field office for help next July will find an out-of-business sign on the door. He will have to go to Washington for assistance.

When this same small businessman finally makes contact with the Department of Commerce he will find that many of the services that were once available are no longer to be had. Take the Census Bureau statistics as an example. During the past year the Census Bureau has been working to set up a modern reporting service to keep retailers and other kinds of small businessmen informed about the buying habits of their customers. A reporting panel has been set up to include about 175,000 firms in all important types of retail, service, and related businesses. The statistics based on reports from these firms enable businessmen to tell how their firms are doing in comparison with other firms. The proposed cuts will make it necessary for the Census Bureau to eliminate about one-third of the information now available for certain types of retail and service businesses. In addition, it will be impossible for the Bureau to go ahead with its plans to extend this service to 24 additional cities with populations over 100,000. In other words, these proposed reductions will take away from grocers, druggists, lumber dealers, filling-station operators, and other types of small businessmen in many parts of the country the information they need to plan their businesses and operate successfully.

The small importer or exporter relies more heavily on the Department of Commerce than on any other single source of information. He needs lists of foreign dealers and distributors. He needs to know the facts about business conditions in foreign countries—and he needs to know about foreign tariffs and controls of all kinds. Already the Department is far behind in answering requests or this kind of information. The cuts proposed by the Appropriations Committee would make it even harder for the small exporter and importer to do business, and in some cases the delays might be so serious as to put him out of business entirely.

The committee also proposes to cut the budget of the Office of Technical Services by 50 percent. To the small businessman this means that the Department of Commerce can no longer encourage research to open up new industrial opportunities for small producers in various parts of the United States. It means, too, that when a small manufacturer writes to the Department of Commerce for an answer to a technical problem, he will find that the answer does not come back to him as fast as it once did. If this Congress approves a 50-percent cut in the budget of the Office of Technical Services it will mean that we are shutting our eyes to the needs of the small producer. This is an age of science and technology, and we cannot rob the small manufacturer of his chance to get the know-how he needs to survive.

I have spoken of only a few of the ways in which the proposed budget cuts will affect the small businessman. I could go on and mention many others. My main point is that these cuts will affect the welfare of all business, but they will hurt small business most. For the sake of our competitive, free-enterprise system we cannot afford to take away from the small businessman any of the weapons he needs in his fight for survival.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that the committee has not given full consideration to the consequences which will result from their untimely and unwarranted efforts to economize with regard to the maintenance and operation of Federal airways.

This is not a partisan question. It is one which concerns the safety of our people. There is no justification for shifting financial responsibility in the operation of airport traffic control towers upon such short notice. Neither municipalities nor private airlines have included this item in their budgetary planning. This action comes as a distinct shock to both of them. No; this is not political for I have before me three telegrams, one from a leading journalist, another from the mayor of the city and County of Denver, and the third from a representative of the aviation industry. Let me read to you what each has to say:

DENVER, COLO., *May 12, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN CARROLL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you investigate elimination of funds for control towers in CAA 1948 budget. This seems a tragic blunder.

Regards,

PALMER HOYT,
The Denver Post.

DENVER, COLO., *May 7, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just informed by House of Representatives of the elimination of the expenses attached to the control tower at the Municipal Airport. This city is contributing more than many times in promotion of aviation than the Federal Government does here. Please take this up with the other Members of Congress from Colorado, also hope you can and will use your best efforts to see that the appropriation for municipal airports is not reduced.

BEN F. STAPLETON,
Mayor.

DENVER, COLO., *May 9, 1947.*

Representative JOHN A. CARROLL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Operation of airport traffic control towers essential to safety. Neither cities nor air lines in financial position to take over operation. Request passage of Bakewell amendment to reinstate $4,830,801 in appropriation bill so that CAA will continue operation of 148 control towers.

R. F. SIX,
President, Continental Airlines, Inc.

When you take away from the Federal airways system, as is proposed, one-fourth of its funds for operation, you do two things: You cripple the organization which must operate these airways, in this case the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and you put United States aviation in an unfavorable competing position in world aviation by forcing the curtailment of our Nation's airline operations.

These are two results entirely aside from the danger which you will add to all operations over the airways. I do not think this Congress wants to have it said that it decreased the chances for safety along the airways, and that is exactly what you do when we slash arbitrarily the funds to maintain airway safety aids in condition for proper functioning.

Let us consider the detailed services which this cut in the CAA's Federal airways appropriation of 24 percent or $15,225,000 of the $60,000,000 requested will eliminate:

Operation of 147 airport traffic-control towers must now be paid for by the cities or be inactivated.

Fifty-nine communications stations and their associated aids will be permanently discontinued.

Modernization of the airways system will be stopped in its tracks, with facilities constructed during the current—1947—fiscal year uncommissioned and deteriorating from disuse.

The modernization is the very lifeblood of the safety aids which we supply to our airmen. The CAA is in the midst of a program to change the whole communications and signals system from low frequency to very high frequency, which would provide static-free communications for greater efficiency. It has been forced by many conditions, one of which is limited funds, and the other lack of equipment, to pursue this program very slowly.

Now, when supply matters are loosening up a little, when the first rays of daylight are visible to those who have planned this modernization for many years, we are forced to stop the whole program through failure to provide funds to operate and maintain adequately already constructed facilities and abandon the completion of the planned system.

Piled on top of the committee's recommended slash there is the already added burden of increased costs for operating the airways. There has been criticism of the mounting cost of airway operation per mile, but that is hardly a satisfactory method of estimating the value of the service. It is more fair to consider these aids on the basis of what they cost in proportion to the passengers who used them. On that basis, the cost of airways has gone down steadily since 1935. The cost that year was 1.4 cents per passenger-mile. In 1944, this had dropped to 1 cent, and for 1948, the estimated cost will be eight-tenths of 1 cent.

This despite the growing costs of operating more and more airway aids, some of them of much more expensive nature than any ever used before. Radar aids, for example, require more personnel than radio aids which can be made automatic, and you know that kind of personnel is worthy of fair pay.

In all, this cut will mean that 920 air-navigation facilities, now under construction throughout the country cannot be commissioned, because there will be no funds for operating them during 1948. Included among these are instrument landing aids which were so heartily recommended by our own committee investigating safety on the air lines. It also will be impossible to install radar landing aids just now being applied to civilian air operations, and the light lanes which aid the pilot in the last few seconds of his landing will not be turned on.

This is trifling with certain disaster, I believe. Shocked by the air-line accidents of last winter the whole country heard us urge that the CAA be directed to buy the best safety aids and install them immediately. Now, instead of providing money for purchase and installation of these aids, we take away even that money requested by the CAA for maintaining those already installed. This most obviously is illogical waste—not economy.

I say to you that civilian lives are not expendable. If we want safety on the airways, we must appropriate the money to pay for it.

This is further and conclusive evidence that the mistake made several months ago of attempting a $6,000,000,000 slash in the budget without the proper planning therefor was a most serious one. Every reasonable person recognizes that we must practice economy to the best of our ability, but we cannot do so at the expense of crippling certain programs which are vital to the necessary functioning of our Government. The items mentioned here must be restored. Public interest and safety demand it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. It seems to me it would be a good thing to have in the RECORD the answer to one of the questions that has bothered me a good deal in this discussion, that is, whether in connection with the cuts that were made in the CAA appropriations the question of the development of the Air Corps in relation to national defense entered the picture at all, or whether on the other hand it was a matter merely of the ability of various other organizations to carry forward financially.

Mr. STEFAN. We have nothing to do with the Army Air Corps in this bill; all we do is with civil aviation. To clarify what is in the mind of the gentleman may I say that because we did take into consideration national defense we left in the appropriation all the safety aids required by the CAA. We know there is something new coming as far as radar is concerned, something better than ILS, perhaps some improvement on the ground control approach. We also took into consideration the disposal of about 400 Army and Navy airports which are now being acquired by States and municipalities, leaving their disposal so as to be available in case of emergency. Yes, we did take into consideration the question of national defense.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not agree with the gentleman. I feel that the answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to the contrary, that the denial of money for Federal aid to the airport program and for the air safety control towers has quite an effect upon national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course the gentleman believes in restoring the funds for control towers. We certainly did take into consideration all arguments as far as the national safety and defense is concerned. The disposal of millions upon millions of dollars invested in Army and Navy airports now being declared surplus certainly was taken into consideration by this committee when we followed closely how they are going to be disposed of, in order that the Army and Navy will have priority rights on them when and if an emergency arises. We guarded safety and national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on the very subject about which we are now talking. I think the gentleman from California knows as much about aviation, if not more, than most Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding hearings beginning on the 15th of January, approximately, and proceeding then for 6 weeks, and at intervals since then, on the subject of safety in air navigation. We have been giving very careful attention to that subject because of the rash of air accidents that occurred last year, trying to find the reason for those accidents insofar as the Government might relate to those reasons, and also to discover what steps were being taken to improve the systems of air navigation in order that such accidents might be avoided.

It is a very happy note that since the committee commenced its investigations no serious accidents have occurred on the domestic air lines in the United States in passenger operations. There have been certain other accidents which occurred but they were not in scheduled operation of the air lines.

I would like to speak for a moment on the subject of aids to air navigation because I note a considerable decrease in the President's 1948 budget. Personally, I will have to give almost entire approval to that decrease and suggest that for this year there might even be further decreases in the budget, because the industry is not prepared at the present time to offer a system of air navigation different from what we have had which can yet be finally agreed upon.

In the report from our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we urged the immediate installation of a certain number of types of equipment and perhaps we urged that a little too soon. Additional information has come to some of the members of the committee, and to me among them, concerning certain of these aids to navigation. I will direct my attention for a moment

to the system known as the ILS or the instrument landing system, a system upon which the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been working and developing for a period of some 15 years. They are, of course, to be complimented for their diligence in studying this particular matter and bringing its development to its present high state. But unfortunately there are certain qualities of that system which are not satisfactory which have been discovered by flight tests and which indicate that in all possibility that system is already obsolete and that no further installations of it should be made. I say that because of the obvious electronic facts that are connected with it.

As an aid to increasing the traffic into airports under adverse weather conditions, of course, it is an improvement upon the present range system, but it is not able to measure up to the needs of heavy traffic centers such as the Washington National Airport or the La-Guardia Airport, the Chicago Airport, or any other of the heavily traveled centers. It would appear that it is limited in the number of landings that can be made per hour in bad weather.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, there are developments proceeding in the GCA—the ground-controlled approach system, a radar system which not only bids fair to increase the possibility of landings to the rate of one per minute under bad weather conditions in the future but which will also provide a degree of traffic control which is not now possible.

I would like to remark for the record at this point that I think the Civil Aeronautics Administration was kidding somebody in your committee on page 814 where Mr. Kline gave information concerning air navigation facilities, service, communication, and maintenance, in connection with the Washington Airport for the fiscal year 1948.

I note there that under item 1, ground controlled approach system, $69,068, he has included in all probability a very large number of personnel.

I would like to bring that to the attention of the committee because I think they are being kidded and badly kidded. As a matter of fact, the ground-controlled approach system installed in the Washington National Airport and a number of other airports now, I understand, has a console containing two radar scopes—one of them for monitoring an area of 28,000 square miles around the airport, and the other one for aiding and bringing in to a safe landing the aircraft that will come in over the path provided. As a matter of fact, there need be no additional tower operators where this GCA equipment is used. That equipment should be used by the tower controllers themselves and not by anyone else. There is no need whatsoever for any additional operating personnel in any of these towers for GCA equipment and such maintenance as may be required can be done by anyone who is properly trained in the use and maintenance of such electronic equipment. Consequently, this item of $69,000 set up here for the Washington National Airport GCA system is, I think, very much out of line. I am surprised that the CAA would give you that kind of information.

If it went to $2,000 it would be a large amount. The same thing is true of any other airport where GCA is installed and where a console is provided for use in the airport tower by the airport controller. Insofar as the airport towers are concerned, I think it wise to mention at this point the fact that while the committee has not given direct study as to the proper allocation of cost of operation of control towers, that being a matter which has been brought to the attention of the committee by the proposed reduction to be made of over $4,000,000 which would strike out the airport-control program from CAA, I note that the committee seems to feel that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was put on notice last year by the fact that the committee in that year struck the item from the bill. You indicate that my committee thereby being put on notice that we should devise some legislative system for supporting this undertaking by CAA. I would like to say as one member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—just as one member of the committee—I believe that the indications made by the House to the subcommittee last year when the House promptly and overwhelmingly reinstated that item in the bill was notice to the subcommittee itself that the House wanted control towers to be supported by CAA. The committee differs with us on that matter, and I would say for myself, and I think for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that we all will be interested in a study which we will make at our first opportunity of the subject of the further participation by the users of the airways and their facilities, to the support of those facilities financially. However, that cannot be done between now and the 30th of June. Therefore, if no one else does, I intend to offer an amendment tomorrow to reinstate in this bill the amount required for the operation of the control towers by CAA. Not to do so would be a very serious hazard to all types of aviation, and I include in that private flyers, civil air lines, and nonscheduled operators, as well as the Army and Navy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman for that statement, which substantiates the view taken by at least two of the minority members of the committee. It is my intention tomorrow, when the bill is read for amendment, to offer such an amendment as the gentleman proposes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

I notice on page 25 of the committee report certain language which I am unable to understand, which says:

> Towers should be operated with CAA personnel under CAA standards but the cities, States, and municipalities would merely reimburse CAA for the cost of the personnel required to operate the towers.

I would like to know how you are going to call upon the cities and towns of this country, where airports are located, to force them to reimburse CAA for cost of the operators in the control towers. As a matter of fact, most of those city budgets have already been made up. They have been made up on an entirely different time schedule than they are in the Congress of the United States. They have not included these items in their budgets for this year, because they were not notified that they would be called upon to do so. It would create chaos in the aviation of this country if these airport control towers were now to be thrown out. If the committee insist in their effort and succeed, I am sure it will be put back elsewhere, a thing which I do not like to see occur to the House of Representatives, because, after all, they in the other body then get the credit and we get the discredit. I think it is a mistake.

We have in the United States what is known as the inland waterways system. It includes certain channels that are dug around the outside of the United States, and improvements of certain rivers within the area. Nearly $3,000,000,000 are invested in the inland waterways of the United States, and the annual appropriations therefor have averaged about $116,000,000 in the last 20 years.

Nobody has asked the users of the inland waterways to reimburse the Government for the expenditure that it has made. Nobody has suggested that the users of the lighthouse service and the Coast Guard should reimburse the Government. That is a service performed by the United States for the benefit of shipping.

Nobody has suggested that we go out and make a direct tax upon the users of the highways except for licenses and gasoline taxes, yet there are hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in the United States. Neither is it done in the States and cities for traffic lights, traffic policemen, and that sort of thing.

I do not see why a special mark is being made of the civilian aviation industry. I cannot understand it, particularly when the fact is well known that the system of civil airways is built, of course, for the benefit of anyone who wants to use them; but in time of war they are to be used practically 100 percent by the United States Government and they are there for that purpose. If the airways were to be used only by commercial flyers then the commercial aviation industry, the nonscheduled and the scheduled operators should determine how they should be operated, what the equipment should consist of and what the pay rolls were going to be; but you do not give them that consideration at all, you do not permit them to have anything to say about it except in the matter of advice.

I suggest that if you are going to make a charge against them that you give them a direct voice in stating what sort of equipment shall be installed. I am sure that if the airways and airports were to be used solely by the air lines and the nonscheduled operators the cost of a set-up for that purpose would be very much lower than it is today. As a matter of fact they probably would not need any particular system of airways because there would not be many other aircraft in the air if it were not for these airways.

So I hope that the House will consider the airways and the air-traffic-control centers and the traffic-control towers at airports as being part and parcel of one and the same thing, a system of aids to air navigation in the country just as much as the inland waterways. The aids to navigation in the coastal waterways, the streets and highways of the United States, are parts of integrated transportation systems. These aids to air navigation are provided for the use of those who are engaged in aviation whether they be civil air pilots, that is, private pilots, scheduled and nonscheduled fliers, Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, or even the Civil Aeronautics Administration itself.

In respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Chairman of the subcommittee, let me call your attention to a few figures I think you might take a good look at in the near future. There are approximately 46,000 miles of civil airways. Their set-up, that is, the budget for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, shows 230 planes and they will fly over the 46,230 miles of civil airways making inspections. You will find you have one Civil Aeronautics Administration plane for approximately every 200 miles of civil airways.

According to my figures the Civil Aeronautics Administration wants these planes to fly about 61,200 hours. Now divide the 61,200 hours by 230 and you get a result of 262 hours per year for the operation of each of these aircraft. That is an average of 23 or 24 hours per month, I should say, or about an hour a day. That is a ridiculous situation that you ought to go into if you really want to save some money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to the gentleman from California regarding the cost of operation and maintenance of our air navigation facilities.

Every time one of these commercial airliners leaves the ground it costs the taxpayers of the United States plenty of money. In the case of 50 passengers on a 200-mile flight, 10,000 passenger-miles, it costs the taxpayers $60 every time the plane moves. Forty passengers on an 800-mile flight or 32,000 passenger-miles costs the taxpayers of the United States $192. At the present time it is costing $240.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that statement?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HINSHAW. I merely wish to ask whether in those figures the entire operation of the civil airways is charged in?

Mr. STEFAN. No, no; that is a very small percentage. That is the percentage cost that the taxpayer bears.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the appropriations proposed for the Department of Commerce, and especially with respect to funds for the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In my opinion to follow the recommendations of the committee concerning the establishment, maintenance, and operation of air navigation facilities, would effect complete stagnation of our entire aviation industry for the present and future. A brief résumé of the situation in Norfolk, Va., the largest city in my district, will give the Members of the House a glaring illustration.

Prior to the war no control tower was operated in Norfolk. I understand that during the war the Army and Navy assumed the cost of operating our present control towers by reimbursing the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The operation was carried on by CAA personnel.

This airfield controls all instrument flying for a radius of 25 miles, including the control of the planes of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard, as well as all civilian aircraft.

On Saturday, May 3, 1947, at this airport, there were 1,393 operations executed at this one field alone. Commercial flights accounted for only 40 of these operations. I have heard the argument that municipalities should operate control towers.

In view of the above figures, I believe you can readily understand the utter absurdity of such a proposal. It is unthinkable that employees of the city of Norfolk should attempt to establish a pattern of flying in and around that airport by giving orders to the pilots of Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard planes. Federal control is essential if we would avoid chaos and confusion, and would promote safety not only for commercial flying but also for the fliers of private craft and of the various governmental agencies.

Not long ago commercial aviation had a series of serious accidents which were at least partially the result of inadequate safety aids. In connection with these accidents a committee of this House said the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible.

It must be recognized that, if municipalities all over this Nation undertake the operation of airport traffic control, there will be no standardization of personnel requirements. People entrusted with such essential duties should be carefully selected by standard Civil Service procedure. Otherwise we shall place in jeopardy the safety of all aircraft. It is vital that airport traffic control be exercised by an authoritative Federal agency.

The regulation of interstate commerce is vested in the Federal Government. The operation of aircraft is not only interstate but international in its significance. Norfolk, in my district, is designated as an alternate overseas airport, and this year, when airports to the north were closed, many foreign aircraft landed at and used the Norfolk Airport.

The number of passengers handled out of our airport in 1946 by scheduled carriers alone reached the amazing figure of almost 250,000. It is inconceivable that we should jeopardize the lives of so many people by demoralizing airport traffic control and removing those safety measures which have been promoted by our Government. Rather it should be our policy to promote and develop the growth of safe and sane passenger and freight air transportation.

Consider what confusion would result if 48 States, plus the municipalities in each, attempted to construct a pattern of taxation designed to support the operation of the safety devices inherently necessary for safe flying. Think about the conflicting regulations and controls within two urban areas closely allied geographically, but separated politically. Throw in the mandatory orders of the Army and Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, then we may expect rapid increase in the accident ratio. Misunderstanding of orders, may cause such a mounting death toll that the aviation industry of this country will be so handicapped as to set its development back many years. Municipalities will of necessity have to seek the cheapest and not the best and the lives of all air travelers will be prejudiced to save $15,000,000 for maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and $18,670,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities.

The municipalities which I have contacted, suffering now from lack of revenue, will in many instances be unable, even though it were rational, to install and support the navigational aids necessary to make flying safe.

Not only are the lives of those who travel by air involved, but the safety and homes of those who remain on the ground. People asleep in their beds may be crushed, their homes destroyed, that the Federal Government may save these two sums in a budget so constricted that if aviation attempts to bear the burden, this industry in its youth will be destroyed.

America should be the most air-minded Nation upon the globe. This can be accomplished only by aggressive research, and the establishment of essential safety factors. Has this House forgotten the pitiful experience that the ill-equipped Army fliers had, when, at the order of their Commander in Chief, they attempted to fly the mail?

Let us not place so low a price on the lives of those who fly. Let us restore to this bill the necessary funds to make air transport safe.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND].

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that we must practice frugality in Federal expenditures wherever and whenever such a course is consistent with the national welfare. However, in the name of economy, we should never throttle or destroy an essential and indispensable public service related to the field of Federal functions and dedicated to the economic and industrial development of our country.

Such a course is far removed from any rational concept of economy. It stifles progress, hinders development, and retards those composite factors which blend in their operation to produce a stable and sound economy.

The almost prodigious industrial evolution of this Nation to its place of preeminence in the arena of achievement has been the result of its foresight and vision in investing of the substance of its people to enhance the growth and development of the mighty potential of its fabulous resources.

If we should weigh and evaluate every segment or phase of the potentialities of our industrial and economic future, in an honest effort to select that which will contribute the most to our growth, prosperity and security in war and peace, then with unequivocal unanimity we would choose the aviation industry.

This great industry, yet in its infancy, if its growth and development in the public interest is to keep abreast of the times, must be sanely regulated and promoted by the Federal Government.

More than 9,000,000 people rode the airways of this country in 1946. Their safety should be a matter of deep, abiding and constructive concern on the part of the Federal Government. To abandon essential support of aerial traffic control towers, instrument landing facilities and full weather reporting would be tantamount to criminal negligence. Members will say that this is a matter of State and local concern, and that the Federal Government should be relieved of this burden. The fact remains that some municipalities are not financially able to assume the burden and some will not assume it whether able or not. The result will be to create serious bottlenecks in air transportation at vital points to the detriment of the air mail service, air travel and air commerce. The elimination of safety factors with the consequent increase of air tragedies will place the blood of innocent victims upon the hands of this Congress. I, for one, will not by my vote accept any such terrible responsibility.

In 1916 the first Federal appropriation of $25,000,000 for public roads was up for passage. A minority report warned that this was a policy which would lead to enormous expenditures in the future with but little benefit to the Nation as a whole. Where would this country be today but for the greatest and most elaborate network of highways of any country in the world?

We hear the same cry today relative to civil aviation.

In the last 27 years we have invested about $1,000,000,000 in this newest form of transportation, compared to more than $10,000,000,000 which we have invested in railroads, waterways, and roads, all of which have paid dividends immeasurable.

Civil aviation is rapidly developing into a great industry and is a vital factor in expanding and speeding up our entire economic system.

With sound development and sane supervision it will augment a direct return to the Government in taxes on aviation enterprises.

In 1945, air-line industry operations produced $21,000,000 in transportation taxes and $17,500,000 in income taxes. In 1946, transportation taxes amounted to $35,500,000. Income taxes were negligible as the industry as a whole lost $3,000,000. There is little doubt that Government assistance now is an investment in the future of a great industry which will return far more than the Government outlay.

What is more vital than safe aerial navigation in good weather or bad? It is something which we cannot afford to trifle with. Air travel is synonomous with speed, it knows no State boundaries, it is essentially interstate commerce personified. Supervision, control, and administration of uniform safety measures and devices is a Federal matter. Delay in technological advancement and the installation and improvement of facilities, for short-sighted reasons of economy, will not only result in tragic loss of human lives, undermining public confidence in air travel, but will postpone the day when the industry itself can be self-supporting.

There is no more vital and integral part of the airways system than airport traffic control towers. The operation requires technical knowledge and the operators must of necessity be under the control and surveillance of the Government. Without traffic control, airplanes cannot fly onto an airport under instrument weather conditions. In this matter we cannot afford to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

In 1946 the revenue to the Post Office Department from domestic air mail was $68,427,924. Expenditures were $49,011,932. The excess of revenue over expenditures was $19,415,992. We cannot afford to retard the expansion of this service.

I can conceive of no action more steeped in folly nor one calculated to render a greater disservice to our people than to fail to provide a sufficient appropriation for the protection of an indispensible service and the safeguarding of the precious lives of American citizens.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to put a stop to the so-called Voice of America broadcasts to foreign countries as at present conducted.

The House Appropriations Committee refused to vote funds for this activity for a very good reason.

These broadcasts are doing more harm than good. They are not checking the spread of communism. Propaganda that ostensibly is intended to build new respect for the United States is being used instead to criticize private enterprise, to express partisan opinions, and to distort the picture of life in the United States.

There is little in these outpourings to make the listeners believe more firmly in our form of government. I do not believe that Mr. Benton can produce one broadcast that, on its face, was deliberately framed to support the American foreign policy of blocking the spread of communism; not only that, so far as I can determine, no serious attempt is being made to answer the constant attacks that Communists are making on the United States.

At best the broadcasts are confusing. In instance after instance they detail events in the United States about which even our own citizens lack information. Foreigners cannot possibly understand what the voice is talking about in these cases. Many of the broadcasts deal with trivialities and at times the programs are downright silly.

They are on a par with the other activities carried on by the Office of Information and Cultural Program of the State Department, for which $31,000,000 of the heavily burdened taxpayers' money is requested.

In this connection, let me refer to the pictures bought for foreign exhibition as a sample of American art. One gem in that collection is called Circus Lady Resting. A copy of this picture appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of May 6. The Post described this masterpiece as looking like "something between Primo Carnera taking an enforced siesta and the product of an early Easter Islander after a bad night."

It is obvious that Secretary Marshall involved as he is in diplomatic negotiations, has not had time to read these broadcasts. He must rely on the information given by subordinates, who obviously are misleading him. If the Secretary could take an afte noon off and read these broadcasts carefully with his trained military eye, I think he would clean house without waiting for the Congress to do it.

There are three groups that are carrying on the propaganda for continuation of these costly and useless broadcasts.

One is the group that owes its allegiance to communism and not to this country.

Another group are the persons who are benefiting financially by the programs, through jobs and otherwise.

A third group are the uninformed persons who have not investigated the situation and who have been misled. With them I have no quarrel. I simply ask them to get the facts.

I urge the press and radio commentators to actually read these broadcasts. I have copies or reviews of a good many of them in my office. They can be examined there.

To illustrate what I am talking about, let me quote excerpts from a few of these broadcasts.

Broadcast to Germany, April 21, 1947:

In the year 1946 industrial profits have reached a record high. The chief responsibility for the shaping of prices lies in the hands of management. Government price control was abolished against the wish of President Truman. It is the task of management to see to it that upward move of prices is reversed into a down vard trend.

From the week-end report on radio output for April 19-20:

Broadcast in English:

Sheehan discussed two different versions of the omnibus labor bill which have been launched in the two different Houses and are now headed for a debate and a probable compromise. * * * Sheehan stressed that, of the two versions, that proposed by the House of Representatives is by far the more stringent; it drastically changes the position of labor unions on the industrial scene, limits their rights, regulates their organization, and prohibits absolutely certain practices which in many cases have been traditional for decades.

Broadcast in German:

As promised last week, the ace III labor commentator, Williams, discussed the recent

strike in our coal mines. * * * Williams said that many people believe that John L. Lewis used the Centralia disaster only as a pretext to attack the Department of the Interior.

Broadcast to Austria:

"I Would Like to Know" answered listeners' inquiries regarding the nursing profession in the United States and the gum-chewing habit.

Week-end report on radio output for March 21:

Broadcast to Germany:

Anna Buerger said that Senator ROBERT TAFT, one of the leading men in the Republican Party, and reputed to be one of its most conservative members, made a series of statements a few days ago before the Senate Finance Committee These statements, on strictly domestic issues are particularly interesting because of their progressive attitude, she continued. The fact, however, that they came from the same politician who in the past represented the so-called isolationist point of view in many foreign political questions, must make us think about this man.

Broadcast to France:

A Vos Ordres brought to its listeners a brief biography of Carl Sandburg and excerpts of one of his poems Musical highlights, inter alia, had a recording of Margaret Truman's singing of the Last Rose of Summer and a song by Jean Sablon.

This is the U. S. A. carried features on American railroads (translation of Blaufarb commentary) and on Republican Progressives of Sons of Wild Jackass.

Broadcast in Spanish:

Libros y Autores spoke of Steinbeck's The Wayward Bus.

Weekend report on radio output for March 14–16.

Broadcast in Spanish:

A second story told of a student who was arrested in a park in Portland because he was reading Shelley poetry sitting on the grass, and of the protests of his fellow students which brought him freedom.

Broadcast to Korea:

Liberty Bell was devoted to an obituary of Carrie Chapman Catt.

Daily report on radio output for March 26.

Broadcast in French:

Ace II: featured a review of the book, Modern Woman: the Lost Sex and a comparison of it with Wylie's Generation of Vipers.

Broadcast to Brazil:

Revista Literaria: Our literary commentator spoke of the special poetry issue of the SRL. The speaker recalled that, already in an earlier broadcast, he had regretted the fact that the aesthetic thinking of the artists of the written words was not on a par with the cultural differentiation of our time. The phenomenon does not seem to be limited to any one country; much rather does it appear to reflect the mental lag that can be observed, as regards the progress of poetry, in all countries, including the most advanced ones. Progress of poetry is, indubitably, a highly relative term, since poetic expression has developed very little through the ages. Accepting the thesis of Remy de Gourmont that there exists a law of intellectual continuity for every animal species, we must logically conclude (although the French writer abstained from drawing that conclusion) that only superman, a species that is to succeed homo sapiens, will have a superior intellectual capacity able to realize works more complex and more profound than our limited mentality can produce. The evolution of poetry, then, shows a limited curve, and has generally remained unnoticed by literary critics, by the aesthetes of the word and even by the philosophers. The commentator promised more along these lines for a future broadcast, and then turned to discuss a few of the recent poetry publications mentioned in the SRL issue.

Daily report on radio output for March 19.

English broadcast:

The United States in the World of Art brought an on-the-spot description of the presentation of the Motion Picture Academy awards for 1946.

Italian broadcast:

In answer to questions from listeners, the "request show" touched on the following topics: Housing project for paralyzed veterans, the philosophy of American advertising, the number of red-haired Americans.

Report on radio output for March 26:

Perfil De Da Semana told the story of Paul Porter.

Report on radio output for April 20.

Broadcast to China:

Part 3 of the American Hour (10 minutes) described Chaplin's latest film venture, Monsieur Verdoux.

Report on radio output for April 21.

Broadcast to Latin America, quoting Raymond Gram Swing on the House labor bill:

The House bill was loaded with a good deal more punishment for labor than the Senate is expected to accept; but the more it was loaded the more the Senate would probably leave in. And the more that was left in, the greater the chance for a Truman veto. The whole strategy of including all labor changes in an omnibus bill is aimed to put the President on the spot. * * *

A bill that cracks down on labor more severely than any measure passed in modern American history. * * *

The House seeks to make sure that organized labor will be seriously crippled in future negotiations with management.

English broadcast:

A more critical book about American cities is Our Fair City, an anthology edited by Robert S. Allen. Mr. Allen, a Washington correspondent, served during the war as a colonel on Gen. George Patton's staff. Several reviewers believe he has shown considerable courage in putting together this new anthology, which is a lively and blistering collection of sketches.

These quotations indicate that the Department is not broadcasting the Voice of America but that all the way through there is a deliberate trend to the left; a taking sides on political issues, which is contrary to all concepts of American Government.

If we must have Government broadcasts the filler and the tripe must be cut out and the news broadcast must be accurate and fair.

The American people pay $31,000,000 for this activity. For a small fraction of that sum a real Voice of America could be broadcast.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the people of the country have had less than 10 days' notice of the intention on the part of the subcommittee this year to eliminate the item for payment of salaries of the control-tower operators at the airports. I wish to address myself to that item and to the action of the subcommittee in eliminating that item from the bill.

Many Members have paid tribute to the ability and the good work of the chairman and the members of the subcommittee. I join them in expressing appreciation for that good work. What I shall have to say about it is in no sense a criticism of the action which they have taken.

Since this bill was reported out by the committee on May 5, the fact that they have eliminated the item for payment of salaries of operators in the control towers has caused quite a bit of consternation throughout the governing authorities of cities all over the country. I have had telegrams from the mayor of the city of Atlanta, wherein is located one of the finer airports of the country, from the chamber of commerce of the city of Atlanta and from various other solid, substantial people in Atlanta, urging that this item be placed back in the bill. I have talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, who favors the elimination of this item, and I have talked with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on the minority side of the committee, who has made a talk here already urging that the item be kept out. These gentlemen and those who favor eliminating this item have said that the municipalities and the aviation companies have had notice since last year that the subcommittee in charge of the appropriations for the Department of Commerce intended to eliminate this item, that is, to place the burden of paying the salaries of the control tower operators on the municipalities. However, as was so ably pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] a few moments ago, I feel that the companies and the governing authorities of the municipalities are justified in relying upon the proposition that the Government of the United States itself is not committed to that policy. While it is true that the subcommittee had indicated its intention to do that, nevertheless there are three departments of the Government that have indicated positively a contrary intention: First, the Members of this House; second, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and third, the Budget Bureau, which submitted the budget here for the appropriation for the year 1948. The House last year properly overrode the action of the subcommittee. The Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration had this to say about it in the hearings before that subcommittee this year on page 626 of the hearings. The chairman of the subcommittee asked this question:

This committee at one time eliminated funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. Money for these towers was, however, restored on the floor of the House on a safety argument. What do you think about having the cost of this item transferred to the municipalities now?

Mr. Wright—

I think Mr. T. P. Wright, who is the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics

Administration, is a man whom the public, including the aviation companies and the mayors of the municipalities, is entitled to look upon as a proper person to state the policy of the Government.

He said:

We feel that the airport traffic-control towers are a vital and integral part of the Federal airways system, and it would be absolutely inappropriate. With the increasing traffic that there is it would possibly be disastrous to have those operated by local communities.

You have to fix traffic-control patterns, and you have to have control in the same agency that is operating the rest of the Federal airways system, involving the electronic devices, which you are being asked to approve, and the radar equipment, which is located right in the traffic-control tower.

It is such a vital part of the whole Federal airways system that it must be operated by people under Government surveillance and control.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement along that line. Certainly he voices my views. I think the argument is just as important today as it was at that time, in view of the events of the last few days, and numerous airplane accidents indicate that fact only too clearly.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Surely this elimination, if it should be adopted, is a change of policy—a policy which, for the past 7 years has been followed. That is, during the past 7 years the Federal Government has paid the salaries of the operators of these airport control towers.

Another argument which was advanced to me by these gentlemen who now favor the elimination of this item was that if the Government stands the entire expense of operation of airports it is likely to cause requests to come in from crossroads communities all over the country that do not need airports and that the cost of these would bankrupt the Government.

With reference to that, I want to point out there are roughly 6,000 airports throughout the United States and that up to the last year only 129 of those airports had these control towers and that during the time since the item was placed back last year and today, if that argument were good, there would have been a deluge of requests for the construction of airports. However, I am informed that only 20 applications for control towers have been received by the Civil Aeronautics Administration since this item was placed back. So that is, in fact, no argument for the elimination of this item.

I am informed that the cost of operating one of the airport control towers insofar as the salary item is concerned might range from $36,000 to $50,000 and the entire item which is asked to be put back amounts to $4,849,000, which is estimated to be the cost of 1948 operation of these airport control towers.

That is not an item that threatens the budget of the United States nor the welfare of the taxpayers. That is an item which as so many have pointed out here before me, and it would simply be repetitious to say it again, will not affect the tax structure of the United States and will not in any sense threaten the Government with bankruptcy.

It has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], that just recently within the last 3 weeks there has been a tragic accident in the State of Georgia in which were involved a plane belonging to Delta Air Lines and a plane flown by a private operator. Both were destroyed and nine people lost their lives because there was no control tower there. There is no way to isolate a field so as to confine it to commercial use. All these fields are used not only by commercial companies, but also by private planes and by Army and Navy planes. Aviation is a subject which is not only interstate, but international, and is a proper subject for Federal aid, particularly the item under discussion. I sincerely hope the House again this year will place this item back into the appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention particularly to one item in this bill. It is the item of $500,000 to be spent for so-called entertainment. I do it now so that the committee will be on notice that I expect to offer an amendment to strike when the bill is read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. The item is also described as "Representative allowances, Foreign Service."

Of course those words as they stand do not explain very much but if you will read the hearings you will find out a little more about what they mean, and if you had had some experience in dealing with this problem you would know particularly what they mean, because, after all, practically the entire item of representation allowances goes for entertainment, and the entertainment consists mainly in buying all kinds of liquor for the entertainment of representatives abroad.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. As soon as I get through with my statement I will yield to the gentleman from New York, a hard-working member of the committee. I shall be glad to yield when I get through with my statement. I hope he will agree with me that the amount of half a million dollars is a considerable amount to allow for this sort of thing.

I want to give you a little review of this to show you how these expenditures grow on the Congress and on the country. In 1938, $125,000 was determined as the amount to be allocated for buying liquor and paying for such entertainment, and in 1939 Congress allowed a similar amount. In 1940 it was decided $140,000 should be spent for this purpose. In 1941 it went up to $150,000. In 1942 it was increased to $163,000. In 1943 this Congress allowed an expenditure of $150,000, but they ran short. They ran out of entertainment expense, or whatever it was, so they had to have $35,000 more to replenish the supply.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. The gentleman from Brooklyn was not here at that time and, of course, was not quite so familiar with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that it is not proper to refer to another Member of the House as the gentleman from any certain city.

Mr. REES. With due apologies to the gentleman. I should have said "the gentleman from New York."

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to assure the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas does not yield.

Mr. REES. I decline to yield at this time. I will do so later. I do withdraw my statement about the gentleman being from a particular city. The gentleman from Kansas means well in addressing him as being from a certain city.

Mr. ROONEY. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that I have no objection to it.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman from New York. In 1945 the House approved an expenditure to which I objected in the sum of $300,000 and then Congress replenished the supply again and let them have $129,000 more. Then, in 1946, to cap the whole thing, this Congress allowed $585,000, and they ran short again. So the House allowed another $23,000, making a total of $608,000.

Now, I read from the hearings and I quote the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the committee wherein he says "Now we turn to this representation allowance."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Not at this time, but will be glad to do so later.

Calling attention to representation allowance, Foreign Service, the gentleman from Nebraska called attention to the fact that the request in 1948 is for $1,118,000. He says we spent $891,216 the year before. So we have got up to over a million dollars to take care of this supply of entertainment for representatives abroad. If you will read the hearings you will find the question is asked whether these supplies cost more money.

The witness for the State Department agrees that it costs more money to buy these supplies than it did before. It is also stated more funds are needed because we have a greater number of personnel. In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our diplomacy, our getting along with representatives of foreign countries, falls to a rather low ebb—and I have said this before—when it becomes necessary to spend the taxpayers' money not by the thousands but by the hundreds of thousands for the purpose of entertaining foreigners abroad and, incidentally, for entertaining themselves as well. It seems to me that somewhere we ought to draw the line. I know $500,000 is a comparatively small item, but it is half a million dollars, and even that much money being

charged against the Federal Treasury at this time for these purposes seems to me to be out of line.

I will be glad now to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of New York who is one of the valued members of this great Committee on Appropriations, and one of the industrious Members of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that while I realize that the rules of the House require one Member to address another as being from his State, I make no objection whatever to being called the gentleman from Brooklyn.

Mr. REES. I was very sure the gentleman would not.

Mr. ROONEY. And I am sure the gentleman from Kansas knows that; because I have respected him ever since I have known him.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. He certainly has at all times commanded my respect, although we differ on this particular subject matter.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say however that it seems that the gentleman from Kansas assumes something which is not in the evidence. It seems that he assumes that the entire amount for representation allowances is used for the purchase of liquor. Is that not so?

Mr. REES. I not only assume, but I believe that practically all of it goes for liquor. There is a small part that goes to buy flowers, and there is a small part that goes to pay for some of the expensive dinners that are given; but if the gentleman will investigate the expenditure of the money I believe he will find that most of it goes for liquid refreshments. I will appreciate it if on tomorrow he will bring to the floor an itemized account of the $585,000 plus the $23,000, and indicate to the Committee where the money was spent. I think he will find that practically all of it is for liquor. It may be that the items are not available.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a pretty big order, but I venture the assertion that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee,, the gentleman from Nebraska, can very easily answer the gentleman's question. I believe the gentleman will find that the liquor purchase in this item is infinitely small. I personally see no objection if one is going to sit down to dinner to having a glass of beer or a cocktail. I do not see anything wrong with that; and if we have representatives in foreign countries and are going to furnish a $5 dinner I see no reason why we should not give them a 50-cent cocktail.

Mr. REES. The point I make with respect to that is that I just do not believe it is necessary, with all the allowances that are made to these representatives, with everything that is provided—we pay them good salaries, we provide a place for them to live, we provide all expenses and take them wherever they have to go, to all parts of the world. That is all right and proper where necessary. We pay them a lot of extra incidental expenses, as the gentleman well knows. I think, however, it is carrying the thing a little bit far when, as the gentleman has just suggested, you spend this money not only by the hundreds, not only by the thousands, but by the hundreds of thousands and, according to their request, a million dollars for this sort of thing. I disagree with the gentleman that that amount is infinitesimal, because a million dollars is a considerable amount of money and $500,000 is a considerable amount of money when it goes for purposes of this kind.

Mr. ROONEY. I originally thought the gentleman was going to commend the committee because of the substantial cut that was made. If I remember correctly they submitted a request for $1,118,000 and it was cut to $500,000.

Mr. REES. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ROONEY. The entire committee was very, very much interested in vouchers that were submitted by these people in foreign countries who were representing us but were attending luncheons and dinners day after day and night after night. We saw no reason for it. We thought that they were eating their meals, which they should pay for themselves, with the Government's money. I thought the gentleman would commend the committee for the action taken.

Mr. REES. I do commend the distinguished chairman and the members of the subcommittee as well as the entire committee, including the able member from New York for saving $600,000 that would have been spent from the Federal Treasury if it had not been for the action of this committee. I think the whole thing should be stricken out, but I trust the gentleman from New York and other members will go along with me and cut the thing down to a quarter of a million dollars. That is a further compromise, but it will save $250,000. Perhaps the gentleman will go along with us in saving that much money. That would be a considerable help. It compares with the 1944 figures. Even those who favor this kind of expenditure should go along on an amendment to cut it $250,000.

Mr. ROONEY. You might take three or four courses away from an eight-course dinner. We have a certain number of people representing us at diplomatic functions and I think it reflects on all of us if we do not have the proper set-up for them. We should afford them the dignity they should have in the eyes of those with whom they are doing business in our behalf. Let us take the situation in Russia. I understand that our representatives in Russia, before they can talk a bit of business at all, have to drink innumerable glasses of vodka. I am not in favor of that. I do not believe a man with too many drinks of vodka under his belt can properly represent us.

Mr. REES. That brings me to the subject matter I want to discuss briefly. The gentleman has just suggested that we might use this money to buy vodka for the foreigners in order to get them to talk a bit of business. If there is any good reason in that sort of thing I would like to find out what it is.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not what I said.

Mr. REES. If you have to use this liquor to loosen up the tongues of these foreign diplomats in order to get things done, then I go back to the thing I said before: Our diplomacy is not on the high plane it should be. I am expressing my own opinion of course. If it is going to be used to get these people in Russia or any other foreign country to loosen up their tongues in order to get along with them, we are getting to a low ebb. I believe I trust the gentleman from New York and other members may go along with us tomorrow when I shall submit an amendment to cut this appropriation $250,000 which will be still as much as it was a few years ago.

Again I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and his committee in saving at least $600,000 that might have been spent if those who proposed this particular item had their own way. This committee knew it was too much money. This committee thought a million dollars was too much money. They have cut it in half. Evidently it was a sort of a compromise. Let us compromise once more and cut it down to a quarter of a million dollars. No harm can be done in cutting the supply of liquor for these representatives abroad. It will be a good thing to do. It will save the Federal Treasury a quarter of a million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am terribly sorry to say that I cannot go along with my distinguished and kind friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I feel that the committee has cut this item just about as much as it can possibly be cut. I am sure that if he consults the gentleman from Nebraska he will find that the committee spent a good deal of time going through vouchers on entertainment items which we required to be sent up from the State Department, which showed, in one instance, where a lady was entertaining at luncheon and dinner day after day, for weeks and weeks. However, nowhere in those vouchers was there any indication of any of the money being used for liquor. I say that, although I have no objection to some small part of the money being used for liquor at proper diplomatic functions. I will say one further thing to the gentleman from Kansas, that I did not suggest to him that we use vodka to open the lips of the Russians. I do not like vodka.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the so-called art exhibit that was sent abroad by the State Department is a disgrace to the United States.

President Truman belatedly has taken cognizance of what some of us have been saying for years, namely, that his administration is infected by Communists.

I urge the President to match his very late words with action and to set about cleaning out the Communists and their New Deal fellow travelers.

The alleged art exhibition has sinister aspects. The Circus Girl Resting and

other trashy paintings sent on tour by the State Department, with the taxpayers footing the bill, have done our country harm abroad. Foreigners must be wondering what kind of crackpots assembled such a jumble of paintings.

That painting, Circus Girl Resting, which has shocked the American people, was typical of the amazing group of paintings that the State Department sent abroad as beautiful examples of American art.

The State Department's catalog on its painting monstrosities says that Circus Girl Resting was painted by Yasuo Kuniyoshi. Kuniyoshi was born in Okayama, Japan, in 1893 and came to the United States in 1906.

The catalog further enlightens us that "his art is directed toward a fusion of the East and West."

I do not profess to be an authority on painting. Secretary Marshall frankly admitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that he did not consider himself such an authority. But he has shown the good judgment to call a halt on the so-called art exhibition by his subordinates. Now, I hope he will go on and clean up the art division. He inherited a bad situation when he became Secretary, for which he was in no way responsible.

I have been investigating the art activities of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Much to my amazement, I learned that instead of the pictures being selected by a committee of outstanding American artists, every picture was selected and purchased by one individual He is J. Leroy Davidson, who is no longer with the Department.

Davidson was born at Cambridge, Mass., March 16, 1908. He attended Harvard University and other schools. He reads and speaks French and German as well as English. He also reads Chinese.

During 1944 and 1945 he was an art director in the Army Service Forces in the Pentagon, having had something to do with selecting illustrations for training manuals. I do not pass upon Davidson's knowledge as an artist, but I do contend that no one person has all the knowledge necessary to tell the world what is American art.

It is my opinion that Mr. Davidson in acting as the art arbiter for the United States, has been moving with very fast company in the new dealers' world—that radical band who would uproot all that we have cherished as sacred in the American way of life. Regardless of his patriotism, I say that Mr. Davidson has been taken in by a lot of extremists, who have method in their planning.

When I questioned Mr. Davidson on why such an art exhibit was assembled and sent abroad, he told me that it was done in response to demands from abroad, principally through our various embassies.

In connection with this demand, I was presented several sheets of paper with the heading, "Samples of Requests from Abroad." It struck me as peculiar that most of the requests were dated the first part of October 1946, when, as a matter of fact, practically all of the pictures were bought during the first few days of May 1946.

It was only natural that I should make inquiry on why most of these requests came at approximately the same date. Mr. Davidson informed me that he did not know unless it was in response to what is known as an "artcast" sent out in the so-called Weekly Roundup of the Press and Publications Division, OIC.

I looked over these so-called requests from abroad for the art exhibit, and it was quite obvious to me that what the State Department did was to drum up requests from abroad.

Mrs. Hannah Goldman, author of the Artcast, told me she got her material from Mr. Davidson. Mrs. Goldman is in the Press and Publications Division, OIC. In other words, Mr. Davidson was responsible for creating the demand under which the program was developed to exhibit these pictures abroad.

The 79 paintings which comprised the two exhibits were the works of 45 artists. I have seen pictures of the paintings. Some of them are so weird that one cannot tell without prompting which side should be up. I believe that the background of some of the artists who painted them will throw considerable light upon the reasons why such strenuous objections were raised against the pictures.

I asked the House Committee on Un-American Activities to give me a report on the artists. The records of more than 20 of the 45 artists are definitely New Deal in various shades of communism. Some were found to be definitely connected with revolutionary organizations.

The exhibition is billed by its promoters as "Advancing American Art." Mr. Davidson defended the pictures as being what he termed modernistic. From my discussions with Mr. Davidson, I came to these conclusions:

The pictures of those artists who have been recognized down through the years as old masters are too drab, uninteresting, and too natural.

The movement of modern art is a revolution against the conventional and natural things of life as expressed in art.

The artists of the radical school ridicule all that has been held dear in art. Institutions that have been venerated through the ages are ridiculed.

Without exception, the paintings in the State Department group that portray a person, make him or her unnatural. The skin is not reproduced as it would be naturally, but as a sullen, ashen gray. Features of the face are always depressed and melancholy.

That is what the Communists and other extremists want to portray. They want to tell the foreigners that the American people are despondent, broken down or of hideous shape—thoroughly dissatisfied with their lot and eager for a change of government.

The Communists and their New Deal fellow-travelers have selected art as one of their avenues of propaganda. Their game is to use every field of information and entertainment in an effort to shatter all that conflicts with despotic communism.

When the taxpayers' money is used to buy pictures painted by Communist artists we not only distribute their propaganda, we also put money in their pockets and thereby enable them to influence their efforts to make America Red Communist.

I believe there should be in the State Department an Office of Information and Cultural Affairs, but it should be free of communistic, fascistic, and other alien influences.

There is need for facilities to answer lies against our country by propagandists of other countries, notably the Moscow radio. However, I submit that the State Department art exhibit does not represent American culture and is as foreign to the American way as is the Moscow radio.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, March 24, 1947.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUSBEY: In response to your letter of March 18, we are enclosing herewith a report which contains information from the files and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
Chief Investigator.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 22, 1947

For Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY.

Subject: Milton Avery, William Baziotes, Romare Beardon, Ben-Zion, Cameron Booth, Louis Bouche Raymond Breinin, Bryon Browne, Paul Burlin, George Constant, Ralston, Crawford, Stuart Davis, Julio De Diego, Arthur Dove, Werner Drewes, Philip Evergood, Adolph Gottlieb, William Gropper, O. Louis Guglielmi, Philip Guston, Robert Gwathmey, Marsden Hartley, Morris Kantor, Frank Kleinholtz, Walt Kuhn, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Julian Levi, Jack Levine, Loren MacIver, John Marin, Reginald Marsh, George L. K. Morris, Georgia O'Keefe, I. Rice Pereira, Gregorio Prestopino, Abraham Rattner, Anton Refregier, Ben Shahn, Charles Sheeler, Everett Spruce, Nahum Tschacbosow, Franklin Watkin, Max Weber, Sol Wilson, and Karl Zerba.

MILTON AVERY

Milton Avery was one of the exhibitors at the United American Artists' exhibition which was held on September 18-30, 1939 at the ACA galleries, New York City. The American Artists was a pro-Communist artists organization.

BEN-ZION

Ben-Zion was also an exhibitor at the United American Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA galleries, New York City, at which his painting, the Prophet and the Crowd, was shown.

Ben-Zion was one of the signers of a letter sent to President Roosevelt by the United American Artist which urged help to the U. S. S. R. and Britain, after Hitler attacked Russia. (See Daily Worker, New York, Tuesday, September 16, 1941.)

BRYON BROWNE

Bryon Browne's painting entitled "Figure" was one of those exhibited at the United American Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA galleries, New York City.

PAUL BURLIN

The program, Artists' Front To Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, discloses that Paul Burlin was a sponsor of this organization, which consisted of a group of pro-Communist artists who became violently pro-war after Hitler attacked Russia.

Mr. Burlin is associated with the Communist publication, New Masses, as an artist (New Masses, April 26, 1938, p. 17), and as an exhibitor at the first annual New Masses art exhibition held on November 13-27, 1938. (New Masses, October 25, 1938, p. 2.)

GEORGE CONSTANT

A. G. Constant, of Cleveland, Ohio, sent May Day greetings to the Young Worker, the publication of the Young Communist League. (See Young Worker, May 1, 1930.)

STUART DAVIS

Stuart Davis, according to the program of Artists' Front To Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, was a sponsor of this organization.

The February 14, 1936 issue of the Daily Worker, page 5, reveals that Stuart Davis was a member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School. John Reed was one of the founders of the Communist Party, United States of America.

Stuart Davis has contributed, as both an artist and cartoonist, to the publication of the pro-Communist League of Struggle for Negro Rights entitled "The Liberator" (See the Liberator, June 1922, p. 14; April 1921, p. 15; February 1919, p. 39; September 1922, p. 30; June 1921, p. 21; July 1920, p. 36.)

Stuart Davis has been associated with the publication, the Masses, as the owner (the Masses, June 1917, p. 50), and with New Masses as a contributing editor (New Masses, October 1927, p. 3). New Masses, October 25, 1938, page 2, also discloses that he was an exhibitor at the first annual New Masses art exhibition, November 13-27, 1938. Both the Masses and the New Masses have always been avowed Communist magazines.

JULIO DE DIEGO

Julio De Diego has been associated with the Communist publication, New Masses, as an artist and illustrator. (See New Masses, August 23, 1938, p. 19 and June 8, 1937, p. 18.)

PHILIP EVERGOOD

Philip Evergood was affiliated with the American Peace Mobilization as the signer of the Call to the American People's Meeting, page 2, New York City, April 5-6, 1941. The American Peace Mobilization picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

The program, Aritists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, shows he was one of the sponsors of this organization.

Philip Evergood has also contributed to the Daily Worker. (See Daily Worker, November 2, 1942, p. 7.)

His affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is shown by the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, page 2, which discloses that he was a signer of a statement sponsored by this organizations hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists.

Philip Evergood was an artist, contributor, and contributing editor of New Masses. (See New Masses, May 30, 1944, p. 9; March 28, 1944, p. 29; April 26, 1938, p. 18 and p. 21; and April 30, 1946, p. 2.)

He was a contributing artist to the second annual art auction of New Masses, (see New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 25) and to the New Masses third annual art auction (see New Masses, April 7, 1942, p. 27 and April 28, 1942, p. 2). He was also a member of the committee for the auction for the New Masses fifth annual art auction and a member of the same committee for the New Masses fourth annual art auction as shown by New Masses, February 8, 1944, page 31, and February 23, 1943, page 27.

An undated letterhead discloses that Philip Evergood was a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee, a Communist front organized during the WPA arts projects.

He has been affiliated with the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a signer of the declaration honoring Dimintrov, former head of the Communist International. (See New York Times, December 22, 1943, p. 40).

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, Mr. Evergood was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited for contempt by Congress.

Mr. Evergood has been associated with the United American Artists as a member and exhibitor. (See Daily Worker, October 11, 1940, p. 7).

PHILIP GUSTON

Robert Gwathney has been associated with the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle. (See Fight, February 1938 p. 13.)

ROBERT GWATHNEY

Robert Gwathney has been associated with New Masses as a contributing editor. (See New Masses, April 30, 1946, p. 2.)

MORRIS KANTOR

Morris Kantor was a sponsor of Artists' Front to Win the War as shown by the program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, p. 5.

FRANK KLEINHOLZ

The April 25, 1944, issue of New Masses discloses the association of Frank Kleinholz with that publication as an artist.

YASUO KUNIYOSHI

Yasuo Kuniyoshi was one of the signers of a statement on the International Situation which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy as shown by New Masses, March 15, 1938, page 19.

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals that he was a sponsor of this organization.

Yasuo Kuniyoshi was an auctioneer at the New Masses Art Exhibit. (See New Masses, November 29, 1933, p. 2.)

A letterhead, dated August 3, 1939, reveals that Mr. Kuniyoshi was also a sponsor of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace campaign, another Communist-front organization.

JACK LEVINE

Jack Levine was a contributing artist to the New Masses Second Annual Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 8, 1941, p. 24.)

WILLIAM GROPPER

A person named Gropper has been associated with New Masses as an artist and cartoonist, with the Sunday Worker as a cartoonist, and with the New Pioneer as a cartoonist, cover artist, and illustrator. (See New Masses, March 14, 1944, p. 15; April 14, 1942, p. 15; February 24, 1942, p. 5; February 17, 1942, p. 13; July 9, 1946, p. 10; July 2, 1946, p. 13; June 25, 1946, p. 9; June 18, 1946, p. 13; January 25, 1938, p. 8; and January 11, 1938, p. 8. Sunday Worker, September 1, 1940, sec. 2. New Pioneer, Communist Children's magazine, March 1936, p. 23; December 1935, p. 1; March 1934; June 1937, p. 13; February 1937, p. 10; and March 1932, pp. 9-10.)

A Bill Gropper was a speaker for the American Friends of the Chinese people, which consistently supported the Communist Party of China, as revealed by the Daily Worker, June 8, 1938, page 7.

Bill Gropper is also associated with the Communist Party as a cartoonist and speaker. (See Daily Worker, February 13, 1930, p. 2.)

An article in the Daily Worker, February 16, 1939, page 7, tells of a mural which was done for the Department of the Interior by Bill Gropper.

Bill Gropper was a contributor to the New Masses, December 16, 1941, page 15, and an illustrator for the New Pioneer. (See New Pioneer, December 1934, p. 6; January 1934, p. 204; June 1933, p. 33; May 1932, p. 3; and June 1932, p. 10.) He was also a member of the organizing committee of New Pioneer, according to the Daily Worker, May 7, 1936, page 5.

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals that William Gropper sponsored this organization.

William Gropper has been affiliated with the American League Against War and Fascism as an artist and illustrator for the magazine Fight. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle. (See Fight, November 1933, p. 7, and March 1937, p. 13.)

William Gropper's affiliation with the American League for Peace and Democracy is also shown by Fight, for which he was an artist, cartoonist, and illustrator. (See Fight, March 1939, p. 13; April 1938, p. 53; March 1938, p. 13; May 1934, p. 5; and November 1937, p. 5.) Mr. Gropper also sponsored and supported the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference, held at the New School for Social Reseach, under the sponsorship of the American League for Peace and Democracy. (See Daily Worker, January 11, 1938, p. 2, and January 25, 1938, p. 2.)

William Gropper was a cartoonist for Challenge, the official publication of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County. (See Challenge, July 14, 1940, p. 2.)

The Champion of June 1936, page 4, reveals that William Gropper was an artist for that publication. The Champion was the official organ of the Young Communist League and also of the International Workers Order.

A letterhead, dated September 22, 1936, and the Daily Worker, September 2, 1936, page 2, discloses that William Gropper was a member of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, Communist candidates in 1936.

William Gropper's association with the Communist Party is shown as a cartoonist for the following Communist publications: Party Organizer (Party Organizer, May 1937, p. 5); as a cartoonist for Workers Monthly (Workers Monthly, December 1925, p. 87; November 1925, p. 13; and January 1925, p. 102); and as a cover artist for Jewish Life, March 1938, and February 1938). According to the Daily Worker, January 21, 1939, page 7, column 5, he was also a delegate to the Communist Party's celebration, tenth anniversary of October revolution, U. S. S. R.

A booklet, Those Americans Say, page 10, lists William Gropper as a representative individual of the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, a Communist-front organization.

William Gropper was an artist for the Daily Worker and the Sunday Worker. (See Daily Worker, October 1, 1942, p. 6; January 1, 1930, p. 2, and December 21, 1935, p. 3; the Worker (magazine section), October 4, 1942, p. 7.) His biography appears in the Daily Worker of December 5, 1944, page 4.

Mr. Gropper, as an artist for Soviet Russia Today, was affiliated with the Friends of the Soviet Union. (See Soviet Russia Today, November 1935, p. 46.) This same publication reveals that William Gropper was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, a project sponsored by the Friends of the Soviet Union. (See Soviet Russia Today, November 1937, p. 79.)

According to Equal Justice, June 1939, page 7, Mr. Gropper was a sponsor of the Summer Milk Drive (1939) of the International Labor Defense, cited by Attorney General Biddle as the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Mr. Gropper's affiliation with the International Workers Order is shown by Fraternal Outlook for which he was a cover artist, cartoonist, and lithographer of a picture offered as a premium by that publication. (See Fraternal Outlook, March 1940; November 1939, p. 5; and July 1939, p. 19.) Attorney General Biddle has cited the International Workers Order as one of the most powerful Communist organizations.

The Daily Worker of February 14, 1936, page 5, reveals that William Gropper was a

member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School.

New Masses, June 17, 1941, page 10, discloses that Mr. Cropper attended the Fourth American Writers Congress, New York City, June 6-8, 1941, of the League of American Writers.

William Cropper is affiliated with the Liberator, an early Communist magazine, as an artist, cartoonist, special contributor, contributing editor, associate editor and editor, and with New Masses as an illustrator, artist, cartoonist, contributor, associate editor, contributing editor and cover artist. (See the Liberator, December 1922, page 18; June 1922, page 19; May 1922 (cover); April 1922, page 17; January 1922, page 14, July 1921 (cover; October 1918, page 41; March 1924, page 14; August 1923, page 17; August 1923; May 1923, page 38; March 1923, page 4; February 1923, page 13; October 1922, page 19; October 1922, page 7; August 1922, page 26; August 1922, page 13; September 1922, page 28; July 1922, page 26; June 1922, page 10; April 1922, page 7; March 1922, page 23 and page 16; March 1922, page 10; February 1922, page 12; December 1921, page 15; November 1921, page 17; October 1921, page 26; August 1921, page 27, page 20, and page 16; July 1921, page 29, page 14, page 27, and page 10; May 1921, page 25; April 1921, page 14; March 1921, page 25; February 1921, page 8; January 1921, page 26; October 1920, page 24; June 20, page 26; April 1920, page 39 and page 16; March 1920, page 8 and page 6; December 1922, page 30; January 1921, page 24; April 1921, page 6; February 1924, page 20; May 1923, page 14; and January 1922, page 9. New Masses, May 1932, page 3; April 1932, page 13; January 1932, page 17; September 1931, page 11; September 26, 1944, page 5; June 13, 1944, page 7; June 6, 1944, page 6; May 23, 1944, page 8; May 16, 1944, page 10; May 9, 1944, page 11; May 2, 1944, page 11; April 25, 1944, page 11; April 18, 1944, page 17; April 3, 1944, page 3; November 23, 1943, page 2; August 24, 1943, page 2; August 17, 1943, page 13; August 10, 1943 page 9; August 3, 1943, page 2; July 27, 1943, page 13; July 20, 1943, page 2; July 13, 1943, page 6; June 29, 1943, page 2; June 22, 1943, page 7; March 9, 1943, page 15; February 23, 1943, page 15; October 14, 1941, page 14; July 8, 1941, page 17; December 6, 1937, page 8; November 16, 1937, page 12; November 2, 1937, page 12; June 8, 1937, page 12; May 25, 1937, page 8; May 11, 1937, page 8; May 4, 1937, page 10; March 30, 1937, page 8; March 16, 1937, page 16; March 9, 1937, page 17; August 20, 1935, page 26; March 24, 1942, pages 16 and 17; March 17, 1942, pages 8 and 9; March 10, 1942, page 13; March 3, 1942, page 5; February 24, 1942, page 2; June 24, 1941, page 15; June 10, 1941, page 16; April 8, 1941, page 11; February 18, 1941, page 35; October 29, 1940, page 18; October 8, 1940, page 5; August 27, 1940, page 11; August 20, 1940, page 14; August 13, 1940, page 14; July 30, 1940 page 11; July 2, 1940, page 12; May 28, 1940, page 7; November 14, 1939, page 4; November 15, 1938, page 5; November 8, 1938, pages 16 and 17; November 1, 1938, page 10; October 25, 1938, page 10; October 18, 1938, page 10; October 4, 1938, page 9; July 5, 1938, page 9; June 21, 1938, page 5; June 7, 1938, page 8; April 12, 1938, page 9; March 22, 1938, page 7; March 15, 1938, page 16; March 8, 1938, page 10; February 22, 1938, page 12; February 8, 1938, page 12; April 20, 1937, page 10; November 1932, page 16; July 1932, page 10; June 1932, page 17; February 1932, page 15; January 1932, page 4; November 1931, page 19; March 1931, page 10; January 1931, page 11; December 1930, page 15; November 1930, page 7; September 1930, page 10; August 1929, page 5; February 1929, page 2; December 1928, page 5; February 1928, page 18; October 1927, page 32; October 1927, page 4; September 1927, page 21; September 1927, page 16; February 1, 1944, page 25; April 30, 1946, page 2; October 1927, page 3; March 14, 1944, page 2; September 7, 1943, page 2; June 22, 1943, page 2; November 15, 1938, page 10; Otober 11, 1938, page 8; September 20, 1938, page 14; June 1928, page 3; January 2, 1934, page 1; May 1932, page 3; and April 1931 (cover).

William Gropper was the owner of New Masses (New Masses, June 1928, p. 23), a member of the executive board (New Masses, Dec. 1930, p. 3 and Oct. 27, p. 3), a member of the board and contributing editors (Daily Worker, Nov. 18, 1942, p. 6), a guest of honor at the New Masses spring ball (Daily Worker, Mar. 30, 1938, p. 8), a member of the reception committee of the thirty-second annual artists and writers ball (New Masses, Nov. 30, 1943, p. 31), an exhibitor at the first annual New Masses art exhibition, November 13-27, 1938 (New Masses, Oct. 25, 1938, p. 2), and a a speaker at the anniversary celebration at Manhattan Center, New York City, February 16, 1941, of the New Masses thirtieth anniversary (New Masses, Jan. 28, 1941, p. 2). Mr. Gropper also attended the defense rally of the New Masses (Daily Worker, Feb. 26, 1940, p. 4), and was a signer of the New Masses letter to the President (New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21). In addition to the affiliations already listed, William Gropper was a member of the committee for the auction of the New Masses fourth annual art auction and a member of the same committee for their fifth annual art auction. (See, New Masses Feb. 23, 1943; p. 27 and Feb. 8, 1944, p. 41). Mr. Gropper also was a contributing artist to the second annual art auction of New Masses (New Masses, Apr. 1, 1941, p. 25), as well as the New Masses third annual art auction (New Masses, Apr. 28, 1942, p. 2; Apr. 7, 1942 p. 27; Mar. 31, 1942, p. 27; and Mar. 24, 1942, p. 25).

William Gropper has been associated with the Communist publication, New Pioneer, as a member of the editorial board (New Pioneer, Feb. 1933, p. 2; Dec. 1932, p. 2; and Aug. 1931, p. 2), and as an illustrator (New Pioneer, Mar. 1935, p. 3, Oct. 1931, p. 3; and Sept. 1931, pp. 10, 11, and 14). He was also mentioned in the New Pioneer of September 1935, page 2.

Mr. Gropper has been affiliated with the Communist-supported medical bureau, North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a guest at a benefit (Daily Worker, May 6, 1937, p. 7), and with the writers' and artists' committee of that organization (letterhead, July 6, 1938).

William Gropper's association with the New Theater League and Workers Dance League has been shown by the New Theater of March 1935, page 19 and April 1935 (cover), for which he was an artist. Both have been Communist organizations operating in the theater field.

The Daily Worker of January 11, 1937, page 2, discloses that William Gropper was a sponsor of the Communist-sponored New York City conference against war and fascism.

Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, page 25, reveals that William Gropper was one of the signers of the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union.

William Gropper's affiliation with the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee is shown by the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 40, which reveals that he was a signer of a declaration honoring Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International.

According to New Masses, May 26, 1942, page 31, William Gropper was a lecturer at the School for Democracy, formerly the Workers School, an official Communist Party school.

William Gropper was an artist and cartoonist for the Communist publication, Soviet Russia Today. (See Soviet Russia Today, May 1938, cover; August 1935, p. 5; and March 1935, p. 3.)

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946 Mr. Gropper was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which was cited for contempt by Congress.

Mr. Gropper's association with the United American Artists is shown by the Daily Worker, October 7, 1940, page 7, which reveals he was an exhibitor with that organization and by New Masses, May 20, 1941, page 27, which names him as a sponsor and participant in the testimonial to Rockwell Kent, New York City, May 17, 1941.

The Daily Worker of July 23, 1940, page 3, column 3, reveals that William Gropper was a signer of the statement to Assistant Secretary of State to save anti-Fascist refugees in France which was sponsored by the United American Spanish Aid Committee. An undated form letter also reveals he was a sponsor of this organization, which was Communist supported.

Mr. Gropper was also an artist for the Working Woman, a Communist magazine. (See the Working Woman, May 1933, p. 9.)

REGINALD MARSH

Reginald Marsh has been affiliated with the Liberator and New Masses as an artist and cartoonist. (See the Liberator, August 1922, p. 24; August 1922, p. 15; June 1922, p. 13; October 1921, p. 24; September 1921, p. 29; October 1922, p. 14; and July 1922, p. 25; New Masses, January 1928, p. 18.)

Mr. Marsh was also a contributing artist to the second and third New Masses art auctions. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 25, and April 28, 1942, p. 2.)

GEORGE L. K. MORRIS

According to News You Don't Get, November 15, 1938, George L. K. Morris was a member of National Committee for People's Rights, which defended Communist cases.

I. RICE PEREIRA

I. Rice Pereira was a contributing artist to the Third New Masses Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 28, 1942, p. 2.)

GREGORIO PRESTOPINO

A person named Prestopino was a contributing artist to the Third New Masses Art Auction according to New Masses of April 28, 1942, page 2.

Gregorio Prestopino has been associated with New Masses as an artist. (See New Masses, August 1, 1939, p. 5.)

ANTON REFREGIER

A person named Refregier was a contributing artist to the Third Annual Art Auction of New Masses. (See New Masses, March 24, 1942, p. 25; April 7, 1942, p. 27; and March 31, 1942, p. 27.)

The Daily Worker of March 21, 1932, page 2, column 2, discloses that an A. Refregier was a pamphlet artist for the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. A Refregier was also a contributor to New Masses of September 1934, page 22, as well as a contributing artist to the New Masses Second Annual Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, page 25.)

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, reveals Anton Refregier to be a sponsor of that organization.

The affiliation of Anton Refregier with the American League Against War and Fascism is shown by the publication, Fight, for which he was an illustrator. (See Fight, August 1937, p. 46.)

New Masses of March 15, 1938, page 19, discloses that Anton Refregier was a signer of a statement on the International Situation which was issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy.

As an artist, Anton Refregier contributed to the Champion of June 1936, page 11, and to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1936, page 5.

Mr. Refregier was associated with the John Reed Clubs as an artist of revolutionary themes (Daily Worker, March 21, 1934, p. 7, c. 3), and also as an instructor in the John Reed Club School (Daily Worker, Feb. 14, 1936, p. 5).

The Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6-8, 1934, page 4 (pamphlet), and a memorandum issued by the council, dated March 18, 1946, both serve to show that Anton Refregier was a sponsor

of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

A booklet entitled "Six Hundred Prominent Americans," page 27, discloses that Anton Refregier was a signer of an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, an organization specializing in the defense of Communist cases.

Mr. Refregier was an artist and cartoonist for New Masses. (See New Masses June 14, 1938, p. 7; Jan. 11, 1938, p. 16; Jan. 4, 1938, p. 19; Apr. 13, 1937, p. 15; May 11, 1937, p. 20; Mar. 9, 1937 p. 11; Sept. 29, 1936, p. 18; Jan. 1931, p. 19; Feb. 18, 1941, p. 38; Mar. 1, 1938, p. 21; Feb. 1, 1938, p. 13; Jan. 5, 1937, p. 11; and Dec. 1930, p. 13.)

In addition to the above listed contributions, Mr. Refregier was a contributing artist to the New Masses Third Art Auction (New Masses, Apr. 28, 1942, p. 2), a contributor to the New Masses, issue of April 30, 1946, page 2, and as an illustrator to the New Masses, January 26, 1937, page 8, and October 1931, page 10. Anton Refregier was a member of the committees for the auction for the fourth and fifth annual art auctions of New Masses. (See New Masses, Feb. 23, 1943, p. 27, and Feb. 8, 1944, p. 31.) He was also a signer of the New Masses letter to the President according to the New Masses of April 2, 1940, page 21.

The October 1933 issue of New Pioneer, page 142, mentions Anton Refregier.

Anton Refregier has been associated with the New Theatre League and New Dance League as an artist for the publication New Theatre. (See New Theatre, Aug. 1935, p. 10, and Sept. 1935, p. 11.)

The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, page 4, reveals that Anton Refregier was a signer of the open letter in defense of Harry Bridges.

According to a letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, Anton Refregier was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

BEN SHAHN

Ben Shahn was a contributing artist to New Masses third annual art auction. (See New Masses, Mar. 24, 1942, p. 25; Mar. 31, 1942, p. 27; Apr. 7, 1942, p. 27; and Apr. 28, 1942, p. 2.)

NAHUM TSCHACBASOV

A person named Tschacbasov was the donor of a painting to the Abraham Lincoln Branch, Fourth Assembly District, Brooklyn, N. Y. (Communist Party). This information was obtained from the Daily Worker of May 14, 1936, page 5.

Tschacbasov was an artist and cartoonist for New Masses. (See New Masses, February 1, 1938, p. 16; April 20, 1937, p. 22; and January 26, 1937, p. 30.) He was also a contributing artist to the second and third annual art auctions of New Masses. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 25; March 31, 1942, p. 27; and April 7, 1942, p. 27.)

Nahum Tschacbasov was a cartoonist for New Masses of February 18, 1941, page 51.

MAX WEBER

An undated letterhead which summarizes 1946 work and a letterhead, dated September 11, 1941, both reveal that Max Weber was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

New Masses of March 16, 1937, page 26, discloses that Max Weber was a guest of honor and sponsor of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau.

Max Weber was a member of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, Communist candidates, according to a letterhead of September 22, 1936, and the Daily Worker of September 2, 1936, page 2.

Max Weber was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship. This information was obtained from Soviet Russia Today, November 1937, page 79.

Max Weber has been associated with the International Workers' Order in the capacity of a judge for the American Artists School Competition according to New Masses of March 9, 1937, page 2.

Mr. Weber was a member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School. (See Daily Worker, February 14, 1936, page 5.)

A memorandum issued by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, dated March 18, 1946, discloses that Max Weber was a sponsor of this organization.

Max Weber's affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is revealed in that he was a signer of an appeal on behalf of Darcy, a Communist (Daily Worker, December 19, 1940, p. 5), a signer of a statement hailing the War Department order on commission for the Communists (Daily Worker, March 18, 1945, p. 3), a signer of a message to the House of Representatives (leaflet attached to an undated letterhead), and a signer of an open letter (booklet, Six Hundred Prominent Americans, p. 31). All of these were sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Max Weber was a speaker and sponsor of the New Masses' anti-Cliveden rally. See New Masses, April 7, 1942, p. 27, and April 14, 1942, p. 255.) He was also an artist and contributor for New Masses. See New Masses, May 16, 1944, p. 17; February 22, 1944, p. 23; November 9, 1943, p. 13; and August 12, 1941, p. 10.)

Max Weber was an exhibitor at the First Annual New Masses Art Exhibition, November 13–27, 1938 (New Masses, October 25, 1938, p. 2), and a member of the committee for the auction of the New Masses' Fifth Annual Art Auction (New Masses, February 8, 1944, p. 31).

New Masses of September 26, 1944, page 32, reveals that Max Weber answered their query, "What Presidential ticket are you supporting, and why?"

Max Weber was a signer of the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union (Soviet Russia Today September 1939, p. 28), Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4), and the Open Letter to American Liberals (Daily Worker, February 9, 1937, p. 2, and Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14–15).

An undated letterhead reveals that Max Weber was a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee.

Mr. Weber, according to the New York Times, December 22 1943, page 40, was a signer of the declaration honoring Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International.

Mr. Weber was also a contributor to the July-August 1939 issue of Soviet Russia Today, page 10.

A letterhead of February 26, 1946, discloses that Max Weber was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint-Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Max Weber's affiliation with the United American Artists is shown by New Masses of May 20, 1941, page 27, which names him as a sponsor and participant in the testimonial to Rockwell Kent, New York City, May 17, 1941.

SOL WILSON

Sol Wilson was a contributing artist to the New Masses Third Annual Art Auction, according to New Masses of April 28, 1942, page 2.

Listed below you will find the citations of the organizations with which the above-mentioned persons have been affiliated:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

American Friends of the Chinese People. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Commiteee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

American League Against War and Fascism. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. This was also cited as a Communist-front organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10. The Attorney General also said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

American League for Peace and Democracy. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle also said it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442), and that "the American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7443.)

American Peace Mobilization. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was said to be by Attorney General Francis Biddle "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442), and further, "The most conspicuous activity of American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national-defense program. * * * On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7444.)

Artists' Front To Win the War: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Champion: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The House report of June 25, 1942, page 17, cites the Champion as the official organ of the Young Communist League and also of the International Workers Order.

Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Friends of the Soviet Union: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Fight magazine: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Golden Book of American Friendship: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

International Labor Defense: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It was called the legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

International Workers Order: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942. Attorney General

Francis Biddle called it one of the strongest Communist organizations. (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7447.)

John Reed Clubs of the United States: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

League of American Writers: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, March 29, 1944, and January 3, 1940. The Attorney General said of it, "The League of American Writers, founded under Communist auspices in 1935. * * * The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7445.)

League of Struggle for Negro Rights: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The publication of this organization is entitled "The Liberator."

Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

National Committee for People's Rights: Cited as a Communist front on March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Attorney General Francis Biddle said of it, "In January 1938 its name (National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners) was changed to the National Committee for People's Rights" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446), and also, "A former Kansas Communist State official testified before the Dies committee that the extensive correspondence between himself and various governmental agencies on silicosis in those States * * * had been prepared by the Communist Party headquarters in New York City and dispatched by him on behalf of the NCPR." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It was called, by Attorney General Francis Biddle, "Part of what Lenin called the solar system or organization, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446.)

New Masses: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 24, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

New Pioneer: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

New Theatre League and New Theatre magazine: Cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

New York City Conference Against War and Fascism: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Open letter in defense of Harry Bridges: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Open letter for closer cooperation with U. S. S. R.: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Open letter to American liberals: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942.

Public Use of Arts Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Refugee scholarship and peace campaign: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

School for Democracy: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Soviet Russia Today: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

United American Artists: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

United American Spanish Aid Committee: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Working Woman: Cited as a Communist publication by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

There is no record of Communist-front affiliations of the following persons: William Baziotes, Romare Bearden, Cameron Booth, Louis Bouche, Raymond Breinin, Ralston Crawford, Arthur Dove, Warner Drewes, Adolph Gottlieb, O. Louis Guglielmi, Marsden Hartley, Walt Kuhn, Julian Levi, Loren MacIver, John Marin, Georgia O'Keeffe, Abraham Rattner, Charles Sheeler, Everett Spruce, Franklin Watkin, and Karl Zerbe.

Advancing American art—list of oil paintings

Artist	Painting	Price	Order date[1]
			1946
1. Avery, Milton	Fish Basket	$500	May 4
2. Baziotes, William	Flower Head	550	Do.
3. Bearden, Romare	At Five in the Afternoon	300	Do.
4. Ben Zion	Perpetual Destructor	600	Do.
5. Ben Zion	The Strangled Tree	400	Do.
6. Ben Zion	End of Don Quixote	500	Do.
7. Booth, Cameron	Clown	300	May 7
8. Bouche, Louis	Maspeth, Queens	300	May 4
9. Bouche, Louis	Gallery K	500	Do.
10. Breinin, Raymond	Her Lover's Return	550	May 3
11. Browne, Byron	Still Life in Red, Yellow, and Green	350	May 4
12. Burlin, Paul	News from Home	1,000	May 3
13. Constant, George	Rock Crabs	250	May 4
14. Crawford, Ralston	Wing Fabrication	500	May 3
15. Crawford Ralson	Plane Production	600	Do.
16. Davis, Stuart	Tree and El	600	Do.
17. Davis Stuart	Still Life with Flowers	1,000	Do.
18. De Diego, Julio	Nocturnal Family	500	June 5
19. De Diego, Julio	Under Stiff Rearguard Action	500	Do.
20. De Martini, Joseph	The Ravine	625	May 4
21. Dove, Arthur	Another Arrangement	600	May 5
22. Dove, Arthur	Grey Greens	400	Do.
23. Drewes, Werner	Balcony	400	May 4
24. Drewes, Werner	A Dark Thought	250	Do.
25. Drewes, Werner	Gaiety in Times of Distress	350	Do.
26. Evergood, Philip	Fascist Leader	650	May
27. Evergood, Philip	Girl and Cock	400	Do.
28. Gottlieb, Adolph	The Couple	400	May 4
29. Gropper, William	Home	375	May 3
30. Gropper, William	They Fought to the Last Man	1,125	Do.
31. Guglielmi, O. Louis	Subway Exist	700	Oct. 2
32. Guglielmi, O. Louis	Tenements	500	Aug. 7
33. Guston, Philip	Portrait of Shannah	700	June 6
34. Gwathmey, Robert	Workers on the Land	800	May 3
35. Gwathmey, Robert	Worksong	800	June 6
36. Hartley, Marsden	Wild Sea Rose	250	May 4
37. Hartley, Marsden	Roses	300	Do.
38. Hartley, Marsden	Whale's Jaw, Dogtown	600	Aug. 1
39. Howard, Charles	The Medusa	360	June 5
40. Kantor, Morris	Afternoon	450	Aug. 1
41. Kleinholtz, Frank	Floral	450	June 6
42. Kleinholtz, Frank	Bank Night	450	May 4
43. Kuhn, Walt	Pine at Five O'clock	1,334	June 6
44. Kuhn, Walt	Still Life with Bananas	1,333	Do.
45. Kuniyoshi, Yasuo	Deserted Brickyard	900	May 3
46. Kuniyoshi, Yasuo	Circus Girl Resting	700	Do.
47. Levi, Julian	Still Life	800	Aug. 7
48. Levis, Julian	Waste and Images	500	Do.
49. Levine, Jack	White Horse	1,500	Aug. 1
50. MacIver, Loren	Blue Landscape	450	Do.
51. Marin, John	Sea and Boat	2,500	May 3
52. Marin, John	Seascape	1,200	Do.
53. Marsh, Reginald	Lifeguard	600	Do
54. Morris, George L. K	Shipbuilding Composition	200	Do.
55. Morris, George L. K	New England Church	550	Oct. 2
56. O'Keeffe, Georgia	Small Hill Near Alcade	1,000	May 3
57. O'Keeffe	Cos Cob	1,000	Do.
58. Pereira, I. Rice	Abstraction	450	Do.
59. Prestopino Gregorio	Newspaper	800	Oct. 2
60. Prestopino, Gregorio	Trolley Car	900	May 3
61. Rattner, Abraham	Yellow Table	800	May 4
62. Refregier, Anton	End of the Conference	300	June 6
63. Shahn, Ben	Hunger	875	Oct. 2
64. Shahn, Ben	Renascene	750	Aug 7
65. Sheeler, Charles	Boneyard	750	May 3
66. Spruce, Everett	Owl on Rocks	195	May 7
67. Spruce, Everett	Turkey	220	Do.
68. Spruce, Everett	Canyon at Night	220	Do.
69. Tschachasov, Nahum	Choir Boys	300	May
70. Tschachasov, Nahum	Mother and Child	300	Do.
71. Tschachasov, Nahum	Fish	300	Do.
72. Watkins, Franklin	Portrait of Old Woman	500	May 3
73. Weber, Max	Fruit and Wine	1,200	May 4
74. Weber, Max	Conversation	1,600	Do.
75. Weber, Max	Two Vases	1,200	Do.
76. Wilson, Sol	Fisherman on Wharf	300	Do.
77. Zerbe, Karl	Clown and Ass	850	Aug. 7
78. Zerbe, Karl	The Owls	300	May 3
79. Zerbe, Karl	Around the Lighthouse	500	Do.

[1] Date of DS-12, departmental request for supplies, equipment, or services, preceded by negotiations of various lengths.

PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS DIVISION, OIC

WEEKLY ROUND-UP ARTCAST, SEPTEMBER 20, 1946

(Please note date of exhibition)

Column mail

WASHINGTON (undated).—An exhibition of Advancing American Art, prepared by the United States Department of State and designed to show the scope and progress of contemporary experimental and creative painting in the United States, is scheduled to open on October 4 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. In response to requests from United States missions abroad for a showing of the newest trends in American paintings, the Department has chosen these 79 paintings by 45 artists as representative of fine quality, originality, artistic breadth, distinction, and variety of style.

After a sojourn at the Metropolitan in New York, the exhibit will be divided into two parts: 30 paintings will tour the other American Republics; while 49 will go to Europe on a similar tour, beginning in Paris in November (UNESCO month) then moving through the other large cities of Europe. Less extensive but fully self-contained and representative units of the exhibition later will circulate through the smaller European cities.

The exhibit is planned to acquaint the world with recent developments in American paintings, and presents therefore a national cross-section of the work of the most active and forward-looking of contemporary artists. Included are canvases by well-known and established painters like John Marin, Max Weber, Stuart Davis, Marsden Hartley, and Georgia O'Keeffe, as well as those of such comparatively new arrivals in the field as Jack Levine, Robert Gwathmey, Gregorio Prestopino, and Ben Shahn.

The initiate in art may trace in these paintings important social and cultural influences and traditions, fresh ideas and techniques. Art amateurs will find interest and pleasure in the broad range and variety of subject, style, and approach—the classic precision of Charles Sheeler; the brooding moods and memories of Loren MacIvor; the fantasy of Julio de Diego; the abstractions of Stuart Davis; the somber intensity of Ben Shahn; the social commentary of William Gropper; the biting analysis of Jack Levine and Robert Gwathmey.

Paintings designated to tour the Eastern Hemisphere include Still Life With Flowers, by Stuart Davis; Fascist Leader, by Philip Evergood; They Fought To the Last Man, by William Gropper; Tenements, by Louis Guglielmi; Horse, by Jack Levine; Seascape, by John Marin; Trolley Car, by Gregorio Prestopino; Small Hill Near Alcade, by Georgia O'Keefe; Boneyard, by Charles Sheeler; and Circus Girl Resting by Yasuo Kunioshi.

A parallel selection of artists and paintings for the exhibit in the other American Republics include Robert Gwathmey's Workers on the Land, Yasuo Kunioshi's Deserted Brickyard, Ben Shahn's Hunger, Max Weber's Fruit and Wine, and Reginald Marsh's Lifeguard.

While this is the most ambitious project of this type yet undertaken by the State Department as part of its world-wide cultural activities program, other smaller exhibits of original prints, water colors, and photographs already have circulated abroad, and are reported to have met with cordial response. This exhibit and others now being planned are part of a widespread program of peacetime cultural interchange between the United States and the rest of the world.

HANNAH GOLDMAN.

Sources: United States State Department advance release, interview, photographs, art periodicals.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two very brief observations. As a result of the debate which we have had on the floor of the House the past 2 weeks, I think all of us are well aware of the dangers that lie in the path of legislating a foreign policy in a piecemeal fashion.

It was my opportunity during the war to observe propaganda being manufactured. I know something of its effectiveness. I recognize the definite need for a pro-American propaganda program at the present time. I recognize the power and possible effectiveness of such a program. A weapon of this type can be made so all-powerful that I feel it might be well to have a program of this type more directly under the control of the Congress.

If we are not careful, the tail may wag the dog.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this concludes the general debate on the bill, and I suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL 938—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, S. 938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. HORAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri and Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. HORAN) were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of the artists I mentioned along with the amount paid for each painting and the date of purchase and in addition a copy of the Artcast dated September 20, 1946, which created the so-called demand for this exhibition of art, as well as a report from the House Committee on Un-American Activities on 24 of the artists from whom the paintings were purchased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts from broadcasts and digests of broadcasts furnished him by the State Department.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BULWINKLE, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 12, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation, for public use; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

676. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

677. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $8,850,000 for the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 1628. A bill relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2097. A bill to declare the ownership of the timber on the allotments on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, and to authorize the sale thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2693. A bill for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1555. A bill to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 577. A bill to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts; with amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 981. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1831. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2938. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3143. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1379. A bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1882. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2545. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; with amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2655. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 408. A bill for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and Lawson Ashby, the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander; with amendment (Rept. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall; with amendments (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of Myron R. Leard; with amendments (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Y. S. Hu; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; with amendments (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of John C. Garrett; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1523. A bill for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry and James Curry; with amendments (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 261. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States for the northern district of California, northern division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 10 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1978; 43 U. S. C. sec. 3151); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3430. A bill to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3431. A bill to remove restrictions on the property and moneys belonging to the individual enrolled members of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, to provide for the liquidation of tribal property and distribution of the proceeds thereof, to confer complete citizenship upon such Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3432. A bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3433. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3434. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain emergency officers of World War I seriously disabled from gunshot wounds incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3435. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3436. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3437. A bill relating to the compensation of those veterans of World War I and World War II who suffer from tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3438. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3439. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by the widow or child of a veteran of World War I or II without disqualifying such widow or child for a pension for the non-service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3440. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide that disabled veterans of World War II who elect to receive the educational benefits granted by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) shall receive the entire subsistence allowance provided by such part; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3442. A bill to provide that retired enlisted personnel of the Army who served as commissioned officers during World War II shall receive the pay of retired warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3443. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3444. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3445. A bill to exempt from the immigration quota certain persons who served in the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE (by request):

H. R. 3446. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, title IV of the National Housing Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3447. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3448. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3449. A bill to provide for equalization of flight pay for Navy and Marine Corps officers and former officers who did not receive flight pay equal to that paid to Army officers engaged in regular and frequent aerial flights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3450. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the tornado at Worth, Worth County, Mo., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to study and inspect the operations of the United States Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. Res. 209. Resolution creating a select committee to make an investigation with respect to alien property, private war losses, foreign loans, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Res. 210. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to investigate the causes of and feasible methods of preventing railroad accidents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Szoszana Sierdzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of James R. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Peltier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3456. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Andrew Johnson, Alexander H. Tongue, James F. Sirlouis, James W. Dixon, J. Frank Tongue, Thomas E. Wroten, Halvor H. Hellen, George J. Carey, Robert C. O'Berry, Norman C. Carey, James W. Hungerford, Sarah E. Webster, Nathaniel M. Dare, and Richard J. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

500. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Turbett, and others, Le Grand, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

501. Also, petition of members of Osage Lutheran Church, Osage, Iowa, re S. 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

502. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the members of the Nazarene Church of Charlton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 111, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

503. Also, petition of Mrs. May Miller King and members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Corydon, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 142, S. 265, and S. 623; to the Committee on Armed Services.

504. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition of the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, Ill., urging that the Congress continue program of Federal aid to local communities in the operation of control towers at terminal airports and its program of assistance in the construction of new airport facilities in order that this Nation may keep abreast of the international development of air transportation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

505. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Lowell Hebrew Community Center, Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

506. Also, petition of Lowell Ministerial Association, of Lowell, Mass., concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

507. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Bassett and 41 other citizens of Edgewood, Iowa, endorsing S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

508. By the SPEAKER: Petition of membership of the Pasadena Townsend Club, No. 1, Pasadena, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. Also, petition of members of the Valdosta Townsend Club, No. 1, Valdosta, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

510. Also, petition of the Newark Archdiocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to combating atheistic communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forbid it, Lord, that we should walk through Thy beautiful world with unseeing eyes. Forgive us, our Father, for taking our good things for granted, so that we are in danger of losing the fine art of appreciation. With such dire need in every other part of the world, make us so grateful for the bounties we enjoy that we shall try, by Thy help, to deserve them more.

Where we are wrong, make us willing to change, and where we are right, make us easy to live with.

For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the World Telecommunications Conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 54)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative branch, Senate, amounting to $350,000, fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF THE U. S. S. "TEXAS" TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of Texas had requested the Navy Department to transfer the U. S. S. *Texas* for use as a part of the San Jacinto battleground for historical purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the 30-day period ended April 29, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORTS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, audit reports of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions signed by members of the Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, the Dover Townsend Club, No. 1, and the Valdosta Townsend Club, No. 1, all of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress to enact proper laws relating to the national forests

"Whereas the United States owns or controls lands known as national forests in South Carolina; and

"Whereas some of these lands are quite suitable for continued agricultural use and are not indispensable for national forest use; and

"Whereas some World War veterans are unable to obtain farms or homesteads by ordinary means: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the General Assembly of South Carolina do memorialize the National Congress to enact proper laws to provide: '1) For homestead entry and settlement, with preference to World War veterans, of all lands owned by the United States in rural areas of South Carolina suitable for occupation and use as farms which are not indispensably necessary for public use; and (2) that all of such parts of the existing national forests in South Carolina suitable for occupation and use as farms, not allotted for homestead entry and settlement, be offered for public sale; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress from South Carolina and that they be requested to initiate and press for enactment the necessary laws to accomplish the purposes of this resolution."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 57 citizens of Altamont, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Verne Bowers, president of the WCTU and chairman of temperance in the Methodist Church of DeWitt, Ark., together with a petition, without the signatures attached, of DeWitt, Almyra, and Conway, Ark., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of alcoholic beverages.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter, and petition will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter and the petition, without the signatures attached, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and without objection, the letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWITT, ARK., *April 28, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed I am sending you a petition signed by 91 voters asking that you give consideration and all possible support to S. 265, commonly known as the Capper bill to prevent the interstate and radio advertising of all alcoholic beverages, and that you support any other bills of similar character if by so doing you can help us secure relief from the injurious beverage alcohol custom and traffic. And we ask that you have this petition inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance for anything you can do to help us in this good cause, I am,

Very respectfully,
Mrs. VERNE BOWERS,
President, WCTU, and Chairman of Temperance in the Methodist Church of DeWitt, Ark.

To the Appropriate Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, in Particular to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the Signers of This Petition:

We, the undersigned qualified voters, respectfully request that you give favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; and that you support any other bills of similar character, if such support will best serve to secure quick relief from the offensive and injurious promotion of the beverage alcohol custom and traffic. The social and economic evils arising from the present widespread use of alcoholic beverages should certainly not be increased by the systematic promotion of their use. We believe that many millions of people are profoundly concerned because of existing conditions and almost daily offended because of the invasion of their homes by liquor sales promotion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1. A bill to reduce individual income-tax payments; with amendments (Rept. No. 173).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 805. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a high-school building near Roosevelt, Utah, for the district embracing the east portion of Duchesne County and the west portion of Uintah County; without amendment (Rept. No. 174).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1277. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1278. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to William Fast Horse; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1279. A bill to establish the Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1280. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; and

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of James B. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced Senate bill 1282, to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming (by request):

S. 1283. A bill to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1284. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1285. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

S. 1286. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 1287, to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to "the United States Foreign Trade Board" and to vest additional authority in the Board, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1288. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BOUNDARY TREE TOURIST PROJECT, N. C.

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has granted a loan of $150,000 at an annual interest rate of 1 percent, out of the revolving fund established by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Qualla Indian Boundary, N. C., for the purpose of developing facilities for the tourist trade, known as the Boundary Tree tourist project; and

Whereas the tribal fund of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians has to its credit in the Treasury of the United States over $300,000, which is held in trust by the United States and on which interest is paid by the United States at an annual rate of 4 percent; and

Whereas the land upon which it is proposed to construct the Boundary Tree tourist project was originally a part of the Smoky Mountain National Park and was purchased by the tribal council, under supervision of the Office of Indian Affairs, from the National Park Service; and

Whereas the land of the Eastern Bank of the Cherokee Indians, which is now held in trust by the United States, was originally owned by the band and its members without restriction and was deeded to the United States in trust under the act of June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 376) for the purpose of having all such land allotted equally among members of the tribe, which allotment has never taken place; and

Whereas such loan to develop the tourist project was requested by the tribal council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, but numerous petitions have been received by the Committee on Public Lands from members of such band alleging that the development of the project by means of the loan is not to the best interest of the band; and

Whereas such petitions further allege that the loan will serve to impede individual enterprise of the members of the band and subject them to liability to repay the loan without economic gain commensurate with such liability, and that the development of the project by means of such loan will further subject the members of the band to the supervision and authority of the Office of Indian Affairs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is requested to withhold payment of the loan until such time as the Committee on Public Lands has made a full study and investigation of the allegations made by opponents of the loan and has by resolution signified its approval or disapproval of the loan: and be it further

Resolved, That the Housing Expediter is requested to withhold approval of the application for authorization to construct the building project which is proposed as a part of the Boundary Tree tourist project until such time as the Committee on Public Lands has made a full study and investigation of the allegations made by the opponents to such loan and has by resolution signified its approval or disapproval of such loan.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE also submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. McGRATH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1017) providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes, which contains a feature that is found in House bill 3203, which was recently passed by the House. I request that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

One subcommittee is considering the nomination of Thomas Vincent Quinn to be Assistant Attorney General, and the other subcommittee is considering Senate bill 104, the antimonopoly bill.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is presiding over the subcommittees, feels that these hearings should not be postponed due to the fact that there are a number of witnesses from out of town.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration may meet this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MILK PRICES IN AGRICULTURE'S PATTERN—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

milk prices in agriculture's pattern, delivered by the Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, before a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Schoharie County Democratic Committee, Schoharie, N. Y., on May 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE AND THE PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM ARIZONA DAILY STAR

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Special Privilege and the Press," published in the May 6, 1947, issue of the Arizona Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

STOP THE FEDERAL "BUROCRACY"—AN EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop the Federal 'Burocracy'," published in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRECY AND SCIENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secrecy and Science," published in the New York Times of Monday, May 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating today under a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the committee amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; and immediately thereafter upon the committee amendment, whether amended or not, and upon the final passage of the joint resolution as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Hill
Ball	Donnell	Hoey
Barkley	Downey	Holland
Brewster	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jenner
Bridges	Ecton	Johnson, Colo.
Brooks	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Buck	Ferguson	Kem
Bushfield	Fulbright	Kilgore
Butler	George	Knowland
Byrd	Green	Lodge
Cain	Gurney	Lucas
Capper	Hatch	McCarthy
Chavez	Hawkes	McClellan
Connally	Hayden	McFarland
Cooper	Hickenlooper	McGrath
McKellar	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McMahon	O'Mahoney	Thye
Magnuson	Pepper	Tydings
Malone	Reed	Umstead
Martin	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Maybank	Robertson, Wyo	Watkins
Millikin	Russell	Wherry
Moore	Saltonstall	White
Morse	Smith	Wiley
Murray	Sparkman	Williams
Myers	Taft	Wilson
O'Conor	Taylor	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT protempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at the outset of what I have to say, I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Relations, and particularly its able and distinguished chairman, for the work done to safeguard the expenditure of such sums as may be appropriated at this time for relief assistance. For this, I have nothing but praise. It is concerning the amount of the grant that I rise to speak. The joint resolution as passed in the House provides for an appropriation for relief assistance in the sum of $200,000,000. This has been increased in the Senate measure to $350,000,000.

The idea of a human being anywhere in the world without sufficient to eat wrings the heartstrings of every one of us. The American people, always generous and sympathetic, now enjoying a period of unexampled abundance, will not turn a deaf ear to such an appeal. There can be no question that an urgent necessity for food exists today in many places in Europe, Asia, and perhaps elsewhere in the world. There is nothing new or unusual about this. Unfortunately, it has occurred at many places and at many times in the world's history. The only thing new or novel about the present situation is the idea which has grown up in recent years that such situations should be met, not by voluntary charity, but by taxes to be levied upon the American taxpayer.

The important question for Congress to decide on the pending measure is how far this burden can wisely and fairly be placed upon the American taxpayer. We must bear in mind that we are not deciding an appeal for voluntary charity; we are deciding to what extent the money of the American taxpayer shall be involuntarily taken from him for this worthy and beneficent purpose.

Such a generous gesture must be made in full recognition of two inescapable economic facts:

First. Lavish expenditures, by increasing the cost of our Federal Government, make high taxes inevitable; and

Second. Purchases here for shipment abroad increase prices to the American consumer.

The first of these propositions would seem too obvious for an extended argument. Yet there is reason to believe that many an American citizen has not come to comprehend this hard economic fact of life. He fails to understand that every generous relief gesture from an open-handed Administration means fewer shoes for his own children, less food for his own family, fewer educational advantages for his own community. All of us know, when we stop to think of it, that the cost of the Federal Government is an important and integral part of the cost of living.

The second proposition has been demonstrated by our recent experience. An examination of the prices of the items which make a cost of living index issued by the United States Department of Labor, reveals that the largest percentage rise of any component in the cost of living has been in food. The Index shows that the consumer price of food was about 85 percent above the 1935-39 average, and all items other than food were only 37 percent above this average. In the period 1935–39 foodstuffs constituted about 34 percent of the cost of living, whereas it is now more than 40 percent. In other words, the price difficulty today, with which the President and so many others are so preoccupied, is due to the sharp advance in food prices. The relatively high price of foods is directly traceable to the Government's food purchases for shipment abroad.

Shortly after the first of this year, the Department of Agriculture became aggressive in its food buying. The Department's grain purchasing program for foreign relief was increased from the original goal of 400,000,000 bushels for the fiscal year to "400,000,000 bushels as soon as possible," and as much more as could be purchased by July 1. This was an especially inopportune time for the Government to be in the market.

The visible supply of grain was small and there was an extreme shortage of boxcars for transporting grain. The shortage of transportation facilities was even made more acute by the long hauls of the Government grain to the seaboard and the Gulf.

Nevertheless, in spite of the tight grain supply situation, the Government competed actively with the mills who were attempting to buy enough wheat with which to grind flour for their normal domestic trade. It was contracting with the mills for millions of sacks of flour, also for foreign shipment. The inevitable result was a sharply rising grain market, beginning in February, which spread to other food commodities.

The report of ex-President Hoover, released in late February recommended that the United States pay $475,000,000 for food to German civilians during 1947 and the first half of 1948. Close on the

heels of the Hoover report was the announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson that the United States had agreed to provide the British with sufficient meat to prevent a cut in their current meat ration. He said also that the United States would help Great Britain build up a stock pile of wheat this fall, and that there would be a ready outlet for every bushel of grain harvested this year. These Government announcements were, of course, immediately reflected in the markets, inasmuch as the Government activities already were a dominating factor.

Foreign governments were allocated 140,000 000 pounds of our domestic meat supply for the first quarter of the year. Of this amount, the British Government was allocated 50,000,000 pounds, practically all of which was purchased by the British from between mid-February and April 1. This had a direct and substantial influence in increasing meat prices in this period. More recently the Government has allocated 155,000,000 pounds of meat for purchase by foreign governments during the second quarter of the year.

It must be apparent from these figures that legislative expenditures for relief constitute the first stage, the first step, the first station, along the inflationary line. The praiseworthy efforts of the merchants of Newburyport to reduce the cost of living are doomed to failure so long as the Federal Government itself is committed to inflationary policies.

Mr. President, I should like to believe that the present call for grants, to be a burden on the American taxpayer, will not be repeated again in the near future; but anyone who believes that is living in a fool's paradise. Incidentally, the American taxpayer has urgent calls for charity in his own family and in his own community, to which he is not always able to respond.

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG], with his customary candor, told the Senate that a so-called children's fund proposal would soon be presented to us through the United Nations. So we must ask ourselves squarely, How far can the economy of the United States stand these constant drains with nothing coming in and everything going out?

It has often been said on the floor of the Senate that the most important problem before the Government today is to maintain our free institutions. Unless we can keep our system of free enterprise and free institutions, under which America has grown great and strong, the torchlight of liberty will probably go out all over the world. To do so we must have a sound financial and fiscal structure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the question of the children's fund, I should like to make this observation: I entirely agree with what he is saying, but we must carefully survey the total prospective obligation which is involved when we engage in legislation of this sort. So far as the children's fund is concerned, there is considerable question as to how it ought to be handled. In the House measure, which will be in conference with the Senate amendment, there is a provision that a portion of the pending appropriation shall be used for whatever minimum contribution we shall ultimately make to the children's fund. We have not included that clause in the Senate committee amendment, because we have wanted that whole subject matter, beginning with the total amount of the grant, down to the possibility of including the children's fund, and the inclusion of other factors, to be left in a liquid state, to be adjusted in conference. I say to the Senator, therefore, that the point which he makes regarding the children's fund is a valid point, and one which will be considered in conference.

Mr. KEM. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think the Senator will agree with me also that so long as demands coming from abroad are met at the expense of the American taxpayer, the demands will continue to come.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I agree with his general premise. However, his statement in relation to the prices of farm products in the period from 1935 to 1939 has in it an element of misdirection, because I know from my own experience during that depression period that the farmers of America were selling their crops at prices far below the cost of production, whereas in a great many other lines producers were getting the cost of production. To illustrate, I know that in those years, on a farm which I have owned for a number of years, we were selling milk at prices between 90 cents and $1.25 a hundred. That means that 48½ quarts of good 3-percent milk were being sold on that basis. It cost us between $1.85 and $1.90 to produce the milk at that time, when labor was cheap.

I have seen a great many similar statements in the press, and I am sorry to say that some of my manufacturing friends are using the same figures. At that time the farmer should have received at least the cost of production. In that event, the percentage of increase in the price of foodstuffs would not be so great as it now is. Certain segments among our farmers probably have been making money. At the same time, they have been wearing out their farms. They have not been able to obtain machinery in many instances, and when they bought machinery they had to pay increases of from 100 to 200 percent. I am speaking on the basis of my own experience.

While this is a trifle irrelevant to your main thesis, sir—with which I agree—I thought I should interject these observations at this point, because I feel that, just as there has been propaganda throughout the United States to the effect that the Republican Party, which is in control of the Congress, has not been doing an effective job, there has been propaganda to the effect that the farmers have been milking the public, which is all rot. In the past 10 or 15 years between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 farmers have left the farms, and today farms are again going on the auction block because farmers cannot get machinery or labor. I feel that those facts should be given the publicity which they merit.

In relation to the matter of loans, I had hoped at some time to express my views on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. As a matter of realism, should we not call them grants or gifts?

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator talking about foreign loans or gifts like the present aid bill?

Mr. KEM. I am talking about what we now propose to do, and similar transactions in the recent past.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is correct in that. We have made loans. This is a gift to the poor starving people of Europe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us be specific about it. So far as this bill is concerned, it is a grant and has no relationship to a loan.

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say that the news that came over the radio the other night, and was confirmed in the subcommittee hearing the other day in the examination of a representative of the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that the good Lord has again favored this Nation, that we will have 150,000,000 more bushels of winter wheat this year than we ever had before in our history. I sometimes feel that there are hidden laws which apply, and one of those laws is that when we reach out and do that which our hearts tell us we should do—help those who are in need, save them from going berserk mentally, save them from becoming objects of communism—the operation of that law shows itself in making us adequate. May I say, then, to the Senator, that it is admitted that we will have the greatest national income in our history; it will be approximately $170,000,000,000. While I would be the last one in the world to think that we should become prodigal, I still feel that it is imperative that we do the job as good Samaritans where that is necessary; and that job should be to make the other fellow competent to help himself, and not make him a "leaner."

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I join with him as a brother farmer in his interest in American agriculture. I am sure he would agree with me that so long as the Government, by its purchases, continues to preempt the available supply of agricultural products, such products will rise in price. I am sure he will also agree with me that in the judgment of most students of American agricultural problems the present rise in the price of certain agricultural commodities is unsound and not for the

best interests of American agriculture. I appreciate also the scriptural references made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and I might suggest others, such as "charity begins at home" and "Trust the Lord and keep your powder dry." Perhaps that is not scriptural. I do not know whether it was Cromwell or Napoleon who said that, but in any case there is good authority for it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to give me the chapter and page of the Scripture.

Mr. KEM. I yield if the Senator can correct me in that quotation.

Mr. WILEY. The last quotation, as the Senator suggests, is ascribed to Cromwell. But I remember something which is pertinent to the Senator's argument, and I have quoted it heretofore on the floor of the Senate. I think it was St. Paul who said something to the effect that he who does not look after his own is unworthy. That brings up almost a metaphysical argument. How do we look after our own? It is not by letting the other fellow die while we are looking after our own.

Mr. KEM. I think I may say at the outset that I do not want any Member of the Senate to be deaf to the appeal of someone in need. I am trying to present some economic facts which I think should be taken into consideration. They are hard, economic facts which I think are worthy of our consideration in connection with this problem which is only one of a number of similar problems which without doubt will confront us in the immediate future.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to suggest to the Senator that I am not at all clear about the reference to St. Paul made by the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am clear about a reference to which the Senator can turn to his own great advantage in connection with his argument. It happens to be a statement to which I give my complete allegiance. St. Paul said:

> But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

So, Mr. President, I think we must ask ourselves how far can the Congress of the United States stand these constant drains? It has often been said on the floor of the Senate that the most important problem before the Government today is to maintain our free institutions. To do so we must have a sound financial and fiscal structure. In considering this matter let us be just and wise at the same time that we are generous.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending resolution to reduce the appropriation from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000, which is the amount fixed by the House committee after extensive public hearings. I want to say that this amendment is offered without apology, as a compromise between head and heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000,000."

EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYERS FROM LIABILITY FOR PORTAL-TO-PORTAL WAGES IN CERTAIN CASES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 247)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States with respect to his action on House bill 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, which the clerk read.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5281.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on page 8, line 17, to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when we, as nonpartisan Americans, survey the position of the United States in the world today we are constrained by the sheer brute force of events to come to this conclusion:

In the large sense we have defeated the enemy, but we have not won the peace. We have killed off the German threat and the Japanese threat to our existence as a people, but we have not achieved any of our positive aims. Speaking broadly, Poland has not been liberated, democracy has not been established, autocracy has not been destroyed. To replace a German hegemony by one bearing another national designation is no gain; it is merely a change of name. The Christian concept of the dignity of man, which was the underlying spiritual fact in whatever idealism there was in World War II, is still reviled and violated in most of the world. That is a dreadful statement to make; but there is not a man in this room who does not know that it is true.

Mr. President, what is the matter with us? How is it that we can win the battle and lose the peace?

We need not look back very far to find the mistakes which will supply the answers to that question.

First. For one thing, we gave our supplies and our equipment to our allies during the war with a lavish hand—which was all right. But in conspicuous cases we did it without requiring assurances as to the future—and that was not all right. All of human experience shows that the time to get promises is before the other fellow gets the stuff, and not afterward.

I remember the argument which was made during the war whenever anyone suggested that some assurances as to the future should be received before we turned everything over to an ally. It ran something like this: "If your neighbor's house is on fire you lend him the equipment to extinguish it. You do not stand around arguing over how much it costs or the precise terms upon which you lend it to him. You leave such things until after the fire is out." That is what was said at that time. But, as we read in the book The Strange Alliance, written by Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, who was the head of our military mission in Russia during the war:

> The fire in our neighbor's house had been extinguished and we had submitted ourselves to his direction in helping to extinguish it. He assumed that we would continue to submit ourselves to his direction in helping rebuild the house, and, unfortunately, we did. He allowed us to work on the outside and demanded that we furnish the material for the inside the exact use of which we were not allowed to see. Now that the house is finished we have at best only a nodding acquaintance.

There is no use in crying over spilled milk, but we can reflect in passing on how much better off we would be today if we had exacted some assurances—not selfish promises for ourselves alone, but assurances for the benefit and the peace of the whole world—when we were still in a strong position to do so.

Second. Toward the end of the war we overestimated the ability of the Japanese to resist, and, therefore, in order to secure Russian support we made concessions at Yalta which we now bitterly regret. We made concessions there and elsewhere which not only involved the giving up of our own overwhelming military advantage at a time when our victorious armies were advancing across Germany; they also involved a breach of faith with the people like the Poles, who had believed our plighted word.

Third. We were utterly, completely, and abysmally unprepared for the end of the war. We remember what happened. Those of us who were in the service at that time will never forget it. Not a word did we hear from our national leadership, telling the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen of America, or their military leaders, or their families, or their Congressmen why it was necessary that they remain in the service. Our leaders did not tell us that it was absolutely essential to the national well-being that the United States maintain armed forces after the end of hostilities. They did not say that these forces would have to bear a definite relationship to the other armed forces in the world. If they had, the men in uniform would have understood, and so would their families and so would their Congress. But the tragic fact remains that they were never told why it was necessary for them to stay in the service. Naturally, they wanted to get out. Naturally, their families wanted them at home. Nobody gave them a good reason for not being at home. And naturally a few months after VJ-day, we read of soldiers actually booing the Secretary of War because of their impatience to be out of uniform. By that time it was too late. The water was over the dam, for all the world to see. Mr. President, leadership would have avoided that disastrous occurrence.

Fourth. And so the people of the world beheld this sickening and astounding spectacle: the greatest military power the world had ever seen had, within a few short months, defeated itself by

allowing its huge strength to dwindle away. The armies and the navies which the best troops of Germany and the finest fleets of Japan had not been able to defeat were going to pieces because of the lack of comprehension and the lack of leadership at the head of the government.

It was no wonder that so little could be accomplished at the peace conferences. Our opposite number at those peace conferences had never been taught to respect weakness. Those who faced us at the peace table had been brought up in the hard, flinty, and bloody school of European politics in which no one agrees to anything unless force is in evidence. Indeed, when we consider how fast our Army and Navy were evaporating, it seems a miracle that the satellite peace treaties, unsatisfactory as some of them are, were ever agreed to at all. This was due to the fact that Secretary Byrnes, supported by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], had made it clear that the United States would not yield further.

This was possible because we, the American people, had finally begun to learn the lesson that indecision on our part leads to brutality and bullying and expansionism elsewhere. But we have only begun. We have recognized our mistakes. But as a people, we have yet fully to grasp the far-reaching, positive, and purposeful steps yet to be taken, which I now desire to submit to the Senate under four major headings:

First. Clearly the first item in an effective foreign policy is the personnel abroad to carry it out.

There are many unfair criticisms of our foreign service. For example, it is not fair to say that it is largely composed of millionaire graduates of Ivy League Colleges who loaf in glittering world capitals where, having entirely forgotten America, they adopt reactionary and supercilious views in order to toady to the European nobility. That is a common criticism, but it is not true. Whatever merit that criticism had in the past, the truth is today that in the main our foreign service consists of men coming from all sections of the country, who depend on their salaries for their living, and who have had to meet stiff requirements in order to enter the service and then to stay in it.

They must often endure a life of isolation, separation from families, appalling prices at the official rate of exchange, which of course they are compelled to use, lack of food and fuel, and an unrelenting grind of work, often in hostile surroundings, and with very few diversions. I believe that our Foreign Service is, on the whole, as patriotic, as intelligent, as broad-minded, and as industrious as any other professional group.

This, however, does not mean that they are without faults, some of which are attributable to the vastly increased scope and volume of their work. Conceding that we have sound human material with which to deal, I believe these latent faults can be corrected if the following specific recommendations are adopted:

(a) With so much of the world behind the iron curtain, it seems vital that our Foreign Service officers receive specialized training in intelligence work to enable them to recognize the intelligence techniques being practiced by designing nations.

(b) With the entire world a welter of propaganda, our Foreign Service men should have training in publicity methods and in public speaking. They should be able to mix with, talk to, and understand all groups, just as we who hold elective office must do every day.

(c) The struggle between democratic parties and communism for influence with foreign organized labor, for example, opens a new and unfamiliar challenge to the Service to play an important part in demonstrating the advantages of a free system without involving interference in a nation's internal affairs.

(d) The great increase in the size and diversity of activities in our embassies requires better training in administration and organization.

(e) It is also probably true that many Foreign Service officers have spent too much time abroad; and the new requirement that they must have leave in the United States every 2 years, and a tour of duty in the State Department early in their service, is a good one and illustrates a policy which could be broadened.

(f) Another defect in the Foreign Service, which I believe has had some serious consequences, is the idea that the chief can do no wrong. We saw this attitude time and again in the military service. It kills a lot of initiative and independent thinking. I believe that the country has paid a heavy price for it. One remedy would be to have other reports coming into the Department through other channels to counterbalance, and give proper perspective to that of the chief. Further, I am told that there should be an improved inspection system which would periodically bring all foreign service officers to Washington so that their work could be appraised in such a way as to check the all-too-human tendency to curry favor with the boss.

(g) Thought should be given to having some permanent officials in certain key positions in the State Department who will give continuity to our policy and who will consequently prevent a lot of mistakes and errors by virtue of their knowledge of what has happened before. One often gets the unfavorable impression that there is not always enough teamwork and coherence among the top men in the State Department.

(h) One last word about the men of our Foreign Service. Even the best of them, and there are some very able men in it, give the impression that in diplomacy it is more important to avoid blunders than to achieve successes. I recognize that there have been many occasions in history when this has been a good rule. But we are in an era now in which we must be somewhat venturesome if we are to avoid disaster. Only the bold ever rise above mediocrity. We need an infusion of new blood or of new spirit or of both into our representation abroad which, excellent though it is in many individual cases, still in certain quarters regards it as outside its province to come aggressively to grips with the forces in the world which so closely affect American destiny. I deem it of fundamental importance, Mr. President, that we inculcate our Foreign Service with the spirit of positive, not negative, action.

(i) Finally, the President and the Senate have a direct responsibility, insofar as the caliber of our American representation abroad is concerned. We have the job here of confirming the diplomatic appointments which the President sends us. We should carefully scrutinize them, whether they be career or non-career men. There was a time in the past when, without dangerous consequences, their jobs could be objects of political reward, and I know that both parties have played that game. But today, it would be both dangerous and reprehensible to select men to head our missions abroad on any basis other than that of fitness to do the job. It is offensive to one's common sense, to say nothing of one's patriotism, to think that the United States should be represented abroad year after year by men who have never had any qualifications at all and are only there because they had a friend at court. Good men from outside the Service are a great asset and are necessary to effective carrying out of foreign policy. Inferior political diplomatic appointees, on the other hand, do a great deal of undeserved harm to the Foreign Service career men. They lower the prestige and depress the morale of the career service as a whole.

(j) Congress has just appropriated $400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey. We are in the course of appropriating $350,000,000 more for general relief abroad and the end is not yet. But we all know that unless these programs are ably administered they may be worse than useles . I know that able men to render this service are hard to find. It is easy to name men who are too arrogant; or men who are too soft and who, desiring some local popularity, think they are doing a people a favor by pauperizing them. The foreign-relief program calls for the best human talent in America.

So much for personnel.

Second. Then comes the development of a consistent, coherent, and thoroughgoing attitude on the part of those who conduct our foreign relations, supported by an understanding public opinion. We must not blow hot and cold. We must not be caught by surprise. We must be thoroughgoing as well as consistent.

(a) We would do well to make it clear immediately that we shall not aid governments which have failed to carry out their commitments of the United States. In particular, the executive branch should take all necessary steps to insure the registration, the screening, and the effective control of all contracts which Americans have made with such governments, giving special attention to those contracts which call for the acquisition of our production "know how" in industry—which, I am told, is what some of our international competitors particularly want to know. In fact, I submit we

should not let agents of a foreign country into our plants unless the foreign country allows Americans to enter its country and poke around in its plants.

(b) While we must be prepared to spend some money, we must not "pour money down a rat hole." There is never any use in pledging financial outlays abroad until we are satisfied that it is not a mere hold-up game or a last-minute rescue party and until we are sure that fundamental steps have actually been taken which will change the situation permanently for the better. No nation—and certainly not the United States—is rich enough to be strong everywhere at once. No nation is rich enough ever to splurge money recklessly. There is a limit; we must pick the place where we can properly influence the situation for the better. We must not only pick the place; we must make our expenditures solely in pursuance of an intelligent plan whereby in exchange for our outlays these peoples become self-supporting and thereby enable us to achieve those concrete things which need to be done. What are some of these things?

For example, it is frequently and correctly pointed out that the nations of western Europe are not making a real recovery from the damage done by the war and that they are staggering along on a hand-to-mouth basis. We in America certainly have a great stake in getting these nations back on their feet and on a self-supporting basis, if for no other reason than that we can then stop our own expenditures for foreign relief. To reestablish these nations, will, however, cost money. But it is worth doing, if in exchange for our aid, the nations of western Europe agree, for example, to integrate themselves, not in a military or a linguistic sense, but into an economic arrangement which has the possibility of life and growth. It is sickening after each war to reconstruct the same old European crazy-quilt. Of course, this European unity must be entirely voluntary. Although its present divisions are killing it, Europe, the birthplace of Western civilization, does not wish to be—and must not be—"united" under any foreign ruler.

Another example of getting something in return would be to work out our entire raw materials program as a part of our foreign policy. It is well known that we are short of many very important commodities, and that in some ways we have become a "have-not" nation. In formulating our new foreign policy we should seek to obtain the raw materials which we need and do not possess ourselves. This would be helpful to us and to the world and would be a self-respecting solution of several serious problems at one and the same time.

We and those nations with whom we have relations must deal in realities in terms of human freedom. In exchange for our help the military and political pressures which now cause fear and worry as to the future must be removed. We are constantly reminded that there are still military factors in back of foreign policy. Once political and military conditions are stable, much of Europe can again become a sound economic risk. If positive steps are not taken to solve these political and military problems, we shall go from tensions to hatred to civil war and finally to world catastrophe.

Whether we look at this proposed foreign policy from the standpoint of integrating a new Europe, or from the standpoint of easing our raw material shortage, or from the standpoint of restoring peace and prosperity, we may as well realize that it will in all probability be cheaper to appropriate substantial sums to be spent in accordance with a sound plan than to appropriate a smaller sum on a shotgun basis. In one case you have a good chance of getting your bacon back; in the other you face the sure prospect of total loss.

(c) Mr. President, it is distressing to me to hear an increasing number of Americans say: "Here we go granting millions of dollars to foreign governments while we do nothing to ease the high cost of living and the housing shortage for the poor American people." It is distressing to hear it, but we all know that an increasing number of Americans all over the United States today are talking that way. And as long as they think that we are getting nothing out of this foreign program they will go on talking. But if they are convinced that they will get new markets for their products and vital raw materials which they need and a real chance for peace for their children as a result of these expenses, then this talk will stop. But to convince them, we must have a real far-sighted plan. We must be ready to undertake this nonbrutal, nonimperialistic, noncompulsory, nonviolent, nonselfish, and nondestructive assistance program, not because it is against something we do not like, but because it will build that solid individual prosperity which is a man's best hope of being rescued from his misery.

Third. We must make American democracy an article of export. Actually the Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world. But for some reason or other—call it lack of imagination or lack of understanding—we have allowed the materialistic and brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief, which springs from eternal sources and which can never run dry. We must export our way of looking at our fellow man. This does not mean that we try to force anything down any man's throat. That would be imperialism. It emphatically does not mean that we uphold any regime, no matter how corrupt, provided it is anti-Communist. That would be nihilism. But it does mean an outlay of time, intelligence, energy, and money to present our view and to give compelling demonstration of its worth. It is the essential first step that we believe in ourselves. Without such belief nothing can be done. Without such belief, all expenditures are mere waste.

Mr. President, let me sum up. We made dreadful mistakes, when the shooting stopped because we were not prepared for the end of hostilities. To avoid these mistakes in the future, we must:

First. Develop a modern-minded American personnel to carry out our foreign policy abroad.

Second. Make a consistent, decisive, and thoroughgoing over-all plan for foreign policy which will secure military, political, and economic conditions in the world which will make peace and prosperity possible; and which, by making foreign peoples self-supporting, will obtain for us the markets and raw materials we need. In other words, Mr. President, what is wanted is a foreign-aid program which will also aid the American people.

Third. Make American democracy an article of export.

Fourth. There is a fourth point—one more word of advice, which always and ever underlies a constructive and fruitful foreign policy. That word calls for a strong America—strong in its economic life, strong in its enthusiastic faith in its own institutions, and strong in its armed forces on land, sea, and air, without which no foreign policy can be aught but mere words.

We can, I think, be hopeful that these things can and will be done. The American people are showing a keen interest in world conditions. We have in General Marshall a Secretary of State who is completely above party and is of proven ability. We have in the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who acts always in an utterly nonpartisan spirit and who has evoked widespread admiration by his sure grasp of the challenge which confronts America. We can look confidently to the future with their wisdom and patriotism at the country's service.

Above all, let us realize that our foreign policy exists—and our effective support of the United Nations is possible—only in proportion to the national strength behind it. The fact that we allowed so many of the war's painfully won gains to slip away between our fingers in the year after the shooting stopped must teach us once and for all what a crime we commit against ourselves and against humanity when we allow ourselves to become weak.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are admonished that it is strictly against the rule of the Senate that any demonstrations be made from the galleries and that the rule will be strictly enforced.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer certain perfecting amendments, the necessity for which will be obvious. They constitute precisely the same formula which is in the Greek and Turkish aid bill. Obviously there is going to be a gap between the authorization and the time when the appropriations themselves can be made, and provision is made in the Greek relief bill that a temporary advance of $100,000,000 can be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be reimbursed to the RFC the moment the appropriation itself is made. It is doubly necessary that there be an arrangement of a similar sort in connection with the pending measure, because there is a similar gap, and the pressure for some immediate funds to start the purchases or relief supplies is absolutely unavoidable. Therefore, at the request

of the Department—and although I have not had time to canvass it with the committee, I am sure it would meet with the committee's approval; at any rate, I will put my own personal request behind it—I ask for the adoption en bloc of certain amendments, the net result of which is exclusively, after the passage of the authorization and preceding the passage of an appropriation, to make available from the RFC $75,000,000, to be reimbursed to the RFC from the appropriation as soon as it is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to immediate consideration of the amendments? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the Chief Clerk read them all, because they all can be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be considered en bloc, and the clerk will state them.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, it is proposed to delete the words "to be appropriated."

On page 13, line 24, to delete "appropriated pursuant to" and substitute "authorized under."

On page 8, after line 21, to add the following paragraph to section 1:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $75,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. From appropriations authorized under this section there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under the authority contained herein.

On page 9, lines 7 and 8, to delete the words "appropriated pursuant thereto" and substitute therefor the words "authorized herein."

On page 9, line 14, to delete the words "Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to" and substitute in lieu thereof "Funds authorized under."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is one other perfecting amendment, necessitated by the following fact: The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 fixed specific ceilings for civilian personnel in the War and Navy Departments. Under the pending measure it is contemplated that some of the personnel will be borrowed from the War and Navy Departments, and the sole purpose of the amendment which I now submit, at the request of the Departments affected, is to eliminate for the time being from the ceiling applicable to civilian employees in those departments such employees as are borrowed. The amendment is very essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 24, it is proposed to insert a new subsection as follows:

(d) Such additional civilian employees as may be required by any department, agency, or independent establishment in connection with the furnishing of procurement, storage, transportation, and shipment services under this joint resolution and which services are paid for from funds herein authorized, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946.

It is further proposed to change subsection "(d)" to subsection "(e)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to inquire whether or not the agencies which are to furnish these employees are going to be reimbursed from the fund now proposed to be authorized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the Committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 7 I gave notice that I would propose an amendment to the pending joint resolution which would exclude from any of its benefits certain countries and governments to which, under existing circumstances, I feel we are not obligated to provide relief, and with respect to which the cost of relief, if provided, I feel would impose upon the people of this Nation an unjust burden of taxation. Moreover, Mr. President, the spending of money for relief purposes in the countries which my amendment would exclude from the provisions of the joint resolution would be inconsistent with the action of the Congress and with the established policy of this Government as contained in the recent Greco-Turkish relief measure which has been enacted.

As I stated yesterday, I voted for the Greco-Turkish aid bill with considerable reluctance, because it was not primarily a relief bill in the sense of relieving human distress. We all know that one of the major objectives of that bill is to enable Greece and Turkey to build up their military strength for resistance to military, political, and economic pressures which are being applied for the purpose of undermining their governments, at least with that purpose in mind, and possibly with the purpose of consummating further expansion into regions even beyond their territories.

Mr. President, everyone knows whence that pressure comes. When we speak of external pressure on Greece and Turkey everyone knows its source. Now we are going to take from the Treasury of this Nation $400,000,000 to bolster these weaker nations—Greece and Turkey—and to build up resistance to that form of aggression and insidious infiltration which seeks to undermine the established governments of those countries.

Mr. President, when I gave notice on April 7 that I would submit this amendment to the general relief bill, there was greater reason and more justification for its adoption than there is now. At that time the final form of the joint resolution now pending before us had not been determined by the Foreign Relations Committee of this body. The Foreign Relations Committee, as I said in my brief remarks yesterday, Mr. President, has done a marvelous job in placing in the joint resolution certain provisions which are restrictive in character and which impose conditions upon other governments whose people are to be assisted, conditions which have to be met before this relief will be available to them.

Another forward step that was made by the committee in framing this joint resolution, in contrast to the policy we have pursued in the past under UNRRA, is that we retain full control and supervision of the funds which are to be expended.

Mr. President, I adverted to a point yesterday which I want to mention again today. When the bill authorizing and committing this Nation to the UNRRA program was before us I had serious apprehension that in such a tremendous program, with such a great outlay of money under the set-up as proposed, we would find that we were having very little control or supervision over UNRRA funds notwithstanding we were to contribute more than 70 percent of the total funds involved. That absolutely occurred. In many instances those funds went into countries and were actually used by the political authorities in power for strictly political purposes. In other words, the poor victims for whom UNRRA relief was really intended, got no assistance unless he was subversive to the political clique and authorities in power. If not, relief assistance was denied him.

Mr. President, the amendment I offer would make Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria ineligible for any benefits or assistance from the appropriations authorized in this bill. When I gave notice that I would propose such an amendment, Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD tables of figures which had been prepared for me and made available to me by the State Department and by the Legislative Reference Service and other agencies of the Government, showing the assistance that these countries had already received from us amounting to more than $1,200,000,000 since VJ-day. As I interpret the measure now before us, in view of the explanation made of it yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and taking into account the letter of Secretary Marshall, which has been placed in the RECORD, setting forth in what countries the funds proposed to be appropriated shall be expended, the expenditure and supervision of which is left to the State Department; it appears, Mr. President, that none of this money will go to any of the countries referred to in my amendment except to Poland and Hungary. I do not know to what extent the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which this amendment was referred, considered it; but to that extent

I assume that my objectives and purposes have been served, in that five of the countries which I have named in my amendment have been eliminated. I concede this in view of the letter from General Marshall and the assurances that have been given here on the floor of the Senate by the chairman of the committee.

I can well appreciate the fact that there might be differences of opinion as to the wisdom and propriety of specifically naming in the legislation the countries which are to receive aid, as did the House in its measure, because such action implies a commitment to those countries with respect to their share of the aid, and it would possibly be embarrassing to withdraw the aid at any time if, under the restrictions which have been placed in the joint resolution, a situation should arise under which we thought the aid should be withdrawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to suggest that many of the matters referred to by the Senator from Arkansas can best be handled by administration, rather than being placed in a straitjacket. If there should develop such a situation that it was desired to change the policy, that could be done under the flexible provisions of the joint resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate what the Senator says, and I thank him for his suggestion. I wish to emphasize that I am grateful to and compliment the Committee on Foreign Relations on the fine job it has done. It is such a contrast and such a departure from the policies and procedures of the past that it is a monument to the committee's credit. Many of the objections which I have urged are the same objections which I had with respect to UNRRA. Then I did not know how UNRRA would work. I could only anticipate, and it did work out and operate just as I thought it would. My reasons for opposing that measure in the form in which it passed have been fully vindicated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY At the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York the United States delegation took the position that we would have nothing further to do with UNRRA, under the arrangement by which we paid 72 percent of all the expenditures and largely turned its administration over to foreign agencies. We discovered that in many countries the authorities would take over the administration of the money which was 70 percent ours, and create the impression among the recipients that it was another government altogether that was bringing them relief. So we determined later that whatever plan we adopted in the way of relief would be an American plan, under American control, financed by ourselves, and terminable at the will of the President, whenever conditions reached the point where we thought it was necessary to discontinue relief. The joint resolution is hedged about with restrictions, limitations, and conditions. I think it is about as well prepared, as well considered, and as well drafted as an act of this kind could be. Of course there will be mistakes. There will probably be extravagances in some places. But on the whole, the control is wholly within the United States. If it fails, we shall be somewhat derelict in our administration of the act.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not predicting failure under this measure as it is now drawn. That is not what I am trying to emphasize. I am very much pleased that we have profited by the mistakes which were made in connection with UNRRA. We should not make them again. We propose to keep the control under our own authorities. We reserve the right to withdraw the aid if at any time a condition arises which warrants its withdrawal. This aid is not a perpetual or continuing commitment or obligation. We can withdraw it at any time, as I understand the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator has said about the action of the committee in going so far to meet the objections which he had expressed by way of his amendment. In view of what the committee has done, in view of the letter of the Secretary of State, the report of the committee, and the statement of the chairman, and in view of the understanding which all of us on the committee have, does not the Senator feel that he might be justified in not pressing his amendment, or withdrawing it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that I am not pressing it now with the same vigor I would have pressed it had the joint resolution not been so well prepared by the committee. I do not believe that the need for my amendment is nearly as urgent as it might otherwise be. However, I wish to keep the record straight. I am opposed to this Government giving aid and assistance in any form to governments whose action, conduct, and policies make it necessary for us to provide military assistance to weaker nations upon which they would impose, and with respect to which they pursue policies of aggression and expansion that would undermine and destroy those weaker nations. Aid under such circumstances is incompatible and inconsistent with any sort of sound fiscal policy, if nothing else were involved.

I cannot vote for a measure which would give promise of funds for the assistance of governments which are pursuing that sort of policy. If it were a personal matter, I would contribute my own money to provide food or relief for suffering human beings, whether they were Hungarians, Poles, or Chinese. I would make no particular distinction by reason of nationalities. I know that that is the spirit which dominates the heart of Christian America. But there are times when we must be practical.

This Government does not have the resources or the capacity to completely rehabilitate the world at our expense. The line must be drawn somewhere. There are limits beyond which we are unable to go without inviting disaster to our own security and our own economic welfare.

While I should like to support a smaller amount, I am willing to spend $350,000,000, if necessary. However, if we are to spend that much more than we have already expended, we can extend aid to countries whose governments are democratic and friendly to us, governments which grant the greatest measure of liberty and justice to their own people. On the other hand, we can spend the money in countries like Poland, which is under the domination of Russia, where there is no freedom, no liberty in the sense that we speak of it in America. Whenever we speak of a dollar in such countries we simply enable them to continue to make expenditures in great amounts—greater than the amounts we are spending—for military purposes.

Every dollar we spend for the relief of those nations which are under the control and domination of Russia and communism is a direct aid to Russia and the further spread of communism. This simply makes it possible for Russia to spend that much more money for military purposes. I cannot vote for it, and I shall not do so. I would be willing to accept the resolution as it is and to vote for it with the assurances which have been given if those two countries, Poland and Hungary, were excluded as my amendment proposes to do. But I will not vote one dime of American taxpayers' money knowingly to aid communism or to assist Russia or any of her satellites while she spends $13,000,000,000 per year for military purposes as she is doing this year.

I shall not take time to revert to the figures I have previously placed in the RECORD except to point out that the countries which are named in my amendment have received from this Government, or will have received by June 30 of this year, a total of more than $1,800,000,000. Over $1,800,000,000 in relief of one form or another has already been provided by our Government for those countries which are named in the amendment. That is too much already and I do not want to give them any more.

I do not think I shall call for a record vote on the amendment, but I want to keep the record straight. I cannot explain why we are pouring out money to buy military supplies and build military strength in Greece and Turkey, and at the same time, taking the taxpayers' money and helping to feed people on the other side of their borders in countries which are applying pressure against them. We should not arm one people to defend themselves and their government and at the same time give aid to the other side.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand, the able Senator from Arkansas is quite satisfied to have a viva-voce vote on his amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am perfectly satisfied, I will say to the Senator. I simply

wanted to offer this amendment. I acknowledge, as I have said, that the need for it under the circumstances, as the joint resolution now stands, is not as great and urgent as it was at the time I said I would propose an amendment, but it should be adopted so that Poland and Hungary will be excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator offering his amendment at this time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I offer it. I thought possibly it was the purpose of the Chair to let the amendments all lie on the desk and have them acted on after 2 o'clock.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think we had better proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending, which was offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I understand that is the parliamentary situation. I am perfectly willing to have a vote on my amendment whenever the parliamentary situation will permit it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none. Therefore the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 13 and 14 in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the Governments or to the peoples of Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, or Bulgaria, or to any other government or governments, or to the peoples thereof, whom the President may hereafter determine to be under the political and/or economic domination or sphere of influence of Soviet Russia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply want to say that in the viewpoint of the committee and from the standpoint of those who are responsible for this program, it would be a very serious mistake to undertake to write any identifications of countries, either pro or con, into the text of the resolution. On the one hand, we do not want to seem to create any rights or interests in behalf of any specific countries, and on the other hand, we do not want to seem to write any inhibitions or proscriptions into the law, in view of the fact that we can rely categorically upon the statement of the Secretary of State in his letter which is printed in the report and is part of the public record in respect to the places where expenditures are to be made.

So far as the general objective of the able Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I have a great deal of sympathy with what he said. I am happy to have him so generously acknowledge the fact that we have written precautions and protections into the resolution, so that there is really no possibility of exploitation in any such fashion as has been suffered heretofore. But, under the circumstances, I respectfully ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I want to express my full agreement with the purpose of the amendment as expressed by the Senator from Arkansas. It is difficult for me to reconcile an appropriation of millions of dollars for military aid for the avowed purpose of stopping communism, and then to allow millions of dollars to be appropriated for Communist-dominated countries. I realize the difficulty of drawing a direct line of demarcation between relief and its general effects and the use of relief money for the building up of communism. America has traditionally been the most generous country in the world.

I shall vote for this appropriation for the needy of the world; but I say that unless there is a change of heart on the part of the State Department itself with respect to the administration of the food distribution organization, merely naming certain nations in the resolution is an idle gesture; it is a mere use of words, and I do not have much confidence that the State Department will implement the words. I hope they will, at least this is a step in the right direction. I trust that the able Senator from Michigan who heads the Committee on Foreign Relations and who has so valiantly supported these proposals, will be equally valiant in the effort to assure a proper dissemination of news so that we may know that we are not going down both sides of the street, but are taking a definite step to bring some good out of the disbursement of the great wealth of America under the theory that we may encourage someone somewhere to follow our example.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I again advert to my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3729, on April 21, when I said that the objective of the American people, namely, perpetual peace and the elevation of the peoples of all nations to a standard of living comparable to ours, is clear and well defined.

One of the points I made in the course of my remarks at that time was that with two world wars under our belts in our generation, we have never yet in 30 years established an American policy, geared to our national economy, which makes sense and which can be carried forward without a continued undue drain upon the taxpayers and workers of the United States.

The Senate of the United States has not the moral right to abdicate the powers entrusted to it under the Constitution of the United States by continuing thoughtless gifts to foreign nations. Certainly it has no legal right to relinquish to the Executive its obligation to review in detail such expenditures.

In principle, I do not see how the Senate can abdicate its powers on any issue affecting the well-being of the American people, except under wartime emergency. Each individual Senator presumably is elected on the basis of a full exercise of these powers, which in our system of government are intended to operate as a check against the Executive power of the administration.

If it is represented that these are matters which must be decided on the spur of the moment and instantaneously, the representation presumes upon a fallacy, since the relief suggested is based upon long-continuing conditions, and is not due to some special act of God, such as an earthquake. Even in the latter event, the Senate should be permitted to exercise its powers, the assumption being that it is no rubber stamp Reichstag, but is the final authority on whose decisions the United States foreign policy is based.

If it is urged that there is no time to acquaint the Senate with the full facts of the case so as to allow for requisite debate, that is tantamount to saying that only the so-called experts empowered in the administration are capable of making the decision. Government by experts is precisely the definition of fascism or, for that matter, of the Communist style of government. It assumes an honesty on the part of the experts which does not always exist, and an infallibility which is more than questionable.

As we know, the record of the experts in reference to all of the propositions which have been stampeded through the American Congress has been an unsound one. Refer back to the claims made for the British loan, the United Nations, Bretton Woods, and so forth, and it is seen that none of the basic assertions urged by the experts were correct.

The record of administration of UNRRA played directly into the hands of Tito in Yugoslavia.

So long as foreign relief can be utilized for political purposes, it constitutes a weapon by which the policy of the United States is and has been committed along definite lines. If the experts, for example, were to commit the policy of the United States to the relief of Poland and Yugoslavia, that would represent a shift in the present determination to wall the Communists off. It places immense power of decision in the hands of middle-level officials whose judgment, in effect, would commit the entire policy of this Nation, not only along relief lines, but along military and political lines as well, because the unwise use of the first may lead to the second. It would allow the support of a dictator, as against the will of the people, by committing the opponents of their regime to starvation.

It seems to me that in the present crisis, only the Congress can determine these issues, and no one else. The abdication of its powers by the Congress, even in this comparatively small degree, is a frightening step backward, exactly as would be the recognition of the right of search and seizure without a warrant.

The whole system of stampede or panic politics by which, on one occasion after another, the Senate was urged to back a policy or a grant on which there was said to be no time for deliberation, discussion, and thought, is contrary to the entire spirit of this Government. In its own small way, it is uncomfortably similar to the means by which the Hitler regime secured a blank check for its policies from the Reichstag, allowing Hitler's government to carry on undisturbed its totalitarian policies with the legal cloak of the Weimar constitution and republic. The process now under way represents an invasion of the rights of Americans as a free and democratic people, as well as of the duties and privileges of their representatives.

The whole attitude, moreover, is one of reckless deficit spending without relation to the ultimate welfare of the Nation as it might be envisaged along sound conventional lines. This is a proposition which was current during the entire Roosevelt administration, namely, that deficit spending or piling up a huge national debt was an act of health, since it put people to work. Our foreign export is now operating at the rate of some $8,000,000,000 a year. For each billion dollars, it is estimated that 1,000,000 Americans are employed. Since there is no floor to this export, and since it is not paid for in the usual way of conventional exchange of sound money and economics, but is being supported by American grants-in-aid to the importing countries, at some point it will have to stop. This point will be accelerated if the present threatened recession actually occurs this fall or in the near future, as is feared. The exports then will drop drastically, adding millions more to the unemployed lists which presumably will then exist.

No part of our plan seems to envisage placing the world on a sound economic basis, but instead, represents the support of tottering monarchial or dictatorial regimes by hand-outs designed to operate as a brake against communism.

The only defense against communism will be a healthy and sound economic life in Europe and Asia, as well as other parts of the world. This will require a world plan on the part of the United States, which will have to be considered by the Senate, which envisages bringing the present crises affecting all countries to an ultimate conclusion by which those countries will be self-supporting and healthy enough to be proof against revolutionary doctrine. Anything else plays into the hands of the Soviets and constitutes a continuous drain upon the resources of the United States which will ultimately bankrupt us.

The present deficit spending is not too much different from the old plan of plowing under cotton or dumping into the sea our surplus of potatoes. It is up to the administration, it seems to me, to present to the Congress for approval a plan by which the Western World at least can be brought to ultimate economic and political health, by which it can produce the necessities of life and pay the debts it incurs. They can hire our engineers and economists, who can show them how to set up their own taxing districts, taxing their own people to pay the technicians and to pay their own wages to build their own projects.

Under such circumstances, the Congress can intelligently fund the plan, granting the required moneys in aid; and the individual Members of Congress will then be in a position to assure their constituents that the emergency is a temporary one, not a continuous one.

There is not even a rational plan in reference to the needs of the American economy in making a transition from a wartime to a peacetime base, the requirement for replacing obsolescent machinery and vehicles, housing, and so forth. Such a plan is desperately required if the American productive economy is expected to turn out vast quantities of materials to be sent abroad free.

The part played by British politics in this proposition, it seems to me, also should come under examination, since to date we have been committed to supporting an empire whose bankruptcy is self-evident, and whose continued operations will end in communism among all the peoples on whose back it functions.

Our resources are not limitless. We cannot play God to the rest of the world forever without having a clear concept of the ultimate goal and the ultimate outcome, as well as of the means by which it is to be secured.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD a statement by Jesse Jones in regard to subsidizing the British Empire. This statement appeared in the April 16, 1946, issue of the Houston Chronicle and Herald:

SUBSIDIZING THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By Jesse H. Jones)

No money should be loaned to Britain for expenditure in other countries without proper security, particularly since the British have substantial profitable investments and operations in the United States which could be used as collateral for a loan.

Approval of the proposed loan now before Congress— .

Referring to the $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain, at that time under consideration by the Congress—

would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster. Too much spending and lending and losing is a sure road to ruin. The Congress should not ignore the dangers that lie ahead.

Mr. President, I should also like to refer to a statement made by Marriner Eccles, before the Foreign Policy Association, at Philadelphia, on February 9, 1946. The statement was printed in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of March 1946, and in it Mr. Eccles gives several reasons for extending aid to foreign countries. I quote from his statement:

Against these reasons for our extending aid to foreign countries, we must weigh the pressures on our own domestic economy. We cannot ignore the fact that such aid through Government channels, necessitates an increase in public expenditures.

We must recognize also that the expenditure of the proceeds of the loans in this country cannot be entirely welcomed at the present time. Many of these purchases will be made for products of which we will have an adequate or even a surplus supply. But inevitably other purchases will be for goods that are, for the time being at least, in short supply and to that extent such purchases add to inflationary pressures.

Mr. President, these piecemeal hand-outs, especially as they relate to the support of foreign Marxist and semitotalitarian regimes, are a simple piece of folly which will leave this Nation poorer and weaker, not only materially, but in its relation to the world forces with which we are contending.

If the cause of this senseless behavior is fear of Soviet Russia, it would be better for us to have a show-down with Russia immediately, rather than to continue an irrational system of hand-outs which weaken our economy, destroy our trade, and makes us the ally of the small-time dictators and world cartelist exploiters whose very success will spell Russian opportunity and the collapse of the western system of free enterprise.

I do not object to extending relief as such to any country; but I do wish to see whatever assistance we can logically give other peoples, rendered upon a businesslike basis, and in accordance with a well-conceived and well-thought-out plan based upon the ability of our national economy to carry the load without injury to our own people.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for this loan, against my better judgment, merely because it is called a loan to make it possible to furnish food to the peoples mentioned. However, I serve notice now that the fight is only starting, unless in the future such proposals are made under a well-coordinated and well-thought-out plan

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an article entitled "Need Abroad Is Crux of Economic Trends," from Barron's National and Financial Weekly for May 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW'S BUSINESS?—NEED ABROAD IS CRUX OF ECONOMIC TRENDS

News of the worst famine conditions and industrial stagnation in most of Europe since the Thirty Years' War—when cases of cannibalism were reported—are gradually obtruding themselves on the national consciousness through the daily press. Instead of the reconstruction it seeks, the world faces an economic crisis of appalling scope.

Over the coming weeks and months the administration will make a major effort to bring the magnitude of the crisis home to the American people. Secretary of State Marshall began the campaign when, in his report on Moscow, he said the European patient is dying while the doctors debate. Undersecretary of State Acheson continued last week by spelling out "what Marshall meant" in terms of more exports, more foreign loans, and reconstruction of Germany and Japan so they could again become the international workshops they were in the past.

Two years of unspeakable suffering abroad have been accompanied by wastage of billions of our money diverted in part to strengthen our enemies and help them disrupt the world further. Even today Russia is feeding her troops in Rumania with the help of the wheat we send there. Our efforts have been floated on veritable seas of sactimonious promises about the benefits of new global institutions and multilateral economic systems. But all this is now culminating in poverty, misery and starvation everywhere else in the world on a scale that threatens to engulf our own prosperity.

CAUSES

This crisis is the direct outcome of the faulty thinking and inadequate planning for the postwar world which so signally characterized the policies of our national Administration in the closing years of the war. The economic disaster that is smiting Europe and the Far East is but the natural sequel of three basic errors in our war and postwar strategy. These have gradually snowballed into an almost irretrievable collapse abroad of all the physical means of production and distribution which hold modern civilizations together.

The first of the errors of judgment was the prevention of Germany's surrender until the country was literally turned to rubble. It was made worse by the prevention of reconstruction of civilian life there through application of the incrediby ignorant and shortsighted "pastoralization" policies of the Morgenthau school. Now we are faced with the need of spending more dollars to rebuild what we wantonly destroyed at enormous expense in men, materials, and money.

A LOSING GAMBLE

The second great error in judgment was that of proclaiming a new international order on the basis of superficially cordial contacts between a few individuals. The United States was committeed to a vast new symbolism, although lacking any common understanding with the Soviet Government as to practical interpretations of the symbols. Not only that, but we took absolutely no alternative precautions to enable us to enforce our interpretations where it was important to do so against nations, like Russia, that do not accept them.

Even after the catastrophic climax of the war in Germany, the disaster could have been mitigated if our victorious Russian ally had not made such a bitter farce of the aspirations of peoples regarding international amity and cooperation. The masters of the Kremlin maintained 5,000,000 men under arms, engineered fifth-column offenses in every European country, imposed quisling governments in every nation within their orbit, and incited civil war in China and tried to do so in Iran.

Thereby they created an international situation of such deadly totalitarian menace that the rest of the world is more intent on defense than on the reconstruction it needs so acutely. Nations which are desperately anxious to disarm and reintegrate their soldiers in peaceful rebuilding, are forced instead to carry truly staggering burdens of wasteful military expenditures. Thus, they are unable to organize civilian life on any rational basis.

VICTORIAN DREAM

The third great mistake was, in absolute disregard of the fatal economic consequences of our German and Russian policies, to try to base our postwar economic arrangements on the fiction that the world of Queen Victoria's England could be revived. In those days there were six or eight great powers with roughly equivalent strength, and many other genuinely independent countries. International trading among such sovereignties grew and prospered in a healthy atmosphere of competition in which everyone had a chance.

That kind of thing is impossible today, when the United States alone possesses economic power of the same order of magnitude as that of the rest of the world put together, and when only this country and Canada have the surplus resources that can be exported for reconstruction. Yet, our State Department and Treasury still try to force other western nations into trade agreements which they are totally unable to make, but to which they nervously pay lip-service because of our overwhelming strength and their overwhelming needs.

CASSANDRA'S APOLOGY

It is because of such evidence of the continued hold of our wartime dreams for postwar happiness, that it seems necessary at this late date to harp upon the mistakes of the past. That the foregoing three major economic and political misconceptions either had to result in general collapse abroad or commit us to enormously expensive rescue operations seemed clear a great many months ago. In mid-1945 Barron's published gloomy comments on the probable consequences of Potsdam, and was chided for them by readers impressed with the propaganda of that day.

It seemed far more important to say all these disagreeable things to readers than to dilate complacently on the high level of business activity or to advertise further the well-advertised minor recession which persists in not making its appearance. Even so, it was difficult to demonstrate the error of the major policies of our administration at a time when the late President Roosevelt's magical gifts of suggestion and inspiration had stirred the public's hopes. It was also too early to explain on other than purely deductive grounds that this wonderful castle that was being built up before our eyes was nothing but a castle in the air. This column was reduced to the unhappy necessity of trying to counter mere assertions which people liked, with equally bald assertions they didn't want to hear.

SHOW-DOWN

Now, however, the consequences are becoming clear and Washington is saying the same things as Barron's. The reason the consequences are getting so obvious is that the first real post-war show-down is now so near. It is in the critical years 1947 and 1948 that we must decide the general framework of our future course. In doing so we have the advantage now of knowing what our mistakes have been and, therefore, what our new tack should be.

In simplest terms, the problem is as follows: Owing to the gratuitous prolongation of the war in 1944 and the Kremlin's sabotage of peacemaking from the very moment the fighting ended, world reconstruction has made dishearteningly little progress. As stated earlier, only North America can supply the deficiencies of the rest of the world. But, the countries in need do not have the dollars with which to buy. Therefore, if the rest of the world is to be rebuilt so that it can operate without help, we shall have to lend many more billions in order to finance that reconstruction.

The problem is roughly similar to the medical one of the patient weakened by loss of blood to the point where his system cannot restore itself without outside aid. Transfusions will bridge that gap, until one day the recipient may himself be able to contribute blood to others.

TWO OPTIONS

Much of the world is in just such desperate straits today. Secretary Marshall's description of the vicious circle which shortage of coal imposes upon industries of all kinds, was a pale illustration of the much more vicious circle imposed by lack of food. When, as in Germany, there is not enough to eat to supply a theoretical ration which itself represents only about half the American daily food intake per person, not only is there no energy for production, but much time must be spent in the mere pursuit of nourishment.

These conditions exist even though we have given away a lot of money and made a number of untenable agreements. Whatever good we have done along such lines has not been sufficient to repair the previous errors. There are just two options for us and neither of them is very attractive. But the time has come to face the music. Face it we must, or the rest of the world will make us face it later.

INFLATION

One option is to give the necessary transfusions. Naturally, we cannot stand too many of them too close together. The billions we lend will be spent in the United States and the expenditures will be concentrated on all the scarcest lines. Therefore, there will be genuine danger of further inflation if we lend on the needed scale.

The second alternative is to wash our hands of the mess we helped to create and say that the danger of inflation is too great to permit added loans. The consequence of that would be a sharp decline in exports from the United States and a collapse of world commodity prices in free markets.

That this would affect us in a seriously deflationary manner here is quite clear. Although the long-heralded recession still refuses to take place except for occasional spotty declines which, often as not, are offset by rising activity elsewhere, there is no doubt that the upward-driving forces are much weaker now than last year. Replenishment of empty pipe lines can no longer be counted on in most fields, and the Government is collecting a big cash surplus almost every month. At this time a combination of declining commodity prices, with the inventory losses that would result, and a shutting off of our export markets, would make the business picture here look bad.

SOCIALISM

Furthermore, in every foreign country affected by our refusal to grant credits extremely drastic controls over all phases of national economic activity would have to be imposed. Thus, we would be converting the rest of the world to state socialism in one fell swoop. That Socialist world would hate us as the cause of its miseries, and its leader would be Russia.

While the errors of the past are irretrievable in some respects, it is not yet quite too late. We can still use our enormous power for the good of mankind. If we do not, the penalty will be that we shall have used it for our own ultimate destruction.

An important condition is that, learning from experience, we should not, when extending financial aid to foreign nations, burden them with impossible economic conditions. We want engagements that actually can be fulfilled. The goal to strive for is a Commonwealth of United Nations, all believing in and strictly adhering to the same ideal that we serve—freedom from coercion for the individual. If Russia and her quislings will abide by this ideal as expressed in her own constitution, she will be a welcome member. If not, such a commonwealth still can be built.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I intend to support the pending joint resolution to provide $350,000,000 for relief to the people of foreign countries devastated by war. Like most Americans, I have been trained all my life to contribute to worthy causes, I believe in giving. It is just as true today as in ancient times that it is more blessed to give than to receive. The experience of giving brings to us more satisfaction than almost anything else we can do. It does something for the man who gives just as for the recipient.

However, I must confess that I am voting for the joint resolution with the

most profound misgivings. Personally, I am not at all satisfied with the precedent we are apparently establishing of meeting the needs of charity by gifts of Government money and material. The money we are now voting comes entirely from the American taxpayer, of course. It is his money, and he is ultimately the giver. Yet, this type of giving—through the Government—does not give the taxpayers any of that satisfaction they would certainly feel if each one made a voluntary gift of his proportionate share. The giver is not made happy by our gifts of his taxes. Anyone who has sat through hearings on a tax bill will testify to that.

I am almost ready to suggest that the Government go out of the relief business and return the operation of such programs into the hands of private groups where charity belongs—such as the American Red Cross. This fine organization has had tremendous experience in feeding the starving and helping the needy. I believe that a dollar spent by the Red Cross goes 50 percent farther than a dollar spent by the Government. During the last fiscal year alone, the American Red Cross spent almost $150,000,000 for foreign relief. Furthermore, they know how to spend it where it will do the most good.

In contrast, we have the unhappy experience with UNRRA as a sample of Government operation in this field. I realize that the framers of the pending measure have done their utmost to correct the tremendous waste and the other evils of UNRRA administration. We have eliminated UNRRA, but I am not at all sure that we have gotten rid of the people who administered the UNRRA program. I suspect that the same people are lining up for jobs with the new agency and are being given jobs on the basis of their experience in the distribution of relief. I have had some correspondence myself with persons of that type who desire employment.

As I here said, I shall vote for the joint resolution. I do not know where it will lead, and I am fearful of the ultimate consequences of a program of giving and giving Government funds. I think we might do better by turning the money over to the Red Cross, which at least knows how to dispense relief on an economical and impartial basis. Although I am supporting the joint resolution, I hope it will not be necessary for me to cast a vote again for any measure giving Government funds for foreign relief, except through the Red Cross or some similar organization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the pending amendment, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], is of a major character, and its submission to a vote should probably await conclusion of the debate on the bill. It is my understanding that the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has an amendment to submit which deals with the subject we canvassed at some length yesterday. The Senator has shown me his amendment, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to it. I would suggest that the Senator present his amendment now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 20, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

(h) Provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies.

On page 11, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment is very simple, and to my way of thinking it goes to the very heart of the problem we are seeking to solve. It makes it possible for the supplies to be purchased by the huge sum authorized in the joint resolution to be fairly and equitably distributed among all of the people we are attempting to assist. In short, it authorizes a system of controls which assures the poorer people a fair share of the supplied needed by them to warrant the minimum diet suggested by the committee. I hope I said nothing yesterday, during the course of my remarks, which indicated that I was against the pending joint resolution. My sole and only object, I repeat, is to make it possible for all of the people of all of the countries which we intend to assist to obtain their just share of the supplies we expect to make available.

As was developed yesterday in the course of the debate, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated that 80 to 85 percent of the supplies would be distributed by sale, in accord with the custom and practice in the country receiving help. I stated then and I repeat now a system of price and rationing controls must be established so that the well-to-do will not be in position to obtain more than their just share of the supplies that we allocate to the countries in need. In the committee report it is stated that the purpose of supplying these countries is to make it possible for all the inhabitants to be afforded at least 2,000 to 2,200 calories. I am in thorough agreement with all the conditions which have been placed in the joint resolution with reference to administration of the funds. My amendment simply adds another condition, which by all means should be adopted.

During a visit I made last year to China, Greece, Italy, and other countries we are seeking to assist, I found that in many places food was plentiful for those who had the money with which to buy it. For instance, in Shanghai one could get beefsteaks, chicken, and all kinds of food, if he had the money with which to buy. It was rather high in price. The same condition prevailed in Greece. In Athens, if one had the wherewithal, he could buy almost any kind of food he desired.

The amendment I propose is to be inserted on page 11, line 20, immediately after the condition imposed under subdivision (g), and it reads as follows:

Provision will be made for a control system so that all classes of people within such country will receive their fair share of essential supplies.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan stated yesterday that from 15 to 20 percent of the supplies will be made available to the indigent, those who cannot afford to purchase food, and that 80 to 85 percent of the huge amount of supplies will be distributed in the countries in accord with whatever system of distribution now prevails in those countries.

In most of the countries there is a system somewhat similar to what we have in our own country. There are the wholesalers and there are the retailers who distribute the supplies to the consuming public.

If the supplies are placed in the hands of the retailers without restrictions, it is my view that those who are better able to pay will be in a position to obtain more of the supplies than those who are really in need and thereby defeat the purpose of supplying a minimum of 2,000 to 2,200 calories per person.

In conclusion, may I say I am glad the distinguished Senator from Michigan has no objection to the proposed amendment.

I desire to read a paragraph from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, page 9:

If the relief program contemplated in the resolution is put into effect the United States would negotiate agreements with each of the recipient governments. These agreements would include the various conditions specified in the resolution and would outline the general procedures and controls which would be established with respect to the procurement and shipment of supplies.

Then follows the provision which I want to emphasize:

Provisions would also be made for a ration and price-control system so that all classes of people within a country would receive a fair share of essential supplies.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to carry out the recommendation of the committee, which I contended for in a colloquy with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I cannot understand why it is that the committee failed to adopt the language I am now proposing, since it was understood that a requirement such as the one proposed was to be made and incorporated in all agreements with the countries entitled to relief.

Mr. President, I do not propose to go into further details and I am hopeful that the amendment will be adopted so as to insure, I repeat, a fair distribution of all the supplies that we will make available to all classes of people we are seeking to assist in the countries selected for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say again that the amendment merely writes into the joint resolution the obvious purpose

of the measure as stated in the report, and I have no objection to acceptance of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] wishes to resubmit his request for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment I shall be glad to have him do so, and then I wish to say a word about the amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, very earnestly I want to say a word to the Senate about the pending amendment. The able Senator from Missouri has offered an amendment to reduce the over-all authorization in the joint resolution from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000. I can quite understand the feelings of the able Senator from Missouri as he has stated them in connection with his presentation of the amendment, but I very respectfully submit that this is a situation which does not yield itself to the ordinary considerations of economy which we all have very definitely upon our minds at such a time as this.

I suggest that Senators remember, first, that the united authorities, not only of the United Nations, but of our own Government, have set the utter minimum necessity in these identified countries between now and New Year's at a minimum of $600,000,000, in human need for the utterly elemental things which are defined in the joint resolution.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan if any other countries have already contributed their share of the money. It is understood, I believe, that the amount carried in the joint resolution represents about 58 percent of the need.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nevada is quite correct in the allocation of the percentages. Our share of the fund is 58 percent, which we have accepted, and we have accepted it with a clear understanding that there may be some difficulty in raising the remainder of the fund. Unfortunately, the raising of the remainder has been postponed due to the delays here in Congress in the passage of the legislation. I may say to the Senator from Nevada only this, that up to date the British Government has made certain direct promises to one or two of the countries concerned, amounting, my recollection is, to $40,000,000. Denmark has made certain specific commitments. I think Norway has made certain specific commitments. The development of the remainder of the program has been awaiting our action.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Has any of the money actually been contributed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No money has been contributed because the fund cannot be set up until the United States has taken action.

Mr. President, our share, I repeat, is $350,000,000. We had accepted that as a matter of good faith in the General Assembly of the United Nations, not binding, I agree, legally or in any other way upon the judgment of the Senate if the Senate's judgment is otherwise, but accepted at least on the theory that we are the authors of this alternative plan under which we advance our own funds and take our own responsibility for the administration of those funds so as to avoid all the scandals and the mismanagement and the maladministration of UNRRA in days gone by. Our share, I repeat, is $350,000,000 That sum, allocated to the seven countries which are listed, is an absolute minimum by way of meeting the challenge of this situation. If the amount is reduced to $200,000,000, as proposed by the able Senator from Missouri, there will not be a sufficient fund even to meet the basic needs in Greece, Italy, and Austria, the three basic countries where we cannot possibly escape the challenge which we confront in respect to this relief matter.

I submit to the Senate that when we confront a necessity for $350,000,000 in connection with a task of this nature, if it is cut arbitrarily to $200,000,000 we are placed in the same position as we would be in if we stood on the dock and threw a 10-foot rope to a man who was drowning 15 feet off shore.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, the joint resolution itself had better be defeated than to have the basic authorization cut down at this particular moment by the Senate. I shall give some further reasons why I make that statement. In the course of its consideration of the measure the House voted to reduce the figure to $200,000,000.

I think it is fair to say that in the view of most of us who have had an opportunity to examine the House record, it is clear that the House decision was made on the basis of a misunderstanding of the facts. At any rate, the $200,000,000 figure proposed by the able Senator from Missouri will confront the conference. I am asking, and the committee is asking, that we leave the Senate committee amendment at what is deemed to be the utter minimum of necessity, $350,000,000, so that the two figures can go to conference. If the amendment of the able Senator from Missouri were adopted there would be but one figure in conference, an utterly inadequate figure, and even from the standpoint of the able Senator from Missouri, I am sure he would be willing to give the conferees at least that much opportunity to resurvey the situation to determine whether or not we would be making a desperately serious error if the reduction were made.

Furthermore, I remind the Senate that this is only an authorization, and that the ultimate appropriations under the act will come when the actual requests for appropriations are made.

I beg the Senate to reject the amendment, at least until such time as the conference can bring forth a final report on this legislation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator if the decision of the House was reached after extensive public hearings?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. KEM. Are those the only public hearings that have been held on the question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator if he can give the Senate any estimate as to additional demands of the same character which are likely to be made upon us in the near future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of none, if the Senator is talking about relief funds, except as the Senator may refer to the proposed children's fund.

That is another reason why I am asking the Senate to give us this leeway when we go to conference. Under the provisions of the House language it is proposed to meet the suggestion regarding a supplementary children's fund by using some of the authorization in the joint resolution to meet the obligation contemplated under the children's fund. Except as we can have the full authorization in conference, it will be impossible for us even to consider the possibility of including the children's fund within this appropriation. I am not at all sure that there will be a children's fund anyway, under the circumstances. So far as I know, the consideration of the supplementary children's fund is the only proposal that is pending, in addition to the proposal on the desks of Senators at the present time.

Mr. KEM. If I correctly understood the able Senator from Michigan yesterday, he put us on notice that there would likely be in the immediate future a request for a children's fund, in addition to the present proposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As usual, I was trying to be completely frank with the Senate. One thing above everything else that I cherish is the confidence of the Senate in what I say to it in respect to matters of this nature.

Mr. KEM. The Senator certainly has the confidence of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I wanted to be completely fair about the discussion of the children's fund. It is exceedingly difficult for me to be specific, because the suggestion in respect to the children's fund has not yet even been sent to Congress. It is a supplementary sort of undertaking which was born at New York in the General Assembly of the United Nations, when it was discovered that there was a little fund of $550,000 left in Mr. LaGuardia's control as the trustee of UNRRA when it was going out of business. It was proposed to use that little nucleus by way of building up a supplementary fund exclusively to combat the malnutrition of children in certain areas in Europe, as a specialty, a fund to which private contributions could be made, a fund which at that time, I am very frank to say, contemplated no such magnitude as is discussed downtown at the present time in connection with this fund.

The Senator from Michigan does not attach himself to any promises in respect to the children's fund, because so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he feels that basic relief is the primary challenge here. If it is possible to develop a children's fund supplementarily, I shall be very happy to participate in the effort; but so far as a further substantial demand upon Congress is concerned this year in respect to the children's fund, let me say that at the maximum we would not confront a request for more than ten or fifteen million dollars; and so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he is not even committed to that.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. At the risk of being tedious, I should like to ask the Senator two further questions.

First, in its deliberations, did the Committee on Foreign Relations give any attention to how far the American economy will stand drafts of this nature?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. The Senator is quite justified, and so are all other Senators who speak in terms of a demand, that we should survey our own resources in total to see to what extent we can deal in enterprises such as the one now before us.

In respect to this relief, it is imminent and unavoidably necessary if body and soul are to be kept together in the areas of liberated Europe between now and harvest time. It is so obviously apparent that except as body and soul can be kept together in this fashion, the forces of physical, mental, moral, social, and political disintegration will have complete right-of-way in those areas between now and harvest time, that I would say it was unnecessary for the committee, and it is now unnecessary for the Senate, to await any domestic survey in order to make up our minds that this limited challenge is one to which we dare not, on any basis of intelligent American self-interest, turn a deaf ear.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator place that challenge ahead of the challenge that we should see, first and foremost, that we are maintaining America as a bulwark of free institutions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would put the challenge which the Senator now defines at the base of every consideration in the world, because except as we can keep a solvent, healthy America in existence, there is no hope whatever, not only for us but for anyone else on this earth.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator. Without some consideration of the effect of this and similar drafts upon our economy, how can we be sure that we can withstand them?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan we should be making the precise studies which the Senator from Missouri is discussing; but I submit to the Senator that even with that fundamental, overriding requirement, which ought to be a constant challenge to our attention, it is impossible to plead that that necessity must suspend this relief appropriation, upon the immediate effects of which depends almost every hope we have, not only in respect to humanities around this earth, but in respect to stabilities.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Michigan be willing to join me and other Senators who think as I do in suggesting that the amount be reduced to $200,000,000 pending an investigation as to the effect upon the economy of the United States?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish it were possible to agree to a proposal of that sort; but upon second thought the Senator himself must realize that the purpose of this measure primarily deals with a crisis between now and harvest time in the liberated areas of Europe. The major expenditures for relief under the joint resolution involve situations that are already critical and will become increasingly critical up to a climax not more than 90 days hence. So it is quite impossible, I am sure the Senator, upon second thought, will concede, for us to suspend our attention to that imminent challenge for the purpose of making such a study as the Senator contemplates; but I would happily join with the Senator in setting up some sort of a system under which we shall make a total inventory of our available American resources and look in sum total squarely into the over-all possibilities within which America must live.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Michigan join me in some impatience in viewing these constantly recurring crises emanating from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I not only join in the Senator's impatience, but I join in wishing that it were not my constant assignment to have to present these situations to the Senate. I think the best proof of the fact that I consider it unavoidable is that although they come from an Executive and a State Department downtown, which are under the general control of a party to which I am not attached, nevertheless I consider it to be my duty and the duty of my party in connection with matters of this nature to present a united front.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator, on the next occasion of this kind——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean, the next crisis?

Mr. KEM. Yes. Will the Senator be kind enough to convey to the Chief Executive the wish of a very inconspicuous Member of this body that an opportunity be given for careful deliberation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to carry the Senator's message.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield in a moment. I want to be sure to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] before my time expires.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan, in order to make it plain, with reference to the answer to an inquiry which I made yesterday afternoon, that the Senate is not committed to the definite amount of $350,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad the Senator has brought that up again. The Senator is totally correct. It is up to $350,000,000, if, as, and when the necessities are demonstrated to the Appropriations Committee of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. It is upon that theory that I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, for whom I have the highest respect, that what the Senate does, if it agrees to this joint resolution, is in reality to place a maximum ceiling above which we cannot go, but the justification has to be made to the Appropriations Committee to make the appropriations which that committee feels are justified, and then the question comes to the Senate for its vote. Am I correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I still have the floor I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan this question: In addition to the crisis technique with which we have become so familiar, is this also a blank check?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not consider it to be a blank check, because, upon the insistence of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the destination of the funds is spelled out in the committee report over the signature of the Secretary of State, with the direct statement from him that it is a categorical commitment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield once more. I must yield the floor to the able Senator from Texas.

Mr. MALONE. I want to ask the able Senator from Michigan if there is any record of any part of an appropriation made for any purpose in the crises which have been referred to by the Senator from Missouri, having been turned back into the Treasury or having remained unexpended?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not know whether there is or not; and it would not make the slightest difference in my judgment respecting the vote which I have to cast here. I should like to call the attention of the able Senator from Nevada to the fact that under the textual terms of the joint resolution upon which he is now asked to vote it is required that all the funds obtained in local currencies abroad as the result of the distribution of this relief—and there will be very substantial funds obtained—shall be deposited in trust funds under the control of the Government of the United States, and the final disposition of the balance is at the command, textually, of the Congress of the United States. I submit to the Senator that that is a very far advance, he will at least be happy to agree with me, upon the techniques from which we have suffered heretofore.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I merely addressed the inquiry to the able Senator for the reason that the junior Senator from Nebraska stated that the pending measure was merely an enabling act to enable the Government to spend up to the amount of $350,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Texas. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I feel it is hardly necessary for me to make any remarks on the pending measure, for, in view of the state of the record and of the able presentation by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I cannot conceive that the Senate would refuse to grant this authorization. At that point I want to emphasize the fact that this is not an appropriation; it is simply an authorization. There will not be a dollar expended under this resolution until the Congress specifically appropriates funds within the authorization.

I very much hope that the Senate will not adopt an amendment, such as that suggested by the Senator from Missouri, which would substantially reduce the amount of the funds. If we undertake this work at all, let us do it completely; let us not do only half of it.

It has been estimated by those in authority in the Department of State that $600,000,000 will be required to meet the relief needs of the countries involved, and that our portion of it will be approximately $350,000,000.

I want also to emphasize the fact that this resolution is limited to relief. Under this measure rehabilitation and reconversion are not considered. We do not even send agricultural machinery. Seed, insecticides, and things of that kind are to be sent to devasted countries whose people are in distress, as well as food and clothing and the elementary necessities of human life.

The war has left us with tremendous responsibilities, some of which are implied from the war and some of which we are assuming ourselves. Of course we are all concerned with the economic conditions in our own country. Of course, we feel the necessity of preserving the economic status of the United States. We do not want to waste the resources of the United States. We do not want to dissipate the elements of our strength. But what are we to do? We are a part of the world. We are not all of it. But whatever happens in Europe in the field of politics or government or economy, has its repercussions in the United States, regardless of our will or regardless of our attitudes. We want a peaceful world; we want a prosperous world. We want, insofar as we can, to banish the terrible conditions existing in the devastated countries of Europe.

Mr. President, the Senate is well-advised about this measure. I do not wish to consume much time at this point; but I feel that I should say a few words, in view of the many reasons that are being urged by Senators in regard to amendments and other matters.

I have often heard it said, "That people in Europe do not appreciate that we are doing for them." Mr. President, under UNRRA there was substantial complaint, which was justified, that UNRRA was extending aid in the form of food and raiment to countries that were, in turn, expending their own resources for the maintenance of large armies. It was justly complained that UNRRA was feeding the civilian populations, whereas the governments themselves were expending their resources in the maintenance of armies and in preparation for military action. But that will not be the case under this joint resolution; we have safeguarded against that.

It is true that many of the residents of Europe do not appreciate what we have done. Many of them never even knew that we were contributors to UNRRA. They were misled; they were misinformed; they were misguided; they were under the delusion that the aid which we granted under UNRRA was coming from some of the governments of Europe with which we are not in very great sympathy.

But, Mr. President, regardless of whether they are grateful or are not grateful, we, the people of the United States, have a high obligation in this respect. Our obligation is not simply a matter of charity, but we have an obligation to try to resurrect the world, so that we shall have peace in the future, instead of chaos and misery and suffering, which constitute a rich breeding ground for war and international discord.

Mr. KEM rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, if he wishes me to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, about a request for $200,000,000 for Korea, which appears to have been announced today from the White House, according to newspapers which have come to the Senate Chamber. They indicate that such a request has been made. Will the Senator from Texas give us some information in regard to that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I shall. I shall say—although the Senator from Missouri is probably as well informed about that matter as I am—that at this moment there have been newspaper stories and reports that the United States, in carrying out its agreements with Russia in undertaking to establish a stable government in Korea, is adopting the attitude that all elements in the population of Korea should be consulted, and that we should set up a really democratic system of government there; and, of course, funds will be required for that purpose. So I assume that we shall be called upon to provide such funds. I do not know what the amount will be, but I assume that it is true that we shall be called upon to provide such funds.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield, although I wish to leave some time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. KEM. I should like to place in the RECORD——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a bad time to have matters placed in the RECORD, because we are operating under a very limited time schedule. Certainly the Senator has all afternoon to place matters in the RECORD, after the approaching vote is taken.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article appearing in today's Washington News, entitled "Korea Needs Only $200,000,000." The article begins with the statement:

> The administration today rushed plans for a $200,000,000 economic aid program for southern Korea as Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, demanded Congress be told how much is planned for foreign spending instead of being asked for money in "dribs and drabs."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA NEEDS ONLY $200,000,000

The administration today rushed plans for a $200,000,000 economic aid program for southern Korea as Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, demanded Congress be told how much is planned for foreign spending instead of being asked for money in "dribs and drabs."

It was reported the Korean program would be presented Congress very soon. Its purpose would be rehabilitation of railways, textile mills, and other industries destroyed by the Japs.

The Korean aid plan will be pushed despite an American-Soviet agreement to reopen talks on Korean unification in Seoul May 20.

Senator BRIDGES in asking for some estimate of the over-all anticipated cost of the Truman doctrine charged the Administration had given no indication of what the final total—estimated unofficially at possibly billions of dollars—might be.

Thus far Congress has been asked specifically for $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey and $350,000,000 for general foreign relief. The Greco-Turkish fund has been authorized but no money has been appropriated. The general foreign relief fund is up for Senate vote today.

The State Department admitted the Administration now faces a handicap of its own making in further implementation of the Truman doctrine.

Congress approved the Greco-Turkish grant in response to Mr. Truman's appeals which stressed urgent military dangers involved.

Now, however, the State Department wants to put the emphasis on the economic implications of its program, particularly in getting Congress to approve wide expenditures to prop up western European economies.

State Department difficulty with Congress over its foreign broadcast propaganda program continued. Representative KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, proposed to read scripts of the Voice of America program in Foreign Affairs subcommittee hearings to determine whether criticism directed at the programs was justified.

The Italian political crisis appeared to be moving toward solution. Premier Alcide de Gasperi was expected to broaden his government by adding right-wing elements while retaining Communists and left-wing socialists.

The United Nations General Assembly prepared today to approve a broad investigation of Palestine to open the way for specific UN action next autumn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not object to having the Senator put the article in the RECORD. The good old RECORD is the repository of a great deal of material which is rarely ever read by anyone who keeps up with information from reliable sources.

Suppose such funds are requested for Korea, what is the Senate going to do? Shall we say to Korea, "No; we are not interested in Korea; we do not care what kind of government exists there; we do not care whether Russia gobbles up Korea"; and if I am asked what I am going to do about that, am I to say, "I have before me an article from the Washington News which seems to be against the proposal, and therefore I will vote against it"?

Mr. President, of course, Senators will not vote against it.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will please address the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator make his peace with the Chair, and then I shall yield to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to say that I will do as I have done on two former occasions: I will ask for a comprehensive plan, geared to our national economy and our ability to carry out such a program. But without such a plan, in the debate on this floor, I shall oppose the granting of further requests; I shall stand against them as long as I can.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator will stand as long as he can, Mr. President. He has already served notice on us in regard to what he will do. He did so in a speech he made earlier today.

Mr. President, let me say that even the countries which do not appreciate what we are doing, will appreciate it in the years to come. We are here to discharge our responsibilities. We are here to meet our obligations and to do our duty. I would hate to have history record that in this hour of trial and distress, when the nations that have been liberated are in sore need, we did not do the handsome and the generous thing.

Mr. President, we poured out probably $300,000,000,000 in an effort to arrest aggression and to preserve the liberties and the freedoms of the very nations for which the proposed aid is intended. Shall we now take the position that, after spending $300,000,000,000 in that effort, which indirectly, through the opposition of the enemy, resulted in the killing of the citizens and in bringing about the collapse of those nations, now that they are in dire need of assistance, the United States Government will say "No"?

Mr. President, now that the necessity exists for us to help them the United States Government will not say "No," nor will we be deterred by the fact that within some of those countries there are people who are ungrateful or lacking in appreciation. But, Mr. President, when the historians come to record the transactions of this period the noble part played by the United States will be written in bright and livid letters on an honored page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment. On this question the ayes and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several Senators have entered the Chamber since the amendment was read. I ask that it be read again at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 8, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—19

Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Moore
Brooks	Kem	O'Daniel
Buck	McCarthy	Robertson, Va.
Butler	McClellan	Russell
Byrd	McKellar	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	
Ecton	Martin	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Holland	Smith
Cain	Ives	Sparkman
Capper	Jenner	Taft
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Connally	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Tydings
Donnell	Lucas	Umstead
Downey	McFarland	Vandenberg
Eastland	McGrath	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hatch	Myers	

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin	McCarran	Stewart
Capehart	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Reed	Tobey
Langer	Revercomb	Wagner

So Mr. KEM's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, further debate is prohibited. Although amendments may yet be offered, no debate can be had thereon. Are there any further amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY (when Mr. BALDWIN's name was called). The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of illness. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Taylor
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ellender	Magnuson	White
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Wilson
George	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	
Gurney	Moore	

NAYS—4

Bushfield	O'Daniel	Williams
McClellan		

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin	McCarran	Stewart
Capehart	Overton	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Reed	Tobey
Langer	Revercomb	Wagner

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARTLEY, Mr. LANDIS, Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. BARDEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 76, Senate bill 526, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 526), to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, our forefathers, at the founding of this great Nation, were rightly suspicious of granting too much authority to that necessary adjunct of a sovereign State, the armed forces. In their wisdom, they wrote into the Constitution definite provisions which they believed would forever maintain the Army and the Navy as the willing servants of civil power and would never permit them to become our master.

In these troubled days and until such time as the nations of the world will compose their differences without recourse to war the military services are an evil that must be maintained to preserve to us and to our children the benefits of our constitutional form of government. But like all such growths, they are never satisfied with what they have. Believing in spite of all the evidence to the contrary that civil government is dilatory, inefficient, and extravagant the military continually seeks to extend its influence, both within and without the armed forces, and to take unto itself many of the prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

We have been told repeatedly during these past 2 years that in these days of total war, involving every governmental agency and every walk of human endeavor, that our only hope of survival rests in the lessening of civilian control over the military services, and in the concentration of power and authority in the hands of the few, who will, in turn, be dominated by their professional military advisers.

There is nothing new in these proposals, for history is replete with examples of them and, what is more important, with the sobering and terrifying results that have inevitably followed in due course when they have been adopted.

It was such a philosophy that permitted Napoleon to become the scourge of Europe at the beginning at the nineteenth century. It was such a philosophy that permitted the professional militarists of Germany to dominate that country in the short span of 70 years and to bring about the cataclysm of World War I, in spite of the provisions written into the Prussian Constitution of 1850 which gave to the Diet—much as our Constitution gives to Congress—nominal control over the military budgets and over the war minister. It was such a philosophy that resulted in the military domination of Germany, Italy, and Japan during the last decade, a philosophy that we have just waged World War II to defeat. It is such a philosophy that we are now being urged to accept without the most searching of examinations because it has been recommended to us by our military advisers.

Do we really wish to follow in these footsteps of history? to provide for military domination of all of the agencies of our Government, of our industry, and of our manpower? and to come at last to the inevitable military defeat that has followed in due course, as the night follows the day? I do not think so; nor do I advise that it be done.

I know that many will say that these things cannot happen in this free country of ours. But I say that they can happen here; that they can and will happen unless we retain within these Halls of Congress our traditional and constitutional civilian control over the armed forces of this Nation.

In 1919, at the end of World War I, a bill was introduced in the Congress which would have deprived it of its power to control the Army. This bill was defeated by the efforts of Senator Chamberlain whose summation is as cogent today as it was 28 years ago. I quote from his analytical and explanatory statement as printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by the Government Printing Office, 1919:

> This bill was framed by military advisers of the Secretary of War. Inasmuch as many of these proposals are radical and even revolutionary in their nature, and, if rejected now, are likely again to be urged upon Congress, possibly in other forms, it seems advisable now to examine all of them very thoroughly. The comments made herein with regard to them will apply to them equally as well whenever and however they shall appear in the future.
>
> Briefly stated, the principal purpose of the legislation proposed by this bill is to empower the chief of an all-powerful general staff corps, acting by authority of the President or in his name, or with the acquiescence and in the name of the Secretary of War, to do whatever such successive Chief of Staff may from time to time desire to do with regard to the duties, powers, functions, records, property and personnel of all military bureaus and offices of the War Department. All previous legislation by Congress with respect to the duties, powers, and functions of officers of the various staff corps and de-

partments and of the line of the Army is to be repealed expressly or by implication. Nearly all the control heretofore exercised by Congress over the Army is to be transferred, theoretically to the President, but practically, to the Chief of Staff. However, Congress is still to be permitted to foot the bill.

Upon careful consideration of this section of the bill (sec. 1), especially the last sentence thereof, it will be seen that the enactment of it will give to the executive permanent and unrestricted authority to distribute as and when he pleases, anywhere in or out of the War Department, any or all of the duties, powers, functions, records, property, and personnel heretofore assigned by law or otherwise to any of the existing departments, bureaus and offices of the War Department.

From very early days of the Army and up to the present time Congress has prescribed the organization and the commissioned and enlisted strength of the various arms, regiments, battalions, troops, batteries, and companies of the line. It is now proposed that Congress shall relinquish to the Executive substantially all of this control. There is no limit as to the frequency with which this enormous power may be exercised by any President or any of his successors to meet the ever-changing opinions, views, or whims of an ever-changing Chief of Staff and his immediate subordinates. It is inevitable that the power will be so exercised, if Congress is unwise enough to permit it, with resulting instability and uncertainty throughout the Army, and great and useless expense.

The whole theory of this and other sections of the bill is unlimited, autocratic, one-man control over the entire organization and personnel of the Army. Congress is asked in effect to undo all that it has done in the past with respect to such control and to keep its hands off in the future.

Of course, in practice, the exercise of all this tremendous power would be substantially, if not entirely, controlled by the Chief of Staff. This preposterous scheme, together with many others of like intent in the pending bill, spells one-man dominance, staff despotism, and militarism to a degree never surpassed in the palmiest days of the great General Staff of the German Army.

The method adopted by the framers of the bill in order to conceal this scheme and its true inwardness, and thus to secure its adoption by an unsuspecting Congress, was somewhat complicated. The whole of it is not to be found in any one section of the bill or in plain language anywhere. But it is all there, nevertheless, and it can be discovered readily enough by assembling its ingeniously scattered parts.

Now, today, at the end of World War II, we have for consideration before the Senate Armed Services Committee a measure which proposes to do for all the armed forces of this country what the bill of 1919 would have done for the Army alone. I refer to Senate bill 758.

That bill would establish a single department—the National Defense Establishment—bringing all the armed services under the administration and control of a single, all-powerful super Secretary of National Defense. It would set up an embryonic over-all high command—the Joint Staff, suspiciously like its authoritarian prototypes—a permanent militaristic staff corps superimposed over the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the Marine Corps. By its failure to delineate by statute the functions for which the various services are created by Congress, the bill will permit, at the whim of some future President or of some future super Secretary, the complete destruction of our traditional types of balanced forces and their reorganization along the lines heretofore adopted by continental powers.

Further, and more important than this drastic reorganization of the armed forces in a pattern which, I repeat, has never yet been victorious in total war, that bill, S. 758, would provide for the eventual domination by a group of professional militarists of all the civilian agencies of Government, of our foreign policies, of our industries, and of our natural and human resources in the event of another war, if not actually in the preparatory stages for such a war.

That bill, too, was drafted by the military advisers of the Secretaries of War and of the Navy. It is couched in language so vague—and perhaps purposely so—that no two witnesses have yet agreed upon its interpretation. It is, in effect, a blank check for the single, super Secretary and for the armed forces to do as they choose to do in the future without restraint by Congress. To paraphrase a passage from the Declaration of Independence, it "erects a multitude of new offices, and sends hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

I freely admit the urgency for legislation which will perpetuate many of the joint agencies now in existence which proved so invaluable in prosecuting the war just ended—legislation which will bring about a closer coordination of all of the departments of Government concerned with our national defense.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I prefer to continue.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought at that point I should like to ask if the Senator has noticed that in the bill concerning which the Senator is speaking, and to which he is opposed, there is no provision for a really centralized purchasing authority which would eliminate the competition between the various armed branches and divisions of the Government which existed during World War II, and has existed in the past, which has tended greatly to increase the cost of war materials?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from West Virginia that there is no provision in Senate bill 758 for such a purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the point I wanted to bring out. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. But I should like to point out to the Senator that there already exists under the Army and Navy Munitions Boards many joint committees of the Army and Navy for procurement.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator ever investigated the results of their operations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I do not know that I can say I have investigated them. We have questioned witnesses on the subject at numerous times, and every witness who is competent to speak has spoken in the highest possible terms of the coordination which has already taken place.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator familiar with the Joint Board on Standardization, which was formed in 1920 for the purpose of standardizing articles and equipment?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; I am not.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator realize that since 1920 that joint board, being in session constantly, has succeeded in standardizing only packing boxes for overseas shipment, and that there still remain unstandardized all ammunition, all clothing and shoes, and all weapons above .30-caliber rifles and .45-caliber pistols?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I was not aware of that fact, but I am very pleased to have the Senator call attention to it.

Mr. KILGORE. The idea of committees does not work as well as the plan of having one man who is responsible.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am delighted that the Senator has called the attention of the Senate to that point. I will say that in the bill which I am about to introduce there is provision for a coordinator to do that very thing.

Unlike the proponents of Senate bill 758, I believe that these admirable objectives can be attained without a drastic reorganization of our military departments; without the creation of a bureaucratic monstrosity; without the establishment of a militaristic national high command which will inevitably extend its power beyond its proper sphere—and again I point out that every nation that has adopted this sort of an organization has suffered defeat in war—and, finally, I believe that in consideration of the total aspect of modern warfare, the brunt of which falls so heavily upon the civilian, we should increase rather than decrease the amount of civilian control over our defense structure.

With these considerations in mind, I am herewith introducing for the consideration of the Senate a bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare. This bill is entitled "The Defense Coordination Act of 1947"; it might appropriately be called "The Anti-Military-Dictatorship Act of 1947." I respectfully request that it be referred to the appropriate committee for study and report to the Senate.

In many respects the bill which I am introducing resembles Senate bill 758 in that it continues those coordinating agencies now in existence which should be retained, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board. In many respects it differs from S. 758, since it makes no provision for a single department of the armed forces, for a single supersecretary, or an over-all high command. Most important of all, it sets forth the governmental agencies concerned with national defense in their proper perspective to each other and maintains the civilian control over the

armed forces so essential to the continued existence of our constitutional form of government.

It is my belief that the provisions of this bill will allay the apprehensions which have been voiced on all sides by spokesmen for the Navy, fearing the loss of naval aviation; for the Ground Forces, fearing the loss of their close support air arm; for the Marine Corps, fearing the loss of its Fleet Marine Forces; and for the Air Force, fearing that it may be submerged under the surface elements of both the Army and the Navy. Further, it is my belief that this bill will best adapt to modern conditions the time-tested principles of organization of our armed forces—principles which have served so successfully to defend this Nation through the 158 years of its existence.

With but one or two exceptions, every single element set forth in this bill has been subjected to the test of war; they carried us through World War II to victory; they have carried us through the days of readjustment since August 14, 1945. While avoiding the pitfalls of Senate bill 758, which can surely lead us along the road to military dictatorship, this bill will provide the agencies which are so necessary for the proper coordination of all the elements of Government concerned with our national defense.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1282) to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to submit a series of amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and I request that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Vermont for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming what the testimony before the Armed Services Committee has shown in regard to the relative costs of maintaining the armed services under the merger bill which has been under consideration, and under the present system. Does the testimony before the committee show that under the merger bill, upon which hearings have been held, there would be a material saving in the cost of maintaining our armed forces?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There has been no testimony at all to show any saving whatsoever. Letters have been received from two officers, one of the Army and one of the Navy, responsible for Senate bill 758, setting forth the salaries which would be paid to the chief officers of certain newly created departments. Those salaries would increase the costs by more than $900,000—practically $1,000,000—but the letters do not enlarge in any way on the costs of the establishment which would be necessary under that bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Wyoming believe that that is a very important question to be considered, and that the Congress should know what the relative costs of maintaining the armed services would be under the system in effect, as compared with the system proposed?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. Not only should the Congress know, but I feel that the committee should know, before it takes any action on the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a comment on the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

I should like to make a very brief statement, because of the fact that the Senator from Wyoming has just introduced a substitute for Senate bill 758, known as the bill for the unification of the armed forces.

This bill has been considered in hearings before the committee for a period of 8 weeks. I believe that we have full information on the bill. Personally, I believe that the bill was a good bill when it was introduced. It represented the best thought of the men who had brought our country through the war. It represented a meeting of minds in the War and Navy Departments, a mutual agreement, and it was sent to us by the President as a mutual agreement of the War and Navy Departments. It is not my intention in any way to say that the Armed Services Committee has come to any conclusion on that bill. I stated in the beginning that it was my belief that it was a good bill. I believe the thought which has been given this bill in committee will make it possible for the committee to bring to the Senate floor not only a good bill, but an excellent bill, which will afford an opportunity to save a large amount of money and to get a great deal of efficiency not only out of the Army and Navy, but also out of the new branch, the Air Forces Branch, which is to be established by the bill. I believe that when it comes out of committee it will be a bill which a majority of the Senate will support.

It is the intention of the committee to go into executive session next Tuesday to mark up the bill. It was so ordered in a vote yesterday. At that time the substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] will be fully considered, as will be all amendments which may be offered by any other Senator. Certainly it is the intention of the Committee on Armed Services not to report a bill which can by any stretch of the imagination be called a bill that would set up a military dictatorship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a brief comment on the matter which is under discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has listened for the last 8 weeks to the hearings on the armed forces bill, together with the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota, I believe that the committee will report a bill which can be supported by a great majority of the Members of this honorable body. For one, I certainly shall never support a bill which could be interpreted as justifying the far-fetched conclusions which my colleague from Wyoming suggested would be a possibility under the bill which was drafted in 1919. I am confident that there is not a member of the committee who would advocate or vote to report a bill which might lead to such a military dictatorship as has been suggested.

As the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota, has said, the committee has just begun its executive consideration of the bill, and I hope, as he does, and as I am confident the Senator from Wyoming hopes, that we shall be able to prepare and report a bill which will solidify the amazing advancements in military security which were developed during the war and make such legal provision concerning them that they may continue to be employed in the days to come for our greater security at home. Many of the improvements are now simply carried out through mutual agreement of men in the different branches of the armed services. What we desire to do is to make possible improvements which need legislation, without in any way setting up a military dictatorship or impairing the integrity of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Forces.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the prog-

ress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. McFARLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia. I understand he wishes to make a brief statement about the pending legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk five amendments to the pending bill and ask that they lie on the table and be printed. It is my hope, Mr. President, that the bill will not reach a vote until tomorrow, so that these amendments may be printed and that all Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to read them. The amendments are in line with the bill passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress. They are intended to cure what some of us think are weaknesses in the pending measure. Three of them I offer on my own behalf. One I offer on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Another is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I express to the Senate the hope that they will be printed before it is necessary to discuss them and before it is necessary to vote on the amendments and the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to say that I regret very much that these amendments have been presented so late. Last February I invited various Senators who I knew were interested in the subject to collaborate in presenting amendments. I recall that the Senator from West Virginia said he had some amendments to offer. I hoped he would offer them in time. I regret that there has to be a further delay to wait for printing of additional amendments, because I think there has been adequate time. I do not want to be an obstructionist. I do not want to do other than show the utmost courtesy to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, but, for the RECORD, I must express my regret that this bill will be held up by a long debate on seven or eight amendments such as we discussed over a 2- or 3-day period last year, at which time their provisions were clearly set forth in the RECORD. I am convinced that we can pass the bill if we move forward with the discussion without unnecessary delay. I do not object to the amendments being offered. The Senator has the right to offer them, but I regret that we are asked to let the matter go over a whole day, when I thought that after I had finished my discussion on the positive side of the matter the amendments could be discussed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that it go over until tomorrow if we can finish the bill. I should like to say for the RECORD that the amendment in which I join with the Senator from West Virginia is not one which should surprise the Senator from New Jersey. It is almost a part of the history of the last two Congresses in respect of the allocation of funds. I am sure all of us on both sides who have been interested in the matter over a period of some years are familiar with it. I do not know what the other amendments are, but I presume that the Senator from West Virginia is offering amendments with the contents of which we are familiar.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey the fact that last year an agreement on a bill was reached by all factions. At the last minute amendments were offered, and the debate was prolonged for 4 days. The Senator from New Jersey was one who proposed some amendments at that time. I say, in all fairness, that I knew nothing about the unanimous-consent agreement which was reached yesterday evening. I had been endeavoring to prepare some short amendments which would not disturb the bill too much, and yet would embody the theory which I feel confident must be considered. I apologize to the Senate for doing this, but it is something that could not be helped. That is why I am asking the indulgence of the Senate in the matter, because we had an adequate precedent last year.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to be sure that I understand the parliamentary situation. I believe amendments have been offered by two Senators, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Washington, and with the submission of the amendments the suggestion has been made that a vote shall not be had on either the amendments or the bill until tomorrow. I had assumed that we would press forward with the bill this afternoon. I wish to make sure whether the Senator from New Jersey has agreed that votes will not be pressed for this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH. I can say to the Senator from Maine that I have not agreed to anything of the sort, but of course I shall not embarrass the Senator from West Virginia. He has offered certain amendments. I understand that other Senators will offer amendments. As the debate proceeds, if it becomes obvious that those Senators will not have a chance to present and discuss their amendments today, I certainly shall not press for a vote today, thus denying them a chance to be heard. I had hoped that we could dispose of this bill today.

Mr. WHITE. Then do I correctly understand that there is no agreement to postpone the vote until tomorrow?

Mr. SMITH. At the moment there is no such agreement; but I have no objection to having the Senator from West Virginia submit his amendments and ask that they be printed. Of course, they cannot be printed until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wondered whether there was an agreement in regard to postponing the vote until tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH. There was no agreement of that sort, and I did not understand that the Senator from West Virginia had requested such an agreement. I understood him to express the hope that it would be possible to have the amendments considered tomorrow. I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether I correctly understood him.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. I have submitted my amendments, and it is my hope that they may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that the amendments which are offered will go to the desk and will lie there, subject to being called up when they are reached in the course of the proper consideration of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, sometime ago I introduced a bill providing funds for a Cancer Research Institute. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] also introduced such a bill. I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] associated himself with me in connection with the bill I introduced.

After considerable discussion, it was determined by all of those interested in the establishment of such a Cancer Research Institute that it could properly be handled as a part of the proposed National Science Foundation. Therefore, we have prepared an amendment which establishes within the general framework which the Senator from New Jersey is about to describe, a special commission on cancer research, a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary.

Our feeling is that with a special cancer commission directing the research in the Biological Sciences Division and the other divisions, it will be possible to secure the same result, in a coordinated form, as could be secured by having a separate commission or institute established.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr.

MAGNUSON], and myself, I offer this amendment, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, with regard to the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio, I may say that I am more than happy to have that amendment submitted; and as the introducer of the pending measure, I am glad to accept it. It represents the end of a long series of discussions with the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators regarding the important subject of cancer research and heart research; and it is very gratifying to me that we have been able to agree with the American Cancer Research Institute and other organizations to have that provision incorporated in the bill. I shall discuss it later during the presentation of my views on this measure.

Mr. President, on February 7 I had the honor to introduce, on behalf of five of my colleagues and myself, a bill to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and to secure the national defense by establishing a National Science Foundation.

That bill was reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by unanimous vote, I may say. During the time it was before the committee, it acquired the support of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who had introduced a bill, known as Senate bill 525, but who now, as a result of revisions on the part of both the Senator from Utah and myself, joins me in sponsoring Senate bill 526.

We are now asking the nonpartisan support of all Senators for this bill. It already has the bipartisan support of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its wholly nonpolitical nature may be gaged by the fact that it bears the names not only of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, but of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. During the committee sessions, we had the benefit of the cooperation of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I believe this is a bill upon which all Senators can agree, both as to objectives and methods. It results from our wartime experience with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which the proposed National Science Foundation would replace—let me emphasize that fact—and from important wartime scientific developments up to and including the discovery of practical methods of employing atomic energy. The bill was drawn up specifically with a view to meeting objections that previous bills in this field were too broad in scope and overly centralized in authority.

It is my hope, Mr. President, and the hope of the other Senators who have joined me in sponsoring this bill, that all branches of science will unite in recognizing the need to support a single bill in this field.

The proposed National Science Foundation is not new to Congress. Similar legislation was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Over 150 witnesses have been heard by committees in both Houses of Congress, and 149 of them urged the creation of a National Science Foundation. There was only one witness opposed to that proposal. The bill was debated thoroughly in both Chambers of Congress. It passed in the Senate, but died in the House. I refer to the bill of last year.

The Government has long recognized the contributions made by science. Abraham Lincoln, on March 3, 1863, approved an act incorporating the National Academy of Sciences. Mr. President, I wish to read and incorporate in the RECORD at this point sections 2 and 3 of that act:

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the National Academy of Sciences shall consist of not more than 50 ordinary members, and the said corporation hereby constituted shall have power to make its own organization, including its constitution, bylaws, and rules and regulations; to fill all vacancies created by death, resignation, or otherwise; to provide for the election of foreign and domestic members, the division into classes, and all matters needful or usual in such institution, and to report the same to Congress.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That the National Academy of Sciences shall hold an annual meeting at such place in the United States as may be designated, and the Academy shall, whenever called upon by any department of the Government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of science or art, the actual expense of such investigations, examinations, experiments, and reports to be paid from appropriations which may be made for the purpose, but the Academy shall receive no compensation whatever for any services to the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, this society of elders serviced the Government for over 80 years. Their advice and counsel has been a noteworthy contribution to scientific progress.

President Woodrow Wilson, on May 11, 1918, created the National Research Council, by Executive order, to supplement the work of the academy. This was during World War I.

President Roosevelt, in June 1940, created the Office of Scientific Research and Development, headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, to mobilize science for war. That, of course, was during World War II. It was this organization that gave birth to the atomic energy project in December 1940, and later turned it over to the Army in 1942.

At the request of President Roosevelt, Dr. Bush and 50 of the Nation's other eminent authorities prepared a report on a plan for a program for postwar scientific research. This report, known as Science, the Endless Frontier, was submitted to President Truman in July 1945. I may state that we have placed on the desks of Senators copies of this important pamphlet prepared by Dr. Bush and his colleagues. It has been the handbook on postwar scientific planning. The National Science Foundation bill, which I am reporting today, has been drafted to carry out the purposes of this report.

Mr. President, science must be an essential contributor to the advance of civilization in this postwar era. Radar, guided missiles, supersonic speeds, radioactive isotopes, good and bad germs, and the atomic bomb itself should convince all of us that we live in a scientific age.

Science, industry, and the military combined to give us the atomic bomb. Our scientific skill and industrial know-how are principal causes of our leadership in the world today. But we must also recognize the hand of God in the shaping of our national destiny.

Mr. President, we are the temporary custodians of this leadership. It is a passing advantage unless we provide for its future growth. We cannot continue to enjoy the fruits of past research unless steps are taken now to encourage the growth of scientific manpower and research facility in our national institutions.

The National Science Foundation bill, S. 526, is designed to meet these needs—to promote the progress of sciences; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I propose now to discuss the bill, and the field we aim to cover by the various provisions in it. Let me first consider the over-all organization of the foundation.

The proposed National Science Foundation is a new venture for government in an untried and uncharted field requiring highly specialized guidance. Recent debates on this floor are sufficient evidence that in highly specialized scientific fields the Government must depend on the part-time services of men of outstanding ability capable of determining the most fruitful fields of research and of developing its supporting talent.

I now quote from the report on the bill, Report No. 78. On page 2 we refer to the matter of the set-up of the foundation, as follows:

S. 526 provides that the foundation established to develop a national policy for basic research as distinguished from applied science—

Let me emphasize that in the bill we are dealing with basic research, and not applied science—

should be directed by the collective wisdom of a 24-man part-time board of scientists, educators, and men of public affairs appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The foundation would elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, who would ex-

ercise the powers and duties of the foundation, and, with the approval of the foundation, appoint a director who, as the chief executive officer, would be responsible to the foundation. (Excerpt from Report No. 78, of S. 526, p. 2.)

I may step aside from my prepared remarks to say that after consultation with the Director of the Budget and the President of the United States himself, an amendment has been prepared, which I shall accept, which provides that the immediate appointment of the Director shall be by the President of the United States, but that the Director shall still remain subject to the control of the foundation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What the Senator has just suggested is provided in the amendment I have just submitted in behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I referred to the amendment which the Senator from Washington had submitted, and which as I have said, I am happy to accept, because I think it solves one of the problems with which we have had to deal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator from Washington to state what is provided by the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. SMITH. I should be very glad, for the RECORD, to have the amendment read, in order to bring out the point I am making, although that will be touched on later. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment is offered as a substitute for section 6, and reads:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of the Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the executive committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving the recommendations of the executive committee, and he shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year.

Mr. HILL. It is for no fixed term?

Mr. MAGNUSON. His service is to be at the pleasure of the President.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say, at this point, Mr. President, that we have given a very considerable amount of study to the organizational plan for the Foundation. It is essential that we understand from the beginning that the proposed Foundation is not just another Government agency. It has been designed to fit a specific need and to accomplish a definite purpose. We in Congress are asking the eminent men and women of science to chart a program for basis research to insure our future.

I should like, Mr. President, to quote from the testimony of one of these eminent men of science, Dr. Vannevar Bush, on this point:

The Foundation will be faced with many different but exceedingly complex and highly technical questions. For example, it must annually evaluate the relative importance of scholarships, basic research, international undertakings and publications in the terms of the over-all national welfare. Within its allocation for research, the Foundation must determine the relative importance of the different fields of science. Finally, it must be able to evaluate on the basis of their scientific merits, not only the relative importance of the various specific projects, but also their potential effectiveness. Decision of these questions will require not only extensive and varied scientific knowledge, but also broad and sound concepts of the Nation's best interests. In other words, the decisions must be wisely made from the standpoint of many considerations.

In the long run and in general, the Congress should, as representative of all the citizens, make decisions of policy. It is obvious, however, that the Congress lacks sufficient time to inform itself as to the various considerations involved in making these particular decisions. It must therefore delegate to others the power to make them, retaining its ultimate control through annual reports and appropriations.

That is the way we have framed our bill. The Foundation must come back to the Congress with its annual report and its request for appropriations. That is how the control is preserved in the Congress. Dr. Bush continues:

In my opinion, this delegation should not be to one man but should be to a group of the ablest men and women in the United States, drawn from all parts of the country, who would represent the different fields of science, education, and public affairs.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of securing the services of the ablest possible individuals to guide the Foundation. A board which is only advisory would bear responsibility for the decisions of the administrator, but would not have any real authority to control those decisions. I believe that in order to be sure to secure members of the requisite caliber it is essential to give them authority commensurate with their responsibility. (Excerpt from testimony of Dr. Vannevar Bush before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, March 7, 1947.)

I may point out that one of the issues involved in the consideration of this matter last year, and one of the issues involved in its consideration this year, is whether there should be one man appointed this year by the President, with an advisory board, or whether the center of gravity for developing the policy of this great Foundation should be in a group of scientific men, the director to be subject to the direction of the board of scientific men.

The atomic age requires the decentralization of every facility. To this end we have proposed a Foundation of 24 members, to be drawn from all areas of the Nation and from all walks of life. The Foundation, therefore, will not be composed entirely of scientists. Section 3a of S. 526 covering this point reads as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be men and women who are recognized leaders in the fields of sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and without regard to political, social, or religious factors; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation.

Let me emphasize the next sentence I am going to read, because this has been the subject of a great deal of discussion, and it is one of the most important features of the whole bill:

The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

Mr. President, the question has been raised frequently whether in setting up the Foundation there is danger of overlooking our Land Grant Colleges and our State-supported universities, and concentrating scientific research, in well-known institutions, for example, in the East. It has been the endeavor to provide definitely against that danger by incorporating in the bill a provision requesting the President to accept nominations from the Association of Land Grant Colleges and the National Association of State Universities. It is inconceivable that the President would not appoint representatives of those important educational groups to a Foundation of this size and this significance.

The membership would receive rotating appointments to insure continuity of guidance. It is important, Mr. President, that appointments to the Foundation would represent all areas of the Nation and all branches of scientific knowledge and educational institutions to insure against any concentration of this important field of research.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator is speaking of the membership of the Foundation, I note an amendment on page 2, line 7, where it is proposed to strike out the words "medical science." The amendment would strike from the list of those who may be appointed to the Foundation recognized leaders in medical science. I wondered why an amendment was offered which proposed to strike out those words?

Mr. SMITH. I recall that.

Mr. HILL. I ask the question particularly in view of the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has just offered on behalf of himself, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Florida, in connection with cancer research.

Mr. SMITH. I think it was felt that the words "leaders in the fields of the sciences, engineering, education, and public affairs" would be adequate; and as the bill proceeds the Senator will see it provides very specifically for a division of the medical sciences as part of the whole program. We felt it was sufficent to reflect that branch of science in the later set-up of the divisions.

Mr. HILL. The thought comes to my mind that the words "medical science" having been in the bill, if those words are now stricken therefrom, it might invite a result different from what the Senator has in mind, certainly a situation different from that which might have resulted if the words "medical science" had never been put into the bill. To say the least, I commend to the careful consideration of the Senator, if I may, particularly the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, on behalf of himself, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Florida, with the suggestion that, before the amendment is acted on by the Senate, the Senator carefully consider whether or not he now wishes to strike out those words.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield if I may first answer the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama. Even some medical friends of mine raised the question of why, in one sentence, we said "fundamental sciences," and then, in the next sentence, said "medical science," as though medical science was not a fundamental science. They took issue with it, saying we made a sort of technical distinction in sciences. I think it was to please the medical men, rather than for any other purpose, that the specific words were stricken out, relying on general science to cover the matter.

Mr. HILL. I notice the committee amendment would also delete the word "fundamental."

Mr. SMITH. That is true. It was in the interest of bringing all the different groups under the heading of "Sciences."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My attention was attracted to the same point raised by the Senator from Alabama. In my own mind, I reconcile the amendments to mean that the word "sciences" includes "medical science."

Mr. SMITH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TYDINGS. And therefore it was not necessary to make an enumeration of the branches and divisions.

Mr. SMITH. That was the reason.

Mr. TYDINGS. While I have the Senator's attention I would like to ask a question along another line. I suppose the safeguards against overlapping research or scientific study could not be written in the bill, but I assume it was the philosophy of the authors of the bill that the directors of the "academy," so to speak, would so allocate the scholarships and other work that overlapping would be reduced to the irreducible minimum. Am I correct about that?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, that is the purpose. There is a provision in the bill aimed to prevent overlapping, by bringing together all the research work of the Government. I shall come to that later. On page 15, line 12, the bill contains section 14 (a), under the heading "Interdepartmental Committee on Science":

> There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Committee on Science, to consist of the Director of the Foundation, as chairman, and the heads (or their designees) of such Government agencies engaged in or concerned with the support of scientific activity to a substantial degree as the President may from time to time determine. The interdepartmental committee shall meet whenever the chairman so determines, but not less than once a month.

Then, paragraph (b) of the same section outlines the field covered by the Interdepartmental Committee. In drafting the bill those provisions were framed to cover the point the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe I made my position clear. I assume, for example, some of the great universities or medical centers, to use a very apt case, may be engaged, let us say, in cancer research; and I assume the Federal Government will want to foster certain activities along the same line. I would assume the Board of Directors would be so selected and so widely chosen that they would, by management of the functions of the Government's part of the undertaking, so conduct its research as not to duplicate work that is proceeding under more or less private or semi-private auspices.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the whole purpose and spirit of the bill; and also it is the spirit of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio a few minutes ago, in collaboration with other Senators, to cover a special cancer commission and a special heart commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. I realize it is difficult to write language into the bill to prevent overlapping of the kind I have described, but I imagine, if the Board of Directors of the enterprise were wisely chosen, they would be sufficiently well informed in various fields to give it more or less such direction as would prevent overlapping.

Mr. SMITH. It is, of course, the purpose of the framers of the bill to prevent that kind of thing.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will not interrupt the Senator again, but so long as I am on my feet I wish to ask a question only for information and not by way of criticism. Has the Senator in mind how much of an initial appropriation could be efficiently used, assuming that the bill passes the Congress and is signed by the President.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that in my later remarks I shall present an estimate of the amount. Outside the cancer or heart needs, which may call for a separate appropriation, because we have now added them to the bill, we estimate that about $20,000,000 is needed at the present time to pick up the research that is going on and take care of the immediate prospects. We believe in starting in a small way—not trying to expand all over the place—and feeling our way by what might be called the trial and error method to ascertain the most effective method of advancing the purposes of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I imagine that a considerable proportion of the $20,000,000 would be spent through scholarships and fellowships in the various State and land-grant colleges and universities, and hospitals, and so forth, looking to the field of medicine to augment work which is already being undertaken there and to bring it to fruition at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SMITH. That is the purpose. I think our estimate called for about half the amount the first year to go into scholarships and fellowships and the various items to which the Senator from Maryland has referred.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Answering the inquiry of the Senator from Maryland about coordination of research, there is in the budget, as the Senator from New Jersey no doubt has stated in his speech, about $200,000,000 proposed to be appropriated for the Army for research work by the Army. It is supposed that a great deal of the money which is to be distributed to private institutions for research can be handled through the Foundation. Subsection (b) of section 14 provides that the Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall make such recommendations to the President * * * as in the opinion of the committee will serve in effectuating the objectives of this act and other legislation providing for Federal support of scientific research and scientific development.

If they make a recommendation to the President, for instance, that of the $200,000,000 or $250,000,000, $150,000,000 should be handled through the Foundation, it is presumed that the President will follow their proposal and instruct the Army to proceed in that way. As a matter of fact, I understand the Army is anxious to have that done; so there will be no difficulty about that. But in general the Interdepartmental Committee on Science ought to make such recommendations to the President, who supervises all this research in the last analysis, so that he can effectively direct a coordination that will prevent duplication.

Mr. SMITH. I might add that we are not only going to try and cover the overlapping, but also to fill the gaps. The purpose is to bring the whole thing under one umbrella, so to speak, in order that there may be a coordinated advance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In further answer to the Senator from Maryland, I think what I now wish to say will interest him. Recently I had occasion to go through the School of Public Health at Harvard University, and the same question was asked of an expert in one of the scientific laboratories there, that was asked by the Senator from Maryland this afternoon, and his answer was that where assistance was being given by the Federal Government to different problems of research, particularly in connection with public health, there was no overlapping. The Federal Government was doing an excellent job. Where the colleges themselves were engaged in investigation in scientific work there was perforce some overlapping, because they could not know what each one was doing, but that there was a very close correspondence between them, and particularly was that true where the Federal Government was concerned. I hope that

statement will be of interest to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, allow me one more observation.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the whole idea is new to us, but it seems to me that the Director who is hereafter to be appointed, or the Deputy Director provided for in the bill, after having broken down the scientific field into its different categories, would be very well advised if he would contact the colleges, the hospitals, and the universities, and catalog the different research programs being carried on in each. If that were done, it would present a pretty good picture of the research activities of the Nation in the laboratories, schools, and other places where experiments are being undertaken, and then it would be more easy to integrate, to find the gaps and the lapses and the overlapping, than it would be if there were no exact knowledge of such activities. I assume the Director would find out first what the situation was, and where there were lapses in the program, and would attempt to fill them up, and where there were overlappings he might even, without expending governmental money, call to the attention of the Foundation that the research program was a little lopsided and, as a sort of a Federal coordinator without authority to correct, help straighten it out.

Mr. SMITH. I can say to the Senator that I am advised that already some research is being done in that connection, and an attempt is being made to find out what is going on in all the colleges. Of course, the information ought to be gathered by the Foundation, as the Senator suggests.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the purpose of the bill which was passed last year was to do that very thing. One of the first projects undertaken by the Foundation would be to take a look around the country and see what was going on, particularly in the field of military science, because the Foundation proposed in the bill would take over Dr. Bush's work, which also concerns itself with military science, and that would be one of its first projects.

The Senator from Maryland well points out that at this time the University of Washington may be doing one thing and the University of Maryland may be doing another thing, and the Carnegie Institution still another, and they may not get together unless there is constant communication established between them. But one of the very first things that should be set up is a committee which would take a look-see at these matters. That is what is really needed first. That is one of the basic purposes of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has been very kind in yielding to me. Will he yield again?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to observe that this is a very commendable undertaking, and I think it is well for us to spend a little money on the construction side as well as give somewhat overgenerously to purposes for which we are called on from time to time to appropriate.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to scholarships.

Mr. SMITH. I hope to cover that point when I reach it in order.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to upset the logic or the pattern of the Senator's speech. He is going to take up that subject, is he?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. That is one of the most important things in the bill.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator also going to discuss the Interdepartmental Committee on Science?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that will be covered also.

Mr. HILL. I shall withhold any questions at this time. It may be that the Senator will anticipate my questions and answer them in his speech.

Mr. SMITH. I think I shall cover all the points before I finish my remarks, because I have tried to cover the whole bill. I was discussing the set-up of the Foundation and the scope of its operations. I desire to call attention to another provision of the bill, section 15 (h), which we incorporated after discussion with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who has been engaged in educational work for a long time and knows the field thoroughly, and who felt we ought not to leave a stone unturned to discover scientific talent wherever it might be. So we elaborated on this section to bring in certain points which I want to emphasize by reading section 15 (h):

In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research—

And by the way I should stop there for a moment to say that the Foundation itself is not going to engage in any scientific research. The Government is not going to operate any plants of its own. Contracts will be made with different institutions for carrying out the projects in connection with which it seems wise to pursue the research.

I return to section 15 (h):

SEC. 15. (h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The Foundation will be able to take a bird's-eye view of the entire country and determine the places where it is worth while for the Government, by subsidy or financial aid, to help in research projects. We want to make the coverage as broad as possible, to include individuals who show promise in the field of research. Later I shall come to the question of scholarships and fellowships.

The Foundation made up of 24 members is consistent with the broad national coverage desired and is aimed to provide adequate assurance for the distribution of research funds to all types of institutions.

Before we are through discussing some of the amendments, probably there will be suggestions made that we reduce the size of the Foundation; but I wish to say for the RECORD that we gave most careful thought to the size of the Foundation. We wanted to have the entire country represented. We wanted all sorts of educational institutions and other institutions represented so that no stone would be left unturned in discovering the sources of scientific advance.

It has been suggested that the Foundation be reduced to a small board, or to a single director. Those of us who drafted the legislation fundamentally disagree with that thought. We believe that the broad matters of policy should be taken care of by a Foundation of 24. We started with 60, reduced the number to 50, then 48, and finally to 24, as a workable figure, in line with executive appointments by the President on a board. The membership of the board would not be the same year in and year out, but would change every 2 years as the President made appointments.

The Foundation members meeting several times a year would decide policy and the most fruitful avenues of research and bring to the Foundation fresh points of views from their respective fields of endeavor.

Let me stress the nature of the Foundation's activities and the scope of its authorization. We are speaking now of fundamental or basic research. This is the field in which this Nation is deficient. No one has ever suggested that the United States is deficient in applied research. Given the basic ideas we have always been able to turn them into practical uses. But the storehouse of basic knowledge needs to be replenished; much of it has been destroyed in Europe.

A couple of months ago, in company with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I had a most interesting meeting with 25 of the leading research men of important industries in this area of the country. They pointed out that their speciality was applied research. They said, "We do not need any help in applied research. We can take care of applied research, which is the practical end of scientific research. We need research in basic science." They said that we would have the wholehearted support of industry. Industry can take care of its own applied research, but we have the wholehearted support of industry in finding budding scientists who discover the ideas behind all the great advances in science. That is the important feature of the bill, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly or too often.

The powers and duties set forth in S. 526 are as follows:

1. To develop and to encourage the pursuit of a national policy for scientific research and scientific education;

2. To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research;

3. To initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

4. To grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

5. To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries; and

6. To correlate the Foundation's scientific research program with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups. (Excerpts from S. 526, pp. 3-4.)

At that point we proposed to add a seventh paragraph, incorporating the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and their colleagues who are interested in the campaign for research in cancer and heart disease.

The Foundation would look to a nine-man part-time executive committee elected biennially from its own membership to exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. In actual practice they would probably meet once a month, but they would be on constant call. So we are not denying the concentration of authority in a smaller board. However, we feel that the broad Foundation is the proper way to organize the activity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Apropos of the establishment of the executive committee of nine members to which the Senator has just adverted, I was a little disturbed about the mandatory language applying to the executive committee, lest it might be construed as meaning that the Foundation could not act directly, but that the whole executive power of the Foundation would be vested in the executive committee. Is that the intention of the able Senator?

Mr. SMITH. It was certainly not the intention. The thought was that part-time experts from all over the United States, meeting probably once or twice a year, should determine general matters of policy. I think the Senator from Florida would agree with me that a smaller body would be required for the function of carrying out the policies decided upon. But it is certainly not the intention to do what the Senator suggests.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 5, beginning in line 3, the language is as follows:

The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation.

I was wondering if it would not be better, if the Senator intends that they may exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation, to use the word "may" rather than "shall," so as to avoid any appearance that the Foundation must act through the executive committee, and be denied the power of acting directly.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator makes a good suggestion. It is not the intention to take any powers from the Foundation. I am not sure whether we should say "may exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation" or "shall, under the direction of the Foundation," or "under authorization of the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation."

Mr. PEPPER. We might say "may be authorized by the Foundation to exercise its powers and duties," or something to that effect.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator like to make a specific suggestion? I suggest that the Senator prepare appropriate language which would be adequate. We cannot do it in the middle of a speech. I shall be glad to accept his amendment. I think the point is very well taken.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is a simple matter. Why should we not say "which shall, when authorized, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation"?

Mr. SMITH. We could say "when authorized by the Foundation."

Mr. PEPPER. We might say "which shall, when authorized by the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation."

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer the amendment for immediate consideration?

Mr. PEPPER. I offer the amendment for consideration.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that the committee amendments have not yet been considered, and that therefore the amendment would be out of order.

Mr. PEPPER. It is a minor matter. Would it be within the proprieties to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment can be considered by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not object, because I think it is a good suggestion, particularly when I read the language in lines 19, 20, and 21, on page 4:

The members of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less frequently than once each year.

The thought in the bill seems to be that the Foundation group of 24 shall not meet very often—perhaps not more than once a year. If that be the case, it seems to me that the Senator's amendment is proper. There must be some committee, such as the bill contemplates, to carry out the policies of the Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator from Florida please state the amendment in full?

Mr. PEPPER. The suggested amendment is on page 5, line 5 after the word "shall", to insert the words "when authorized by the Foundation."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would raise this question to the Senator from Florida. If we change the word "shall" to "may", it may raise questions with the Budget Director and with the financial authorities of the Government. Assume they have to make quickly a decision to go into a side line of scientific investigation, and the Foundation has authorized them to take the main line and not the side line, and the Foundation can be gotten together only once a year. It might raise a question of appropriation. It seems to me that these responsibilities are protected by the fact that they must render a report once a year, and the Foundation can be called together more than once a year if it is absolutely necessary to do so. I would be inclined to the word "shall" rather than the word "may."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Massachusetts that the only trouble about it is that, taking the language literally, it would imply that the Foundation cannot act except through the executive committee. I am sure we do not mean to deny the principal the power to act except by the authority of the agent. That is the reason I raise the point, either changing the word "shall" to "may" or adding such words as I have suggested, "when authorized by the Foundation."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I merely wanted to inquire whether it would not be better to dispose of the committee amendments before amendments from the floor are considered and acted upon.

Mr. SMITH. I will say in answer to the Senator from Maine that that point was raised a minute ago, and I thought it was a minor amendment which might be taken care of by unanimous consent. That was the only point in doing it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida insist upon the consideration of his amendment at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I defer in order to hear a statement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I simply want to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the Foundation itself could delegate any authority it wished to delegate to the executive committee to be exercised in the absence of the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That would be my construction of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it appears that the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] may not be well founded. The Foundation could delegate its authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should assume so, if there were a broad authorization. That is what the Senator from Florida implied.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. President, I shall merely say that this is rather a small amendment, and I thought it might be taken care of by unanimous consent on this exact point.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the amendment, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Florida whether or not the insertion which he suggests will follow the word "shall"?

Mr. PEPPER. In response to the Chair's inquiry, it would follow the word "shall." The words inserted would be "when authorized by the Foundation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes a comma would likewise be inserted?

Mr. PEPPER. It would be posterior to the comma in line 5 and anterior to the comma in line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall continue.

I have said the Foundation would look to a nine-man part-time executive committee elected biennially from its own membership to exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. In actual practice they would probably meet once a month.

Decisions of scientific research procedure and policy are not daily problems similar to the conduct of a Government department.

I think that is all the more reason why the point raised by the Senator from Florida relative to the delegation of authority to a smaller committee to meet when the Foundation is not in session is relevant.

It is our feeling, Mr. President, that the Foundation should start in a modest manner, taking over the remnants of the Office of Scientific Research and Development—approximately 50 people—and proceed from there to explore the basic research needs in the respective fields, within their jurisdiction. In this work they would have the benefit of the studies now being made by the President's Research Board who are surveying the research program of the Nation and plan to submit their report before they dissolve on June 30, 1947.

I regret that the Senator from Maryland has left the Chamber, because I think that answers the point which he raised, that one of the first duties of this new Foundation would be to make a complete survey of what is being done in all the educational institutions of the country.

We are not unmindful, Mr. President, of the executive and congressional prerogatives to review the conduct of agencies under their jurisdiction. The Foundation is required to render annual reports to the President and to the Congress. Its budgetary requirements will be under congressional control and subject to review by the Bureau of the Budget.

In order to provide for the day-to-day problems confronting the Foundation, the bill provides for a chief executive officer known as the Director.

The original provision for the employment of a director I shall now read, and I call the attention of the Senate to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] with regard to the appointment of the Director. The way in which the provision originally read was as follows:

> The powers and duties of the Director shall be prescribed by the executive committee and shall be exercised and performed by him under the supervision of such committee. The Director shall be appointed by the executive committee, with the approval of a majority of the members of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

The amendment simply provides that the Director shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; but outside of that, he is still subject to the control of the Foundation and the executive committee.

Mr. President, I have spoken at length on the type of agency we are considering and its organization structure because our hope of success lies in creating a foundation directed by the greatest minds we can urge to serve and giving to them our complete confidence, free from any political pressure.

We have achieved, by considerable concessions at all points to present a bill free from the political bias and enjoying bipartisan support. It is my hope, Mr. President, that as my colleagues proceed with the discussion of the various features of the bill the Senate will appreciate our efforts to keep politics out of the National Science Foundation by placing the appointment of the Foundation members in the hands of the President subject to confirmation by the Senate. It is our hope that the appointments to this Foundation will not be embroiled in bitter debate, and it is for that purpose that power has been placed in a broad board, representative of all areas of the Nation. Since the Foundation will not operate research facilities itself, but will contract with existing institutions, the broad membership of the Foundation accomplishes still another purpose in that it insures representation on the board of all types of educational and research facilities.

That is where the work is to be carried on.

Mr. President, let me now consider another matter which has been the subject of a great deal of debate with regard to the handling of the allocation of the research fund.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is emphasizing the fact that the duties imposed by the Foundation are not to be carried on by the Foundation itself, but established institutions, universities, and so forth, which may be selected to do the work. May I ask the Senator if the Foundation itself under this bill could undertake to do such work directly?

Mr. SMITH. I can answer the Senator in the negative. It is not proposed that the Foundation shall carry on any research on its own account at all.

Mr. GEORGE. But would it have the power to do so if it should elect to do so?

Mr. SMITH. No; it would not have the power to do so. I think there is a provision in the bill itself—I shall have to look it up—which distinctly negatives the carrying on of research work by the Foundation itself, even in pilot plants.

Mr. GEORGE. I am interested in the statement the distinguished Senator has made, because I think that it would be very bad policy for the Foundation itself to undertake such work.

Mr. SMITH. I call the distinguished Senator's attention to page 17, line 5, under the heading "General provisions," paragraph (c):

> The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

Mr. GEORGE. In other words, it is to have no physical properties or facilities, and it is to do all its work by contract. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; it is to do all of its work by contract.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, there are governmental departments which carry on research, but that is a different matter. This Foundation will not carry on research on its own acount.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I understand.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in further reference to the matter of the allocation of funds or grants, I shall quote from page 2 of the committee report on the bill, under the heading "The allocation of grants." Let me state that we had under consideration two different positions. One was based on the theory that these funds should be distributed on the basis of population, on the expectation that if the funds were allocated on that basis, the desired results would be obtained. The other view was the contrary policy, which the sponsors of the bill adopted, inasmuch as the purpose of the bill is to support and give aid to research projects, wherever they may be best organized.

I now quote from page 2 of the committee's report on the bill:

> The allocation of grants: S. 525 (the alternate bill) provided for the allocation of grants-in-aid to research on a Nation-wide basis, allocating a percentage of the total amount appropriated for this purpose to each one of the States on the basis of population. After full discussion the committee felt that this would not be a proper basis for the allocation of grants inasmuch as such allocation would seem to be inconsistent with the

primary purpose of the bill. The bill is not aimed to subsidize educational and research institutions throughout the country, but rather to support specific fields. The committee felt, therefore, that a competent board, such as the Foundation will be, should place research contracts wherever facilities and manpower offered the greatest hope of success.

Under this theory S. 526, as amended, instructs the Foundation to utilize appropriations for—

I have read this before, but I repeat it now:

1. Research by organizations, agencies, and institutions qualified to handle the selected project;

2. Strengthen the research staffs of organizations, and particularly nonprofit organizations;

3. Aid institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance further research; and

4. Encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The committee considered that adequate representation of the various scientific groups throughout the country on the Foundation was a more satisfactory method of assuring the proper allocation of grants, and consequently amended S. 526 to include nominations for the Foundation from the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and other scientific or educational organizations. (See sec. 3 (a); excerpt from Rept. No. 78 of S. 526.)

Mr. President, let me say that this question has been debated more fully than any other subject. I mention it now because I am aware that amendments will be offered providing for the other procedure; namely, to have the funds distributed on the basis of population. I can only say that I am firmly convinced, from my study of this subject, my experience in educational work, and as a result of my conversations with scientific men, that to allocate the grants or funds on the basis of population would be an incorrect approach. I am aware that there is a difference of opinion on this issue, but I submit that the committee's conclusions are sound and should receive the support of the Senate.

Mr. President, a feature of the program is the provision for divisional distribution of responsibility. In order to more effectively concentrate scientific knowledge in its various fields, five divisions have been established within the Foundation:

1. A Division of Medical Research, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the medical sciences.

Here, again, I refer to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and other Senators who collaborated with the Senator from Ohio in regard to an amendment providing for setting up in the Foundation, under a special heading, a Commission for the purpose of carrying on research into cancer and heart diseases.

2. A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences.

3. A Division of Biological Sciences which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the biological sciences.

4. A Division of National Defense, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research on military and naval matters.

5. A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences. (Excerpt from S. 526, pp. 6-7.)

These divisions are to be surrounded by divisional committees appointed by the Foundation. Members of the divisional committees will serve part time or whenever committee meetings are called, and will be experts in their respective fields. In this manner the Foundation can start modestly, without excessive overhead. The divisional committee members will be the real working-level scientists, and it is at this level that their counterparts in Government research agencies will sit with them in planning the method of attack on specific research problems to be recommended to the Foundation.

The Division of National Defense has been designed to meet the needs of the War and Navy Departments, who recommended the specific language of the bill covering the Division of National Defense.

Recognizing that today we cannot foresee the future, provision has been made that the Foundation may create such other divisions as it may from time to time deem necessary, thus providing long-term flexibility to the Foundation's divisional structure.

It is appropriate, Mr. President, I feel, at this point to indicate the attitudes of our Military and Naval Establishments toward this legislation, for I have frequently been asked whether the military and naval authorities approve of this National Science Foundation set-up.

Secretary of War Patterson, in his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings, said:

I sincerely believe that the National Science Foundation would be the focal point for replenishing this reservoir of knowledge and skills, and for the requisite collection and dissemination of scientific information.

The War Department believes that a National Science Foundation is vitally needed—the sooner the better. It needs an official agency of science with which to maintain its scientific contacts.

The need for this contact has been made more evident by the passing of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the National Defense Research Committee, which supplied these contacts during the war.

The performance of this task by joint activity by science and the military is not the only reason why the War Department wants the National Science Foundation. There should be a clearing house for Federal research contracts, in order that the War Department, which is just one of many Federal agencies with a research and development program, may know whether work is already being undertaken elsewhere in a field which it desires to explore. It needs to know the best place to go for its pure research work, as well as the best-qualified people to do the job it has in mind.

And, finally, there has to be some sort of mobilization plan for science, not only in the event of an emergency, but to carry on the necessary research work in peacetime. The War Department is not the agency to prepare such a plan; yet, in the absence of such agencies, it has felt compelled to go ahead with planning in this field in cooperation with the National Research Council and other civilian agencies that are concerned with the plans for scientific manpower. A National Science Foundation could do all of these things with propriety.

The War Department does not desire to comment on any details of the provisions of the bills before Congress, but I cannot help but express my opinion that these bills should not in any way interfere with the existing patent laws. If there is to be legislation on the patent question, it should be entirely apart from the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

I wish also to repeat my hearty support for the establishment of a National Science Foundation to obtain the objectives outlined in the measures pending before your committee.

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal made the following statement in the same hearings:

The Navy expects to support legislation providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

Only a national foundation, such as is envisaged by the bills before your committee, will be able to bring together the necessary personnel, command the necessary resources, and possess the necessary knowledge, to do this job as it must be done.

In addition, the Navy is playing an active part in the Joint Research and Development Board which, under its civilian chairman, Dr. Vannevar Bush, provides the machinery for formulating a long-range research program for both the Army and Navy, serves to coordinate the research activities of the two services, and furnishes an over-all evaluation of the military and naval research programs.

Mr. President, with the reading of those quotations I have finished the references to the War and Navy Departments which I wanted to put into the RECORD, as I said before, because I have been asked many times whether or not the War and Navy Departments were in favor of the bill. I have talked this matter over with both Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal in some detail, and they are eager to have us pass the pending measure, because it will tend to coordinate all the scientific activities, both for war purposes and peace purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might also point out that the basic principles of the bill, and of most of its provisions, are somewhat consistent with their position a year ago, when they also highly endorsed the bill.

The Senator will recall that we had before us some 150 witnesses from all walks of life—and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], whom I see present, participated in the hearing—captains of industry, representatives of labor, Nobel Prize winners, and others, and of all the 150 only 1 objected, and he only to some provisions of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comments.

I now wish to discuss another subject which has been a debatable one in the field covered by the bill, namely, whether we should include in the National Science Foundation a division of social sciences. I wish to address myself to that point in a moment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from New Jersey, but due to a previous engagement it is necessary that I absent myself from the sessions of the Senate tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that before he leaves, the Senator from New Mexico will express his approval of the very worthy bill we are considering, so that he may be on record.

Mr. SMITH. That is a fine suggestion from the Senator from Washington. I trust we may hear from the Senator from New Mexico on that subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am very happy to express my complete and enthusiastic support of the pending measure. If it shall come to a vote tomorrow, I shall regret not having the privilege of voting for it. I want these remarks to stand in the RECORD to show that if I were present I would vote for the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. It will be very helpful to have the country know that the Senator from New Mexico favors the measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator intend to discuss the provision for compensation of the members of the Foundation?

Mr. SMITH. I do not have that in my prepared discussion, but we can discuss it very readily.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator a question in regard to subdivision (d), on page 17, which provides compensation at the rate of $50 a day for members of the Foundation, for members of each divisional committee, and of each advisory committee, appointed by the Foundation. I think that is proper compensation, providing it is to be for a limited time or limited in aggregate amount. I was wondering whether there should not be a limitation. It might well be that some of these persons would draw $50 a day for most of the year.

Mr. SMITH. Of course that was not the intention. This is the way it reads:

> The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee and of each advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

It is difficult to say for how long a time a man would be engaged. We felt that we would have to offer men of this caliber adequate compensation for services they would be rendering, and it would probably be rendered for a very short time, because they would be in a more or less advisory capacity.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that it is not the intention to provide for a long engagement, but if it should happen to continue for a long time, then the Foundation would find itself in the position of having to pay a very substantial sum for the services of members of the Foundation and members of the different committees.

In subdivision (e) it is provided:

> Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees or of any advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

Was it the intent of the sponsors that they would take leave of absence, and then go on the Government roll at $50 a day and $10 per diem in event they were called in for advisory purposes?

Mr. SMITH. No. It says "they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their service in such other offices." A man receiving a salary from the Government and called in would not be paid compensation.

Mr. McFARLAND. All they would have to do in order to get this pay would be to go off the pay roll in their regular capacity for the length of time they were called into the Government service?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless they were very valuable scientific people, the Foundation would not ask them to go off the pay roll. No one will get more than he deserves. As a matter of fact, most of the members of the Foundation and of the advisory committee will probably be losing money by coming here to render for the people of the country the service contemplated by the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad of the comment of the Senator from Washington. In drafting the bill we did not see how we could set a limit, because this employment applies to men who are called away from their headquarters, where they may be at special work for the Government, and we did not think they would be men of the caliber who would try to put anything over on the Government.

Mr. McFARLAND. That undoubtedly is true of the great majority, and I take it that would be true, but as to some of them their services might well be required for a good portion of time. Generally, as a matter of sound fiscal policy, some limitation is fixed in legislation of this character or some limit of time fixed as to the period for which a man might draw $50 a day.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There might conceivably be a very eminent scientist, or the president of a great educational institution, whom the Foundation might want to keep around for a long time at $50 a day. He might well be worth that. I know the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that if anyone does not justify such payment, the Committee on Appropriations will take care of the matter very quickly when the Foundation comes before it for money.

Mr. McFARLAND. I might say that there have been examples of considerable sums of money paid out to certain employees of the departments in situations similar to this and the Committee on Appropriations has not been able to do anything about it. The time to correct such a situation is when we write legislation.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate the comment by the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to add that it is very difficult, as the Senator from New Jersey knows. It might be stated that no such member of the advisory committee shall draw more than $5,000 or $6,000 per annum, yet if he drew the whole of it for 365 days a year, he would probably be well worth it by reason of his contribution to the scientific knowledge of the country. He would be the kind of man needed. By the same token, it might be limited to a certain amount, and if the Foundation or the advisory committee needed an eminent American to serve longer than the basic period, he might do so at a personal sacrifice to himself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I had no such limitation in mind as $5,000, but I would say that perhaps there should be a limitation of $12,000 or $15,000. There should be some limitation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a man devoted 365 days to this work.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to help clarify the record a little. I heartily agree with the Senator from Washington as to the ability of scientific personnel, but I do not want the misapprehension to creep into the record that deans of scientific colleges are highly paid men. Most of them are distinctly underpaid. The reason they are holding their jobs is that they are more interested in their work than they are in the remuneration. I take my hat off to them. They are spendid gentlemen. But please let us not entertain the idea that the heads of colleges are fabulously paid men. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from New Jersey will admit that, considering their qualifications, college teachers are about the lowest-paid group among the income earners.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with everything the Senator from West Virginia has said. There is no question that the men we are calling on for this work are, in the proportion to the value of their services to the country, being paid the least of any group. I think I am correct in saying that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the Senator from New Jersey has been underpaid, himself, on several occasions.

Mr. SMITH. I am not now speaking personally.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not very good at figures, but I have been informed by the assistant to the able Senator from West Virginia that, if a man were kept on the job for 365 days, his compensation would amount to $18,250, which would be all that he would receive under the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. The maximum amount a man would get if he served every day in the year would be about $18,25.. If anybody should begrudge that, for the kind of work he would give, I should feel very sorry for such a person. I do not think the provision possibly could be abused.

Now, Mr. President, if I may continue the discussion of divisional distribution, we had before us the question of whether or not the social sciences should be included. On this point, I want to quote again from the committee report, because his is a matter that has been brought up and discussed at great length, and I have had the privilege of discussing it both with people who are for the inclusion and those who are against the inclusion; and I have discussed it with the group here in Washington who represent the social sciences. I quote from the committee report:

> Your committee has rejected the proposal that the social sciences be included as a division of the Foundation at this time. It is cognizant of the impact of fundamental science on modern society and of the need for social-science studies. It feels, however, that the disciplines of the social sciences are not at this time sufficiently well defined to include them in a foundation designed to treat with the basic sciences. Rather, it is the opinion of the committee that the broad, collective wisdom of the Board must be relied upon to determine the time and to what extent changes shall be made in the divisional status of the Foundation; section 7 (2) provides "and such other divisions as the Foundation may from time to time, deem necessary."

That is the section which provides for the divisions, and we say:

> Time may change the relative importance of the divisions. The foregoing clause permits the necessary flexibility and leaves to the wisdom of the Board the extent to which the social-sciences disciplines are to be explored. It may thus be said that S. 526, as amended, denies mandatory provision for the social sciences, but establishes the right of the Foundation to explore the needs of the social sciences and to determine the extent, if any, that studies in this field are necessary to support work in the other divisions.

In other words, our whole emphasis is on the natural sciences, but we have left the door open for this Foundation to say if there is some area of the social sciences that should be explored, in considering the whole project that the program represents. I feel, Mr. President, that that is the correct answer to the question. Frankly, with respect to the social sciences—and I am a social science man myself; I was engaged in the social-science field, and no one values it more highly than I do—in my judgment this particular bill, which contemplates research in basic sciences and medical science, should not undertake to cover the vast field which is embraced in the term "social sciences."

During the debates in the Seventy-ninth Congress there was wide difference of opinion as to how best to deal with the patent issue. I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that patents were not considered to be controversial in this revised legislation by the committee. This is largely because it is now clearly recognized that the Foundation will deal with basic research primarily and will give only a minimum of attention to applied research.

It was the unanimous opinion of the committee, and the President of the United States concurs in this view, because I discussed it with him personally, that the Foundation should abide by the existing patent practices of the Government until such time as Congress revises them.

Basic or fundamental research seldom develops patentable processes. Where this does occur, and in each contract relating to scientific research the Foundation is required to make provision before the contract is signed governing the disposition of inventions produced in the course of this research in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the contractor.

We all recognize that in the field of applied science the patent laws are important, but we are trying in this bill to stay away from applied science and limit the work of the Foundation and the subsidies provided to basic scientific research. In that area, we do not feel special patent provisions are necessary. But we have an escape clause under which when a contract is made the relative interests of the Government and the individual are taken care of.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The question arising in my mind is, Does the bill, in the opinion of the Senator, eliminate applied research?

Mr. SMITH. The bill did not eliminate applied research entirely, as obviously it could not. There are borderline cases. But we did eliminate the words "applied research" and "research development" where they appeared in earlier drafts of the bill and of course military and naval research, which the bill provides for, includes applied research.

Mr. KILGORE. May I inquire of the Senator if it is not also true that the field of medical and health research offers a wide field for applied research? I call to the attention of the Senator, for instance, the cancer research that is being conducted, in which there may be tremendous advances, possibly the discovery of important inventions which may be patentable, as for instance, the process by which penicillin is now made, the patent on which gives a complete world-wide monopoly to one company. Is there not a possibility that that may likewise occur in the field of applied research? Is there not the danger that has been experienced in the past, of the patenting of the results of military research, to such an extent that inventions, intended for the defense of this country, find their way abroad almost before our own pilot models can be developed? That is one thing about which I am worried in connection with a bill of this kind.

Mr. SMITH. Answering the distinguished Senator, my feeling is that the Foundation has to be on the lookout for those things, of course, in making its contracts and developing its whole program; but I do not feel that a bill which provides for basic research in fundamental science is the place to write patent laws. If the patent situation has not been regularly covered in our patent laws, that is the place to tackle that question, and not under this bill. I feel very strongly on that subject. So far as the other proponents of the bill and myself are concerned, we feel that the way we have dealt with it is the right way. I respect the views of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, but I respectfully differ with him when he thinks we should write into this bill fundamental patent laws. They should go in the patent laws of the country, and not in a fundmental scientific research bill. That is the feeling of the committee, which I submit to the Senate for consideration.

Let us consider the relationship to other governmental agencies engaged in research. I touched on this before, but I shall follow my text, to have the story complete. A very considerable amount of research, mostly in the applied field, is now being conducted by various Government agencies. It is true that we have applied science in our Government agencies.

An Interdepartmental Committee on Science is to be established within the Foundation, consisting of the Director as chairman, and representatives of interested Government agencies. This committee will survey scientific research and development activities within their agencies and make recommendations to the President concerning these activities.

The bill itself spells out the relationship of the Foundation to existing Government agencies in section 15 (i), which reads as follows:

> (i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing, and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to engage in scientific research or scientific development.

We want to make it perfectly clear that we are not setting aside any work which is now being conducted. Our work is to be supplemental to the existing working of the Government agencies with which we have this intergovernmental relationship.

Another important matter is cooperation with scientific research in other countries.

There have been many regrettable instances where scientists in this country have been unable to participate in meetings and studies of their scientific groups in other countries. I have in mind, Mr. President, a specific case within my own State of New Jersey. Prof. Murray Wax-

man, Rutgers, discoverer of streptomycin, had insufficient funds to go to an international medical conference.

Modest provision has been made for the Foundation to cooperate in international scientific research activities. The approval of the President and Secretary of State are, of course, required where research outside the United States is to be undertaken. Examples of this would be certain weather and oceanographic studies, fungus and tropical disease research.

I now come, Mr. President, to one of the most important features of the entire bill. This feature deserves our very earnest attention, because it has been the subject of a great deal of discussion with the educators throughout the country. I refer to the scholarship and fellowship provision of the bill. It reaches out into every section of the United States in search of the inquiring investigative mind. That is the great quest in any country. Other countries of the world have been screening their young men and women to find this type of mind, and we are faced with the same problem.

It is useless, Mr. President, to consider ways and means of spending money for research unless first-rate men and women are available to do the work. It is the trained minds that count. Dollars alone, for example, however great in number, will not find the cure for cancer. It is limited by the number of competent men and women available to undertake the task.

Mr. President, the provision for scholarships and fellowships is part and parcel of the whole concept of the Foundation. It is designed to provide the seed corn for our national future. The GI scholastic program and the Holloway plan of the Navy are steps in this direction. The officers of the line they develop are no more effective than the weapons science provides for them to use.

Perhaps the greatest authority on this subject is Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University and former chairman of the National Defense Research Committee. Let me quote from a portion of his testimony on this bill given before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 7, 1947. Dr. Conant says in this connection, and I quote from him because it is important to bear in mind what he has to say in connection with this important feature of the bill:

> In all the discussion about research that goes on in these days an obvious fact is sometimes overlooked; namely, that it is men that count. And today we do not have the scientific manpower requisite for the job that lies ahead.

I can say there, Mr. President, that in talking with my former colleagues in Princeton University I find that they are alarmed at the lack of scientific manpower which was lost because this generation of young men was forced to take part in the war and did not get back into the scientific field.

> The bottleneck of our scientific advance is essentially a manpower shortage, and unless something is done about it the bottleneck will be more constricted a decade hence. Now, let no one imagine that, like some of the manpower shortages in the war, this can be cured by mobilizing and training for a short time the first people who come to hand.

If an emergency arises we cannot pick men up for this kind of work.

> Scientific and technical advances depend on quality as well as on quantity or, to put it another way, on the quantity of exceptional men. These men have to be located when they are young and then given a long and expensive scientific education. If the proposals before you become law and Congress appropriates the money, we will see a flowering of scientific work in this country the like of which the world has never seen before. For only in this Nation where universal education reaches to the high-school level is it possible to locate the hidden reservoir of talent which, if tapped, can enrich our life and that of all mankind.
>
> The bill before you—

Referring to the bill now being considered by the Senate—

> provides for a long-term plan. The measures proposed would have been desirable even if there had been no war and no consequent deficit in our scientific and technical manpower. To the extent that we fail to cure this deficit in the next few years by proper governmental action, to that extent a federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is even more essential
>
> The arguments in favor of Congress providing for such a program and making adequate annual appropriations can be summarized as follows:
>
> 1. The welfare of a free society in an industrial age depends on a continuous advance of science and the application of the new knowledge to useful ends.
>
> 2. Both the advance of science and the application of science to industry, to medicine, and to agriculture depends on the quality and quantity of scientists and engineers available in a nation.
>
> 3. The supply of men depends on the number trained and the innate ability of those who undertake the special training.
>
> 4. The scientific professions in question require a long and expensive education beyond high school.
>
> 5. This education is of such a nature that it can be given at only a relatively few centers in every State.
>
> 6. Therefore, unless a student lives in one of these centers, his professional training must be costly, for he must pay for room and board away from home as well as other expenses.
>
> 7. The consequent financial barrier now prevents many boys and girls of high ability from going on with an advanced education. Much talent is lost to the Nation by this educational waste.
>
> 8. To right the balance, a federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is required.
>
> Such is the argument in a few words in terms of the peaceful development of the country. When we turn to consider the possible contingency of war and measures for national defense, the argument for finding and developing scientific talent is even stronger. There is no longer any argument about the role of science in a defense program. If we are to remain strong from a military standpoint, as I believe we must until international agreement provides a reasonable plan of disarmament, our need for scientists is as great as our need for Army and Navy officers.
>
> A relatively few men of great ability, imagination, daring, and with the proper training as officers of the armed forces have more than once in history determined the fate of nations. A relatively few men of great scientific ability and imagination, and thoroughly trained, can play a part in building the military strength of this Nation in the next decade to a degree that can hardly be imagined by those who are not close to the research and development program of the Army and the Navy.

In connection with the same matter of the need for trained personnel, Dr. Vannevar Bush in his important book above referred to, Science, the Endless Frontier—which is on the desks of all Senators—gives startling evidence of why we must have financial aid if we are to keep our sources of supply constantly flowing. He points out dramatically how few of those who start in the elementary school actually survive to do advance work. Taking one of his illustrations and using 1,000 elementary school, fifth-grade students starting in 1930 and 1931, he shows year by year the fall-off until finally in 1938 the graduates from high school are only 417 and the graduates from college following high school in 1942 are only 72.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without reading, to place in the RECORD at this point the figures for elementary schools, high schools, and colleges.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Elementary school:	
Fifth grade, 1930-31	1,000
Sixth grade	943
Seventh grade	872
Eighth grade	824
High school:	
First year	770
Second year	652
Third year	529
Fourth year	463
Graduates, 1938	417
College:	
First year	146
Graduates, 1942	72

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, undoubtedly there are many reasons why boys and girls drop out of school, but I think we are all agreed that financial consideration plays a most important part. Certainly this is true of those who ultimately fail to get to college. To the extent that family finances are a determining factor, potential professional talent is lost to the Nation. This is one of the evils we are trying to correct by the scholarship and fellowship provisions of the bill.

This subject is covered in section 9 of the bill which I quote at this point in order to emphasize its importance.

This is the scholarship and fellowship provision:

> SEC. 9. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to

the applicants in such a manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

I emphasize the last clause especially—

The Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

What we are seeking in this bill is to make the search for scientific talent widespread, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Canadian border to the Mexican border.

I do not need to burden my colleagues further with data supporting the need to restore our scientific manpower so sadly depleted by the war. I am advised that Russia today has five times as many students in technical schools as we have in similar training in the United States. Mass attack of scientific problems may not of course guarantee solution, but it increases the probability of success, and with reasonable administration of the program we should find our way to the right formulæ for selecting these younger students of scientific promise.

Mr. President, in summing up my presentation of this case for a National Science Foundation, let me point out again that we propose a 24-man part-time board appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I emphasize that in this board will be centered all the responsibility for the development of policy. This board in turn will elect a 9-man executive committee which will exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation and which committee will be constantly functioning. A full-time director nominated by the executive committee will administer the policies laid down by the Foundation.

As I pointed out a little while ago, under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Director will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

When the Foundation is set up, it will take over the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, together with their respective staffs.

As I stated above, there will be five divisions within the Foundation and corresponding divisional committees. All these men will be part-time employees of the Foundation representing the most eminent authorities in their respective fields. Their part-time services and their knowledge will be given to the Nation from the institutions and laboratories where they are now engaged, and their work for the Foundation will not require them to give up their present activities.

The work of the Foundation naturally falls into two main fields: First, developing basic research; and second, training men and women in the fields of basic research.

The Foundation will not itself operate laboratories, but will contract with existing research facilities and encourage by contract the establishment of facilities throughout the country where they do not exist.

The Foundation through its special division for that purpose will develop a scholarship and fellowship program through which it will discover the outstanding talent in the country to be brought into the fields of higher research.

In this proposal and this new legislation we have a new venture in a really untried and unknown field. Because of its being a new field we have simplified the bill as far as we could, and have drawn its provisions with the greatest care and after a large amount of study and consultation with experts all over the United States.

It is my own judgment and that of my colleagues and the scientific people with whom we have conferred in this matter that we should start the Foundation in a modest "trial and error" way. We are aware that any large expenditure of money in the early stages of the development of this work might easily be wasted, and therefore we believe that the step-by-step method of expanding the work is the one to follow.

No appropriation is mentioned in the bill because it is felt that the Foundation itself as part of the executive branch of the Government should year by year present its program to the Congress and should ask for its annual appropriation. We figure that a modest start can be made, based on existing research activities, for about $20,000,000.

When one considers the possibilities of this Foundation, the modest estimate of $20,000,000 is very impressive to me. In later years it will expand, but that is the estimate at the moment. With the addition of cancer and heart research provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], special provision would have to be made in those fields, in addition to the $20,000,000.

With this explanation of the bill and its principal features, and the controversial issues that have been cleared up by discussion and exchange of views, I am happy, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, to submit the bill to the Senate with the earnest hope that it will be passed promptly by both Senate and House as the National Science Foundation Act of 1947.

Mr. President, I request that the Senate proceed to consider immediately the amendments reported by the committee. I think those amendments should be disposed of so that the bill may be before the Senate for consideration with the amendments. If it is proper, at this time I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, under those circumstances, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am not asking to have the bill passed now.

Mr. KILGORE. I feel that more Senators should be present during the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Perhaps it might be well to take a recess at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for a moment to make a suggestion?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator will not withhold his request until what little I have to say about this subject can be said. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] desires to speak for 5 or 10 minutes on another subject. Then we can see whether we want to continue with the consideration of the committee amendments, and we can then call for a quorum. I dislike to call Senators into the Chamber to listen to informal discussion.

Mr. SMITH. I will withhold my request.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to address myself this evening to the pending measure; but in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that the majority leader would like to have an executive session held today, and the further fact that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] wish to address the Senate, I shall not address the Senate at this time. However, before I relinquish the floor I ask unanimous consent that at the beginning of the legislative session tomorrow, I may have the floor so as to proceed to address myself to this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war: agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 14, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or

quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

NEED FOR REVIEW OF THE FOREIGN COMMERCIAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board, and to vest additional authority in the Board; and I shall ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I shall speak briefly to the point, under the heading "Need for review of the foreign commercial policy of the United States." I almost apologize for addressing myself to so mundane a subject, after our indulgence in foreign loans and in scientific abstractions, but I think we must continue to eat in this country, and I shall make no apologies for diverting the attention of Senators remaining in the Chamber for a short time to the very practical question of how we are to maintain an economy which will make it possible for us to carry out both our foreign advances for relief and also the scientific research which we consider so important. So I address myself to our trade relations.

Many changes have occurred in our trade relations with foreign countries since the time when we ceased to be a colony of England. At first the changes took place slowly and we were able to analyze and meet each of them as they occurred. More recently the changes have been more numerous and the solutions less well thought out. The war has made it difficult to appraise the cause and effect of these changes. Now that the war is over the time for review is at hand. We must make this review a thorough one, and when the facts are all before us we must, if necessary, readjust our thinking in the light of present-day developments and our plans for the future of this Nation.

REVIEW OF UNITED STATES TARIFF POLICY AND TRADE

The United States has for many years maintained a policy of tariff protection. The Democrats have been low protectionists and the Republicans have adhered to the high-tariff policy. Under the system of protection this country has prospered, its resources have been developed until today its standard of living is the highest on earth. Its industrial capacity has been the wonder and amazement of the world and the sustaining force which has made it possible for us and our Allies to emerge victorious from two world wars.

When tariffs were first applied in this country they were for revenue, and as our imports increased this revenue became the principal source of income for the Federal Government. In fact, as late as 1913, when the income tax was first adopted, tariff duties supplied one-half of the total Federal income. But by 1939 customs duties were only 6 percent of the funds collected by the Government.

Our foreign trade during this period has undergone a continuing change until today it is almost the reverse of what it was 75 to 100 years ago. How different the imports following the Civil War from those in the period preceding World War II.

In the earlier period imports normally exceeded exports, and such differences as occurred were settled by transfers of gold, remittances, loans, services, and so forth. Imports consisted of about 35 percent foodstuffs and 40 percent finished manufactures. Gradually a change occurred. Finished manufactures lost first place and crude materials took the lead.

In the case of exports, the changes were even more important. Finished manufactures which accounted for only about 15 percent of the trade in the earlier period had increased to the point where half of our exports were finished goods and another 20 percent was semi-manufactures. Exports of foodstuffs and crude materials, which after the Civil War accounted for 80 percent of our export trade, went down until just before World War II they accounted for less than 30 percent of the total.

At the same time that these shifts were going on in the composition of our foreign trade, changes were also occurring in the relation between total imports and exports. Imports were larger than exports in the post Civil War trade but for the last 70 years we have had an excess of exports. At first the excess was small. Gradually it increased until in 1946 exports exceeded imports by about $5,000,000,000. These export balances are far too large to be offset by transfers of gold, or travel expenses, remittances, and so forth, and so the Government is making loans to foreign countries to finance these purchases.

Men in public office have long been aware of these changes and have recognized that changes in our foreign policy must be made in order to cope with the situation.

With the end of the war we have an opportunity to review the situation to see what has been done and what should be done. The New Deal undertook to offset our excess balance of exports by importing high-priced gold and burying it. In fact, that is one thing that we are still doing. Then as the international problems of the thirties became more complicated the trade agreements program was evolved as a means of reducing tariffs and increasing imports even though the act itself gives as its main purpose the expansion of export trade. But reduction in duties was not the only use made of this authority. It was used to obtain political as well as economic ends. The terms of the agreements were not enforced; and the claim that the agreements would keep this country out of war has long since been exploded.

The Trade Agreements Act was adopted originally in 1934. From then until 1944 agreements were negotiated with some 18 countries in the course of which the average duty collected on dutiable imports dropped from 48 percent to 33 percent, a decline of almost 31 percent. Rising prices have also had their effect in bringing down the relative height of the duty so that in 1946 the duty collected was equivalent to only 25 percent of the value of dutiable imports. Please note that the rate is 25 percent of dutiable imports, not total imports. We have always tried to exempt from duty imports of merchandise of a kind not grown or produced here, with the result that about two-thirds of our import trade has been free of duty or other import restriction. Today new agreements are being negotiated as a result of which import duties will be reduced much further; how much further it is not possible to say, but it is certain that the time has come to review what has been done, to see where we are going. The Trade Agreements Act expires in June 1948, and before it is renewed future policies will need to be adopted and established.

Under existing law the existing duties may be further reduced by 50 percent from the present average of 25 percent to what would then be an average of slightly more than 12 percent, or approximately 15 points under the Underwood tariff of 1913.

THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL POLICY AND TRADE

As indicated above, last year our exports exceeded imports by approximately $5,000,000,000. This excess of exports must be paid for in gold, commodities, expenditures for travel, services, or loans. If we use the latter method of payment, we only postpone the time when some of the other forms of payment must be accepted. If we continue to take payment in gold, we will in the course of time have stored in caves in this country most, if not all, of the gold of the world. We certainly do not wish that to happen. It is evident, therefore, that if we are to maintain a high level of export trade that we must arrange to accept payment principally in commodities, services, and travel expenditures. If we are to maintain our place in the community of nations, we must be willing to assume the obligations that attach to that position. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress to determine how these problems should be solved.

With that in mind, I am now introducing a bill to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board and to vest additional authority and responsibility in the Board.

In endeavoring to reach a decision as to what steps the Congress might take to facilitate foreign trade, considerable attention has been given to the operations of the British Board of Trade.

The British board reaches into the actual operation of trade far beyond that which I believe to be either necessary or desirable in the United States. In the sense, however, that the British board studies and coordinates all the foreign-trade activities of the British Government, the United States Board will do likewise.

My bill establishes the Foreign Trade Board at staff level. It directs the Board to study all factors directly or indirectly affecting the balance of international payments between the United States and foreign nations and to make recommendations to the Congress and to the President respecting the changes it believes desirable.

The Tariff Commission has had many years of experience in dealing with the problems of foreign traders. It has made extensive economic analyses of American industries. It has gained a reputation for impartiality, and, accordingly, it appears to be in the best position of any of the existing governmental organizations to undertake this assignment. The Tariff Commission, which under the terms of this bill will become known as the United States Foreign Trade Board, has never been an operating agency and is not likely to become ambitious to seize operating functions.

It should cooperate fully with the President's Council of Economic Advisers as organized under the Employment Act of 1946.

The study I contemplate in introducing this bill should recommend a settlement of the long-standing and still unsettled dispute between the State Department and the Department of Commerce as to which shall control the direct and specific aids which Government can properly render to the foreign-trade fraternity.

Some more authoritative expression is badly needed to emphasize the importance of commercial promotion by our Foreign Service officers. The tendency to minimize the importance of the commercial functions, to assign commercial activities to the lowest paid members of the staff, must cease. The market survey and economic analysis of conditions in foreign countries are highly important functions and should have primary attention by the Foreign Service. An alert Foreign Service constantly watching for opportunities to expand our foreign trade can do a great deal to equalize our international balance of payments.

There are many fields in which Government must render aid to the foreign trader. There are many fields which Government should leave entirely to business. The problem of determining a balance between these two positions needs continuous and impartial review.

The examination which I believe the Foreign Trade Board can make and the contribution which it can continue to make will take the form of periodic reports to the Congress and the President, and those reports will carry with them the prestige of impartiality; and the recommendations will, accordingly, have the respect of the Congress and the country at large.

Some expansion of this agency will be necessary in connection with the study, although it is not contemplated that at the present time any additional personnel should be added. The obvious duplication of functions and maladjustments among the departments and agencies concerned can well be located and commented on by the present staff. Its experience in testing the counterclaims for tariff revisions has given it a background which should be very valuable in enabling it to distinguish between economic and uneconomic governmental activities.

It is my view that industry must stand the test of efficiency and economy when it asks for protection. I do not believe, however, that any existing or prospective domestic industry should be injured by reason of foreign competition if it is capable of efficient and economic operation.

The Republican Party has adhered to the policy that tariffs should protect American industry and agriculture. I believe in that policy, but some of the misapprehensions about that policy should be clarified.

The necessity for equalizing our international balance of payments is self-evident, and it is my firm conviction that this end can be attained with adequate protection for our own people in industry and agriculture against injury from the influx of competitive products, either industrial or agricultural, at ruinously low prices, resulting from low labor costs abroad.

The bill specifically directs the Foreign Trade Board to examine the possibilities of foreign travel, and fairs and exhibitions, as ways of aiding in the equalization of our present international unbalance.

I believe the potentialities to be realized through travel go far beyond those commonly recognized. The Department of Commerce, basing its figures on systematized sampling, finds that travel averaged about $400,000,000 during the 20-year period from 1920 to 1939. The Department's figures include the sums paid for transportation to foreign shipping companies and the sums spent abroad by the United States travelers.

I may say that when we compare the volume of imports of all commodities, including, of course, sugar, coffee, and rubber, we find that the so-called travel import of Americans traveling abroad constitutes the largest single item in our entire balance-of-trade activities. That fact may lead us to the inference that it may be the item most easily susceptible of expansion.

Projecting into the future, on the basis of a national income of one hundred and fifty to two hundred billion dollars, which is the estimate for our national income at the present time, the Department feels it reasonable to anticipate travel expenditures by United States citizens abroad of between one and two-tenths and one and six-tenths billion dollars. That estimate, in my opinion, is far below the figures which I believe possible, when the potentialities of air travel are given full attention. It is by no means fantastic to foresee thousands of our middle-class families flying to spend a 2 weeks' vacation in visiting points of historical and cultural interest in Britain, Europe, around the Mediterranean, around South America, and, in the not-too-distant future, in the Orient. The time is, indeed, not far distant when flights across the Atlantic will be offered at $100 for a passage in a period of perhaps 6 hours. Many officials in foreign lands to whom I have spoken about the tourist travel possibilities have expressed great interest and have given me confidence that we may well find this a means of making from two billion to three billion dollars a year available overseas with which the products of American farms and factories can be purchased by our foreign friends.

Encouragement for the establishment of international fairs and exhibitions is also particularly called to the attention of the Board in this bill. Such international events—many of which can be staged here in the United States—will stimulate commercial as well as tourist travel.

It is, therefore, my suggestion that there be established a Foreign Trade Board in which the Congress can have confidence, and that the solution of these problems be entrusted to that Board, with the understanding that they will be solved, as all national economic problems should be, in the best interests of the Nation as a whole, and that the considerations will be above party politics and in keeping with the position which this Nation expects to maintain in international matters. It is my hope that all who are interested in maintaining a high level of employment in this country and in securing fair treatment for both producers and consumers at home and abroad, will support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill which I have introduced printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1287) to change the name of the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Foreign Trade Board and to vest additional authority in the Board, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION. 1. That this act may be cited as "The United States Foreign Trade Board Act of 1947."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) To maintain a high level of employment in industry and agriculture;

(b) To formulate policies with respect to the foreign commercial activities of the United States which will conform to and supplement national domestic policies;

(c) To attain a better balance between our exports and imports, including the export of capital and capital goods under appropriate conditions, thus reducing any necessity for foreign loans by the Government;

(d) To avoid the purchase of abnormal amounts of gold;

(e) To provide for more efficient administration of the Government agencies having regulatory or promotional responsibilities directly or indirectly related to foreign commerce and travel and to coordinate their activities; and

(f) To encourage foreign travel by United States citizens and travel in the United States by citizens of foreign countries as an important element in maintaining peaceful relations between nations and in aiding in the process of making United States dollars available abroad for the purchase of products, agricultural and industrial, from the United States.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE BOARD

SEC. 3. The United States Tariff Commission shall hereafter be known as "the United States Foreign Trade Board," and all provi-

sions of law now applicable to the United States Tariff Commission shall be applicable in the same manner and to the same extent to the Board.

DUTIES OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall, in addition to any other duties prescribed by law, study all factors directly or indirectly affecting the balance of international payments between the United States and foreign nations and submit recommendations to the Congress and to the President from time to time respecting such changes and adjustments in law, regulation, or procedure as in its opinion may be necessary to achieve the aims set forth in section 2.

(b) In making its studies and recommendations the Board shall give particular attention to:

(1) The coordination of the activities of the several Government agencies dealing with foreign trade, including the collection and dissemination of information and statistical data by such agencies;

(2) The encouragement of foreign travel by United States citizens and travel by citizens of foreign countries in the United States; and

(3) International fairs and exhibitions as a means for promoting the interest conducive to trade, travel, and friendship.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks last Monday on the then-pending labor bill, I referred at some length to the propaganda activities of an organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. Through error, I linked that organization with a citation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The organization promptly denied my statement, and requested that I correct it. This I am glad to do. That organization had trouble, not with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but with two other committees—one a Senate committee and one a House committee.

In order further to set the record straight about the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., Mr. President, I should like to say I spoke from memory on Monday; and what I had in mind was the citation of Edward A. Rumely and his trial last year before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia on a charge of contempt of the House of Representatives.

He was charged specifically with having been subpenaed—I now quote from the charge—to "produce certain records before a special committee of the House of Representatives, records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, of which he was executive secretary, he willfully made default of that subpena by not producing the records."

The congressional committee referred to there was the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, 1944. The House committee was trying to find out about the financial operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Let me add that in the record of the hearings before that House committee and in the court testimony in that contempt case, Mr. Rumely held steadfastly to the contention that when he refused to divulge the information wanted by the House committee, he was acting upon and in accordance with the instructions of the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. In other words, he was the full-fledged agent of that organization.

That citation by the House committee was not the first time Mr. Rumely had been in difficulty with a congressional committee. In 1938 he was called before the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. According to the RECORD, Mr. Rumely refused to produce certain records before that committee.

I might explain that the name of the organization he was representing then was the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, the predecessor of the present Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

As I understand, he escaped citation at that time through the propensity of the Senate to filibuster.

While Mr. Rumely was able, through technicalities or other means, to stand off the attempts of congressional committees to get the facts of his organization's financial operations, the evidence adduced at the proceedings both before congressional committees and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia is even more revealing as to the wide ramifications of the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., than the unchallenged statements offered by me before the Senate on Monday.

The only statement I made was that they had been cited by the House Committee on un-American Activities. I was incorrect in making that statement, and I have just said it was two other committees with which they had difficulty instead of that committee.

The RECORD further shows, Mr. President, that while Mr. Rumely has been successful in his skirmishes with congressional committees and the courts in connection with the concealment of the financial operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., he was not previously so successful with the courts in connection with charges of financial operations with foreign nationals.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate today to elaborate on what I said Monday about the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. By the way, I do not know how long the "incorporated" has been on the end of the name. The same people have operated under a different name during the last 10 years. I submit that much of the literature circulated by this committee is inflammatory, biased, and propagandistic.

If the Members of the Senate are interested in pursuing further the operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., I recommend the reading of the testimony before the Special Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities, United States Senate, Part 7, 1938; testimony before the House Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, Part 7, 1944; and the testimony in the contempt trial of Mr. Rumely in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, Criminal No. 74,306, 1946.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that the propensity of Mr. Rumely to refuse to produce records subpenaed by a committee of the Congress—and this has happened on two occasions—and to escape any punishment whatsoever for so doing, is a sharp reminder of the helplessness of committees of the Congress to obtain information from any organizations or any persons, even by means of a subpena, if the organizations or persons decides that they do not care to give the information demanded by a committee. It occurs to me that this is a matter which must be corrected in some way before the Congress can adequately and properly function in this respect.

In regard to the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., they have unquestionably distributed inflammatory material which has tended to incite class against class. For instance, they distribute their material to professional classes, and the material naturally has a tendency to inflame the professional classes against the working classes. But under our present law there is nothing we can do to find out who are the real backers of this organization or any other organization. We know that under our Constitution the privilege of free speech is very broad indeed, and it should be very broad. I would oppose restricting free speech, or the distribution of propaganda throughout the United States. But I believe that the Congress should have the power, through its duly authorized committees, to investigate any organization in this country, to ascertain the facts as to its financing, where it gets its money, how it spends its money, and, more important than that, who are its real backers.

Mr. President, this is not the only organization of the kind. Many good people are listed as its sponsors, but I venture to say that not one of them has read any part of the inflammatory material which the organization, so sponsored, has been sending out during the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. President, this situation emphasizes the helplessness of the Congress to ascertain facts which it should be within the province of Congress to learn. I hope that before long some action may be taken so that when a committee of Congress issues a subpena, the subpena will be more than a scrap of paper.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF JOE B. DOOLEY TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS—REPORT OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 28, 1947, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably to the Senate the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

I now ask unanimous consent to submit a written report (Executive Rept. No. 3) thereon, which contains a synopsis of the hearings on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first order of business on the Executive Calendar.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive F, Treaty of Peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the treaties are to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the consideration of the treaties will be postponed. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER—UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that this nomination go over. I understand it is highly controversial, but I think an effort should be made to find a definite time when it can be taken up and disposed of, because the nomination has been on the calendar for a substantial time, and some steps should be taken for its disposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not insist on taking up the nomination at this time, because in all probability an entire day will be required for its consideration. However, I should like to have the majority leader arrange for its being called up at some convenient time. I have not insisted, because the Senate had before it the labor bill, and the tax bill is coming along, and I did not want to disrupt the program of the majority, but I think this is a matter which should have the attention of the Senate as soon as it can be conveniently taken up.

Mr. WHITE. I give the Senator from Texas my assurance that I shall do whatever I can in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the nomination will be passed over.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to this nomination, but I wonder if any Member of the Senate knows what the California Debris Commission is, and why the President nominates, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, members of that commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Owen McIntosh Burns to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the amendments to the Scientific Foundation bill tomorrow, without asking for a vote on the bill. I think it possible to do that, and I think it is in order to do it without a quorum call, if we confine the agreement to the amendments. I would like to propose a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May it be understood that, by unanimous consent, the Senate is again in legislative session?

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois objects to the Senate resuming legislative session?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to take a moment in executive session, on a matter relating to nominations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course if the Senator from Illinois objects, very well; but I do not know why the unanimous-consent agreement could not be made in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say I am agreeable to having the unanimous-consent agreement made if the Senate remains in executive session.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that, not later than 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, the Senate proceed to vote upon all pending amendments to the bill now before the Senate, until the voting is completed, and that, at that time, the bill be read a third time. I ask further that the time be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who will have two hours, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who will have three hours, of the total of five hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the pending bill, but, unfortunately, under the procedure which we have been following I have been prevented from attending the session of the Senate this afternoon. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is handling the Department of the Interior bill. I am aware of the fact that many other Senators have been absent from the session of the Senate this afternoon during the discussion of the pending bill, because they also have been in attendance upon other committee meetings.

The Senate has unfortunately fallen into the practice, Mr. President, of granting unanimous consent that various committees may sit during the sessions of the Senate. The result has been that the floor has been emptied of Senators and important debate on matters of the greatest importance takes place without any opportunity for Senators who are vitally interested to participate. I have no desire to delay effectuation of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote, but I should like very much to have the opportunity of at least reading the RECORD of today's proceeding and knowing what amendments are pending before such an agreement is made. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the request might well be made some time tomorrow, in view of the very small attendance here, and in view of the facts I have just stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course, in the latter part of this session it is absolutely impossible that the Appropriations Committee and the Senate can hold mutually exclusive meetings. Members who are on the Appropriations Committee for years have never been able to attend meetings of the Senate, and never will be, under any circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have done very well, I think, speaking for myself.

Mr. TAFT. My comment has nothing to do with the Senator's request, but it is a comment merely on what he said. I hope he may agree to my request. If not, it can go over until tomorrow, and

another effort can be made first thing in the morning. However, it seemed to me, and it seemed to the Senator from West Virginia and, I understand, to the Senator from Washington, who has some amendments, that the whole position of proponents of the amendments could be stated in 3 hours. There was considerable discussion of the proposal last year, and most of the questions involved have been discussed by Senators who cared to discuss them. I only hope the Senator may agree, in order that there may be a definite understanding as to when the vote is to be taken and Senators will remain tomorrow afternoon to hear the debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no disposition at all to prevent an agreement, but I think it is of the utmost importance that the Members of the Senate and the people of the country should know that under the procedure now being followed the Senate is being prevented from giving the attention it ought to give to the important measures which are before it. The Senator from West Virginia is present. He is very much interested in the pending bill, as is the Senator from Washington. I would be very much disposed to conduct myself in accordance with their wishes, but I feel that it is a great mistake for the Senate to continue the procedure of having committee sessions all over the Capitol while the Senate is in session.

It has been my experience, over a period of 14 years, contrary to what the Senator from Ohio has just said, that the members of the Appropriations Committee in the past have been able to devote their attention, both to the work of the committee and to what goes on on the floor. The unfortunate fact is, with respect to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, the House of Representatives made so many drastic cuts in the appropriations, in order to carry out some political promises which were made during the campaign last year, that the Senate committee is now being deluged by requests from all over the United States to restore items which were stricken out by the House. A committee of western Governors appeared before the committee this morning, protesting against the cuts, and there are many other similar matters of that kind.

I will say to the Senate that some nine appropriation bills are being held up in the House at this moment. Hearings upon the War Department bill were completed as long ago as the 1st of March, but no report has been submitted by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. I have good reason to believe, Mr. President, that the purpose of that is to have the Senate act upon the tax bill before the House determines how much of a deficit the Government will have next year. If the Senate can make the tax reductions that are being proposed, before the House and the Senate know how much money must be appropriated to carry on the War Department and the Navy Department and other necessary functions of government, then the melon will be distributed to the taxpayers and the country will be plunged again into an era of deficit financing; although at this moment there is a surplus in the Treasury. So, Mr. President, I am very much disposed to call attention to this very serious situation by objecting to a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I trust the Senator will not follow his disposition to make the objection. After all, it has no direct relation to a vote on the unfinished business. The Senator will have full opportunity on the tax bill, I am sure, for a number of days, to discuss the question of appropriations. If we cannot take bills of what we might call secondary importance, and get them through the Senate in 2 days, we are going to be tied up indefinitely and practically become a body that cannot transact ordinary business; we will be confined solely to the very important legislation, including appropriation bills. So I hope, when we have under consideration a bill which it may be said is of importance, but of secondary importance from a public-interest standpoint, and not in itself likely to create debate, that, if possible, unanimous consent may be granted so as to reach a conclusion on the bill. I hope the Senator may be willing to agree.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very amenable. Let me therefore ask the Senator from West Virginia if he has had an opportunity to participate in the debate today upon this important question?

Mr. KILGORE. I have participated, mostly as a listener. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will permit, I may say something to the Senator from Wyoming at this time in explanation of what has happened. At the time the suggestion of the unanimous-consent agreement was made, there were very few Senators on the floor. I canvassed those present, and it seemed to be the consensus that we could reach an agreement. I met with certain protests. I discovered that far more Senators were interested in the pending bill than I thought, and that they did not think there would be sufficient time allowed; they did not know what would develop. I went back to the Senator from Ohio and told him at that time that I knew of one objection which I was trying to straighten out, and that I would see what could be done about it. Since that time I have found the objection to be well founded. For that reason, I do not like to limit myself at the present time, and in particular, I do not like to limit other Senators who may want to discuss the amendments, and who will want to have something to say about the bill, even though it may be said to be of secondary importance.

Mr. TAFT. I did not mean to say it is of secondary importance. What I meant to say was that it is one which does not excite tremendous public interest and debate. It happens that nearly everyone interested in it wants the bill passed as rapidly as possible, but individuals differ with respect to various amendments to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate gave unanimous consent that I may have the floor tomorrow at the beginning of the legislative session to discuss the pending legislation. If the proposed unanimous-consent agreement were entered into what would happen to the consent which I secured to have the floor tomorrow? I do not know how long I shall speak. I hope I shall not speak long.

Mr. TAFT. I will say that I am sure the Senator will be given any reasonable length of time he wishes to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate at this moment to state for the benefit of Senators who were not present a short time ago, that within the last half hour unanimous consent was given to the Senator from Washington to be recognized at the beginning of the session tomorrow.

The Chair rules at this time that that agreement will not be set aside by agreement to the unanimous-consent request now proposed. Consequently the Senator from Washington will have the floor tomorrow, unless he himself voluntarily should relinquish that privilege.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we were discussing the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Ohio. I understand from the Senator from Washington that he might proceed to speak for 30 minutes today. That would take 30 minutes from the time he would otherwise use tomorrow. For the reason that some of my colleagues have stated that they would object, I feel obliged to object to the unanimous-consent request, although I had previously stated that I would agree to it. I wish to withdraw such consent temporarily until matters are straightened out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from West Virginia now does object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KILGORE. I shall have to withdraw my previous consent due to the conflicts which have arisen on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not clear whether the Senator from West Virginia is now objecting to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say that because of the fact that so many Senators are absent from the Chamber, and that a number of Senators to my knowledge desire to speak on the subject referred to, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

DELAY IN CONSIDERATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine consent that the Senator from Illinois may have the floor in his own right at this time?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Monday, February 10, 1947, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is

chairman of the Civil Service Committee, made a speech in the Senate calling attention to what he said was a most deplorable condition in the Post Office Department. At that time the Senator from North Dakota made a request, by an appropriate resolution, for some $35,000 for the purpose of investigating certain conditions in the Post Office Department which had existed prior to the time the Democrats took over the administration of the Government in 1932. In his speech the distinguished Senator from North Dakota notified the Senate and the country that there were pending in his committee at that time, roughly some 500 nominations of postmasters, and advised the Senate in no uncertain terms that no action would be taken on any of them until they had been subjected to the closest possible scrutiny, in order to determine whether certain practices referred to in the resolution submitted by him had been indulged in respecting the nominations in question.

Mr. President, since that time almost 300 more post office appointments have been submitted by the President of the United States to the Senate for confirmation. The nominations involve postmasterships in every State in the Union. As one United States Senator whose State is interested to the extent of 37 postmasters whose nominations are now being held up arbitrarily and without any reason whatsoever upon the part of the chairman and other members of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I rise at this time, in executive session, to voice a most serious protest against the procedure now being followed by that committee.

Mr. President, in order to accomplish what I have in mind and to give these nominees for post offices throughout the United States of America an opportunity to know that at least some United States Senators are interested in seeing that their nominations are confirmed, I am today taking the privilege in executive session of filing a number of motions to discharge the Committee on Civil Service from the further consideration of certain of the nominations in the hope that, perhaps, by that method it may be possible to secure action one way or the other by the majority party upon what seems, in the minds of some Senators at least, to be one of the most important questions which has been pending before the Senate for a long time.

Mr. President, from the minority views filed in connection with the resolution submitted some time ago by the senior Senator from North Dakota, I read the following:

In answer to a request by Senator HAYDEN, the First Assistant Postmaster General, on March 19, 1947, supplied the following information relative to the nominations that have been referred to the Senate Committee on Civil Service during the present Congress and upon which no action has been taken:

"Your questions will be answered in the order in which they have been submitted:

"1. Since January 3, 1947, 639 nominations have been submitted by the President to the Senate of persons to be appointed postmasters at Presidential offices, that is, post offices of the first, second, and third classes.

"2. Of the 639 nominations, 349 were selections of the highest eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission. Of this 349, 156 have military preference.

"3. Eighty-one selections were made of the second eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission and of this 81, 48 have military preference.

"4. The third eligible on the registers submitted by the Civil Service Commission was selected in 38 instances and, of this number, 21 have military preference.

"5. Of the total of 639 nominations submitted to the Senate, 253 have military preference.

"6. Of these 639 nominations, 128 involve the reappointment of the incumbent postmasters where the offices have been advanced from fourth to third class. These reappointments were made under the act of May 20, 1944. Of the 128 postmasters nominated for reappointment, 13 have military preference.

"7. The promotion of a classified employee is involved in 40 of these nominations. That is, 40 nominations are for the promotion of employees in the classified postal service and of this 40 so recommended for promotion, 15 have military preference."

Then the committee gives its conclusions, which are highly interesting, but which I shall not read into the RECORD at this time.

Another very interesting factor in this situation can be found in the records of the Post Office Department, which show that of the 137 postmaster nominationss pending before the committee, for offices which are advanced in class, 54 of the appointments were made prior to 1933. That is significant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I shall not interrupt him if he prefers not to be interrupted.

Mr. LUCAS. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senator from Maryland interrupt to ask questions he may wish to ask.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Illinois the contrast, since he has mentioned the date 1933, as between the situation which existed after 1933 and the situation before that time.

In Baltimore we had a postmaster named Benjamin Woelper, who was an active Republican. He was appointed to the office before the Democrats came in in 1933. My colleague, Senator Radcliffe, and I decided that he was an efficient man, and we let him hold that office until he resigned many years thereafter, showing that where there was good service in the Post Office Department, even though a man had been an active Republican worker and officeholder, two Democratic Senators from Maryland thought the office was being well conducted, and ought not to be disturbed.

In my home town of Havre de Grace, Md., one of my boyhood friends, an active Republican, was appointed postmaster on my recommendation. In contrast, to that, the Senate Committee on Civil Service is now holding up all the post office appointments in Maryland. Many of the appointees are veterans, and some are disabled veterans. They are being kept out of their offices month after month when the overwhelming majority of them stood No. 1 on the register.

When we were in control of the Senate, by contrast, my colleague and I, in our respective home towns, where we both earn a livelihood, recommended the appointment of Republican postmasters, and kept them there. That contrasts in a very significant way with the rather partisan approach which is being applied in the present session of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maryland for the contribution which he has made. I am glad to know exactly what was done in his State with respect to the appointments to which he has referred. What he has said bears out what this report shows with respect to the number of persons who were appointed prior to the time the Democrats came into power, and who have been reappointed, or are still serving as postmasters in their respective communities throughout the United States.

For the State of Illinois approximately 37 postmaster appointments have been sent to the Senate by the President of the United States since January 3; and I am glad to inform the Senate that 23 of the appointees whose nominations have been sent to the Senate by the President are veterans of either World War I or World War II. Ten of them are acting postmasters at the present time. Of the 37, 14 were appointed who were highest on the eligible list. Surely there can be no objection to the individual who is No. 1 on the register. Surely there can be no objection to the individual who is a veteran and also No. 1 on the register.

As the Senator from Maryland has said, it is strange that the Committee on Civil Service of the United States Senate has apparently taken a partisan approach to all these important appointments, involving veterans of World War I or World War II, who offered everything they had, if necessary, in the defense of their country. The gentlemen who are now holding up these nominations were among those who told the boys, "When you come back you can have anything we have in this community." Yet when one of them has been appointed to a small $1,200 postmastership at Xenia, Ill., or some other city, we find partisan politics of the cheapest kind holding up brave men who were willing to die, if necessary, in order to help save this country.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking as a member of the Civil Service Committee, I wish to let the Senate and the country know that it is not the Democrats who are holding up the appointments. Several appointments have been made to postmasterships in South Carolina, and the appointees are now writing me and asking why I have not permitted their appointments to get out of my committee. That is the way they write. I want them and the other people of the United States who have been appointed to know that it is the Republicans who should have the blame or the credit, and not the Democrats.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am happy that a member of the Committee on Civil Service is present while I am discussing this matter. I appreciate what he says. I understand that the Committee on Civil Service has had a roll-call vote on

whether or not these postmaster nominations should be reported to the Senate. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, it was a party vote.

Mr. President, the course which is being followed is not right. If there is a single thing against one of these appointees, let a protest be filed before the committee, supported by credible and competent evidence, and let the committee hear the complaint against the nominee. But to blanket all these appointees in one group and say that none of them is fit seems to me to be shameful and disgraceful.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that of 37 nominees for postmasterships in the State of Illinois, 10 of them are acting postmasters, and all of them are veterans?

Mr. LUCAS. Not all of them are veterans. Twenty-three are veterans, or 62 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the acting postmasters?

Mr. LUCAS. No; of all 37. Twenty-three of the 37 are veterans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How many of the 23 are acting postmasters?

Mr. LUCAS. That I cannot say. I think probably three or four.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator is aware of the provision of the law that if an acting postmaster's nomination is not confirmed during the session of the Senate to which his name is sent he will no longer be able to serve in that capacity. So the result of the situation which the Senator describes will be that hundreds of veterans all over the United States who have been made acting postmasters, whose nominations have been sent to the Senate, and who are No. 1 on the eligible register, will be incapable of holding office unless the Senate acts upon the nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I thank him for it. I know what the law is along that line. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I wonder if it is to be the policy of the majority in the United States Senate to adhere to the position they have taken to the extent that they will hold up these nominations during the entire session, so that when adjournment comes not a single nominee, regardless of the merits of his appointment, regardless of his background or his qualifications, will receive the appointment, because the majority will block his confirmation. In the name of all that is fair and just, in the name of economic justice, if you please, for these servicemen, I cannot believe that, without any other reason the majority of the United States Senate will continuously hold these nominations in committee and block the appointments. I am satisfied that once the nominations reach the floor of the Senate a majority of the Republican Members will vote for their confirmation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator has made the remark which he just made, because I think it is only fair to say that there are many Senators on the other side of the aisle who are not familiar with this circumstance. I am very hopeful that the Republican leadership, there being so much justice and equity in the claim of the Senator from Illinois, will examine into this matter and afford relief. It is very embarrassing to write a disabled veteran whose name has been sent to the Senate by the President and who is on the eligible list and clearly entitled above everyone else to the position, and say, "I am sorry, but as United States Senator I cannot do anything about it. The matter is in the Committee on the Civil Service." His natural reaction is, "What are you doing there if you cannot do something about it?" I am hopeful that those on the other side will take hold of this matter and, in a spirit of equity and fair play, provide some relief.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I want to be sure that I correctly understood the Senator in something which he said awhile ago which actually amazed and astonished me. Did I correctly understand him to say that a vote was taken in the committee on all of these nominations, in one lump, so to speak, and the committee voted not to report any of them?

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding. If I am wrong I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was not present at that particular meeting, but that is my understanding.

Mr. HATCH. Was there any protest filed in the committee against these nominations?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Senator will find a single protest filed against any one of the nominees whose names have been sent to the Senate by the President. If there is a protest, I should like to know about it. If there is any complaint about the 37 men who have been nominated to postmasterships in the State of Illinois I think I would know something about it. I keep a complete record concerning each and every one of the appointments in my State, and there is nothing in my office even remotely resembling a complaint. I have never heard of a complaint filed against any one of the 37, and I am satisfied that there are no such complaints.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking as a member of the committee, I have not heard of any protests.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—he may already have discussed it, but let me inquire what justification is given, if any, for the course of conduct which is being pursued by the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I read in the beginning from a speech made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in which he told the Senate of the United States that unless he got from the Senate $35,000 with which to investigate certain conditions in the Post Office Department running back even prior to 1933, not a single one of these nominations would be reported by his committee. That is the only justification. The Senator can find that on page 926 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 10, 1947.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. It is evident that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is a man of his word for so far none of the nominations has been reported. But am I to understand that the Senator from Illinois is not willing to accept the decision of the chairman of the committee and is about to move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico is correct. I am not willing that these nominees, many of them veterans, shall continue to wait upon the Committee on the Civil Service without vigorous protest being made, without information as to the reason for the action being furnished, and without debate upon the floor of the Senate which will at least enable them to know that some Senators are interested in attempting to do something for them.

I shall cite a typical case, the case of a man who was nominated last November. There was nothing that could be done about it then, for the Senate was not in session. He was renominated on January 3 of this year. I want the Senator from New Mexico and the Senate to listen to this case, which of itself alone, should give every Member of the United States Senate serious concern.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds with the case, will he yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no desire to prolong this session. It is getting on to a quarter of six. It seems to me that if the Senator is going into typical cases he would wish the Senate to recess as in executive session so that he might proceed tomorrow when more Senators are present in the Chamber, and explain the cases which have been held up so that all will know about them. There are some veterans in whom I am interested, and I should like to follow the Senator from Illinois and ask the other side if it is the intention of the majority to hold up the nominations of these men. If the Senator speaks tonight I am afraid that many Members will not understand what is involved.

I make that as a suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to comply with the suggestion if it is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the majority leader if he would be willing to recess as in executive session, so that we may continue the discussion tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I had the floor a while ago and was about ready to make a motion that the Senate recess as in legislative session. I did not know that I was to sit here and receive all this castigation from the other side. I have found

satisfaction in the good deeds to which the Senator from Maryland has made reference. I rather expected that from him, and I congratulate him that in those instances, at least, he has been right and has done rightly.

I do not want to enter into any agreements with respect to the procedure tomorrow. I am quite content to let the day take care of itself. A motion to recess, of course, would continue the discussion of the Foundation bill. I had hoped, and I now hope, that that might be the course to be taken and that there might be some more appropriate time found for this political discussion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me make this suggestion to the Senator: For example, suppose unanimous consent were requested that the executive session, in the event we recess in executive session—and let me inquire first, whether the Senate will meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock?

Mr. WHITE. The Senate will meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose that the executive session should terminate at 12:45 p. m. tomorrow and that the Senate should then go into legislative session. If that were done by unanimous consent it would assure the Senator from Maine that we were not intending to prolong the discussion.

Mr. WHITE. In the situation which confronts me I shall not consent to anything. If I have the opportunity to take the floor again in my own right I shall move that, as in legislative session, the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow That will keep the bill which has recently been before the Senate in its position. I think it is vastly more important—and I say this with great respect to the Senators on the other side—that we proceed with the unfinished business as rapidly as possible and that the observations which are being submitted—I say this to the Senator from Illinois with great respect—be submitted at a more appropriate time.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the able Senator from Maine has said with reference to submitting observations at a more appropriate time, but I do not know of any more appropriate time than to submit them when we can finally meet in executive session.

Mr. WHITE. I make the suggestion that it would be a more appropriate time when some of the majority members of the committee of which complaint is made are on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot control the majority on the floor. It is too bad that there are not more Members present on the other side.

Mr. WHITE. I should think that if the Senator from Illinois knew he was going to make the talk which he is making he might well have notified someone on the majority side that it was in contemplation, and members of the Civil Service Committee having jurisdiction over these nominations might have been present to speak for themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend that if I had been certain that I could have obtained the floor and would not be deprived of it by an adjournment or a recess——

Mr. WHITE. The Senator knows perfectly well that I never refuse to yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that, but I am speaking of something else.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that Senators on the other side of the aisle will have difficulty in locating an instance when I have refused to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not complaining at all about the able Senator from Maine. He has always been fair in his disposition toward the minority, ever since he has become majority leader.

Mr. WHITE. I think that disposition to be fair has gotten me into trouble in the present instance.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no; because when the Senator from Maine gave up the floor, the Senator from Illinois had a right to obtain it. I do not think the Senator from Maine would move that the Senate adjourn or take a recess, without giving me an opportunity to have the floor. The Senator would have had trouble following any other course.

Mr. WHITE. I did give the Senator from Illinois the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and I had a right to take the floor at the time when I took it.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, I do not know how long it will be before I regain the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be some time, I may say to the Senator from Maine, unless he enters into an agreement with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in order to expedite settlement of the situation, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, it proceed in executive session until 12:30, so as to give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to present his case before a larger number of Senators.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, an agreement has already been entered into with respect to the proceedings tomorrow. The entire subject now under discussion can be debated during the time when the Scientific Foundation bill is before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine is correct about that, and probably we shall discuss this matter during that time. But, as the Senator from Maine well knows, at a time when the Senate is in legislative session, it is not proper for a Senator to move that a committee be discharged from the further consideration of an executive matter, such as the one we are now discussing. That is the primary reason why I obtained the floor. I shall move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of all postmaster nominations in my State so as at least to place before the Senate and the country something in regard to what has been happening to these postmaster nominations.

A moment ago the Senator from Maine spoke of the importance of the proposed Scientific Foundation bill, which is the unfinished business, and he indicated that we should not be considering matters of the kind I am now discussing until the unfinished business is disposed of. I wish to say to him that the unfinished business, the bill relating to the Scientific Foundation, is exceedingly important from the standpoint of the welfare of the economy of the United States, as well as of the world, but, on the other hand, if the Senator from Maine were to make such an argument in a small community such as the one to which I referred, to the postmastership of which one of these veterans had been nominated, he probably would be challenged from the beginning to the end.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has said that this is a political discussion. I do not know who brought on the political discussion unless it was the majority, because of their action in holding up the confirmation of these nominations. They can call it politics if they want to, but we on this side of the aisle did not start it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to say that no one could be fairer than the Senator from Maine has been, and I certainly had no intention, either by innuendo or in any other way, of reflecting upon him or upon the other Members of the majority or, in fact, the entire group of Senators on his side of the aisle; but I say to the Senator from Illinois that when these men have had their appointments held up month after month after month, although they stand first on the list and are veterans—many of them disabled veterans—who served in the recent war, in my opinion, in the light of this long delay, we are justified in bringing this matter out into the open and giving these men their day in court, so to speak.

I propose that when the Senate takes a recess this evening it be taken as in executive session, so that we may have a showdown on this matter tomorrow, because I do not think there is any more important business immediately before the Senate than to give these veterans the justice which we said they would receive when they came back from the wars.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is so correct about the entire situation that I thank him from the bottom of my heart for the statement he has made. Certainly they are entitled to attention.

I wish to refer to only one case, and to state it for the RECORD, so that the Senate and the country may know precisely what the Committee on Civil Service is doing. I refer, for instance, to the nomination of Roy M. Martin, to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill. As I said a moment ago, the appointment was made last November, and a reappointment was made in January. I now read an excerpt from a letter addressed to me:

I am now receiving 30-percent-disability compensation, which amounts to $41.40 monthly; in addition to this, I can receive $20 weekly social-security payments. Pre-

vious to entering the Army, I was making $300 per month. My disability now prevents me from accepting the same type of employment. I have been waiting now 7 months for this appointment, and certainly cannot wait much longer.

I certainly appreciate your efforts in my behalf, and thank you sincerely for such.

Mr. President, he had 1 year and 8 months of service. He was in the Ordnance Department of the Army. He had 6 months' duty overseas. He is a married man, and has a wife and four children to support. Before he went into the service he made $300 a month, working as a roofer. Now he is living off of disability compensation and social-security compensation, while the Senate of the United States deprives him of the compensation to which he is justly entitled under all the laws of decency, equity, and fairness. I understand that one of his children is 7 years old, one is 11 years old, and one is 13 years old, and one is 15 years old. He is not employed. He states in his application that he worked as a roofer for a service company at Fairfield, Ill., from the date of his discharge from the Army until April 1946. Because of the disability he incurred in the line of duty as a soldier he simply cannot do the heavy work he formerly did.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that that appointee is not now an acting postmaster.

Mr. LUCAS. He is not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But he is number one on the eligible register; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I further understand that he has the service-connected disability of which the Senator from Illinois has spoken, and that he cannot get the position in the post office, because of the failure of the Senate to confirm his nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought it important to have that situation clearly pointed out as a part of the RECORD, namely, that the man is number one on the eligible register, is a disabled veteran, with a family to support, and is waiting to assume the responsibility for which the Civil Service Commission has found him eligible and capable. Yet he cannot do so because the Senate of the United States will not act upon his nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is quite correct.

Let me say that the letter which was addressed to me was written on March 6, 1947, and in it he states:

I have been waiting now 7 months—

And here it is May, 2 months after the time he wrote the letter—

for this appointment, and certainly cannot wait much longer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was not that man, who was found eligible No. 1 by the Civil Service Commission, entitled to believe that inasmuch as there was no objection to his appointment and inasmuch as he had had that service in the Army, the Senate of the United States would not delay as much as 24 hours in confirming his nomination?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, he certainly was entitled to believe that. All this delay is beyond my comprehension. I never have been able to understand this situation. I have waited days, weeks, and months for the Committee on Civil Service to make some kind of report on these postmaster nominations; yet nothing has been done. Such treatment is utterly unfair. I say with the utmost sincerity that it is shameful and disgraceful, in my humble opinion, when we consider the person whose case I have presented to the Senate, that he and his family are denied the rights to which they are justly entitled under the laws which have been enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois knows that the case to which he has referred can be paralleled by many others among the approximately 700 nominations that have been referred to the committee.

I ask him whether he has any idea what the monthly salary is for the position to which that veteran has been nominated.

Mr. LUCAS. I would say that probably that postmaster position carries with it a salary of not more than $2,000 or $2,400 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. This is the case of a wounded veteran who has lost approximately $1,200, who is on relief and drawing social security, entitled to $1,200 from his country, but who cannot get it, who has to throw himself on the charity of the town and lose the $1,200, which he will never recover as long as he lives.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Another temporary postmaster is taking the money to which this veteran is rightfully entitled.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senator much longer, but I should like to refer to one phase of the speech made by the Senator from North Dakota of February 10. He said:

The members of the Senate Civil Service Committee intend to do everything they possibly can to see to it that the civil service operates in such a manner as to insure that veterans will be given the preference of first-, second-, and third-class postmasterships which the Nation wants them to have. I believe this applies to Democratic and Republican members alike.

He made that statement, but he does nothing to comply with the statement he made. I think the $35,000 for the investigation is still being held up somewhere in the United States Senate.

I do not care how much they investigate. I am not here attempting to defeat the resolution submitted by the able Senator from North Dakota providing for an investigation. They can investigate, and investigate, and fumigate, and fulminate throughout the Post Office Department so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned. I am attempting only to defend the rights of men in my State who have received appointments from the President of the United States to postmasterships after civil-service examinations, that is all.

Only yesterday I appointed as No. 1 to a little post office in my State a man who was a Republican, and there was a Democrat on the list who was a veteran I could have appointed, but the man I appointed had a great war record in World War II. He is a fine, upstanding citizen of the community, and I have attempted, since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, to do my best to follow out the spirit of the civil-service laws which have been passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have a number of resolutions I intend to submit. I shall read one; they are all of the same tenor:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be and it is hereby discharged from further consideration of the nomination of Roy M. Martin to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill.

Mr. President, I send the motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, and will lie over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send Resolution No. 2 to the desk, and ask that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Guy E. Midget to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say, with respect to this man, that today Mr. Midget is living on a disability pension. Every case I have presented has been for a serviceman.

The next one is with respect to Frank R. Johnson, to be postmaster at Geneseo, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Johnson is an old comrade of mine of World War I, who was wounded in France, and who now seeks to get a little compensation to help him out in the latter days of his life, but he is denied the opportunity because of the action of the United States Senate.

Here is another one for William P. Hohs to be postmaster at Skokie, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. I think this man is acting as temporary postmaster. He had a wonderful record in the war. He was 43 months overseas, and won about all the medals any one man could win.

The next one is for Leland Adams to be postmaster at Dieterich, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is satisfactory with the able majority leader, I shall file the resolutions en bloc, without reading them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask what the papers are that are being sent to the desk?

Mr. LUCAS. I am submitting a series of resolutions asking that the Committee on Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations of these respective postmasters in my State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is merely filing the resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. That is all I can do at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say, for the information of the Senator from Maine, that the Chair has ruled that the resolutions will be received and lie over 1 day under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the conclusion of the offering of the Senator's resolutions I have here about 14 relating to cases in Maryland, many of the men affected being veterans. I shall not take the time at this late hour to describe them all, but the first one on the list is a veteran, Edward P. Harris, of Snow Hill. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Illinois would yield to me long enough to file those resolutions as in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that, when I conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions presented by the Senator from Maryland will likewise be received and lie over 1 day under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say that I have certified copies of the discharges of every one of these veterans and whenever we enter upon a discussion of these cases, if that should happen, I shall discuss the record of each and every one of them. The records of many of them are comparable to the first case I discussed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not the intention of the Senator from Illinois, and also probably of the Senator from Maryland, to call up these resolutions for action by the Senate in executive session at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that these resolutions lie on the table for 24 hours, and that then Resolution 1 will automatically come up as a privileged matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the resolutions will respectively lie over until the next executive session, whenever that may be.

Mr. TYDINGS. They will come up automatically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will then be laid before the Senate, following the legislative procedure, before the calendar of the executive session is called.

Mr. LUCAS. They will be on the Executive Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will lie over 1 day under the rule, and they will be taken up as indicated by the ruling of the Chair a few minutes ago.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that they will not appear on the executive calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; they will not appear.

Mr. LUCAS. But they will have the same standing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The situation is now analogous to what happens in a legislative session. The resolutions will lie over 1 day, and while they will not appear on the calendar, they will be automatically laid before the Senate at the next executive session. Each of the resolutions will come before the Senate for action at the next executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. They are in the nature of privileged motions, are they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will follow the analogy of legislative procedure, and will be laid before the Senate at the next executive session for action.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My reason for asking the question of the Senator was that I know that the majority leader has the feeling that he should have had some notice that this discussion was to take place. He has just informed me that yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service gave notice that he would be gone from the Senate for a week, and whatever the desires of the Senators are, it occurred to me the Senator from Illinois should make his notice specific and plain so that everyone would have ample opportunity to be present when these motions or resolutions come before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I want it distinctly understood that I did not bring this matter up today simply because the Senator from North Dakota happened to be out of the city. I did not have the slightest notion where he was when I began my remarks.

This matter has been pending for months, weeks, and days, and this is one of the first opportunities we have had in an executive session really to bring it to the attention of the Senate, in view of the tremendous amount of work the Senate has been doing on other important matters.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would not suggest, much less say, that the Senator from Illinois made his remarks today in the absence of the Senator from North Dakota with any ulterior purpose. Everyone who knows the Senator from Illinois recognizes that he has the courage of his convictions in all matters.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the whole Senate was here.

Mr. WHITE. But it is an unfortunate fact that the chairman of the committee gave notice yesterday that he would be absent for a week, and that today this assault comes on his committee and on the Senator as chairman of the committee. I feel that it is regrettable; I feel it is inexcusable.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator. It may be regrettable that the Senator from North Dakota is not here, but it is not inexcusable, so far as I am concerned, and I resent the statement that it is inexcusable, because there is not anything so important from the standpoint of certain individuals, who are entitled to their rights in this country, as having this matter brought before the Senate of the United States, whether the Senator from North Dakota is here, or whether he ever comes back.

Mr. WHITE. I agree they have the right to have this matter brought before the Senate of the United States. I was only commenting on the time when it is appropriate to do it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly hope the Senator from Illinois will arrange with the majority leader to fix a time for the discussion of this matter when the Senator from North Dakota can be, and will be, present. I should like to have every member of that committee here on the floor to explain why he voted to postpone the nominations of men who have not had a word of protest filed against them. I hope the Senator from Illinois will cooperate to fix a time when the entire committee can be present.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, if I may say a word—and I say it on my own responsibility; I absolve all others of any responsibility for what I am saying—I personally have no sympathy with holding up nominations, week after week and month after month, for no reason other than political considerations. If that is what is being done—and I make no assertion that it is—if that is what is being done, I have no fellowship with it whatever. If it were a matter of 2 weeks, or 3 weeks, or possibly a month, before a change of administration, I should feel that a party in power was justified in holding on to the nomination, or holding on to the opportunity of making nominations; but—I repeat it for emphasis—I have no fellowship with holding up nominations for a year, or for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator from Maine has just said. I know exactly how he feels about a situation of this kind, but I regret that more of the Members on his side are not present.

Mr. WHITE. It was understood that we were going to recess, when I yielded to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true; but there were some Members on the floor of the Senate, including the senior Senator from Ohio, who was here and heard me start talking about postmasters. I do not know whether he understood what I was going to talk about or not, but I think it regrettable that they left the Senator from Maine here to hold the bag, when something extremely important is involved. At other times, I should not pay much attention to their absence.

Mr. WHITE. If there is one thing the Senator from Ohio has above all else, it is political courage.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. What impressed me, Mr. President, was this: The chairman of the committee obtained permission to be absent. Are all the other Senators to suffer because of that fact? Senators talk about economy. My office has been wasting Government money on telegrams and telephone calls and everything else because of the delay in the consideration of these nominations.

The Senate may not realize it, but in certain sections it is difficult to obtain postmasters. There is no chance even to ask the applicant whether he voted the Communist or Prohibitionist ticket; we just need a postmaster; and then when one is nominated it is impossible to obtain his confirmation. In the meantime, a certain post office within my State is without even an acting postmaster at the present time, because the man who was recommended has not been confirmed, and it is impossible to get anyone else even to take the position of acting postmaster. It is a small post office; true.

It seems to me that if the chairman of the committee must be absent, he should certainly leave someone in charge of matters of this sort. A committee could not vote postponement indefinitely on such matters, without a majority of the membership voting on it. In the absence of the chairman, it seems to me the senior member of the committee should be present to defend the position of the chairman and of the committee. Would it be necessary for the Senate to wait on the chairman, in the event he obtained permission to take a 3 months' vacation or a 4 months' vacation? Would the Senate be precluded from discussing the matter?

I may say to the distinguished leader of the majority, he knows very well that I have the utmost regard for his sincerity. I know the situation in which the majority leader is placed. I am not talking about the conduct of the majority leader; I am talking about a committee that, in my opinion, has not performed its duty. It occurs to me the Senate ought to castigate not only the chairman but the entire committee as well.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I am not a member of the committee, and I know only by repute and what I have heard on the floor about the attitude of the committee. I am disposed to give the committee the benefit of all doubts. I assume there are certain reasons which are motivating them, and which they will be able to state to the Senate and to the country when the time comes for that to be said, but I do not want to assume the obligation or attempt the burden of explaining what I do not understand or know.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions I have offered be printed in the RECORD, together with those offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be printed, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. My request is that they be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. LUCAS were ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Executive Resolution 1

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Roy M. Martin, to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Guy E. Midget, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 3

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Frank R. Johnson, to be postmaster at Geneseo, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 4

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of William P. Hohs, to be postmaster at Skokie, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 5

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Leland Adams, to be postmaster at Dieterich, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 6

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of LaVerne E. King, to be postmaster at Ashkum, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 7

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Marvin Randall, to be postmaster at Forsyth, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 8

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Charles H. Lawler, to be postmaster at Cortland, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 9

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of James H. Randolph, to be postmaster at Beason, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 10

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ray P. Callery, to be postmaster at Princeville, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 11

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mary E. McCarl, to be postmaster at Kinderhook, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 12

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Eva S. Hooe, to be postmaster at Niantic, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 13

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Charles J. Murphy, to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 14

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of George A. Brown, to be postmaster at Mahomet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 15

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harry M. Ostrander, to be postmaster at Harmon, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 16

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Joseph H. Pulcher, to be postmaster at East Carondelet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 17

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ted Bauer, to be postmaster at Benton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 18

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Irwin C. Stoltz, to be posmaster at Bellmont, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 19

Resolved, That the Committe on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Waldo M. Hennings, to be postmaster at Wayne, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 20

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Winifred Hughes, to be postmaster at Broughton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 21

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Oscar Hayward Holman, to be postmaster at Geff, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 22

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Joseph J. Smaron, to be postmaster at Posen, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 23

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harold E. Hohenstein, to be postmaster at Mount Auburn, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 24

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of John G. Robben to be postmaster at Germantown, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 25

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Jesse B. Thacker to be postmaster at Butler, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 26

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Lincoln A. Hardcastle to be postmaster at Royalton, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 27

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Gerald L. Hamer, to be postmaster at Olivet, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 28

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Herbert M. Bowman, to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 29

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Donald R. Toberman, to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 30

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the urther consideration of the nomination of James A. Giesler, to be postmaster at Cisco, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 31

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Francis L. Weghorst, to be postmaster at South Pekin, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 32

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Orville L. Glasford, to be postmaster at Trivoli, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 33

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Pauline M. Hutchison, to be postmaster at Shirley, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 34

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of James P. McGannon, to be postmaster at Flora, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 35

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Ada J. Ulrich to be postmaster at Thomasboro, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 36

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mabel H. Green to be postmaster at Alvin, Ill.

Senate Executive Resolution 37

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Margaret Carlson to be postmaster at Bureau, Ill.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. TYDINGS were ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Executive Resolution 38

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Edward P. Harris, to be postmaster at Snow Hill, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 39

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination o. Alice A. Kellner, to be postmaster at White Marsh, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 40

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Milton T. Holt, to be postmaster at Brandywine, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 41

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Vera M. Gordon, to be postmaster at Fork, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 42

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cora L. Sappington, to be postmaster at Keymar, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 43

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Gertrude S. Chapman, to be postmaster a' Lanham, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 44

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of William E Spoerlein, to be postmaster at Oakland, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 45

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Anita G. Swann, to be postmaster at Piney Point, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 46

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of John T. Smullin, Jr., to be postmaster at Pocomoke City, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 47

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cosette I. Hopkins, to be postmaster at Tyaskin, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 48

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Grace H. Hudson, to be postmaster at Bishop, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 49

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Harry R. Ringler, to be postmaster at Bishopville, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 50

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Mary R. Schmidt, to be postmaster at Eccleston, Md.

Senate Executive Resolution 51

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Cornelia W. Hickman, to be postmaster at Point of Rocks, Md.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect as well as friendship for the able leader of the other side, the Senator from Maine, but several Senators on this side feel rather keenly about this matter. We tried to have the nominations reported, but have not been able to do so. It is a duty that we owe to the men whom we represent to try to exert every legislative and parliamentary effort to have the nominations considered, and so I hope the majority leader will not take any offense at what I am about to do. I move that the Senate, in executive session, now recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment I think probably the Senator from Maine would feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum, in that event, and I am going to ask the Senator from Maryland to withdraw the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I may say to my friend from Maine that the Senator from Illinois and I have been waiting for a month to get an opportunity, in executive session, to bring up these matters.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, Mr. President, that may be so; but the fact remains that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Illinois have found the occasion when the chairman of the committee was absent, when he had given notice that he was to be absent; and the Senators choose that time to bring it onto the floor of the Senate and to suggest certain procedure.

Mr. President, it is a small, trivial matter, who makes the motion to recess. I submit that I had the floor, that I was about to make the motion to recess; and I thought I was doing a courteous thing when I yielded to the Senator from Illinois. I now find myself in a position where the Senators on the other side propose to take charge and to make motions. I do not like it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I think if he will reflect a minute, he will concede that the position he takes is not altogether fair. Certainly, the Senator moved the various motions that were made, to handle and to expedite consideration of the Executive Calendar. We did not interrupt him. But then, if the Senator had kept the floor through all this, and had moved to adjourn, what he is saying in effect is that we, who wanted to transact business in executive session, should not have interfered with his making a motion to recess. That is untenable. Certainly we are Senators and we have got a right to rise and make any motions we see fit, before a recess is taken.

Mr. WHITE. I agree to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. And certainly I think we are duty-bound, in view of the long delay on the part of the Committee on Civil Service, headed by the able Senator from North Dakota, who has unwittingly perhaps punished certain veterans, some of whom were wounded, some of whom are entitled to the offices, from getting the bread they need to feed their wives and children. We are entitled to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and have a show-down; and I think that is a superior right to any absenteeism that might be offered as a counterright.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with the Senator as to the right of the veterans to have their cases passed upon; but I challenge the consideration and the courtesy of Senators on the other side, to whom I yielded the floor in courtesy, and then find that I have lost the right, which was mine while I had the floor, to make the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland will kindly allow the Senator from Maine to proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator from Maryland the right to address the Chair and ask the Senator from Maine to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has that right, but the Senator from Maine has clearly shown that he is not yielding. The Senator from Maine has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will proceed. The Senator from Maine has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I decline to yield at the moment. I do want to say that I do not like the course of conduct followed here at this late hour this afternoon. It makes no really substantial difference whether the Senate recesses on the motion of the Senator from Maryland or on my motion. I shall not raise the point of no quorum, and I am not going to adopt any dilatory tactics, which can only inconvenience other Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was trying to have the Senator yield to me to say to him that I thought it was unfortunate that he took our motions as any personal affront to him, but may I say that so high is my regard for him and so deep is my confidence in his innate justice, that I am going to withdraw my motion and trust to the fairness of the majority leader to see that we be given a proper chance to air this matter in the next executive session that is held, whether the Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, be present or absent. We owe it to these veterans and others on the list of those who have been nominated and whose nominations have been before the committee for 3 or 4 months, to give them their day in court without further delay.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has passed up to me a proposition with respect to which I cannot make an answer with any authority. I cannot tell what the committee will do. I do not know what the committee will do. I know what I would do if the responsibility were mine, and mine alone, and I have indicated that to the Senator.

Now, if I may, I am going to return courtesy for courtesy, and ask the Senator from Maryland to make his motion to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I hope it will not be coupled with embarrassing conditions, however.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Chair will recognize me next.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say a word in conclusion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion of the debate that this is the first time in my experience as a Member of Congress that I have filed a motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of legislative measures or nominations submitted by the Chief Executive. I filed the motions with great reluctance. I had hoped that some constructive action in accordance with fairness and justice would come from the Committee on Civil Service of the United States Senate, but as days dragged along and even extended into months, and no action was being taken to relieve these veterans and other worthy citizens of various communities in every State in America, I felt, as a United States Senator from Illinois, that it was my bounden duty to secure action by taking the procedure which is allowed a Senator under the rules of this body. Mr. President, I propose to follow through on this matter. The opposition can term my actions anything they please. I know whereof I speak on this question. I know that I am right and that someone else is wrong. When I have deep-seated convictions upon such a question as this, I do my utmost to help those who are in distress because of political reasons for which they are not responsible. It may be called a political discussion, if anyone wants to call it such, but as I said previously, we have waited a long time to see whether or not those who are really playing politics with the post offices of this country in violation of the civil-service rules laid down by the Congress would finally yield to the right. I think the motions filed comprise our only remedy.

Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Maine that I regret he has been here alone representing his side of the aisle and shouldering the responsibility that is his as majority leader. There is no man in the Senate on either side of the aisle for whom I have a deeper affection than I do for the Senator from Maine. But I do not keep track of which Senator leaves the Senate Chamber and which Senator remains. I did not know that the Senator from North Dakota was out of town. It would not have made any difference had I known it, because this was the first opportunity to present the case in executive session, and it was the only time I could do so. I looked up the rules carefully and examined into the matter thoroughly before I made the motions to discharge the committee with respect to these various nominations. I do not know when we will have another executive session. The majority can control whether or not we shall have another one. It has been days since we have had one, and it might be weeks before we have another executive session. But this matter is now before the United States Senate, and we are going to talk about it tomorrow and the next day and the next day until these nominees, these veterans, are given their just deserts. That, Mr. President, is no threat. It is no idle promise. We are going to have a show-down on this matter. That is all I have to say.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I did not call attention to it, but a motion to recess, I believe, is not debatable, and the occupant of the chair, who was very zealous in carrying out his duties, overlooked the fact that no Senator had the right to speak when the motion was pending.

Mr. President, I rose to say to my good friend and colleague from Maine that I appreciate his generosity in giving me the authority, so-called, to act for the Senate in making the motion but I could not do so as long as he is in the Chamber. No leader in either party could have better intentions of doing the fair and the right and the proper thing under any and all circumstances that he, and I think I would be a small imitation of his greatness and fineness and generosity if I were to accept his offer to make the motion, and I return the accolade to him with genuine affection.

Mr. WHITE. May I say just a word before I make the motion?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I ask th. Senator not to make a point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to make a point of order. I merely wish to say that I am glad that the Senator from Maine is getting over on this side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the RECORD show that the Senator from Maine has returned to the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that the kindly things they have said about me personally, and which have distinguished their attitude during the entire time I have been here, amply repay me and atone for any moments of embarrassment I have suffered this afternoon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not wish to let this occasion pass without making a brief observation. I have not joined in the general compliments to the Senator from Maine, and have not said a word. However, I wish to add that everything that has been said about his fine spirit of leadership and his spirit as a Senator and gentleman meets with my full and complete accord. I wish I could add something that would really give the Senator the praise to which he is fairly and justly entitled.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat with added emphasis all I said a moment ago in expression of my gratitude and appreciation for the kindly things Senators have always said and the courtesies which they have always shown me.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if we have reached an understanding, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 21), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Dean G. Acheson, resigned.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Andrew N. Overby, of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, vice Harry D. White, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Stanton Griffis to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

George R. Merrell to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edwin A. Plitt
Charles H. Derry

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Richard D. Gatewood
Douglas Jenkins, Jr.
John D. Jernegan
J. Jefferson Jones 3d
Charles R. Burrows
William F. Busser
Robert P. Chalker
Glion Curtis, Jr.
Philip M. Davenport
Miss Constance R. Harvey
John Frémont Melby
Boiard More
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor
J. Graham Parsons
Halleck L. Rose
Fred K. Salter
William P. Snow
David A. Thomasson

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3

William K. Ailshie
E. Tomlin Bailey
Ralph J. Blake
Carl H. Boehringer
Niles W. Bond
Charles R. Burrows
Richard W. Byrd
John Willard Carrigan
Norris B. Chipman
Walter C. Dowling
John K. Emmerson
Andrew B. Foster
Norris S. Haselton
L. Randolph Higgs
Outerbridge Horsey
John D. Jernegan
U. Alexis Johnson
George Lewis Jones, Jr.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr.
Douglas MacArthur 2d
Elbert G. Mathews
Gordon H. Mattison
Brewster H. Morris
Robert Newbegin
J. Graham Parsons
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
G. Frederick Reinhardt
Arthur L. Richards
Livingston Satterthwaite
George F. Scherer
Donald W. Smith
William P. Snow
Philip D. Sprouse
Carl W. Strom
Clare H. Timberlake
Ivan B. White
Evan M. Wilson

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William Bruce Lockling

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Clarence Boonstra
Willard O. Brown
Joseph L. Dougherty
Hugh D. Farley
John C. Payne
Edward J. Rowell

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wymberley DeR. Coerr
Charles Robert Moore
H. André Weismann

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Arthur B. Allen
John A. Armitage
Denis A. Baumhover
William B. Cobb, Jr.
Richard T. Davies
Lambert John Eichner, Jr.
Baird E. Emmons
John Calvin Hill, Jr.
Elmer C. Hulen
John A. McKesson III
Paul M. Miller
Miss Susannah Mirick
B. Frank Poe, Jr.
Wells Stabler

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1

Paul H. Alling
Charles E. Bohlen
William W. Butterworth, Jr.
John M. Cabot
Paul C. Daniels
Howard Donovan
David McK. Key
Edward B. Lawson
Warwick Perkins
Edwin A. Plitt
Karl L. Rankin
James W. Riddleberger

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2

Theodore C. Achilles
John M. Allison
H. Merrell Benninghoff
James C. H. Bonbright
Philip W. Bonsal
John H. Bruins
Homer M. Byington, Jr.
Cavendish W. Cannon
Vinton Chapin
Warren M. Chase
Oliver Edmund Clubb
William P. Cochran, Jr.
Robert D. Coe
Gerald A. Drew
Everett F. Drumright
Elbridge Durbrow
Walton C. Ferris
Raymond A. Hare
Cloyce K. Huston
Gerald Keith
John B. Ketcham
Charles F. Knox, Jr.
Foy D. Kohler
Hervé J. L'Heureux
John H. Madonne
Sheldon T. Mills
Harold B. Minor
James K. Penfield
Guy W. Ray
Edward J. Sparks
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr.
Edward T. Wailes
Thomas C. Wasson
James [redacted] Wright

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4

Charles W. Adair, Jr.
H. Gardner Ainsworth
John H. Burns
Donald B. Calder
V. Lansing Collins, Jr.
Leonard J. Cromie
Richard H. Davis
Irven M. Eitreim
Robert S. Folsom
Edward L. Freers
Paul E. Geier
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr.
Richard E. Gnade
Caspar D. Green
Franklin Hawley
Martin J. Hillenbrand
John P. Hoover
John Evarts Horner
Richard A. Johnson
J. Jefferson Jones 3d
M. Gordon Knox
William L. Krieg
Sidney K. Lafoon
Donald W. Lamm
Robert H. McBride
David H. McKillop
John M. McSweeney
Albert E. Pappano
Milton C. Rewinkel
Stuart W. Rockwell
William Langdon Sands
Bromley K. Smith
Henry T. Smith
John W. Tuthill
J. Kittredge Vinson
William W. Walker
Fraser Wilkins

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5

Alvin M. Bentley
Donald C. Bergus
W. Wendell Blancké
Thomas D. Bowie
Howard Brandon
Herbert D. Brewster
William C. Burdett, Jr.
George Carnahan
David P. Coffin
A. John Cope, Jr.
Robert F. Corrigan
Forrest N. Daggett
Robert J. Dorr
Donald A. Dumont
John F. Fitzgerald
William J. Ford
Douglas N. Forman, Jr.
David L. Gamon
Michael R. Gannett
William C. George
Charles C. Gidney, Jr.
Thomas A. Goldman
Marshall Green
Joseph N. Greene, Jr.
J. Brock Havron
Douglas Henderson
J. William Henry
Charles E. Hulick, Jr.
Armistead M. Lee
George T. Lister
Rupert A. Lloyd
Albert K. Lucy, Jr.
LaRue R. Lutkins
James G. McCargar
Cleveland B. McKnight
James L. O'Sullivan
Henry L. Pitts, Jr.
Randolph Roberts
Ralph A. Schweitzer
Cabot Sedgwick
Richard M. Service
Robert M. Sheehan
Harold Sims
J. Ramon Solana
Herbert D. Spivack
Norman C. Stines, Jr.
Weldon Litsey
Richard E. Usher
Sheldon B. Vance
Edward L. Waggoner
Harvey R. Wellman
George M. Widney
William A. Wieland

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William M. Bates
Robert O. Blake
Philip J. Halla
Raymond J. Harris
Robert S. Henderson
Peter Hooper, Jr.
Warren A. Kelsey
Bruce M. Lancaster
Miss Constance McCready
John B. McGrath
James D. Newton
Kenedon P. Steins

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

William E. Warne to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick to be a member, California Debris Commission.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Luis Negron Fernandez to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Owen McIntosh Burns to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto F. Heine to be a United States marshal for the district of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King Eternal, as we come to our duties, take our thoughts, our motives, and our labors, that we may continue them with Thy blessed approval. At times we desire to do that which is beyond our strength; be gracious to accept the wish when we fail to do the deed. Let us feel Thy great mercy stirring the depths of our souls in closer dedication to our God and our country.

Do Thou endow us plenteously with those gifts which enlighten the mind, that we may realize that the world has no lasting honors for those who seek only self, while those who interpret their surplus as another's need will awake to find themselves immortal. Dear Lord, human hearts are failing, but in Thy sight no life is common or worthless; so bless us with the inspiration of hope and with a sense of dignity, that we may be real and abiding contributions to the moral and spiritual forces of our land.

Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 16, 1947:

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

On April 25, 1947:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1947:

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

On May 1, 1947:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3020. An act to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a Wilmington, Del., newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a signed editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News by John S. Knight on the subject Curb on Reckless Spending Requires Public Support.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Monday next, but that being the day set aside for memorial services I ask unanimous consent that I may have this same special order on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PILGRIMAGE FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS, SISTERS, AND WIVES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman recently called for approval of the provisions of the Gold Star pilgrimage bill which I introduced in the House in January 1945 and which I am once again proposing to Congress.

The Hall measure reads as follows:

A bill to provide for pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands

Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for, as soon as possible, and to pay the necessary expenses of, pilgrimages of mothers, sisters, and wives of servicemen who died during World War II and were buried in foreign lands, to their sons', brothers', and husbands' graves.

Every Gold Star mother, sister, and wife of the recent war should be given the chance to visit the grave of her loved one if it is at all practicable and possible.

The practice of bringing home remains of veterans who fell in battle is now being followed to some extent in accordance with the wishes of the individual family. But most people seem to prefer that graves of the fallen be left unopened. Many would rather the sorrow brought on by death be locked within the mound of earth on that far-off shore instead of renewing its pangs by the return of mortal clay.

It is logical and natural that those nearest and dearest to the deceased should want to make a pilgrimage to the place, however remote, yet hallowed, where he fell fighting for his flag and his country.

After the First World War, several thousand Gold Star Mothers visited their sons' graves in France at Uncle Sam's expense. They set the precedent which ought to be observed at the present. I hope Congress will not hesitate in providing funds and the authority with which to make similar pilgrimages possible in the near future.

I feel sure that all veterans' organizations in America, along with their auxiliaries, will be strongly in favor of the plan as outlined in my bill. The Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives ought to be considered and included in any mass pilgrimage which finally takes place.

How soon action is to be forthcoming in this regard will depend upon the sincerity of all who give lip service to the relatives of these dead heroes. Let us, then, arouse ourselves to our duty. The Hall bill provides for these pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers and sisters and wives to the graves of their closest ones, who died in service during World War II, and are now buried in foreign lands. There should be no delay in our making such a measure the law of the land.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARTLEY, LANDIS, HOFFMAN, LESINSKI, and BARDEN.

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that under House Joint Resolution 134, the so-called foreign relief bill, the United States undertakes relief to Italy and Hungary, while under the proposed peace treaties Italy is to pay Russia $100,000,000 in war reparations, and Hungary is to pay Russia $200,000,000 for the same cause, is anomalous and inconsistent to a great many American people. While Italy will not begin payments, as I understand it, until 2 years after the treaty, Hungary is already charged with that obligation, and it was freely said in the hearings that Hungary would not need relief if she did not have to pay reparations.

It seems to me that this difficulty could be obviated if President Truman, in exercise of the powers vested in him by the Lend Lease Act, negotiate with Russia for an assignment of these war damage claims against Hungary and Italy, for which we in return would give her credit on the $11,000,000,000 she owes us. We could then cancel these obligations against Italy and Hungary, which would do more for European recovery and good will than almost any other thing we could do.

We could even go further and do the same with the $300,000,000 proposed as war damages to Russia by both Finland and Rumania. In fact, there is no reason why we could not carry this to other countries faced with payment of war reparations to Russia, in each instance giving Russia the credit on her indebtedness to us under lend-lease, and canceling the obligation of the debtor nations This would, of course, not directly interfere with either House Joint Resolution 134 or the peace treaties.

Russia could not complain, and there is no reason why the President should not undertake negotiations to accomplish what seems to me is one of the biggest steps toward peaceful relations in Europe and world peace.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Memorials, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that all necessary arrangements have been made for the annual memorial services to be held next Monday, May 19. The families of our deceased Members who passed on during the past year have been invited, and many of them, no doubt, will be here. We should make every effort to be here next Monday, just before noon. It is a mark of respect we owe to our deceased colleagues.

The memorial addresses will be delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] will sing two selections during the services. The music will be furnished by the United States Marine Corps orchestra.

AID TO KOREA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I came into the Chamber I noticed that one of the Democratic Members of Congress was reading this newspaper carrying the caption "Truman asks $200,000,000 for Korea" in big headlines. Now, you know that Mr. Truman asked for $300,000,000 for Greece; Mr. Truman asked for $100,000,000 for Turkey, and he is asking for millions and millions for various countries of the world. This administration is at home asking Congress to appropriate the great, large gifts. If you pick up the statement issued by the Treasury Department you will notice that on May 9 we were $275,639,000,000, and many more dollars, in the red. This administration has always been in the red. We have been in the red so long that since the New Deal came into power we have increased our national indebtedness over 1,200 percent. Think of such an increase. Oh, it is terrible. Now you are coming in here with appropriation bills asking the Congress to cut down our home appropriations—and rightfully so. We should cut down these appropriations everywhere we possibly can at home, but how can you cut down your own people when you are asked to give millions and hundreds of millions to every country in the world? It does not make sense. This morning the United States News says that Britain is going to ask for another loan for Great Britain in 1948. Do you fellows not know that you gave Great Britain $4,400,000,000 last year? That is enough. Now they want another loan in 1948. So, if you give any more money to those fellows to socialize Great Britain, you are just simply nuts. That is all it is. We must economize or bust. We will wreck our country unless we can balance our budget. Think of increasing our debt over 1,200 percent. That is what you have done in 14 years. You were elected to economize—the majority of you. Let us do it. Again, I tell you 10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us squeeze the eagle and make him holler. Be wise and economize.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the American Bar Association Journal by John R. Nicholson of the Chicago bar entitled "Pensions for Partners: Tax Laws Are Unfair to Lawyers and Firms."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of Policy Committee to members of the Rochester United Nations Association.

CONDITIONS AT IWO JIMA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from a young friend of mine currently stationed on Iwo Jima. At this time when committees of the Congress are considering merger of the armed forces, appropriations therefor, and huge gifts for the relief of destitution, the following excerpts from this young man's letter seem to me to be particularly pertinent:

1. The Air Force is in very bad shape, both as regards equipment and maintenance. Also, it makes a very poor job of running, or trying to run, as a separate unit. It has neither the quantity or quality of personnel to do two jobs—the work of the air corps and the ground forces. It has to call on other branches such as Engineers, Ordnance, Signal Corps, etc.

2. The dependent housing situation is bad. Many officers are leaving the service because they cannot bring their families overseas. It has caused a distinct lowering of morale even among Regular Army. They were promised housing within 3 months and even after 6 months' duty there is no prospect of obtaining it. On a place like this they could have all the houses they need in 1 month. There are literally hundreds of quonsets which require only minor repairs, which could be utilized.

3. The civilians (excluding the teachers) have not been utilized fully or properly. Many of them are having a vacation at a high salary, but it is not their fault. They were sent here as instructors and supervisors of equipment, maintenance, etc., but they are not being used for that purpose. One Diesel mechanic, who lives with me, has not done 2 hours' work in the 2 months he has been here. He wants to work, but there is nothing for him to do.

4. There seems to be some animosity between Air Forces and Ground Forces, between Army and Navy. I hope the merger will allay some of this feeling.

5. The waste of equipment is shocking. Lately, it seems, they are beginning to do something about it, taking inventory and shipping it to China, Korea, etc, but for months very valuable material has lain exposed to the elements and "cannibalized" by scroungers. As a taxpayer, it hurts. * * * My over-all reaction is that somebody had better "get on the ball" and do something to bring the Army to some degree of discipline and efficiency.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the controlling factor motivating the vote of many on the bill for aid to Greece and Turkey was the fact that the President had announced to the world that we would come to the aid of these countries in the struggle which they faced to pre-

vent being submerged by outside pressures. It was felt that to defeat this measure would be a repudiation, not of the President, but of our own position of world leadership, and that such action would be construed as an indication that we are a divided nation and would furnish an invitation to further aggressive and expansionist tactics.

I, for one, and I know I speak for many of like mind on this side of the aisle, strongly endorse our pursuit of a bipartisan foreign policy. We earnestly desire, in complete good faith, to subordinate partisanship completely over this crucial issue which will determine the entire future of our country and, perhaps, our survival as a Nation and a people.

With the utmost deference and respect, therefore, I call to the President's attention the fact that bipartisanship is a two-way street. Our policy, to be effective, must be bipartisan in its conception, as well as its execution.

Every effort should be made to call on the legislative team of both political parties frequently and sincerely in the formulation of our foreign policy. It is disturbing to have loose talk going about by those in high authority regarding $5,000,000,000 loans to other foreign countries until such a program has been discussed and approved in substance by at least the leadership of both parties.

This is a warning, issued in the friendliest spirit and the most sincere desire to keep foreign policy on the high level which it has recently enjoyed. The Congress does not wish to be presented with any further fait accompli. If that happens again, the comparatively clear sailing which the Greece-Turkey aid bill enjoyed may not be repeated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on April 28, 1947, entitled "Expensive Penny-Pinching in Washington."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include editorial comment.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram he received from Allen Rubottom, manager of the municipal airport at Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

OUR AIRPORT PROGRAM MUST BE CARRIED OUT—PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS, IF EFFECTED, WILL RETARD IT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram from the mayor of Chicago and also a telegram from the city council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in the city of Chicago we were fortunate in electing as mayor one of our foremost citizens, a splendid, efficient and experienced businessman, and an economy-minded executive. I refer to Hon. Martin H. Kennelly who succeeded Mayor Edward J. Kelly under whose 14 years of splendid and efficient administration many improvements and betterments were made to our city which time will not permit me to enumerate, yet I cannot resist in calling attention briefly to the construction during Mayor Kelly's regime of many new schools, the demolishing and rehabilitation of many blighted districts upon which many splendid housing projects have been erected, the building of our subway, the construction of one of the country's largest airports, the beautifying and enlargements of our parks, and the widening and construction of over 100 miles of connecting boulevards. It is gratifying that he has been succeeded by a man of the capacity of Mayor Kennelly who, I know, will set an example to the mayors of other cities as to how a municipal government can and should be administered in the interest of its people and taxpayers. Mayor Kennelly was elected by an overwhelming majority of 274,000 votes and this notwithstanding that the Republican National Committee, and the city, county, and State committees, made the municipal election a national issue. I know that he will have the cooperation of all our outstanding businessmen as well as laboring men who have displayed, and justly so, their confidence in him.

Mayor Kennelly will not only follow in the footsteps of such former Democratic mayors as the old and young Carter H. Harrisons, each of whom served five terms; Mayor Dunne; Mayor Dever; Mayor Cermak; and Mayor Kelly, in all of whose administrations the people were efficiently served as compared with the administration of former Republican Mayor Thompson, but he has the interest and welfare not only of his city but that of the Nation at heart, as is evidenced by a telegram which he has addressed to me and to other Members from Chicago, wherein he urges sufficient and proper appropriations in carrying out our Federal airport program. The telegram speaks for itself, and I insert it at this point as part of my remarks:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 12, 1947.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference to House Appropriations Committee eliminating all funds for Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of traffic-control towers and reduction in the amount of money to be allotted for building new airports. Control-tower operations is proper function of Government. Such a move would doubtless create improper control conditions throughout the Nation. Reduction of aid in building airports will defeat entire airport program. Amounts now appropriated and authorized are woefully inadequate to effect purpose of Federal Airport Act. Without Government aid increased rather than diminished, Chicago's Douglas Airport cannot proceed, although it is of vital importance to the continuation of interstate and international traffic and to military operations in case of national emergency.

MARTIN H. KENNELLY,
Mayor of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to Mayor Kennelly's request for the appropriation of these funds and in the carrying out of the program initiated under the Federal Airport Act and appeal to the fair-minded Members of this House to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], to increase the appropriation for Civil Aeronautics Administration to $70,982,000.

I have also received a request from the members of the Common Council of the City of Chicago protesting these proposed cuts and a telegram from the chairman of the aviation committee, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, which I insert as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 13, 1947*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Current attempt in H. R. 3311 to curtail appropriations by eliminating from Civil Aeronautics Administration appropriations the Federal operation of airport control towers is believed by our aviation committee to be inadvisable as without such Federal control each city having important airports might otherwise operate arbitrarily with great probability of serious confusion to pilots of scheduled airlines and danger to traveling public at a time when new era of safety can be foreseen through operation of ground control approach system and instrument landing system which also must be under Federal control for obvious reasons.

Respectfully submitted.

ERWIN SEAGO,
Chairman, Aviation Committee, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these telegrams attest to the vital interest of the people of the Chicago area in this subject legislation and it is my belief that besides these proposed unfair cuts that there are other unjustifiable reductions recommended by the committee which conditions do not warrant. I believe in economy but not a false economy that would jeopardize the lives of thousands of air passengers and I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

MAKE SOCIAL SECURITY A FACT AND NOT A FICTION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity and national security, we have spent billions of dollars for the relief of people in other lands while neglecting the needs of our own citizens.

We are withholding assistance from the people who helped to build our Nation and giving it to strangers who may, at some future time, be our enemies.

Such a contradictory policy is beyond understanding. It is hardly calculated to inspire in our people that faith in representative government upon which our national security primarily depends.

Democracy will not survive and develop on words alone. It must prove that it can work for the good of all. In the first quarter of 1947 many business corporations made greater profits than in any other quarter of their history, not excluding the fantastic years of the 1920's.

In that same quarter of 1947 prices rose steadily toward inflationary peaks, while the aged, the blind, and dependent children, who try to exist on fixed payments that were meager to begin with, have seen their few dollars buy less and less. Slowly but surely they are being squeezed toward extinction.

In addition to the billions we have spent abroad for relief, we have hurried through legislation to provide other billions in loans—more properly called gifts—to foreign governments. But when our own dispossessed citizens ask for the relief they are met with a stony silence.

A little more than a year ago the national average payments to 2,047,446 recipients of old-age assistance were only $39.60 a month; 70,882 needy blind received an average of only $33.35 a month. Since that time the cost of living has risen rapidly. With controls off, there was a mad scramble for excess profits, and our needy citizens became the first victims. Again there are ominous signs that our Nation is on the roller-coaster of boom-and-bust, yet with the terrible experience of the 1930's still fresh in our minds, we are taking no steps to cushion the shock for those who are least able to bear it.

It should be plain to every mature person in our country that the tremendous productivity of our economy is meaningless unless all of our people have the purchasing power to buy the products of agriculture and industry. We cannot survive half rich and half poor. Let us not forget that the "have and have-not" issue which caused, and is causing, so much trouble for the world can also cause us domestic trouble.

With callous disregard for this emergency, the House Appropriations Committee has lopped off $77,800,000 from the Labor-Federal Security budget.

Hundreds of thousands of persons over 60 years of age, too young to get present old-age assistance, must become subjects of direct relief. I know many of these oldsters who have given the best years of their lives to their country. The humiliations they are forced to undergo add insult to injury. I say that we have no right to help the people of other lands unless we are prepared at the same time to help our own. Economy has its place in Government, but it must never be at the expense of the needy. Our present social security program is only a beginning. It must go forward and not backward. One of the first amendments to aid its developments must be the lowering of the eligible age to 60, so that American men and women may apply for old-age assistance in time as a right, and not as a charity.

A recession, mild or severe, with a consequent loss of employment to many is inevitable. We do not want to see our veterans, trying to make a delayed start in life, become its first victims. Far better to retire the old folks who are still working, to make way for the young upon whom the future of our country in the uncertain future immediately ahead depends than to stir up resentment within families.

In the case of those oldsters who are not working, and who will never be hired by industry, the need for reducing the eligible age for assistance to 60 is particularly urgent. Furthermore, there should be no enforced contributions from children. The law must be amended so that those who apply for old-age or blind assistance will be able to stand on their own qualifications. This provision will not prevent children from contributing to their parents' support if they wish to do so on moral grounds. Support-your-relatives or responsible-relatives clause is now invoked in many States, although it is not a Federal requirement. Too often this is used by the States as an excuse to deny aid to a deserving applicant. And where the children are forced to contribute, the cost of the collections greatly exceeds the amount collected. This has caused much misunderstanding and hard feelings among families and has broken up many homes. To show to what extreme such an unworkable law will go, may I quote the experience of Connecticut. In that State, under the responsible-relative clause, it was stipulated that liability rests on a husband or wife, father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, and children or grandchildren.

They call this social security.

It is high time that we as a people put first things first and develop a social security system that will give adequate protection to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, lest democracy become a mockery in our own eyes.

The homes of America must be free from want and free from fear.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

JOHN PAUL JONES BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of 15 members, as follows: The President of the United States; the President pro tempore of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 6 persons to be designated by the President of the United States; 3 Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized and directed to arrange for memorial meetings and exercises in the year of 1947 in the city of Washington and other cities and places in the United States particularly associated with the memory of John Paul Jones, and in universities, schools, and colleges throughout the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission may at its discretion accept from any source, public or private, money or other property to be used for the purpose of making surveys and investigations, formulating, preparing, and considering plans and estimates for the improvement, construction, or other expenses incurred, or to be incurred.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel at it may deem necessary to employ. Such compensation will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(c) To the extent deemed by the Commission to be necessary in carrying out its functions, the Commission is authorized to have printing, binding, lithographing, and other work done at establishments other than the Government Printing Office. Compensation for such work will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(d) The Commission is authorized to procure advice and assistance from any Government agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and to cooperate with individuals and agencies, public or private. The Superintendent of Documents shall make available to the Commission the facilities of his office for the distribution of portraits, pamphlets, and booklets herein authorized.

SEC. 4. That the Commission shall, at the conclusion of its activities, submit to Congress a comprehensive report of the progress of its work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO FIRST INFANTRY DIVISION, WORLD WAR II

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant the Memorial Association of the First Infantry Division, United States Army, permis-

sion to erect on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., adjacent to the monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, a monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces in World War II; the site chosen and the design of the monument and pedestal shall be approved by the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library with the advice and recommendations of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO ANDREW W. MELLON

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant authority to the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee to erect a memorial fountain on public grounds at the intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, in the District of Columbia, such grounds being now owned by the United States: *Provided*, That the design of the memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial: *Provided further*, That unless funds, which in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior are sufficient to insure the completion of the memorial, are certified available, and the erection of this memorial begun within 5 years from and after date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN PAUL JONES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House passed the joint resolution for the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission be vacated, and that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by Messrs. Hulse, Parkman, Burns, Ward, and Powers, of the Senate of the State of California.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY TAXES FOR LAND IT OWNS IN CALIFORNIA—McDONOUGH BILL, H. R. 2030, PROVIDES THIS—46 PERCENT OF CALIFORNIA OWNED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, many of our States are facing a serious curtailment in tax revenue because of the huge Federal land holdings within their boundaries. The Federal Government has acquired vast acreage that has been set aside as national-forest land, and during the war has expanded its holdings for military and naval bases and for use by the multitude of agencies and enlarged departments which sprang up in the war years.

All of this land is tax-free, and the State and local governments are deprived of the revenue which would be paid on this land if it were under private ownership. At the same time both State and local governments must expend thousands of dollars for the protection of life and property in many of these areas owned by the Government, and must maintain roads and other facilities for the use of people living and working on property owned by the Federal Government.

In the State of California alone, the accumulation of land by the Federal Government has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all land within the State. Federal acquisition has extended to 50 percent of all the land in 17 California counties. And in 11 western States, 47 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government.

This presents a serious situation since all of this land is tax free. It means that the property owners must pay higher taxes to compensate for the loss of tax revenue on Federal Government-owned lands. It curtails the expenditure for improvements in local communities and in the counties. It deprives the State of legitimate sources of revenue.

I believe it is time that the Federal Government accept its responsibility to compensate the States at least in part for the loss of tax revenue on lands that are owned by the Federal Government. I have introduced H. R. 2030 for this purpose.

My bill would authorize annual payments to the States, Territories and insular governments by the Federal Government based on the fair value of national-forest lands situated therein for the benefit of the local political subdivisions where such lands are situated. Such payment will avert embarrassing fluctuations of income to counties to which stable income is essential to the efficient conduct of local functions of government. It will also remedy inadequacies of contributions to costs of local government in localities where national-forest lands yield little or no revenue.

Legislation such as H. R. 2030 is urgently needed, and I ask the Members of the House to give consideration to this problem during the present session of Congress. The California State Senate has also passed a resolution requesting such action as follows:

Senate Resolution 79

Resolution relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments

Whereas the problem of the acquisition and ownership of Federal lands in the several States is causing considerable concern because of the reduced evaluation base upon which local property taxes can be levied; and

Whereas such lands are and have been acquired for game reserves, forest reserves, public parks, public monuments, mineral reserves, Federal building for governmental purposes, expanding military facilities, property acquired and used in a proprietary sense and land remaining in public domain; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for governmental purposes in the heart of metropolitan areas of large cities has substantially reduced the tax base laws used in the determination of the ad valorem tax; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for these several purposes has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all the lands in California; and

Whereas such accumulation has extended to 50 percent of all the lands in 17 counties of said State; and

Whereas in all the 11 Western States 47 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such large accumulation of land by the Federal Government in California and the other 10 Western States has been destructive to the fiscal structure of local government; and

Whereas the withdrawal of such large amounts of land from taxation has left local government without adequate revenue for its support; and

Whereas this loss of revenue cannot be supplanted by other sources; and

Whereas it is necessary for local government to provide protection of life and property, the maintenance and construction of streets, roads, and highways, and other local facilities to service the properties acquired by the Federal Government and the people living thereon: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government assume its financial responsibilities in relation to local governmental jurisdictions where such property is located; that Congress immediately enact legislation to this end;

2. That said legislation provide that local government be reimbursed in amount equivalent to taxes lost by virtue of such acquisition by the Federal Government; or that such property as is owned by the Federal Government be permitted to be taxed locally in the same manner and to the same extent as other local property;

3 That property now held by the Federal Government which is not clearly necessary for a public purpose be disposed of in order that it may be returned to the local tax rolls for the purpose of local taxation and support of local government; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action.

(Resolution read and, on motion of Senator Hulse, adopted.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include a series of articles written by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the idea advanced some time ago in the other body by an international statesman that the Congress should consider our foreign policy from a bipartisan standpoint is being extended to cover the domestic situation; that is to say, we are told now that, if the President, or anyone else in authority in the administration, suggests a measure, that we in the Congress ought to go along because if we do not someone in some other country might think we are not united here in America in the defense of our country and do not consider our national welfare. The same thought was advanced when we were considering the Greek-Turkish gift. It was advanced again today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Now, that argument that the Congress must blindly follow the lead of the President or his advisers or members of his administration is neither sound, logical, nor consistent. The Congress and the Members of Congress have certain responsibilities under the Constitution. Unless we want to surrender the major part of those responsibilities and duck our obligation to the people who sent us here, there is no reason in the wide world why we should accept every idea that comes out of the White House, which may have been suggested to the President by someone who has something other than the welfare of America in his mind.

There is no reason why we here in the House should follow international statesmen over on the other side of the Capitol when they tell us that we should cut down appropriations, as we are going to do today, which are for the benefit of our own people, and then pour out our money to every country and every people in the world who may ask for it or who can be persuaded, if we suggest it, to come and get it or let us take it to them. Eventually, we cannot protect ourselves if we continue to pour out our money and natural resources to every corner of the world in a vain and hopeless effort to give everyone everything they want or ask. America and her welfare should be our first objectives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter signed by 200 people, members of a civic welfare organization in my county at Odin, Ill., in which they would like the Government, which ran out on them on a contract just prior to the war, to go through and help finish the building of a sewer project. I do not know just how I can answer that letter if I tell them that the Government cannot afford to keep its contract when last week we voted $650,000,000 to go overseas, which presages a few billion more to follow.

As far as this bipartisan policy is concerned, it is a one-way street, and you might just as well know that now. There will be no cooperation, there will be no bipartisan cooperation except as the Republicans take a "me too" attitude and go along. We will find that out when labor legislation and tax legislation go to the President for his signature, and we find it out every day on the floor of the House when an appropriation bill is presented. The sooner the majority party understands that the people expect them to stand on their own two feet and protect the interest of the people of America first, and then deal out our largess afterward, if we can stand it, the better off the country will be and the better off the Republican Party will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extends my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Republicans will take heed when they hear the words of wisdom uttered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]. The Republicans are in the majority in this body. Yesterday we were lectured by New Deal members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations because we were not cutting enough; that we promised to cut $6,000,000,000, and that we had not even scratched the surface. We will be lectured every day about the very same thing. How can we economize when we vote as we did here last week on the Turkish-Greek deal? The parade is on. Remember, Members on the Republican side, you will be asked to vote for universal military training, you will be asked to vote on any number of military bills, you will be scolded by the administration about not looking backward. Remember your campaign pledges of last fall. Remember that we did not promise to spend money all over the world for all kinds of boondoggling projects, but we did promise to balance the budget and cut expenditures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] presented a resolution which would, in effect, authorize the printing of some half million booklets entitled "Communism in Action." Congress I think rightly took action on that and authorized the printing of them. It was a research analysis by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Since February 5 there has been a similar resolution in this House regarding Fascism in Action. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an analogous report on Fascism in Action which, in my opinion, is just as important to the American people as Communism in Action. That particular resolution has been called to the attention of the Committee on Printing. I understand it is before the full committee today. It is my hope that the full committee will act upon this resolution, bring it to the floor of the House, and let the Members pass the resolution authorizing the printing of this research analysis on Fascism in Action in America.

I refer to an editorial in today's Post entitled "Let the Chips Fall."

We as American citizens are just as much opposed to fascism as to communism.

The editorial reads as follows:

LET THE CHIPS FALL

Today the House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to come to grips with fascism. The issue is House Resolution 83, sponsored

by Representative PATMAN, which calls for publication of a pamphlet, Fascism in Action, prepared for him by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This booklet ought to be circulated as the counterpart of Communism in Action, prepared some time ago for Congressman DIRKSEN. Nearly a million copies of the Dirksen publication already have been printed. A clear precedent is thus established. We hope that the House committee will grasp its responsibility for bringing to the attention of Americans the workings of a force equally as sinister as communism. They are faces of the same repugnant medal.

In this respect the record of the Subcommittee on Printing, which handled the resolution after Mr. PATMAN introduced it February 5, has been anything but encouraging. At first the subcommittee bottled up the resolution. Then, after repeated inquiry, it reported the measure out to the full committee without recommendation. This was, indeed, a strange reaction on the part of men supposedly dedicated to oppose all forms of totalitarianism. If the resolution is allowed to stagnate, Congress will be placed in an exceedingly unfortunate light. It will have, in effect, given its blessing to an anti-Communist crusade while at the same time remaining oblivious to a force no less dangerous to our way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY BILL SIGNED (H. DOC. NO. 247)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed H. R. 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. The primary purpose of this act is to relieve employers and the Government from potential liability for billions of dollars in so-called portal-to-portal claims. These claims have emerged since judicial interpretation of the wage-and-hour law raised the possibility that employers might be required to pay back wages for certain activities which in most industries had not previously been considered by either workers or employers to be compensable. I believe that, in the interest of the economic stability of our Nation, it is essential to clarify this matter by statute.

The Portal-to-Portal Act should end this uncertainty with respect to claims of still undetermined magnitude. Current wage negotiations can proceed more readily to a satisfactory conclusion, and businessmen will be able to plan with assurance for full production and price reductions. This will be of real value to labor and management in the maintenance of a continued high level of employment.

I am confident that the purpose of the main provisions of the act is to eliminate the immense potential liabilities which have arisen as the result of the portal-to-portal claims. It is not the purpose of the act to permit violation of our fundamental wage-and-hour standards, or to allow a lowering of these standards. This is evident from the findings of the Congress set forth in section 1 of the act as to the need for legislation.

Some doubts have been expressed to me, however, concerning the effects of this legislation upon our wage and hour standards.

Section 2 of the act relates to existing claims. From my consideration of this section, I understand it to be the intent of the Congress to meet the problem raised by portal-to-portal claims, but not to invalidate all other existing claims. The plain language of section 2 of the act preserves minimum wage and overtime compensation claims based upon activities which were compensable in any amount under contract, custom, or practice. Various provisions of the act such as sections 3, 9, and 12, would be rendered absurd or unnecessary under any other interpretation. Moreover, a contrary interpretation would raise difficult and grave questions of constitutionality.

As to section 4, relating to future claims, the legislative history of the act shows that the Congress intends that the words "principal activities" are to be construed liberally to include any work of consequence performed for the employer, no matter when the work is performed. We should not lose sight of the important requirement under the act that all principal activities must be paid for, regardless of contract, custom, or practice. I am sure the courts will not permit employers to use artificial devices such as the shifting of work to the beginning or the end of the day to avoid liability under the law.

I wish also to refer to the so-called good faith provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act. It has been said that they make each employer his own judge of whether or not he has been guilty of a violation. It seems to me that this view fails to take into account the safeguards which are contained in these sections. The employer must meet an objective test of actual conformity with an administrative ruling or policy. If the employer avails himself of the defense under these sections, he must bear the burden of proof. He must show that there was affirmative action by an administrative agency and that he relied upon and conformed with such action. He must show further that he acted in good faith in relying upon that administrative action.

Section 11 of the act gives the court discretionary authority to waive liquidated damages. Under the language of the section, however, it continues to be the duty of the court to award liquidated damages unless convinced that the employer has, in good faith, sought to comply with his obligations under the act. I do not believe this section will be used to permit employers to engage in violation of the law with impunity.

I am aware that this act introduces new and possibly ambiguous language, the effects of which can be accurately measured only after interpretation by the courts. I have therefore instructed the Secretary of Labor to keep me currently informed as to the effects of this act upon the preservation of wage-and-hour standards. If those effects prove to be detrimental to the maintenance of fair labor standards for our workers, I shall request the Congress to take prompt remedial action.

The enactment of H. R. 2157 makes necessary additional appropriations for the administration and enforcement of the wage-and-hour laws. The 2-year statute of limitations under this act will in most cases substantially reduce the period of time within which workers' claims may be asserted under the wage-and-hour laws. It will be necessary, therefore, to augment the Government's program of inspection and enforcement in order to detect violations early enough to protect workers from undue losses. Other provisions of the act also place additional responsibilities upon the Department of Labor. I shall submit estimates to the Congress for the necessary appropriations.

Prior to its adjournment last year, the Congress had reached a large measure of agreement as to legislation to increase minimum-wage standards. I trust that with the passage of the Portal-to-Portal Act, relieving the business community of a heavy burden of doubt, the Congress will now turn to a reexamination of minimum-wage standards.

In enacting the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Congress declared it to be our national policy to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. It has become increasingly evident that the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour established by that act is far from adequate to meet that national policy. I am convinced that immediate amendment of the act to provide a minimum of at least 65 cents an hour is necessary. In addition, minimum-wage benefits should be extended to many persons not now protected by the law, as I have recommended in previous messages to the Congress.

I recommend that the Congress take action upon these matters now.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 14, 1947.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on soil conservation appearing in the New York Times.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Boykin
Andresen,	Bennett, Mo.	Buckley
August H.	Bland	Buffett
Auchincloss	Bloom	Bulwinkle
Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.	Butler

Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Miller, Nebr.
Clements	Gifford	Morrison
Clippinger	Gregory	Nodar
Coffin	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Cooley	Hays	Pfeifer
Cox	Hendricks	Powell
D'Alesandro	Jones, N. C.	Rayfiel
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Sarbacher
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Kelley	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Keogh	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	Kerr	Vinson
Doughton	Lemke	Vorys
Ellis	Lyle	Wadsworth
Fellows	McDowell	West
Fernandez	McGarvey	
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on yesterday in an eloquent and powerful manner gave to the House and to the Congress convincing reasons why our short-wave broadcasts abroad, known as the Voice of America, should be continued. As a part of its strategy in making ideological advancement in taking country after country over, an important part of the Soviet Union's war of nerves is in intense radio propaganda. While exact figures are not available, sufficient information is available for our officials and for us to know that Russia is spending for this purpose several times what we are spending, and other countries, recognizing the value of this type of activity, are spending more than we do. It is a well-known fact that adherence, even a limited adherence, to the truth in its propaganda activities is not one of the elements of the Soviet Union's policy. It is also a well-known fact that an intensive drive is being made everywhere possible to place the United States in a false light. Japan, China, Asia, and elsewhere in the Far East did the same thing before and during the recent war.

In the light of world conditions, in the light of the false propaganda being directed at us, it seems to me to be a wise investment to present America in its proper light and to expose the falsity of propaganda the purpose of which is to undermine our prestige elsewhere and to create doubt, uncertainty, and disbelief in the minds of people elsewhere that there is any future for them except through the road of communism. A powerful weapon of Hitler in the technique of the war the Nazis had developed in its first and open stage was propaganda of all kinds, prominent among which was the radio that brought division among the intended victims through fear and uncertainty, the appeal to all kinds of emotionalism, principally fear and hatred.

The same technique is being used now, except instead of the actual attack by the Soviet Union following when a people are weakened and divided from within, the Communist group within a country takes over, and then the real viciousness starts into operation.

The false and vicious types of radio propaganda being given to the peoples of other countries against our country should, and must, be met.

In the Middle East, for example, I have been informed that Russian broadcasts accuse the United States of having diplomatic agents over there to gobble up all oil deposits. They cite in support the fact that we have oil attachés at our embassies and legations, and from this fact alone, being termed "oil attachés"—their title—that we have hundreds of them over there for the purpose of stealing the oil fields of the Middle East. Built up, as they cleverly do, the Russian radio—although it is false except as to the title—and I have been informed that we have only six or seven such attachés—makes out a case that appeals emotionally, and the reaction, as intended, is to create fear and hatred of the United States.

This is an illustration of how the truth is completely distorted. I have suggested to the State Department that the titles of these attachés be changed as an effective means of meeting this false propaganda.

Every kind of deception or falsehood is resorted to—that which they think will assist in producing the desired results—fear and hatred of the United States or Great Britain—and when concentrating their efforts on a particular country, sending out propaganda that will confuse and divide a people, and to further the aims and objectives of the Russian or Communist Party within a country—thereby spreading as far and as rapidly as possible communism internationally, resulting in a more powerful and dangerous Soviet Union internally, and more dangerous as a world power and a world threat.

Their broadcasts on the Moscow Conference is a distortion of the truth. The United States is pictured to unfortunate and starving and distressed persons of other countries—already subjected to fear—as a country that is responsible for their condition in some places, and in other places as a greedy and selfish imperialistic nation.

The blame is placed on the United States principally, and also Great Britain—and France will probably now be included—for the unfortunate conditions that exist elsewhere, for the failure of peace, and being clever propagandists, the Russians portray a discolored picture and a distorted argument that is productive of the results they desire.

The fact that the Soviet Union is responsible for the negative Moscow Conference results is well known to us, but there are many countries in which only the Russian distortion of the story of the Conference is known.

We know that the failure is due to Russia's refusal to cooperate with understanding. Secretary Marshall, in substance, told the world that after his return, but great parts of the world were unable to get his report. In his report Secretary Marshall told us that the Soviet Union—and I quote from the New York Times editorial of April 29—"made agreements impossible by insisting on conditions in both Austria and Germany which made inevitable not only a further drain on American resources, but also a continuous economic deterioration in all Europe, leading to new dictatorships and new strife."

The editorial—and I quote from it again because I agree with it—further says: "And though Mr. Marshall refrained from saying so, it is no secret that it is in such a situation that the Communists put their hope for further expansion."

Under these conditions, in the light of the intense and false propaganda over the radio, what are we going to do? What should we do?

Without discussing the value of the frequency we will lose, it is my opinion that it would be unwise to terminate this activity completely.

The views of Secretary Marshall in the matter have been strongly expressed. It seems to me that his views are worthy of deep consideration. Next to the President, Secretary Marshall is charged with the duty and responsibility of steering our ship of State. He has a duty and responsibility of a primary nature. Unless substantial progress is made toward a real peace settlement at the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers which is scheduled for next November, I cannot see where any good can come of further efforts. As I interpret world conditions and world events, the deadline or time limit is the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers. In the meantime, contrary to the recommendations, in fact, the urgings of Secretary Marshall, should we completely discontinue this activity?

We are also aware that private industry cannot properly carry on this activity, particularly outside the Western Hemisphere. The evidence from leading figures in the radio field is evident in this respect.

You will note I have confined my remarks to the basic question of the continuance of this activity. While I have opinions which in part agree and in part do not agree with the criticisms of personnel and type of broadcast, I refrain from entering into them because they can be corrected if funds are appropriated to continue the broadcasts. I agree that with the continuance the best brains in this country in this specialized field should be obtained, even if some have to respond and do so at a sacrifice

to themselves as they did during the war, in order that the maximum results for our country may be obtained. While World War II is over, peace does not prevail, and the peace is not won. Those in the radio field in whom everyone has confidence should, if necessary, respond to bring to this activity the maximum of success. I am sure they will gladly give their country of their brains and their time in the months ahead, and particularly between now and next November, as they so willingly did during the war period.

My remarks today are addressed to the basic question of the immediate necessity for continuing these broadcasts. I have hopes that this will be done in the House. In a sense it is still not too late. However, if it is not done in this body, I hope it will be done in the other branch, and that the conference committee will see that the funds the Senate makes available are finally appropriated to assure the continuance of this important and necessary type of broadcast.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should approach this problem knowing what we are doing and realizing what we are doing. We should approach this problem with the idea that if the Voice of America is to be continued it shall be the voice of America, and not something that will discredit and destroy America and the good will of other countries toward us.

The trouble with me is that I like to know what I am doing. Would to God that that idea would spread. Every time this broadcasting business has been up I have done something that I do not believe anyone else in the Congress has done: I have asked for copies of the broadcasts and I have read them. I know something about them. I am not so sure but that something must be done some time, and some time soon, with reference to these broadcasts; but for one solid year and a half the same management has been in charge of that operation, and there has been no accomplishment of putting the thing on a sound business basis where it was pulling ahead.

These broadcasts which I shall refer to are of recent origin, coming within the last few weeks, and I do wish some of those who are advocating this would come into my office and read these broadcasts.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Why is it not possible to print a copy of the broadcasts in the RECORD so that we can all see them? Why are they so secret? What is so secret about these broadcasts?

Mr. TABER. There is nothing secret about them. The only question is as to the volume of them. To print those broadcasts in the RECORD would make a RECORD 40 times the volume of the regular daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the lot of broadcasts that I have in my office.

Let me give you an illustration of what is involved. There are 15-minute broadcasts to foreign countries upon the life and character of Carrie Chapman Catt, an estimable woman who died within the last several months, but concerning whom the rest of the world would have very little idea and the present generation of Americans would also have very little idea.

Let me read to you one of the broadcasts to Russia:

> The hero of today's Herald Tribune report has found a brilliant solution of his problem. On Long Island, in New York State, there are a number of abandoned railroad branch lines. Our bright veteran has surveyed the available plots and found himself a cozy railroad station built of red bricks. He then contacted the railroad authorities and leased the empty building for a song. Within a short time the abandoned station was transformed into a cozy house, consisting of a bedroom, living room, kitchen, and bath. The house is equipped with electricity, steam heat, radio, a kitchen range, electric refrigerator, and all other modern living equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Here is another line. They broadcast a number of book reviews covering a long period of time. Amongst the books was a book about the city of Denver. They tell how they used to shoot each other on sight and about the fellow who built an opera house there and the architect put Shakespeare's picture in the lobby. The man who had had the theater built, a silver tycoon, came in and ordered Shakespeare's picture taken out of the lobby and had his picture placed in the lobby instead.

Then there was another book on the anthology of American cities, by Robert S. Allen, telling how corrupt those cities were. There was a broadcast of that. Both of those things were designed deliberately to hold America up to ridicule. When an outfit does not know any better than to do those things, it is time we began to wake up and to get things straightened out. What I demand and what I believe must be done, if we are going to have a Voice of America, is that those things be cleaned up and that we have an outfit that is pulling for America and not trying to make us perfectly ridiculous and asinine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman in mentioning book reviews that have been given over this Voice of America broadcast, has evidently failed to mention the most famous of all reviews, the review of the book on the Wallace family, in which Mr. Henry Wallace was held out as the great American of all times, and the broadcast was made at the very moment he was in Europe attempting to sabotage the President's so-called foreign policy program.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and it is pitiful. The only way we are going to get that thing cleaned up is to have it cleaned up before we make appropriations. I called this to the attention of the head of the State Department immediately after he was appointed. If we are going to have a Voice of America, let me suggest something. Amongst the best of our broadcasters today are Lowell Thomas and Fulton Lewis, Jr. They have probably as much range as any two broadcasters. There may be others. I am not trying to freeze anybody out. But those two men have staffs of six or seven. Four or five people with their proper staffs could take care of the broadcasting that needs to be done, with translators and people who would have to broadcast in those languages. Cut out the kind of thing that is just pusillanimous and silly.

I want to see a decent job done wherever we have a job to do. I want to see an end to those in the Department, who have no business being in charge of this kind of thing, and have them taken off the Federal pay roll, and the Federal pay roll carry only a set-up that may be necessary to do a decent job.

I hope the House will take an American position on this thing and not a position designed to destroy America, and not propose to continue something that is not being done right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that this Voice of America broadcast has more than four times as many, or over 1,500 employees in New York—more than four times as many as any of the American networks have employed in New York City?

Mr. TABER. More than that. They have a whale of a force in Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But over 1,500 in New York?

Mr. TABER. Yes, and $6,500,000 pay roll right here in Washington alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the statements of both the minority whip [Mr. McCORMACK] and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER]. I would like to make sure that all of the members of this committee understand another aspect of this problem which has not been discussed or explored thus far in the debate.

It happens that I am now serving as Chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which is holding hearings on a bill providing for a United States Information Service which includes this Voice of America program. It is H. R. 3342, which I introduced a week or so ago.

Our hearings have now been under way for several sessions.

The report of the Appropriations Committee raises three questions about this particular program. The first is that it is not authorized by law. With that I can find no quarrel. I recognize that a point of order can be raised against this appropriation at this time. I anticipate that such a point of order will be raised because there is obviously enough opposition to the program so that any individual Member of the House can insist that it be authorized by law before it becomes a governmental practice.

Let me say frankly that with that position I have no quarrel. I am one of those who for a long time has felt that the function of the Appropriations Committee is to act as the fiscal committee of this House, to appropriate money to finance projects which have been authorized by legislation. I am glad that this somewhat belated, but I hope firm, attitude of the Appropriations Committee of the House has been announced. I hope it will become precedent. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will not write legislation into appropriation bills at this time or any other time because I think the integrity of the legislative committees of the House should be sustained.

So if the action on this appropriation is the forerunner of a firm and permanent and consistent program certainly I find no quarrel with this attitude of the Appropriations Committee which says simply that from now on they are not going to appropriate money for any purpose which has not been authorized by legislative action and which says that the legislative committees of the House are going to be protected in their position as legislative committees. Members of Congress generally will applaud this decision by the Appropriations Committee. We shall expect it to become a prevailing rule in the future and not simply be used as an isolated device for denying money for Voice of America broadcasts.

The second protest raised against this bill, however, deals with the heart of the program. It says that the Government should not be in the news business. That sounds perfectly reasonable to disciples of the free enterprise system such as we all are in this House. However, the stubborn fact remains that since the war we are appropriating or have appropriated between ten and twenty billion dollars for a reconstruction job to be done in the occupied areas in the world which we have recently defeated, or to be used in other sections of the world where we are interesting ourselves to the extent of granting funds or giving materials or lending money. It is nothing more than good, canny Yankee business judgment to spend a small fraction of 1 percent of that amount to advertise abroad the objectives we seek with those many billions.

This matter of telling the true American story abroad is a job it seems to me that everybody agrees must be done, and I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is on record saying that he too believes that job must be done. We must help the rest of the world understand the purpose for which we are spending these billions of dollars. We must make certain that this burden upon the American taxpayer is not entirely a gesture of futility. Unless our purposes are understood abroad it is apt to become just a gesture of futility. It is imperative that we accompany these vast expenditures with a program of information and edification which will help them to procure and protect the peace.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is not only necessary that the world know why we are appropriating this money but also that it would help a great deal if we ourselves knew why we are appropriating the money.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I read with interest the gentleman's bill and wish to ask him whether in connection with what we are discussing today it would not be possible to include in the bill provisions to prevent these broadcasters from defaming America and conducting themselves in un-American ways.

Mr. MUNDT. I am coming to that aspect a little later in my remarks. It certainly is possible. My bill stipulates such safeguards specifically.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent the gentleman will not have sufficient time to present his statement. I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. McCORMACK. Let us now get down to the problem we face. Here is a job of publicity for the American program which we all recognize must be done. Unfortunately, the private information sources in this country are unable to do it. They themselves have come before Congress and before governmental agencies saying they cannot provide the types of service in the areas of the world which require them. At this time there are 7 licensees of short-wave broadcasting in this country and they all say they are utterly unable as a commercial venture of their own to provide the programs required in various portions of the earth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's statement is entirely true, that they cannot afford through commercial support alone to furnish these broadcasts. Is it not also true that the privately owned broadcasting companies of this country that have short-wave radio facilities can furnish this service, can furnish information for the State Department and for the other governmental departments, to foreign lands at a much lower cost than has been the case under the present program?

Mr. MUNDT. They cannot do it without financial assistance from the outside.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I say at a lower cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps a better bargain can be driven through the terms of a new contract; however, the Federal Government contracts with these licensees and 50 percent of the programs are arranged by them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. These contracts with the licensees are for the use of the physical facilities only. Cannot these same licensees furnish the programs under direction of the Government at much less cost than at the present time?

Mr. MUNDT. Fifty percent of the programs themselves are arranged by private licensees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean to say that 1,500 employees of the State Department in New York are only doing half of the work of this broadcasting arrangement that we now have, and that these six or seven hundred in Washington are only doing a part of the work, that half of the service is being furnished by private industry?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. Half of the information and half of the programs are being furnished by private interests.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that these employees to which the gentleman refers are not only engaged in broadcasting but they are engaged in various other methods of disseminating the facts about America, such as moving pictures and the other activities of the department?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is absolutely correct and to that should be added that they are also engaged in monitoring the broadcasts which Foreign Governments are sending out and which all too frequently are devoted to distorting and perverting our American principles and purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe that these broadcasts, the art and the material that has been furnished by this "Voice of America" and by this division of the State Department are directly representative of the American life and the American way of doing things?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman believes that the broadcasts and the other informational services are rendering great support to the American concept abroad. The gentleman speaking is not willing to defend every single individual broadcast, nor the "Circus Lady" nor the Wallace book. I recognize mistakes have been made and, if I may be permitted to proceed, I will explain why under the basic legislation which I have introduced those types of mistakes will be less frequent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask that the gentleman explain to the House if he believes the people who are doing this work are all good Americans?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will give me time, I will enter into that question also. If they are not, however, my bill, H. R. 3342, contains a section which will definitely and completely correct that situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understood that private broadcasting companies, in connection with Harvard University and certain other universities, were presently carrying on a program.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the seven licensees is a foundation, which includes the broadcasting of programs sponsored in part by Harvard University.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am happy to know that the gentleman's subcommittee is considering this matter, because, as he says, it is vitally important. It is also vitally important that we recognize what private resources are doing in the direction of our foreign relations. It was brought out in a conference at which the gentleman was present, that World-Wide Radio was broadcasting in Greek on their own three times a week, but the State Department only admitted that after we questioned them in detail. We want the whole truth. It is true, of course, that they conduct some moving-picture exercises; however, the moving-picture industry itself is spending today $2,000,000 of their own money in the field of foreign relations. Those things should be brought to the attention of the American people. We have had no success at all in getting the State Department to admit that anybody else but themselves were in this field. The American people are entitled to the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I see no point in discussing a matter that is in this bill which we are going to go into at some length when an amendment is offered to restore the item. I wonder if, for the reason of conserving time, we could not discuss and debate these matters when we come to them at that point in the bill. However, I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you all, sincerely, for your forbearance. I shall not yield at the moment because I want to continue with the points which I was endeavoring to make, and in another 5 minutes I shall conclude.

The second point is that we have asked that to be done which private industry, unaided, cannot do; there is no question about this fact.

The third point is the controversial one. The Appropriations Subcommittee says, with some accuracy in its report, that this program has not been efficiently administered. Certainly, it has made some very serious mistakes. It has done some things which I might even call blunders. But I call to the attention of the committee that this is a new venture; that it is an entirely new experience for the American Government in peacetime to present to areas of the world, with many, many different languages, broadcasts which are going to have the right kind of receptivity and the right kind of result in these countries.

Among the people now administering the program there is real honest controversy as to whether this program, for example, should be sort of a showcase for America, such as you have in front of a big department store, in which you place the items which you have for sale, but in which you place only your best items, the ones of which you are proud, the ones you think will have the biggest appeal to the passers-by. There is one line of argument holding that these broadcasts should be devoted exclusively to that kind of program. They insist with considerable persuasiveness that this information program should be in fact what I would call a showcase for America abroad.

There is also a valid argument that can be presented that these broadcasts should not be a showcase for America, but that, rather, they should be a mirror of America; that they should reflect what happens here; imaging abroad some of the bad things as well as some of the good things.

The Secretary of State leans in the direction of supporting those who believe that we should make these broadcasts a mirror of America. Secretary Marshall says these broadcasts should employ what he has so aptly called "the strategy of truth." Mr. Marshall stresses that you have to develop on the part of the listeners a respect for the objectivity of the programs; a respect for the fact that they do mix the bitter with the sweet.

I am not prepared to say whether this information service abroad should be a show case or a mirror for America. I am prepared to say however, that as this bill is developed during the hearings and through amendments, and as it is then screened through the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of securing money for the services we authorize, Congress can write in the precautions which make it possible for us to voice our will as to whether this program should give only the sunshiney, pollyanic, happy side of America or whether it should present both sides of the picture. In my opinion America is great enough and good enough so that even if our foreign broadcasts are just an honest mirror of what America is and how Americans live we will continue to develop and increase respect for the United States abroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a minute ago that he thought we should give both the good and the bad side.

Mr. MUNDT. I said I was not prepared to say, because there is great argument among those administering the program whether the program should be used as a show case or a mirror of American life. Whichever idea is used, however, I favor keeping the voice of America articulate abroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman tell me just when the new concept of salesmanship took place? I always thought that when a salesman went out to sell his goods, he told about the good things about his goods; he did not tell of the bad things. Now, if we are going to embark on a program to tell the world about the bad things of America, I think we are going far astray from the purposes of these broadcasts.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman has been approached by too many of those blue-sky stock salesmen who prey upon the rich farmers of Iowa, and who certainly give only the bright side of a picture. A good salesman these days does present an honest picture and does not try to sell his product as Utopia.

Mr. JENSEN. That is just talk. I am getting down to brass tacks. I am not floating around in mid-air here and saying a lot of words for nothing. I am trying to find out from the gentleman if it is necessary to spend millions and millions of dollars on this Voice of America to tell the people of the world of a lot of bad things that may be going on here. I do not think that is a good policy. The gentleman is putting himself in the role of a salesman now, he is trying to sell us right now on the idea that this is a good thing to keep up. We know there are a lot of bad things in it, but if we did not know it, would the gentleman as a salesman trying to sell this job to us tell us about all the bad things?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In fact, the burden of my speech has been to present the facts and to point out that this program is not above reproach; it is not above criticism. We are now holding hearings before my subcommittee on my bill for making this the proper type of program so that we can do what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says we should do, have the Voice of America articulated in such fashion that it is clearly and convincingly a real American voice.

Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to title IX, section 901 of my proposed legislation, H. R. 3342, as it is designed directly to eliminate some of the causes for most of the criticism which has been made against this idea to set up a permanent and continuing United States Information Service abroad.

Here is the language of that section:

> No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, that provision assures us all that real, sturdy, Americans—proud of the American concept and eager to protect, preserve, and promote it—will administer and staff this information program. We can be positive under

that provision that no Communists, or parlor pinks, or cryto-communists, or fellow travellers will have any part in this program in any way, shape, or form. That provision should permit us to consider the program on its merit without fear that it will be sabotaged by disloyal or apologetic Americans. That provision makes certain we will have as complete a house cleaning as is necessary and is warranted. It does precisely what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER] has been suggesting. It sets up safeguards for the staffing of this program which are unequaled in almost any other legislation ever passed by Congress—they are as complete, in fact, as those which made certain of the loyalty of the men working on the so-called Manhattan project, the atomic-bomb project, during the days of war.

Colleagues, if the Voice of America has had a faulty lisp at times or a foreign accent, let us not cut the throat of the Voice of America to correct either its diction or direction. Let us rather guide it by congressional mandate and supervision to make certain it develops the sturdy American twang which we all desire it to demonstrate. All of you are invited to bring your ideas and suggestions before my subcommittee which is meeting daily. Any amendments you propose will be most carefully considered. It is our hope to bring this legislation before you at an early date and in such form that its safeguards and provisions will assure you all that this enabling legislation for an American information program abroad merits your approval so that new finances may be provided for it before the ending of the current fiscal year next July 1.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a certain degree of apprehension and bewilderment to what I have just heard. Just what are we trying to do? Are we undertaking to convince the world that we are crazy? If we are, this is a fine program. We propose now to take how many million dollars to do this thing? If it were $5 it would be too much.

Are there those in this body who are apprehensive that the libelers and the slanderers who are undertaking to whistle this country down the wind will not tell enough lies to make the people of foreign countries think we are as bad as they want the world to think we are? Who is it among this motely crew who has sense enough to mirror the people of this country to the world as we really are? I have seen some of this stuff they have been putting out. The representatives of the State Department say they want the people of foreign countries to know what American women look like, and they get up a caricature, a squat creature of the muck and mire and hold this misshapen thing up to the world as an American circus performer taking a rest.

We have Henry Wallace. He has been on the loose. He is not costing the tax payers of the country anything now. He has been to Europe and has misrepresented this country pretty thoroughly. He said we have a malicious purpose to police the borders of Russia in order to impose American imperialism upon the Russians. I noticed in yesterday's paper that Henry said the time has now come in this country for the Federal Government to nationalize the coal mines.

If it were not that some of the inmates are violent, we could empty our lunatic asylums and put the lunatics on the air. I just cannot bring myself to vote any money to finance a fool program like this.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. After reading what Wallace said in Europe and hearing of the broadcast boosting him at the time he was over there, I thought of the Irishman who came back after the First World War and said he found the French so darned ignorant he could hardly make them understand their own language. I am afraid Mr. Wallace had quite a good deal of trouble explaining communism to the Communists of Europe.

Mr. JENNINGS. Generally speaking, when someone is not using him to broadcast a record full of his malevolence he is as clear as mud on any subject to which he addresses himself. We just do not have competent people to carry on a program like this. If we have them, the State Department has failed to employ such persons. If the people of Europe, in spite of the billions of dollars that we have showered upon them—if the people of Europe after having been snatched as a brand from the burning—if the people all over Europe do not know that we are the kindest, most generous, and most sympathetic people on the face of the earth, no amount of silly broadcasting will enable them to realize these facts.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Referring to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota that he thinks we ought to sell the good as well as the bad, I understand that in this same program, before Mr. Wallace made his trip over there, the State Department used a great deal of money that we had appropriated to sell the countries of Europe on the merits of Henry Wallace, and most Republicans ought to know this—they used part of the money to sell the whole world and this country especially on the evils of the Republican Party.

Mr. JENNINGS. I never knew whether Mr. Truman sent boomerang-throwing Henry Wallace up in a trial balloon and forced him to jump out without a parachute, or whether Henry did it while running true to form on his own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, let me point out just one other thing about selling America. I have been trying lawsuits for a long time. If any lawyer should go into court and try a case with the purpose of showing the weak points of his client's case instead of leaving that to his adversary, such a lawyer should be bored for the simples. No man need ever worry that his adversary and his enemies will not point out his weak points. The thing to do if you have a cause that you wish to sell is to put your best foot forward.

What is wrong with this country anyhow? If these people do not know that this is the one free Republic in all the world, if they do not know that this is perhaps the only solvent country in the world, if after we have paved the road of victory to Berlin and Tokyo with the dead and broken bodies of more than a million of our finest, our bravest, our strongest and best men, if they do not know these facts there is nothing in the world that will convince them of what the people of this country have done for them.

Let us keep this money and, if necessary, use it to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is much that I lack in many ways so far as education and training is concerned. For instance, I have not been highly educated in art, but I am sure that we do have in the Congress many Members who are well trained in the arts and sciences and who have studied, with a great deal of care, during the last few weeks some of the material that is being sent out by our Government, at the expense of the American taxpayers, to give to the people of the world a true picture of American life so that they may know something about America; so that they may have some idea of what representative government stands for; so that they may learn what real liberty and true freedom actually mean.

In order that those of you who, like myself, have not had the opportunity to study art at home or in foreign lands may become better informed, I am going to take the liberty of passing around among you some of the pictures we are now spending good money to send abroad. I hope you will be kind enough to return them to the table. I hope that on your own time, and at the proper time, you will be kind enough to give to the House the benefit of your deductions and your understanding of just what these pictures represent in American life.

This picture, I think, represents sleepy-eyed potatoes in the springtime. Here is a very fine illustration. I am sure that from it some of you may now be able to understand what a great contribution we are making to peace abroad. I would like especially to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] explain just exactly what this picture represents.

Here is one that has a colonial hat placed jauntily upon a skeleton. I am

sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] can explain its meaning in his own time. I am certain he will be interested in it.

I have quite a number of other pictures if anyone wants to see them. Anyone who ever lived along the seashore would recognize this picture, either as a fish or the Wreck of the Hesperus. You may make your own decision.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Have you some that you can show the ladies?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I have some that I can show the ladies. I will ask the lady if she ever saw another lady with the physical characteristics that this particular picture portrays? Is it representative of our American womanhood? I pray not.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I never saw her pose for a picture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is what is known in the newspaper business as leg art, in case the lady is interested.

Here is a very, very symbolic picture. I am not sure just what it is, but I am certain the Members would like to look at it.

Here is a picture of a maze that I am sure all of you can find your way out of, if you will look at it carefully and study it. Is it truly representative of American life?

Here is another beautiful picture I think you may all enjoy. It is a remarkable conception of what our Republic stands for, and here is a picture which I believe should be entitled "Congress at Work."

This is a hunting scene that I am sure is typical of some of the work of our aboriginal ancestors here in America.

Here is another picture I am sure you can understand. Of course, there is no congressional mind that cannot grasp the full significance of this picture. I would like for the gentleman from California to study it. If he wishes he can interpret it for us. Perhaps he can give us some idea of what it really means.

Of course, everyone recognizes this picture. This is the Washington trolley system that we have here in our Capital city. It is typical.

I am sure the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], will be interested in this particular picture. Perhaps he can explain it to his constituents when he gets home.

Here is another picture. The only thing I can recognize is the word "Smith." So I am convinced it is either a portrait of Dr. SMITH of Ohio or Judge SMITH of Virginia, but I am not sure which one. This is supposed to be an exhibit, by the way, which truly represents what is going on here in America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it important that it be determined which one it is?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I think we should address a resolution of inquiry to the State Department.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield briefly.

Mr. BUSBEY. I merely wish to advise the gentleman from Ohio that if he will read today's RECORD he will see where I inserted information showing that 20 of these artists have definite Communist affiliations and backgrounds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENDER. Is this picture supposed to be some part of a horse?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not sure; it may be one of our modern State Department employees, at rest.

Mr. RANKIN. This one is of the Eleanor Club, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to have that information, because I am totally uninformed as to what these pictures really do represent. I am just a dumb American who pays taxes for this kind of trash.

Let me say, with all the seriousness at my command, that if there is a single individual in this Congress who believes this kind of tripe is doing any good toward the advancement of world peace, or toward bringing a better understanding of American life, then he should be sent to the same nut house from which the people who drew this stuff originally came. Why, it is simply ridiculous that we put up with this kind of waste of the taxpayers' money for one moment. After all, we do have some responsibility, here in the Congress, to the people we represent. This material, of course, is quite humorous, but it is also a great tragedy that we have representing us today in our Government—in a State Department—those who would spend the people's money for this sort of stuff. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves and we should clean out those who are responsible for such a situation.

However, I have no criticism of General Marshall. He is a great man, with a reputation as an organizer, but he has not had an opportunity to reorganize the State Department. I say, however, that it is about time he starts to reorganize the State Department, or it will wreck him while he is abroad trying to represent the United States in world conferences. Until he does reorganize this department, until he does get rid of these people who not only are not truly representative of America, but actually do not understand America and cannot speak our language, we can only say: "No more appropriations for such nonsense."

I will support an information program whenever the State Department comes here and presents to the Congress the right kind of program; but until it does bring to us a proper kind of information program, which will be run by people who understand America and who are loyal to America, then I am going to oppose any appropriation whatsoever for this type of "bunk."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by my friend from Ohio, and the reaction he got from the Membership shows just how impossible it is for us to make progress with this activity of the State Department until confidence in personnel is established.

I have been saying to friends in the State Department for some time that until Congress became convinced that the influence of the old OWI had been completely eliminated it would be impossible to get any money whatsoever for the carrying on of this work. The photographs which the gentleman from Ohio has distributed here on the floor is in the main a picture of the old OWI which I think was completely controlled by those who exercised an influence detrimental to our country as a whole. I feel, however, that it is due the assistants in the State Department who is in charge of this activity at the present time that I should say that I am convinced that since he took the position which he holds he has endeavored to clean up that branch of the Department over which he presides. I am not convinced, however, that the progress in this respect has been made that might have been made if the cleaning up operation had been handled with less care and tender consideration for the people who were responsible for the bad repute into which this branch has fallen. Mr. Benton is a man of great ability and if given fair support he would make a record of which all would be proud. There is no abler man in the State Department.

I want to make this observation, and I think I am correct, that in the expenditures that we are making abroad in order to promote our influence and protect our welfare it will not be possible to get full benefit of the money which is being expended unless we can take our story to the people that we are trying to help. You are not going to be able to combat successfully this foreign influence with money. It is going to take more than that. The good will and informational program which the State Department is carrying on is a thing that must be continued, but again I want to say for the benefit of the State Department it is perfectly apparent they will not get a dime until they have washed out this whole set-up and regained the confidence of the Congress to the extent that the Congress will believe that only those who are pro-Americans will be used to administer the program. This is something that Mr. Benton can do and will do if given proper support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the fact that no American drew those crazy pictures.

Mr. COX. I cannot think it reasonable to suppose that a sane person drew them or that a man with any common sense at all would have distributed them.

Mr. RANKIN. They are Communist caricatures that are sent out to mislead

the rest of the world as to what America is like.

Mr. COX. These pictures are the same kind of art that you saw so prominently displayed during the World Fair in New York. It is not the sort of Americanism which I, like the gentleman from Ohio, am able to understand.

Mr. RANKIN. Until there is a house cleaning of the State Department that is the kind of embarrassment the American people are going to be subjected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New New York [Mr. TABER] is one of the most valuable Members of this House. He is hard-working and conscientious. He is diligent in the discharge of his duties. He is utterly devoted to the unpleasant task that has been assigned him, and he should have the sympathetic understanding and full cooperation of every Member of this House in trying to cut the cost of Government to the bone. I could say the same fine complimentary things about the chairman of the subcommittee, my good personal friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who is handling this particular bill. Therefore it is with some reluctance that I must say that on this measure—and much to the amazement, no doubt, of many of my friends—I am forced to differ with these gentlemen.

I know you can resort to the art of satire and ridicule. Frankly I have practiced it myself on occasion. But this is too serious a matter to laugh out of court. This Foreign Information Service is in its infancy. It is a new set-up. I am aware that it has made many grievous mistakes; many of the parts of its program have been silly, and some of it has been downright dangerous. And, I agree with former speakers who have said that we need a housecleaning in the State Department. God knows that housecleaning is long overdue. Jimmy Byrnes got rid of a lot of the Reds, but some pinks still remain. I think General Marshall, if given a fair opportunity and sufficient time, wil' get rid of them. It is going to take more than a stiff broom furnished us by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. We will need a pitchfork and a scoop shovel. But, why should we kill a foreign-information program simply because of some mistakes that have been made?

I declare unto you that ideas are the most powerful weapons on earth. An idea is something that cannot be destroyed by a shell or a bomb.

Mind is more powerful than matter. John Huss, the Bohemian reformer and martyr, was burned at the stake, but the cause he espoused was not destroyed. Eighty-three years later a great Italian soul with irrepressible energy, unconquerable convictions, and flaming eloquence was hanged and burned, but his love of liberty, his sense of decency, and justice still live. Giralamo Savonarola is not dead! Abraham Lincoln was assassinated but freedom of the colored race was not destroyed in this country, the Union was not divided, and the ideas of the Great Emancipator still live in the minds of men. Indeed, the Great Teacher of all time was nailed to a cross by an angry mob, but the Crucifixion did not destroy, rather it only served to encourage the growth and spread of Christiantiy throughout the world. Such is the power of an idea and an ideal.

"As a man thinketh, so is he." That is not only good gospel; that is sound psychology, and history is replete with instances that prove the truth of that statement. A nation is no different from an individual. As a nation thinketh, so is it. And, logically and inevitably, action follows thought.

What gave rise to nazism? What made Hitler possible? It was because of the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. It was the doctrine of a superman, the super race that brought forth Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebels, and all their murderous gang. It was the philosophy on von Freitschke and von Bernhardi that "might makes right" and "necessity knows no law."

Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes from a selfish point of view, Great Britain made in the First World War was when she brought a million Indians and Hindus from India to the Western Front to do the housekeeping of the allied Armies. That million Hindus got a look and taste of European life. They became indoctrinated with Western ideas. They saw for the first time in their lives how other people were living. When the war was over and they returned to India, there were a million ambassadors clamoring for India's freedom. Gandhi, a successful barrister and honor graduate of Oxford, left South Africa and returned to India, and that movement for freedom has been going on in India until 375,000,000 people today are seething with revolt and rebellion, and the Indians will obtain their independence next year. Whether it will be for good or ill remains to be seen. Only time can tell.

I want to say to you gentlemen here this afternoon, in my opinion one of our greatest assets in dealing with Soviet Russia—and we will reap the benefit before too long—is the fact that for the first time in their lives hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers were allowed to leave their own country and to penetrate the countries of central and eastern Europe. In spite of the devastation, wreckage and ruin, these Russians saw villages and towns and the way of life of other peoples in Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Austria, preferable to their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. I appreciate very much this additional time.

These hundreds of thousands of Russians who came into central and eastern Europe and mingled, more or less, in spite of the restrictions imposed upon them, with the peoples of other countries, have seen people living in devastated areas much better than most Russians have ever lived. Russia is recalling these soldiers from the occupied areas because she is fearful of the views they might express in clandestine meetings on their return home. She does not want her people to know the actual conditions in other lands. Recently I was talking to a good friend of mine who has spent several years in Russia and who speaks the Russian language fluently. He talked to me off the record. I asked him about conditions. He said, "Dewey, conditions inside Russia are terrible. The people are war-worn and weary. They do not want to fight anyone again." Of course, we know there are about 40 men who would set up world-wide communism at any cost, using every artifice, lie, trickery, and device in order to destroy the bourgeoisie and establish the rule of the proletariat. But I am convinced that these Russian soldiers who are coming back from Europe to their own country are dissatisfied with things in Russia. They are beginning to question, after all, this utopia that has been dinned into their ears and the lies that have been told them. They have seen for themselves life outside Soviet Russia and are now asking, Is life at home so good after all? They are thinking even though they cannot talk.

I say to you, the only way we can penetrate the iron curtain at this time is by the same sort of psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets themselves. It is that infiltration, that psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets that goes into every country in advance of their conquering armies. They soften the enemy before they attack. Their motto is, "Divide and conquer." How foolish it would be because of certain errors and grave mistakes made by this new infant agency to wipe it out altogether. If we hope to establish the free economic, democratic, way of life in this world, then we must assume these enormously increased responsibilities that have been bequeathed to us at the close of this global conflict. The only way we can penetrate this wall of secrecy today, unless we are willing to declare war and go in with our armies and drop our bombs, is by way of radio, the newspaper and the psychological warfare that saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers both in the First and the Second World Wars.

In 1922 when I was a student at Heidelberg, I asked my professor, Herr Hoopes, one day who won the war. The answer was, "Lord Northcliffe's newspapers and Woodrow Wilson's 14 points are what won the war," because literally hundreds of thousands, in fact, millions of pamphlets containing the 14 points were dropped over the German lines. When the Germans picked up those pamphlets and read about the right of self-determination, of territorial integrity, they threw away their rifles and went home and refused to return to the front lines. In fact, the revolution broke out in Munich 60 days before the armistice in 1918, and that revolution assumed

far greater proportions than the outside world has ever guessed.

From this global conflict that has just closed General Eisenhower knows the value of psychological warfare, "Wild Bill" Donovan knows the value of it, and so does George Marshall, who only recently has made a plea that the Congress not abdicate these functions and obliterate this agency.

Let us clean it up and put it in order. Do not kill it. These men know that the psychological penetration we made not only to the armed forces of our enemies but to the subjugated peoples in occupied territories and citizens of the neutral powers did much to win us support of the underground and brought the war to a speedy termination, thus saving thousands upon thousands of American lives. So let us not act here wholly in a spirit of emotion or prejudice. William Benton, after all, regardless of what anyone here thinks about him, has proved himself a successful businessman. You do not have to argue to hard-headed practical businessmen in America about the value of advertising. Just read any magazine or newspaper. I know that Bill Benton is reasonable—he is approachable and agreeable—and I think he will welcome any constructive criticism that Congress may have to offer.

Mr. Chairman, today we are facing a war of ideas, a war between the totalitarianism of communism and the freedom of a constitutional representative Republic. Through the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs the Department of State provides a vehicle for presenting democratic ideas overseas and combatting the misrepresentations of the United States so prevalent abroad. I believe it is most important to this country that we maintain a vigorous foreign information program, and I hope that Congress will pass the bill recently introduced by the gentleman of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], giving basic authority for the Department's foreign information activities, and I hope also that Congress will make available adequate appropriations for this important work. I realize that the appropriation in this bill for this specific activity is perhaps subject to a point of order because it is unauthorized and might be considered as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Recently some of us returned from the Near East, where we attended a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Cairo, Egypt. In Turkey and Greece we found that the Voice of America is coming through and reaching many people. If the Voice of America is stilled, and other activities of the United States Information Service terminated, we would have no effective way of combatting the wave of misrepresentation of the United States daily beamed to these and neighboring countries by Radio Moscow. We would be playing a game with two strikes already called against us.

As Ann O'Hare McCormick pointed out in a recent editorial article in the New York Times, the national interest requires that the Voice of America be heard where at present it cannot be heard.

In the World as it is, a world of competitive systems and competitive propaganda, the United States has to compete in every way it can—

Mrs. McCormick said—

To win in this competition, nothing is so important as to make our system work politically, socially, economically. Retreat on any of these fronts is fatal to the cause of democracy everywhere. The next important thing is to let people know that it works. Money has to be spent to tell the story, to give the population of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe some idea of America other than the image etched on their minds by incessant false propaganda. If a thousand listeners in the upper ranks of the Communist Party hear the Voice of America it is worth the investment. Congress takes a grave responsibility in silencing a whisper that has already begun to echo as far away as Siberia and Baku.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1 the State Department has asked for approximately $31,000,000 for its overseas information program. This is but a minute fraction of the amount proposed for the budget of the armed services. It is perhaps a fourth of the cost of a modern battleship, and represents only the cost of a few bombers. Expenditures for overseas information must properly be considered a premium for peace insurance, and if this money can help in promoting a better understanding of the United States abroad it will be producing dividends that will accrue to the benefit of future generations of Americans.

We must not lose the war of ideas by default. Today we battle for men's minds. Through the Voice of America and the other activities of the United States information service the facts about America and the American way of life reach into the countries behind the so-called iron curtain, giving support and nurture to the idea of representative self-government. We must always remember the potency of an idea. You cannot prevent people from thinking by bayonets. Keep the idea of freedom alive, and it may well be that in the long run the peoples now exposed to totalitarianism, terrorization, and communistic propaganda will halt the tide of communism and enable freemen to move forward as the basis of a new and peaceful world order.

We need friends abroad, and to win friends, it is essential that our policies be understood and fully known to the peoples of the world. We must be strong, with a stable economy, and the world must know that we are strong, with a sound economy, and not on the verge of an economic crash as hinted by the Moscow propaganda.

The information program is really part of our defense program, for one of its principal missions is to overcome the misrepresentations and correct the distortions that are one of the factors that may lead to another war. And another global war will spell the death of our modern civilization.

Short-wave radio is an effective instrument for reaching foreign peoples. It can reach illiterate people, and no censorship in the receiving country can distort or suppress its message. Outside the United States it is estimated that there are 20,000,000 radio sets capable of receiving shortwave programs. It is essential that American democracy be able to speak with a voice of its own on the international stage. To silence the Voice of America, and halt the overseas information program would deprive us, in this critical period in international affairs, of an instrument vitally important in carrying out our peaceful objectives.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is because of my abysmal ignorance due to lack of education and travel and my brief service in this Body that it is utterly beyond my comprehension why or how Members in this Chamber can vote $400,000,000 aid to Greece and Turkey and then refuse to vote less than one-twelfth of that amount to be spent in this essential work by our own Department of State.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the Chamber at the time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] gave the membership the benefit of looking at photographic proofs of some of the paintings that have been used by the State Department in its program. I noticed that as many Members looked at them it created a feeling of levity and there was some outright laughter. There has been a good deal of criticism about the paintings selected by the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who selected these paintings for use in this information program, but I would not be surprised if perhaps nearly every one of the paintings that were exhibited had either received a prize or at least honorable mention in some of the exhibits of this country. I say that for the reason that it only occurred to me as I looked at some of them that my district has the honor of having located in it the Carnegie Institute, and that there for many, many years we have held national exhibitions of art, as well as international exhibitions, and within the past 15 or 20 years I would say that at least three-fourths of the time the paintings that won first prize were what is called abstract painting.

I know that I have never understood them, nor really appreciate their artistry. I believe that if it were left to the votes of the general public that the paintings awarded first prize, and which were selected by the board of artists who make the awards, would never have won first prize.

So, I suggest to you Members here today not to let the exhibitions of these paintings sway you in your judgment. Do not let it sway you in making up your mind as to whether or not this program being carried on by the Secretary of State is a good program or in the interests of the United States.

I know that every time in the last 5 years that first prize was awarded in an art exhibition at Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh practically every newspaper ridiculed the selection, ridiculed the award, and asked, in effect, "Who knows what this means?" "Is it art, and if it is art, I assume we do not know anything about art."

Even columnists who are nationally known, take it as their theme that we had better give up on the subject of art; that the general public does not know what art is. So I am jumping at

the conclusion that perhaps every one of these paintings that were shown to the membership this morning were paintings that had received either honorable mention, or a first prize or other prize in an exhibition.

I join in everything that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said, particularly when he called attention to the fact that we should not use ridicule or levity in order to arrive at a just and fair conclusion on this subject of an information program by the Department of State.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, if I understand the gentleman correctly, he means to indicate that he is not a connoisseur of art.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. But that he doubts seriously whether the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and other Members of this body, are any more connoisseurs than he is? I thoroughly agree with him if that is his position.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I just hope that a view of these reproductions will not have any effect in arriving at the proper conclusion.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I sincerely believe that if Members of Congress and the American people as a whole throughout this country cannot understand these pictures, that most certainly they ought not to be sent overseas.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not know how any board would select the pictures to be used, but I do not know of any better group to select than the board selected by the Carnegie Institute of Art. I do not think we should leave it to any lay group or to Members of Congress or any other such group. I do not see how we might do anything better than to select pictures that had won approval and prizes.

Mr. CHELF. If any pictures are sent abroad, we should see to it that they represent the American home or family life. Not some silly thing that resembles the north end of a south-bound freight train which inadvertently is headed west.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Probably there would be more disagreement about that than there is about these.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the omission from this appropriation bill of money for continuing the Department's information program should not be taken to mean that we are abandoning the program of broadcasting information about the United States to the nations of the world. There is now pending H. R. 3342 which proposes by specific legislation to authorize not only the broadcasting of such information to other nations but a program of cultural and educational interchange as well. The bill will undoubtedly be revised as the hearings and the debate show need for revision but the essential idea is there. The important point now, however, is that the failure to appropriate for the Voice of America broadcasting activities in this bill should not be considered anywhere as an abandonment of the basic American program for letting other nations know how we live, what we think, and what are our intentions. Such a program is a basic function of our foreign policy; for what is foreign policy if not a combination of men's hopes, aspirations, fears, and prejudices. Is it not true that the very thing we complain about now is lack of information in foreign countries about why we in the United States are spending enormous sums of money to help the world to reconstruct itself? The peoples of the world want to know whether this is cooperation in reconstruction or some new form of imperialism. Only information about ourselves will put down rumor and misrepresentation about our motives. Stories about the aggressive intentions of the United States, or its dollar diplomacy, will be found to have no validity by peoples who are given the facts about the United States. Even an expenditure of $30,000,000 for such a program if it is found to cost that much to do the job right, should be found justified on the facts, for it is only one-third of 1 percent of the minimum amount of $10,000,000,000 we are estimated to have invested in world reconstruction since VJ-day. An appropriation only for institutional advertising by any company in that percentage would be considered very modest. We have specifically written into the foreign relief bill the other day and the Greek-Turkish aid bill passed last Friday, provisions that representatives of our press, radio, and movies shall freely circulate in the benefited countries. We want to know a lot about them. Is it not just as sure that we want them to know a lot about us? I agree that such a program must be dignified, factual, and truly representative of the best in our country. But we are the leaders of the world in the techniques of telling a business story. It is high time we became leaders of the world in telling our economic, political, and social story. I fail to comprehend the limited view which would vote hundreds of millions for relief and foreign assistance and stop at voting a few millions for the right kind of a program to tell what we are doing and why. For the lack of these few millions the world and ourselves could easily lose the benefit of all the hundreds of millions. The bill for a foreign information program will come before the House in due course and I trust that it will be well received and passed, for that and that alone can be the justification for leaving out the appropriation now.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate. I cannot refrain at this time from expressing my opinion upon this very important piece of legislation.

We have lately concluded hostilities engaged in by more than 10,000,000 of our young men and young women. Many of those young men who survived that struggle sit before me in this House today. We are now engaged in a great struggle to win to our concept of government the peoples of the earth, because the future peace is bound up in the success or failure of the United Nations.

I am disturbed about the lack of an appropriation for the State Department Information Service.

In these days, following the close of the shooting period of war, we look hopefully toward a just and lasting peace. The whole world does. Many want peace the easy way. They want to shun self-denial and to run away from the hardships incident to obtaining peace. In our urge to forget the blood and tears of war and to return to the pursuits of peace in which we engaged before the war, we often lose sight of the fact that we have invested at least $300,000,000,000 in this war and the peace which we hope will follow it. A considerable sum of money, to say the least. This vast sum of money is a minor item, however, when compared to the thousands of our finest young men and young women who lost their lives in this war. There are also the countless thousands returned to us broken in body and mind who are in our hospitals all over the world—victims of the fight to bring peace to the world.

America must be strong physically and spiritually to be able to help finish the work which these, our gallant sons and brave daughters, have begun at so great a sacrifice. We cannot do it by running from the issues. We cannot do it by dodging the responsibility.

We are not a warlike people. This makes it hard for us to keep prepared for peace. The realization that we must be strong for peace as well as for war is hard for the average American. The one necessity tends to confuse the other necessity in our concept of duty.

During these unsettled days before the treaties of peace are signed; before the United Nations, now in its infancy, has grown strong enough to keep the peace, it is necessary that we remain strong. We are a friendly nation and a generous people. We desire no advantage. Our hope is that the nations of the world will learn to live together as good neighbors. Nothing, therefore, can be a greater force for peace than a strong America, spiritually sensitive to justice.

My belief is that the first line of defense for peace in America is the composite will of the American people to see the United Nations succeed. To do that with the same unselfish spirit which we manifested during the war; it is essential that we have unity at home; that we be determined that all the suffering and heartache of this war were not endured in vain.

The second line of defense is our armed services. We must have an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force strong enough to make our presence felt wherever our

word is given in a world struggling for peace. Our armed services must be arms of justice and decency and freedom for all peoples and not for conquest, as they have always been in the past.

Our third line of national defense is a strong domestic economy. Right now we are having difficulties, including strife between labor and management, high prices, shortages, taxes, debt reduction, and all the myriad problems of our daily living.

Fourth in our line of defense is rarely mentioned in that connection, and it is the one that I wish to stress today.

I refer to the request of the State Department for funds to permit that Department to engage in selling America to the world in those places where our privately owned press, publications, and radio cannot go and do not go.

All over this land chambers of commerce are busy day and night selling to their neighboring communities and to the world at large those things which set these particular communities apart as special attractions to the home seeker, the industries seeking locations for plants, and as places of rest and recreation for people on tour. Millions of dollars are spent this way each year in the United States selling good will.

The United States today is the leading country in the world in its freedom, its culture, its industry, and its religion. We must keep that leadership. Developments in radio and air transportation have made us next-door neighbors to every other place on earth. We are only 60 hours away from the farthest part of the globe in travel and only an instant away by radio.

It is not enough that we be strong physically. As I have said, we must be strong spiritually. We must have an abiding belief in the concept of the brotherhood of all mankind; to be aware of the hunger and heartache of our brothers in all places. If we have that spirit, then we will want to tell our story to the world and we will tell it with our heart in it.

Unfortunately, selfishness still plays a big role in world affairs. We, ourselves, do not have entirely clean hands on that score. As a result, misunderstandings and jealousies have arisen between neighbors, and in some places our story is not told nor is it received. America must accept that challenge in its true sense of good will and tell her story in its full light wherever there are people to receive it—by press, by radio, by messenger. When people know all the facts they can be trusted to solve the most difficult problems. Let us give the State Department the funds needed to carry on this work in conjunction with the press and radio of our country. The State Department must go where private means of communication cannot go because of the cost involved and consequent loss to private enterprise in the effort. No greater defense from war nor a greater force for peace can be developed than a complete understanding of one another's problems—and that understanding can never be had without the people of the world having the full and complete truth.

If we can get our story told, the most doubting neighbors will completely understand that we, in America, long for peace above everything in the world; that we have neither the desire nor the intent to try to impose our ideology of government upon anyone on this earth; that it is our ideal of government that the lowliest citizen has the same rights as the most powerful; that a man can worship God in the manner which pleases him; that he can get up anywhere at any time and criticize his public officials from the President of the United States down to a constable in the smallest township. He can do this and have no fear that he will be stood up against a wall and shot for doing it or of even being punished at all; that his son or daughter, born and reared in the most humble of circumstances, can become the President of a great university, the head of a great hospital, the pastor of the greatest church, or even the President of his country. Yes; when people all over the world understand what our heart is and what our soul is, then we will be far nearer to a just and lasting peace.

Often the news from this country is distorted as it reaches other lands. Where nations are in strife economically or in war, the news is often colored to fit the pleasure of the one sending it or disseminating it. The opposition pounces upon the mistakes which have been made and magnifies them and never mentions the good which may have been done. Statements are studied and selections from the statements are taken which are least favorable. They are pulled from the context and told as the truth. This happens, unfortunately, among nations and is not conducive to better understanding.

What we are endeavoring to do is to get the truth across firmly but in friendship.

When some other nation misunderstands an act of one of our citizens and erroneously jumps to the conclusion that his acts and statements represent the thought and will of America, we must combat that with the most powerful weapon we have—the truth.

What we want the world to know is that here in America we are a country of divergent interests yet withal we are one of the other. The mills of the North and the East, the grain of the great Midwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle ranges of the West and Southwest, the booming new industry of the Pacific coast, are all part of this great land; labor, and management, and Agriculture dependent upon each other to such a degree that the economic illness of the one affects vitally the other two. Our churches, our schools, our hospitals, are all monuments to the free expression given to the everyday, average American. It is America.

This one ideal must exist throughout the world. Otherwise, from generation to generation, the youth of our country will be called upon to go forth to fight to preserve this democracy. And that because those of us before them failed in our duty and ran from our responsibility.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been quite liberal in the matter of time for general debate. So far we have merely read the enacting clause of the bill. We have not started reading the bill itself. I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity for every Member to speak under the 5-minute rule.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the enacting paragraph do now close and that we start reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Salaries and expenses, Department of State: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; salary of the Under Secretary of State, $12,000; health service program as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); not to exceed $26,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Department of State; purchase of uniforms for chauffeurs; purchase of 14 passenger motor vehicles, including 1 at not to exceed $3,000; and dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only, or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls (not to exceed $15,000); rental of tie lines; stenographic reporting and translating services by contract and services for the analysis and tabulation of technical information and the preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; expenses as authorized by title VII (except sec. 705), of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for the issue of passports as authorized by law (22 U. S. C. 214a); not to exceed $40,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department of State as required by the act of June 28, 1944; the examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and maintenance and operation of passport and despatch agencies established by the Secretary of State; $20,000,000, of which $2,000 is for claims determined and settled pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 601): *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,000 of this appropriation may be expended for necessary expenses, except personal services, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1354).

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: Page 2, line 18, after the semicolon insert "acquisition, production, and free distribution of informational materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an information program outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception, the acquisition of land and interests in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) for radio broadcasting and

relay facilities, and the acquisition or construction of buildings and necessary improvements on such lands; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, the purchase, rental, distribution, and operations of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; not to exceed $13,000 for entertainment."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this is not authorized by law and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may be heard.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the information and cultural program to this bill.

May I say that if the information and cultural program is one-tenth as effective abroad as it has been in this country, it is worth 10 times the amount that we spent or will spend for it. In this country it has the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chasing the Circus Lady and the sedate chairman of our subcommittee reading the Memoirs of Hecate County.

Now let me read to you what the committee offers as an alternative program to the present information and cultural program of the State Department. On page 7 of the committee report there appears this language:

> The alternatives to this program, it would seem, are (a) UNESCO, a United Nations undertaking and in which a tremendous interest is developing, and which, as established, will truly represent the views of American people.

I have no disposition whatever to criticize UNESCO. To the contrary, I hope that it will accomplish the purposes for which it was organized. But let me read you what the same committee in the same report on page 12 has to say about UNESCO:

> The committee could not understand why, out of the total of 132 executive personnel already employed by UNESCO, only 14 are from the United States, and out of a total of 259 clerical personnel only 7 are from the United States. It is hoped, however, when this Organization is more firmly established, that a proper ratio of personnel from the United States will be employed.

The committee recommends as an alternative for the Voice of America that we turn this program over to UNESCO, and in the same breath complains that UNESCO at the present time has a personnel recruited almost entirely from other countries. I submit that the Department of State is the more logical and a better qualified agency to interpret America to the rest of the world.

We have heard a lot of criticism of this program. The Wallace program was mentioned on the floor a few moments ago. I hold in my hand a copy of the Wallace broadcast that was sent over the Voice of America. I challenge any one in this House to point out any place in this broadcast where Henry Wallace is praised. As a matter of fact, it is a review of a book on the Wallace family, a family which for a long time adhered to the Republican Party. Now, here is what the broadcast said:

> Through the history of this family there runs, like a red thread, the eternal struggle for an improvement of the situation of the American farmer. Whenever the members of this family turned to agriculture and its problems, their achievements were considerable. When they turned to other problems, the success was dubious.

I know of no program which has been more abused than this program which has been conducted by the Information and Cultural Service.

Gentlemen, we should not junk this program at this time, over the protest of General Marshall, and over the protest of other men who are serving this country in foreign fields. Secretary Harriman has said, "I could not properly have discharged my duties either at Moscow or in London without it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Does the gentleman from Nebraska wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment does propose legislation on an appropriation bill, the functions therein referred to not being authorized by law.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 3, line 1, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is this: On yesterday I called the attention of the House to the fact that not only had we eliminated the program of the Information and Cultural Service from the bill but in the office of the Secretary of the Department of State we had tremendously reduced the regular appropriation. The Secretary of State under the item of salaries and expenses in the Secretary's office and for the work in this country asked for $47,046,000. This amount was reduced to $20,000,000, which was a reduction of $27,000,000. Of that $27,000,000, $21,874,000 was for the Information and Cultural Service. One million seven hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars was for the Intelligence Service, and the balance was for the regular activities of the Department.

The $21,874,000 has been ruled out on a point of order. I seek by this amendment to restore $10,000,000 of those funds, $5,000,000 for the regular activities of the Department and $5,000,000 for those activities within the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs which are authorized by law.

There are certain activities which are definitely authorized by law. One of those is the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, which is a definite program of the Department of State and is carried on by this office. Another is the UNESCO staff itself. In other words, we have recognized the international organization of UNESCO, and we have placed in the State Department and in the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs the necessary funds for the State Department to cooperate with that organization in an effort to work out its program. That amount is $157,000. In addition, we have the Division of Libraries and Institutes, which is authorized by law, and the Exchange of Persons Division, which provides for the exchange of students and technicians between the various countries.

The amendment which I have offered will merely restore to the Office of the Secretary the amount he requested of Congress and which he said is essential to carry out the functions of his office. It also restores the cuts in the intelligence program, a very essential program, and those portions of the information and cultural program which are authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to restore the OIC, which was taken out of this bill on a point of order. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is holding hearings at this time to get some legislation to restore this program.

We have to start cutting down some of the expenses of government. The people have been asking us to do it. It is necessary. Let me point out to the Congress the statement regarding the growth of the Department of State and the number of employees. We state in our report that the salaries and expenses totaled $2,728,347 in 1940. They jumped to $3,453,000 in 1941. In 1942 they jumped to $4,377,105, and in 1943 the salaries jumped to $5,986,800, and even up to something over $13,000,000 in 1946. With a total of personnel running from 1,010 in 1940 to 5,270 at the present time, and proposed for 1948, excluding personnel for the information and intelligence programs, it is extremely difficult for this committee, during this period of need for economy and when the people are asking for economy, to reconcile itself to a need in excess of $18,000,000 for the regular activities. This amount is included in the bill.

The increase in salaries for the Foreign Service under the act that was passed by the House places a burden of $7,000,000 annually on the backs of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I urge you to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I trust the Committee will indulge me for a moment, and, if necessary, for the purpose of being in order under the rules of the House, I shall have to address my remarks to the last two words in line 21 on page 2; namely, the words "penalty mail." It has no doubt come to the attention of the House that through editorials and circulars and statements by postmasters and by protests from home that through the alleged action of the Congress a great many substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the postal service. It has been made to appear that this is due to some lack of action on the part of the Congress. We have noticed some headlines in aggravated areas, such as Boston, where hundreds have been dismissed, and in Long Beach, Calif., where an aggregate of 150 were dismissed. The Subcommittee on Appropriations convened a hearing this morning for the purpose of isolating rumor and confusion from the truth so that the country might well know just exactly what happened. Copies of these hearings will be published and made available to the Members in short order. There you will find a statement by Mr. Jesse Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, as to exactly what the facts are. It was through no laches on the part of Congress and through no negligence on the part of any committee of the Congress that these sundry gentlemen, including a great many veterans, have been dismissed from the rolls. The fact of the matter is that the Post Office Department knew there was going to be a deficit for the current fiscal year as early as January 1947. To be sure, they could not ascertain the amount of the deficit, because the postmasters make only quarterly reports. Yet Mr. Donaldson told us this morning in the hearing that it was obvious to them that a deficiency of at least $10,000,000 would exist as a result of the increased cost of Christmas mail and various strikes along the seaboard and the maritime strike, but they could not ascertain the dollar amount of that deficiency until the quarterly reports had been filed. Just as soon as those had been compiled, an estimate was referred to the Bureau of the Budget. They had a hearing before the Budget Bureau on the 21st day of April 1947. I want you to anchor that date in your memory. The Budget Bureau sent up a deficiency estimate on the 9th day of May 1947, which was Friday of last week—a deficiency estimate in the sum of roughly $11,000,000 for the purpose of taking care of the salaries and expenses of the hundreds of veterans and others who have been dismissed from the rolls in every section of the country. So that estimate came up on last Saturday and in consequence there has been no opportunity for the Congress of the United States to take action thereon.

We confronted Mr. Donaldson point blank with the question whether or not there had been any fault or any lack of diligence on the part of the members of the committees of Congress, and he said, "None whatsoever."

There, then, you have the answer to such things as a 2-inch headline that has been appearing in the Boston newspapers that through lack of action on the part of Congress, hundreds of veterans and substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the rolls. There you have the answer to the headlines that appeared in the Long Beach newspapers and in other sections of the country as to whether or not the Congress has been at fault in bringing about the dismissal of literally hundreds of people. The negligence has been somewhere else besides Congress.

In addition thereto I might say a great deal of confusion arises from the fact that while we are dealing with 1948 estimates, that matter should have been taken care of before now in a deficiency estimate that is chargeable to 1947 appropriations, and for reasons best known to the Post Office Department, to the Budget Bureau, and to the President himself, that was not done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), $500,000.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 7, line 21, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to strike out the item of $500,000 for so-called representation and to insert in lieu thereof $250,000. What we ought to do is to strike out the entire item of $500,000. I trust, however, the Committee will go along with me and save at least $250,000 of the taxpayers' money that ought not to be spent for such purpose. There is no good reason at all why this item should be in the bill.

I do want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who has given this bill and this particular item a good deal of attention, not only on this but on other occasions.

The State Department, through its representatives, asked for more than $1,000,000 for this representation. Just think of it. You would not believe such request would be made right now when we are trying to economize. The committee did a good job in cutting it to $500,000, but it ought at least be cut in half again.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What is this "representation"? I do not know what that word means.

Mr. REES. That is just what I was about to explain to the Members.

This money for what is called representation is spent for liquor. I will say that probably 90 percent of this money goes for liquor.

Mr. MASON. What?

Mr. REES. Yes; liquor of various kinds. "Representation" is a high-powered phrase, but the money buys high-powered liquor; and it is used by our representatives to entertain foreigners abroad. Also, in some instances, to entertain themselves.

As I said on yesterday in discussing this matter, we fall to a pretty low ebb in our diplomacy when we resort to this method in order to get along with, and cultivate friendships with, the representatives of other countries.

Here is what has happened: In 1938 we spent about $125,000 for this purpose; in 1939, about the same amount. Then the allowance was doubled and we spent $250,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman said, "The same amount." He does not mean the same amount of liquor, does he?

Mr. REES. No; I do not know how much liquor was bought; I am talking about the amount of money they spent. We do not know how much liquor was purchased because the thing is covered up. The gentleman from New York and I discussed this matter on yesterday. I thought he might have access to rather accurate figures as to the amount of money spent for liquor, but it seems you cannot do it because these vouchers are regarded as confidential information and we just cannot find out. I will venture the statement, however—from the information I have gathered—that at least 90 percent of the fund is spent for liquor.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. There is a question of consistency which bothers me. This House only a day or so ago voted $5,000 to entertain the WCTU here in Washington. Today it is called upon to spend $500,000 to buy liquor for entertainment.

Mr. REES. It is sort of blowing hot and cold with the same breath in my estimation except that this item is 100 times the amount allocated the WCTU. They will, in my opinion, do more good with $5,000 than the State Department with the $500,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the gentleman's position that in order to do away with liquor that might be served with the meals that we should also do away with the meals?

Mr. REES. Not necessarily. Let me come t. that.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The liquor costs more than the meals, does it not?

Mr. REES. It would be interesting to get figures as to how much is spent on

meals. The meals cost $5, $7, $9, and even $12 apiece. This money is spent by our representatives not only to entertain foreigners but to entertain themselves and their friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan who has always supported me on similar amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered, following up the statement of the gentleman from New York, about doing away with the meals, that if you gave them enough liquor they would not care anything about the meal they got.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe the members of this committee understand that our representatives abroad receive pretty fair pay. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee called attention yesterday to the fact that many of them get as much as $50,000 a year. As a matter of fact, all one of these representatives has to do is pack his suitcase. Everything else is fixed for him abroad. His home is there ready for him and for his family, with all of the equipment and all of the help necessary to run it, everything he wants for himself and family all paid for by his Government. I do not criticize that in this discussion. If the representative happens to be located in a warm climate and is transferred to a colder climate the Government will care for him and his family and see that they get the proper accessories to go with the colder climate. And yet in addition to that you put this additional sum in here to be used for so-called entertainment. It does not make sense.

I do not know whether the membership realizes it or not, but under suspension of the rules last year we added $7,000,000 in funds to provide for these representatives we are sending abroad. It was for additional salaries and expenses. You come to the House with this item of a half-million dollars, which is all unnecessary and uncalled for.

I would like to call attention to something else. I believe I am right in this, and I shall ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska, if he wants to tell me. I want to refer as to how some of this money was spent over in Yugoslavia. I understand they have even gone so far as to use similar funds to entertain General Tito over there, spending a considerable amount of money entertaining him and in entertaining him I am sure there was a goodly supply of liquor. Surely no one thinks any good was accomplished by that entertainment. May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he wants to comment on that? I think he might be able to furnish some information.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I am going to oppose the gentleman's amendment because I think the committee has done a pretty good job in reducing this $618,000. With reference to Tito, there has been premature publicity regarding that.

Mr. REES. I saw some publicity on it and for that reason I am asking the gentleman to explain this matter to this committee.

Mr. STEFAN. It has been published but I did not give permission to publish it. It was the premature publication of some information I had. It is true that some of this money has been spent unwisely and for that reason the committee made these cuts.

Directly answering the gentleman's question, I feel very deeply about spending the American taxpayers' money to entertain a dictator like Tito and his Communists who murdered our heroic aviators. I think I am duty bound to answer the gentleman's question. It is true that before Tito and his Communists murdered our five aviators they did entertain Marshal Tito and his friends with the American taxpayers' money at a dinner costing $600. Shortly after that they entertained him again with your money at a dinner costing $400 or more.

Mr. REES. A total of more than $1,000 for a party given in honor of Marshal Tito.

Mr. STEFAN. There were other entertainments and then they shot down 5 of our aviators. They were continually entertaining Marshal Tito with their representation allowance, which is, in fact, a prestige allowance. I accidentally ran across some vouchers. I did not look for them purposely, I did not look for this information on purpose, but I did find an item for a wreath for the victims of this so-called air accident in the amount of $13.40. Shame on them. Of course this committee, the minority members as well as the majority members, was shocked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the distinguished ranking minority Member [Mr. ROONEY], the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the rest of us took cognizance of this terrible thing. Of course, we took cognizance of the wrongs they do with their money sometimes, but we do not want to castigate the fine Foreign Service officers who are in our employ, and who cannot be blamed for some of the wrongs that some of these people do. We have been giving representation allowance to our Foreign Service officers ever since we sent our first missions to foreign countries to represent us. It is absolutely necessary, and I want to pay a tribute to those Foreign Service officers who have been decorated during the war and who rendered such a wonderful service to the United States in every part of the world. There are many fine Foreign Service officers among them, and this representation allowance is something that has to be appropriated for from year to year, but it must be a modest sum. I have great faith in General Marshall. I have great faith in men like the Under Secretary and others who are watching this fund, and we have to give General Marshall a chance to clean this up. I want a good State Department and a fine Foreign Service Department, and so does every member of this committee. We may have political differences among us, but they are not displayed in committee. Sometimes on the floor of the House it does creep up. As I say, we have to have a good Foreign Service and a good State Department. But, we have to have authority in law for everything that is done, and it must not be done without the consent of the peoples' Representatives here in Congress. I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I am sorry.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's position. He is here on the floor and expected to defend this particular item, and I appreciate his statement. But, here is a fair certainty I do not castigate the services of our representatives abroad. Not at all. They have rendered impressive service. But that does not justify the waste of taxpayers' money in this way. The gentleman from Nebraska has given a glaring example where more than $1,000 was spent in Belgrade for two dinners to entertain Marshal Tito. How our representative could do it in view of the circumstances just recited by the gentleman from Nebraska is more than I can understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that I fully agree with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska. As far as I am concerned, I would not buy a glass of water for Marshal Tito. However, insofar as this item now under discussion is concerned, I would like to say to the gentleman that I recall recently having had a conversation with Secretary of Commerce Harriman who told me that when he was Ambassador to Great Britain, in London, he had a luncheon, which was expected of him because of the fact that all of the Embassies in London representing the various countries served a luncheon at some time or other during the year. This one social event at which about 1,200 people attended more than ate up the entire annual allocation of funds to our Embassy in London for the purpose which we are now discussing.

Mr. REES. I realize these representatives are called upon to do a consider-

able amount of entertaining, but it is terribly overdone. And the liquor part of the thing is beyond all reason. If you have $500,000 to be used to cultivate friendship with foreign people, you will go a lot further in creating understanding by using it to buy food for some of the hundreds of thousands of human beings who are on the brink of starvation. Last year this committee allocated more than $600,000, most of which went for liquor. I just do not believe we can point with pride of any accomplishments in the way of mutual understanding by reason of that expenditure. If you can see anything worth while that was done in this respect, I would like to know about it. Cut this item $250,000 and you are still spending about as much as was spent in 1942 and in 1943 before the State Department went on this spending spree.

Before I leave the floor I call your attention briefly to a copy of a magazine that was handed me a few minutes ago. It is entitled the American Foreign Service Journal. It is a monthly magazine published here in Washington. I am informed that the Government in some way renders some assistance to this magazine. It is a rather small magazine. The thing to which I call your attention is that six full pages of this publication are devoted to advertisements of liquor. I trust you will support my amendment and save at least $250,000 for the Federal Treasury.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I remember 2 years ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered an amendment, and I supported the amendment at that time, to reduce the amount from $800,000 to $400,000. I rise at this time first to compliment the committee. The administration raised the request from $800,000 2 years ago to over $1,118,000 for this year. I find a change in the House this year. The committee has reduced this amount from over $1,118,000 to $500,000. That is just an idea of economy on the part of the majority party that is now in control of the House. The committee should be commended. I should really like to see this amendment adopted further reducing the amount to $250,000. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will buy considerable liquor with which to supply our Ambassadors and other people who represent us with that little extra that goes into entertainment at state dinners. I really think when economies are so hard for us to make here, by reason of the opposition by the administration on every appropriation bill that comes up, that we ought to save $100,000 or $200,000 or $250,000 at every opportunity that presents itself. I should like to see this committee vote to reduce this amount by 50 percent, $250,000. I am sure it will not hurt our Foreign Service. Just think, that would buy a lot of food for the starving children of Europe, which would do a great deal more good than to oversupply our Ambassadors with this opportunity for entertainment by the use of liquors, which are not at all times absolutely necessary, to say the least. I hope the amendment is sustained by the House. There are a thousand places here in our own country where we can do a real service in the expense of this saving of $250,000. Why not vote now against this waste?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we cut this representation allowance from $1,118,000 to $500,000, which compares with $800,000 they had last year. It is my sincere feeling that General Marshall, the head of the Department of State, and the Assistant Secretary for Administration and others are now going into these matters. The Foreign Service, from what has been said on the floor of the House today, should know that the funds we are allowing today should be used for the purpose originally intended; that is, as a prestige allowance, which has been in the foreign service of all governments since we have had a mission in foreign countries. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would hate for the impression to go throughout the country that we are appropriating any such sum as $500,000 for liquor. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has suggested that he thought that 90 percent of this fund was spent for that purpose. As a matter of fact, this item covers all the entertainment, including banquets and the various functions that are given in all the embassies in foreign fields. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; of course, it is included for all representation allowances. If our Ambassador is invited by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom to some function, he returns the courtesy. This money is expended for music and flowers and service, food, and so forth.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman does not mean that this $250,000 is the amount that is expended for all these meals and parties and all of these things that are going on, including the entertainment here at Blair House, where we spend so much money for liquor? The gentleman does not mean to impress us with the idea that that is all the money that is spent on these dinners?

Mr. STEFAN. No; I am not trying to impress on you anything of the kind.

Mr. REES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. STEFAN. I am trying to impress upon you that it has been the custom, since we have been sending missions to foreign countries, to have prestige allowances.

Mr. REES. They call them prestige allowances and, therefore, we proceed to spend money to buy liquor and we use that as a means of trying to get along with foreign countries. That is the whole sum and substance of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the gentleman feel that this has been cut considerably?

Mr. REES. I feel the gentleman has done a splendid job in cutting from over $1,000,000 to $500,000, but to me it is perfectly silly that anybody would ever have the nerve to come in and ask for this money. I will warrant that General Marshall did not come before the gentleman's committee and ask for this $1,000,000. He did not ask for $500,000. He did not even ask for $250,000. Some representative of the State Department must have come down here to take care of this allowance, and I will warrant that even though I was not present, that I am sure is the way it happened. It was not any of the top-flight men who came and asked for this money, you can be sure of that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that the hearings on Department of State appropriations are available to all the Members of Congress, and the hearings are complete insofar as the representation allowances are concerned.

Mr. REES. The hearings are available, but the items for which this money is spent are not available to the Members of Congress, are they?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure that I would be very happy to give the gentleman all the information that I have in my possession.

Mr. REES. I would certainly be happy to have it and look over it.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman would be very enlightened and surprised.

Mr. REES. And I would be surprised, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 32, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may receive a message, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD as of May 16, 1947.

ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I probably could criticize these appropriations as well as anyone in the Committee, but I wish to direct my remarks to the information and cultural program of the State Department in this section of the bill. I concur in the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], in expressing confidence not only in Secretary of State Marshall but also in his Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy. I think it was very unfortunate that General Marshall had to go to Moscow so shortly after taking office.

I repeat, I probably could criticize the State Department as well as anybody, and I propose to show where it should be criticized.

It was very unfortunate that, by Presidential directive, so many people who were Communist and pro-Soviet in their thinking were transferred from the OSS, the OIC, the OIAA, and various agencies to the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable time and study to the activities and composition of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department. Therefore I wish to take a little time to discuss this matter which is at present under consideration by the Congress.

Let no one assume that my attitude is one of hostility toward a constructive program of international information in behalf of the United States. Such a program is an urgent need, in the light of the propaganda barrage emanating from the Soviet Union and its Communist agents all over the world, attacking the United States as a war-mongering tool of the monopolists seeking world conquest, oppressing its own people, lynching Negroes, and guilty of every crime in the calendar of human sins. But the activities of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department must not be confused with a sound program. As carried on today, they are a monstrosity costing the Nation millions of dollars, and serving no constructive purpose for the United States. Conducted by a group of pro-Communist fellow travelers and muddle heads, they fill the ether and tons of paper with a combination of material favorable to the Soviet Union and the Communists, or just plain twaddle.

Let me give you some idea of the personnel conducting the present program. Top-flight assistant to Mr. William Benton is William Treadwell Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Here is his record:

Member of the editorial board of Amerasia from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the Daily Worker and a member of the Communist Party. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffe, indicted and fined for the possession of confidential Government documents, charged by Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO on November 28, 1945, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, until recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Stone's membership on the editorial board of Amerasia covers the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact during which this magazine described the war in Europe as imperialistic, declaring that—

Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses.

Jaffe's Communist alias was J. W. Phillips—Washington Daily News, June 7, 1945, page 1. Mr. Field was executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist front which picketed the White House during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

Writing in Amerasia of August 1937, together with such well-known defenders of Soviet foreign policy as Frederick V. Field, Edgar Snow, and Harriet Moore, Mr. Stone comments as follows on relations with Japan:

Nevertheless, the case against invoking the Neutrality Act, as presented by the State Department and a considerable section of the press, is not altogether convincing * * * on the other hand, if the events at Shanghai have precipitated a general war, as seems likely, a policy of drift which allows munitions shipments and trade in war materials to continue would not advance the cause of peace or reduce the dangers of American involvement. * * * Furthermore, the possibilities of collective action under neutrality have apparently not been explored by Washington (p. 293).

This statement should be compared with the official line of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the time as expressed by Earl Browder, its spokesman in an NBC broadcast on August 28, 1936, as follows:

How long will the American people, who have so convincingly shown their unmistakable desire for peace, continue to hold aloof from collective efforts for peace which alone can check the war plans of the Japanese militarists in the Far East and of their ally, Hitler, in Europe? * * * President Roosevelt—hangs on to a policy of so-called neutrality or isolation which in practice has encouraged the Fascist aggressors. * * * It was this ineffective method which emboldened the Japanese militarists to advance their war plans against China and the United States.

The following article—quoted in part—is taken from Amerasia of October 1940 published under joint editorship of Mr. Stone, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Field, and others, apparently with their full knowledge and approval. The article is entitled "American Far Eastern Policy; For Democracy or Imperialism?" by Frederick V. Field and reads in part as follows:

Our Government is, as it has repeatedly stated, interested in the imperialist status quo. * * * Finally, it may be said that I am expressing an isolated, private view. * * * Over the Labor Day week end more than 22,000 men and women, of whom 6,000 were delegates, met at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago. * * * Two thousand went on to Washington to lobby and demonstrate against the conscription bill. * * * Because to them the building up of a great military machine for the purpose of becoming a partner in a war of rival imperialisms is not consistent with true national defense. I say, therefore, that the views I have expressed are not those of an isolated individual. Rather, they are the views, springing from deep convictions, of millions and millions of Americans who refuse to be duped into war or into an American form of dictatorship and fascism.

No statement appeared in Amerasia to challenge this viewpoint, by Mr. Stone or anyone else.

Again, under the joint editorship of Mr. Stone, with Messrs. Jaffe, Field, and others, there appeared in the January 1940 issue of Amerasia an article by Harriet Moore entitled "Two Wars or One," from which the following excerpt is quoted:

It—

The United States—

should exert its influence to stop the European conflict as soon as possible by means of negotiated balance-of-power peace.

No statement appeared to challenge this viewpoint.

Mr. Stone was formerly with the Budget Bureau as administrative consultant at $9,800. He is said to have drawn up the plan for the Cultural Division of the State Department.

He has been in charge of selection of personnel for foreign broadcasting.

He is reported to have appointed George Shaw Wheeler, while Stone was in London for the Board of Economic Warfare. Wheeler has a long record of Communist affiliations and activities. Because of this record, Wheeler was removed by the Civil Service Commission

and later reinstated as a result of left-wing pressure.

Next we have Haldore E. Hanson, Assistant Secretary of the Office of Information and Culture. Here is his record:

Assistant Secretary and the official lobbyist for the Office of Information and Culture.

Mr. Hanson has spent most of his adult life since leaving school as a free-lance writer in China. He wanted to study, but, as he says:

When the school year drew to a close, I decided to join a group of professors and journalists in Peiping, headed by Edgar Snow [1] and his wife,[2] who were organizing a new political magazine.[3]

He held other positions which some of his superiors considered so important that he was excused from military service. One of these positions was in the Department of Agriculture.

A further indication of the varied and colorful background which he brought to the Department is in an article written about him—Review of Reviews, February 1937, page 95—in which he is referred to as smuggler, soldier, and diplomat. In view of the fact that his military service was not with the United States armed forces, it would be well to learn with whom and for what he fought.

Mr. Hanson can best be judged, however, by his own writings: A. The People Behind the Chinese Guerrillas, published in Pacific Affairs, September 1938:

In this article, he shows that he enjoyed the complete confidence of the Chinese Communists—and that they do not tolerate anyone who is not completely on their side—the official Communist position.

First. Page 285:

To assess the strength of the self-defense governments and the mass movement supporting the guerrillas, I spent 2 weeks traveling through guerrilla territory in central Hopei in March 1938 and brought back copies of nearly all of the official documents of the government in addition to my own observations.

That is, he was given official documents by the Communists, and given safe conduct through their lines.

Second. He shows that the central Hopei mass movement with which he was identified was definitely a part of the official Communist plan.

Third. Mr. Hanson, apparently himself a well-grounded student of the writings of Marx and Lenin could judge the actual knowledge of Marx which the Chinese Communists had.

Page 290:

Naturally the political leaders trained in the anti-Japanese academy are familiar with the writings of Marx and Lenin and have not abandoned their hopes for a socialist republic.

Page 303:

MAO TZE-TUNG'S LONG VIEW

China has the second largest Communist Party in the world. The leader of the party lives at Yenan. Next to Stalin he is the most powerful Marxian thinker and leader in world politics today. I asked for an interview with Mao Tze-tung. (From Humane Endeavor, p. 303.)

Fourth. Mr. Hanson, further, proudly—almost boastfully—shows how completely the Communists accepted him into their confidence. He states:

(a) The guerrillas do not tolerate neutrality: A man is either for or against them (p. 296).

Mr. Hanson was at all times given safe conduct through the Communist lines.

I have traveled in the commander in chief's motor car.

(b) I spent 4 months at the close of 1938 with the north China guerrillas. (The Nation, April 8, 1939, p. 401.)

Page 254:

(c) Thirty miles south of Wut'ai I came upon two Canadian doctors. One was Dr. Norman Bethune,[4] a surgeon from Toronto who was sent to China by the American Committee for Medical Aid to China.

Fifth. Mr. Hanson, with more enthusiasm than objectivity, tells of the aims and achievements of the Chinese Communists.

Page 296:

The Communist agents frankly tell their visitors that they hope the present war will produce a democratic government in China, which will be only one step toward the ultimate goal of a socialist state. * * * This goal was asserted by Mr. Huang Ching, the Communist representative at the Fuping conference when he stated: "The Communist Party is determined to support the formation of a democratic republic and to execute the duties laid upon it by this new political power."

Page 298:

Despite this continued vision of a future Chinese Soviet the qualities of leadership at the Central Hopei headquarters would seem to indicate that the Communists will not fight any more civil wars. * * * This Red leadership is characterized by a bulldog attitude toward the ultimate goal, a flexibility of methods, an attitude of self-criticism toward all present work, a willingness of experiment, and a complete absence (so far as I could see) of personal ambition. The same qualities have marked every great movement in history which has survived the decades of adversity to reach the pinnacles of power. (North China, May 1938.)

Humane Endeavor, page 32:

The Red leaders organized the masses, gave them discipline and something worth fighting for.

Humane Endeavor, page 79:

Russian policy among the Outer Mongolians appealed to the common people by exposing the corruption of both the priests and the princes; aristocratic privileges were abolished; machinery for a democratic government, dominated by Russian advisers but employing whatever educated Mongols were available, was set up at Urga in 1924.

Page 101:

Despite all these apparent handicaps the Communists became the most powerful peasant armies in the history of revolution. They had three qualities which brought armies success * * * a mastery of mobile warfare, skillful political propaganda, and superb leadership. * * * The revolutionary land policy was a second reason for Red success.

It would be well to see who in the Department as well as outside the Department urged Mr. Hanson's appointment to Cultural Affairs, and who in the Department urged his rapid promotion. Evidently under fire of recent criticism, Mr. Hanson has been transferred to the Political Affairs Committee of the State Department.

Another members of the leading triumvirate in Mr. Benton's office is Charles Alexander Thomson. In a study entitled "The War in Spain," published in Foreign Policy Reports of May 1, 1938, page 39, he has the following eulogy of the work of the Communists:

To the Communists must go the major credit for the introduction of order and unity in this nondescript army. * * * On the Government side, the most important political developments have been: (1) the rise of the Communist Party; (2) the working alliance effected by the Communists with the right-wing Socialists and the Republican Parties * * *; (3) the decline of Communist influence and its later resurgence in the cabinet formed on April 4, 1938. * * * When Franco troops approached Madrid early in November 1936, a new and decisive foreign influence appeared on the scene. Russian aid had arrived—not only airplanes and tanks, but also advisers, technicians and the forces of the International Brigade, in many instances recruited by Communist agencies. Thanks in great part to Soviet influence, the Spanish revolution was not destined—as has so often been the case in history—to pass from the hands of moderates to those of extremists. Instead, the Communists cast their weight against radical trends; they proclaimed that the purpose of the war was not to advance social revolution, but to defend a legal and democratic government.

The Spanish Communists must be credited with significant achievements. They led in transforming the militia into a disciplined army, and encouraged a unified command. They worked to unify and strengthen the central government as against the local committees. They put a check on wholesale socialization of industry and collectivization of agriculture. They sought to substitute discipline under centralized authority for the spontaneous and disorderly enthusiasm of the masses. They demanded that the social revolution be definitely subordinated to the task of winning the war.

The Communists, whose numbers had not exceeded 50,000 prior to the revolt, derived power to enforce these policies from various factors. First, of course, was aid from the Soviet Union. A second factor was superior organizing ability, shown by their success in marshaling support both within the army and behind the lines. The Communists won the allegiance of General Miaja and many other officers, largely controlled the commissar system and the censorship, and were particularly strong in the Madrid forces and in the aviation corps. In the third place, the Communists skillfully exploited a policy of moderation toward socialization of industry and agriculture, which gained the support of numerous middle-class elements, notably small business men and the richer peasants. In consequence their numbers showed a marked increase, being estimated at 220,000 in January 1937, and 400,000 in September of the same year.

[1] A prominent pro-Soviet writer on China.

[2] Under the pen name of Nym Wales, wrote extensively in support of Soviet policy.

[3] Page 30, Humane Endeavor, by H. Hanson.

[4] After the death of Dr. Bethune, the Daily Worker told that he had been a member of the Communist Party. The Worker further told that Dr. Bethune had served with the Spanish Communist's Army in the medical corps, and that he had played the hero role in a Soviet picture, Spain in Flames.

This report is in complete contradiction to the statements of numerous anti-Franco authorities to the atrocities and disruption committed by the Communists under their Russian commissars in the Spanish Civil War.

According to Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, former American Ambassador to Spain, in his book, Wartime Mission to Spain, Mr. Thomson was responsible for the appointment of Abel Plenn as cultural attaché in Spain. Mr. Plenn's ideology can be determined from his recent book, Wind in the Olive Trees, which is severely critical of every phase of American policy in Spain during the war. His pro-Communist bias is evident throughout the book which has been enthusiastically promoted by the Communist press and Communist book shops.

According to the Daily Worker of July 4, 1946, page 11, Mr. Thomson entered into hearty cooperation with Tom Brandon, producer and distributor of pro-Communist films. This is enough to show where Mr. Thomson stands.

It will be remembered that the personnel of the Cultural Division is in large measure a legacy from Communist permeated OWI, and the regime of Archibald McLeish. How does it happen, for example, that Mr. Armand D. Willis, cultural attaché in Moscow, suddenly burst into the press attacking American Embassy officers as Russian haters? Is this appointment an accident or is it typical of the Cultural Department in general?

Who was responsible for the selection of Mr. Lau Shaw, who made a tour of the United States as a guest of the State Department? Later Mr. Shaw wrote an article on Hollywood Films in China for the pro-Communist magazine, Screen Writer. In this article he assailed American movies as having "no educational and no cultural attitude and intention."

Who was responsible for sending as a delegate to the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization of the United States Prof. Harlow Shapley, who, in spite of his scientific attainments, has an enormous record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations and defense of Communist causes?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Robert T. Miller, Chief in Charge of Publications, who has since been forced to resign and whose record is one of dubious loyalty to the United States?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Charles A. Page, former cultural attaché in Paris, whose membership in the Communist Party and the Young Communist League is testified to by verifiable Government files?

Who is responsible for the appointment of Stefan Arski, alias Arthur Salman, alias Kalimovski, contributor to the Communist Polish publication, Novy Put'? Arski's Communist record was previously exposed by Congressman Joseph P. Ryter. I do not know what his citizenship status is, but today he is public-relations officer of the Polish Embassy. How does Mr. Benton account for this transition?

Who was responsible for the fact that Jo Davidson, active in numerous Communist-front organizations, has been engaged by the State Department to make numerous busts of Latin-American ex-Presidents at a handsome remuneration?

Who was responsible for the invitation to visit the United States issued to two writers and two engineers from Communist-ruled Kalgan, expenses to be paid by the American Government? These men were Chow Yang, vice president of Kalgan's North China Union University; Oyang Shan-chun, playwright; Nih Chun-jung and Li Su, engineers.

Dr. Esther C. Brunauer was selected by the State Department as United States representative to UNESCO with the rank of minister. Speaking over NBC on May 31, 1946, at 6 p. m., she declared:

> There are many barriers to the concept [of peoples speaking to peoples]; there are the barriers * * * of monopolistic practices to be overcome.

What did Dr. Brunauer mean by this? What country was she criticizing? Was she aware of the fact that she was echoing Soviet propaganda against the United States? Has this lady ever taken a critical attitude toward conditions in the Soviet Union? Evidently, again under fire of recent criticism, she has been shifted to the Office of Public Liaison in the State Department.

Now let us take a glance at the activities of this coterie. Much is made of the Russian broadcast. I am all for effective broadcasts to the Soviet Union. The voice of free America would be welcome if it could reach the Russian people, but there are certain difficulties of which Mr. Benton has not adequately informed the American people. In fact, he has misled them to believe that there is free and easy access for American broadcasts to the Soviet Union. He has not told you that all receivers must be registered at the nearest post office in Russia. What reason have we to believe that a dictatorship like the Soviet Government, with concentration camps, terror, and firing squads would freely admit a broadcast from a foreign democracy? Why should Stalin set up an iron curtain against the press and suddenly withdraw that curtain at the request of Mr. Benton? As Mr. William Philip Simms, the noted columnist, said in the Scripps-Howard press of December 21, 1945:

> Mr. Benton's department can no more speak to people of the Soviet Union than it can speak to the people of Mars. And the same can be said of the steadily expanding areas under Soviet control.

Mr. Benton boasts of having received letters from recipients of messages from America. How does he know that these people are not stooges who have sent their letters with Government knowledge and approval?

According to John Crosby in the Washington Post of April 27, 1947, the State Department broadcast not only the views of Henry Wallace, who was attacking the State Department, but even those of the Daily Worker, which called the Truman doctrine "a national shame."

Of what use is it to the United States to broadcast a talk on the Julliard School, the description of Louisiana, the function and organization of the Supreme Court, and surgical refrigeration issues? What guarantee has Mr. Benton that anybody is really listening to these things?

According to a dispatch from Moscow in the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1947, only a comparatively few Russians heard the United States State Department's first Russian language broadcast. The Star's dispatch says:

> The United States has an elaborate pictorial magazine, but schedules and wave lengths dealing with the State Department programs have not been published in it.

On April 14, 1947, the State Department broadcast a supinely apologetic statement by David Lawrence in which he pleaded with the Russians as follows:

> Let us confess that we each have made mistakes and that we, for instance, may misunderstand even now what you are doing in the Balkans, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea. * * * We are not without sin. You mentioned the Negro question. Be patient with us.

Is that the tone which a self-respecting nation should adopt toward a ruthless, expansionist power? Following this broadcast, Mr. Lawrence was duly assailed by Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet spokesman, whereupon he issued the following abject apology:

> If it will help matters, let me present my humblest apologies and regrets for anything that I may have ever written derogatory to Russia and may we all let bygones be bygones with respect to everybody's past writings on other sides.

How the Russian power politicians must have laughed at this spectacle.

Miss Elizabeth Egan, Acting Chief of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs in Moscow for 2½ years, has herself admitted the limitations of broadcasts to the Soviet Union. In the Washington Post of January 16, 1947, she is quoted as saying that there are few short-wave sets in the Soviet Union—the average family having a plate which is turned to the local station only.

Mr. Benton has made a great to-do of the publication of the magazine Amerika. George Moorad, a Moscow correspondent and author of Behind the Iron Curtain, has described the American project as follows:

> The American effort was not serious enough to warrant unusual curbs. Since we were printing in New York, the text had to be translated into Russian, cabled to Moscow for censorship and correction, cabled back to New York, and finally printed in Russian. Then came the matter of shipping some thousands of copies into Moscow, when transport was available, and the result was only two issues during the 7 months I was there. Our own American difficulties were so staggering, it was hardly necessary for Soviet bureaucrats to devise others.

Mr. David Sentner, writing in the Los Angeles Examiner on January 15, 1946, has described the steps in publishing Amerika as follows:

> The proofs are first sent to Moscow for Soviet approval. The Russian Government censors the contents and sends back the approved portions. * * * No copy of the magazine has ever been seen on a newsstand in the Soviet Union. * * * Why do we permit the Soviet Union to censor an American Government publication when the Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics issues through the Soviet Embassy a weekly bulletin of information which is uncensored Communist propaganda and in violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Indicative of what is going on inside of Mr. Benton's Department is the following quotation in the pro-Communist publication In Fact for January 21, 1947. It evidently followed numerous leaks in the Department. I quote:

> Unless the State Department sets up a United States Gestapo to intimidate its employees into silence, the secret and confidential directives will continue to reach the light.

This was an open invitation to the employees of the Department to divulge confidential information to Communist channels. One would think that as a result of this statement which reached Mr. Benton that he would act decisively, determine the sources of the leaks, and reorganize his Department in the most drastic manner. Again we have to rely upon In Fact, which apparently is well informed as to what is going on in Mr. Benton's Department. In the issue of April 8, 1946, appeared the following:

> Sixteen days after In Fact exclusively published the pattern of State Department propaganda operations and printed authentic propaganda directives issued by the State Department to implement its objectives, an official order by Assistant Secretary William Benton to his propaganda staff, marked "confidential," declared that after February 6 the use of the term "directive" would no longer be used and that henceforth all such propaganda directions will be referred to as guides. It can now be revealed that within 24 hours after the In Fact publication of the propaganda-directive exposé, top State Department officials met in closed session to plan their strategy.

In other words, Mr. Benton made a full retreat in the face of the pro-Communist gang in his Department.

Another point: I would like to know who was responsible for the invitation the United States tendered to Anthoon Koejemans, editor of the Dutch Communist paper De Waarheid. The Communist Workers of February 3, 1946, stated that the gentleman "is now in the United States on a six-man delegation of Dutch newspapermen, sponsored by the State Department's Office of International Information."

I should also like to know who was responsible for the display of the film entitled "Now the Peace," produced by World in Action on August 1, 1946, before State Department employees. This picture was severely critical of the American system of free enterprise and was thoroughly Communist in tone.

Characteristic of the chaos in Mr. Benton's Department is the incident described in the New York Times of March 30, 1947, in which Mr. Benton announced that "the relay transmitters at Munich, which beam the daily short-wave program of the State Department to Russia, were sabotaged recently and the broadcasts were turned away to South America." A subsequent investigation resulted in a complete whitewash of the incident, although a later report admitted that a German Communist had been employed in the broadcasting station.

The Daily Worker of April 30, 1947, in the column conducted by Barnard Rubin, publishes in detail a summary of a State Department directive to its international broadcasting division. Has Mr. Benton ever made an inquiry as to how the Daily Worker secured this directive?

Mr. Benton has himself shown a certain apologetic attitude toward the Soviet Union. In the New York Times of March 4, 1947, speaking at Atlantic City, he is quoted as saying that the Soviet Union spends three times as much for education as does this country. I seriously doubt the authenticity of this estimate.

The Motion Picture Herald of July 6, 1946, has reported a number of film enterprises undertaken by the State Department. One is entitled "Banjo Picking Boy," produced by Irving Lerner, who has a long list of Communist affiliations.

The criticisms made of the activities of the Cultural Division are too numerous to cite here. Let me repeat, however, the statement made by Congressman TABER that this branch is "loaded with people whose loyalties are not with the United States." Let me mention the titles of some of the films distributed by the State Department to enhance the status of this Government: Grasshoppers, Tennis Rhythm, Reproduction Among Mammals, The Farmer's Wife, Willie and the Mouse, Music for Tiny Tots, Chicken Little, Unit Cast Partial Dentures.

Congressman STEFAN on April 11, 1946, declared that State Department programs channeled to the Caribbean area, with a population of 31,000,000, reach only 45,000 families, the number with usable receiving sets. Moreover, he said the programs are broadcast in English, which is understood by only a small part of the population.

You are all familiar with a recent broadcast of a book review of the biography of Henry Wallace and his family at the very moment when he was criticizing the policy of the State Department and being applauded for it by Communist audiences throughout the world.

Mr. Benton, who appears before you with a request for $31,000,000, does not explain how he proposes to tackle the difficulty which he confronted in Belgrade, when the doors of the American reading room and library were shut down. Indicative of the loss in prestige which we have suffered during the period of Mr. Benton's promotion of our stock is the fact that the French Government did not hesitate to shut down our radio station in Algiers as a result of Russian pressure.

Our Ambassador to Argentina has clearly outlined the ineffectiveness of Mr. Benton's outfit in Latin America. He declared that communism had made great strides in the southern hemisphere. He pointed out that Communist organizations in Latin America had received large funds from Moscow and were doing over-all propaganda against economic and political imperialism with the United States as the chief target. This report has been corroborated by W. H. Lawrence in the New York Times of January 1, 1946, when he declared:

> A propaganda effort helpful only to the Soviet Union and harmful to the United States is under way throughout Latin America through formal channels of the Communist Party, including its newspapers and radio stations.

Mr. William H. Newton, well known Scripps-Howard staff writer in China, has made the following report of State Department incompetence in the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1947:

> The United States Information Service here is under orders from Washington to confine its activities to publishing official documents, innocuous Government releases, and press dispatches. Both the Information Service and American consular employees are aware of the beating the United States is taking on the propaganda front, but no one is permitted to do much about it. • • • The steady day-by-day impact of the Communist propaganda is having its effect here, particularly since our Government's principal response is stories about the TVA and photographs of the little red schoolhouse in Georgia.

Another sample of sheer waste in the Cultural Division of the State Department is the appropriation for the publication of an elaborate Who's Who of personages in Latin-American countries. God knows how much good that will do.

Let me mention in passing also that in the Baltic states—grabbed early in the war by Stalin—all short-wave radios have been confiscated and domestic radios are forcibly tuned to Kremlin broadcasts.

Let me ask of what earthly use is it to us to broadcast Benny Goodman's jazz, Turkey in the Straw, Night and Day, cowboy tunes, and a description of infrared photography while the Russians are lambasting us as power-hungry imperialists.

Charles Coulter, who just returned from a year in Europe, testified to the ineffectiveness of State Department broadcasts in the Washington Post on April 14, 1947. He said:

> In something like a year spent in Europe recently, I tried again and again and again to listen in to the American broadcast. I could not pick up the broadcast. On the other hand, I could and did receive Russian, English, Swedish, Danish, and other European broadcasts, and even numerous programs from Africa, from Cairo to the Cape.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, distinguished editor of the magazine the Americas, has testified, according to the New York Times of January 5, 1947, to the inexcusable inefficiency of the State Department's program in Latin America:

> One reason for the formidable Marxist infiltration throughout Latin America is the singularly inept and sadly ineffective nature of the State Department's Division of International Information and Cultural Affairs. • • • Dr. Thorning called for "intelligent use of the taxpayer's money at a time when the shadow of Red fascism hangs over the entire world and is exploiting every conceivable issue, false and true, in order to undermine the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere. • • • What is required is not a great appropriation by Congress but rather some measure of imaginative

resourcefulness, artistic presentation of the abundant material we have, and an alertness in meeting and overcoming the totalitarian propagandists."

The eminent observer Constantine Brown, has described the effect of State Department cultural activities in Paris in the Evening Star of February 21, 1947, as follows:

> The United States has spent many hundreds of millions of dollars in assisting France since her liberation, but few in France realize or appreciate this fact * * * the great majority of French people are firmly convinced that the Germans were defeated by the valiant bravery of the Red Armies. * * * They (Mr. Benton and his assistants) aim to inform foreign countries about the United States, but are reluctant to do anything which might be interpreted as propaganda.

Perhaps the greatest hoax put over on the American people has been UNESCO, over which that great poet and fellow traveler, Archibald MacLeish, is the chief architect. Mr. MacLeish has been associated with numerous Communist-front organizations and has written poetry which has drawn the acclaim of the Communist press. Mr. MacLeish is sharply critical of things American. Speaking before a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York on February 22, 1947, he said residents of foreign countries distrusted America's vast communication powers, the radio programs produced by advertising agencies in New York and the mass-produced day dreams of this country's motion-picture industry. They are afraid we will destroy the richness and variety of the several cultures of the world. He said the United States had undergone an extraordinary deterioration of the will to peace.

Mr. Benton has paid tribute to Mr. MacLeish, declaring that "There is no American—nor anyone in the world for that matter—who has contributed so much to the formation of UNESCO and to the writing of its charter."

According to the New York Herald Tribune of April 14, 1946, the UNESCO constitution calls for "the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace."

Kenneth Lindsay, of Oxford, a leading educator who represents English universities, has ridiculed this conception in the New York Times of November 23, 1946. He is quoted as follows:

> I see danger of trying to produce, instead of concrete specific proposals, a whole world of philosophy. If UNESCO is going to try in a Europe, which has got Roman Catholics and Communists and other distinctive creeds, to produce another creed, I foretell that it will be doomed.

In spite of UNESCO's announced cultural and educational aims, it is significant to note that no public- or private-school teacher has been invited to serve as a delegate to this Organization.

It will be remembered that the Soviet bloc in the United Nations has consistently fought for the severance of relations with Franco-Spain. We understand, of course, the exigencies of Soviet power politics involved. It is interesting to note that UNESCO invited representatives of the Spanish Republic to its meetings in conformance with the Communist line supported by the entire Soviet bloc, and in contradiction to the procedure laid down by the United Nations.

The placing of control over information and culture in the hands of a centralized agency like the State Department or UNESCO on an international scale is fraught with serious dangers. According to the New York Times on September 27, 1946, UNESCO proposes the revision of textbooks and other teaching materials used in schools and colleges throughout the world. Who will determine the nature of this revision? Will it be the left-wing ideologists in the State Department and the UNESCO?

Robert McLean, president of the Associated Press and publisher of the Philadelphia Bulletin, in a speech delivered in Philadelphia on January 17, 1947, denounced the plan for a Government merger of all communications beyond its shores and the establishment of short-wave radio broadcast, charging that the Government had arrogated "to itself in fact a power of censorship—for the power to determine what shall be sent out connotes the power to determine what shall not be sent out."

The Motion Picture Association, according to the Washington Post of January 11, 1947, accused Assistant Secretary of State Benton of trying to bend the movies to fit "a synthetic Government propaganda."

A statement issued by Joyce O'Hara, assistant to President Eric Johnston of the association, said:

> What the American people fear is the type of culture which Mr. Benton proposes to spread abroad. Mr. Benton would do far better if he followed the traditional policy of his own State Department in opening up world channels of news and information instead of trying to remake the patterns of American culture.

We are being asked to provide $31,000,000 for State Department information services while it is being steadily excluded from country after country. World Report of October 15, 1946, lists the following exclusions of this kind:

> Shut-down of Belgrade library of the United States Information Service; Bulgarian censorship of United States Information Service material; Polish restrictions on the scope of United States information; censorship in Hungary; etc.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that I believe cultural and information activities are essential for the security of the United States. We are now experiencing a propaganda offensive directed against us in all parts of the world. To defend ourselves we should first of all make a thorough house cleaning and liquidation of the present monstrosity in the State Department, and then set up an efficient machinery which insists and obtains complete reciprocity with the various countries with which we have treaty relations, and which will provide the Congress from time to time with concrete and adequate information based upon facts and check up as to the effective operation of this machinery.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

PRICE PROPAGANDA VERSUS COMMON SENSE

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem of the United States admittedly is not our most important problem, but it furnishes an example of the hundreds of problems which we must solve if our people and the people of the world are going to attain maximum prosperity and good living in the coming years. For this reason, I want to discuss the potato surplus problem again today.

To millions of Americans who know very little about potatoes except that they like to eat them, it may not seem worth while to worry about the potato surplus problem, particularly in view of the larger problems that confront us. However, we in the Congress know that all of the little problems piled up make a very big problem, just as a lot of little potatoes piled up make a mighty big surplus. This year that surplus is 100,000,000 bushels, a large part of which went to waste.

The potato problem impinges on other problems facing us as legislators today. What we do, or fail to do, in formulating a program to do away with the potato surplus will affect, to some degree, the tax rate in the years to come. It will affect our Government's operations. It will affect the prices consumers must pay for potatoes, and the kind of potatoes the housewife can buy at the corner grocery store. It will even affect the price of the wheat that goes into the bread which most Americans eat every day, as I shall prove a little later.

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem even has an important bearing on our overseas relief policy and on our export program of commodities generally. Just last Friday, May 9, the Department of Agriculture put out a release stating that nearly 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes from the 1946 potato crop have been shipped abroad under the Department's export program. In the course of the release, the Department noted:

> Potatoes were made available for export as soon as they were harvested, but foreign countries at that time had sufficient quantities for immediate use and preferred to purchase grain. In early spring, however, it was possible to arrange for appreciable exports in spite of the difficulties involved in the handling and shipping of fresh potatoes.

It is significant to note these words, for they bear out a contention I have made before. Other nations are in our wheat market here, buying huge quantities of grain for use as flour. Many times these governments purchase flour. Our own Government purchases wheat in our relief program. This forces up the price of wheat and other grains in this country. If potatoes were processed into potato flour, the flour could be shipped instead of the wheat flour and the other nations would be glad to get it. Fifty thousand carloads of flour could have been produced from this year's surplus potatoes, most of which were destroyed.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; what we in this Congress do about the potato surplus in the long run will even help determine the prices consumers have to pay for many items which they purchase for use on the farm or in the home.

For these reasons, every American and every Member of Congress ought to learn a little more about the potato-surplus problem that seems to grow worse with

each passing year. A study of the problem gives us more insight to solve not only this problem but a multitude of others now before Congress and eventually to come before Congress.

It is true that several groups of Americans already are studying the potato-surplus problem and that the Department of Agriculture is offering every cooperation to me and to others that are seeking better means of disposing of the potato surplus. But it is also true that there is too much apathy on the subject and that the average individual must be made to understand that he will benefit materially if Congress goes into action on the potato-surplus problem.

The potato-surplus problem is important to several distinct groups in America. As we will see, none of these groups is small. As a matter of fact, every one of us is a member of one group or another that is affected by the potato problem.

First. The problem is important to the potato farmer. Right now, the average potato farmer is getting a good price for his product, but he knows—as we all know—that when the price of his product depends on artificial factors, that is, Federal price supports, sooner or later the problem will get out of hand with disastrous results to the potato grower himself.

Second. The problem is important to the thousands of independent bakers throughout the Nation. They are now paying an abnormally high price for flour. They lately have seen the price of flour go higher and higher, while at the same time they have held off putting into effect all the price increases at the retail level they should have put into effect to get their usual mark-up.

Wiser bakers have been chagrined to see their own Government working to make prices higher, while at the same time President Truman has been waging a fictitious war on high prices.

Take the present high wheat prices, for example, and consider these in the light of the potato surplus. If the Government, instead of spending $80,000,000 this year to support potato prices, would have built several plants for processing potatoes into potato flour, roughly 50,000 carloads of potato flour could have been shipped overseas in this crop year. Think of it. This flour could have been shipped instead of a comparable amount of wheat flour which, because it was sent overseas, actually helped boost American prices for flour. In other words, such activity by the Government as I have suggested actually would have helped keep prices down in the United States—and eventually reduced them down to the housewife's table.

As every economist knows, the supply of any product, or a substitute that is as good or better than the product, has a great bearing on the price the product demands. The present administration continues to think in terms of price ceilings, or allocations, or controls, in relation to prices, while at the same time overlooking the supply factor. This supply factor is in reality our biggest worry, at least for the time being, and the President could do more about bringing prices down by following policies that will increase production, or byproducts, that by making pretty speeches about the Newburyport plan, or any other similar plan based purely on publicity.

If we had had the foresight to process our surplus potatoes last year into potato flour, the people of Europe would gladly have taken it as a substitute for the wheat flour we had to ship abroad. It is just as good and just as nutritious and just as flavorful as wheat flour. They could have used it to make bread, to make potato soup, or to make potato gravy. Or, had they chosen, they could have used it in a variety of other ways. The flour not used for human consumption could have been fed to cattle or poultry and its food value ultimately realized by human beings. As it was, we dumped millions of bushels and shipped a comparatively little of our surplus to Europe, with the likelihood being that many of the potatoes were not worth consuming by man or beast by the time they arrived there. This can conveniently go on year after year with millions of people in need of food. Lives can be saved if action is taken now.

By so constructing and operating these potato-processing plants to prove the usefulness and profitableness of making potato flour, our Government actually would have added to our assets as a nation. Furthermore it would have been taking a big stride forward toward a solution to the pressing potato surplus problem which hangs heavy over our heads year after year. Private industry could lease or buy these plants from the Government, and by promoting consumption of potato flour in America, actually could do away with the potato-surplus problem.

The thoughtful bakers of this Nation already are recognizing the usefulness of adding a potato culture to their regular wheat-flour mix in baking bread. More than 300 bakers already use potato culture in their operations and others are turning to it each day. They, in effect, are helping already to solve the potato-surplus problem, while at the same time actually increasing the consumption of wheat. The ratio of wheat even in bread with potato culture is very great, and an increase in consumption of potato bread means an increase in consumption of wheat in the long future.

Third. The problem of the potato surplus is important to consumers in America. As we have seen, because the Government has failed to attack forcefully and logically the problems presented by the potato surplus, more wheat flour has been shipped abroad, thus forcing up its price at home. In addition, the American housewife has had to take a poorer grade of potatoes at the corner market than she should have had to take. If the Government converted surplus potatoes into flour, the culls and the lower grades could be used, thus leaving only the best, or United States Standard, grades of potatoes for purchase by housewives to serve in their homes.

Fourth. The problem of the potato surplus is important to taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, I will now give startling figures of interest to every man, woman, and child in America, as well as everybody all over the world. This year we are spending $80,000,000 on potato support prices because of a 100,000,000-bushel potato surplus. Now, $80,000,000 may seem like chicken feed in these days of billions for loans, grants, and gifts to other nations, but it is still a very imposing sum to most Americans, and if we could cut out this expense without hurting the potato farmer, we would be doing the Nation a great service. This $80,000,000 represents virtually a net loss to the United States Treasury. We Republicans have promised economy in government and this potato-surplus price is one of the best ways we can start practicing economy, yet not upset the prices which potato farmers are getting and deserve to get.

If, instead of spending the $80,000,000 on support prices, the Government had invested a few million dollars in potato-processing plants to turn surplus potatoes into flour, there would have been none of the dumping of potatoes we have all read about and most of us have deplored. There would have been no eventual loss to the Government, the taxpayer or the consumer. There would have been a net gain, in actuality. All of the potato surplus can be converted into flour and stored for 3 years, or more. It can be shipped over seas and used to obviate the need of sending that much wheat flour abroad. Or it can be used at home in the baking of bread, cake and many other products. There is no rhyme or reason ever in destroying an agricultural surplus as long as our scientists retain their ingenuity in finding new uses, our industrialists retain their will to distribute and their "know-how" to produce, and as long as our people will accept new, flexible policies that will add to our national wealth.

Henry Wallace, who currently is in disfavor because of his Russian stand, was never more wrong in his life than at the very beginning of his career in the New Deal government when he sponsored and put into practice his "plow-'em-under" ideas. We all lived to see the disastrous results of that policy in the long run. Yet, the Department of Agriculture still is following a "plow-'em-under" policy on potatoes. The only difference is that today the potatoes are dumped after having been grown and harvested and shipped at great loss of time and effort.

I know that my colleagues will agree with me that men who are public-spirited and do things in the public interest should be praised on the floor of Congress, whether they are in government, business, or take part in other legitimate endeavors. That is why I have no hesitancy again in praising Jack Schafer, the president of Peter Pan Bakeries in Detroit, Mich., who has put forward a plan to solve this potato surplus and to restore a normal economic price to potatoes in the United States.

Jack Schafer, who is no relative of mine, also is president of Schafer-Varney, Inc., which company serves other bakers throughout the Nation with potato culture, made from potato flour and other products. As an active businessman, he travels into all parts of the Nation and contacts independent bakers, large and small. He tells me that they

are very worried about the price of flour and the results of such prices in their operations. He says that the whole baking industry sees the need for new thinking and that bakers are turning to the use of potato culture in increasing numbers to add flavor and goodness to their product and to overcome buyer resistance which continues to develop as wheat prices climb.

I mention him because I want to pay tribute to his initiative and to his stick-to-itiveness. He has studied potatoes as an active grower, as a salesman, as a marketer, and now as the manufacturer of a potato culture, and he deserves the thanks of all Americans for the time and thought he has given to the potato-surplus problem and possible solutions to it.

He and hundreds of other bakers have endorsed the House resolution which I have introduced. This resolution provides for a study of this whole potato-surplus problem by the Committee on Agriculture and for the formulation of a plan of action that will bring relief to the American taxpayer, the American consumer, the American baker, and will help both the potato farmer and the wheat farmer in the long future. I again urge support for this study among all Members of the House of Representatives and from bakers and other citizens throughout the Nation.

My mail indicates that there is a widespread demand for such a study and for positive action on the potato-surplus problem. We cannot afford to let it run on and on. The problem is a perennial one now and it will get worse and worse if we do not take constructive steps. I submit that a plan such as I contemplate and as I have outlined is the logical next step for the Congress and for the Department of Agriculture to take. This plan has been endorsed by bakers, consumers and nutritionists—in fact, by every informed person who has taken the trouble to learn the details of the potato-surplus problem.

In conclusion, why talk about price reduction when we waste 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, pay out $80,000,000 in subsidies, ship out 500,000,000 bushels of grain, causing our own flour and bread prices to go up? If all surplus potatoes were processed into potato flour there would be no surpluses, no $80,000,000 tax, no abnormally high-priced flour or bread and millions of people here and abroad would be better fed. And please remember, this problem will face us again and again year after year, unless we do something about it. I urge the Rules Committee to bring out my resolution providing for a thorough study of the potato-surplus problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, $950,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the State Department appropriation language be considered as read and that amendments may be in order to any part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates for individuals not to exceed $50 per diem; teletype news service (not exceeding $1,000); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (not exceeding $3,000); $800,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 41, line 19, strike out "$800,000" and insert "$1,335,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations have recommended a cut of 40 percent in the budget of the Office of the Secretary in the Department of Commerce.

I want the House to consider this recommendation from the practical standpoint of efficiency.

I am confident that every Member of the House wants more efficiency in government. We all know that making adequate provisions for efficient administration is the only economical way to get any job done. Years of experience in both business and Government show that we can get efficiency only by providing for effective management. That is a simple principle that every successful business and every effective Government agency follows.

But despite charging the Office of the Secretary with at least three new management burdens, the majority members of this committee have recommended a drastic 40-percent slash in the appropriation for his office.

Let us look at the new responsibilities the committee demands that the Secretary's office fulfill with a 60-percent budget.

First. It wants the office to put more effort on the study of current business and industrial needs and to provide more suggestions about the types of legislation that will meet those needs.

Second. The committee wants more screening of the Department's publications and more coordination and consolidation in the publications program.

Third. The committee wants more time and effort spent on getting coordination between the Department of Commerce and other departments of the Government.

I subscribe to all of these suggestions. But these very important responsibilities can be carried out only in the Secretary's Office. Each one of them imposes an additional management burden on his staff. I want to point out that the recommended slash of 40 percent in the funds for the Secretary's Office would make it impossible for him to fulfill the responsibilities the committee has assigned him. Gentlemen, let us be realistic. Even the most able craftsmen need tools. I think an ordinary sense of fairness must bring us to the conclusion that it is ridiculous to impose these additional responsibilities on the Secretary's Office and at the same time reduce his staff.

The committee has made another recommendation with respect to the Secretary's Office that is grossly inconsistent with our interest in efficient management. I think the suggestion that the Department's Central Services Pool be abolished and the work parcelled out to the various bureaus and offices would tend to defeat the Committee's avowed interest in economy. This central office which now handles personnel, printing, accounting and general office services for many offices of the Department was set up for the very purpose of avoiding duplication and confusion. It has resulted in considerable savings and in the very types of coordination that create the efficiencies and economies the Committee says it wants. To scatter this management function out among various bureaus and offices would require the employment of more people and encourage the confusion we all want to avoid. It would require the Department to spend more money on less efficient management.

The appropriations request of the Secretary, who is an experienced business man and administrator, has included less than one-half of 1 percent of his total budget for the management and supervisory services that are the very basis of efficiency and economy. To cripple the managing office of a department to which every business in the United States looks for efficient service would be penny wise and pound foolish. I urgently recommend that we give this able administrator the funds he needs to do the big job he has so ably started.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would increase the amount for the office of the Secretary of Commerce from $800,000, as recommended by this committee, to $1,335,000. The committee has gone into this matter very carefully and after a very, very serious study we feel that we have perhaps been a little more liberal than we should have been in reaching the amount of $800,000.

This office in 1938 had $478,000. In 1939 they had $484,000. In 1940 they had $617,000. In 1941 they went back to $460,000. In 1942 they had $557,000. In 1943 they had $586,000. In 1945 they had $689,000. In 1946 they had $570,000, and after Mr. Wallace went into office and reorganized it, to $925,000. Now, they are asking for $1,335,000.

Let me tell you what they have in that office since Mr. Wallace went in there. They have a secretary, an under secretary, and an assistant secretary. They have an assistant to the secretary, and an executive assistant to the secretary. They have an executive assistant to the

under secretary, and an executive assistant to the assistant secretary. They have a secretary to the secretary and a secretary of public relations, and they have secretaries all over the place.

I think the committee has given them an ample amount of money to carry on the Department of Commerce in an orderly and effective way.

I suggest that the Committee vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to technological development as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, office of the Secretary," is available (not to exceed $25,000), for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and not to exceed $60,000 for printing and binding, $1,700,000, of which not to exceed $500,000 may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards for testing and other scientific studies.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I made a point of order against the language on lines 3 to 14, inclusive, on page 42 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract; purchase and rental of office furniture and equipment including mechanical and electrical tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices; tabulating cards and continuous form tabulating paper; $5,000,000: *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1947, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, N. Y., and of the foregoing amount $1,200,000 shall be available exclusively for this purpose.

Mr. BEALL. I make a point of order against the language on page 43, line 18, beginning with the word "provided" and going through line 22 on the same page, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 43, line 18, after the amount "$5,000,000" and before the period, insert a comma and the words "of which amount not to exceed $3,800,000 may be expended at the seat of government."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The Chairman. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. We had anticipated that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] would make the point of order with regard to the language in the paragraph we inserted on page 43 with reference to moving the Office of Foreign Trade Statistics to New York. The question of economy, which is paramount in the minds of all of us, plays an important part in this item.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This is the place where it is very desirable from the standpoint of economy that the Bureau of the Census be not permitted to have 700 employees doing the work that 50 employees used to do in New York. I think the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is correct and proper.

Mr. ROONEY. However, I want to make myself perfectly clear that I am not in accord with the reduction made by the committee from $11,500,000 to $5,000,000 in the over-all figure for the collection of current census statistics. I was thoroughly in accord with the language on page 43 to which the point of order has been made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The funds there concern the collection of foreign-trade statistics, the office which does most of the work having been located in New York for a great many years. The committee held extensive hearings with regard to the situation and the New York office, and found that a saving of more than $200,000 could be made by locating the entire outfit in New York.

Mr. STEFAN. It is $250,000 that we are saving by this amendment. The gentleman might also add that we had investigators look into this matter several times and it was on the recommendation of these investigators that we have taken this action.

Mr. ROONEY. If I may conclude on the gentleman's time, the minority members of the subcommittee are in thorough accord with regard to the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I trust it will be adopted and the work of collecting foreign-trade statistics carried on in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] wish to make the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important matter and one with which I believe the Members of the House are not familiar.

The facts are that at the present time there are approximately 300 employees in Washington in this Foreign Trade Section of the Census Bureau and approximately 90 in New York. Now that the point or order to the removal proviso has been conceded this amendment is offered which in reality is a back-door attempt to move this Section to New York.

The Foreign Trade Section is but one minor department of the Census Bureau. In the Census Bureau there is the population census, the housing census, the manufacturing census, the employment census, the agricultural census not duplicated by the Agricultural Department, local and State governments census (relating to tax information of over 150,000 political units), and numerous others.

The pending bill reduced the current expenditure from $10,000,000 to $5,000,000. Of that $5,000,000 this amendment would earmark nearly $1,200,000, or allot approximately one-quarter of the total appropriation to the Foreign Trade Section alone and locate in New York against the judgment and wishes of the Commerce Department. The other phases of the work which I have mentioned would have to be administered with less than three-quarters of the appropriation but require about 10 times as many employees.

This Foreign Trade Section gets information from ships at ports all over the United States. Such information is sent by mail to Washington. New York is the only port in which they attempt to tabulate and publish the information themselves. Baltimore, ports on the Gulf and Pacific coasts, and other ports on the Atlantic coast send their information to Washington where it is tabulated and accessible.

The important thing in a census is not getting these reports from the ships, for the reports can be mailed in, as they are from every port except New York; the important phases of a census is the tabulating and dissemination, the publication of the information. At the bureau it is available to Congressmen, to other Government departments, to other branches of industry.

If this amendment prevails it will not only throw the allocation way out of balance, giving about one quarter of the total appropriation, to Foreign Trade Section, but in addition to that it will move the office which tabulates, disseminates and publishes the information to New York. Suppose this were permitted at every port and someone wanted to get information on the subject? Anyone desiring information regarding foreign trade port would have to get information about all the ports throughout the United States would have to contact each individual port. At the Census Bureau it is accessible. There it is tabulated and published.

My distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the Chairman [Mr. TABER], naturally are for this amendment because they are both from New York.

It has not been called to the attention of the House that the Director of the Census and the Commerce Department are opposed to this removal. This matter has come up from time to time. A year ago the Bureau of the Budget was called upon to make a study of this

subject and prepared a report for the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, a year ago when a study was made by the Bureau of the Budget for report to the Appropriations Committee, after extensive study they advised against it. They said:

> The foreign trade statistics program cannot be merely a routine tabulation of the data contained in export and import documents. Its usefulness depends upon its adaptability to changing situations and needs. The program is not isolated, but closely related to working programs and responsibilities of many Government agencies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Section of Customs Statistics should be located in Washington from the standpoint of administration. If the offices were in Washington many problems could be adjusted from time to time before assuming large proportions requiring investigations. The location of the section in Washington would permit of a greater and more expeditious use of the basic data.

As it now stands, there are 300 employees here tabulating and disseminating and publishing information and if this amendment prevails they will be moved to New York where all that need be done is to take the data from the ships as is done in other ports by mail.

In addition to that, if I may repeat it again, it throws the appropriation way out of balance and earmarks over $1,000,000 for this activity. If it is left here we will have the benefit of all the information.

These 300 families who would have to move to New York would not only have to give up their homes here, but would have difficulty in finding homes in that already overcrowded city. I hope the admendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. Does the gentleman from Virginia press his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and Mr. SASSCER) there were—ayes 71, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 43, line 18, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$11,500,000."

USE OF CENSUS FIGURES IN MAINTAINING STABLE ECONOMY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am certain there is one thing on which every Member of this House will agree. I think we would all agree that the chief responsibility of business, industry, and government today is to work together to insure a stable, high-level economy for this Nation. If we were to be plunged again into a deep, morale-shattering depression, there are very real reasons to doubt that our form of government could survive as it now is, and as we want it to continue. There are some who are just lying in wait for that to happen.

We must do everything humanly possible to assist business and industry maintain high levels of employment and production. The people in my district and the people everywhere want to attain higher living standards and a greater measure of security that comes from full employment and a stable economy. With that in mind, I want to discuss what to me is one of the most short-sighted and uneconomic proposals I have ever seen. That is the proposal of the Appropriations Committee, in its recommendations on the budget of the Commerce Department, to cut the funds of the Bureau of the Census for current statistics from $11,500,000 to $5,000,000.

At this time in the Nation's history when it is imperative for all of us to make wise economic decisions, the Appropriations Committee proposes to reduce the main Government agency which provides Congress, business, industry, and agriculture with the facts and statistics upon which sound judgment and action can be based.

Full employment depends on high production and it takes shrewd, hard-headed managers, of large and small business alike, to maintain high production. They must know the right thing to do at the right time. Can this be expected of management unless up-to-date and accurate facts are available to them?

This need of business managers for facts, facts and more facts, is not something I have pulled out of a hat like a magician's rabbit. The urgent need of businessmen for information to guide them in intelligent management decisions is attested to by the strong position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce and other business organizations in support of the fact-gathering work of the Bureau of the Census.

Business representatives point out that they must have these facts for intelligent planning. They want to have the most recent information available on current production and distribution, both retail and wholesale; they want to know the size of their markets, the size of the labor force, and latest figures on unemployment. These facts help them plan plant-expansion programs, how to schedule their purchases, their production, and their sales activities.

I said the information they need must be recent because in these days of rapid shifts information goes quickly out of date. It is therefore absolutely necessary that information be kept current, that old figures be replaced by new ones, so that decisions can keep pace with changes that are taking place.

Unless the funds we vote for the Census Bureau are adequate for its operation we will find that we here in Congress, businessmen, and farmers throughout the country will not have the basic facts and figures on which to operate their enterprises. This is a time when everyone is wondering whether a recession or a depression is inevitable, and it is exactly the time when everyone should be well informed on all aspects of our Nation's economy.

I want to say again that it is our duty to maintain a stable economy. Our own welfare and that of the world depends on the steps we take in Congress to do this.

I believe that a reduction in the funds available to the Bureau of the Census is a step in the wrong direction. I ask the Members of the House to restore the funds to the $11,500,000 which the Bureau requested. I think this is a step in the right direction and that it is one of the best investments this Congress can make in the welfare and prosperity of the Nation and the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would seek to increase the amount of $5,000,000 allowed by committee for current census statistics to $11,000,000. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Bureau of Census has taken unto itself unusually broad authority to take whatever census seems to come to their minds. Much of this, in our opinion, is not authorized or never was expected to be authorized by the Congress of the United States. I wish to call your attention to the fact that we have money in this bill for the decennial census—that is, to start the decennial census—which comes in 2 years, at which time practically all of this will be taken over again. We have information from various parts of the country indicating that the Census Bureau is now setting up field offices all over the United States, similar to the field offices of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce. A majority of the committee are of opinion that the amount that we allowed in this bill, $5,000,000, is ample to carry on the current statistical work. We have allowed $4,000,000 in this bill for the current census of manufactures. We see no reason, in view of the fact that the people want us to economize, why we should not reduce this sum to the amount we suggest, $5,000,000. I call your attention to the fact, too, that in 1943 the amount for current census was $1,242,000; in 1945, $4,300,000; and in 1946, $5,318,000. They are asking now $11,500,000. I urge the members of the Committee for the sake of economy to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities and air-traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; including personal services in the District of Columbia; the operation and maintenance of 226 aircraft; contract stenographic

reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; purchase of 325 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; $66,133,000, and the War and Navy Departments are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge aircraft, aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport-traffic control towers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "$66,133,000" and insert "$70,982,000"; and on page 45, line 23, strike out the proviso beginning with the word "That" and ending with the colon in line 1 on page 46.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the item in which I know a great many of us are vitally interested. This is the paragraph in the bill wherein the entire amount of moneys requested by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for airport traffic-control towers is eliminated. The majority members of this subcommittee and the majority members of the full Committee on Appropriations in their judgment cut out the amount $4,849,000 for these very, very necessary airport traffic-control towers. My amendment would put the airport traffic-control tower program back in circulation. It would increase the amount on line 18, page 45, from $66,133,000 to $70,982,000, and also strike out the proviso beginning on line 23 on page 45 wherein the committee would like to have us say that none of the funds appropriated in the paragraph shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers.

I feel that I do not need to say very much with regard to this item because the temper of the House was expressed yesterday. I inserted at page 5196 of yesterday's RECORD a list of the airport traffic-control towers, numbering 148, showing the locations where those towers were intended to be. This is just another instance of penny-wise, pound-foolish economy on the part of the majority. They eliminate 148 of these traffic control towers with the expectation, the hope, and the prayer that somebody else will pay for them, when the fact of the matter is they are thereby jeopardizing safety on our entire system of national airways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What was the expenditure for this service last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have that figure readily available.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, we had an amount last year for 130 towers. They are asking for 18 more this year. It was about $3,000,000 last year.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust you will support the amendment I have offered, which would, as I said before, put back into circulation our airport tower control program.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This committee eliminated $4,849,000 for the air-traffic-control towers because the membership is convinced now, more than ever, that these towers should be operated by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derived the benefit from the traffic of the airports. The commercial air lines, the nonscheduled air lines, and private fliers should participate in this cost. Last year, the funds for these towers were restored on the floor of the House for the same arguments being presented today. I supported the amendment last year, feeling that we should take care of the most important towers temporarily as a stopgap. Before the war, the control-tower operators were paid for by the municipalities. Many of them used CAA operators. The Army then took over the operations of the air-control towers, and when the war was over, the Army stated they no longer needed the towers for the prosecution of the war and they returned them to the municipalities. It was thought at that time that it would be well to continue operating some of the most important towers under Government expense for about a year, in order to give the municipalities, the air lines, and the CAA an opportunity to arrange for a method of paying for these operators out of private funds. The committee felt that, as long as the Government is constructing most of the airports furnishing most of the equipment and safety aids, it should not be called upon to pay for the salaries of the operators of the air-control towers any more than it should be called upon to pay for the railroad operators and train dispatchers in the railroad depots. A majority of the committee feels that with a transfer of the costs of operating these towers the safety factor is in no way affected. The towers would be continued to be operated by CAA personnel under CAA standards and the cities and municipalities would merely be reimbursed $25,000 or $35,000 each annually for the operation of the towers. The actual maintenance of these towers, that is, installing equipment and keeping it in first-class condition, would continue to be a responsibility of the CAA and funds are provided in this bill for that purpose.

It is my sincere belief that if something is not done, or started very soon, this item will eventually cost the taxpayers more than $150,000,000 a year and the present amount will be increased every year, or as rapidly as the real pressure can be placed on the CAA by the hundreds of cities which want the government to pay for this service and which they are paying for themselves without complaint. These municipalities and their officers tell me, "We are paying for the operators in our towers ourselves and we are willing to do that if the rest of the cities in the United States are given the same treatment; but if you are going to pay for the operators in the control towers of 130 cities, we want the same advantage and do not want to be discriminated against." So the committee felt that in view of this hodge-podge program which now has gotten into the category of "pork barrel" we should call it to the attention of Congress by eliminating the item, so far as the payment of salaries to the operators is concerned, and leave in all of the safety factors.

I know how difficult it is for Members of Congress to make their decision on this amendment, because every Member who has a control tower in his town and district being paid for by the Federal Government has a score of telegrams in his possession demanding that he work to restore this money into this bill. Also, a large number of Members who have air control towers in their towns or districts, being paid for by municipalities, have telegrams and letters in their possession from the mayors and other officials demanding to get in on the band wagon.

Those of you who believe in economy and recognize the financial condition of the Federal Treasury should hesitate before you cast your vote in favor of this amendment. The amendment should be defeated in order to give the Interstate Commerce Committee notice that we want some legislation in order to safeguard our Treasury and bring about a badly needed review of the entire financial conditions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and its relationship to the American taxpayer and the aviation industry generally.

I want to repeat what I told the members of the committee yesterday in my general statement regarding my concern over the matter of cost, and the predictions which are made every day connected with the air industry. This refers to the great increases in the number of airplanes and personnel and the air industry generally that affect the future. I might point out that the number of domestic civil aircraft produced in 1941 was a little over 8,000. It is estimated 50,000 will be produced in 1948. The total registered aircraft in 1941 was 22,500, and it is estimated 171,000 will be produced in 1948. The total revenue passenger-miles in 1938 was 1,300,000,000, and it is estimated that in 1948 the total revenue passenger-miles will be 7,500,000,000. It seems obvious that the Federal Government cannot afford to continue to increase appropriations to the CAA in proportion to the increased air activity.

It would be very well for Members of Congress to inform themselves what it cost the taxpayer every time a commercial airplane leaves an airport with a load of passengers and freight. It is time to review this entire matter of cost.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Does the committee understand that we have 4,700 airports now in the United States?

Mr. STEFAN. We have 4,728 airports in the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. That means we have 100 airports for every State in the Union.

Mr. STEFAN. Besides that, the Army and Navy turned over to us by way of surplus more than 400 surplus airports which were built for war purposes. They told us in committee they will have in addition to that many more surplus Army and Navy airports for which they will have no further use.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is not the gentleman and the committee aware that this air transportation is increasing by leaps and bounds and that it would be manifestly unfair to unload the cost of maintaining these towers on the local governments?

Mr. STEFAN. I am aware of that more than you are because I have lived with this thing for more than 15 years. I know about it. Certainly I am aware of it. I am just as interested in the safety factor as you or anybody else. That is what I am going to talk about. We cannot discriminate on safety. If one airport gets the service, why should not other airports get the service?

Mr. SABATH. But the elimination of this appropriation will not help for the safety for our air travelers.

Mr. STEFAN. I will get into that and explain it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true that we are at the place where we have to make a decision? Either we have to cut out the control towers or we have to furnish control towers and operate them for every airport.

Mr. STEFAN. Absolutely. Somewhere along the line you have got to make a start, and here it is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do not the fares which are charged passengers for traveling in these planes cover a substantial gross cost so that the air lines can pay for some of these improvements?

Mr. STEFAN. The argument will be made that they do not and that the commercial lines are not making money now.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut for the Rooney amendment: On page 45, line 18, strike out "66,133" and insert "$70,983."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this matter was pretty well discussed on yesterday. I want to explain the difference between the substitute amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York suggests that we strike out the proviso at the end of the section which permits the CAA to receive reimbursements from States, counties, and municipalities. I believe that should be left in the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not it at all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did not the gentleman ask that that proviso be stricken out?

Mr. ROONEY. The only proviso that I asked be stricken out was the proviso which stated that none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air traffic control towers.

The gentleman's amendment does not even include that. So while the gentleman asks for the same amount as I do, except an additional thousand dollars, more or less, he does not provide that the airport traffic control towers may be maintained.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I beg the gentleman's pardon and the pardon of the Committee. I had the wrong proviso in mind. The proviso I had in mind was at the top of page 46.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute amendment and that I may be recognized on the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Briefly.

Mr. BROOKS. I assume from what the gentleman said that he is very much in favor of increasing the appropriations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am absolutely in agreement with the gentleman from New York in restoring the full amount.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very glad to learn that and I assure the gentleman that I think he is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Our distinguished friend from Nebraska made the statement that the only reason we favored this was because we got telegrams from mayors and so forth. Is that the reason the gentleman favors it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have not received a single telegram from any mayor in my district. There are only two control towers in my district. To me this is a matter of making our airways safe and nothing more.

I usually agree with the gentleman from Nebraska. As I said on yesterday, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska in the ultimate plan of eventually turning the cost of these control-tower operations back to the States. I believe, however, that should be done only after the Congress has considered legislation whereby we can set up a plan and determine who is going to pay for a lot of this airway equipment. I think the day will soon be here when the air lines should pay a greater share of the cost of the air-line equipment; but I do think it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide the equipment to operate what we usually refer to as our Federal airways system.

The gentleman from Nebraska stated that there were 4,000 or more airports in the United States. Nobody is even asking that we put a federally-operated control tower at every one of those airports.

This expensive CAA program has grown considerably in the past few years and it is going to grow in the future, but so have the revenues. I want to refer to a paragraph of the testimony presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this morning bearing on this subject of revenues from air lines and air-line operations. Mr. Carlton Putnam, president, Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., testified:

Under an estimate made for Congress by the Board of Investigation and Research, the domestic air lines thus far have received in the way of mail subsidy about $110,000,000. This appears to have been pretty well paid back, since the direct expenditure from appropriations in the domestic air-mail service by the Post Office Department, including both the payments to carriers and all the other direct costs of maintaining the service, but not indirect allocations, was $361,436,839 through 1946, whereas the postal revenue was $484,071,259, leaving a credit in the air lines' favor on this basis of $122,634,420. This exceeds by more than $32,000,000 the $90,000,000 estimated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to be the air lines' share of the costs of airways and airports. So we have a total of perhaps $200,000,000 (the $110,000,000 plus the $90,000,000) so far advanced by the Government, in the form of support, with accruals back to the Government of all of this, plus the Post Office's direct allocations, plus $32,000,000.

A great deal of this maintenance cost for airways is coming back to the Treasury through the Post Office Department.

Mr. Wright, of the CAA, testified when this matter was under consideration by the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT. We feel that the airport traffic-control towers are a vital and integral part of the Federal airways system, and it would be absolutely inappropriate. With the increasing traffic that there is it would possibly be disastrous to have those operated by local communities.

Again he said:

Mr. WRIGHT. If you are talking of the reimbursement to the Government of one part of the expense, such as we are talking about under this general Federal airways program, that would be a possibility, if you could get all the cities to do it, but if one refused to do it, it seems to me you would be left without one link in your whole Federal airways system, and you simply could not fly airplanes into that airport under instrument weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, there is the best authority I know of on the operation of the American airways.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much does the gentleman's amendment increase this

appropriation for the maintenance of these airways?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. A little less than $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Rooney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW for the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "$66,133,000" and insert "$70,848,500", and strike out the proviso beginning on line 23, page 45, and ending on line 1, page 46.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Rooney amendment and my amendment is the deduction of $133,500 which I find upon reading the hearings and the committee report was allocated and assigned to the Washington National Airport and included in the Washington National Airport appropriation for the purpose of maintaining the control-tower operation here in Washington. Consequently, it is not needed as a part of this over-all appropriation, and I have deducted it from the total amount.

In respect to control tower operation, I think that I am as well qualified to speak on this subject as nearly any Member of the House, having been a member of the investigating committee of which the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Nichols, was chairman, and which included the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kleberg, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Pearson. The first time that we came to the full conclusion that control towers definitely should be operated by the Federal Government was upon the investigation of the accident that occurred at Atlanta, Ga., wherein our former colleague, Bill Byron, was killed, and Eddie Rickenbacker was seriously injured. We came to the conclusion then and there that to trust the municipality for the quality of operators, with the salary scales offered by some municipalities and with the patronage system involved, was a wholly unsatisfactory way to operate such an important part of our airway system. If you will examine the accident statistics over the years you will find that a very high proportion—the exact proportion is not in my mind at the moment, but it is in my mind as 80 percent—of all accidents to aircraft, both civil, military, and commercial, occur on or in the immediately vicinity of airports when the airplanes are under control of the local control zone operator or the airport control-tower operator. Consequently, it is of the very highest importance that these control-tower operators be just top notch.

Now, to say that you are going to turn this function back to the municipalities on June 30 next and expect them to support the operation of control towers is, in my humble opinion, perfectly ridiculous. The local communities are not in a position to take over these control towers on the 30th of next June, and if they were, there are many of them that would not be able to afford to do it, because while they might be an important airport for either air line flying or private flying or military flying, they might be small municipalities, and hence be unable to support a control tower. My committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having the subject of air safety under investigation and study since the 15th of January of this year, is now giving very careful thought to many matters relating to aviation, and this is one of them. Whether or not we will be able to resolve an equitable solution to this problem any different than the one now being used, is a question which we cannot answer as yet. It is entirely too complicated.

There are airports which are used principally by Army and Navy fliers. There are airports which are principally used by the private fliers flying small airplanes. There are airports such as LaGuardia and Washington National that are used very largely and almost exclusively by commercial operators. Landing fees are charged to commercial operators, of course, but there is only one airport in the United States that is even breaking even today—I guess Washington National is coming close to it—but LaGuardia Airport, I understand, shows a small profit. No other airport in the United States is able to show a profit on its operations as yet. However, the business is growing, and it may be that in the not too distant future some will be able to show a profit on their airports. However, they are not presently able to support the quality of control-tower operators and the number of control-tower operators that are required to bring safety to aviation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was it not brought out before our committee that if this GCA equipment is operated, as they hope to by the control-tower operators, that it will make them even a more essential part of the control-tower operation?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. A console with two radar scopes can be used very handily by the control-tower operators themselves, and much to my surprise, in the Washington National Airport budget, they put in $69,000 for additional personnel to operate the radar scope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no need whatever, as I see it, to supply additional operators at control towers for the operation of these radar scopes. I understand however, that very large sums of money were suggested by the CAA for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman stated at the outset that his substitute amendment was similar to mine except for the amount of $133,500 for the Washington National Airport. Does the gentleman realize that on page 47 of the bill under "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport," the amount of $133,500 to which he refers is included?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly why I deducted it from the over-all item, because it is included in the Washington National Airport item according to your committee report and hence is not needed as a part of the over-all amount.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is utterly incorrect. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee on his side will explain it to him.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the chairman of the committee if I am not correct in that statement?

Mr. STEFAN. The item was deducted in the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Deducted from what?

Mr. STEFAN. It has been deducted from the amount we allowed. If the gentleman will read the third paragraph on page 27 of the committee report, he will find that we deducted this $133,500 for the maintenance and operation of air control tower, Washington Airport, from the item the gentleman seeks to decrease on page 45, line 18, namely, $66,133,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman means that the amount of $4,890,000, or whatever it is, was originally $133,500 higher than that?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then I am wrong, but the bill and the committee report are quite indefinite on that point. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my substitute amendment, with the hope that the Rooney amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read to the House two telegrams which I have received from officials of the city and county of San Francisco. The first is from Hon. Roger Lapham, mayor of San Francisco. I quote:

Am advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from Commerce Department appropriation bill funds for operation of San Francisco airport air-traffic-control tower. While we naturally protest imposition of this financial burden on our local government, we are more principally concerned because of firm feeling that all traffic-control-tower men should be hired and controlled by one agency, necessarily Federal, in the interest of uniform control in all airports and resulting standardization of safety for benefit of all pilots as well as passengers. It is unthinkable that national and international air commerce and lives of countless thousands of passengers should be jeopardized.

I personally oppose centralization of government in Federal hands as a matter of

broad principle, but feel that air commerce, which knows no State boundaries and few international ones, is type of operation so fast moving and broad that centralization in Federal agency of safety control and supervision is only answer in this particular case.

San Francisco now spending $20,000,000 to make our airport one of world's finest. Many other cities also modernizing airports for safety and convenience. All this would be undermined if uniform safety standards of air-traffic-control-tower men are sidetracked by Federal Government.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,
Mayor.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a telegram which I have received from Mr. Mike Doolin, manager of the San Francisco Airport, who is in attendance at the convention of the American Association of Airport Executives in Chicago. I quote:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. This association, composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on air line or any other aircraft.

Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

MIKE DOOLIN,
Manager, San Francisco Airport.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL for the Rooney amendment.

Page 45, line 18, strike out "$66,133,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$71,045,734."

On page 45, line 23, strike out beginning with the word "That", down to and including the word "towers", on page 46, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That $4,877,734 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers."

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, the objective of this amendment is substantially the same as the objective of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York. However, it goes a little bit further than his.

His amendment eliminates lines 23, 24, and 25, which provide that these funds should not be used for the personnel handling air-control towers. My amendment goes further and affirmatively states that these funds, if they should be reinstated, shall specifically be used for this purpose. My amendment likewise increases the amount from $4,849,000 to $4,877,000, in order to include within this program an airport which was approved and recognized by the CAA after it had submitted its figures to the Committee on Appropriations.

As we all know, the primary responsibility for the safety of the airways is lodged in the Civil Aeronautics Authority. To attempt to return that function to the communities, would in my judgment be inviting confusion, lack of uniformity, and possibly disaster. The CAA has very high standards and qualifications for its personnel. It has an established and uniform system throughout the country. It means a great deal to every Army, Navy, commercial, and private pilot who comes into an airport if he is accustomed to the system of communications which is in operation there. There is now perfect cooperation between land and air which must be maintained, particularly when we consider the split-second decisions which frequently must be made in bringing a plane in for landing at a crowded airport or controlling traffic for take-off.

What is the cost of this program? I believe in economy. This program is less than $5,000,000. Yet, if you have one disaster involving a DC-6 you will have lost almost a million dollars right there. Of course, we would not attempt to evaluate in dollars and cents the human lives, and on these large passenger ships there can be 40, 50, or 60 people.

The committee recommends that the CAA personnel still operate these airports, but that the city should reimburse them.

With due deference to this recommendation of the committee, I do not think that it is realistic. There will be a division of responsibility. You will have these flight-control tower operators in the impossible position of trying to serve two masters; that is, the CAA, by whose regulations they must abide, and the municipalities, who are paying their salaries.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to say to my colleague from Missouri that I support wholeheartedly the idea that this should be under Federal supervision, and I will support not only his substitute but I would support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. However, I do believe that with the tremendous growth of this cost to the Federal Government, an immediate plan should be brought about whereby we will have local reimbursement. I do not believe we should go on and on and on and let these costs mount when in the main they are to the credit and the additional service of the air lines and the municipalities. I support it in the hope that this Congress can bring a program which will reimburse the Federal Government for the management of airport controls.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman please advise the amount that he inserted in line 18 in lieu of $66,130,000?

Mr. BAKEWELL. $71,045,734.

Mr. ROONEY. May I inquire of the gentleman how he arrived at that figure?

Mr. BAKEWELL. This figure includes the $4,849,000 which was cut by the Appropriations Committee together with the sum of $63,734 submitted by the CAA as the cost of devices and personnel required for the operation of an airport which was recently approved by it, that is, after the CAA had submitted its original estimates to the Appropriations Committee. In that regard I should like to defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this recently approved airport is situated.

Mr. ROONEY. I think there are a number of gentlemen who have local airports they would like to have included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would advise me as to how he arrived at that amount.

Mr. BAKEWELL. I defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this particular airport is located.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I hope to get time after the gentleman has yielded the floor. However, I will say that the CAA furnished me the figure of $63,734 for the operation of the control tower and the replacing of equipment there at St. Joseph, Mo.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] also has an airport down in New Orleans that the CAA gave him some figures with regard to a new project. Does the gentleman from Missouri realize that these items have not been presented by the Bureau of the Budget; that they have not been examined by this committee and by the able chairman the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the majority members of the committee, and that the figure which he suggests is one that is more or less taken out of thin air?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and now if I may answer him: In the first place I do not think that the CAA merely takes its figures out of thin air. As far as I am concerned, I think every airport that is under the supervision of the CAA should have this same type of operation. I would have gladly acceded to the request of any Member of this Congress in whose district an airport might recently have been approved but for which funds were not allocated in this bill. And now to include the airport for which the request is made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], is just extending my theory that you must have uniformity in every airport throughout the country.

We witnessed a series of air casualties last winter. The Congress initiated an investigation. Suppose we deny the CAA these funds, and some crashes occur as a result. Suppose, further, that the Congress undertakes an investiga-

tion, and comes to the conclusion that the crashes were due to untrained and inexperienced flight-control operators. Then the Congress will stand self-accused and self-convicted before the entire country.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to restore these funds. Aviation is peculiarly interstate and national in scope, more so than any other medium of travel. To turn this responsibility back to the local communities would definitely be a step backward in the development and progress of aviation. There must be uniformity in the operation of air-control towers. To deny these funds to the CAA is tinkering with safety and toying with human life which we cannot afford to do when we consider the comparatively minor sum involved.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter received from Gen. Milton W. Arnold, vice president, in charge of operations and engineering of the Air Transportation Association of America, and also a copy of a telegram received from Mr. David L. Behncke, president, Air Line Pilots Association:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1947.

The Honorable CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,
Congressman from Missouri,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAKEWELL: I thought you might be interested in the thoughts of the Air Transport Association concerning the proposal of the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of airport control towers.

The scheduled air-line industry is greatly concerned respecting the possible decrease in safety that would occur should the important function of airport traffic control, with the accompanying responsibility of approach control under instrument approach conditions, be assigned to air traffic controllers who were employees either directly or indirectly of any agency or organization other than the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It has been agreed by all Government agencies concerned with the operation of aircraft, as well as representatives of all segments of civil aircraft operations, that airport and airway traffic control are no longer separate and distinct functions and must, in the interests of safe and reliable aircraft operations, function completely under the supervision and the control of one agency.

As you are aware, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has adopted a policy of approving approach control only at those airports where airport traffic control is under its jurisdiction and the tower operators in its employ. The air lines concur wholeheartedly with this stand.

There have been several cases in the past where approach control has not functioned to the best interest of safe aircraft operations where control tower operators were employed by the municipalities. I believe outstanding examples that can be cited are La-Guardia Field and the Detroit city airport, the towers at both of which have subsequently been placed under the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

With an ever-increasing utilization of airway and airport facilities, and the installation of improved navigational aids at airports, designed to permit speedier and more reliable instrument approaches, it seems more important than ever that everything be done that will provide the maximum amount of safety in all aspects of air traffic control.

The committee has recommended that the airport control tower operators be retained in the employ of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the individual cities reimburse the Civil Aeronautics Administration for salaries which supposedly would allow standardization. There is no law nor requirement to force the cities to take such action. Furthermore, if a number of key cities fail to accept this responsibility the entire system of traffic control is broken and safety is greatly jeopardized. This type of arrangement will necessarily require airport traffic controllers to serve two agencies; namely, the individual cities and the Federal Government which will not be conducive to efficient and safe operations.

For your information, we are attaching a condensation of the reasons that the air-line industry feels that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should operate airport traffic control towers. This material has been supplied to the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies interested in the matter, which have requested that the Air Transport Association provide this data for their guidance in considering this question.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON W. ARNOLD,
Vice President, Operations and Engineering.

REASONS FOR CAA OPERATION OF CONTROL TOWERS

1. Standardization of training of controllers has been reached through CAA training courses.

2. Procedures and phraseologies have been standardized.

3. Technical advances in equipment design more readily possible.

4. Purchase of equipment incorporating latest design features possible under Federal operation of control towers because of greater resources and purchasing power of the CAA at a saving to the taxpayer.

5. Approach control, a necessity to more reliable and safe clearance of aircraft into and out of airports under restricted conditions of ceiling and visibility, can only function when both airport tower personnel and airway traffic personnel are responsible to the same central authority.

6. Maintenance of tower-operating equipment such as radio transmitters and receivers, voice recorders, interphone circuits, etc., more economically and efficiently accomplished by technical specialists employed by the CAA.

7. Competent tower-operating personnel essential to the safety of air commerce more readily accessible to the CAA than through municipal sources because of CAA ability to reach by means of Federal civil service all corners of the country. Opportunities for advancement will be greater because under the CAA particularly competent personnel may be promoted to better positions at other towers.

8. Air traffic now using, and which will continue to use, the airways consist of Army and Navy aircraft, air-carrier planes, miscellaneous aircraft, privately owned aircraft, and planes of foreign registry. Owing to the widespread diversification of interest of operators of the various types of aircraft it is essential to orderly and safe operational procedures that airport-traffic control be exercised by an authoritative Federal agency.

9. The practice of permitting airport-tower personnel to make official visibility observations under conditions of variable visibility for transmission to pilots of aircraft approaching the airport for landings is only authorized for tower operators employed by the CAA. This service is of great importance in that the pilot receives instantly any visibility information that may affect the safety of his approach procedure.

10. A large proportion of airport traffic is interstate or international rather than local and the responsibility of controlling this traffic should not be placed upon the municipality.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 10, 1947.*

Hon. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Word has reached me that there is language in H. R. 3311, page 45, and elsewhere in this measure, that strike out $4,849,000 which will have the effect of discontinuing all present Federal air traffic control tower operators. Under this plan replacements can come only from local municipalities improperly trained, ill-equipped political appointees. The Nation's air line pilots object most strenuously to this deletion of funds from H. R. 3311 on the grounds that it will have the effect of causing the harmful disintegration of the present Nation-wide uniform air traffic control operation procedure which is marked advance in air traffic control methods. The presently employed air traffic controllers, methods, and procedures are the results of years of trial and error, careful selection, and expert training. To destroy all this and throw it into the hands of local municipalities where these jobs will become political footballs and will be used for local patronage purposes dependent on who happens to have the upper hand politically at the time and changing with each changing political regime, will result in a disastrous backward step in the development of our air line network so important to our air commerce and to national defense. Air line traffic and air traffic control from one end to the other still has a long way to go to reach perfection but if the parts of it that have reached reasonably safe and practical development are destroyed by foolish economy then we are turning our backs upon what is right and proper and inviting an epidemic of air crashes and marching backwards to the dark ages of air line traffic control. I am sure that the Congress of the United States would not want to do this and upon knowing the facts will wisely restore the money that they have struck from H. R. 3311 for the payment of the presently employed highly experienced and efficient air traffic control tower operators in preference to the hodge podge of political appointees to control our air traffic. The air line pilots of our Nation will deeply appreciate a reconsideration of this action by the Congress of the United States, many of whose Members they fly as passengers to and from their districts. To not restore these funds would be calamitous to the best interests of our country's air lines and to the defense of our Nation.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE,
President, Air Line Pilots Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include two resolutions.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a telegram.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address given by the Vice President of the Philippines at the Press Club on yesterday.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow and take up first the conference report on the Greek-Turkish aid bill.

We will then continue the consideration of the State, Commerce, Justice bill, which I trust can be disposed of expeditiously.

The bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency will then be considered and if it is disposed of, and barring some unforeseen development, we expect to adjourn over from tomorrow afternoon until Monday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for tomorrow on account of personal and important reasons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SECURITY PROBLEMS IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent passage of the Greek-Turkish loan, the United States is embarked on a far-reaching and radically different foreign policy.

Many of the people who are fairly well-informed about the atomic-energy development, look with great concern on the steadily deteriorating relations with Russia. Many of us who are neither pro-Russian nor pro-isolationist reserve the right to be pro-American in the best sense of the term without becoming anti-humanitarian.

It is because of my deep interest in conveying to the people of my district and the Nation some very pertinent thinking on the implications of the atomic-energy discovery—that I have asked for this time to read into the RECORD a startling, brilliant, and challenging address which was recently given by one of our brilliant young scientists, Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr.

Mr. Meyer, in the latter part of his address makes an analysis of the Baruch plan and makes certain conclusions with which I am not wholly in accord. However, his arguments are strong and worthy of serious consideration. I confess that I am not able to completely refute them with the knowledge I now have. With his suggestion that we approach control of the atom by strengthening the United Nations in the direction of world government on the security plane, I am in complete accord.

Mr. Meyer's address follows:

I hardly need to remind you here who are close to events in the National Capital of the crisis in foreign relations which our Government now faces. It is impossible to exaggerate the fatal significance of the decisions that America cannot avoid making in the immediate future. Whether our fate is to be peace or an atomic-biological war is the issue. I do not overstate the case when I say that the lives of more than one-third of humanity and the survival of what we have chosen to call civilization are at stake. Let me describe briefly the three basic alternatives before us.

The first alternative is to attempt to insure our national security by remaining the strongest military power in the world. Although there is no effective defense against an atomic attack once it is launched, we can try to prevent a would-be aggressor from ever beginning such an attack by the obvious size and efficiency of our preparations for a counteroffensive. By building up our capacity to retaliate even though our cities lie in ruins and half our people are killed, we can hope to instill such fear into other governments that they will never dare to risk war with us. This is the policy of peace through intimidation into which our Government is rapidly drifting.

If we adopt this alternative, other nations have no choice but to do likewise. When superior military power is the sole guaranty of national security, each government is forced to compete for that superiority. Every increase in our armed strength will provoke a corresponding increase in the power of others. A mounting competition for arms, allies, strategic bases, and raw materials is the inevitable result. Our only possible competitor in this struggle is the Soviet Union, which alone has the potential strength to challenge our lead. Quite apart from ideological considerations, the United States and the Soviet Union are doomed to be the two central contestants, because in the search for national security each is the only real threat to the other.

Before we are finally and irrevocably committed to this meaningless struggle there is still time to consider the consequences. We cannot insure our ability to strike back after the holocaust of a modern assault merely by building more atomic bombs, biological weapons, bombers, and rockets than our possible opponent. That nation which is able to protect from atomic bombing vital sections of its industry and population by subterranean dispersal will enjoy a decisive advantage in any future war. If we seek protection in our ability to retaliate, we have no time whatever to lose in building secret and self-sufficient underground production centers. Our present concentration of men and machines in a few congested cities makes us the most vulnerable target in the world. There is also need for a large professional standing army equipped with the most effective modern weapons, widely dispersed, and kept in instant readiness to launch the counter-offensive. As far as possible our urban population must be protected by underground shelters. The concentration of the entire directing personnel of the Government in Washington can no longer be tolerated.

This is the minimum price of modern preparedness. It can only be paid by profound changes in our political and economic system. The necessary dispersion of industry can only be accomplished by autocratic planning and Government edict. Labor will have to be conscripted to work in the underground factories. As the stock piles of weapons grow our living standards will decline. Antisabotage and antiespionage precautions will restrict and finally eliminate our civil liberties. In foreign policy, the search for allies will lead us into backing any regime, no matter how corrupt and tyrannical, so long as it opposes Russia. In attempting to defend the independence of our country by military power in this new age, we will have to give up all that has made it worth defending in the past. When the last measure of preparedness has been completed and the state has become one vast military machine poised for instantaneous retaliation, we will be a driven and degraded people and life for the individual will be a drawn-out agony of oppression and suspense.

Will these sacrifices accomplish their purpose? Can war be prevented by fear of our armed power? I do not believe so. As the nations accumulate the weapons with which they can annihilate each other's cities suspicions will grow monstrous. Already as the struggle for power increases between the United States and Russia each Government protests that its own preparations are purely defensive, but each suspects that the other plots aggression. Now that the only defense is a counter offensive, there is no longer any way of distinguishing between defensive and aggressive preparations, until the last moment when the attack is launched. Sooner or later fear will provoke war, and one nation or the other will strike first in order to deny the advantage of the initiative to its opponent. Peace cannot be built on mutual terror. In the war that will inevitably result from competing programs of preparedness industrial society will be totally destroyed.

The second alternative is the preventive war. The difficulties and dangers of a prolonged competition for military supremacy with Russia have led some to the conclusion that we should attack now while we have the atomic bomb and they don't. Life magazine has recently condensed for mass consumption James Burnham's vision of an American empire established and maintained by nuclear fission. There are demands in

the Congress for an immediate show-down with Russia. Because the body of opinion that believes in the preventive war is growing with remarkable speed the argument is worth refuting. Morally, preventive war is a nice name for aggression. The unsubstantial suspicion that our victim planned to attack at some future date could not mitigate our guilt. Preventive war is the act for which we hung the Nazi leaders at Nurenburg. Practically, the preventive war is not as easy as it has been made to appear by its supporters. It would not end with the atomization of Moscow and Leningrad. The Red Army would march into western Europe, the Middle East, and China. They would have many allies, as our attack would alienate even our own friends. The resulting land campaign would be long and incredibly costly. England and Europe would be ruined beyond repair. If the Russians do not yet have atomic bombs it is quite probable that they are already armed with the means of biological warfare. Should we attack them they would be justified in striking back with incurable epidemics that might eliminate whole sections of our population. Eventually we might be able to win a shadow victory. We would then be forced to establish an iron tyranny over the entire earth in order to prevent the defeated from constructing modern weapons for revenge. Nor can the spread of communism be stopped by killing large numbers of those who believe in it. Past attempts to crush militant faiths by the sword have been singularly unsuccessful.

Who would fight this preventive war for those who seek to provoke it? I believe that there are many who fought bravely and well in the last war to defend their country who would prefer jail to the role of aggressors. Preventive war is a nightmare that we must reject.

There is a third alternative: It is the policy of attempting to find with the Soviet Union and the other nations a cooperative solution of the security problem. Good-will gestures of unilateral disarmament are futile and dangerous. But we must offer to join with others in transforming an impotent United Nations into a reliable system of international security while preserving our national armed strength until general agreement to the new system is obtained. Once it is recognized that no amount of sacrifice for armaments can delay war for long or protect the country when war comes, it is clear that we have a right and a duty to demand that the first objective of the United States Government be the establishment of an effective international organization for our protection.

What has the United States Government done to date in order to strengthen the United Nations and to halt the suicidal arms race that has already begun? It has proposed the Baruch plan, and many think that in doing so we have fulfilled our obligation as the first country to develop and use atomic weapons. The feeling is general that we have done all within our power to assure peace. Now, it is argued, the other nations, and particularly Russia, must accept the Baruch plan or, by refusing it, convict themselves of intent to commit aggression. Whether this view is accurate can only be shown by a critical analysis of the Baruch plan itself.

As you know, the plan calls for an abolition of atomic weapons. Inspection and an international monopoly on the potentially dangerous peacetime uses of atomic energy are to insure that bombs cannot be secretly constructed by any government. Only by expropriating the plants of the international authority would a nation be able to manufacture bombs, and this seizure would be immediately evident to the world. All other nations acting through the Security Council are then to join forces against the violator, which would not retain its veto to prevent collective action. In other words, if and when the Baruch plan is put into effect, the danger of sudden and surprise attack with atom bombs will be eliminated, since no nation will have them. Any attempt to make bombs is to be discovered by an international intelligence service, and all governments can then seize the atomic plants in their respective territories and join in the race to make the first bombs for the resulting atomic war. All weapons except atomic explosives are to remain uncontrolled and each nation is to retain its army, navy, and air force. How practical is this plan and what chance is there of its general acceptance?

It has been claimed that by eliminating the veto the Baruch plan would insure effective enforcement action against a government violating the atomic agreement. I cannot agree. Here in new guise is the old fallacy that separate armed nations can find security by formally undertaking to use their respective armies jointly against any one of their number that commits aggression. It is an attempt to revive the impractical principles of the League of Nations and to graft them on to a veto-ridden United Nations. A mere change of voting rules in the Security Council can have no effect on the actions of the United States and Russia. If either chose to defy the international inspectors and seize the plants of the Authority, the result would be World War III, with the two giants and their satellites ranged against each other. No majority vote in the Security Council could disguise that reality or provide protection. It is even unlikely that such a vote could ever be taken. The seizure of atomic plants would be such a clear indication of aggressive designs that it would only be attempted in coordination with a general assault launched with rockets, blockbusters, bacteria, and mechanized armies. The victims of the attack would be more interested in defending themselves than in voting. Changes in the structure of the United Nations more fundamental than a juggling of voting rules in the Security Council are necessary, if the swift, certain, and sure system of punishment which Mr. Baruch called for is to be achieved.

Under the Baruch plan, veto or no veto, war would result from interference with the inspection system. The plan recognizes this fact by calling for a strategic balance of atomic plants among the nations. The number of plants and the amount of nuclear fuel within the borders of each nation will be an essential factor in its national security. If one nation seizes its plants to produce bombs, the others will be forced to seize theirs, and the side that has the largest atomic industry will have a considerable advantage in the resulting war. Agreement to a scheme determining the allocation of atomic industry is a prerequisite to the acceptance of the plan and such agreements extremely unlikely.

For instance, if the Soviet Government believed that the United States and the British Commonwealth would be allied against it in the event of another war, it could hardly agree to an equal division of atomic facilities among the three. Nor can I imagine either the United States or Britain consenting to a balance which would give the Russians as large an atomic industry as they owned together. Similarly, the number of atomic plants the United States might allow France for peaceful use would depend entirely upon the direction of French foreign policy. A victory at the polls for the French Communists would swing France into the Russian orbit. The United States would then be compelled to demand a revision of the balance or accept military inferiority when and if aggression occurred.

Agreement to a distribution scheme is further complicated by the impossibility of equalizing the factors that condition the speed with which the various nations can convert to bomb production. The high level of industrialization, the technological skill, and the special experience of the United States wth atomic energy combine to place this country for a long time at a distinct advantage in any sudden attempt to construct bombs. The Soviet Union might well hesitate to agree to a plan which upon the first violation would commit it to an atomic armament race which it would have little hope of winning against the technological superiority of the United States. Russia may prefer to continue unrestricted and secret competition for atomic weapons in the belief that an inferior supply of bombs is more protection than no bombs at all, if a potential enemy can construct them with greater speed than its own industrial efficiency permits. Even if accepted, the Baruch plan would only replace competition for bombs by an intense rivalry between the nations for the personnel and methods with which to produce bombs in the shortest possible time. Peace based on a balance of power has proved to be a brief truce between wars. Peace based on a nice balance of atomic power is not likely to be any more stable or enduring, whether that power exists as bombs ready for use or as plants capable of conversion within 3 months to bomb manufacture.

Another serious obstacle to the acceptance of the plan is the fact that under its provisions the nations are to remain free to compete for every weapon except bombs. With proper concern for American security, the Senate would be justified in refusing to destroy our atomic weapons except in conjunction with the demobilization of the Red Army and in return for material proof that Russia was not preparing for other types of specialized warfare. The Senate leaders have repeatedly demanded a fool-proof system of security in return for any surrender of atomic secrets. The Baruch plan is far from foolproof. Each nation would retain as many millions of soldiers, as many mechanized divisions and biological weapons as it wished. Against a large nation armed with these forces, an attempt to punish a violation of the atomic agreement would result in a long and indecisive conflict. By agreeing to the Baruch plan, the United States would be giving up its one decisive weapon in return for the privilege of competing for other weapons where it has no advantage.

I hope this analysis of the plan will indicate why many of us in UWF believe that a more comprehensive and effective scheme is necessary, if there is to be any chance of acceptance by either the Russians or the United States Senate. The fatal defect of Mr. Baruch's proposal is the false assumption that atomic bombs can be prohibited while aggression in all its other forms remains possible. Security is indivisible and cannot be realized by attempting to ban one particular type of weapon. The first and only step toward the prevention of atomic warfare is the creation of an international organization powerful enough to prevent all war between nations. By specific amendments, the United Nations must be strengthened to the point where national preparation for war is not only unnecessary but impossible. The indispensable changes are briefly these:

First, the United Nations must be given the power to administer world laws binding the individual citizens of each country as their first duty. This constitutional authority must be strictly limited to those matters found essential to the preservation of peace. For example, the United Nations must be able to prohibit by binding enactment the manufacture or ownership by any national government of the means of organized warfare. It must be able to prohibit the use of force in the settlement of international disputes, and

it must be able to control and regulate the dangerous aspects of atomic development.

Secondly, the United Nations must have the power to arrest and try in world courts those who violate the basic security law. We need a procedure through which a Nuremburg trial can be held according to an established law before rather than after war has begun.

Thirdly, the United Nations must have the power to conduct an international system of inspection with free access into every country. It would be the task of the inspectors to discover any illegal attempt to produce the prohibited armament.

Fourthly, the United Nations must have not only the right to prohibit international war but the police power to enforce its authority. A world police force must be recruited from the individuals of each nation. It must be responsible only to the United Nations, armed with a monopoly on modern weapons, and strategically distributed. Until national governments are willing to give a world organization preponderant military power to keep the peace, they will be condemned to compete for arms among themselves.

These significant additions to the authority of the United Nations will necessitate certain changes in its internal structure. Particularly, the Security Council will cease to be legislator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. It will become an executive cabinet operating to administer the laws every nation has accepted as essential to the common security.

This would be world government, if you want to use the word. But it would be government only in a very limited area. Each nation would remain free to conduct its domestic affairs and foreign trade without restriction. The nations in agreeing to these amendments would be giving up only the right and means of annihilating each other.

There is but one way in which these changes can be made realities. As the Nation which first developed, employed and continues to manufacture atomic weapons, the United States has the responsibility for taking the initiative in proposing the formation of a strong United Nations. Our unilateral action in Greece and Turkey has been explained on the ground that the United Nations is not yet capable of assuming such a burden But the United Nations cannot strengthen itself. It is a league of sovereign states and will remain impotent unless its members agree to give it the strength it needs. Through every available instrument of public information, the American people must be reached with the knowledge that they must choose between a suicidal war or a strong United Nations. An insistent and informed public demand must be brought to bear on the Government here in Washington.

But what of Russia? There are many who claim that the Soviet regime would reject any radical amendment of the United Nations and that the offer is not worth making. I am not so pessimistic. They have as much to lose as we do in a mutually devastating war. Faced with a choice between a desperate arms race ending in war and an effective system of security protecting them and us alike, the Kremlin leaders may well choose security. At least, until the Russians are given a fair opportunity to make the choice, we cannot tell whether the purpose of their present policy is aggression or defense. An American offer to erect an enforceable world law would be the only real test of Russian intentions. If they turned that down, we would be justified in assuming the worst. But let me repeat that I believe there is a good chance that they would accept.

I recognize that the changes necessary in traditional institutions are great and the time short. A shooting war may not be imminent but we are rapidly approaching a critical point when in preparation for conflict policies will have been adopted that make war inescapable. Soon preparedness and propaganda will have swept both governments past all chance of turning back. While there is still time and room for hope, let us present to the people of this country the real choice, the destruction of civilized society or some measure of world government. When they understand that choice, I have confidence in their decision. Men are sufficiently rational to acquiesce in their own survival.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the State of Texas of U. S. S. *Texas* for maintenance by the State for historical purposes as a part of the San Jacinto battleground; to the Committee on Armed Services.

679. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Commission of Women, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

680. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report with regard to the remodeling of the Senate and House caucus rooms and restaurants; to the Committee on Public Works.

681. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

682. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; with amendments (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture H. R. 1826. A bill making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3457. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3458. A bill to reduce the retirement age and to increase benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3459. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3460. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN (by request):

H. R. 3461. A bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3462. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3463. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3464. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, and other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3465. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3466. A bill to clarify and amend section 2 of the act of Congress of February 11, 1929, with respect to the granting of relief by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in cases in which certain special assessments have been paid and later held to be void or erroneous; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3468. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to grant certain personnel equitable treatment in the matter of leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3469. A bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3470. A bill to provide for pilgrimages of gold-star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3472. A bill to provide disability benefits for persons who performed uncompensated services in the administration of the Selective Training and Service System and the emergency price control and rationing program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3473. A bill to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss in the case of anticipatory replacement of property condemned for public use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3474. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit compensation or reimbursement in certain cases to persons acting in a representative or fiduciary capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 211. A resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Works to conduct surveys of certain works of improvement; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3476. A bill for the relief of James J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Mattia Racine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

511. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by 64 residents of Inglewood, Calif., urging the passage of S. 265, which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

512. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition relative to the Capper bill, S. 265, which penalizes interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, news reels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor, advertising by radio being also prohibited, as well as the sending of circulars, letters, and so forth, into States which bar liquor advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Daisy McConnell and other members of the Methodist Church of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2468; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition forwarded by Mrs. A. J. Abling, route 3, Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 14 other residents of the community, urging favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Snow Hill, Md., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and broadcasting alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the enactment of H. R. 318, a bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thou who art our merciful Heavenly Father upon earth, hear us as we tarry at the altar of prayer. We art Thine, and Thou wilt surely hear us when we call and answer us when we pray.

"Made in His image" is the blessed word in the front door of the immortal Book. O direct us that we may never violate our sacred inheritance. Give us to understand that rich character is the offspring of unbiased meditation inspired by honest purpose. Grant that all decisions of this august body may be couched in wisdom; O keep us this day without sin and abide with all in the measure of a great peace.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as Alternate Representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5394.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONVENTIONS ON PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations which was approved by the General Assembly by a resolution adopted February 13, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Commission of Women, and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REMODELING OF SENATE AND HOUSE CAUCUS ROOMS AND RESTAURANTS

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with regard to the remodeling of the Senate and House caucus rooms and restaurants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

AUDIT REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A copy of a letter dated May 13, 1947, from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to the report on the audit of the War Shipping Administration by the Comptroller General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate an invitation to the Senate from the chairman of the District of Columbia I Am An American Day Committee inviting Senators to participate in the program. Without objection, the invitation will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invitation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY COMMITTEE
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: On behalf of the committee for the observance of I Am An American Day for the District of Columbia, I desire to extend to you and all other Members of the Senate a most cordial invitation to attend the ceremonies in connection with this observance, to be held at the Sylvan Theater, Monument Grounds, Sunday, May 18, at 3 p. m.

The Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, will be the principal speaker, and our program includes the Army Band; Edward J. Arnold, motion-picture star and originator of I Am An American Day; Hildegarde; Arnold Eidus, the young violin genius; the Howard University choir of 40 voices; and others.

If it is possible to have some announcement made in the Senate Chamber or otherwise concerning this ceremony, it would be greatly appreciated, as we should like to have many of the Members present to enjoy the exercises.

Thanking you in advance for your courtesy and cooperation in the matter, and trusting we may have the pleasure of your appearance on Sunday, I remain,

Respectfully,

HERBERT J. JACOBI,
Chairman.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to the rate of interest on land sales, and requesting the Congress of the United States to approve amendments herein set forth of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. Effective upon approval by the Congress of the United States, chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, is amended in the following respects:

"(a) By amending section 4565 thereof by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"'The rate of interest charged upon any sale of public lands for homestead, residence, or other purposes shall not exceed 4 percent per annum.'

"(b) By amending section 4601 thereof by deleting from paragraph numbered '1' thereof the words 'six percent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four percent.'

"SEC. 2. Effective upon approval by the Congress of the United States, the rate of interest on all special sale agreements and special homestead agreements theretofore made is reduced to 4 percent per annum as to interest thereafter accruing.

"SEC. 3. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to ratify and approve sections 1 and 2 of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. The commissioner of public lands is hereby requested and, insofar as lies within the power of the legislature, directed to fix the rate of interest charged upon any sale of public lands hereafter made for homestead, residence, or other purposes at not more than 4 percent per annum.

"Approved this 8th day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to increase the compensation of certain public officers in the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas in 1945 the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii did adopt Joint Resolution No. 10 requesting the Congress of the United States of America to increase the compensation of certain Territorial and Federal officers; and

"Whereas the compensation now paid to certain Territorial and Federal officers in the Territory of Hawaii is utterly inadequate to compensate them in view of their duties and responsibilities or to enable them to meet the heavy expenses involved in the proper performance of their respective duties and the maintenance of the services required of them by law or demanded of them by the communities which they represent; and

"Whereas such condition has resulted and will continue to result in deterring able citizens in moderate financial circumstances from seeking public offices; and

"Whereas in 1946 by enacting Public Law 601, the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, increased the compensation of the Members of the Congress including that of the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; and

"Whereas the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii enacted Act 261 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1945, providing for the payment by the Territory of Hawaii of additional compensation to certain public officers so as to augment the compensation fixed by Federal law until such time as Federal increases are granted: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to amend section 92 of the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for an increase in the compensation of the following officers: Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii, judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. For the reason that the compensation of the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii is fixed by the Congress of the United States in conformity with the compensation paid to other members of the Congress, no request is hereby made as to an increase in his compensation, but the same is left to the sound discretion of the Congress.

"SEC. 3. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall forthwith be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States, and the Judiciary Committees thereof, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 8th day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 45

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to maintain constant water levels in the Mississippi River

"Whereas a constant and stable water level in the upper Mississippi River is highly desirable and of vital importance in the interest of agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation and sanitation in Wisconsin; and

"Whereas the United States War Department is by Federal law restricted to operation and administration of the nine-foot channel dam pools in said river solely in the interest of navigation and flood control with resultant winter and other periodic drawdowns; and

"Whereas such drawdowns have caused lowering of lakes and marshland and taxed the subsurface moisture of the State, causing undue damage to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, and recreation values, and further, causing extreme aggravation to many communities in their efforts to maintain necessary sanitation standards; and

"Whereas these periodic drawdowns are very detrimental to the fish and wildlife resources and recreational values, which the Federal Government has recognized and sought to perpetuate by creating and maintaining the upper Mississippi River Fish and Wildlife Refuge: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to give proper and due recognition

to these valuable assets by enacting legislation amending the present act governing operation of said dam pools in such manner as will give the same position to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation, and sanitation as is now given by law to navigation and flood control; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Wisconsin Member of Congress."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 240 citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 175).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1289. A bill to exclude certain lands from becoming a part of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate bill 1290, to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of Manuel DeSousa Grade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1292. A bill for the relief of Ramon Formoso Lago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming) introduced Senate bill 1293, to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1294. A bill to permit grants for old-age assistance in the case of individuals who are inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire M. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of James A. Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1297. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1298. A bill to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill providing for national school health services.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1290) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is a suggested Federal grant-in-aid program to the 48 States and Territories. It aims to improve and extend health facilities for American school children. This legislation does not seek to be all-inclusive or pretend to be the only answer to the fundamental and long-neglected problem of improving the health of our young people. However, it will make a modest start toward establishing a national policy whereby our American children will not be permitted to reach maturity with physical or mental defects which can be diagnosed or corrected in the early stages. Such a policy designed to meet this undisputed health problem may be considered one of the soundest investments we can now make in our Nation's future.

Briefly, the national school health services bill will assist States to:

First. Provide and maintain school health services for the prevention and diagnosis of physical and mental defects and conditions. This would mean, for example, more thorough examinations to determine whether the child is gaining weight and would detect faulty teeth, eyes, heart, and so forth.

Second. Provide for follow-up treatment of such defects and conditions especially in rural areas and areas of severe economic distress where the need obviously is most pressing.

Third. Provide for demonstrations and training of personnel for State and local school-health services.

Fourth. Integrate new services, made possible by funds under this bill, with the health activities and facilities presently provided by the communities.

Fifth. Establish a School Health Services Board comprised of the Chief of the Children's Bureau as chairman, the United States Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to work with the Children's Bureau in considering and approving State plans.

Sixth. Establish a National Advisory Committee on School Health Services of 12 members appointed by the President. The members would include representatives of health, education, and child welfare.

The initial appropriation for this child-health program would be $10,000,000. Ten percent of this sum would be earmarked for training personnel, for demonstrations, and for Federal administrative purposes. One-half of the remainder would be matched dollar for dollar by the States. The other half would be allocated on an unmatched basis to the States according to a definite formula, using per capita Federal income-tax payments and the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, in each State as factors. After the first year the Federal appropriations would be raised to fifteen millions.

In offering this bill on behalf of my colleagues and myself, may I stress the following points:

First. State planning for the proposed school-health services and the actual administration of the program would be left entirely to the discretion of State agencies. Federal standards would be set up but there would be no Washington interference and dictation. As there might be jurisdictional overlapping between State health and education agencies in carrying out the program, this bill would leave this administrative question in the hands of State officials. With the advice of the School Health Services Board and the National Advisory Committee, the Federal Security Administrator would handle the program on the Federal level through the Children's Bureau, and in matters involving State education agencies would utilize the services of the Office of Education.

Second. Our bill aims directly at the heart of this problem through the existing administrative set-ups in the State and National government.

Third. States would offer all school-health services—examinations, preventive, and corrective work—under this bill with complete disregard for race, color, or creed.

The wealth of experience and study which documents the present unsatisfactory state of our youth's health is unlimited. Selective Service records from September 1942 through June 1943 reveal, for example, that 28 percent of our young men 18 years old were rejected because of physical or mental handicaps—about the same rate of rejection as was experienced during the First World War. George J. Hecht, published of Parents' Magazine, recently stated that one child in every 20 born each year will spend some time in a mental hospital—yet there are 25 States without a single child guidance clinic and thousands of communities have no program for early detection and treatment of mental disorders. The United States Children's Bureau recently reported that three-fourths of the Nation's 30,000,000 children need dental care. We all know of many such instances in our own communities that distress us and impel us to try to improve the health of our young people.

I trust that this bill may act as a foundation on which to build a sound and practical answer to this great problem. An almost identical bill was introduced in the House by Representative HOWELL, of Illinois, on February 17 and is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Other general health measures have been filed

during this session, but I believe no legislation has been introduced in the Senate which addresses itself solely to the specific health problem of our school children. I hope it may receive an early hearing and get the benefit of further suggestions that will be helpful.

I have had prepared a table which gives a rough estimate of how the unmatched Federal funds would be allotted to the several States under the formula I have proposed. I wish to emphasize that these percentages are necessarily only estimates at best because they are based on 1943 figures. This certainly was not a normal year as regards population and income, but they were the most recent figures I was able to obtain. I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State percentage of unmatched funds under proposed national child-health services bill, based on 1943 Census Bureau and Treasury figures

State	Population 5 to 17 years, inclusive	Per capita Federal income tax payments	Percent of total fund under bill
1. Alabama	790,000	$18.71	5.04
2. Arizona	148,000	28.44	.62
3. Arkansas	488,000	16.11	3.61
4. California	1,452,000	63.62	2.72
5. Colorado	245,000	38.99	.75
6. Connecticut	341,000	85.51	.48
7. Delaware	57,000	161.74	.04
8. District of Columbia	144,000	106.37	.16
9. Florida	452,000	32.10	1.64
10. Georgia	825,000	24.06	4.09
11. Idaho	120,000	31.04	.46
12. Illinois	1,504,000	71.33	2.52
13. Indiana	729,000	45.15	1.93
14. Iowa	501,000	30.29	1.97
15. Kansas	372,000	32.41	1.37
16. Kentucky	704,000	17.03	4.93
17. Louisiana	611,000	25.52	2.86
18. Maine	188,000	34.45	.65
19. Maryland	427,000	68.78	.74
20. Massachusetts	852,000	57.12	1.74
21. Michigan	1,196,000	68.38	2.09
22. Minnesota	555,000	40.38	1.64
23. Mississippi	594,000	11.75	6.03
24. Missouri	751,000	40.69	2.20
25. Montana	109,000	40.33	.32
26. Nebraska	270,000	36.88	.87
27. Nevada	27,000	91.77	.04
28. New Hampshire	98,000	40.63	.29
29. New Jersey	805,000	62.44	1.54
30. New Mexico	152,000	23.96	.76
31. New York	2,403,000	83.09	3.45
32. North Carolina	977,000	18.53	6.29
33. North Dakota	145,000	19.88	.87
34. Ohio	1,418,000	56.28	3.01
35. Oklahoma	535,000	21.62	2.95
36. Oregon	225,000	51.65	.52
37. Pennsylvania	2,083,000	66.98	3.71
38. Rhode Island	144,000	57.74	.30
39. South Carolina	542,000	14.48	4.47
40. South Dakota	137,000	16.59	.99
41. Tennessee	739,000	22.27	3.96
42. Texas	1,575,000	34.90	5.39
43. Utah	157,000	28.62	.65
44. Vermont	75,000	28.90	.31
45. Virginia	708,000	26.69	3.16
46. Washington	364,000	56.57	.77
47. West Virginia	499,000	20.81	2.86
48. Wisconsin	659,000	37.84	2.08
49. Wyoming	56,000	41.32	.16
Total	28,928,000	[1] 49.21	100.00

[1] Average.

HOUSING FOR PARAPLEGICS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide housing for persons who are commonly known as paraplegics. They are veterans of World War I and World War II who sustained spine injuries of such severity that they will be doomed to wheel chairs the remainder of their lives. A considerable number of such veterans are married. The majority of them, of course, entered the service without any considerable amount of funds, and, therefore, they presently have no money with which to build homes.

The cost of the particular type of home needed by a paraplegic is considerably higher than that of the average home. The New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, working with the Red Cross, has been doing excellent work in the preparation of plans and blueprints of suitable homes for paraplegics. However, notwithstanding the excellent work that is being done, the veteran is still left without money and without other means of building a home.

The bill provides that the Veterans' Administration may secure the land, build a home, and turn the deed over to the disabled veteran.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I am very sympathetic with the purpose of the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how many veterans would be covered by the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not have the exact number of paraplegics. The number is roughly 2,300. The entire 2,300 may not desire homes. Some of them may continue residing in hospitals. Nor do I have the number of paraplegics who are married. I know that a sizable number of those young men were married before they entered the service and have families. They, I am sure, will take advantage of the provisions of the bill and request that homes be built for them.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1293) to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

FORMATION OF A UNITED EUROPE—ADDRESS BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Winston Churchill to a large gathering of some 6,000 people of all political and religious faiths delivered a very significant speech which I wish to put into the RECORD. Many of us will recall his speeches to the joint sessions of Congress during the war, and none of us can forget the inspiration that he imparted to the people of Britain during the darkest days of the war. In his speech of yesterday I think he has done the same thing for the people of Europe. In the desperate circumstances in which they find themselves today I believe his speech will bring a ray of hope for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the entime speech be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but I also should like to read, as a sample, about two paragraphs which I hope will be sufficient to induce the Members of the Senate to read Mr. Churchill's speech in its entirety. I think that it raises the most important political problem confronting not only the people of Europe but confronting this country. It has particular appropriateness, I think, to the action the Senate took yesterday in passing the relief bill. I quote the following excerpts from Mr. Churchill's speech:

> Are we Europeans to become incapable, with all our tropical and colonial dependencies, with all our long-created trading connections, with all that modern production and transportation can do, of even averting famine from the mass of our peoples? Are we all, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States?
>
> The time has come when these questions must be answered. This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness and abundance to begin again their healing flow.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontier, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization.
>
> In the rich pattern of this culture, says Mr. Sewell, there are many strands: the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty and goodness; the Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But, if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

Mr. Churchill also points out, I think probably the most important question which will confront this country, our State Department and this body in the

next few weeks when he says this about Germany:

The central and almost the most serious problem which glares upon the Europe of today is the future of Germany. Without a solution of this problem, there can be no united Europe. Except within the framework and against the background of a united Europe, this problem is incapable of solution.

I think there could not be a truer statement. There is one further reference to the United States. He says:

When I first began writing about the United States of Europe some 15 years ago, I wondered whether the United States of America would regard such a development as antagonistic to their interest, or even contrary to their safety.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I submitted a resolution some weeks ago, and it seems to me that the least we can do is to give a definite answer to the doubt which still exists in the mind of Mr. Churchill, although he goes forward to say that he surely cannot believe that there is still a doubt. There is no reason whatever why this country should not lend encouragement to the accomplishment of this purpose.

I, for one, cannot understand why our Government cannot proceed to give some thought to the problem. If there are problems the solution of which will contribute to a peaceful world, this is the most important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the speech of Winston Churchill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All the greatest things are simple, and many can be expressed in a single word. Freedom; justice; honor; duty; mercy; hope. We who have come together here today, representing almost all the political parties of our British national life and nearly all the creeds and churches of the Western World—this large audience filling a famous hall—we also can express our purpose in a single word: Europe.

At school we learned, from the maps hung on the walls, that there is a continent called Europe. I remember quite well being taught this as a child, and, after living a long time, I still believe it is true. However, professional geographers now tell us that the continent of Europe is really only on the peninsula of the Asiatic land mass. I must tell you that I feel that this would be an arid and uninspiring conclusion and, for myself, I distinctly prefer what I was taught when I was a boy.

It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontier, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization.

PATTERN OF MANY STRANDS

In the rich pattern of this culture, says Mr. Sewell, there are many strands: the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness; the Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But, if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

These are not my words, but they are my faith; and we are here to proclaim our resolve that the spiritual conception of Europe shall not die. We declare, on the contrary, that it shall live and shine, and cast its redeeming illumination upon a world of confusion and woe.

That is what has brought us all together here this evening, and that is what is going to keep us all together—however sharply or even deeply we may be divided on many other matters—until our goal is reached and our hopes are realized.

In our task of reviving the glories and happiness of Europe, her culture, and her prosperity, it can certainly be said that we start at the bottom of her fortunes.

CITES WORLD CONTRIBUTIONS

There is the fairest, most temperate, most fertile area of the globe. The influence and the power of Europe and of Christendom have for centuries shaped and dominated the course of history. The sons and daughters of Europe have gone forth and carried their message to every part of the world. Religion, law, learning, art, science, industry throughout the world all bear in so many lands, under every sky and in every clime, the stamp of European origin and traces of European influence.

But what is Europe now? It is a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions district and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations.

Evil teachers urge the paying off of old scores with mathematical precision, and false guides point to unsparing retribution as the path to prosperity.

Is there then to be no respite? Has Europe's mission come to an end? Has she nothing to give to the world but the contagion of the black death? Are her peoples to go on harrying and tormenting one another by war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated?

Are the states of Europe to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?

DEPENDENT ON UNITED STATES

Are we Europeans to become incapable, with all our tropical and colonial dependencies, with all our long created trading connections, with all that modern production and transportation can do, of even averting famine from the mass of our peoples? Are we all, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States?

The time has come when these questions must be answered. This is the hour of choice and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

This is the supreme opportunity, and if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be.

In my experience of large enterprises it is often a mistake to try to settle everything at once. Far off, on the sky line, we can see the peaks of the delectable mountains. But we cannot tell what lies between us and them.

PERSUASION, NOT ORDERS

We know where we want to go, but we cannot foresee all the stages of the journey or plan our marches as in a military operation. We are not acting in the field of forces, but in the domain of opinion. We cannot give orders. We can only persuade.

We must go forward step by step.

I will, therefore, explain in general terms where we are and what are the first things we have to do. We have now at once to set on foot an organization in Great Britain to promote the cause of United Europe and to give this idea the prominence and vitality necessary for it to lay hold of the minds of our fellow countrymen to such an extent that it will affect their actions and influence the course of national policy.

We accept, without question, the world supremacy of the United Nations organization. In the constitution agreed at San Francisco, direct provision is made for regional organizations to be formed. United Europe will form one major regional entity.

This is the United States, with all its dependencies; there is the Soviet Union; there is the British Empire and Commonwealth; and there is Europe, with which Great Britain is profoundly blended. Here are the four main pillars of the world temple of peace. Let us make sure that they will all bear the weight which will be reposed upon them.

It is not for us at this stage to attempt to define or prescribe the structure of constitutions. We ourselves are content to present the idea of united Europe, in which our country will play a decisive part, as a moral, cultural, and spiritual conception to which all can rally without divergence about structure.

It is for the responsible statesmen who have the conduct of affairs in their hands and the power of executive action to shape and fashion the structure. It is for us to lay the foundation, to create the atmosphere and to give the driving impulsion.

First I turn to France. For 40 years I have marched with France. I have shared her joys and sufferings. I rejoice in her reviving national strength. Certainly I will not abandon this long comradeship now.

But we have a proposal to make to France which will give all Frenchmen a cause for serious thought and valiant decision. If European unity is to be made an effective reality before it is too late, the wholehearted efforts, both of France and Britain, will be needed from the outset. They must go forward hand in hand. They must in fact be founder-partners in this movement.

GERMANY CENTRAL PROBLEM

The central and almost the most serious problem which glares upon the Europe of today is the future of Germany. Without a solution of this problem, there can be no united Europe. Except within the framework and against the background of a united Europe, this problem is incapable of solution.

In a continent of divided national states, Germany and her hard-working people will not find means or scope to employ their energies. Economic suffocation will inevitably turn their thoughts to revolt and revenge. Germany will once again become a menace to her neighbors and to the whole world; and the fruits of victory and liberation will be cast away.

But, on the wider stage of a united Europe, German industry and German genius would be able to find constructive and peaceful outlets. Instead of being a center of poverty and a source of danger, the German people would be enabled to bring back prosperity in no small measure, not only to themselves but to the whole continent.

Germany today lies prostrate, famishing among ruins. Obviously no initiative can be expected from her. It is for France and Britain to take the lead. Together they must, in a friendly manner, bring the German race back into the European circle.

No one can say, and we need not attempt to forecast, what will be the future constitution of Germany. Various individual German states are at present being recreated. There are the old states and principalities of the

Germany of former days to which the culture of the world owes so much.

END OF RETALIATION SEEN

Without prejudice to any future question of German federation, these individual states might well be invited to take their place in the council of Europe. Thus, in looking back to happier days, we should hope to mark the end of that long trail of hatred and retaliation which has already led us all, victors and vanquished alike, into the pit of squalor, slaughter and ruin.

The prime duty and opportunity of bringing about this essential reunion belongs to us and to our French friends across the Channel. Strong bonds of affection, mutual confidence, common interest, and similar outlook link France and Britain together.

The treaty of alliance that has lately been signed merely gives formal expression to the community of sentiment that already exists as an indisputable and indestructible fact.

It is true that this task of reconciliation requiries on the part of France, who has suffered so cruelly, an act of faith, sublime in character; but it is by this act of faith and by this act of faith alone that France will regain her historic position in the leadership of Europe.

ROLE OF ITALY DISCUSSED

There is also another leading member of our ancient family of nations to be held in mind. There is Italy. Everything that I have said about the imperative need of reaching a reconciliation with the German race and the ending of the fearful quarrels that have ruined them, and almost ruined us, applies in a less difficult degree to the Italian people, who wish to dwell happily and industriously within their beautiful country and who were hurled by a dictator into the hideous struggles of the north.

I am told that this idea of a united Europe makes an intense appeal to Italians who look back across the centuries of confusion and disorder to the glories of the classic age, when a dozen legion were sufficient to preserve peace and law through vast territories and when freemen could travel freely under the sanction of a common citizenship.

We hope to reach again a Europe purged of the slavery of the ancient times in which men will be as proud to say, "I am a European" as once they were to say, "Civis Romanus sum." We hope to see a Europe where men of every country will think so much of being a European as of belonging to their native land, and wherever they go in this wide domain will truly feel: "Here I am at home." How simple it would all be, and how crowned with glory, if that were to arrive.

BOUNDARIES NOT IN ISSUE

It will next, of course, be asked: "What are the political and physical boundaries of the United Europe you are trying to create? Which countries will be in and which out?"

It is not our task or wish to draw frontier lines, but, rather, to smooth them away. Our aim is to bring about the unity of all nations of all Europe.

We seek to exclude no state whose territory lies in Europe and which assures to its people those fundamental human and personal rights and liberties on which our democratic civilization has been created.

Some countries will feel able to come into our circle sooner, and others later, according to the circumstances in which they are placed. They can all be sure that whenever they are to join, a place and a welcome will be waiting for them at the European council table.

When I first began writing about the United States of Europe some 15 years ago, I wondered whether the United States of America would regard such a development as antagonistic to their interest, or even contrary to their safety.

But all that has passed away. The whole movement of American opinion is favorable to the revival and re-creation of Europe. This is surely not unnatural when we remember how the manhood of the United States has twice in a lifetime been forced to recross the Atlantic Ocean and pour out their treasure as the result of wars originating from ancient European feuds.

SEES AMERICAN BLESSING

One cannot be surprised that they would like to see a peaceful and united Europe taking its place in the foundations of the world organization to which they are devoted. I have no doubt that, far from encountering any opposition or prejudice from the great Republic of the New World, our movement will have their blessing and their aid.

We here in Great Britain have our own self-governing dominions—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa. We are joined together by ties of free will which have stood unyielding against all the ups and downs of fortune.

We are the center and summit of a world-wide commonwealth of nations. It is necessary that any policy this island may adopt towards Europe should enjoy the full sympathy and approval of the peoples of the Dominions. Why should we suppose that they will not be with us in this cause? They feel with us that Britain is geographically and historically a part of Europe and that they also have their inheritance in Europe.

If Europe united is to be a living force, Britain will have to play her full part as a member of the European family.

The Dominions also know that their youth, like that of the United States, have twice in living memory traversed the immense ocean spaces to fight and die in wars brought about by European discord in the prevention of which they have been powerless.

We may be sure that the cause of united Europe, in which the mother country must be a prime mover, will in no way be contrary to the sentiments which join us all together with our Dominions in the circle of the British crown.

It is, of course, alleged that all advocacy of the ideal of united Europe is nothing but a maneuver in the game of power politics, and that it is a sinister plot against Soviet Russia. There is no truth in this.

TO PREVENT AGGRESSION

The whole purpose of a united democratic Europe is to give decisive guaranties against aggression. Looking out from the ruins of some of their most famous cities and from amid the cruel devastation of their fairest lands, the Russian people should surely realize how much they stand to gain by the elimination of the causes of war and the fear of war on the European continent.

The creation of a healthy and contented Europe is the first and truest interest of the Soviet Union. We had therefore hoped that all sincere efforts to promote European agreement and stability would receive, as they deserve, the sympathy and support of Russia. Instead, all this beneficient design has been denounced and viewed with suspicion by the Soviet press and radio. We have made no retort, and I do not propose to do so tonight.

But neither could we accept the claim that the veto of a single power, however respected, should bar and prevent a movement necessary to the peace, amity and well-being of so many hundreds of millions of toiling and striving men and women.

We see before our eyes hundreds of millions of humble homes in Europe and islands outside which would be affected by war. Are they never to have a chance to thrive and flourish? Is the honest, faithful bread-winner never to be able to reap the fruits of his labor? Can he never bring up his children in health and joy and with the hopes of better days?

PERILS TO BE ELIMINATED

Can he never be free from the fear of foreign invasion, the crash of the bomb or the shell, the tramp of the hostile patrol or, what is even worse, the knock upon his door of the secret political police to take away the loved one far from the protection of law and justice; when, all the time, by one spontaneous effort of his will, he could wake from all these nightmare horrors and stand forth in his manhood, free in the broad light of day?

The conception of European unity already commands strong sympathy among the leading statesmen in almost all countries. Europe must federate or perish, said the present Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, before the late terrible war; and I have no reason to suppose that he will abandon that prescient declaration at a time when the vindication of his words is at hand.

Of course, we understand that, until public opinion expresses itself more definitely, governments hesitate to take positive action. It is for us to provide the proof of solid popular support, both here and abroad, which will give to the governments of Europe a confidence to go forward and give practical effect to their beliefs.

URGES BROADER VIEWPOINT

We cannot say how long it will be before this stage is reached. We ask, however, that in the meantime His Majesty's government, together with other governments, should approach the various pressing continental problems from a European rather than from a restricted national angle.

In the discussions on the German and Austrian peace settlements, and indeed throughout the whole diplomatic field, the ultimate ideal should be held in view. Every new arrangement that is made should be designed in such a manner as to be capable of later being fitted into the pattern of a United Europe.

I must end where I began, namely, by placing this immense design of Europe within and subordinate to the United Nations organization. Unless some effective world supergovernment, for the purposes of preventing war, can be set up and begin its reign, the prospects for peace and human progress are dark and doubtful.

But let there be no mistake upon one point. Without a united Europe there is no prospect of world government. It is the urgent and indispensable stop toward the realization of that ideal.

EARLIER FAILURE CITED

After the first great war the League of Nations tried to build, without the aid of the United States, an international order upon a weak, divided Europe. Its failure cost us dear.

Today, after the Second World War, Europe is far weaker and still more distracted. One of the four main pillars of the temple of peace lies before us in shattered fragments. It must be assembled and reconstructed before there can be any real progress in building a spacious superstructure of our desires.

If, during the next 5 years, it is found possible to build a world organization of irresistible force and inviolable authority for the purpose of securing peace, there are no limits to the blessings which all men may enjoy and share. Nothing will help forward the building of that world organization so much as unity and stability in a Europe that is conscious of her collective personality and resolved to assume her rightful part in guiding the unfolding destinies of man.

In the ordinary day-to-day affairs of life, men and women expect rewards for successful exertion, and this is often right and reasonable. But those who serve causes as majestic and high as ours need no reward; nor are our aims limited by the span of human life.

If success comes to us soon, we shall be happy. If our purpose is delayed, if we are confronted by obstacles and inertia, we may still be of good cheer, because in a cause, the righteousness of which will be proclaimed

by the march of future events and the judgment of happier ages, we shall have done our duty and done our best.

BRITISH COTTON BILL SET FOR KING'S SIGNATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to read into the RECORD a news release from London dated May 13 and issued by the Associated Press. This item was carried in the New York Herald Tribune of May 14. It reads as follows:

BRITISH COTTON BILL SET FOR KING'S SIGNATURE

LONDON, May 13.—Except for the formality of King George's assent, a bill banning private importation of cotton and closing down the famed Liverpool Cotton Exchange became law tonight.

The bill, already passed by the Commons, was given final passage in the Lords without a vote after Conservative Lord Rea, leading a last futile attack against the measure, declared 80 percent of Britain's cotton spinners opposed it.

I wish to recall for the record that I voted against the British loan because the Senate was unwilling to write in reservations which would require credit balances to be canceled in the event that Great Britain used any of the funds to the detriment of the United States.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Truman Doctrine," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, before the Optimist Club of Topeka, Kans., on May 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the record an article relating to a bill introduced by him and Representative BROWN of Ohio providing for reorganization of executive branch of the Government, written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MOBILE REGISTER

[Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. OVERTON), asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Drive To Sink Vast Federal Fund in Part-Time St. Lawrence Waterway," published in the Mobile (Ala.) Register of May 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation may be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent tomorrow on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a conference report, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in the House amendment insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

"(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

"(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the Act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this Act until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

"(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this Act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

"(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this Act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

"(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

"(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

"SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this Act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this Act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this Act; (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this Act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this Act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this Act through such

department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

"The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

"(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

"(2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

"(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the Act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the Act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

"(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 8 are not being carried out.

"SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this Act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

"SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities, which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments, under authority of this Act.

"SEC. 8. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this Act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this Act as the President shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is a unanimous report from the conferees, and I shall make a brief statement respecting it. The report has just been adopted by the House of Representatives.

The bill as it comes from conference is practically in the form in which it was passed by the Senate. The bill passed by the House did not include provision for confirmation of the administrators by the Senate. The conference report does include such a provision.

The bill as it passed the House did not contain the correct version of the so-called Vandenberg amendment respecting the United Nations. The House recedes, and the conference report bill contains the formula contained in the Senate bill.

In addition, the Senate conferees have agreed to the following three additional restrictions put into the bill by the House:

First. Provision for investigations of personnel by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Second. Provision for termination of the act by concurrent resolution of the Congress whenever Congress so wills.

Third. Provision for termination of the act if the President finds any of the requirements of the act not being carried out.

About the only change in the bill as it passed the Senate was the elimination of the so-called Johnson amendment, which provided that, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments."

It was the position of the House conferees and a majority of the Senate conferees that no such agreements can by any stretch of the imagination be considered to exist now or to be in contemplation, and that therefore this particular amendment was unnecessary.

Otherwise, I repeat, the conference bill is practically in the form of the bill passed by the Senate, plus the acceptance by the Senate of the three additional protections as provided in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to express my approval of the conference report. Substantially it contains all the vital matters the Senate bill embraced. While I personally disagree with one provision, to the effect that the act can be terminated by concurrent resolution, which I do not think would be legally effective, I shall not press that matter. I agree to the conference report, and I trust the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending legislation, if we shall be successful in having it passed by the Senate today, and perhaps passed tomorrow by the House of Representatives, may well be one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted during the present session of Congress. It may be recalled by Members of this body that the proposed legislation is not of recent origin. The subject has been studied for the past two and a half years by many Senators on both sides of the aisle, by many of the scientists of the Nation, and by prominent lay persons and prominent Government officials.

The bill comes to the Senate from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with a unanimous report. There are some slight differences of opinion regarding certain features of the bill, but the basic principles are agreed upon by practically everyone.

A year ago when the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I, together with other Senators, held hearings on the legislation similar to this we interviewed approximately 150 witnesses—I believe 151, to be exact. Those witnesses, Mr. President, included all the eminent scientists of America, prominent businessmen, Government officials, Cabinet officers, and practically everyone we could think of in high place in the economic and scientific life of America. Of the 151 witnesses, 150 testified in favor of the basic principles of the legislation. Of course, during the testimony suggestions were made by many of the witnesses regarding certain features of the bill. After the hearings were concluded we sat down and tried to frame a bill which would more or less coincide with the ideas of all those prominent people, including Government officials, Cabinet officers, and Members of Congress. We were successful in doing so, and after about 4 days' debate in the early part of last summer the bill passed the Senate by practically unanimous vote. In the closing days of the session it was lost in the House, not because the members of the House committee or Members of the House did not favor the bill as it was written, with minor amendments, but because the pressure of legislative business at the close of the session was such that the House adjourned before it could take action.

Now the new Congress has again taken up the legislation. It was wisely suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that we hold no further hearings on the matter but that the House committee hold hearings, because last year the House committee did not interview and hear all these witnesses. The House has done so, and I think I can say without fear of misunderstanding the situation, that the House committee is also ready to report a bill somewhat in the form of the pending Senate bill.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from New Jersey gave the Senate a very careful résumé of the bill. As I previously pointed out, many other Senators have made a thorough study of the legislation. The only feature which has been added to the legislation is the very vital and important subject of cancer and cancer research in the United States. Personally I am somewhat familiar with that subject and legislation dealing with it, including the new feature placed in the pending bill, because approximately 10 years ago the then distinguished senior Senator from my State, now a member of the circuit court of appeals in San Francisco, former Senator Bone, and I introduced a bill to establish a cancer institute, which now exists in Maryland. That cancer institute has been operating for approximately 20 years with a great deal of success. It might be well to note that of all the appropriations dealt with by the House, the only appropriation which has been voluntarily increased is

that made for the cancer institute in Maryland. However, in several discussions held recently, those of us interested in the bill, both in Congress and outside of Congress, have decided that we might well incorporate in the National Science Foundation the broad purposes of cancer research, and not only cancer research, Mr. President, but research into heart disease and, if you please, the common cold, and many other diseases and ailments which reduce the human life span.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said recently during a floor debate, "You cannot drive the scientists into their laboratories"; but, Mr. President, we in Congress can provide a common meeting ground and an adequate facility wherein a free science, both within and without the Government, can come together voluntarily and in the interests of humanity plan a mass attack on those problems of science and medicine which have not yet jelled to our best efforts.

Science, medicine, and their lifeblood, education, have taxed their existing resources to keep pace with our complex civilization and our expanding frontiers. The individual efforts must continue to be encouraged, but where the problem requires Nation-wide effort and facility, the resources of individual or even group effort are inadequate.

President Roosevelt recognized this in 1939 and 1940 when he created the National Defense Research Committee headed by Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard Universtiy, and later the Office of Scientific Research and Development directed by Dr. Vannevar Bush. I could recite at length the brilliant record of secret weapon development within these agencies from the atomic bomb to the commercial development of DDT and penicillin.

Mr. President, these were wartime agencies operating under wartime conditions to mobilize science for war. When peace was at hand, President Roosevelt in a letter dated November 17, 1944, requested Dr. Bush to report on a program for postwar scientific research. Once again, the Government turned to science for peacetime guidance of our scientific future. Dr. Bush and his colleagues and the eminent scientists of America prepared a report for submission to President Roosevelt. After President Roosevelt's death the report was submitted to President Truman. Copies of it are on the desks of all Senators. The report is well worth reading. The broad and basic principles of the bill are founded upon the report.

Mr. President, I know of no legislation in my experience where the testimony of so many outstanding men in every walk of life were in agreement. Federal aid to basic research and a scholarship program were unanimously recommended by these men in answer to the Government's desire to provide for a postwar scientific program.

We cannot stand by and allow our world scientific leadership to be frittered away. Less than two-thirds of 1 percent of our national income goes into research and only one-third of one-tenth of 1 percent of our national income goes into basic research, I doubt if any business, large or small, can gain or maintain leadership in the future, whether it be domestically or in the world, with so little investment.

Mr. President, Dr. Bush in his report, Science the Endless Frontier, estimated last year that the country needed to have 17,000 more persons trained in the basic sciences. I do not know what the figure is this year, but I suspect that if an estimate were made, it would be even larger.

We in this country adopted a very short-sighted policy during the war. Instead of permitting youngsters with inquisitive minds and those who were scientifically bent to proceed with their training as basic scientists, we took them into the Army and made no exceptions. No other country in the world engaged in the war adopted such a policy. Russia, Germany, Japan, England, Canada, and even Australia said to their youngsters who were scientifically inclined "Go into a laboratory. That is your part of the war effort." Several of us, aided and abetted by those on the outside who saw the short-sightedness of this policy, attempted to change it. We even went to the extent of offering amendments to the military conscription bills whereby scientifically trained men or youngsters with scientifically inquisitive minds might be exempted from military duty to carry on their scientific training and education. We never succeeded until near the end of the demobilization period. The result is that this country in proportion to its population has fewer basic scientists than any of the other countries in the world, including even some of the so-called backward countries. We cannot expect to keep pace with the rest of the world scientifically, whether it be in military science or domestic science, unless we adopt a national policy such as is embodied in this bill.

I need not point out that the potency of the German war machine was due mainly to the fact that long prior to the war—even long prior to World War I—and all during the period between World War I and World War II—Germany made a special attempt to train her young scientists and to subsidize applied science. I might even suggest that if the German population, with its scientific policy, could conceivably have been living in this country, with its great potential economic and national resources, probably we might not have won the war.

During the war Russia made special cases of her scientific personnel. We have had a complete hiatus—a twilight zone—for seven long years, without the training of a sufficient number of basic scientists in this country. The result is that today even in private and Government research we are having the greatest difficulty in recruiting young men and women who can apply basic science to our problems.

So this bill is important. There will probably be offered four major amendments which the Senate should examine carefully. It must be remembered that we are entering a new field. The Senate should realize that for the first time, aside from the Cancer Research Institute created by the so-called Bone-Magnuson bill 10 years ago, and research within some of the departments, such as the Bureau of Mines and the Department of Agriculture, the Government of the United States is embarking upon a new program. The Government is entering the field of scientific research. As was well pointed out yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, it is not intended that the Foundation shall operate any Government plants. As a matter of fact, there is a prohibition in the bill against the Foundation, if it is established, operating any plants whatsoever. It will be a policy-making board. The most important and major part of the bill is that the Government will say, "We are going to see that there are a sufficient number of basic scientists in the United States to keep America abreast of the scientific world."

Qualifications for scholarships and fellowships will be determined by the Foundation, but the Foundation itself will not establish any plants. It will say to private institutions and Government agencies, "Here is the problem. Here is the scientific policy of America, as we see it. We are going to aid you in solving the problem for the welfare of the whole country." That problem may be in medicine, in biology, or even in social sciences. Surely the Foundation can be of great aid in military science. The Foundation will in no way interfere with the present research plans of the Army, the Navy, or any other Government agency. As a matter of fact, the governmental agencies are so convinced that the Foundation will supplement and assist their activities that every agency has indorsed the bill as it now stands.

Some question was raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as to whether or not the Foundation would interfere with the policies laid down by Congress in the Atomic Energy Act. He has proposed an amendment, which will be satisfactory to most of us who sponsored the bill, whereby there will be no conflict between the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation for a great deal of its research.

Another amendment will be offered, with respect to which there will probably be considerable argument. There is a basic difference as to how the Foundation should be administered. Some would like to have a director appointed directly by the President, and then have an advisory board of scientists and eminent laymen to direct his policy, or at least suggest to him the policy. There are others who would like to have a board appointed, and have the board appoint its own executive director. In order not to impair the basic principles of the bill, we have attempted to arrive at a compromise. I believe that one plan is just as good as the other, depending upon the men who are behind it. The latest suggestion is to have a board appointed in accordance with the provisions of the bill, and have the director also appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to carry out the policies of the board.

The fourth amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio

[Mr. TAFT] and myself. It will include cancer in the research purview of the National Science Foundation. I should like to say a word for the RECORD on that subject. I am somewhat familiar with the problem of cancer research, and with the legislative policy—if we have had a policy—regarding cancer research.

Scientists tell us that sometimes too much money is detrimental to research. As I pointed out earlier, the House increased the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute at Bethesda from approximately $1,750,000 to about $27,000,000. In the meantime there is a private drive so far as cancer research is concerned, led by a very fine group of citizens who have banded themselves together and called themselves the American Cancer Society. They have recently conducted a very successful drive throughout the country. If the $27,000,000 appropriation should stand, it would probably channel too much of the cancer research into a Government institution. It was thought that the wiser course to follow would be to reduce the appropriation recommended by the House to approximately $7,000,000, which the Cancer Institute can well use, and which will adequately provide for its program, and to establish a cancer division under the National Science Foundation, which would correlate the Government activities with those of private institutions and the American Cancer Society.

As one of the so-called fathers of the Institute, I think that is a wise course. The American Cancer Institute tells us that it has plenty of funds to carry on its program as far as it can go. It has not sufficient personnel efficiently to spend all its funds. It is encouraging young men and women to enter private institutions or the Government Cancer Research Institute and there participate in the attack on this dreaded disease, which kills at least 3 people every minute in this country, a disease from which 17,000,000 Americans now walking the streets of American will die, regardless of what we do in this bill or what is done by the Cancer Institute. Seventeen million Americans today have cancer, and probably 16,000,000 of them are not aware of it.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and I, hope that by providing for cancer research by the Foundation all cancer research work can be coordinated.

It is also hoped that with the aid of Government funds, private funds, and such funds as we may be able to secure elsewhere we can successfully combat our first great killer, heart disease. An over-all America, through this bill, if it is enacted, will take cognizance of and attack the entire field of scientific problems.

I think that 10 years from now that this legislation may well be considered the most important passed by the Congress at its present session. I hope there will not be too much controversy over the phases of organization and some of the amendments which will be proposed, because, basically, we are all trying to move in the same direction. It is high time we did, because it will be from 7 to 10 years before there will be trained in this country a sufficient number of basic scientists to carry forward an adequate scientific program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the Senator upon his very comprehensive and very clear exposition of the bill. I had not heretofore given the matter much thought or study, and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I do not wish to proceed further, but I think I should say that this bill also has great defense implications. Whether atomic energy will be the great defense weapon of America I do not know. There is such a thing as bacteriological warfare. It has never been explored. There is such a thing as keeping America defensively strong by protecting and improving public health. That is a subject which we have gone into, but not adequately. There may be, which God forbid, such a thing as another attack on America waged wholly along scientific lines. There is such a thing as placing two or three men in a laboratory and having them help more in the defense and welfare of this country than would 10,000 men marching up and down a parade field.

This bill is at least an approach to the objective. I hope the Senate today will see fit to put its stamp of approval upon this piece of legislation which many of us have thought about and labored over for a long time and which has practically the unanimous approval, I am sure, of all the citizens of America. As the Senator from New Jersey pointed out, we hope to start modestly. We may ask for approximately $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, and surely, with all the money America is spending for other things—such an appropriation would not be unreasonable. The sum we are asking is not so much as the cost of one heavy cruiser—but the fruits within the first year of the life of this Foundation, will be worth to America, the cost of many cruisers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3 (a), in line 2, on page 2, it is proposed to strike out "forty-eight" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four."

FREEDOM OF NEWS IN THE WORLD

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have during the four previous sessions of Congress considered many problems, including the legislation which was passed yesterday, which involved the destiny and welfare of nations and a lasting peace in the world.

One of the most important problems in the world today is the free and unfettered exchange of news and information among the peoples and the nations of the world. It is a problem to which men of good will have addressed themselves for many years in the belief that if citizens of every country knew their neighbors better, the chances for differences between them would diminish. For centuries men of vision have pursued this ideal. In ancient Greece, Plato and Socrates advocated spreading the culture of their land by encouraging students to travel widely; in later times, Britain's great empire builder, Cecil Rhodes, established a system of scholarships in England with the purpose of making Americans know England and English ways better.

At no time in the history of the world is this need for a freer and more complete interchange of news and information among nations more necessary than today. It is needless to emphasize that this is the atomic age, the age of guided missiles and rockets, the age when misunderstandings between peoples may lead to speedy destruction—even annihilation. It is an age when it is vitally important to the people of every land that they know from day to day, from hour to hour, what goes on in the world, that they know the truth—or as much of the truth as it is possible to know.

Men talk about iron curtains in the world. The iron curtain that is a bar to understanding, a shield for intrigue and trouble, is the curtain of perverted and false information about other men and nations. One of the great accomplishments of the United Nations can be to tear down that iron curtain—to allow mankind the world over to learn the truth because the truth will set them free.

Here in the United States we have a free press. It is as free as mankind can make it in the kind of economic society in which we live. It is true that the owner or publisher of a periodical cannot be compelled to print what he does not want to print. But it is also true that there has been builded up great news-gathering and news-distributing agencies whose principal function is to assemble the news of the world and distribute it among publishers. In a competitive society, we have at least the assurance that some publishers will publish honestly the news that is made available to them each day. Actually, the overwhelming majority of publishers do so.

For many years I have been interested in this problem of the gathering and distribution of news. Particularly have I been interested in the distribution of American news in foreign lands, and conversely in the foreign news distributed in America. Long before I came to the Senate, during visits to Europe, I made it my business to look into this situation, to study European newspapers for their American news content, and American newspapers for their European news content. Later, as I have visited Europe and the Orient, I sought to keep informed on this subject.

I believe, and I am sure that every Member of the Senate agrees with me, that if every literate person in every country on earth had the opportunity, day by day, to know what goes on in this country to know what we say and what we think, how we live, and to understand us by observing us in our folkways and in our daily lives, our negotiations with the representatives of other lands would be easier and more satisfactory to both parties. Similarly, if we too knew more about some of our foreign

friends, our Russian friends, for example, whose land covers such a vast proportion of the earth's surface, and whose people are of so varied a kind and complexity—if, I repeat, we could know more about them, their daily lives, what they think, how they live, we could make a great deal more progress in dealing with their representatives over the counsel table.

I mention these matters because I believe the Senate will be very much interested in a situation I ran into in Australia in the course of a recent survey trip on Pacific communications installations and problems.

I mention this not by way of criticism but as an example of how a free flow of American news does not exist in a friendly nation like Australia—a nation which we in America regard as one of our best friends. If our two nations cannot have a free flow of news, how can we expect other nations to understand us or we them?

News from the United States destined for Australia—or, for that matter, destined for any overseas part of the British Commonwealth of Nations—gets there via Montreal and London in the majority of cases, because it may be cheaper and is always more expeditious to handle that way. It would be a good deal cheaper if American press had the full advantage of the so-called Empire rate of 1 penny a word—approximately 1.68 cents at the present rate of exchange. Let me explain that the Empire rate is a device whereby all members of the British Commonwealth of Nations enjoy exclusively among themselves a low international communications rate. As a matter of convenience, the Associated Press, the United Press, or the International News Service transmit their news destined for Australia first to Montreal, where it is transmitted overseas through the facilities of the British communications monopoly, known as Cables & Wireless, to London, and eventually to the Amalgamated Wireless of Australasia, a central, government-controlled agency, which operates the only commercial radio service into Australia and manufactures telecommunications equipment. Until recently the Australian Government owned 51 percent of the stock of that company; it is now purchasing complete ownership of the radio services of the company, and these will be managed by a recently established telecommunications commission. It is illegal to distribute to the press of Australia any material that is not received via this Amalgamated Wireless, and it is also illegal to rebroadcast in Australia any voice material from overseas which is not picked up by Amalgamated. This agency, therefore, is the chosen instrument monopoly through which news must flow.

The recipient of all foreign news in Australia is an agency known as Australian Associated Press, in no way, of course, connected with our own AP. Until last year the Australian Associated Press had exclusive contracts with AP, UP, and Reuters. Its contract with American AP, for example, entitled it to access to the complete daily AP news file. From that file the Australian Associated Press bureau in New York excerpts about 5,000 words a day for transmission to Melbourne, where it is picked up by Amalgamated Wireless and delivered to the main Australian Associated Press office. The Australian AP, in turn, distributes this news file in two ways: First, the complete file to its member newspapers in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth; a condensed file to nonmember country papers, which buy the service but have no voice in the agency's management; second, an even more condensed file, known to newspapermen as a "pony service," to the New Zealand Press Association. Except for the newspapers owned by Ezra Norton, who publishes two papers, and who is not a member of the Australian Associated Press, the entire daily press of Australia is wholly dependent for its American news upon this one source. What actually does this mean, as a practical matter?

First, far less than 5,000 words of American news gets into Australia daily, simply because in the case of the United Press, International News Service, and even Associated Press files, the first condensation in New York is further condensed in Melbourne before transmission to member newspapers.

Secondly, the condensation, of course, may frequently result in distorted American news dispatches made available to Australian editors for publication. I do not say this in criticism of Australian newspapers or their employees; but the plain fact is that in any condensation of news, parts of a story are omitted, and what remains does not present a true story. This is the fact about American news in Australia. Perhaps it is because news of the more sensational events that occur in another country makes more readable news. I certainly would not want to charge that it is because the Australians are Empire-minded and want the Empire to present a better picture to their readers than our country does. But I think it is important to point out that the effect is the same. For example, when I was in Australia last December, Atlanta, Ga., experienced its disastrous Winecoff Hotel fire. There was no other American news than this in the Australian dailies; and headlines not only told of the awful tragedy but insert stories made clear that nothing like that could happen in Australian cities. On that latter point, I make no comment, except to point out that I specifically asked about fire escapes in the hotel I stayed and in two or three famous eating places, and learned there were none.

Thirdly, on a reciprocal basis, the American Associated Press is supposed to have access to the Australian Associated Press news file. The joker here is that there is no Australian news file. The Australian AP has no news-gathering staff or facilities of its own. Unlike AP or UP in this country, it is not a channel for exchanging Australian news among Australian newspapers. Its exclusive function is to "cannibalize" material gathered from its offices in New York and London. What this means is that we in America know little of what is happening day by day in Australia.

I think it is important to point out here that neither the Australian people nor its present government are wholly responsible for this situation. The Australian people are friendly to the United States; they like our ways and our standards. Many of our boys have married Australian girls, and are staying there; many of their girls have married our men, and have come here to live. More and more Australia and Australian businessmen realize that strategically and economically their best bet is the United States. The war brought that home to them. Of course, the ties to the Empire are strong; they have been building up for more than a century; they are being assiduously cultivated today. For example, Australia is on an "austerity" diet, which means other commodities, as well as food. In a land where meat, milk, and vegetables are available in tremendous quantities; where wool, leather, and other commodities are available for export; and where citizens have money to spend, a program is pushed to largely restrict exports except to England, and to avoid purchases until the Empire can supply the commodities and luxury items that Australian people want and can afford to buy. For example, I am informed that the only deep-freeze in the entire Commonwealth is owned by the American ambassador. The American ambassador's automobile is the only one like it in Australia, and is the cynosure of all eyes, and crowds gather to look at it and admire it. I want to add that Ambassador Robert Butler is a real American ambassador, as American as corn bread, and proud of it. He is a friendly, aggressive American businessman, anxious to cement American-Australian relations and build up business between the two countries. Our former Secretary of State Byrnes is to be complimented on his choice, and if Ambassador Butler is typical of the new blood in the American State Department, I can only say that this country owes Mr. Byrnes a rising vote of thanks for making our State Department an agency of Government of which we can all be proud.

But to return to the press problem: What is the answer; what are American news agencies seeking to do about it; how successful are they in their efforts?

From November 21 to December 4, 1945, was held the British-American Telecommunications Conference in Bermuda. At the conference, America, Canada, and the United Kingdom agreed to permit private reception of multiple-address newcasts. All countries of the Western Hemisphere, the Philippines, Japan, almost every part of the Orient, Sweden, Switzerland, and Italy also permit this. These multiple-address newscasts are simply the broadcast of a large amount of press copy, beamed at a particular geographical area. Newspaper subscribers of some designated agency of the newspaper copies that part of the news broadcast of interest to that portion of the area which they serve. For example, a broadcast from the United States may be relayed via Hawaii and beamed to the entire Orient from Korea

on the north to Singapore on the south. Subscriber newspapers in Japan copy that portion of the newscast they want; Shanghai or Hong Kong newspapers copy what they want, newspapers in the Malay States or Singapore copy what they desire. Obviously, this is a cheap method of transmitting news, assuming the transmitting or receiving agency charges the subscriber a fair rate and only for that portion that he copies.

At the Bermuda conference, Australia agreed to these multiple-address newscasts, but with a reservation which made its Government-owned telegraph administration the sole receiver and retained the power to exercise its discretion as to the granting of permission to private recipients for the reception of such newscasts through their own installations or other private installation.

Note how this reservation has worked to prevent the American news services from getting into Australia with American news, or getting any substantial volume of Australian news to this country. The AP and UP sought to bring into practical application the Bermuda agreement. Strange to say, to a degree, they were aided in their efforts by the Australian Government's own broadcasting system, a government-owned and operated system which is anxious to have access to a large volume of American news for rebroadcast in its news broadcasts in Australia. But Amalgamated Wireless, the government-controlled communications agency, began by quoting a rate of a penny a word—the same as the Empire press rate. After discussion they lowered this to 3 farthings, and finally to 2 farthings per word. In other words, they started at 1⅓ cents a word, and came down to 6½ mills a word. On the surface, this may seem more than reasonable. But the rub is that an Australian newspaper or the radio-broadcasting system actually would find usable only from 20 to 40 percent of the total newscast, simply because a great deal of the total daily newscast is of no interest to Australian readers. For example, apart from tennis, boxing, or horse racing, American sports news is not followed in Australia, while baseball and football stories are avidly read in Japan and China. It is obvious, therefore, that if only one-fifth of the news is used and the newspaper has to pay 6½ mills per word for this entire broadcast, the usable portion actually costs almost 3½ cents a word—a prohibitive rate.

Both the AP and UP have made alternative suggestions to accomplish the objective of getting news into Australia, even offering to guarantee that the income to the Government would not be less than under the existing system. Numerous proposals have been made to the Overseas Telecommunications Commission of the Commonwealth, and in December, when I was in Sydney, the AP and UP were still waiting for an answer.

It seemed to me, when AP and UP, as well as our State Department representatives, told me the story I have just related to the Senate, that the official position of the United States Government is simply this: We are not interested in exclusive privileges; we seek no special concessions for American news agencies. We ask only that the peoples of other nations have the same free access to American news which our people have to the news of other nations, and, conversely, that the American people have the same free access to the news of other nations that they have to American news. For example, Reuters, the principal British news agency, has many clients here in the United States who contract directly with it for the complete Reuter's service on the same basis on which they would buy from AP or UP.

On this basis, and because during my service in the Senate I have taken an active interest in communications matters, I acceded to the request of AP and UP representatives, as well as the State Department press officer, and conferred with Mr. James Malone, chairman of the Australian Telecommunications Commission. Mr. Malone is an intelligent, courteous, and charming gentleman. I explained to him our concern about world press freedom; my belief that we cannot get a balanced presentation of American life in the Australian press so long as virtually all news about the United States flows through the single channel of the Australian Associated Press, which is not a governmental agency. I suggested that if American news agencies were permitted to bring their news files into Australia and distribute them there, it would not only multiply by several times the volume and variety of American news but would also probably cause the existing agency to strengthen its own American coverage.

I discussed with him the urgent necessity, in the kind of world in which we are living, of having as free and complete an interchange of news and opinion among nations as possible. He agreed with me that many of America's and Britain's problems with Russia would iron out far more readily if British and American correspondents could report all the news from the Soviet and if Soviet newspapers carried a greater proportion of American and British news. I emphasized that we in America have no desire to tell newspaper publishers and editors what to publish; that we do not do that in the United States. But what we are fighting for is the opportunity for editors to have on their desks each day more world news.

When we were about through, I inquired what the position of the Telecommunications Commission was on this subject, reminding him that our concern was chiefly that Australia put into practical application the Bermuda telecommunications agreement. He replied the matter was under study, but that the final decision was to be made in London by the Imperial Telecommunications Commission.

I have made this factual report to the Senate, not alone because the problem of relations with Australia is important to both our countries; not alone because I believe that the free interchange of news among nations is a keystone to peaceful relations among nations, but because it points up again the basic problem with which some of us here in the Senate have been concerned for some years—the problem of American international communications and the difficulty in meeting the competition of a world-wide single British Empire communications system.

Our communications companies are not at fault. Neither in management nor technique are we behind. On the contrary, we emerged from the war paramount in communications equipment, techniques, and know-how. No other country was even close to us.

The basic fault is the lack of a clear, well-defined, all-embracing American international communications policy. Such a policy cannot be created alone by the Congress. In large part, it must be shaped by the Executive, although in implementing it, the Congress will have much to say.

The Senate should know that in the last stages of the war, this Nation owned and operated the finest, fastest, and most modern communications system ever known in the world, built at tremendous cost in blood and money. It included the finest world-wide airways communications service possible. That system is largely gone—junked, torn up, stolen, sold as surplus, or given away. At the height of the war it was relatively safe to fly even in the most remote parts of the world. Today, in the words of General MacArthur, it has become dangerous to fly. Ask air transport people, ask Army and Navy air transport, ask communications experts just what flying is like west and south of Hawaii, in Alaska, or east of Paris or Frankfurt.

There was a time, scarcely a year ago, when this Nation had the power and the ability to negotiate with the nations of the world for a world-circling airways communications service, not necessarily owned or even operated by the United States, but a cooperative enterprise which could have been taken over as a going business. That day is gone; the opportunity has been lost. The millions that we spent to build and operate the system are thrown away; even more important, the world is paying in lives lost in aircraft accidents, a fearful cost for that lost opportunity. We had the chance, too, of building up a world-wide commercial communications enterprise; an enterprise that would insure the prompt delivery at relatively low cost of American businessmen's messages thoughout the world, safely and securely; of American diplomatic and military messages, securely and promptly. We had the chance to establish almost overnight a permanent peacetime system of communications which could have been our good right arm in times of emergency or war.

I wonder, Mr. President, how long we will sit back and wait; how long we are going to continue to attend conferences and wind up low man on the totem pole.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to ask recognition that I might make the point of no quorum. If I have recognition, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hawkes	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "have" to strike out "forty-eight" and insert "twenty-four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendments were, in section 3, on page 2, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "outstanding"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "fundamental"; in the same line, after the word "sciences", to strike out "medical science"; after line 16, to insert "Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; in the same line, after the word "years", to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; in line 4, after the words "four years", to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; and at the end of the same line, to strike out "twelve" and insert "six", so as to make the section read:

MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be men and women who are recognized leaders in the fields of the sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and without regard to political, social, or religious factors; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nominations which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 8 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of 2 years, six at the end of 4 years, six at the end of 6 years, and six at the end of 8 years, after the date of enactment of this act. No person who has served as a member of the Foundation for more than 4 years shall be eligible for reappointment as a member until the expiration of 4 years after the termination of his previous term.

(c) The President shall designate one of the original members of the Foundation to act as chairman of the Foundation until such time as the executive committee referred to in section 5 (a) is elected and chooses its chairman as provided for by section 5 (b). The member so designated shall call the first meeting of the members of the Foundation and shall preside over such meeting until a chairman has been chosen.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 5, on page 5, line 5, after the word "shall", to strike out "except as otherwise provided in this act"; in line 25, after the word "Foundation", to strike out "for submission to the President and the Congress" and insert "and to the President and Congress", so as to make the section read:

CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions, within the Foundation, any of its powers, duties, and functions.

(b) The executive committee shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the Foundation. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence.

(c) The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(d) Five members of the executive committee shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The executive committee may establish such advisory committees as it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the consideration of programs administered by the Foundation.

(f) The executive committee shall render an annual report to the Foundation, and to the President and Congress summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were in section 8, on page 8, line 3, after the words "multiple of", to strike out "four" and insert "twelve"; in line 4, after the words "not less than", to strike out "eight" and "insert "twelve"; at the end of the same line to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-six"; in line 7, after the words "representatives of the", to strike out "War and Navy Departments" and insert "armed services"; in line 8, after the word "numbers", to insert "respectively"; in line 9, after the words "by the", to strike out "Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively" and insert "Secretaries of the principal branches thereof"; at the beginning of line 13 to strike out "five" and insert "not more than six"; in line 16, after the word "thereof", to strike out "one" and insert "a"; in line 16, after the word "representing", to strike out "the War Department and designated by the Secretary of War, and one member of such committee representing the Navy Department and designated by the Secretary of the Navy", and insert "each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof"; on page 9, line 5, after the word "procedure", to insert "subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee"; on page 9, after line 12, to strike out:

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

And insert:

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall advise the Director with respect to the establishment of regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any such information or property which may be classified by the Director in accordance with such regulations and procedures.

So as to make the section read:

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee, except the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall be appointed by the Foundation

and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

(c) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of members in a number which is a multiple of twelve, to be fixed by the Foundation, but which shall be not less than twelve and not more than thirty-six. One-half of the members of such committee shall be civilians appointed by the Foundation, and the remaining half shall be representatives of the armed services, designated in equal numbers, respectively, by the Secretaries of the principal branches thereof. There shall be within the divisional committee for the Division of National Defense an executive committee of not more than six, consisting of the chairman of the divisional committee, as chairman; two civilian members of such committee elected annually by the civilian members thereof; a member of such committee representing each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof. Such executive committee shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Committee for the Division of National Defense with the approval of the Foundation.

(d) The term of each member of each divisional committee shall be fixed by the appointing or designating authority. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive committee.

(e) Each divisional committee shall have the power and duty to make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the executive committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division, and shall have such additional powers and duties as the Foundation may delegate or assign to it.

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall advise the Director with respect to the establishment of regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any such information or property which may be classified by the Director in accordance with such regulations and procedures.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, on page 13, after line 17, to strike out:

(b) All inventions produced by employees of the Foundation in the course of their assigned activities for the Foundation shall be made freely available to the public, or, if patented, shall be freely dedicated to the public.

And insert:

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

So as to make the section read:

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

The next amendment was, in section 15, on page 16, after line 18, to strike out:

(b) The Director may appoint with the approval of the executive committee a Deputy Director who shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

And insert:

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the executive committee, a Deputy Director who shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of the Director during his absence or disability and shall exercise and perform such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Director. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

On page 18, line 23, after the word "by", to strike out "the"; in the same line, after the word "organizations", to insert "agencies, and institutions"; on page 19, line 1, after the word "agencies", to strike out "best"; in line 2, after the word "desired", to strike out "and"; in line 5, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "(3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals."; and on page 19, after line 14, to insert:

(j) Funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research or development, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds appropriated to the Foundation for its general purposes.

(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

So as to make the section read:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that, when deemed desirable by the Director, technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, and their compensation may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and advisory committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the executive committee, a Deputy Director who shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of the Director during his absence or disability and shall exercise and perform such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Director. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee and of each advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees or of any advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation or of a divisional committee or of an advisory committee shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) The Office of Scientific Research and Development is abolished, and its affairs shall be liquidated by the Foundation, which shall be its successor agency. The property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds now available), and contracts (and rights and obligations thereunder) of the Office of Scientific Research and Development are transferred to the Foundation. Such abolition and transfer shall take effect as of the date upon which five members of the executive committee provided for in section 5 have qualified and taken office.

(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will, in its discretion, best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia; (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance further research; and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

(i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to en-

gage in scientific research or scientific development.

(j) Funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research or development, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds appropriated to the Foundation for its general purposes.

(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a question to the Senator from New Jersey in connection with a matter which he has discussed?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator whether, in his opinion, there are adequate safeguards in the bill for the protection of the rights of individuals in the administration of patents, for example, or whether such rights might be claimed by an institution or subdivision?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to page 13, section 11, subsection (a), which provides for patents and the protection of individuals, as we conceived it to be covered by this type of bill. I quote from section 11:

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

It was felt by the committee that especially in view of the fact that we are dealing with basic science rather than applied science, there would be very few cases in which the patent issue would arise, but that when it did arise it would be protected by the contract made by the Foundation with the institution or individual concerned.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the information and express myself as satisfied that this is a proposal which can be of inestimable value to our generation.

Will the Senator state whether or not in his opinion there is any proper method established for the screening of applications so that there might be eliminated proposals from irresponsible sources, or what in the vernacular might be termed "crackpot" suggestions?

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the distinguished Senator that we made no legislative detailed rules, because we felt that the way in which the Foundation would be established, with 24 selected persons appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, was the wiser way to protect us in the screening process in determining what basic areas of research should be pursued by the Foundation. We felt that that was the best protection that could be given to the American people in the proper handling of the Foundation.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I notice one provision on page 11 which I think should be explained. I refer to the language in line 3, in which we say:

No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent.

I ask the Senator from New Jersey whether that means that the Foundation will maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel of all types, including those who have fellowships and scholarships.

Mr. SMITH. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Therefore the restriction that no individual shall be listed in such register without his consent means that no scientifically inclined person need participate unless he wishes to do so.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the correct explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Undoubtedly most of those who receive scholarships or fellowships would be listed anyway, with or without their consent.

Mr. SMITH. I think they would be listed automatically. Probably they would want to be listed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to state at the outset that I agree with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that this is an important piece of legislation. It is not only important, but it is one of the most important that will face this Congress. It seems a crying shame to me that yesterday afternoon, and again this afternoon, when a matter of the importance of this legislation is under consideration, affecting not only the safety of this country, but its health and welfare and prosperity, there should be present not more than a handful of Members of the Senate, who will vote on a bill about which they apparently know nothing unless they have studied it.

Mr. President, in my opinion the bill contains a few major weaknesses. The purpose of the bill is one which we can no longer avoid, one upon which we as a Congress must take action. The general purpose is the development in this country of a body of research scientists. Many persons look upon this bill as a step in the development of scientific research. What is scientific research? Scientific research has one foundation-stone, and that is the building of a body of persons capable of carrying it on, and the maintenance of that body of workers so that when the occasion arises the necessary research will be done.

Let us look at the problem from the military viewpoint. A new weapon may be developed tomorrow, the next day, or next month. We found that weapons developed 20 years ago were obsolete when we got into World War II. We discovered that the same thing was true even of weapons developed a year before. Anyone who doubts that statement should read the history of the famous Grant tank at El Alamein. Thus it should be clear that it is the personnel capable of going ahead with these projects that means so much to this country.

We have had a rather backward view of research. It has been purely commercial, dollar-conscious, nickel-conscious, penny-conscious. We led the world in applied research and applied engineering; but we have taken from others—from Germany, from England, from France, and from Italy—the basic ideals. We talk about the atomic bomb. The principle of atomic fission was discovered long ago. We made a spectacular application of it. The people of the United States think that we have the secret of the atomic bomb, but actually its basic principles were discovered in Europe originally, and other principles far in advance of those may be discovered any day abroad and the application which we have made may become obsolete. This is best illustrated by the fact that one of the principal questions in connection with this bill is that of dollar application. The theory of the bill, as it now rests, is that it is a bill for scientists. I do not say, to produce scientists; I say, for scientists. It is a bill for patents. What are patents? Patents are property; they are property rights in the things that are developed. But the minute the United States Government undertakes to apply to inventions the same principles that are applied by every commercial company in the United States, hands are thrown up in holy horror, and it is said that the people, as stockholders in the corporation, should not apply those principles, that, if they do, they cannot get to work for them such scientists as those who work for companies X, Y, and Z.

Let me refer to the history of this subject. There has been some talk about it. I have been engaged in an investigation of this subject since 1941. I have drafted, with the assistance of others, 11 or 12 bills seeking to bring this matter to a head. In the Seventy-ninth Congress we drafted a bill. After it was drafted we met in the old Military Affairs Committee room, across the hall from this chamber, with Dr. Bush, whose name has frequently been mentioned, Dr. Bowman, and various others. We prepared a bill which would produce the result upon which we agreed, and we agreed that the bill would work. The bill was brought to the Senate floor with the understanding that it was a compromise measure; it was a measure to which even the most inveterate opponents of monopoly could not object. It was only when Mr. Teeter, who sat opposite the Senator from New Jersey during the hearings, became active when the bill reached the floor of the House, that it was discovered that some people who

were in the meeting had welshed on their agreement.

The principle of this bill is of paramount importance, but the principle is not as yet adequately represented. The principle of the bill, I may say, Mr. President, is, first, the development in the United States of a group of research scientists. Let me define what I mean by that. It has been well defined by Dr. Bush, Dr. Jewett, Dr. Bowman, Dr. Conant, and various others, who stated in the hearings in the Committee on Military Affairs, which hearings apparently have not as yet been read, that no invention or discovery of real value in the basic sciences was ever made by persons over 35 years of age. The basic principles come from young scientists; the theory being, apparently, that when they are over 35 they become, so to speak, in a rut. Thus it means that if we in the United States hope to go ahead and maintain our place in the sun, we must have a constant flow of young scientists. We have woefully slipped in that endeavor. We drafted our young scientists during the war; we made infantrymen of them. We did everything with them except what should have been done.

Today we find ourselves at a blossoming period in the United States, devoid of most of our scientific students except those who were rated under a IV-F classification, those who are taking advantage of the GI bill of rights, and some who are endeavoring with their own private funds to get an education. We have lost at least 5 years, and we were woefully behind even before we lost those years. We were not keeping abreast of research. That is plainly evidenced by the fact that the country could afford to go into applied research only in the case of engineering work. Let me give the Senate an example. Penicillin was discovered in England long years before it was ever used in this country. We conducted applied research which produced a commercial method of manufacture. But all research has been dominated by one thing—commercialism, the dollar value. That is one thing we should get away from if we can, if we expect to progress. We have bought basic ideas from Germany, and in the buying of them we have surrendered our rights by entering into cartels. We have bought them from England, France, and Italy, and then we have gone ahead with engineering and merely applied them. They will return great benefits to us if we properly apply them, if we give to the young men and women of inquisitive and scientific minds a chance to get an education, if we encourage them to forge ahead and to advance into the unexplored fields of science, the great unknown. Dr. Bush called it the great frontier. No frontier can be adequately maintained unless we have a sufficient number of people to explore it, guard it, protect it, and to advance along the frontier when opportunity demands. Science is the great frontier, but unfortunately we have gone ahead only in those fields which paid dollar dividends. We have spent millions of dollars in discovering a new enamel for refrigerators that will not stain. I think it was the General Motors Corp. which devoted 12 months' time in research because an atmospheric condition in Baltimore caused the enamel on a refrigerator to stain. At the same time no effort was made to do certain other things which might have been done. I do not blame GMC. They are in business for money, and they must take care of themselves. We in the Government are interested in the welfare of all the people, and for that reason we must develop scientists and take care of them.

As I have stated, at the last session of the Congress the Senate passed a bill known as Senate bill 1850 which had been agreed upon as a workable bill, a bill under which we could do the greatest amount of development with the least amount of interference with private enterprise. That bill passed the Senate after a 4-day debate in which every point was discussed. It went to the House, where, due to various conditions, it died by a process of strangulation, I may say.

In the main I agree with the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for himself and other Senators, except as to certain operational necessities. I want to suggest one idea with regard to the bill. I do not want this bill to be a basis for loot and theft. I am going to be frank, Mr. President, and call a spade a spade. We must realize that the people of the United States—not merely a small group, but the whole people of our country—are going to support these efforts and have an interest in the results, if any are achieved. I agree with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the major portion of the processes and articles derived from this research, indeed, I should say 80 percent of it, will not in any sense of the word be patentable; but a certain percentage, particularly as pertains to the national defense, will be patentable.

In the past we have patented new inventions in connection with national defense, and have turned over the manufacturing rights in connection with them to certain private companies, that, in many cases, under cartel agreements, as is plainly shown by records in the possession of the United States Senate, have made such inventions available to foreign nations, and have received payment therefor, so that in those cases the results of Government research went for naught.

In the past our Government has developed other things for which private organizations have sought to take credit. For instance, let me refer to the processes for the hardening of woods. In this instance there was a great deal of newspaper publicity, in which credit was given to a certain private company as being responsible for the development of those processes, although they were actually developed by the Government. Finally the company which received the publicity apologized and said it was merely manufacturing under the processes perfected by Government scientists.

Mr. President, in this bill we should seek to avoid various mistakes which have been made in other cases. Nevertheless, in the first place, it was admitted by the Senator from New Jersey that under the bill the plan is to proceed by the trial-and-error method. It is useless to follow a trial-and-error method when we know that something is wrong. We had better cure it in advance; that is only common horse sense.

Mr. President, why do Senators think they were sent to Washington? Do our States send us to Washington as Members of the Senate and do they send Members of the House of Representatives to Washington, and merely give us a license to muddle through, to experiment with the people's money by means of trial-and-error methods? Or do the people send us to Washington to use the sense God gave us and the sense they think we possess; they may be making a terrific mistake about that, and sometimes I think they are, so that there may be a minimum of error and a maximum avoidance of the trial process; in short, so that we, the representatives of the people of the United States, may proceed to enact laws which will be so well considered in advance that in most cases a process of trial-and-error will not be necessary. I do not like the trial-and-error method, and I do not think the people like it. It is the little fellow who always suffers under the trial-and-error procedure; he is the one who is hurt, and who does not have sufficient money to hire the lawyers to protect himself.

As I have said, I have long been interested in scientific research and a Government scientific foundation. I have been working on it for a long time, even at times when it was almost dangerous to do so; at times when, if a man went into the McGraw-Hill organization or into other organizations of a similar nature and admitted that he was interested in a Government scientific research program, he would almost have been shot.

Mr. President, as we were told yesterday, the committee heard 150 scientists testify in regard to this subject. Let me say something which was not stated yesterday, namely, that the only one of the 150 scientists who testified in opposition to the bill was a very distinguished scientist by the name of Dr. Jewett, who is president of the Bell Research Laboratories, vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and at the time he testified was president of the National Academy of Sciences. All the other scientists who testified were in favor of the entire program proposed by the bill. For some reason, unknown to me, Dr. Jewett opposed it. However, he is, and has for a long time been, the leading figure in the National Academy of Sciences. I call attention to the section of the bill which provides that the National Academy of Sciences shall nominate—and probably dominate—the dollar-a-year board which would have control of the operations under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, recently, at a meeting in Washington of outstanding scientists representing the leading scientific societies of the United States, those at the meeting went on record by casting a number of votes in regard to the various provisions of this bill. I should like to state for the RECORD something with regard to those votes. According to the minutes of the meeting, which was held on February 21 of this year, a straw vote was cast, for instance, on the question of

the administrative set-up to be established. In that vote, 41 of an approximate total of 115 who were present voted in favor of having a single administrator. Only 22 voted in favor of a part-time board, which is suggested by the pending bill. Thirty-two were in favor of a full-time board, and 18 expressed no preference. That vote was on the question of the form of administration to be established. In my opinion, the provisions of the pending bill with respect to that matter constitute one of the weaknesses of the bill. As I have said, all those scientists testified that unless our Government took action to further scientific research, basic science in the United States would not advance beyond its present state, and in fact would deteriorate, because of the failure to train thousands of potential scientists.

Mr. President, during the past 5 years I have received a tremendous volume of correspondence on this subject. It has covered many details. I wish to direct the especial attention of the Members of the Senate to three principal items for which provision is made in the pending measure, because they are the principal points which have been raised in these discussions. Although I feel the utmost sympathy for the attitude of many of the writers, I also realize that if a Government proposal affecting the bar association were presented to a group of lawyers, they would tend to be highly critical and to take a stand in opposition; and it seems to me that we would meet with a similar situation in the case of a group of doctors or in the case of a group of farmers. We must remember that most of our scientists have spent their lives in universities or in private commercial laboratories. They have worked with or under research foundations administered by boards of trustees or directors, practically all of whom are hired for their business ability. In most instances, the men on those boards of trustees or boards of directors are appointed or elected to serve as trustees or directors of certain funds which private philanthropy has provided, or, in the case of Government, funds which have been dedicated to one direct objective, as was the case when the Congress recently appropriated $200,000,000 for research for the Army alone. I may mention also the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and others, in which research is carried on under certain specific directives. In order to utilize the funds, the board of trustees establishes an operating agency of scientists, usually at a university or in connection with a foundation, and then selects and hires an administrative head or officer to handle the business and administrative details. He, in turn, selects and hires the technical operating staff. That is the way these things are handled, and have been handled in the past.

In the business end, the men who handle the funds are specially trained for that purpose, and they select the technical men who say how the funds shall be spent, and what are the most worthwhile projects.

Mr. President, we are stepping into an unexplored field. Never before has this Nation thought of going into a project of research, which would seek unexplored fields and explore them, and in that operation pick out to be explored first the most important ones which would bring the greatest benefit in the shortest time. Never have we sought to develop the scientists to explore those fields. We have appropriated money to train soldiers, we have appropriated money to train various others; but never have we appropriated men to handle the most important part of the defense of this country, not only in peacetime, but in wartime.

Much was said yesterday about the various scientific organizations which have done magnificent work for the Nation, and I do not wish in any way to decry those organizations. In 1863, when the War Between the States was in progress, when the Union Army needed the utmost which could be provided by scientific development, which then was relatively small, President Lincoln first organized a group of scientists, and later a bill was passed creating the National Academy of Sciences. It functioned magnificently during the Civil War.

The Spanish-American War was relatively a minor skirmish, and not much along this line was needed. We were then experimenting with dynamite-throwing ships, but that was done by the Navy.

World War I came along, and a new organization was set up. Why did the Government set up a new organization? Why did it not continue the old organization, the National Academy of Sciences? It was because the National Academy of Sciences, born in the heart of a bitter war, which had done magnificent work in that war, had gradually become a society to honor leading scientists by electing them to membership. We had to get a new organization for World War I. We got one, and it did fine work in that war. But once the patriotic fervor and the patriotic demand of war ceased, just as in the case of the National Academy of Sciences, it retrograded to a peacetime status.

Then came World War II. We had the National Academy of Sciences, we had the organization which followed it. Nevertheless we had to create the Office of Scientific Research and Development, because the second organization had in turn become obsolete and obsolescent. In both cases no provision had been made to maintain an operating scientific agency, to pay people to see that progress was made. Once the fervor and the patriotism of war had passed, there was not much activity.

Oh, yes, we can submit a question to the National Academy of Sciences, and eventually, when they have had time to look into it, a group will be appointed to go into the matter, and then eventually, when the group has had time to operate, their suggestions will be submitted.

Mr. President, I do not blame them. Those gentlemen are busy. All of them are men of great scientific attainment. They are men who have to make a living. They have families to support. They have to keep progressing in the businesses in which they are engaged. A college president cannot leave his college every two weeks and journey to Washington, to spend several days looking over the minute details of operating a government agency. He may meet with others, and gladly will meet, for the formulation of general policy, but the details have to be neglected. He cannot find the time to meet others and lay down policies which will last for several months, unless they be very general.

Mr. President, let us go back to the year 1942, and read some of the reports of the War Investigating Committee and a few of the reports of other committees on the subject of dollar-a-year men, and the waste entailed by the utilization of dollar-a-year men, the waste entailed in war by the fact that we could not hire competent men, the men we needed, and put them on a full-time basis. I suggest that Members of the Senate go to the General Electric Co. and talk to Mr. C. E. Wilson, who gave up his position as president of that company, and came to Washington and worked for $9,500 a year, because he declined to be a dollar-a-year man. I have the utmost respect and love for Mr. Wilson; he is a splendid, patriotic American.

Talk to Donald Nelson, who was the head of the War Production Board. He did the same thing. Talk to a few others who declined to be part-time men, and, instead, accepted a bare living wage in order to devote their entire time to the Government service in Washington, and be cut off from other things. If Senators will talk to these men, they will understand to what I am referring when I speak of administrative questions.

So, Mr. President, the question of administration is important, because the previous, "part-time" administrations have failed, except in time of war. In time of war men will give their time to their government, and gladly give it, but in time of peace it is different. It is hard to get men who will devote the time necessary to enable them to go into the most minute details of operating an organization of the size and of the national importance of the proposed Foundation.

Russia has set up a program by which in 5 years she hopes to overshadow the rest of the world in the development of scientists, under a foundation which makes provision for sending potential scientists to school. If we would keep our place in the sun, we cannot depend on the basic research of Germany as we have in the past, we cannot afford to have our business and our defense efforts stultified by being compelled to buy their second-hand manufacturing licenses under their patents. We have to find new methods, new things, new men, and we have to develop the men who can function efficiently in this Nation.

As I said before, the scientists in colleges and universities have their work cut out for them. They are 7-day-a-week men. The scientists in the large laboratories, except the executive types, have their work cut out for them, and one of their first tasks is to see that their laboratories do not get into a jam by losing any patent rights.

We are looking after the Government. I care not how many men come from various corporations and ask me to protect the patent rights of corporations, I shall make the same answer I have always made, "I want to do the same thing for my Government, which is the greatest corporation in the United States of America, that you gentlemen do for the private corporations you represent." That touches on one feature which I think is a weakness in the bill.

Note that under the pending bill, if the Senate follows the recommendation of the committee, the Foundation is to be composed of 24 men selected by the President, from lists submitted by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, and the Association of State Universities, and such other scientific or educational societies as the President may wish to consult. I should like to ask that, at some time during the debate, my very distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey, place in the RECORD a list of all the scientific societies in the United States that could qualify under the pending bill. It would be interesting to see to what extent they interlock, and to see how many jealousies there would be.

Under the bill the Foundation in effect selects a director on a full-time basis. However, the director is answerable only to a select executive group of 9, who in turn are answerable only to a general group of 24, who in turn are answerable to nobody. I have observed similar groups in operation over a long period of time, and I have discovered that multiple groups may be extremely valuable on judicial questions, in advisory capacities, and in laying down general policies; but, when it comes to the employment of a man who is answerable only to such group, I find the multiple group does not function so well. Numerous experiences of governments, both State and National, in the past 25 years have shown the weakness of multiple groups. The same thing is true in respect to the employment of a part-time man, who may say, "I simply did not have time; I was simply too busy in the laboratory to investigate this matter thoroughly; I have to rely on the suggestions of John Smith, here."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator, out of his long experience, is able to cite any precedent for an organization of this particular type, connected with the Government?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I can think of no precedent in the Federal Government for this particular type of organization. There are, however, many general precedents, involving boards that have been established. I may mention as a fair precedent, the dual control of OPM, two men having been appointed to head the Office of Production Management. As a result, nobody ran it. Before that, there was a committee of five. If it had been left in the hands either of the two men or of the committee of five, with no responsibility on the part of a single individual, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I do not know whether by this time we should have been saluting the Rising Sun of Japan or the Cross of Hitler. In any event, we certainly would not have had any of the equipment which was so badly needed in the war. Every time poor old General Knudsen was jumped on he had the convenient excuse of blaming it on his associate, who had blocked him; and every time General Knudsen's associate was jumped on he had the convenient excuse of blaming it on General Knudsen. When it was handled by a committee of five, each one of the five was able to pass the blame on to four others. There was no responsibility to the Government on the part of any single individual.

Mr. President, let us not get away from the fact that, if we are to believe the Constitution, the Government of the United States consists of every citizen of the United States. We speak of the Government in Washington, or the Government in some other place. The people of the United States are the Government, and, when the people are paying the money and furnishing everything, certainly they must be entitled to an accounting by their elected representatives; they should not be left to a hand-picked group having no particular responsibility to the people.

I do not want the debate to be influenced by politics. What I am saying is that I do not want our action to be dominated by partisan politics. I realize that under present conditions that is to be avoided. I think that a President, answerable to the whole people, would and should be above that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I merely wanted to ask the Senator one question. I gathered from his statement that he considered the functions of OPM to have been cast in exactly the same mold as that provided in the scientific research bill. I entirely disagree with him. There is at this time a project of an entirely different kind to be carried out. What failed in the case of the OPM has nothing whatever to do with the present debate, and is entirely apart from the discussion.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey whether he can define the duties of the OPM and its predecessor, the National Council?

Mr. SMITH. All I can say is, I see no possible relation between OPM and the National Science Foundation. The point I make is that the argument is not relevant.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator from New Jersey know what the duties of the OPM were?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the duties of OPM were very similar to the duties of the National Science Foundation, proposed in the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH. I simply disagree with that.

Mr. KILGORE. The duties of OPM were, without contract, controls, or anything else, to obtain production, which is what the National Science Foundation is going to be required to do. The Foundation, without the ability to enter into ironclad contracts, or to draft people, and things of that kind, must produce scientists. It will have to do just as the OPM did. However, that is not the vital point. The vital point is that where there is a division of responsibility to such an extent that responsibility can be shifted from person to person there is never an acceptance of responsibility by anyone.

I refer to the pending bill:

> The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation.

Under that provision, the members of the executive committee become the agents of the United States Government.

> The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions within the Foundation any of its powers, duties, and functions.

It may, therefore, shift its responsibilities, if it so desires. It is a great buck-passing proposition.

> The executive committee shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the Foundation. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence.
>
> The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was interrupted a moment ago. What I had in mind was, in the field of applied science, an activity such as that of the Bureau of Standards, the general purpose of which, in a sense, is similar to what is being attempted by the pending bill. In agriculture a good deal of basic research has been performed; but as an administrative matter independent agencies have not been set up—independent, we will say, on the one hand, of the Secretary of Commerce, or, on the other hand, of the Secretary of Agriculture. The matter of the administrator's responsibility seems to me to be very important. It is the same as the problem with which the Senate struggled last year, at which time something in the nature of a compromise was reached, still retaining responsibility to the Government. That is the point I think should be made very clear.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. That is a correct statement of what was done last year. A method of selecting the administrator was determined, as a result of which he was made responsible. That was done with the view of obtaining his best services, while at the same time permitting scientific groups, through the suggestion of names, to have the utmost say in his selection. Responsibility was also placed upon the President of the United States, in order that he might not, as it were, shirk the responsibility of naming a well-qualified man.

Before I yield further to the Senator from Arkansas may I say that, in my opinion, the best illustration of that

situation is the Bureau suggested by the Senator, namely, the Bureau of Standards. Perhaps the Senator from Arkansas does not remember, but about 14 months ago I think every Senator and every Member of the House and many others were asked by the Secretary of Commerce if we could recommend an individual to head the Bureau of Standards. The reason was that the Director of the Bureau of Standards was about to retire and the Secretary wanted as his successor the best man among the top-flight scientists in the United States. He asked us if we could recommend such a man. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas received the same kind of letter I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. At that time I did not make a recommendation, but I was very much impressed by the way in which the Secretary approached the situation. He said, "I want the best man I can place in that position, a man who is both a scientist and an administrator." I believe he secured a good man for the position.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also believe he did. Will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have some sympathy with the argument that there should be no politics connected with the Foundation. We hear such statements on all sides. We hear such statements in respect to State educational institutions. I have had some experience along that line. I do not believe the answer is to try to cut out the influence of politics in connection with responsibility for a public institution. The only answer is to have good politics.

The Senator said something about nonpartisan politics, or whatever words he used. The word "politics" has through the years come to mean different things to different people, but basically I do not think the answer is to try to cut off politics. I do not think that is sound procedure, as the Senator has pointed out. So long as Government money goes to support an institution, and it is directed toward the public benefit, I myself do not see that it is necessary to divorce it from politics. There must be some trained responsibility at the head. We cannot legislate soundly if we do not secure good administrators. It is essential that good men be found to administer organizations which are directed toward the public interest. That is illustrated by what has happened in connection with the information service in the State Department. Everyone agrees that the information service in the State Department is a good thing, but some do not like the way it is administered, therefore they wish to abolish it.

Mr. KILGORE. Knowing that the Senator from Arkansas was once the head of an educational institution, I wish to cite to him a situation which might well be considered in connection with what we are now asked to do. Let us say that a man selected to administer an institution is not answerable to public authority, but is answerable to a nine-man executive committee. Let us say that, nevertheless, a legislative body may control him by threatening to cut or actually cutting off his appropriation. How would a university or any State educational institution be able to operate if the legislature, the Governor, or anyone else connected with the State government said to the administrator: "If you do not do just what we want you to do in connection with the institution of which you are the head, we are going to cut off the money needed for its operation"?

Mr. President, I have found that the average educational institution appreciates constructive views from Governors and State officials. When they make mistakes they want to have them called to their attention and they endeavor to correct them. They do not want to have the State funds cut off. The members of the board of governors of any educational institution who are appointed are usually laymen who are placed on the board to give advice, to find out how things are working, and see to it that certain things do not happen. A board of governors consisting only of college professors would not work well.

Senators may remember that the bill passed by the Senate last year contained a subdivision similar to the one contained in the pending amendment. It provided for a director, and for a board to serve under him consisting of men representing a cross section of the finest minds that could be found, and below the board we provided what might be called the college professors or deans. The bill provided for committees and divisions to plan all the scientific work. Then it provided for another individual who knew all the cross sections, who could come forward and say, "We think the work you are doing is fine. We will get the money needed, and stand back of you." Then the men who really controlled the policy down below, who did the work, felt safe in going ahead.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks and his suggestion. I think he is absolutely correct. Bad politics always interferes with successful operation of an institution. But I may say that, as the Senator well knows, our Government is run by politics. Politics is policy making. If politics were abolished, democracy would cease. We could not even have a republic without politics. Perhaps my good friends across the aisle might insist that we could. But I would say that we could not even have a Republican Party without politics. The Government is operated by politics. The better the politics the better the Government and the better off are the people. If politics should be abolished, what would we have? We would have totalitarianism or an oligarchy, because that is what comes from abolition of politics. Politics is necessary to the successful operation of a free government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sorry I was obliged to leave the Senate Chamber while the Senator from West Virginia was delivering his fine address, but so long as he is on the subject of the administration of the Foundation, I wish to say that yesterday, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas and myself, I submitted a sort of compromise choice between what is represented by the idea advanced by the Senator from West Virginia, as embodied in last year's bill, and the idea embodied in my original bill, and somewhat different from what is contained in the pending bill. After some conferences that proposal was found to be subject to amendment, and I have now prepared language which I desire to send to the desk and ask to have lie on the table. The amendment I propose reads as follows:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the Executive Committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving the recommendations of the Executive Committee, and he shall serve for a term of 4 years subject to removal by the President or the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year.

The only difference between the substitute proposal and the original proposal is that the original proposal provides that the Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President, and our proposal limits his term to 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I favor a full-time administrator. Under the present implementation of the bill provision is made for a full-time administrator who is responsible only to a committee of 9, and through them to a committee of 24. He serves, it is true, by appointment of the President and at the will and pleasure of the President, but he has to report only to the President, only once a year, and then the only thing the President can do, if he wants to do anything, is dismiss him. The only thing the Congress can do, if it wants to do anything, is to cut off the appropriation. There is no chance to place a check upon him because he is the servant of a small selected group, not the employee of the Government of the United States. We are subsidizing that group.

There is another thing appearing further along in the implementation which I do not like. I now am thinking of the plane on which the real scientific work must be done. Again going back to Dr. Bush's Science—The Endless Frontier, I wonder if we could defend a frontier, Mr. President, if the soldiers charged with its defense served whenever they felt like it and without pay. I well remember reading a book dealing with the Boer War which I always said contained the perfect illustration of how not to win a war. The book described soldiers who served in just that way. If the soldiers wanted to go visiting, they went visiting. The number one sentry, when he went on outpost duty, always took two servants and a feather bed with him. He and his servants rode out on their horses, and when they got to the outpost the servants immediately prepared the feather bed, and the soldier went to sleep on it, and

the two servants stood one at the head of the bed and the other at the foot of the bed, and if some one tried to come through the guard line the soldier was awakened, and since he possessed the only gun, he was the only one who could challenge. But if someone came up to the guard line and fired before the soldier was awakened, that was the end of that soldier. If we are going to defend the endless frontier and keep scientific exploration constantly proceeding, we cannot depend on part-time individuals in toto.

The bill which the Senate passed last year provided for a full-time deputy to coordinate the work of the committee, and to see that its members were called together and that they were operating in their own particular fields.

I think that is absolutely essential. It is not contained in the present bill. I do not see how any group can hope to function, can hope to carry on this exploration, can hope to maintain this frontier, can hope to eliminate useless projects and promote useful projects, if we have a committee which comes to Washington occasionally at the call of the chairman, a committee none of whose members are paid except, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], $50 a day when they come here. How can we operate in that way and expect to hold the frontier and carry on the exploration?

If I were not convinced that there are many scientists who are willing to accept the challenge of these full-time tasks, I would not support legislation to establish the Foundation. They may be willing to take over these jobs, but we cannot expect them to work for us and try to carry on another full-time job at the same time, and devote the necessary time to the task. If we agree that the National Science Foundation is to be a governmental agency rather than a quasi-public civic organization of some kind, and if we agree that the powers of such an agency must be vested in full-time Government employees with no responsibility other than to science and the Nation, we must still face the problem of the best form of top administration.

There are two general solutions to the problem of top administration. Both are known. Senators have heard both solutions described. We have one more. All the solutions have real advantages, and they all have disadvantages.

The first solution is that of having the President appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a single administrator in whom all powers of the agency are vested, and in whom all responsibilities are vested. This administrator, in turn, selects and hires other Government employees and his division chiefs. These, in turn, select their subordinates. Thus there is created a definite organization similar to the Department of Agriculture, which has done magnificent work in the research field with a like organization; similar to the Department of Commerce, which operates the Bureau of Standards so adequately; similar to the Department of the Interior, which handles mine safety and mine engineering so well, under Dr. Sayers. The same system is used in all Government departments and in bureaus of those departments. It has also been successful in many agencies of the executive branch of the Government. This agency must be a part of the executive branch.

The advantages of the single-administrator form of organization are clear-cut. He has all the responsibility for the success or failure of the organization. If it is satisfactory, he gets the credit. If it is unsatisfactory he takes the blame. Everyone working in the agency knows the responsibilities under which he works. If one division is not doing a good job, the man in charge of that division takes the blame.

The disadvantages of the single-administrator form are simply stated. It involves placing heavy responsibility in the hands of one man. If he is a good man, if he selects able administrative assistants and accepts their counsel in arriving at decisions, he will operate a good agency. Is not that true all the way through the Government, regardless of what party is in power and regardless of the period of time in which we were operating? That system has not produced a bad country. It has produced a country which you, Mr. President, and I would not wish to leave to become a resident of some other country.

That is the policy under which we have grown up, regardless of whether the President was a Republican or a Democrat. Regardless of the politics of Congress, there has always been on every Member of this body the responsibility to his own people. There has always been responsibility on the part of the chief of every bureau, upon the President, and upon all of us. There has always been one man on whom responsibility could be fixed. We know that if we vote wrong on the floor of the Senate the people of our home States will call it to our attention. They will not blame some other organization for our vote. They will not accept any such explanations. They will say, "Senator So-and-So did not vote in accordance with our interests."

If the President does something wrong, his is the responsibility. If the secretary in charge or the head of any Government agency does something wrong, the people will blame it on him.

But suppose we had five Presidents. Suppose we had a committee of Senators from each State, or a committee of Members of the House of Representatives. Where would the people place the blame? How many persons in the United States know the names of all the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a relatively small body? How many persons in the United States know the names of the members of the CAA or the CAB? But they all know the name of the head of a department, or they can find out in a hurry, and they can jump on him. They know who is President. They know who their Representative is, and who their Senator is. That is the reason for responsibility and credit, and that is what produces good government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The criticism which is advanced on the ground of politics is one-sided. Is not such criticism offset by the probability that there will develop, under the administration as established, a conflict of interest between the interests of the large board and the interests of the institutions which its members represent, institutions which are likely to be the agencies with which contracts are made?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, we never eliminate the question of the possibility of a conflict of interest—the possibility of political interference on the one hand if the member happens to be appointed and is responsible to the Government; or, on the other hand, a corresponding conflict of interest in the case of a man, we will say, from Massachusetts Institute of Technology who happens to be on the board. There will undoubtedly be contracts between the Foundation and MIT. Does the Senator feel that the member would not be influenced in the consideration of such a contract?

There is the element of interest which we often call politics, which will be in the picture anyway. On the other hand, there is the interest of the organizations with which the scientists who make up the board may be identified, institutions with which contracts will be made for research. So we do not eliminate that problem. We only shift it to a different field, where there is not the responsibility which would exist if the man were appointed by the Government itself.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. He has hit the nail squarely on the head. The responsibility of the single administrator to the Government, to the President, to the Congress, and to the people as a whole, rather than to a selective group of 9 or 24, who in turn are not known to the people, is much safer from the standpoint of the betterment of the program than would be his responsibility to a group of 9 or 24. There would be less chance of what we may call political maneuvering than there would be if the member were responsible only to a small group.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To make it clear, the 24 members, as I understand, will be selected from among the leading scientists of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nine out of ten will be from the leading institutions of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Either from the leading institutions of the country or the leading laboratories. They will have to be from one or the other category—from the private laboratory or the public laboratory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are the institutions with which contracts will be made.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So we are confronted with a very serious problem. Should the men who are to make contracts involving large sums of Government money have control over such contracts when they are identified with the institutions with which the contracts are

made, which institutions really pay them?

We have heard a great deal about the $1-a-year men who came to Washington during the war from the United States Steel Corp. They are alleged to have favored the United States Steel Corp. in contracts. In this instance we would have the case of a man from MIT, for example, who might favor MIT with a contract. That condition is inherent in any such situation, regardless of the honesty of the men involved.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those are natural feelings which people have. We do not avoid that question by establishing a board of pure scientists—I mean "pure" in character. That is an illusion. They may be the best kind of men, but they will be subject to the same sort of interests.

Mr. KILGORE. In reply to the Senator, let me say that I have yet to see a businessman who did not think that the company with which he was connected could do a better job than could any other company. I have never seen a college professor who did not think that his associates could do a better job of training students than could anyone else. I have never seen a Democrat who did not think his party was the best, and I have never seen a Republican who did not think his party was the best. It is human nature.

We must also realize that we are dealing with scholarships, fellowships, and the building up of schools, to a certain extent. All those things enter into it. Therefore the more general the control the better.

Another feature is the appointment by the President of a Foundation consisting of 24 members who, in turn, select an executive committee, all of them being on part-time. The President nominates a director who is answerable only to the Executive Committee which reports only once a year to the Congress. Then there is provision for a full-time board. I find that scientists are rather evenly divided on one of two things: Either a small full-time board appointed by the President, with a director, who devote their entire time to the work, or a director with a fairly sizable advisory board.

There is a second provision in the bill which I think is dangerous, and I want to go into that a little further when we debate it.

I also desire to call the attention of the Senate to a couple of other things. There has been, in my opinion, more misrepresentation on the question of patents than on anything else. The Senate is being led to believe that S. 1850, the bill originally passed last year, was an amendment to the patent law. I have had a great deal of experience with the question of patents and shop rights, as have had other Members of the Senate, during the war, and I had a healthy disrespect for the policies of the United States Government in respect thereto, and a very healthy respect for the policies of American business and various educational institutions with respect thereto.

Never have I attempted to modify the patent law. As a matter of fact, a clause was drawn to get away from any modification because the patent laws of the United States are now being criticized and are subject to modification if the committee ever gets around to it. But there was an effort made in the bill—and, in my opinion, there must be—to prevent the patenting of inventions perfected with Government money unless there is a contract which has been entered into covering the matter. That applies particularly to cases in which people making the inventions are on the public pay roll. In other words, the theory in S. 1850 was that John Jones agrees to do the work for which he is paid and not to patent anything he produces so that the results of his investigation and his research shall become public property. That is all S. 1850 ever attempted to do. This bill does not do that. One reason, I think, that this must be done is that every department of government has its own policy with reference to the subject.

In 1943 I went with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to Tucson, Ariz., to look over and investigate some complaints with reference to an airfield there. We discovered that one of the causes of the trouble was the fact that a foreman had stolen an invention perfected by a couple of other Government employees and had sold the right to patent to some "gadget" company in Ohio. That had disrupted the morale of the field. Of course, I will admit that the commanding officer was doing many things he should not have done, but it probably never would have stirred up any commotion had it not been for the fact that the foreman had stolen the patent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The foreman was not from Arizona, was he?

Mr. KILGORE. No. I will have to admit to the Senator from Arizona that the foreman was an importation to his fair State. The only thing I checked up to see was whether he came from my State, and the Senator from Michigan checked up to see whether he was from his State, and we dropped it at that. But I know he was not from Arizona.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He probably picked it up after he got there.

Mr. KILGORE. I should not be surprised.

Mr. McFARLAND. Possibly he picked it up on the way through Arkansas.

Mr. KILGORE. It is said that everything in Arizona has thorns on it—the cactus, and even the toads—and the thorns pick up things. Of course, I am not referring to the human beings there; I have not seen any thorns on them. Of course, this is all in the spirit of levity.

There is nothing contained in the amendment I have offered which deals with patents, other than to forbid them. If Senators will read the history of the patent monopoly in vitamins, particularly viosterol, they will find it very interesting. Every mother in this country knows the terrific price paid for it. Its purpose is to prevent rickets in children. The invention was made by a couple of scientists on the public pay roll, and the result of their invention was turned over to another group who eventually capitalized on it to the tune of millions of dollars at the expense of American children. It developed in the Supreme Court of the United States that it was not an invention at all; that the humble farmer, in curing his hay, had long ago discovered it—the sunshine vitamin. In the meantime, thousands of children in the United States had died of rickets and malnutrition because the price of the vitamin was placed too high.

Mr. President, I could go on for the remainder of the afternoon, tomorrow, and the next day citing examples. The only thing that my amendment seeks to do is to prevent people who are working for the Government from patenting anything unless their contract provides for it. It is in order to provide a uniform standard, so that a man working for the Department of the Interior is in the same situation as a man working for the Navy Department or the War Department or any other department. There are cases where people are paid for developing something and then have to pay someone a bonus for using what their money developed.

That, Mr. President, is the second one of the objections I have. It is all left up to the discretion of the nine-man board and the director. They can do anything they want to. They can take the funds of the United States Government and permit anyone a patent except one of their own number.

I suggested to some of the proponents of the bill that it be so amended that no one operating with Government funds could patent any invention.

Let me tell the Senate of the attitude of a private corporation. I shall call names. I will say du Pont, Union Carbide and Chemical, Hayden, or any other research organization in the United States. A man doing research work for a railroad, for instance, signs a contract, before he starts, that all the results of his work shall be forthwith patented by him and the patent sold to the company. I think du Pont is very generous. It gives $25, but the rest of the companies, I believe, give only $1. The employee understands that situation, yet he does good work. Nevertheless, I have heard it stated here on the floor of the Senate that financial gain was the incentive for the work done by scientists. Such statements are not true, and scientists should vehemently deny them. I have found that a scientist who is worth his salt will work for the pride of accomplishment and for the record to be gained, and he will work in order to be able to feel, down in his heart, that he has done a good job and has accomplished something for science and something for the people of his country. His feeling is similar to that of any good Member of Congress, whose reward is, and should be, a statement at the end of his term, "Well done, good and faithful servant." That is all the scientists want, as I have observed them.

As I said yesterday, they are an underpaid group of people. Sometimes I have laughed at the comparison which is to be made, upon examination of Poor's Manual and other financial manuals, between the salaries of vice presidents of

large corporations who are in charge of research and development and the salaries of vice presidents of such organizations who are in charge of the legal divisions, for in making such comparisons we readily observe that the vice presidents in charge of the legal divisions usually receive salaries three times as large as those received by the vice presidents in charge of research and development. Yet the men in research work are usually well satisfied and happy, and they do a good job. So, Mr. President, it is completely inaccurate to say that their primary motive is one of financial gain.

I wish to take up another matter at this point, and I consider it one of most serious import. I state with the firmest conviction that there is one prime purpose behind this bill, and it is the development of research scientists of the first order. As I have previously stated, eminent scientists, including such men as Dr. Jewett, Dr. Conant, and Dr. Langmuir, tell us that the young scientist is the real basic research man. So it is from the young scientists that we shall obtain our dividends, and it is upon them that the national security will depend in case of another war. The men in that group will be the ones who will maintain our economic security and our prestige as the leading industrial Nation of the world. They will be the ones who will help maintain our leadership in world affairs. If we fail to develop such a group of men, we shall fail to achieve our other objectives, because the nation which can produce a vast group of young men and women who are capable of forging ahead in the development of new ideas for new things and new processes and new substances, will be the leading nation of the world, particularly in view of the fact that the world is becoming more and more short of natural resources.

So, Mr. President, the primary objective of the bill is the training of such young people; and in that connection, one of the basic needs is some place in which to train them, some place to which they can be sent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question or for a short statement, but I do not yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is not the purpose for which I am asking the Senator to yield. He is making such a splendid and instructive address, that I feel there should be a greater number of Members of the Senate present to hear him. Will the Senator yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KILGORE. Very well; I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent, in that connection, that the Senator from West Virginia shall not lose the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if I yield for that purpose, will I lose the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from West Virginia can make his second speech, following the quorum call.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Chair, because I have developed only one-third of my remarks, and after the quorum call I shall wish to proceed with the remainder of what I have to say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hawkes	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated, and then I shall discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, before line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section 12, and to renumber all ensuing sections:

MANDATORY AMOUNTS TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE VARIOUS STATES

"SEC. 12. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research and development activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: One-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census, of the amount apportioned to each State at least one-half shall be expended only for carrying on research and development activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements made by the Foundation under this section. The balance of the amount for each State shall be expended only in nonprofit colleges or universities in the States. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research and development projects but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless it submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may, after receiving the advice of the Board, establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I desire to discuss the amendment briefly. As I stated before, the primary purpose of the pending bill is the development of competent research workers, with a view to the research work they will do, and the resultant benefits to both American and world civilization. In order to accomplish that purpose, there must be a wider distribution of activities under the bill. A greater number of research institutions must be developed. In other words, the research work must not be allowed to be concentrated in a few institutions. Most of the institutions are State-financed and State-owned; or, as has been repeatedly shown on the floor of the Senate, the institutions are under-financed.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to assure the development of institutions where young men and young women may receive proper training to qualify them in scientific research, whether the students receive the training under scholarships or as the result of working to obtain the necessary funds with which to attend the schools.

The agricultural colleges have been greatly benefited by the tremendous strides made by the Department of Agriculture in the development of its program. They have cooperated with State educational institutions in developing scientific farmers—young farmers, if Senators please—who have stepped up the production on farms of the United States. The pending measure will extend that type of service in the fields of industry, public health, and various other fields. The number of institutions carrying on this type of work must be expanded. If the bill becomes a "pork barrel," by which a few people hand out money to institutions with which they care to deal, we shall have conditions similar to those which were experienced in the war. I am not criticizing anyone, but the Government agencies had a very limited number of institutions with which to deal. I received constant complaints from engineering colleges throughout the United States and State universities that they could not obtain a part of the research work distributed by the War Department, or by the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and that all such work was being done in a small, hand-picked group of schools, four or five or six of them at the most.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But is there not a great difference between the conditions in wartime and in peacetime? There might be justification in time of war, when there is a necessity for getting results immediately, or within the shortest possible space of time, but such justification may not exist, where there is a long-range program, having in mind not only the work ultimately to be carried on, but

the ability to engage in research work in various institutions. Is there not a great distinction?

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator for his suggestion, because that is the point I am trying to emphasize. We were handicapped during the war and, while I received many complaints, the departments were always able to answer that only at a certain limited number of places were there people who were qualified by training to carry on the particular work. I want to see such training carried on in every State of the Union. I may say, and I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who has had experience in education, will bear me out, that training in research is an indispensable part of the equipment of any teacher in higher education, and that the teacher who is able to conduct independent research makes the best type of teacher obtainable. Training in research is indispensable even to the teacher of law. He must be able to conduct independent research in connection with principles of law. In every branch of education, the men who are to become leaders in the training of our young men must have opportunities such as those to be provided under the pending measure.

The wartime policy was based upon the necessity of accomplishing a great deal in a very short space of time. The proposed program is calculated to accomplish a great deal, but in a much longer time. Therefore, the procedure which was found necessary in time of war should not be considered necessary in connection with the proposed National Science Foundation. Every institution that cares to participate in the program should be allowed to do so. All the competent teachers are not to be found within merely a few large institutions. One of the best engineering students in the country came from a little crossroads college in the State of Colorado. He has made an outstanding record in the University of Chicago. That is true of other smaller institutions; they produce exceptional students, but they lack facilities, and the students continue their work in the larger schools. The students feel that only in the larger institutions are they able to find facilities for proper research work, and that it is only in the larger institutions that they may advance sufficiently to become teachers and leaders, and to achieve results in keeping with their mental qualifications and the concentration of their efforts.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not collect that, as the bill is now written, it provides for a Foundation composed of 24 men, to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, for 8-year terms? After confirmation by the Senate and the beginning of the 8-year term, there is no longer any control, or anything of the kind, so far as either the President, the Congress, or the Government is concerned. Is not that true?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. As the bill is now written, the Foundation, consisting of 24 men, names an executive committee of 9 men; the 9 men being chosen from the membership of 24?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Then, as the bill is now written, the director is named by the membership of 24. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; and, if I may interrupt, the director reports to the President only once a year as to what has been accomplished.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to correct a misunderstanding? On page 2, paragraph (b) the bill reported by the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Alabama is a member, provides as follows:

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 8 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

(2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 6 at the end of 2 years, 6 at the end of 4 years, 6 at the end of 6 years, and 6 at the end of 8 years, after the date of enactment of this act. No person who has served as a member of the Foundation for more than 4 years shall be eligible for reappointment as a member until the expiration of 4 years after the termination of his previous term

The whole purpose of that is to prevent the kind of permanency which has been criticized by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. But each gets an 8-year term. Of course, I understand that, to begin with, it is sought to stagger the appointments; but, if a man gets a 2-year appointment in the beginning, he can have an 8-year term afterward, can he not?

Mr. SMITH. Conceivably, he might have a 6-year term.

Mr. HILL. He might have another 8 years; and, after he once gets his 8-year term, there is no control at all, is there?

Mr. KILGORE. Except by refusing an appropriation, if I may say so.

Mr. HILL. Of course, Congress will not do that, because Congress will be very much interested in the Foundation. The point I am making is that, as the bill is now written, the full say, control, authority, and power is entirely in the hands of the 24 men. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that it was intended that the center of gravity of the whole bill should be in the hands of the 24.

Mr. HILL. The bill makes that very clear. What the Senator from West Virginia by his amendment seeks to do is to place some limitation in the bill so as to make certain that all the funds shall not go to a few institutions or to a few places. Is that not correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That is, the amendment would limit what would otherwise be the unlimited discretion of the Foundation. Is that not correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That is what the Senator proposes in his amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The only thing in connection with the Senator's amendment to which I object is that it departs from the theory of establishing the best possible research plan we can establish. Take the cancer division which is proposed to be placed under the National Foundation. So far as I can understand, the general opinion is that there are not more than 10 institutions in the United States sufficiently equipped to do substantial work in the field of cancer. That means that 38 States would not come under the cancer provision. I do not know in which States the 10 institutions are, but if we are concerned about getting the best possible research development it seems to me we must go to those places which are adequately equipped with personnel and technical equipment, but particularly personnel. If Senators insist upon State by State distribution it seems to me that a very large part of the money will be wasted which should be used for the development of a general research program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I see considerable merit in what the Senator from Ohio has just said. I do not know whether there is some other basis on which to work out the plan which would be better than the basis suggested by the Senator from West Virginia in his amendment. I do not know why we should follow a State by State plan, or a plan fashioned along geographical lines, but I think there is danger in giving wide discretionary powers to the Foundation, for it may result in too great concentration by the Foundation in its allocation of funds to a very few institutions and to a very few places. I should like to see a safeguard provided against such a danger.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield, but I should like to have an opportunity to answer the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest then a supplemental view respecting that question, that if such a situation should develop—and I do not think it possibly could develop, for I cannot conceive of the 24 men being influenced by any purpose except to obtain the best possible research work in the various fields of science—but if it should so happen that the members of the organization seemed to be unduly influenced, they could always be hedged around by some sort of condition placed in the appropriation bill, if in some year it should develop that such an abuse were developing. But I think it is hardly possible to conceive of such a thing.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that under the Reorganization Act the Senate now is restricted and limited in the matter of hedging, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, by placing limitations in appropriation bills. The Senate

does not now have the same latitude it enjoyed in the past, because the Reorganization Act very definitely restricts and limits it so far as placing conditions on appropriations is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I think that even under the Reorganization Act conditions can still be attached respecting the purpose for which the money is to be used.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say further in connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said, that men necessarily think in terms of their experiences, their personal knowledge and their environment. These 24 men, coming from particular institutions or from particular surroundings, are naturally going to think in terms of those institutions and of those surroundings. A distinguished governor of Alabama once served for a short time in the Senate of the United States—the late Governor B. B. Comer. One of his favorite words was "environment." Men are naturally, subconsciously, we might say, influenced and swayed by the environment in which they live, by the environment from which they came. It is only natural to think that these 24 men will be very much influenced, very much persuaded, by the environment from which they come. They will know that environment, and they will be aware of its problems; they will know the pressures, the needs, the demands of their environment, but they may not know the demands, the pressures, and the needs of the institutions and sections outside of their own environment. If there were something in the bill which would safeguard against such a danger as some of us envisage, if we could make a little more sure that the money will be used more on a national basis, with the whole country in mind, it would be well. It would be a very wise and much-desired thing to do.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say something in line with what the Senator from Alabama has just said. We had a perfect illustration of what he has spoken of during the war. As Senators know, during the war mica was used for insulation, for resistance purposes, I may say, in many electronic instruments manufactured for use in airplanes and submarines and otherwise. We had for years yielded to the British idea of ocular appeal, that if mica was clear and free from visual cracks it could be used for resistance purposes in the electronic instruments, but if it was spotted or clouded it was of no use in such instruments. That included all the mica mined in the United States. The British idea of ocular appeal was accepted, and it so happened that the only mica of that type came from India and South Africa, and it cost us $3,000 a ton for shipment alone. A certain young engineer connected with the United States Government decided that if mica was to be used for resistance, why not test it with electricity and see whether the mica mined in the United States could not be used. He went to our Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards listened to his presentation and said his idea and scheme were fine. They said, "We will have to build some machinery and test the mica. We do not have an appropriation to do so. Go down to the Office of Scientific Research and Development." So he went down to OSRD. It so happened that the man who had to pass on the question came from the Bell Research Laboratories, and with perfect human characteristics he said that the only place where that matter could be worked out was the Bell Research Laboratories. As a result the problem was sent to the Bell Research Laboratories. There were men in our own Bureau of Standards who said they could work out the problem within 60 days. A machine was perfected which showed that our mica was just as good as the British mica. But at that time the test had to be made at the Bell Research Laboratories because the men to whom the problem was submitted came from those laboratories. The Bell Laboratories man was sincere. He had worked in the laboratories. He was imbued with the idea that the men in those laboratories were the only men who really knew electronics and could conduct the tests successfully.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of any youth who went to college who, when he graduated and left it, did not feel that, after all, though it may not have been the richest college and may not have been the greatest, it was just about the best college in the United States? That is the spirit of those who leave college, is it not?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would compel the apportionment of the money available in equal portions for every type of research?

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no; nothing whatsoever, I may say to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. In other words, the States could be picked out for the work which their institutions might be best equipped to carry on?

Mr. KILGORE. I will explain that a little later. That will be found in the wording of the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not true that some States have institutions equipped to perform certain types of research work?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I contend that there are certain types of work that the institutions in the State of Arizona are better equipped to do than those of other States. So the argument of the Senator from Ohio falls by its own weight.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arizona for pointing that out. I had intended to enter that field of discussion, and I shall do it now. First, however, I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I appreciate the sincerity of his suggestion, but I should like to call one historical fact to his attention. When we were young I believe everyone in the northern part of the United States, when something became seriously wrong with him, went to Johns Hopkins in Baltimore to have his case diagnosed. Later there was a school established in Louisiana known as Tulane University, which had a couple of large hospitals connected with it, and many persons, when they became ill, went to the hospitals connected with Tulane University. Then a couple of brothers by the name of Mayo built a clinic in Minnesota. We heard about the Mayo Clinic, and people started going there. Then the University of Virginia gradually built up, and people began to go to hospitals in Charlottesville, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] knows. In the home town of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], there grew up the Cleveland Clinic. All this shows that such programs spread with proper opportunity.

Mr. President, this bill does not provide an arbitrary distribution of all funds. It is not arbitrary in the least. It provides that 25 percent of certain types of funds shall be distributed in order to make sure that every school has an opportunity to do what it can do best, and to develop itself in that field, so as to obtain the distribution we need. If we are to rely on doing all our engineering at MIT, if another war comes along all the enemy will have to do will be to blow up MIT, and we shall be out of the war. If we limit it to MIT and the Sheffield School at Yale, we shall be in the same difficulty. We might branch out and limit it to MIT, Sheffield, Harvard, and Princeton. We would still be in trouble.

As was well stated by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], every State has scientific and technical problems. The problems of my State lie in the field of coal, oil, natural gas, and related matters requiring geological research, investigation of various sands, and so forth. A great deal of excellent research work can be done in that State along those lines.

The State of Kentucky is in the same situation. The State of Florida is interested in a number of things. All the States have programs which they can further. This amendment provides one thing to which I wish to call attention. We do not arbitrarily dish out the money to the schools and the States. We do not arbitrarily hand them so much and say, "Do as you please with this. This is only a little subsidy." Under the terms of the amendment, which is carefully worded, the institution involved must first submit to the scientists a comprehensive project and program, showing what they can do by way of research, and much money will be required. Then and then only can they be assigned definite work to do, a definite part of the program. There is an incentive to build up. There may be an incentive to spread cancer research a little more widely, because I find that people in my State suffer from cancer too. Regardless of the perfect health of the inhabitants of my State, they occasionally have lung trouble, and also a little heart trouble.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator indicated one of the answers to the observation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In a program such as cancer research, the Senator's amendment would not require that even 25 percent of the

cancer funds be distributed among all the States. That is an over-all requirement as to the entire program. I think a somewhat fuller answer is required.

I think the Senator is quite right as to the part of the program designed to achieve immediate results in the way of physical inventions or discoveries; but equally important is the development of further facilities. As I conceive this program, I am sure that that is part of it, as indicated by the provision for scholarships, study, and so forth. That part of the program is not designed to produce immediately a new bomb or a new kind of nuclear fission. A very important part of the program is to give an opportunity to talented people in many parts of the country who cannot attend the large institutions. Within the past month I have received numerous requests for assistance in getting constituents into large schools. I am sure that other Senators have had similar requests. I have received several with respect to MIT. I received one today for Columbia. I have received 20 or 30 such requests. Almost without exception they cannot get into those schools.

No one will deny that the genius of this country is that brains can be found anywhere, in any part of the country. It is true that in past years, after a person had been discovered to have conspicuous abilities, the tendency was to drift into the larger communities where the rewards were greater. I think that is true today. But it is very difficult to continue that process.

It seems to me that it is important, for the long-term future, to provide an opportunity to discover and bring to the fore unusually gifted individuals in the States. I would not favor a program under which all the funds must be divided in this way; but the restriction applies to only 25 percent, with the further proviso that if a State presents a program, that program may still be turned down as not being acceptable. I believe that the development of young scientists in the future, who may grow up in any part of the country, is an essential part of the program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I wish first to answer the Senator from Arkansas, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The 25-percent limitation applies to such funds as may be appropriated for the Foundation. If money should be turned over by the War Department for special research, the 25-percent restriction would not apply to such funds. If money for cancer research should be contributed, the 25-percent restriction would not apply to it. It would apply only to money appropriated for the general use of the Foundation. The purpose of the Foundation is development. The proviso is very clear. A minimum of one-half of the money apportioned to be used in the States shall be used in land-grant colleges and State-owned institutions. There is some laxity there. If the land-grant colleges and State institutions have the facilities and the program, the entire amount can be given to them. Anything that is left may be used in nonprofit, privately owned institutions in the State.

The reason for this provision is that the State universities and land-grant colleges have always carried on programs of scientific training, to a much greater extent than have privately owned nonprofit institutions. The land-grant colleges have carried on agricultural and engineering programs in the States. In fact, they were subsidized for that purpose by the Federal Government. That was the reason for giving them first priority. If they could not absorb the amounts allotted for their projects, any balance would go to nonprofit schools.

The reason for the 25-percent limitation was that 75 percent would be utterly free, to be used anywhere—to be sent to a private laboratory if it were necessary to work on a serum or on a weapon for the Army, to work on a new development in engines, or something of that sort. But only 25 percent is set aside for the development of places to train those in whom we are primarily interested, the scientists.

The amendment also provides that the Foundation itself must decide whether or not each institution is capable of carrying out its program, and whether or not it has a proposal.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Let us assume that the appropriation will be $20,000,000 the first year. Perhaps that is all that can be used from year to year. The $20,000,000 is to be divided into little pieces. This organization is not to be engaged in research in general. It will confine itself to particular subjects of research; and to conduct research into those particular subjects it will be necessary to go to the particular places where there are scientists who know something about the particular subjects. If it is desired to train workers in a particular field, they must be sent to the places where there are those who know something about that subject. The $20,000,000 would be divided into many small pieces. Twenty-five percent of $20,000,000 is $5,000,000. By the time we are through, many States may be entitled to only $10,000. For what? It will not be a bit of help in the particular research in which the Foundation is then engaged. It will be that much money thrown away.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I take issue with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. The purpose is not to build up a great many colleges all over the United States, or enable them to increase their facilities. This country is in need of research development in connection with the different problems which it wishes to solve. In the case of half the States the money for particular projects, so far as the interest the Foundation has in them is concerned, would be wasted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if this work is worth doing—and I think that all of us agree that it is—it is worth doing well. The fault is not to be found in the method of allocating the funds as proposed by the Senator from West Virginia and others, including myself, but in the total inadequacy of the amount provided. I certainly should hope that in such an important matter as this, on which the fate of this country and the welfare of its people may depend, we will not be niggardly in the future in appropriating for this purpose. I do not believe that the work can adequately be done for $20,000,000, but I think that is much better than nothing at all, which is what we have today. I believe we should provide an adequate appropriation, possibly eventually ten times $20,000,000. When it comes to passing along the amount allocated to the State colleges and other colleges where the work is more concentrated, it should be sufficient to contribute materially to the objective which we seek, which is the highest development of scientific research, particularly basic research.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to one thing which no Senator has before mentioned. The boys who have come back from the service are, for the most part, intensely interested in scientific research and development. Sixty-one percent of the GI's who are benefiting through the GI bill of rights in securing a higher education are attending State-controlled institutions. Thirty-nine percent of them are attending private institutions. I think that fact alone should convince us that we should make a reasonable amount of this sum available to colleges in every State. I do not regard that as a distribution of funds at all. I advocate it simply because many of the greatest inventions in our time have come from sparsely settled rural areas, from the poorest States of the Union. The benefits become concentrated and manufacturing becomes concentrated in large centers of population, but many of the inventions have come from rural areas. In my own State the Fairbanks scale was invented and developed and is still manufactured there, and John Deere, who was the father of modern farm machinery, started from scratch in a small Vermont town. Many machine-tool inventions have come from a plant of which my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] was president for a long time. The plant is located in a small Vermont town. The boys and girls from small towns and from farms are often of a more inventive nature—because they have to be—than some of their brothers and sisters who are raised under more auspicious conditions and with what would seemingly be a better opportunity in life. So I do not think that we are doing wrong in allocating to all the States money which can be concentrated in half a dozen scientific colleges. We have established the policy of giving boys and girls from all sections, even the poor sections of our country, an opportunity to share in the benefits and to make their contribution toward bettering their country, and the whole world, for that matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement on this matter?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield for a short statement.

Mr. SMITH. I want to try to iron out what seems to be the confusion which seems to have arisen in the discussion at the moment. I am a member of the committee along with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I share with him the feeling that all our young people must be given equality of opportunity in educational areas. This bill has not that objective. It is primarily a bill providing for basic research in the sciences, to find the projects in the field of science which should be pursued in the national welfare. We have discussed the matter for 2 years. We have provided for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded by a special division of the Foundation in any part of the United States where promising young scientists appear. We have had the question up time and time again, and we finally decided that the way to deal with it was to have a Foundation of sufficient size, whose members should be appointed by the President, that would represent all corners of the country, so that the Foundation would be able to determine where the basic projects were and where were the promising young scientists. Therefore in section 3 of the bill it is provided specifically that—

> The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences—

This is the important point—

> Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

We felt that the best way to deal with the question which we are discussing now was to put the responsibility on a group of eminent persons—they are not all scientists; some are in public affairs—who would search the country over from one end to the other to discover what are the basic steps in science which should be pursued and subsidized by the Government, and, secondly, to locate promising young persons who should be given the aid needed in order to develop science.

I submit that we have come to the right decision in not making the distribution on a State-wide basis and putting the responsibility in the group which the President appoints to make the selection both of projects and of the young people we want to train in this field.

I think that is the main issue in this immediate discussion, and I cannot see the justification for feeling that through this bill we should try to aid institutions all over the Nation, much as I favor that. We are dealing with that question in other bills in other ways. This bill is aimed to develop basic research in fundamental science.

I will add also, if I may——

Mr. KILGORE. I did not know that the Senator was going to make a speech.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield, there is one provision to which I should like to call attention in this connection. It was suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is greatly interested in the subject and who is not here today. We wrote into the bill, on pages 18 and 19, at his suggestion, this paragraph which I should like to read in order to show that we were carrying through the idea of finding areas of research.

Paragraph (h) of section 15 reads as follows:

> (h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The point is that we want a selected approach to this subject, and not a wide, general approach, distributing funds all over the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful that I have finally "smoked out" the ultimate objective of the proponents of the bill, which strengthens my efforts to have these amendments adopted. I say to you, Mr. President, the opinion that has just been stated by the Senator from New Jersey is not the opinion which prevails in the colleges and universities and among the educators of the United States, and the representation the Senator from New Jersey has just made is not the one which has been made to them by Dr. Bush or Dr. Conant or Dr. Bowman or various other of our outstanding scientists. The aim and purpose which have been stated by the Senator from New Jersey are not the ultimate aim and purpose of the Foundation as represented to the public at large. If the ultimate aim and purpose are as stated by the Senator from New Jersey, then the pending bill, if enacted, will represent the biggest steal that has ever been perpetrated, and I say that advisedly. If the results of the research and invention that are to be carried on and developed by the use of Government funds are to be patented for private gain, what will the result be? There has been no resistance to any proposed prohibition against the taking out of private patents based on the results of the proposed research. Also, Mr. President, what will we do when the research men of today, whom we now favor so much, die? Where will the new group of scientists come from? Are we to presume that the brains of this world are to be found only in a few places? I admit that some people think so, but I deny it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I refuse to yield. I have already yielded for too many speeches. I shall conclude my remarks in a few moments.

Mr. President, the proposal is that only 25 percent of the total fund be used for the development of scientists who will carry on a long-range program. Apparently, we are still proceeding under the impetus of some war thoughts which made the National Academy of Sciences ineffective, and made the Research Council of World War I ineffective, and made the Office of Scientific Research and Development ineffective in the last war, because those organizations sought results in the way of inventions.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that the Congress of the United States is not simply trying to have certain inventions and discoveries made. I do not think that is what we should seek to achieve. I think our principal objective is to develop a group of scientists who will be able to make inventions and discoveries. I think we should treat fairly these allegedly incompetent State educational institutions, which some persons seek to discredit and disqualify. If I were to propose that 25 percent of the fund be given to the States, I would be doing exactly what some persons claim as the purpose of the bill—namely, to give these funds to a few selected groups.

Mr. President, the Senators who now are opposed to my views admit there will be no general participation. As a result, we now can see that if they have their way, there will be no general distribution in regard to the membership of the proposed boards. If that is the purpose of this measure, I shall join in the war cry of the Senators on the other side of the aisle in 1946, who shouted to the high heavens, "No more subsidies"—because if those on the other side of this issue have their way all this bill will provide will be a subsidy for present profit, rather than a fund to be used to build up a cadre and personnel of scientists who can make real progress in the advancement of science for the United States, to make and keep the United States the outstanding Nation of the world in respect to scientific progress and invention. Mr. President, such progress will not be made if we begin by looking for a few new drugs or a few doorbells or some new mouse traps or a new rat poison or a few new serums; for under a similar procedure, later on we would find, as we did during the last war, that we had obsolete tanks and obsolete airplanes. In the last war, the only thing that saved us, and that was not obsolete, was the American boy. Thank God, Mr. President, he had brains because he came from all over the United States. He was not obsolete; he kept abreast of developments because he had intelligence. If we had waited for the veterans of the First World War to win the Second World War, using the inventions developed in the First World War, the United States would have lost the war. But with our boys, using the adaptations and implementations of foreign research, we developed the tools and the machinery with which we won the war.

Now we are trying to win the peace and to build up a peaceful army of scientists. If we confine to one or two institutions the recruiting depots for that army, God help the United States of America, Mr. President. If in connection with this bill, we depart from the proper policy and principle, we shall have deceived the honest scientific societies and educational societies, so far as this bill is con-

cerned, and we shall have foisted upon the American people an improper thing.

So, Mr. President, I desire to move the adoption of this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who wishes to discuss the amendment for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield the floor?

Mr. KILGORE. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from West Virginia, as I understood him, stated that by not distributing the proposed fund to all the States the promising students in certain States will not receive proper consideration. Mr. President, let us consider this matter realistically. For instance, let us consider a student in a university in the State of Vermont, to which the Senator from Vermont has referred. Let us assume that the student is one whom the Government seeks to train in medical sciences. Then the question should be, What is the best way to make him a research man in medical sciences? The obvious answer, in all probability, is that he should not be left in the State of Vermont, but should be sent to Johns Hopkins or to one of half a dozen leading medical schools in the United States. That, of course, is where the boy himself would wish to go. If he wanted to become a research man in the physical sciences, he would wish to go to the University of California or to one of half a dozen other outstanding institutions which deal with that particular field; and a similar situation would apply to other fields. Such a procedure would not be discrimination.

On the other hand, if instead of following that procedure, an attempt were made to build up in Vermont a research medical institution where he could be taught to be a research man, and if corresponding attempts were made in all the other States of the Union, the total cost would be 100 times as much, and in the long run the education such young men received would not be the education and training they wished to have.

In many fields, Vermont may have the proper institutions to which we would send men from other States. But the idea that it is necessary to distribute this money by States, in order to develop research, seems to be entirely mistaken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Washington has the floor, but while I am on my feet I wish to say that the Senator said his purpose was to establish a proper environment. My whole purpose in connection with this bill is the establishment of environment, and now the question is whether it will be a scientific environment or a political environment. That is the main issue which is presented by the amendments of the Senator from West Virginia. If we are going to do this job on a scientific basis, then we wish to subsidize the institutions in which there is the possibility of making the fundamental discoveries and research which are provided for in this bill.

Similarly, in the case of the other amendments, it seems to me that if we wish to develop a scientific environment we had better give all the power to the 24 scientists and let them handle the entire matter. I am in favor of keeping scientists out of politics, but I also am in favor of keeping politicians out of science; and that is the main issue which is presented by the amendments offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The organization set up under the provisions of the pending bill should be a scientific organization conducted by scientists, who will appoint their own Director and will distribute the money on a scientific basis to the institutions where the best scientific research will be done and where a sound scientific research staff, on which the success of the program will depend, will be developed. We shall waste the money if we try to have the program handled on a political, pork-barrel basis of having so much disbursed in each State. Personally, I do not care whether Ohio gets any of the money, unless Ohio has an institution which is outstanding in some particular field for which funds are requested.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that the boys and girls of Vermont and other States can study medical research at the medical college of the University of Vermont just as well as they can at New Haven or at Boston or at Baltimore or anywhere else; in fact, some of the greatest physicians and surgeons of the United States have been educated at the University of Vermont.

I recall one eye surgeon who received his early training at the University of Vermont, to whom people came from all over the world, including the King of Siam, who came a few years ago to have an operation on his eyes. Even before the GI bill of rights went into effect, the medical college of the University of Vermont, which has the same rating in the medical world, I believe, as do the medical schools of Yale and Harvard and one or two other New England colleges, had applications for admission from several times as many boys and girls from all over the United States as the college was able to accept. It can accommodate only about 60 freshmen a year. It always has several times that number of applications.

I recall that recently the university was chosen by some foundation to continue experiments in child nutrition, and some pamphlets have been printed showing the results of that research work, which is extremely important, and which was conducted by the medical college of the University of Vermont.

I am frank to say, Mr. President, that I want that college to have the right, and the boys and girls who attend that college to have the right, to carry on the research work envisaged in the bill. I do not want to have it taken from Burlington, Vt. I do not want the right to continue medical research work taken away from the University of Vermont, or the University of Arkansas, or the University of Washington, and concentrated in three or four medical colleges of the United States. I realize that 75 percent of the amount sought to be appropriated under the bill and under the amendment may be given to half a dozen medical colleges or scientific schools, but I do want the other 25 percent to be made available to provide opportunity for the young people of rural areas, who in many cases are just as scientifically minded as are young people in the cities.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that while I appreciate the fact that he admits that perhaps Vermont might have something good to teach, and West Virginia might not have anything to teach, what he complains of is taken out of the bill by the amendment. I do not want the trial-and-error method adopted, requiring the institutions to be certified, and then the projects which can best pay be listed, and the money set aside for those projects and those projects only.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the observations of the Senator from Vermont, I do not really look upon what is proposed as something for the benefit of Vermont, or of Arkansas, or of any other State. I really believe it is very important that access be afforded to these various institutions from the point of view of the national problem. In other words, it is the Nation as a whole from which the brains will come. I do not know that it is of any particular benefit to Vermont, as Vermont, as much as it is to the whole Nation. It is an integral part of the national program that access be afforded to the brains of Vermont in this direct way.

The Senator turns the proposal about, presenting it as if he were thinking only of building up Vermont. Obviously, from what the Senator says, the University of Vermont does not need assistance. There are applications for admission to that university by three or four times as many as the university can take care of, and Vermont is a thrifty and a relatively wealthy State. The important thing is to make Vermont available to the program. I think every State has some program, or at least a prospect of some program.

It occurred to me, while the Senator was talking, that many years ago a young Jew came to Arkansas from abroad, and while he is on the pay roll of the university, the general education board has supplied him funds for experimentation in nutrition, in which he uses white rats, and he has become one of the greatest authorities in that particular field. It is a small operation, involving, if I recall correctly, about $6,000 a year, furnished by the Board, which finances the purchase of the rats which are the subject of the experiments. I think a little money, such as the Senator from Ohio mentioned, can do much in many special cases all over the United States.

What the Senator has in mind is the development of another atomic bomb or another proximity fuze. That is one phase, I grant, but a very special phase, and I do not see that that is the only phase, or even the most important one.

Furthermore, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke about not wanting any politics in this undertaking. There certainly was politics in the development of the atomic bomb. If it had not been for politicians in the Senate and politicians in the White House we would not have had the atomic bomb. The same is true of the proximity fuse. As one of the best politicians in the world from any point of view, I do not see why the Senator from Ohio would so object to politicians having something to do with the program. I think politicians have added a great deal to the vigor of such programs, both in wartime and in peacetime.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there was any politics in the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have heard the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] time and again relate the details of the financing of the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. TAFT. The administration got behind it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The administration is composed of politicians.

Mr. TAFT. There was no distribution of a fund among 48 State offices and no effort to divide up the money. It was applied to the particular purpose designated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The politicians made the decisions and supplied the money, which was the real risk that was taken. The Senator has heard the senior Senator from Tennessee tell on various occasions about how he lay awake at night thinking of it, and all that. I grant it was a great responsibility to undertake to spend $2,000,000,000 without the consent of the Congress. Members of Congress and the Executive took that responsibility. They were politicians. There is a tendency always to think that if politicians have anything to do with a thing it is necessarily bad.

My remarks particularly are directed to the administrative features of the bill. If we insulate the organization from all influence of public men—if Senators do not like the word "politicians," let us say "statesmen"—if we attempt to prevent any statesman of the Congress or of the executive branch having anything to do with the matter it seems to me we go too far.

I do not think the record during the war of the influence which this body of Senators exerted, justifies the idea that we must completely eliminate the influence of the politicians, or statesmen. I do not think the Senator himself feels that because we in this body, or the Executive, might have some influence, it is necessarily bad.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield ?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is bad if we are in a position where we have to claim money for our States. If a certain amount is to be allocated to Ohio, I will have every college in Ohio after me to get the director, or the President, who would control the director under the proposed amendment, to get money for my State. That is politics.

The Foundation will go to the Committee on Appropriations and say, "Here is a project we need money for next year," and the Committee on Appropriations, or the Bureau of the Budget, will approve the particular project.

I think we should keep our hands off. I think we should turn the matter over to the Foundation, and let them work it out in the best possible way, without pressure being brought by any Senator, which is bound to occur, if we are to appropriate money to be prorated among the States. We cannot help it, if there is money to be distributed by someone subject to the President's order on the basis of a certain amount going to every State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio has just said any Senator who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations will be approached.

Mr. TAFT. I would not ask where the contracts were to be let, or anything about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Senators will be asked to see that the Appropriations Committee acts. They are not going to get away from their responsibility as Members of the Senate, one way or the other.

Mr. TAFT. I think that under the committee bill I shall be relieved very largely of any responsibility to get money for Ohio as against some other State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think Senators should approach the matter in that spirit. I do not think they do. We have had the land-grant colleges for 75 years, and nobody bothers us about getting money for them. They do not bother me; they have had assistance for many years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if all the other States have now been heard from, I should like to proceed for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it seems to me Senators are becoming unduly excited about the amendment. A similar provision was included in the bill last year. On the question involved, the argument which has just been heard has been proceeding for 2½ years, in a hundred conferences, in meetings where witnesses were heard, and in a great many public gatherings, formal and informal. What the Senator from Ohio said is true, or it might be true if the great over-all projects could be left in the hands of the Foundation.

I may say that, after 2½ years of discussion with Senators, scientists, and everyone else, this is about the first time the Senator from New Jersey and I seem to disagree. At least, we have not yet come to an agreement. Why the provision was not placed in the bill again this year, I do not know, because last year there was agreement upon the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. The Senate agreed by a substantial majority, I think. If I recall correctly, there was a yea-and-nay vote.

If there were to be the over-all projects, and if only $20,000,000 were to be spent, the argument by the Senator from Ohio and other Senators might be well taken. But, Mr. President, if that is all that is to be spent in connection with this matter, the bill might as well be thrown out the window now. If, in order to keep abreast of the world scientifically, there is not to be spent upon research in this country more than $20,000,000 a year, or, as I said, more than the cost of a cruiser, then we had better quit. Although there will be great over-all projects, the real purpose of the bill is to correlate, in small areas and in small projects, all over the United States, all types and forms of scientific research. As certain scientists who were in the gallery yesterday and who may be in attendance today will tell you, Mr. President, the atomic bomb and the proximity fuse were not developed entirely at any one place. The scientists engaged in that work were spread all over the United States, but there was a correlating division. The product was manufactured at two places. The scientists came from universities and colleges, and from the nooks and corners of all the United States.

The amendment does not provide that one-fourth of the funds, whether it be one-fourth of $20,000,000, or one-fourth of $200,000,000, or whatever may be appropriated, shall go to the 48 States. It merely says that one-fourth shall be distributed in a certain way among the States and universities that send scientists to develop the great over-all projects of which the Senator from Ohio speaks. It merely means that such States have an opportunity to be heard, and to present research plans to the Foundation. If a plan thus presented fits into the over-all plan, or if it be a special, isolated plan, then an allocation may be made for it from one-fourth of the money. There is nothing serious about that. Seventy-five percent of the fund may well go, as I have said to the Senator from New Jersey, to the Ivy League colleges; that would be all right with me; but one-fourth of it could be distributed in the manner indicated, if a plan is presented that correlates with the over-all plan, and if it is a specific project that is worth while, whether it be from West Virginia, or whether it be—and I might as well include my State too—from the State of Washington, or from the State of Rhode Island. It means that the plan may be presented and, if it coordinates with the plan of the Foundation in the selection of individual research and development projects, then those presenting the plan are entitled to dip into 25 percent of the fund. It is not serious; it merely allows the entire country to have an opportunity to participate. That is the best way I can express it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I first yield to the Senator from Wyoming, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I notice the Senator says, in defense of the amendment, that it is not serious, as though perhaps there were something questionable about it. As I understand the amendment, it is not only not serious, it is very essential that an amendment of this kind be adopted, if we are going to make the facilities available to all the States of the Union and all the schools of the Union, as listed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean that it is not serious to the over-all project, or to over-all plans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator means that it does not hinder the over-all project at all, but rather advances it; does he not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It advances it. It affords an opportunity for development along the lines that were followed during the war of enlisting the efforts of people from all over the country. It does not by one iota interfere with fellowships or scholarships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator what objection is raised against the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The principal objection partly comes from those who believe it might become some sort of political thing; that people from different States and universities might come forward and say to their Senators, "You have got to get 25 percent of these funds, or our share of 25 percent of the funds." The amendment does not contemplate that at all. It merely says that unless a State, for example the State of Wyoming, has a plan fitting into the over-all project of the Foundation, it is not entitled to anything at all. The Foundation, in the last analysis, directs the distribution of the moneys, regardless of anything that may have been said. I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me on that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether there is anything in the bill as now drafted, without the amendment, which would prohibit the selection of a college in a particular State that might have a program fitting into the over-all program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; nothing at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. But under the amendment it would be compulsory that 25 percent of the fund be scattered among the 48 States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the plans presented by the 48 States and by the institutions within the States could and would coordinate with the over-all plan of the Foundation, yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill as drafted makes it a matter of discretion, whereas the Senator's amendment makes it mandatory?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to answer the question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield the floor, with just a concluding remark.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to answer the Senator's question before the Senator from Washington yields the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say to the Senator from Michigan, in answer to his question, that 25 percent of the fund is set up for use by educational institutions within the various States for research work, but before any of it can be used, a plan acceptable to the Foundation must be presented. Under the original provision, the Foundation could spend the whole sum in one college, if it wanted to.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether, under the bill, the Foundation may not, in its discretion, allow funds to go to any college within the United States?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the amendment here proposed would compel them to seek various colleges with which to spend 25 percent of the fund?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would compel them to determine if a certain plan would fit in with the over-all plan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct. That would make it mandatory.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor, with this observation: As I say, this is an amendment that has been long discussed by Senators, by scientists, and by many other persons interested in the matter, and which, after all the discussions, was finally placed by the Senate in last year's bill. The Senate placed the stamp of approval upon it. I hope, as I said earlier in the day, that nothing will be done that will impair the basic purpose of the bill. I think the amendment helps to carry out the basic purposes of the bill, including the wide distribution of research and the wide distribution of opportunity to develop the scientific potentiality of America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming raised the question a moment ago as to why anybody should oppose the amendment. I regret the distinguished Senator was not here when I tried to state what the proponents of the bill felt was the right approach to the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I say in explanation of my absence that I was in attendance on the session of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SMITH. I am fully aware that when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is not present in the Senate Chamber he is engaged in most important service of the United States Government, and I understand his position perfectly. But in answer to his question, why anybody should oppose the amendment, I wanted to say briefly that those of us who proposed the pending bill, and those of us who voted in committee to report the bill, have been aware of the continuance of debate over the entire period of 2 years on this very question. The question is: What is the purpose of the bill? The purpose of the bill is not primarily to help all the educational institutions of the country. The purpose of the bill is to locate basic research projects in science for the benefit of all the people of the country. Its purpose is not to scatter fire all over the country to see if we can ignite something here or there or some other place. The purpose is to locate basic research projects and then subsidize such projects.

Our second purpose is to locate promising young students who may become scientists, and assist them.

Mr. President, we purposely placed in the bill, in section 3, as I previously read, the provision that in connection with the appointment of the 24 individuals who are to constitute the Foundation and who are to determine policy, discover the projects, and find promising young scientists—

> The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

We are putting members on this foundation who will study the entire country and find places where the money can be spent most profitably, without scattering it loosely all over the country in the hope that it may gather fire somewhere and do something.

I realize the position of the Senator from Wyoming. He thinks we should encourage scientific research in every State of the Union, and I agree with him. But we cannot start this project in such a way without getting into far greater trouble by reason of the expenditure of more funds than can be justified. If we do not receive substantial appropriations, the small amount that might go to each State would be hardly worth while. I have before me some tables which I shall not place in the RECORD, but which show that on the basis of $10,000,000 distributed throughout the States on the formula proposed by the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, we would have variations in amounts granted for teachers from Alaska, where there are very few teachers, of $4,800 each, to Maryland, where there are 1,770 teachers, of $90 per teacher for research work. The formula of distributing the money by States under the plan proposed by the amendment is not sound. The money must be distributed in a totally different manner than that proposed by the amendment. We must begin by getting the very best brains we can to direct the work of the Foundation, and have them determine the policies and the projects, and then have them come to the Congress and say, "This is our program for 1948. These are the young persons we have discovered who should have our assistance as students and scholars and fellows. We ask for so much money for this project next year, so much money the year following, and so much money the year following that." Ultimately, we may get money for this purpose for every State in the Union. But if we scatter our fire in every State of the Nation, my opinion is that we will jeopardize the project in its very inception, because it will simply be the handing out of money to each State by reason of the pressure put upon us. It will not be the development of projects which mean so much for the welfare of the country. That is the theory of those of us who oppose the

amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from New Jersey always makes himself very clear.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the record of the development of State universities in this Nation is a record which controverts every argument the Senator makes. These State universities have prospered and grown and expanded in the realm of education more than all the endowed universities in the United States have done. The frontier now is the frontier of science. I come from an area which 50 years ago or 75 years ago was beyond the frontier, and people who were seeking new opportunities could with certainty go out beyond the Mississippi River and the Missouri River in the knowledge that they would obtain opportunities there to build new homes and create new means of livelihood. But those opportunities have now passed. If we are to develop in the future, the development must be by way of expansion of the frontier of science.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Within the past 3 or 4 weeks news has come from Soviet Russia that a great program has been undertaken by the Government of Russia to develop the mineral resources of the Russian territory. There have been suggestions made here that we should do likewise. Last year I had the opportunity of standing upon the Senate floor to urge the passage of what was known as the Stock Piling Act. It was adopted. It is the law. That law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake work intended to develop our sources of strategic and critical materials. In every one of the Western States and in many of the other States of the Union there are undeveloped resources which science can make available. I know of no reason why in passing the bill we should not adopt the formula contained in the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, that if the schools in the various States can present plans which conform to the plan laid down by the Foundation, that 25 percent of the fund can properly be held for use in those States. The important thing, it seems to me, Mr. President, is to bring about the distribution among the people of the United States of the opportunities of securing scientific training and education.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is a question of method. I agree with everything the Senator has said about the importance of these State institutions, but the question is whether we are going to say, "We shall distribute funds to every State in the Union," or whether we are going to have a board or cabinet selected which represents all these groups, which shall decide where to begin. The question is: Do we want to give funds to every institution? Or do we want to select 10 this year, 20 next year, and, as we progress, select more? Or do we want to say that we shall start with a smaller amount for each one? Or shall we concentrate on our research? That is the problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me the answer to the question which the Senator asks is found in the provision that the institutions, to qualify for a part of this distribution, must present a plan which is acceptable to the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That is true the way the bill reads now, but it is not mandatory that we have to give money to every State. There is very little difference when we come to the application of the plan, but there is a great difference when it comes to the matter of principle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Are the figures which the Senator gave based on a $20,000,000 estimate?

Mr. SMITH. The figures are based on the assumption of a $40,000,000 total contribution from the Government, and an allocation of 25 percent thereof to all the States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has given a very good example of how the proposition would work out. The Senator said that in the Territory of Alaska, $4,800 would be allotted to each teacher. Unless the University of Alaska, located far north of Nome, could fit into the overall plan of the Foundation, its teachers would not receive the $4,800. I stood on the floor of the Senate a year ago and pleaded with the United States Senate to add to an appropriation bill the sum of $10,000 to continue the geophysical laboratory at the University of Alaska which had made a great contribution to the study of geophysics of the entire Arctic in which military maneuvers are now taking place, and in connection with which the results of the work of that university are being utilized.

Mr. SMITH. I recall supporting the Senator when he raised that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. The way our bill is drawn, that is exactly what would happen. The institution would present its case to the 24 members of the Foundation, and they, I presume, would give their approval to that project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The plan of the University of Alaska would have fitted into any kind of over-all plan.

Mr. SMITH. If it came into an overall plan it would be limited, whereas if it placed its case before the Board it could receive the sort of appropriation the Senator suggests. It is simply a matter of approach.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator a moment ago said something about $90. I should like to know what figures the Senator had in mind, so as to have the record made clear.

Mr. SMITH. The figures are based on the plan of apportioning money to the various States, the number of available teachers in each of the States, and the allocations to teachers.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is speaking of the number of available college teachers?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator attempt to represent to this body that under my amendment the money would be allotted in such a way that each teacher would receive a slice of it?

Mr. SMITH. Of course not. The study is based upon available teachers.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The point I wish to make clear is that a certain amount would be allotted to each State if it could furnish a project which was acceptable.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the only difference between our two theories is this: As was well expressed by the Senator yesterday, we are going ahead by trial and error. I am trying to remove any possibility of one error. I want to make sure that one error will not occur.

Some of the smaller colleges are doing very fine work. I was talking recently about a very small college in the State of Colorado of which I had never heard. I discovered that some of the things which were done in the field of engineering by that little college were outstanding. They were not publicized. I do not refer to the Colorado State School of Mines. It is a much smaller school. It is rarely heard of. A college like that might present a program. It might get an appropriation and it might not. If it could present an acceptable program involving a certain amount of funds, the Foundation would be bound to grant the funds. There would be no chance for political trickery. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has certainly had enough experience with colleges and universities to know the amount of politics among the faculties of such institutions. I have been told by college professors that tangling with the State legislature was child's play compared to getting into a faculty meeting.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, we have heard all these suggestions before.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who would decide whether or not a project was acceptable.

Mr. KILGORE. The Foundation itself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then what is the need for this amendment? If it is an acceptable project the Foundation, if it is performing its duty—and we assume that it will be composed of reliable, zealous individuals—would be bound in all moral conscience to give them the money anyway, without this amendment, if the project were acceptable. Under the general provisions of the bill, if the Foundation says that it will not grant the money to an institution because the project is unacceptable, it would say the same thing, if it were composed of honest men, under the terms of the Senator's amendment; and either 25 percent of the funds would be frozen or the institutions would say, "We must dig up a project, because there is some money waiting for us in Washington. Let us dig up a plausible project so that we can get the money."

Mr. KILGORE. That may be the theory of the Senator from Iowa. We talk about the Foundation's money. It is the people's money. We talk about making inventions. What is to happen when the scientists who make the inventions grow old and die? Dr. Jewett stated that no scientist was worth anything for original work in basic science after he reached the age of 35.

What I am trying to do is to make sure that there will be no forgotten States, and that they will at least have the opportunity to submit projects which fit the various States, and which may be in line with the general program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I approach the action on this bill with the utmost confidence that this will be a completely reliable group of superior-minded individuals and superior-intentioned persons of distinction. I believe that they will have at heart the development of science in all its phases.

From listening to the debate, with some memory of what has happened in the past, I believe that this amendment would do a disservice to the people in the expenditure of their own money. The Foundation will dispense the money, whether it is the people's money or not. The practical result of the amendment would be to earmark 25 percent, which would not be subject to the superior judgment, examination, intelligence, and discretion of the members of the Foundation.

I hope to be able to have confidence enough in the Foundation to assume that if any institution has a sound, feasible, and practicable project that will contribute to the advancement of science, the Foundation will immediately give it such aid as it can. If the Foundation adopts any other attitude, then the very basis of the Foundation itself will crumble. I believe that to earmark 25 percent of the money and make it mandatory that it be scattered broadcast on projects upon which the Foundation would pass in either event, would represent the isolation and sterilization of a substantial portion of this money, so that it could not be used with versatility by the Foundation. To that extent the freedom of science and the freedom of projects would be curtailed.

Mr. KILGORE. What does the Senator mean by "scattered broadcast"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several Senators have asked me as to when a vote on this amendment may be expected. Senators are compelled to be absent from the Chamber in attendance upon committee meetings, and I wonder if we could not arrive at a decision as to whether or not we wish to vote on this amendment this evening, or whether we can obtain unanimous consent to vote on it sometime tomorrow, so that Senators who are present may be able to attend to other duties.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was about to yield the floor. Would it be agreeable to the Senator from West Virginia, unless some other Senator wishes to speak, to vote immediately on this amendment? Then if there is another amendment with which we can deal tonight, well and good. If not, I should like to think in terms of some sort of unanimous-consent agreement to vote on all amendments tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if it would be agreeable to vote on this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, and upon all other amendments to the bill at 3 o'clock, with an appropriate division of the time. Is that a reasonable suggestion?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. We do not know what amendments are to be offered. So far as the two amendments in which I am interested are concerned, I could get along under such an arrangement. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] has an amendment. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has an amendment. Several other Senators may have amendments. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I got myself into a rather embarrassing situation yesterday, and I do not wish to speak for any of my colleagues today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Could we vote on this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to vote upon this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, or at 12:30. I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has anything to say about it. I do not know whether the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wishes to discuss the amendment further.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator be willing to accept a limitation of half an hour's debate on any amendment which may be offered? Some amendments may be offered which may require a little more time.

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to limit myself to 12 minutes, although I should like to have a little more time on the two amendments in which I am interested.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it be agreeable to the Senator to vote at 12:30?

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to vote on the pending amendment at 12:30.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote tomorrow at 12:30 p. m. on the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment, and that the time be divided equally between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question? Does he refer only to the amendments to the pending amendment?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. At that time it is my hope that we may agree on a time to vote on some of the other amendments. I should like to have them settled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will withhold his request long enough to permit me to submit two amendments at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Are they amendments to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; they are amendments to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement relates only to the pending amendment, and amendments to the pending amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am submitting an amendment in two alternate forms. I should like to have the amendment considered.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to withhold the request so that the Senator from Iowa may submit his amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill, and ask that they lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in response to the requests of several Senators I now modify my request to make the time 1 o'clock instead of 12:30.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the request is to vote at 1 o'clock tomorrow on the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I hope very much that we can finish the bill tomorrow. While there may be more amendments, I think there is only one which will provoke much debate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] regarding the appointment of the Director of the Foundation——

Mr. SMITH. I should like to make an extended statement with reference to it when it is presented. There is a difference of opinion about it, and I want to make the issue perfectly clear. So far as I am personally concerned, it would be agreeable to me, but some of my colleagues do not agree regarding it.

Mr. HILL. It may be the best that can be worked out at this time, and I am mindful of the fact that the bill will have to be acted on by the House committee, passed by the House, and most

probably will go to a conference committee.

Mr. SMITH. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from Alabama would rather not have the amendment adopted and would prefer to leave the bill as it is?

Mr. HILL. I prefer the amendment to the bill as it is, but I do not think the amendment is a very good compromise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question with reference to this amendment, if I may. In the first place, I am opposed to the amendment and agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said and what the Senator from Iowa has said. The purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to get the most benefit we can from a comparatively small amount of money.

It seems to me that the amendment is erroneously drawn, for these reasons: First, on page 2, in lines 1 and 2, it states that one-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and then there is a comma. If $20,000,000 is appropriated, 25 percent of that is $5,000,000, and one-fourth of 25 percent is $1,250,000, which means that $24,000 will go to each of the 48 States and must be apportioned among them. As I read it, it does not specify how the money shall be used. The remainder of the paragraph discusses contracts and financial arrangements satisfactory to the Foundation. But the first quarter which will have to go to each one of the States goes to it, or is held for it, regardless of any financial or contractual arrangement with the Foundation.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to another mistake, as I see it. In line 21 reference is made to advice received by the Board. I imagine the amendment was drafted to apply to the bill of last year. So far as I know, there is no board, and there could be no advice received from any board.

I personally hope that the amendment will not be agreed to, for the reasons already stated. If it is to be agreed to, it seems to me it should be revamped.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. The language has been lifted from last year's bill, and the word "Foundation" should be substituted for the word "Board."

With reference to the one-fourth which shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, that is also subject to the Foundation's approval of a plan which fits in with its other plans.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think it clearly so provides.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It should. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. HOEY. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would consider an amendment in line 18 on the second page of the bill, by adding the words "Association of American Universities", so that that association would be on the list of those who would be permitted to recommend nominations to the President. A great many educators and scientists have been insistent that the Association of American Universities should be specifically recognized.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the suggestion of the distinguished Senator. I think it is relevant, and I think that change could be made. It was not originally intended to omit it. We brought in the land-grant colleges and universities when we were discussing the type of distribution, and we thought we would protect them by including them in the list.

Mr. HOEY. I offer, then, an amendment to include in line 18 on page 2 of the bill, after the universities named, the words "Association of American Universities."

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I offer the amendment, and the Senator from New Jersey has accepted it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to the bill itself. Is there objection to its consideration at this time? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the certainty that this matter cannot be disposed of tonight, and in view, also, of the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, I wondered if the Senator desired to continue longer this evening,

Mr. SMITH. No. I should be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me for a closing question. I have an amendment which is thoroughly satisfactory to all the sponsors of the bill. I have submitted it to all of them. It refers to a protection against the invasion of the atomic-energy field by the Foundation without the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission. I do not think there will be any debate on it, because the sponsors of the amendment have all said that it was perfectly satisfactory. I should not want to propose an amendment with only a small attendance in the Senate unless the sponsors of the measure feel that it is perfectly proper so to do. I think we may as well get it out of the way, unless there is some objection.

Mr. SMITH. I will say in that connection that the only question I raised to the distinguished Senator from Iowa was that, naturally, I do not want to see anything done in the way of basic research which will fail to protect the Government in the atomic-energy field under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act. Of course I assume that research in this field will be subject to the control of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no objection to an amendment which will protect the security of the country, and, at the same time, which will not be so stringent as not to permit the fullest experimentation in these various fields.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield, I will say that I talked to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] about 10 minutes ago on the floor and submitted to him this amendment, which I think is a milder form of amendment than the one I originally submitted to him, and he agreed to it.

I also submitted it to the other sponsors of the bill.

At the end of section 15 of the bill I propose to add a properly designated paragraph, as follows:

> The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

That is one of the two alternative amendments which I have sent to the desk to have printed. It is the one I prefer, and I think it is probably the better of the two. It would be the one that I would offer tomorrow. As I have said, if there is objection to having it considered tonight, I shall wait until tomorrow to have it considered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the spirit of the amendment. It relates to a very important matter, and I have discussed it quite extensively with various persons who are interested in the subject. I should think it would be wiser to present it tomorrow, when more Senators are present, and I should prefer to have it presented tomorrow, although of course I do not attempt to interfere in any way with what the Senator seeks to accomplish

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I prefer not to call up the amendment at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any particular reason why the cancer amendment should not be considered and adopted at this time?

Mr. SMITH. No; so far as I am concerned, I should be happy to have it adopted now.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself. I understand that the amendment is entirely satisfactory to the authors of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. It is entirely satisfactory. I have questioned all the authors of the bill about it, and all of them have agreed to this very important amendment relating to the field of cancer research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, for himself, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 19, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to insert the words "and directed";

On page 4, line 15, to strike out the word "and";

On page 4, line 18, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, to insert the following:

(7) To establish (a) a special commission on cancer research, (b) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and (c) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary. Each commission shall consist of 11 members, 6 of whom shall be eminent scientists, expert in the field of medicine or the basic sciences, and 5 of whom shall represent the public, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and to serve at the pleasure of the President. It shall be the duty of each special commission created under the authority of this subsection to make a full and adequate survey of research both public and private being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the National Science Foundation an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such programs are being carried out.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the president of the American Cancer Society, suggesting that the commissions referred to in the amendment be set up in such a way that the terms of office of three of the members expire in one year, and the terms of four expire in the following year, and the terms of the last four expire in the third year. I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio would like to include in the amendment appropriate language for such a provision.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it wise to include such language. The amendment covers various kinds of commissions, and they may be of different sizes and characteristics. I should think we could leave that matter to the Executive Committee and the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I have read the telegram simply because I have received it from Mr. Adams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will I have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow? I should like to have the floor at that time, so as to continue with the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New Jersey will be entitled to the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow.

TOWN AND COUNTRY—EDITORIAL BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, considerable circulation has been given recently to statements and comments which tend to separate the various segments of our economic life and various groups of our people. I have been especially disturbed over what appears to me to be a recurrence of differences between farm and city people. Statements are made that a reason for the high cost of living is the fact that the Government has maintained a price support under basic agricultural commodities. Farm people have been accused of profiting under Federal subsidy. Our rural areas and their people have been indirectly attacked by those who oppose such programs as rural electrification and soil conservation.

Many of those statements and accusations, as we well know, are based on misinformation and distortion. The differences they create are most unfortunate. It was with considerable satisfaction, therefore, that I read an editorial, entitled "Town and Country," which Mr. Alfred D. Stedman wrote for the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Sunday, May 11. It is so true and so constructive in spirit, that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN AND COUNTRY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

A way now is found to clear up misunderstandings between city and country.

That way has been shown in recent days by the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, in conducting the rural church institute. In that institute, ministers of different denominations explored with faculty and research men the social, religious, and economic problems of town and country. The work with this group can be done also with other groups.

Thus the basis is laid for a very broad function for the college. That is service as a meeting point and information center for groups wanting light on country-city problems. The college's emergence in this role justifies by performance the Minnesota Legislature's recent remarkable vote of confidence in it.

For today, a very special need exists for enlightenment and tolerance as between farmers and city people. The reason is the current barrage of publicity tending to stir up misunderstandings, if not ill will, between them.

One sample of that barrage is J. B. Griswold's featured article in the May issue of the American magazine finding that American farmers are the most pampered people in the world. That conclusion he supports in part by charging up to farm aid all costs of all Government departments of agriculture for everything, including many services to the general public, and in part by a gross error lumping half a billion dollars of consumer subsidies spent to keep food prices down under the general head of Government spending to keep farm prices up.

Another sample is Life magazine's full-page blast on May 5, which singles out as its target this country's governmental umbrella over the poorer 3,800,000 of the Nation's 5,800,000 farm families. If the inefficient farmer chooses peasantry, let him have it, is Life's view.

Other appeals to city people to support the slashing of Government aids to farmers are frequent.

But what about the facts bearing upon the questions thus being raised? The rural church institute uncovered a great storehouse of authentic information. It performed a real service by calling attention to the progress of human knowledge in this field.

Are farmers really our most pampered people?

As to income, the Government's official postwar hope is that they may average half as much individual income per year as other people. As to living, almost half the farm homes in the country and nearly 9 out of 10 in the Dakotas still lack electricity and the conveniences, sanitation, and everything else going with it. As to working, farm hours of labor are 30 to 100 percent greater than city working hours. As to health, farmers have more sickness, worse teeth, more accidents, fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer hospitals, and higher death rates among fathers, mothers, and children than city people have. As to education, farm people have worse schools, poorer teachers, and more illiteracy than city people. As to security, farmers and farm labor are the only group left out of the social-security system. As to churches, the struggles against poverty, debt, low pay of pastors, and multiplicity of churches are worse than such struggles of city churches.

Of course, all this doesn't discount the opportunity for the selective type of Government economies that would thin out ineffective helpers of agriculture, get rid of deadwood in Government personnel, eliminate the overlap in governmental farm agencies, and still not cripple any real service.

But it does definitely dispose of the charge that this country's farming people are pampered in any ordinary sense of that term.

The true story of the relation between city and country people deserves to be mutually understood.

The fact is that American cities depend on the farms for their very populations. Those that, like St. Paul, are growing, derive part of that growth from people drawn in from the farm. Others whose growth has leveled off must depend on an influx from outside to keep their present size. These would shrink if they had to depend for replacements on their own birth rates alone.

So the cities must look to the farms for their people. In Minnesota, of 9,000 farm boys and girls reaching 18 years of age each year, one-third move to town. Nationally, the farms are the real mothers of the cities.

And for renewal of population, the cities must turn specifically to the low-income farm group. For the birth rate among the higher-income farmers is itself falling. It's the poor who have the most daughters and sons to send to town. And more and more, the poor white and poor black farm population of Southeastern United States is becoming the human reservoir of this Nation's cities.

It's not intelligent to draw a line between city and country, and to let bad health, illiteracy, bad morals, and poverty spread on the farm side of that line. For such infections are sure to be carried cityward, thus increasing the cities' already great financial burdens of combating those ills within the city limits.

So it is demonstrated that the great problems of farm and city are truly mutual. And the Minnesota College of Agriculture in the rural church institute has served as a meeting place for effective mutual work on those problems. The pattern is adaptable to later discussions that could include representation of business, labor, professional, and other groups. Plans for a town and country conference already are being talked about.

Thus the foundation is laid for a work of continuing usefulness for the college. Better understanding between country and city can be the goal. The college has shown how it can serve as a center of group efforts to that end.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TREATIES OF PEACE WITH ITALY, RUMANIA, BULGARIA, AND HUNGARY (EX. REPT. NO. 4)

As in executive session,

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted a report to accompany the treaties of peace with Italy, Executive F; Rumania, Executive G; Bulgaria, Executive H; and Hungary, Executive I, heretofore reported by that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman, of Newport, R. I., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Harold R. Medina, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Samuel Mandelbaum, deceased.

Albert V. Bryan, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Hon. Robert N. Pollard, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Roy S. Nunnally to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947.

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

James R. Ahern	Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Bruce A. Benson	Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
William D. Crawford	William J. Reynders
Gail L. Heasley	Joseph E. Spalding
Sheldon L. Hirsch	Gerald H. Weyrauch
Martin D. Marder	Harry I. Zankman

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

George R. Lathan
Neil E. Nelson, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated:

William E. Ainslie	Harold A. McCauley
Robert M. Bonk	Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Duane D. Borgert	Edward A. Short
Raymond E. Jeffery	Samuel S. Stephens
John R. Logan	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated:

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
James L. Yates

The following-named to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

William Blanchard, Jr.
Frank G. Simala

The following-named to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Robert R. Poitras
Donald B. Small

The following-named to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

"W" "J" Blevins	Bernard J. Isabella
Richard L. Divoll	John A. Mitchell
David LaM. Flynn	Herbert F. Zinsmeister,
Robert H. Hartley	Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT

*Rauber, Louis J.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Belcher, Preston R.
*Castro, Luis V.

ENSIGNS

Ackiss, James H.	Kedigh, Percy E.
Alley, Justus N.	Kimener, Robert A.
Applegate, Richard C.	Konrady, John A.
Bailiff, John W.	Loftis, Raymond M.
Barckmann, Walter H.	Mapes, George C.
Barley, Cecil E.	Martini, Livio
Bernstein, Fred J.	Mawhiney, William T.
Best, Charles L., Jr.	McCracken, William H.
Boston, Leadore G.	McDonald, John S.
Bragg, Frank B.	Millar, Robert W.
Brennan, William F.	Nelson, Gerard L.
Briggs, Winston D.	O'Rourke, Gerard A.
Bryant, Harold V.	Plath, Carl W.
Chapman, Kendall J.	Reese, Clyde V., Jr.
Claudius, Robert H.	*Rice, Charles E.
Coe, Arthur S.	Saine, James E.
Conley, Richard D.	Scoggins, Willis L., Jr.
Coonrod, Edgar E.	Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Cunniff, Roger L.	*Sharratt, George S. H., Jr.
Entrikin, Joseph W.	*Smith, Emory C.
Everett, William H.	Smith, Newel W., Jr.
Fischer, Richard H.	Spoon, Donald D.
Franek, Rainold J.	Steer, George L.
Gentry, Harold R.	Valencia, Eugene A.
Giessner, LeRoy H.	Vaught, Thomas B.
*Greenberg, Mack K.	Webb, Howard "T", Jr.
*Greene, William N.	Wells, John T.
Guedel, Kenneth C.	Williams, Nathaniel T., Jr.
Harbaugh, James A.	Windsor, Clayton C.
Hawkins, Carl R.	
Husty, Richard M.	
Irvine, Harry B.	

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Flannery, John L.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Berry, Reginald V.	Marr, James C., Jr.
Campbell, John C. W.	Marra, John J.
Delaney, Henry R.	Naman, Marvin J.
Horr, Edward A.	Stovall, William D., Jr.
Mallams, John T.	Taber, Thomas H., Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Baumgartner, Donald F.	Holt, Robert O.
Bell, Adrian D.	Kramp, Henry F.
Boltwood, Chester M.	MacLeod, Murdock R.
Craven, Ethridge	Pavlick, Marvin S.
Deem, Ralph E.	Peck, William G.
	Walsh, Robert G.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Dwyer, William D.	Loomer, Gwenn M.
Gray, Gus W.	McGrath, Noel G.
Hill, David A.	Miller, John W.
Kennedy, Loren S.	Newman, Dwight W.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF GUNNER

Nikkonen, Rudolph

CHIEF TORPEDOMEN

Andrews, David "J"
Collier, Charles L.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Barnes, Arthur W.
Jackson, Harry W.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Allbritton, Alton S.
Hearst, Ray
Yates, Henry S.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHER

Olson, Lloyd A.

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Conoway, Theodore H.

The following-named officers to the rank and grades indicated to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed:

ENSIGN

Setser, Lester E. G.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Leiser, Harry W.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the living God and the God of the living, Thy immortal word is with us: Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits. He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. For He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust.

O Father, Thou who art ever present in the hidden life in which we live and move and have our being, be Thou in our thoughts unspoken, in our feelings unexpressed, and in the concealed conflicts in the soul. Whatever this day may reveal, we pray Thee to bless us with quietude of spirit and serenity of soul and lead us into the love of our

Father and the patience of our Master. In every crisis may we keep our anchorage to Thee unbroken.

In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1947:

H. R. 2157. An act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes.

On May 15, 1947:

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States Commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; and

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MAY 14, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby wish to inform the House that I have transmitted to the Governor of Maryland my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress from the Third Congressional District of Maryland, effective May 16, 1947.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maryland.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Sumner Welles.

THE ITALIAN SITUATION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Italy is deteriorating at an alarming rate. And yet we appear unable to develop continuity and integration in our foreign policy. At a time when Italy requires a minimum of $120,000,000 for relief for the balance of the year in order to stave off starvation and communism, this body reduced the amount in the relief bill by $150,000,000. It is my fervent hope that the House will accept the decision of the other body to provide the full amount.

At a time when we have voted $300,000,000 to resist Yugoslav despotism in Greece, the other body is contemplating the ratification of the Italian peace treaty which constitutes, in effect, assistance to Yugoslav despotism in Italy. Ominous portents of the rise of communism are implicit in the resignation of Premier De Gasperi. It is time that we demonstrate a vigorous consistency and forthright leadership in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in America, May 10, 1947, which contains an interview between Mr. Henry L. Nunn, a Milwaukee industrial leader, and attorney David Keyser.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ansel E. Talbert concerning the 16-pound $130 radar which protects the commercial air liner, about which there has been so much discussion regarding air safety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item.

AVIATION

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee of the Whole arose late yesterday afternoon, it had under consideration a substitute amendment which I offered to provide funds to the Civil Aeronautics Administration with which to operate air traffic control towers throughout the country. This morning's Washington Post, in a news article, stated that the particular airport for which funds had been added in this substitute amendment was in my district. I wish to correct that impression. That other airport is not in my district.

I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate what I stated yesterday that, by any parliamentary device conceivable, I will be very happy and anxious to include funds in my substitute amendment that would include any airport which had been authorized and approved by the CAA subsequent to the time the CAA submitted its proposed estimate to the Committee on Appropriations.

In this regard may I also state that I think my substitute amendment is most comprehensive in that it is up to date, including an airport which has so recently been approved, and it makes affirmative provision that these funds shall be used for this purpose. I think it tends toward uniformity and is indispensable to the safety and uniformity of our air traffic throughout the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

AID TO ITALY AND GERMANY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] proceeds to tell us that Italy is going to collapse unless we pour American money into that disturbed area. You will find an article in today's Wall Street Journal to the effect that the rest of the world will virtually depend upon the United States for their livelihood during the coming year.

It says that "in 1947 the world by its own labors will pay for only 54 percent of what it obtains from the United States."

What is to keep those Italians from making their own living?

Why not let them go to work and produce food for the Italian people?

We should pursue a similar course in Germany.

For my part, I would like to see us make a separate peace with Germany along with such other non-Communist allies as care to join us.

Our present conduct in Germany is a disgrace. The best thing we could do would be to get those Negro troops out of there and stop the perpetration of crimes against the helpless white women of Germany that would shock the modesty of the savages of the jungles.

The next best thing we should do would be to send some real Americans, some white gentiles, if we are going to send anybody to Germany, stop harassing the German people and let them go to making their own living.

If the Italian people are not willing to work and make their own living out of Italian soil, certainly the people of America, who are now struggling to make their own living, cannot keep them up indefinitely. I say it is about time we clean house in the State Department and every other department of this Government and get back to the old fundamental American principles advocated by Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin and start to restoring the peace of the world—regardless of Communist opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the resolutions committee of the Jewish World War Veterans.

BRING UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT UP TO DATE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there are some people who assume that if a person is employed by the United States Government he does not labor. Yet to take one Government agency as an example, in this case the Post Office Department, we find that every individual and every business in the country depends upon its services. The billions of letters and parcels that are collected, transported, and delivered to thousands of communities in the United States during the course of a year, is a task of mammoth proportions, and is work in the real sense of the word.

However, these and all other Government employees are denied the rights enjoyed by workers who are organized in private employment to improve their standards. They cannot strike. The only recourse they have is to appeal to the Congress to correct inequalities as they arise. Sometimes the merits of their case get as far as committee hearings and no further.

The provisions of the United States Employees' Compensation Act offer stark proof of the way in which our trusted Government workers are neglected.

This act was originally passed on September 7, 1916.

With minor exceptions, it has remained unchanged for 31 years, during the most changeful period in American history. Hours, wages, working conditions, prices, and the whole economic pattern of American life has become more complex and interdependent, so that adjustments are frequently needed to keep the system in balance. The depressed condition of labor has changed for the better. Even the textile workers of my district, for years one of the most underpaid groups in the Nation, are coming into their own. Organized they have won decent pay, safer woking conditions, unemployment security, old-age security, sickness and accident insurance, and many other benefits.

Government employees have also shared in some of these gains. The one shocking oversight is in the matter of compensation paid for injuries suffered while in the performance of duty.

A Government worker is not an abstraction. He is a human being and is entitled to the same consideration and protection as other workers. Day in and day out, Government workers perform tasks which too often are taken for granted. In the course of their employment, they too, meet up with certain hazards.

If they are injured, or fall sick, they suffer more than many other groups of workers by the lengthening gap between the small, fixed compensation they receive and the soaring prices they must pay for the bare necessities of life. To call this situation unjust, is a mocking understatement. Government employees are worried. How can they possibly make both ends meet under deflated compensation rates, and inflated prices, if they become disabled at their work? For the answer to this haunting question, they turn to the Congress seeking an equitable adjustment.

The present ceiling on which compensation rates are based is a salary of $2,100 a year. In the last few years, Federal employees have received raises which, for many of them, put their earnings above this figure. One who was earning $2,100 before the general pay increases is now earning $2,770.20.

The old monthly maximum and monthly minimum rates for compensation should be computed against the higher ceiling of $2,770.20.

I am introducing a bill to provide for this upward adjustment.

Under its terms, section 6 of the act of September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 756—is amended by striking out "$116.66", wherever such sum appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "$153.90" and by striking out "$58.33", wherever such sum appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "$76.95."

The original pay increases were granted to help Government employees keep up with the increased cost of living, which, discounting the inevitable drop in prices, will never go down to prewar levels.

Compensation for injuries incurred while working for the Government must also keep step with present-day realities.

This legislation has been long overdue. Government workers are looking to this session of Congress for its speedy enactment.

ANOTHER BRITISH LOAN? NOT WITH MY VOTE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is evidently a great deal of propaganda being spilled into this country by the British Information Service, the British Embassy, and other British agencies to whoop up enthusiasm for another British loan—the third British loan.

This money is being asked to support British socialism at home and imperialism abroad. Great Britain is suffering the pains of Empire. She is now paying the penalty for her Empire sins, like the Amritsar massacres, the Black and Tan murders, and Dov Gruner executions. The chickens of her policy of divide and conquer are coming home to roost. For all of this she has the audacity again to ask our help.

Under the second loan agreement, she promised to dissolve the sterling area bloc pool by July 18. She must default on this promise. She owes over $14,000,000,000 to India, Egypt, Brazil, South Africa, Iraq, Palestine, and so forth. All these countries have refused to scale down her debt. She cannot pay the dollars she owes them. Hence she will default in her promise to dissolve the pool. She deliberately violated the loan agreement when she signed her trade pact with Argentina, whereby she demanded that Argentina purchase her future goods within the sterling area.

She refuses to do away with imperial preference, which is a studied discrimination against our goods in all her far-flung dominions.

With our dollars she supports needlessly over a million men in arms. She said she could not afford to keep 14,000 troops in Greece, but she maintains over 100,000 troops in Palestine. These troops support a police state there and keep the country and its inhabitants in a state of fear and terror.

She will now ask another loan to bail out, to support that police state in Palestine and her Empire dominions in various parts of Africa and Asia.

The British Empire is sick and decadent and dollars will not save her.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

"(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

"(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the Act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

"(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personel of those countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this Act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

"(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this Act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

"(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

"(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this Act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this Act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this Act; (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this Act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this Act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this Act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

"The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

"(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

"(2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

"(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the Act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the Act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

"(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out.

"SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this Act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

"SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities, which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments, under authority of this Act.

"SEC. 8. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this Act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this Act as the President shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is in the form of a substitute for both the text of the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The bill agreed to in conference is for the most part the same as the bill passed by the House. Except for minor technical and clerical differences, the differences between the House amendment and the conference argument are noted below.

The House amendment contained a provision that no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of the act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement provides that no such assignment shall be made until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The House amendment contained in substance the provision known as the Vandenberg amendment. As passed by the House, the second paragraph of this amendment was not identical with the paragraph as passed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes the language finally adopted

by the Senate. The provision requires the President to withdraw aid if the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained a provision requiring that the chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of the act as the President shall prescribe. There was no corresponding provision in the House amendment. The conference agreement includes this provision.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Auchincloss	Evins	Mansfield, Tex.
Barden	Fellows	Meyer
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Miller, Nebr.
Bender	Forand	Mitchell
Bennett, Mich.	Fuller	Morrison
Bland	Gavin	Patman
Blatnik	Gearhart	Pfeifer
Buckley	Gifford	Phillips, Tenn.
Buffett	Gregory	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hall,	Rayfiel
Butler	Edwin Arthur	Sarbacher
Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Scoblick
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Clements	Jennings	Somers
Clippinger	Kearns	Sundstrom
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Devitt	Lesinski	Vinson
Dingell	McDowell	Vursell
Dondero	Macy	West

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to line 5 on page 46. There was then pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House have come to see me this morning and asked me to explain what this amendment does and whether or not it has anything to do with another item in a subsequent page of the bill having to do with Federal airports.

This amendment seeks to restore $4,849,000 on page 45 under the heading of "Civil Aeronautics Administration", line 18, reading "other agencies serving aviation: $66,133,000." The amendment seeks to increase that by $4,849,000 and would restore 130 air-control towers in 130 locations plus 19 others in 19 locations over the country. You will find an explanation of that on page 797 of the hearings for the Department of Commerce. The hearings are available at the desk.

This has to do with the operation of the control towers only. It has to do with the restoration of the salaries paid to the operators in those 130 towns, plus 19 towns. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Federal-State airport program, the 7-year program, which we implemented with $45,000,000 last year. We will come to that portion of the bill later on. This has absolutely nothing to do with the Federal airport program—merely with the operation of the control towers.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. On yesterday my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY] read a long list of names of cities that would be affected by the construction program. This particular item has nothing to do with those cities or the airports in those localities whatever. That deals entirely with the construction program, rather than with the operation program.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I want to further explain that the names of the towns to which this amendment applies are found on page 797, plus the names of the additional 19 towns that have been added.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that on page 5195 of the RECORD of May 13 will be found a list of the 148 cities which would be affected by the action of the committee in denying funds for the operation of these towers.

Mr. STEFAN. It has nothing to do with any other cities except the operation of the towers in those cities on the pages I mentioned.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman is speaking with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. A substitute was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL], and includes at least one city at the present time that has been approved, but approved too late to be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for consideration.

Mr. STEFAN. Your town would also be included in that category, would it not?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. My town is included.

Mr. STEFAN. Your town is paying for its own operations. There are many other towns paying for their own and are satisfied with that. If they cannot get if they do not want others to have it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Is the gentleman going to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly not.

Mr. RIVERS. I think you would be wise to accept it, because we are going to win anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If it is the policy of the Government to subsidize control towers at the various airports, why should they not subsidize the railroad signal tower down here at Union Station?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman has no airport in his district?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, I have; plenty of them.

Mr. RIVERS. In other words, if you cannot have it, you do not want us to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. I do so because I think failure to adopt this amendment would strike a staggering blow at air safety in the United States.

Before I forget the question that was just asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] with reference to railroad signal stops, I should like to ask the same very distinguished gentleman if he favors turning back to local operation and local responsibility the navigation locks on all of the navigable streams in the inland-waterway system. I do not believe any such proposal will be made. I am certain the Congress would not give serious consideration to such proposal if it were made, because it has long been recognized that on the inland-waterway system it is a Federal responsibility to operate those navigation locks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Inasmuch as the gentleman raised the question, I will say

that I am positively opposed to the Government's subsidizing inland waterways. I think the users of the inland waterways should pay for their operation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield briefly, but then I should like to proceed to give a brief summary of the situation, if I may.

Mr. BONNER. With regard to the operation of the inland waterways system, the Federal Government recognizes the responsibility of safety at sea. We maintain the Coast Guard, lighthouse stations, and airplanes to provide safety at sea. It is just as necessary that the Government provide these aids for safety in the air as it is that they provide aids for safety in navigation at sea. It all has but one purpose, the preservation of life.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman, and I believe the situations are similar, and that regardless of all other arguments, the big question presented here is that of the safety of our airways and the protection of human lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just briefly to review this situation. A year ago the committee recommended the elimination of funds for the maintenance of air traffic control towers. At that time I offered an amendment to restore approximately $3,000,000 to the appropriation bill for this operation. That amendment was adopted and the amount was restored for another year. The control towers were operated by CAA personnel from funds furnished by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that air traffic control towers are the very heart of the Federal-airways system. I believe no one who has made a careful study of the situation will hold any different opinion.

I believe that failure to provide for Federal operation of these control towers would be a very tragic action on the part of the Congress of the United States.

The proposal here is to turn these traffic control towers back to the operation of the municipalities across the country. That is the proposal. In other words, at the beginning of a new fiscal year, and without previous notice whatsoever, at a time when the officials of most of the municipalities have already made their budgets, the Congress says: "You must assume this additional responsibility beginning July 1." Such action will create utter chaos and confusion in the airways of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And coming at a time when city governments throughout the country are having serious fiscal problems of their own, this is a matter of national concern.

Mr. PRIEST. It is indeed a very, very serious problem of national concern, and I thank the gentleman for his very apt observation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wish to concur in the views of the gentleman from Tennessee and to ask this further question: Is it not true that these control tower employees are required to pass examinations and meet CAA standards of competency?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct. And let me add one statement in that connection. In the report of the committee—and I do not say this with any desire or intention to be critical of the subcommittee or its distinguished chairman—the statement is made that these towers, in the opinion of the committee, should be operated by CAA trained personnel. That, however, is not the requirement of any law, and I do not see how we could say to a particular city in a particular State that it must employ certain persons who have not certain standards. I do not believe we can require that, under any existing law.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have, along with the other distinguished members of that committee, given a great deal of time and attention to the whole question of air safety. Our committee, acting under direction of the House, has carried on a very extensive investigation of air accidents and safety since the first of the year.

As a result of that investigation and previous study of the subject, I feel very strongly that failure to provide funds for the operation of control towers will endanger the lives of thousands who fly our airways each day, and in effect would mark the beginning of the breaking up of our Federal airways system.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the committee has made a serious mistake in eliminating all appropriations for the employment of personnel who operate the airport-traffic-control towers now established throughout the Nation. The committee must realize that if these control towers are closed down, it will prove a real hazard to air travel, and it may well be assumed that air lines will detour all airports not providing control tower service. In this connection I want to make special reference to the situation as it presents itself at the Sioux City Municipal Airport in my congressional district. There have been over 8,000 aircraft movements, that is, landings and take-offs, on the Sioux City Airport during the month of April this year. The facilities of this airport are also used by the Iowa National Guard for training purposes. At the present time the Iowa National Guard has 35 planes stationed at this airport, 25 of which are P–51's. These planes travel at the rate of about 450 miles per hour and are often in the air at the same time as the smaller and slower planes are aloft. Anyone certainly can realize the great danger involved in such a situation without the use of a traffic-control tower. Surely these control towers are just as essential to safe navigation of the airways as lighthouses are to the safe navigation of the sealanes. The continued development of aviation depends greatly on the element of the danger involved.

The elimination of this appropriation will also place on cities the responsibility for financing operations of the airport control towers in all municipalities except the city of Washington. Unless these cities are prepared to finance the operation of the towers by July 1, 1947, the effect may be a virtual paralysis of commercial air transportation. The committee report advocates that the full cost of operating these towers should be defrayed by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derive the benefit from the airports. In the first instance, the committee forgets that much of the traffic at these airports consists of Government aircraft who pay nothing for the service rendered by the control towers. There is nothing fair in such an arrangement.

The elimination of this appropriation will have serious repercussions in Iowa as far as needed finances are concerned for the operation of its control towers. In the first instance, budgets for cities and towns in Iowa are made in August of each year. Therefore, no funds were budgeted in August 1946 for the year 1947, and, consequently, no appropriations were made in 1947 for traffic-control-tower expense. No fees are collected from Federal, commercial, or private planes for control-tower service, and the city finances have been based upon the fact that the Federal Government was financing control-tower service, and as a result the cities have not attempted to recoup any sums of money from any person, firm, or corporation affording themselves of the control-tower service.

Control-tower expenses in a city is a definite hardship and adds to the burden which will ultimately destroy an efficient national system. For instance, the city of Des Moines, Iowa, has for many years had an annual deficit averaging $18,000 on its airport. The Federal Government has occupied its hangar for $1 per year during the war and is still hanging on to it. There is a like situation at the Sioux City Airbase. Here eight men are employed by the CAA to operate the control tower, and the cost of operation is $32,821 annually. It is financially impossible for the city of Sioux City to make any budget arrangement whereby they can assume this load. In this connection, it should be said that the CAA has been contemplating the installation of an instrument approach system at the Sioux City Airbase to guide planes into the airport regardless of the weather. This is another development which the city could not afford to install, and as a result there will be further hazards in connection with all airport movements at the airport in case of bad weather.

I realize that the committee is insisting on economy in Government, and they are to be commended for attempting to do that very thing. However, there is such a thing as false economy, and it seems to me that the elimination of appropriations for the operation of air-traffic control towers is in that category. Certainly we cannot afford to increase the hazards in air traffic, and it

is my firm opinion that if the appropriation for the operation for these control towers is eliminated many cities in which the towers are located will simply discontinue the service because they do not have the money to carry on. I earnestly hope that the amendment is adopted.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on some time. I wonder how many want to talk on this amendment. Certainly it is not the purpose of the committee to limit debate, and I certainly shall not move to cut debate because I want to be as liberal as I possibly can.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, we can agree on any time. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I cannot understand why the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to eliminate the funds needed for CAA financing and operating traffic-control towers at Billings, Helena, Lewistown, Butte, Great Falls, Missoula, and elsewhere in Montana. The risks to commercial and private flying would, if these funds are not restored, be too excessive and the public would pay for this false type of economy. The cost of maintaining control-tower operations are not the obligation of the cities concerned, but are of the Federal Government. The public safety is paramount and it is our obligation to protect it. The alternative to supplying the needed funds for these projects is to close them entirely or turn them over to the cities concerned. In the latter case the result will be to close them because the municipalities just have not got the finances needed to carry them on.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the House to vote for this amendment, and I insert with my remarks letters and telegrams received from Montana about this subject:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 8, 1947.*
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised that House Appropriations Committee has reduced funds requested for CAA grants to cities for airport projects by 50 percent. This reduction completely eliminates the city of Great Falls from participation in National Airport Act program. Wish to protest this action as city of Great Falls is financially unable to complete repairs of emergency nature which must be accomplished this summer.

HJALMER C. JOHNSON,
Mayor.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *May 8, 1947.*
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised that House Appropriations Committee has eliminated funds for CAA operations for airport-traffic control towers. Wish to protect this action as city of Great Falls would be unable financially to assume this burden.

HJALMER C. JOHNSON,
Mayor.

BILLINGS, MONT., *May 11, 1947.*
Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Will you help cities get control-tower operation costs restored in Federal budget? These costs definitely not city obligation. Costs are Federal or air lines responsibility.

H. E. BIDDINGER,
Mayor.

BUTTE, MONT., *May 14, 1947.*
The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised proposal now made to cut budget fund of Civil Aeronautics Authority in amount set up for manning control towers for commercial air lines. Hope you will investigate this matter, and if commercial air transportation likely to be hampered by such deletion ask that amount be reinstated.

BUTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. S. THOMPSON, *Manager.*

LEWISTOWN, MONT., *May 14, 1947.*
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
Washington, D. C.:

Central Montana Chamber of Commerce opposed curtailment proposed CAA budget with reference to funds for operation airport control towers fiscal year 1948. Risk to commercial and private flying excessive.

ASHLEY C. ROBERTS,
Secretary,
Central Montana Chamber of Commerce.

HELENA, MONT., *May 15, 1947.*
MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you take all possible action to prevent removal of CAA tower and facilities from Helena Municipal Airport.

J. R. WINE, Jr., *Mayor.*

HELENA, MONT., *May 15, 1947.*
MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Montana Pilots' Association requests you oppose at the hearing attempts being made to eliminate CAA control tower and facilities throughout the State.

J. R. WINE,
Secretary, Montana Pilots' Association.

BILLINGS COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Billings, Mont., May 10, 1947.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congressman from Montana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: We are informed Congress is apparently about to cut off 1947–48 operating funds for airport control towers in many cities, including Billings.

I doubt that the city will take over this expense if Federal funds are not available thus closing down this operation at the airport.

You should know the tower was built at substantial cost to Billings at the urgent demand of the CAA during war time and for safety because of the Army ships using the airport along with the commercial transports. CAA agreed to finance the control tower operations annually, providing the city paid for its construction.

CAA insisted the tower was absolutely necessary for public safety in transport flying. If this is correct, CAA, the commercial airlines operators, and Congress certainly have an obligation not to close this safety device.

It seems to us it is equally obvious the operating costs belong to the agencies charged with public safety and those benefiting financially from their monopoly franchise.

We doubt that Congress can offhand close these towers or demand the local government to finance their operations which we were coerced by a Federal agency in setting up.

Sincerely,

BILLINGS COMMERCIAL CLUB,
H. L. BUCK, *Secretary-Manager.*

BILLINGS, MONT., *May 8, 1947.*
Hon. MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funds for CAA financing and operating traffic-control tower at Billings Airport for fiscal year beginning July 1.

This operation vital to all commercial, military and private flying including personnel and passengers in area bounded Twin Cities, Spokane, Great Falls, Cheyenne. Impossible for municipality to assume this financial responsibility.

Urgently request you do everything possible to have this appropriation restored.

BILLINGS AIRPORT COMMISSION.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] which would increase the amount recommended by the committee approximately $5,000,000. It occurs to me that the Congress would be assuming a great risk to save $5,000,000.

From recent investigations made of air accidents, it seems to me considerable emphasis was laid on the necessity of the safe take-off and landing of aircraft. The efficient control of the air towers located on airports is very essential in making take-off and landing safe.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] always makes a good argument. It is true the air towers are stationary and do not move in interstate commerce, but certainly the traffic they control does move in interstate commerce, and if there ever was a time and place where we need uniformity in operation it seems to me that place is in the operation of air fields, including air towers.

Air transportation is in its infancy. It needs to be encouraged. It needs to be made safe and it seems to me, to make a little saving here would be an unwise and dangerous chance to take.

As has been referred to by previous speakers, many of the municipalities are having their own difficult times in financial matters, and their budgets have already been made. It would seem to be the wrong thing to do at this time for the Government, without notice, to refuse funds to carry on this very important activity. I am very much in favor of the amendment and shall vote to have the funds restored.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to lay before the committee the over-all picture of the operations of our Federal airways system. It was first authorized under a very general law which provided for the development and the installation and the operation of anything necessary to maintain the safety of the airways. Under this vague authority lies our entire system of navigation facilities and aides of all sorts. Through the years that has grown, and it has grown in a rather irregular and uncontrolled manner. Last year we appropriated $39,000,000 for the purpose of all phases of this program, including control towers. The original budget request that came before our subcommittee this year for this program was for $54,500,000 for fiscal 1948. But, to give you some concept of the problem that confronted this subcommittee, I want you to know that while the hearings were going on we had a supplemental request come to us that raised this total figure to $63,333,000. Last year the total personnel connected with the over-all operation of the Federal airways system called for 7,331 persons. They had an authorization for a little over 8,000 persons and in the present budget they request in addition to that 4,000 added personnel. Now, that is in the over-all program in which this item involving control towers is a part.

The position of the committee is that we have something here before us now that we are appropriating Federal funds for that is big, and we recognize that it is going to be and should be even bigger. It involves more than just the Federal Government. Of course, it is interstate commerce and traffic, we know that, but it involves municipalities; it involves the air lines themselves, and we have taken this procedure of focusing your attention on the control tower part of this appropriation, which is a purely local matter—control towers are fixed; they do not travel between space—of focusing your attention upon something that we feel should be thoroughly considered by the Congress and for which we have a duty to perform of proposing fundamental law. That is the job for the Congress of the United States right now.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree that it is well to call this to the attention of the House, but will the gentleman agree that it would be safer and perhaps a better procedure to give the Legislative Committee now going into this very same matter, in view of the rapid development taking place since the war ended, a reasonable time—and I mean by reasonable, during the Eightieth Congress—to present legislation dealing with this over-all program for the guidance not only of our Committee on Appropriations, but for the cities and States?

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman from Connecticut raises a very valid point. It will be answered in detail by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. It is true that the fiscal year will be ended in about a month and a half, and that does not give too much time for a full consideration of this matter. However, I call your attention to the fact that the same warning was made last year. We will not have solved anything by adopting the Rooney amendment. It will be expediency again. We have a job to do here, and we take this opportunity and this method to call it to your attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Conecticut, as the gentleman states, the matter was brought up last year when Mr. Raybaut was chairman of the subcommittee. Immediately upon the convening of this Congress and its proper organization the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is charged with legislative jurisdiction over this subject, commenced the hearings to which the gentleman referred. Those hearings still continue, and the committee is learning all it can and will ultimately present a solution, but it cannot do it by June 30 of this year.

Mr. HORAN. But certainly the airline growth is not waiting. The point we are making here is that we of the Appropriations Committee have to face the facts as they are. We cannot put off beyond the limits of the fiscal year a determination of this matter. I think it is about time that the committee to which the gentleman referred got busy and came out here with some sort of a pattern under which we can appropriate intelligently.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want first to read a telegram I have received from the capital city of my State, Phoenix:

> Information has just been received regarding proposed elimination of Federal funds for operation of control towers at CAA designated airport. Phoenix Sky Harbor ranks very high in air traffic movement and during three of the past 12 months led the country.
>
> That may be surprising to a good many of you, but it is a fact easily explained by the strategic location of Phoenix, Ariz.
>
> To in any way restrict present control tower operation would result in creating a hazard that would endanger the thousands of users of Sky Harbor. The City of Phoenix is prevented from contributing in any measure to the maintenance of control tower as budgetary limitations created by State law permit of no funds for this purpose. We strongly urge you to use your influence to the end that adequate Federal funds are furnished for this very important public service.

The foregoing telegram was signed by the Municipal Aeronautics Commission, including John L. McAtee, J. E. Redmand, Martin E. Wist, Charles L. Strouss, A. Lee Moore, Neil B. McGinnis, James Girand, and Walter P. Fulkerson, manager of the airport at Phoenix.

In addition to the message just read, I would like also to offer the following telegram from Tucson, Ariz., and a letter from Mayor E. T. Houston, of Tucson. The telegram is:

> Urge you to exert every possible effort to restore airport control tower funds to CAA Appropriation (H. R. 3311) in interest of safety. This is a serious and important matter. We hope you will point out the needs for more not less navigation control.
>
> AVIATION COMMITTEE,
> TUCSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The letter is as follows:

> I understand that the House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funds for CAA operation of traffic-control towers on municipal airports, including Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Ariz., effective July 1, 1947.
>
> The elimination of such funds will throw an undue burden upon the city of Tucson in its operation of Tucson Municipal Airport No. 2. The city budget for the fiscal year 1947–48 will have to be increased in the amount of $80,000 for the operation of Tucson Municipal Airport, excluding operation of the traffic-control tower. If this additional burden falls on the city, it will cost the city an additional $30,000 per annum. The city of Tucson has been requested by the War Department to remove all commercial operations from Davis-Monthan Air Base at Tucson by July 1, 1947, which will necessitate activation of the traffic control tower on Tucson Municipal Airport No. 2, which is not now in operation.
>
> We urge that all steps possible be taken to reinstate the appropriation for the operation of airport traffic control tower at Tucson
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> E. T. HOUSTON, *Mayor*.

Let me give one more telegram, this one from the mayor of Winslow, Ariz., E. P. Kiernan:

> Strongly urge that you support appropriations bill which will provide Federal funds for operation of municipal airport traffic control towers. Tower at local muncipal airport has been inoperative since February as no funds available for its operation. Control tower badly needed as a safety measure. City of Winslow not financially able to assume cost of operation.

A look at the air map will reveal the importance of a control tower at Winslow, Ariz. It is a junction point in air way traffic. Winslow is not a large or rich city but its importance as a transportation center far exceeds its size. I call your attention in particular to the message from the capital city of Phoenix, which is on a great interstate airway transportation line. However, the other two cities are also key centers in aeronautics.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Practically every city concurs in these messages. Our city manager has just contacted me. We also have Stanley Caldwell, civic leader, from northern Ohio. And above all it is what is right, not who is right.

About a year ago when we created the control of air towers it was directed to the attention of this House by myself. Who would want to do away with towers in the lighthouses on our seas and our lakes? Air transportation is much greater. Would it not be more hazardous to do away with the air traffic control towers at this time than to do away with the lighthouses on the seas?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman is exactly correct. It is a good analogy.

It was said by the preceding gentleman that this problem of control towers needs a different solution so that it would not have to come up here annually. I agree with the gentleman in that respect. I am not asking that this same benefit and support be extended to the hundreds and hundreds of other cities with air fields. There must be a limit somewhere I know, but there are key cities with airports that are the centers of the Nation's air commerce and certainly we ought not to leave this matter of control towers to the hazard of municipal operation.

I am in favor of the Rooney amendment. I hope we can by its adoption take care of control tower operation for at least another year until corrective legislation can be enacted.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am amazed that this Congress should seriously consider at this time abolishing Federal aid to the control towers for air traffic in the United States.

Here we are the greatest country in the world dealing with this sort of transportation which still has a number of elements of danger connected with it. This certainly is false economy to fail to provide these funds for control towers for our air traffic.

There are two aspects to the element of danger. First of all, if we were to let the public know that at one stroke of the pen we would cut out this Federal aid and throw back to each individual city the support and maintenance of these control towers, the public would feel that the element of danger would be increased, and that, I think, would result in a falling off of air traffic.

This situation is not at all comparable to the railroads, in my opinion. There is not the same essential element of danger involved in rail travel today as there is in air travel.

We, as the greatest country in the world, should see to it that we do everything possible to support the development of air traffic.

The definition of economy is the careful, thrifty, and orderly management of one's affairs. To throw back to each individual city the support and maintenance of these control towers is not an orderly management. My city, the city of Milwaukee, is located in a key position, so far as air traffic to the Northwest is concerned. Certainly it, like many other cities, will be affected by this hodge-podge method of dealing with this situation.

I think the majority of the Members of the House feel that it would be false economy to take away from the air-control towers the Federal aid which they have at this time. We cannot afford not to fully support that form of transportation which is very important to the United States, the most important country in the world today, and perhaps that form of transportation that will be the most important for the entire world of the future.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that would restore and provide funds for our national airport traffic control-tower program. There are two or three things which I wish to say in support of this program.

It is my firm conviction that this is one of the most important issues to the safety of air navigation and our aviation program, which is rapidly expanding day by day. We have a lot more at stake in the consideration of this amendment than a reduction of this amount of money for economy's sake or whether it is a pork-barrel issue, as has been charged. The question is, What policy should we pursue to give us the greatest safety in the operation of our aviation program? Can we have greater safety in the operation by CAA of our control towers in connection with the national airway system, or would we have greater safety by such operation on a local basis?

In determining this issue I trust that we may consider it openly and in accordance with the facts and not approach it from a blind or fallacious argument. It is too important to consider otherwise. The gentleman says the support of this amendment is brought on by wires and messages received from our districts back home. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have received no wire or communication from anyone in my home city or from my district, and I should like to say further that among the list of control towers proposed by the CAA in this program there is not one in my district. I ride the airplanes frequently, and I, as do thousands of people throughout this Nation, want to travel safely and have the realization that the best policy to give me the greatest safety is being pursued.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I do not have any air-control towers in my district, either, and I have received no wires, and I feel exactly the same as the gentleman feels. It is because of the safety involved. I have flown a lot; but if they delete this appropriation for this safety control, I am not going to fly any more at all until they are put back in there again.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, the gentleman no doubt expresses the opinion of a great many other people throughout the country.

Another argument proposed which I wish to refute is that this is permitting the "camel's nose to get under the tent." Such an argument has no foundation in my opinion. The gentleman says that such a program would run into astronomical costs to the Government of $200,000,000. Such a position is wholly unrealistic and approaches the ridiculous. It is indicated that for the Government to carry out this policy it would be necessary to install and operate a control tower in all of the 5,000 airports in the Nation. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] stated "that means we have 100 airports for every State in the Union." And the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] said "either we have to cut out the control towers or we have to furnish, control, and operate them for every airport." I am sure the gentlemen are not serious in making this charge. Certainly anyone can understand there will be no need for control towers in every little airport, and, in fact, many of our larger airports. Under the established policy, there was never any intention of establishing air-control towers and service in any of the airports except those included in our national airway system and where commercial service is provided and where the airports are used by the Army, the Navy, and international and such other service incidental to that particular airfield for safety purposes. Certainly it is contemplated that there will be ultimately some more control towers established, because they will be necessary to the operation of our national airway system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only part of the airports are what are known as control airports. Those are the only ones that have towers.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I was going to mention that.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the very able gentleman from Nebraska, the chairman of this subcommittee, has given many years of study to the problems of aviation. I have for some years admired him for his interest in promoting aviation. I must frankly say, however, that I am somewhat puzzled at his attitude in connection with this program. Not because I differ with him on a matter of policy, but because, Mr. Chairman, in connection with his insistence of his position on this issue which will in my opinion eliminate the control towers and many of our important and necessary airports, and also with his insistence that the CAA be limited and seriously handicapped in carrying out commitments and our obligation in the development of airports. It strikes me as an attitude of seriously curtailing the continued progress and development of a program that is needed, demanded, and is here to stay.

In the report on page 25 it is stated:

> It is the contention of this committee that safety factors are not involved in any way.

Certainly your committee does not mean that. Because the whole question involved is safety. Were it not for the safety program involved there would be no necessity whatsoever for control towers. The report further says the towers should be operated with CAA personnel and under CAA standards.

This means, as I interpret it, that the committee is of the opinion that the CAA program in the operation of these towers is needed and necessary and that CAA should control the personnel and provide the standards. If safety is not involved, Mr. Chairman, why would they want the CAA to control the operation?

Yet the report further says:

> The States, cities, and municipalities would merely reimburse the CAA for the cost of the personnel required to operate the towers.

I can see the gentleman requiring Omaha to pay for the operation of a pro-

gram that was controlled and maintained by someone in Washington. I can see the gentleman from Washington saying to the mayor and the council of the city of Spokane that an agency from Washington, D. C., has personnel under their direction and control in Spokane and want you to pay for it. I can see the Federal Government going to any city throughout the country and saying, "Here we have a program that is needed and necessary. I am going to provide the personnel. I am going to control it. But you are going to pay for it." I ask you, is that reasonable? You know what they are going to say. They are going to say, "Here, Mr. Federal Agency, this is a national or an international plan. We are not going to provide the cost of something that is your responsibility." The results will be that a very few control towers will actually operate. The results would be that the progress we have made in air safety would be largely nullified. The results would be that air transportation would be extremely curtailed.

Let me read another statement from the report. On the same page of the same paragraph, it is stated, "air accidents will only be eliminated, it seems to the committee, when people stop flying." I wonder if that is really what the committee believes. I wonder if this House is to take that statement that this committee proposes that we completely eliminate air transportation. Had it not been for the progress we have made in aviation when we became involved in this tragic, global war, where do you think we would have been today? Is there any question in anyone's mind that we would be sitting here in this Chamber legislating for the people of this great country of ours? The gentleman talks about the Army and Navy turning over 400 airports to CAA and there are some yet to be transferred. Does the gentleman not realize that these airports cost the taxpayers of this country enormous sums of money which would not have been necessary had we provided adequate national airport development beforehand? Does the gentleman also recognize that should there be a future emergency we will not have the time to provide such needed facilities? Ah, yes; this, Mr. Chairman, transcends political issues and arguments for expediency.

I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and we too have made extensive and exhaustive studies of this program. For several years I have studied it, and there are some members of this committee who have given their time and efforts to this program for more than 25 years. We have held hearings constantly on this question since January. We reported out the airport bill in the last Congress and considered all phases of the aviation program at that time and in previous Congresses. We have seen the actual operation of control towers and all the technical phases of it. We have seen how necessary it is for the proper operation which can be attained only by proper control to the various landing approaches like the ILS, GCA, and FIDO operation. These are new developments in landing of our aircraft, and even yet in the experimental stages. Yes, we have observed the importance of the operation of these air-control towers from Los Angeles, from Washington to New York, and throughout the Nation—even on nonstop flights from the west to the east coast. To be sure the approach control is necessary to reliable and safe clearance of aircraft into and out of airports under such restricted conditions of ceiling and visibility, and there can be safe operation only when both the airport-tower personnel and airway-traffic personnel are responsible to the same central authority. We have considered boundary lines and local control, but it is the considered opinion and best judgment from the experience of our committee, from the experience of the industry, from the experience of the agency which is administering this program, that we will have greater safety in this national-airport system by the Federal Government which is the only central authority assuming and carrying out this responsibility. I cannot urge, Mr. Chairman, too strongly the importance of this amendment in the carrying out of a policy that this Government must adopt and must continue in connection with the operation of the actual life line. Yes, the very heart of our national airway system.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Rooney amendment.

The largest city in my constituency is Portland, Maine. I have a letter from the Portland City Council—and I do not know why anybody should be apologetic about having a city in his district which is affected by this legislation. The city council writes me as follows:

> If this cut is upheld by Congress, it will remove from CAA's appropriation funds sufficient to operate a control tower at the Portland Municipal Airport. The city has gone ahead with construction of the tower with a commitment from CAA to finance its operation from Federal funds, and CAA has planned to locate a mobile control tower here pending the completion of the permanent tower.
>
> The operation of the tower is essential to the safety of flying at the airport, and its cost would be a burden which the city should not be expected to carry. Even more importantly, the nature of the responsibility is a Federal one, inasmuch as it involves the control of air traffic within a radius of 50 miles or more from the airport and across State lines.

I also have in my hand the 1947 national airport plan of the Department of Commerce which shows that Portland, Maine, is being raised from a class 3 airport to a class 4 airport.

In the summer of 1944 a Mitchell bomber, an Army plane, was approaching the airport in foggy weather. A wing tip of the bomber hit a trailer village. The bomber crashed. Eighteen people in the trailer village were killed, the entire crew of the plane was killed, the plane itself of course was a total loss to the United States and the trailer village was largely destroyed by fire. I introduced appropriate legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress to compensate, insofar as money could compensate, for the losses and deaths involved. The legislation was passed. I forget what the aggregate cost of that accident was to the United States, but it certainly must have run very deeply into six figures. I believe that accident would not have occurred if we had had a control tower.

I believe the responsibility for air safety is a Federal responsibility. If it is not to be a Federal responsibility then there should be some general legislation making the contrary provision.

I want to call attention to just one thing, on page 25 of the committee report there appears the statement:

> Air accidents will only be eliminated, it seems to the committee, when people stop flying.

Is that the way we are going to eliminate air accidents? It is not my idea of the way to do it or the way to approach this question.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as most of the Members know, I come from Kansas City, Mo., which has a large airport. It is the geographical center of the United States. At this airport, stop daily many of the transcontinental planes.

Kansas City is very much interested in this question.

I rise in support of the amendment, reluctantly I may say, in view of my very great respect for the distinguished members of this Committee. As we have read the press during the last few months we have seen to our dismay an increasing number of accidents in air traffic. There is nothing which contributes more to the safety of the American traveling public by air, perhaps, than these control towers.

I received the other day a telegram from the Honorable William E. Kemp, the distinguished mayor of Kansas City, in which he set out his views. I think these views are important because I think they perhaps reflect the views and the situation in most of the cities in the United States. He points out, and I want to read a paragraph or two from his telegram:

> Assuming city elected to assume and carry on operation of control tower, it would in this and other cities, result in lack of uniformity control-tower operation which might inject element of serious hazard to safety of air-transport operation. So far as Kansas City is concerned, cost to Federal Government of control-tower operation is practically offset by approximately 10,000 square feet space furnished Federal Government at municipal airport for Post Office, Weather Bureau, and CAA communications. Am advised same situation exists most municipal airports throughout country.

Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes to ask the membership for the serious consideration of this amendment because it means not only the continuation of a very valuable safety-device program, as the mayor of Kansas City pointed out, but if you do away with it from the Federal standpoint you will

have no uniformity over the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In reference to Kansas City, the gentleman has a very curious and interesting situation in which the airport is in one State and the population in another.

Mr. BELL. I will have to correct the gentleman on that. We do have an airport on the Kansas side, but the municipal airport is in Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is likewise a great deal of population in Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. BELL. They are just a little suburb of Kansas City, Mo. Though we do graciously admit that Kansas is a State and in reasonably good standing with the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW. But the control of the aircraft is over a 25-mile zone which crosses into the State of Kansas.

Mr. BELL. That does not make it any less necessary; if we are going to avoid these accidents we have to have control.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I know a good many pilots fly into Kansas City. I know that the lives not only of our pilots but of the flying public depend upon these safety devices. I hope the Congress, in view of its commendable desire to save money, will not save at the wrong place. Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow to go unchallenged the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri relative to my home town Kansas City, Kans., being a suburb of Kansas City, Mo. It is no part of, and has no connection with, the Missouri municipality, which possibly affixed the name of the fair State of Kansas to give an aura of respectability.

Kansas City, Kans., is a city, a first-class city, of the first class, in its own right. The airport is a municipal airport and it is bigger and better in all aspects than the Kansas City, Mo., airport. It is big enough, good enough, so much bigger and so much better than the Missouri field that it is the Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport at which the President's plane, the "Sacred Cow," arrives and from which it departs.

It was at Fairfax—Kansas City, Kans.—Airport that thousands of North American B–25 bombers were built and tested during the war.

Its runways are long enough, wide enough, heavy enough to accommodate any plane now made or in the planning stage. Yet as spacious as it is it is subject to still further enlargement.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to how many commercial air lines utilize the airport in Kansas City, Kans.?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There are practically none; I will state that frankly. And, if you want, I can go into details why, but that does not have anything to do with this particular debate.

But, in all seriousness, I feel quite sure that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], was not too serious in his statement concerning my city, of which we are properly proud. But, he has presented a situation that has developed, because those two airports are just across the Missouri River, the dividing line that makes a great difference in more ways than one. The pattern in and out of those two airports do cross. There is some conflict, and it was with some difficulty that we were able to convince the CAA that these two towers should be interlocked and coordinated. There have been, to my recollection, no serious accidents on either one of those airports in the last several years.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to endorse completely what the gentleman from Kansas has said. The airport to which he refers is a magnificent airport, beautifully designed, beautifully located, and it is imperative that the important work that goes on over there should not be curtailed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume the gentleman is now speaking of our Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport.

Mr. REEVES. I am speaking with great respect and admiration and praise of the Kansas City, Kans., airport.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me make this further observation before I close. It would seem to me that one job should be done by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. They have been studying airplane accident prevention now for some time, and they should come to us with some remedial legislation which would clarify this situation. In view of the fact that many of the airports to which we have referred handle a large number of Government planes, for which the municipal airports cannot make a charge, there should be some logical, sane solution for the situation that now faces us. I trust that the committee will soon, in their wisdom, bring in that type of legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has brought up a very important point with reference to two airports in two different States that should be interlocked. They are very similar to Bolling Field and Anacostia Field and the Washington National Airport. If they were going to be operated by separate jurisdictions, that interlocking relationship could not be properly applied for the safety of the aircraft using both airports, and that is one of the problems of our committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My reaction from the statements made here was not that there would be any complete kicking loose from the CAA in the operation of these towers, but that only the airports themselves or the cities owning them should pay for the operation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, that is correct, but the gentleman's airport does not receive the revenues that the other airport does.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right. That is why some equitable plan should be proposed.

Mr. HINSHAW. On the other hand, it has a very important function to perform.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have not been able to get the figures, but my recollection is that well over 60 percent of the traffic of the Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport is Government traffic, including Reserve flyers, for which there can be no charge.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment gives every Member of the House an opportunity to show whether he really believes in Federal economy or whether it is merely a political issue. The Congress last year authorized the expenditure of one-half billion dollars as Federal aid for an airport construction program. The policy of the Federal Government in assisting the localities in the construction of airports in my judgment is sound and I gladly supported that measure. There are in the United States at the present time 4,723 airports and it is contemplated when the program is completed there will be 6,300.

At 130 of these airports, the Federal Government is now operating air control towers, the cost of which amounted to over $3,000,000 this year. The operation of these towers was assumed by the Government during the war as a defense measure and the facilities were used extensively by the armed forces. The war is now over. These towers have reverted to civilian use. Instead of relinquishing this war activity it is proposed to extend the service to 19 additional airports during the next year at a total cost to the Government of approximately $5,000,000. Many other localities which have not yet received the official nod from the CAA are also clamoring for towers.

One airport at which the Government now operates the control tower is located in the city of Richmond, which I have the honor to represent. I ask the Members of this House by what process of logic and fairness can I support a program under which the Federal Government operates a control tower in my district and then vote to deny it to Oshkosh, or any other airport in the United States. If, however, this service is extended to the 6,300 airports which we will have in the United States, it will cost this Government over $200,000,000 each year to maintain air-control towers alone. In my judgment, therefore, we must transfer this cost to the localities where it properly belongs before it reaches such tremendous proportions.

In fact the cost of maintaining these towers should not be borne by either the Federal Government or by the localities, but it should be paid by those who use the airways; those who receive the special benefits which these towers provide. Reference has been made on the floor of

the House to our great highway system. The Federal Government contributed to the construction of our highways, but it has never contributed to local maintenance, and, moreover, the highways of this country have been financed largely through the gasoline tax which has properly placed the burden on the highway users. Let us follow the same policy with regard to the airways.

The argument has been advanced that this sudden action will not give the localities an opportunity to arrange local financing. This action is not sudden. The proposal to eliminate these funds from the Federal budget was made last year and the same argument was used against it. We come now to another year and unless something is done about it we will have the same argument next year and the year following and on ad infinitum.

We need to work out a definite pattern of Federal, State, local and private cooperation in our entire air-transportation program. That pattern will never be worked out, however, as long as the Federal Government continues to foot all the bills. The elimination of some of these Government contributions, on the other hand, will hasten consideration of such a program of coordination. The time to act is now before this octopus gets any larger. I, therefore, urge you to stand by the committee and vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 2 minutes, in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that the operation cost of a large airport is around $1,000,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. What we are arguing about here today is an item of $4,800,000 for the payment of salaries of operators in these control towers. All the safety aids and equipment and all the other operation and maintenance are there. There are only 3 or 4 large airports in the United States where a maximum of 16 of these operators are employed. They include New York City, Chicago, Dallas, and the Washington Airport. It costs about $56,000 for those 16 operators in New York City, Chicago, Dallas, and Washington. The other thing we are arguing about is the from 6 to 16 operators in the smaller airports.

What you are really arguing about is an average cost of $32,000 for the payment of these operators of the control towers, whereas the maintenance and operation equipment is in the bill. All you are arguing about is whether or not these commercial air lines and nonscheduled air lines, States, and communities should cooperate and pay for all or part of the salaries of these operators.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that that is not only true but it is also true that these towers are not needed in all of the 6,300 airports that we will have in the United States. If the localities have to provide them, we will not have them, but if the Federal Government provides the towers free of cost to the localities, then all of the 6,300 airports will demand them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's derk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Strike out "$70,982,000" and insert "$71,081,484."

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri, my good friend and colleague [Mr. BAKEWELL], for including the amount necessary to operate the control tower at Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo., in his substitute amendment.

Most of the Members who have spoken in favor of this proposal refer to the Rooney amendment. Therefore, I feel that it is necessary in order to protect myself and the two other Members who are in the same position as I to offer this amendment to the Rooney amendment.

The Rooney amendment seeks to restore in this bill the amount necessary for Federal control-tower operation during the next fiscal year for all of the control towers that have been operated with Federal funds during this fiscal year plus 19 others that were proposed to be so operated at the time the budget was submitted.

Unfortunately, there are three of us, namely, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE], and myself, who each have an airport in our district that is qualified to receive Federal funds for control-tower operation and has been approved by the CAA, but approved too late to submit the amount necessary for such control-tower operation to the Budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I cannot yield at the moment.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am going to help him out a little bit.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Then, I am glad to yield. I need the help.

Mr. STEFAN. How much are you increasing this amount?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. My amendment increases the Rooney amendment by $99,484.

Mr. STEFAN. What airports does that take in—the one at St. Joe, and what others?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. St. Joseph, Mo., New Orleans, La., and White Plains, N. Y.

Mr. STEFAN. You missed about 45 others that are in the same category. But do you include the equipment?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. No.

Mr. STEFAN. You have left out a lot. There are many things that you have left out there.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I did not include anything except the amount necessary to pay the salaries of the personnel of the control towers because I am informed that there are sufficient funds in this bill for tower equipment and maintenance.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask my friend how he knows that this money will go to these towers? Has he consulted the CAA?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yes; I have.

Mr. STEFAN. And they approve this and the Budget approves it? The CAA has approved it, and they said that if you would get this amendment in they would put it into these towers? There are 48 or 49 other towers in the same category, and the one at St. Joe and these others want the same thing.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. Let me quote from a letter from Mr. Wright in which he tells us to come to Congress and get this appropriation and that they have approved of it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is correct. I intend to cover that.

The gentleman from New York indicated yesterday that we were taking these amounts out of thin air. I have in my hand a letter from Mr. T. P. Wright, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, in which he says:

The St. Joseph tower was commissioned by the Civil Aeronautics Administration with funds transferred by the city to the Government on December 17, 1946. The traffic figures in points per month are as follows—

I will quote only the one for March of this year—

March 1947, 10,416 points.

It is a big field.

I continue to quote:

From the above it appears that the St. Joseph tower now meets the minimum requirements of 7,500 points for Federal operation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Not at the moment. Mr. Wright says in regard to the funds necessary for the operation of the tower at Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.:

If the St. Joseph tower is included for establishment during the fiscal year 1948, it will be necessary to add $28,734 to provide for a basic minimum complement of one chief airport traffic controller and five airport traffic controllers for air operation.

I am informed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that the amount necessary to operate the control tower at the New Orleans field is $35,755. This figure was obtained in the same way, from the same source. I am also informed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] that the amount necessary to operate the control tower at the airport at West Plains, N. Y., is $35,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, those figures were obtained from Mr. Wright, from the same source and in the same manner.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], for whom I have a very high regard—and I want to thank him at this time for the courtesies he extended me upon the many occasions I have discussed this matter with him—indicated that those of us who are not included in this are going to oppose the amendment and the substitute amendment should my amendment fail. That is not true. We shall support them. We are not like dogs in the manger who, because they cannot eat hay, will not permit others to do so. We think we should be fair about this proposition, and that those fields that have qualified and have been recommended should be included, and the others as well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that this matter has never been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; that it has never been submitted to the members of the committee, either the majority or the minority; that the gentleman is now airing it without its having been given consideration by those who are economy-minded in this Congress, with the idea that if there was merit to the proposition it would be granted by the committee?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that the Civil Aeronautics Administration knows the amount necessary to operate these towers, because these towers are being operated with municipal funds under their supervision, and have been for the past year?

Mr. ROONEY. I had the mistaken impression apparently that the Congress was running the Congress and not the CAA.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that Congress should always decide the amount necessary to operate Government agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. I personally resent Mr. Wright or anyone else horning into this matter.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But the fact remains that he knows the amount necessary to operate these towers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to extend their remarks on this amendment at this point in the RECORD may have that permission.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. The most important argument in its favor is the fact that we need uniform regulations in operation of our airports throughout the United States. If this is admitted by this House, and from what I have heard I believe this is a fact, therefore, the Federal Government should pay for the operation of these control towers. Every Member of this House is in accord on the absolute necessity for these towers. Just recently we have seen the lives of eight prominent officials of one air line and the operator of a private plane taken because there was no control tower operated at a particular airport. Thus we are convinced that we need the control towers, and the need for uniform operation of the towers is absolutely necessary if we hope to protect the lives of our citizens who utilize the air lines as a means of transportation. I hope that the House will pass this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Of all the amendments offered on this section of the bill the one offered by Mr. ROONEY is the most effective. I do not believe any of the others have been as carefully thought out or that they would meet the situation as effectively as would the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I am hopeful that the House will accept Mr. ROONEY'S amendment and in so doing save the air-traffic-control program.

We cannot evaluate this program in dollars and cents. It is a matter going to the very heart of aviation development in this country.

Yesterday I received a telegram from the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly, mayor of Chicago. In substance Mayor Kennelly advises that if Federal funds are eliminated for control-tower operations and this financial obligation is placed upon municipalities the safety of air operations will be greatly impaired because few communities are going to be in a position to pay the cost.

All local communities are already hard pressed for funds. Some of them may be so hard pressed that they may not give full cooperation in this important safety program. From coast to coast there will be missing links in this chain of control towers unless the operation of the program remains Federal. We cannot very well afford to have a single missing link in this safety chain.

While I appreciate the laudable aim of the subcommittee to reduce Government operation expenses, I cannot go along with it when I feel that by holding back Federal funds we may be holding back development of aviation. Sometime in the future when commercial air operations are on a more profitable basis I can see these costs being borne by the air lines themselves, or by the municipalities, or by joint cooperation between the air lines and the municipalities. But I do not believe either the cities or air lines are ready to assume this cost now.

We cannot afford to gamble with the safety factors involving our Nation's airways. For a while, at least, the Federal Government must continue to give encouragement to aviation in this and other forms. We must never lose sight of the fact that the air lines of America are a strong link in our national defense. Cutting off of funds for the operation of air-traffic control towers at this time would, in my opinion, be a very serious mistake.

I appeal to the Members of the House to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. The defeat of this amendment means the curtailment of air navigation facilities in this Nation and at a time when we can ill afford to do so.

I am in receipt of a letter from the State director of aeronautics of the State of Alabama in which he states that the Department of Aeronautics is particularly concerned over the reductions proposed for the establishment of new air navigational facilities and for the maintenance and operation of existing air navigation facilities; also the elimination of all funds for the operation of airport control towers, except the one at Washington National.

I am greatly concerned over the elimination of funds for the operation of airport control towers as it means the elimination of the tower in Montgomery, Ala. I am in receipt of a telegram from Col. W. A. Gayle, city commissioner of Montgomery, in which he urges the continuation of the control tower at Dannelly Field, the municipal airport. Montgomery is not in financial condition to support this tower. The city owned one of the finest fields in the country, namely Gunter Field, which was turned over to the Federal Government at the outbreak of the war. This field has never been returned and it become necessary for the city to go out at great expense and purchase other property. It is not a question of the city not wanting to assume the responsibility of the control tower, but it is a question of this city and many others not being able to do so. It is a matter of public safety. The cost is small in comparison to the benefits obtained. We just cannot fail to continue to make air travel safe by continuing appropriations not only for control towers but for the improvement of landing systems.

I trust that nothing will be done in this bill to affect air safety of the aeronautical communications stations. We have one of these in my district at Evergreen, Ala. These stations are important to safe air travel.

It is true that this Congress must practice some economy. However let us be careful where the cuts are made. Let us not make them in a case like this where the lives of so many people are at stake.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize the Appropriations Committee is faced with a most difficult problem in carrying out the reduction of Government expenditures and at the same time examining every individual item and evaluating it. The commitee is to be congratulated upon its diligent effort with respect to this particular bill. I take this time, however, to call to the attention of the House the provision with respect to the need for payment of the cost of air traffic control towers. This item has been eliminated from the bill approved by the committee, and

while I am most reluctant to oppose its judgment, yet, in this particular instance, believe that the committee is in error.

Only last year, the air-control tower was established at the Topeka, Kans., municipal airport. This was in furtherance of the policy determining that these facilities were the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The present bill seeks to eliminate this policy without notice to the municipalities involved, the result of which would require the closing of these safety devices. The cities, at this late date, would have no opportunity to either levy taxes or assessments against the air lines for the purpose of continuing the program.

Because the Government established the program and because it is necessary to the safety of the traveling public and because of the inability of the municipalities to cope with the situation in so short a time, I must oppose this item of the bill and vote for the amendment restoring the appropriation providing for the cost of these air-control towers.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment because I firmly believe we need uniform control of airport towers as a necessity to the safety to air travel.

The comparative saving that would be realized by not adopting this amendment cannot be compared to the possibility of one air accident that might occur through lack of or inefficiency of proper airport tower control. We cannot expect to refer this responsibility to the cities, counties, and States who have depended upon this service, because they may not be equipped to handle it and the result would be the danger of air accidents which might otherwise be prevented.

I agree with requests I have received from the Los Angeles Municipal Airport Commission and from the Long Beach Municipal Airport that this service be continued. I therefore urge the members of the Committee to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, in our desires to economize in expenditures of public moneys, frequently we are confronted with difficult decisions. No one can deny the fact that we simply must reduce Federal expenditures when and if possible. In the present instance, however, it seems to me that the elimination of necessary funds to provide for control towers would certainly be false economy.

We recall some months ago when we had more than the normal number of air tragedies a great hue and cry went up throughout the entire country demanding a reduction in air tragedies and contending for greater degrees of safety. These days many of us are accustomed to and, in fact, are compelled to use air transportation in order to meet our many important engagements. We not only travel by air ourselves but our constituents, friends, and families are fast becoming accustomed to and demanding the right to travel by air.

As an example of the advantages of air travel, some months ago I was in St. Louis, Mo., and needed to return to Washington by the most direct and quickest route, when I learned that the fastest train scheduled from that city to the Capital required 22 hours, whereas by air only 4 hours were needed.

This is an air-minded age. Thousands of our fine young men by reason of their military experience are eager to continue their air careers. Airplanes have come to be essential in this modern age for convenience, commerce, and national security. Maintenance of air-traffic control towers increases safety in too many ways to enumerate here.

The argument to discontinue this vital service is no more logical than for a person to discontinue the carrying of insurance, either personal or property. We have become accustomed to paying insurance premiums and are glad that we seldom suffer losses.

If, as, and when the Federal funds are discontinued and the matter of safety controls at airports reverts to municipalities, counties, and States, all semblance of uniformity will be lost. The pilots will not have time to familiarize themselves with the various types and forms of safety devices, if any. In my judgment, we simply cannot justify the striking of necessary funds from this bill which would carry on essential air-control towers. I strongly urge the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Chairman, many municipalities operate air fields for commercial aviation that can and have been used by our Army and naval aircraft. These fields are a part of our national defense system. They are available at all times to the Government. The control towers at these fields have been operated by our Government for many years. These control towers are safety devices that are absolutely necessary. The omission of an appropriation to continue the operation of the control towers will compel the municipality to bear the operating expenses. Some of our cities and larger communities cannot afford this additional expense which would impair the service rendered by these towers.

I favor the restoration of the amount needed to operate these control towers in this appropriation bill. It is one service our Government can render to the air bases of America.

We have held many long hearings on air safety, and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is fully aware of the need for every safety device we can obtain to make air travel safer. Certainly a properly operated and completely staffed control tower is imperative. We cannot afford to cut expenditures where the safety of human lives is involved. The amount of money needed for this service is not large and our country will be amply repaid for this service to our airfields.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, elimination of the $4,849,000 item requested in the Commerce Department budget for the operation of air-traffic control towers at 148 airports is almost certain to result in serious disarrangement of air traffic and in increased danger of landing and take-off accidents.

It is entirely possible that a careful examination of the list of airports where the CAA now operates control towers would reveal a number of instances where the local municipal government could well afford to take over this expense, as suggested by the committee. This would result in a substantial saving to the Government, and would not interfere with aviation operations or increase hazards. This investigation certainly would be a better approach to the problem than the outright elimination of controls at 148 airports.

Such an investigation would reveal, however, that the cities of Great Falls and Billings, Mont., are not financially able to carry the burden of control-tower expenses at this time, and certainly not upon the short notice given them by this action of the Appropriations Committee. I am advised that it would cost the city of Great Falls $29,000 a year to pay for the control tower. The city is not able to provide those funds, as I have been advised by the mayor, Mr. Hjalmer C. Johnson. Mayor H. E. Biddinger, of Billings, also has informed me that his city cannot assume this burden now.

Both Great Falls and Billings are important crossroads of air travel in the Northwest. Both are served by several regular flights daily of northwest and western air lines, and the volume of private air traffic has increased tremendously since the war ended. Great Falls is the terminal of the inland air route to Alaska, a route of increasingly great importance both commercially and for defense purposes. If the House approves without change the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, the busy airports at Great Falls and Billings, serving a vast area in Montana and Wyoming, will be without control towers.

It has not been very long since a converted Army training plane and a transport carrying eight Delta Air Lines officials collided in a take-off accident in the South. This accident almost certainly would not have happened if there had been a control tower at this airport. The tower would have notified each pilot of the whereabouts of the other, and many lives would have been saved. But if the committee's action is allowed to stand, similar accidents will increase in number throughout the country as control towers are taken out of operation. We do not want this to happen at Great Falls and Billings, or at any other city which is unable to carry the burden of control tower operation.

In the interests of air safety and the successful operation of air carriers, I sincerely hope that the requested funds will be restored in this bill.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the restoration of the Government funds for operation of the air-control towers by the CAA, I do it with the keen realization that I am speaking for an area in which air-control towers represent the difference, in many cases, between an easy, successful landing, and a disastrous, deadly crash. The jagged peaks and the deep canyon valleys of the Rocky Mountains make it absolutely mandatory that control towers be used.

It seems to me that the proper control of air traffic is a Federal function, since from the time the plane leaves the ground until it reaches its destination it is almost entirely interstate traffic.

In my opinion, this action would leave the responsibility of such operations to the respective communities, which cannot operate as efficiently, effectively, and economically as the coordinated activities of the CAA.

The Salt Lake Airport in my district is vitally located, and a place where a great number of Army as well as civilian airplanes use its facilities. It is a key airport to the Intermountain West and the Pacific coast. Likewise, many of the other strategically located airports throughout the country will be affected. In view of these facts and the numerous Federal uses made of the municipal airports throughout our country, it seems only logical to restore these funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get together on limiting the time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why cannot each man who desires to speak on this have at least 5 minutes? Some of us have been sitting here for 3 days awaiting a chance to be heard. I object if we cannot get 5 minutes apiece.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to move that debate close for I do not want to cut it off.

Mr. RIVERS. Then just give each man 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that the hour will be divided among those now indicating a desire to be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. It does, less the 5 minutes reserved by the committee to close the debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that 20 Members have sought recognition. Five minutes will be reserved for the committee to close. Each Member will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL. Strike out "$71,045,734" and insert "$71,081,484."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I offer as a substitute for the Bakewell amendment is merely a safety valve to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]. The Cole amendment is a matter of arithmetic merely. In order to bring three additional airports into the list, airports which have been approved by the CAA, my amendment is to bring the Bakewell amendment into conformance with the total amount of money required.

In passing let me cite the situation of the New Orleans airport and direct your attention to the fact that the Army was operating this airport and without warning canceled out its operation, which naturally threw the airport onto the local community to operate.

Mr. Wright, in his letter to me of April 15, makes the statement:

At the time our fiscal year 1948 budget request was prepared, the air traffic at the New Orleans airport was under the control of the military authorities. This office had no knowledge of the volume of traffic at this airport, nor did we know that the military intended to relinquish their control. Therefore, funds for the operation of a control tower at the New Orleans airport are not included in the budget request now being reviewed by the Congress.

We have received a recommendation from our fourth regional office requesting that this Administration assume the operation of the New Orleans airport traffic-control tower as of July 1, 1947. Unfortunately, it will not be possible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to change our fiscal year 1948 budget request at this time. For us to take favorable action on the region's recommendation, the Congress will have to add the New Orleans tower to the approved list while the appreciations bill for fiscal year 1948 is being considered.

That is what I am adding in this connection today, taking the advice of Mr. Wright, who has approved it on the authority of his own agency. I take full cognizance of the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I agree wholeheartedly with him that the Congress is running the country in the ultimate analysis, which is one of the reasons why I cannot understand why he asks if this matter has been referred to the Bureau of the Budget. Certainly the Congress is running the country and, in my own way of thinking, the Budget Bureau stands merely as a witness before any committee the same as the representative of the CAA would stand as a witness and I would take the word of the expert and the advice of the expert, Mr. Wright.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I have 2½ minutes allotted me. Is it possible for me to yield those 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not possible to do that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment and want to read a wire that I received from the Honorable Harley E. Knox, mayor of the city of San Diego, as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *May 10, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are informed House Appropriations Committee has reduced funds for CAA grants airport projects by 50 percent. We realize need for economy and will not protest this action at this time. However, we are also notified that the same committee has eliminated all funds for CAA operation traffic-control towers municipal airports. This function has been carried on as Federal responsibility for many years. We do not believe that the Congress is doing other than kidding us by transferring Federal responsibilities to already overburdened municipal government and calling it economy. We strongly protest this action, and I am authorized to tell you that local government will not pay for operation of these towers. Strongly urge your assistance maintaining airport control towers as necessary and proper expenditure involving safety control of interstate transportation. Kindest personal regards.

HARLEY KNOX.

I have voted for every Republican economy measure on the floor of Congress, but I, for one, will not accept the responsibility for the deaths which would ensue if air-traffic control towers were not operated uniformly.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as being very strongly in favor of the Rooney amendment, which provides that the Federal Government will continue to operate the air-control towers for another year.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the point has been repeatedly made that this involves a considerable expenditure on the part of the Federal Government. I believe the fact has been overlooked, however, that on every air-line ticket there is a 15-percent tax. Certainly the people have a right to get something for that 15 percent.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman is correct. I believe the Federal Government should carry this financial burden at the present time. In San Diego, for example, Government planes use the municipal airport, and the Government gets revenue from commercial aircraft engaged in interstate commerce. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has a sane approach, and that is to have the Federal Government carry the financial burden for the personnel of the air-control towers for this year only until a permanent and more equitable plan can be placed before Congress. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] informs me that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is considering a bill to provide a fair division of the operating costs of air-control towers between those who use and receive benefits from the operation of the towers. Until such a measure is enacted into law the Federal Government should continue to operate the towers from which plane traffic is routed in and out of airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

As I understand it, the amendment only changes the present bill by around $4,899,000; in other words, it changes the sum inserted in the bill from $66,133,000 to $70,982,000. This is the amount requested by the CAA, but for some reason the committee, in the exercise of its power, has limited or cut off this amount, and the committee also provided that none of the funds shall be used for paying employees of traffic-control towers, which to me is one of the most important parts of the safety-device installations.

Mr. Chairman, the Seventy-ninth Congress went on record as being in favor of the development of the airports of this country, and we passed a bill providing the sum of $500,000,000 to be spent over a certain term of years. What good is it for this Government to go just halfway in providing a system of airports unless we provide for the operation in a safe way of those airports? This would provide something that we cannot continue unless we have air-control towers. It is very much like the Congress did in providing the terminal-leave bonds for the veterans. The bonds in the hands of the veterans are not worth a cent to them for use now. Those bonds cannot be cashed nor be negotiated for a period of 5 years. They have to just sit and wait and hope for a period of 5 years before they can get payment on the bonds.

Now this is the same thing we are doing here. We are in favor of this program, yet they want to restrict the use of the funds. It is just as logical to say that we shall not pay the salaries of the employees of the post offices in the various communities as to refuse to pay the employees for the operation of traffic-control towers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, the proposition of eliminating control-tower personnel from Federal support presents a very peculiar problem to the city of Long Beach, Calif. Our municipal airport, one of the finest on the west coast, was taken over, to a large extent, by the Army at the beginning of hostilities. Now that the war is over and the city has agreed to allow a considerable Army Air Force training establishment to remain permanently, we are endeavoring vainly to get the rest of the airport freed from the shackles of Army control.

So far we have had little success, although month after month we have promises that the ponderous wheels of governmental red tape will grind finally to a successful conclusion, but only God knows when this may be. Certainly neither the Army, nor War Assets, nor the humble Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth District has any real idea when this may be accomplished, although we are all in agreement as to its desirability.

So now, with the Army still in legal control, and with the airport partially used by an Army training command, we are asked to assume financial responsibility for the tower operations.

Mr. Chairman, we of Long Beach should like, at least, to get the Army out of our airport before we are called upon to pay for operating expenses for tower personnel which serves the Army as well as commercial traffic. Perhaps some of you have similar conditions in your district.

I intend to support the amendment.

THE LIVES OF AIR TRAVELERS MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemar from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am for economy but not for false economy that may endanger and even cost many lives if control towers should be operated by municipalities with employees who have no experience whatsoever. As one who saw the very first airplane flight at Fort Meyer, Va., in 1909 and who advocated and voted for the bill establishing the air-mail service, I have always been interested in the progress of aviation. Consequently when former Representative Nichols, of Oklahoma, urged an investigation into air-line accidents and crashes I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, realizing the need for such an investigation, succeeded in having a resolution reported by the committee and passed by the House. Some 8 months thereafter the committee made a report and one of those joining in the signing of the report was the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I was greatly impressed with the splendid investigation conducted by the committee and with the report of its findings and recommendations. Today I was very much interested when the gentleman from California made his speech urging favorable action on the Rooney amendment to increase the appropriation to $70,892,000 to provide for the operation of control towers. While the situation and need for the operation of the control towers by Civil Aeronautics Administration had been explained in telegrams which I had received from Mayor Martin H. Kennelly, of Chicago, from the Aviation Committee of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, and others, I was greatly impressed with the sound facts and reasoning given by the gentleman from California in urging the increased appropriation. I am satisfied that his statement and that of his colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], who also made a convincing plea, made a favorable impression upon the membership. I observed between 40 and 50 Members on the floor who sought to obtain recognition when the gentleman from Nebraska moved to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the subsitute or amendment offered to the Rooney amendment will not prevail and that the original Rooney amendment will be adopted. I have always believed in safety, especially in air travel, and feel that the public is entitled to all the protection and safeguards that this Government can give it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, during the last few months it has been my duty as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to sit in on the hearings investigating air accidents, and I assure you that that committee is getting ready to make a report. It is quite evident that the responsibility of the Government is to aid and assist in air navigation in this country. It is absolutely necessary that air control be uniform. It is a matter of national defense and security to the people of this country and I know that no one wants the blood of any one who might be killed in an air accident on his hands. I state unequivocally that any one who will oppose uniformity of air control tower operation in this country will have on his hands the blood of any one who dies as a result of this very carelessly laid down plan and scheme. It is very necessary for the defense of our country that we have a strong air force. We are now first in the world, but to create such a chaotic condition as the proposal here to cut out national support of air control towers would bring us to the last place. Now, until the necessary legislation is enacted, we must continue the plan that we now have.

It would be penny-wise and pound-foolish for us to cut out the national uniform system of air-control towers in this country.

The network of airports throughout this country which would be benefited by this legislation is extensively used by the Army and Navy. It is reasonable to expect that the National Government should participate in keeping the control towers of these airports in operation. If the Federal Government ceases to participate in the operation of these control towers it is evident that there will be a tendency of various airports to adopt special and separate regulations. This would result in chaos in the entire air-transportation industry. Therefore, in the interest of efficiency, uniformity and national defense, I plead with you to restore the Federal funds for the maintenance and operation of the air-control towers in the airports throughout this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, 2½ minutes is wholly inadequate to discuss this subject. I think it might be brought out for the benefit of the subcommittee that while it did not place this item in the bill last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the House overwhelmingly instructed the committee to reinsert the item in the bill, by a very large vote.

Immediately upon the convening of this Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce took up the subject of air safety, and it has been in almost continuous session morning and afternoon since January 15, very largely on that subject. There is much more involved in safety in air navigation than merely control towers. There is the proper equipment of the various airways,

there is airport zone control, there is airways traffic control—there is a myriad of subjects involved. We are doing our best, and we will come up with a report one of these days which we think will be a correct report, and not something just put together slap-dash in a few days of hearings.

In the meantime, I think it is going to be quite evident that it will be necessary to support all of the control towers in the United States whether the amount be $5,000,000 or $15,000,000. The question is how to pay for it. The reason why that is a big question is, as the gentlemen from San Diego, Calif., and from Kansas City, Kans., pointed out, that some airports are used very extensively by the military, some are used very extensively by private fliers, some are used almost exclusively by the military, and some are used almost exclusively by the non-scheduled operators. To find a satisfactory basis for the payment of that sum for the airport control towers is a very difficult thing. You cannot charge it to the municipality. You are going to have to charge it to the users of the airports on some equitable basis, but you are going to have to have a determination made as to the amount the Government has to pay for the military and naval use. At long last those airport control towers and the airways and the facilities are all 100 percent for the benefit of the United States Government in the event of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, anything that might be said now would have to be by way of repetition, but since this is such a glaring example of where a heedless cut affects not only the economy but the safety of our country, I am constrained to make a brief observation. Air traffic, probably more than any other traffic, needs all the safety devices and protection possible. Taking off and landing are the most hazardous parts of that traffic. The air-traffic control towers tie right into the landing and the taking off.

I hope this Congress, for the sake of saving a few dollars temporarily, will not imperil the traveling public on air lines. I received this morning from the chairman of the Baltimore City Aviation Commission a telegram protesting the cut and urging that the air-traffic control-tower program be continued.

Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to extend to the Members of the House on both sides, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO], who resigns tomorrow to take his seat a few days later as mayor of the city of Baltimore, an invitation to attend his inaugural ceremonies at the city hall in Baltimore at 11:30 on Tuesday next. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO] is an outstanding, energetic, capable, and beloved Member of the House. He leaves an enviable record here. Representative D'ALESANDRO enjoys the complete confidence of his colleagues. I know I speak the feeling of all here when we wish him well as mayor of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, the Cole and Hébert amendments to the Rooney amendment seek to give equitable treatment to all air-traffic control towers which qualify and have been approved under the requirements of the CAA formula, including the Westchester County class 4 airport. I believe that they should all be treated equitably, both those on the March list submitted by the CAA to the committee, which list appears in the hearings, all of which are included in the Rooney amendment, and those which have since met CAA standards and are now qualified.

The Westchester County Airport is now qualified under the CAA standards and the air-traffic control tower at this airport is operated under the supervision and control of the CAA. The traffic in and out of this airport records 13,574 points, using the point method developed by the CAA, which almost doubles the minimum of 7,500 points per month required before CAA will take over operation of a control tower. While at the present time the CAA is operating the air-control tower at the Westchester County Airport, the cost of operation is being borne by Westchester County, which reimburses the CAA for the cost of its operation each month. It is not of course equitable or fair that this airport should have to pay for the operation of its air-traffic control tower when other qualified air-traffic control towers are operated at Government expense. The purpose of this amendment is to have this cost paid by the CAA to the same extent it is now paying the cost of operation of all other approved air towers.

The traffic at this airport, located as it is in the metropolitan area, is increasing by leaps and bounds and will continue to do so.

Had there been a control tower at this airport at the time the large Army bomber smashed into the Empire State Building last year the accident could have been avoided because, while the bomber could not land at LaGuardia Field due to weather conditions, the Westchester County Airport was clear. As a matter of fact many planes now land at the Westchester County Airport when due to weather conditions or fog they cannot land at LaGuardia Field.

I sincerely hope the Cole and Hébert amendments are adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to continue for a year Federal operation of the control towers at the 148 designated airports. I wish the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has been investigating the whole matter of air safety and control, had been able to complete its study and bring before us a well-considered over-all plan for development of airports, coordination of air traffic and proper allocation of costs among the Federal Government, States or municipalities, and those who use the airports, such as military planes, commercial planes, and private planes.

The subcommittee reports that it will be able to complete its work and report out basic legislation in the next few months. Until we have enacted such legislation, I believe we must continue the present Federal support of the program as it has been developed by the Government during the war.

For instance, in my district is Wold Chamberlain Airport, which serves the Twin Cities and is already one of the busiest and most important in the country. As traffic to Asia expands, it should become the major port for air traffic to and from Alaska, Russia, and the Orient. Obviously, uniformity in signals and control is as essential for international air traffic as it is for sea navigation, lighthouses, and so forth. For Congress to reject the pending amendment would leave municipalities with the impossible task of making other arrangements in the 6 weeks between now and June 30, the end of the fiscal year. Some municipalities could take over the support of control towers; many could not. The net result would be disruption of the present efficient air-control system of the Nation. From the standpoint of our national defense alone, I cannot believe such action would be the part of wisdom or of economy, and I hope the amendment to continue the program for 1 year will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, 2½ minutes does not give one much time to talk on such an important matter, but I want to again call your attention to the testimony of Mr. T. P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, found on page 627 of the hearings in which he says the following:

> If you are talking of the reimbursement to the Government of one part of the expense, such as we are talking about under this general Federal airways program, that would be a possibility, if you could get all the cities to do it, but if one refused to do it, it seems to me you would be left without one link in your whole Federal airways system, and you simply could not fly airplanes into that airport under instrument weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I know a little something first-hand about this thing, because I flew 3 years as a pilot for the United States Army Air Forces, and I flew 3 years in civilian aircraft. I know what Mr. Wright says is true, because if you break that one link you have practically ruined your entire Federal airways system.

With this provision in this bill you are gambling with human lives. It is an expensive gamble. If you fail to adopt this amendment, you are going to be sacrificing human lives on the altar of petty politics and false economy. The amendment should be adopted. Any man who has ever tried to sweat an airplane in with a 200-foot ceiling to a field without a control tower knows that if we do not pass this amendment sooner or later we are going to have blood on our hands.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman means, I assume, that the amendment should be adopted with the proper figure inserted in it as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am certainly in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]; if that is not adopted, then I am in favor of the Rooney amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. But with the figures inserted in it, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to one consideration that has not been brought out in this discussion. That is the question of the relation of national defense to this particular endeavor toward economy. Shall we allow the development of these CAA control towers to be done independently of each other and as a matter of municipal pride or political interest or financial ability, or shall we make it actually a matter of national concern? If so, we must provide national control and national confidence. I think unless the Rooney amendment is adopted we are crippling our Air Corps and the development of future members of the Air Corps, and that we would be doing something that I know the committee did not want to do; that is, crippling the national defense.

I call your attention very seriously to the fact that what we did last week, when we adopted an international position which has gone far beyond any we have adopted heretofore, should make us all the more careful that we think soberly in terms of the development of these new things which may help sustain our international position. In these I think the Air Corps is one which must be sustained and encouraged. I believe that every penny we can put in which will make the Air Corps a more valuable arm of our national economy, the better off we are and the better we safeguard our Nation's future.

Therefore, I recommend strongly that you support the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I agree that this Congress must of necessity drive toward economy in every possible way, but I do think economy in this kind of measure is unwise at this time.

Suppose you took a plane from the National Airport in Washington, and the city of Knoxville decided they did not want to maintain their control tower, or the city of Memphis did not; and you were going to Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, or somewhere in the southern part of the Nation, and this plane lacked a control tower for landing at either of those two cities. Or suppose on the other hand that they did have a control tower but it was operated by novices, without proper qualifications to operate it, because there is no necessity for a city to employ CAA qualified employees, nor those suggested or approved by the CAA. You just would not be safe in the air.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. These control towers will still continue to be operated by CAA-personnel. It will be simply a question of reimbursement.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But suppose a city refused to raise the money or could not raise the money, they would not be operated then by CAA, would they?

Now, it is not a new thing in the history of transportation for transportation facilities to be subsidized to a certain extent. In my State, where I have practiced law for 25 years, I have examined many abstracts during that time in which the State of Texas granted millions of acres of land to railroads. I do not have the figures but I am sure that billions of dollars have been granted to ship lines.

I favor the Rooney amendment to this bill as a necessary safety measure.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when I had the floor some time ago, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], chairman of the subcommittee, asked me what made me think the funds which my amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] increased the Bakewell and Rooney amendments, would be used for the employment of those who operate control towers in our respective districts.

I wish to point out that the Bakewell substitute carries this proviso:

> That $4,948,484 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I gladly yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. In connection with the sum, the Bakewell amendment carries $4,877,734. In conformity with arithmetic, as I explained—the amendment I offered and which the gentleman from Missouri has offered being really just a correction in arithmetic—I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment be changed to read $4,948,484 in order to conform to the total amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to modify his amendment as stated by the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Gladly.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I offer this observation in order that we may know the situation in the Committee at the present time? There is only one question before the Committee and that is the question of whether or not these funds will be restored which have been taken out by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the cognizant committee.

The two amendments now before the Committee offered by the gentleman from Missouri and myself merely clarify or perfect the original amendment; in other words, they do not change the sense of the original amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

So it is quite necessary in supporting either the Rooney amendment or the Bakewell amendment that the two perfecting amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri and by myself be supported also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, in my State, and I may bring it down to my district, and I am not embarrassed because I mention it, in Winston-Salem there is a large airport, a highly important one.

Under the laws of my State, the city of Winston-Salem cannot contribute to this expense. We would have to go back to the legislature and get authority to do it. The legislature adjourned months ago and will not reconvene for 2 years. It could not be included in the budget if the budget were to be made a week from now, or at any time, without legislative authority.

Mr. Chairman, I know the subcommittee is trying its best to do in every instance what is wise and required, but I do feel that the elimination of this support of safety for air travel is not justified at this time; indeed, I believe and state that in my opinion the position taken by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is the wise one; that finally the Government may have to get out of this, but when it does it ought to be at a time when the airways themselves can furnish this safety measure.

Let me say also before I take my seat that I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that White Plains, N. Y., and the two other airports, St. Joseph and New Orleans, be included, because these places have just recently been made eligible for this service, although there has not been time to go through the regular routine of having it approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I think they are entitled to come in also. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether there are many Members of Congress who have not received complaints in reference to

the elimination of funds for the operation of airport traffic control towers. One of the messages I received was from the mayor of the city of St. Louis in which he urged that funds for the operation of these towers be provided in the pending bill. I submitted the mayor's message to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, urging reconsideration of the committee's action. I also presented a copy to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has sponsored the amendment to provide for the continued operation of the control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

To my mind this amendment is vital to the safety of everyone who flies in airplanes. The air-traffic control towers are lighthouses of the air, directing operations of commercial aircraft. Those who operate the electronic equipment in these towers must be qualified and it stands to reason if the standards and requirements are prescribed by one agency it will go a long way to increase the factor of safety for air travelers.

Even the Appropriations Committee recognizes the desirability of a central authority, but, in an effort to save a small sum, wrote into the bill that no funds in the pending appropriation could be used for the employment of personnel in the operation of air traffic control towers. The intent of the committee is to shift the burden for the operation of control towers to the States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities. Clearly it is the intent of the committee that qualified and trained CAA personnel be used to man these towers, but such a good intention would certainly be a poor defense for the loss of one single life in a landing accident.

Within the past few months a number of airplane crashes have occurred. This Congress recognizing its responsibility provided funds for a study in this field.

A few years ago a study was made by a select committee of Congress of the causes of air accidents. This committee went into the matter thoroughly at that time and found that the inefficient operation of control towers by incompetent, and in many instances underpaid, municipal employees, was in part responsible for several serious accidents. The committee recommended to the House at that time that the operation of these towers be taken over by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It would certainly be inconsistent for this Congress to increase the hazards of flying by refusing to provide funds for the operation of these towers.

A parallel action would be to refuse appropriations for lighthouses which are scattered along the coast and require coastal cities to support them. I believe most of us realize the necessity for uniformity in the operation of lighthouses.

The control tower at the St. Louis municipal airport, which serves my district, is a part of the pattern of the control-tower system which links together the major airports in the United States. The control tower at St. Louis is perhaps just as important to Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York as it is to the St. Louis airport. Transcontinental flying cannot be carried on without this air-control-tower pattern.

I believe it has been clearly shown that uniformity of operation cannot be achieved if a hundred different cities are to employ, train, and direct the employees of these towers.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the committee, will continue the present uniform operation. I think we will make a serious mistake if this amendment is not adopted.

For one, I certainly do not want to take the responsibility of voting against it. The funds asked for are nothing as compared to the loss of one life.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Rooney amendment as well as the perfecting amendments thereto. Coming from the west coast, I have opportunity, of course, to see the essential necessities for safety in air traffic. My district is as far away from Washington as perhaps any other district in the Union, being some 3,000 miles from Washington to Portland where we have a very fine, large airport. Air traffic is essential to our national economy, and its safety is of utmost importance.

We have all been cognizant in the last year of the necessity for air-traffic safety controls. We have witnessed a number of deplorable air accidents in the last year which calls to our attention that we must perfect every mechanical device and safety measure known to man in order to provide safety in the air. At best it is a hazardous undertaking to go three or four thousand miles through the air. In my opinion, it would be a great mistake at this time to dispense with any safety measures, such as these control towers, in an endeavor to save some expense. I am heartily in accord with saving every dollar we can in the operation of the Government, but until we perfect other arrangements whereby these control towers can be taken care of by non-Federal agencies and adequately manned it would be a very serious mistake to enact legislation that will prevent us from having this one particular safety device under Federal operation, which is so essential to air-traffic safety.

I therefore trust that my colleagues will support these amendments, which will assure the keeping the control towers under Federal control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment to restore the appropriation for the operation of control towers at certain major airports, and the perfecting amendments thereto, because I believe that this web of airport towers is essential to the safety of air transportation. After all, they constitute the safety net under those who fly and if any part of that net is gone the efficiency of the whole net is affected and deteriorates until it may just as well not be there at all.

I do not know so very much about flying but I have learned that it does not make very much difference what the weather conditions are or what happens at take-off but you do want to know the conditions at the point of landing. Taking out any of these towers materially affects the landing of airplanes either at destination or in forced landings en route.

I, too, have received a protest from the people who manage the Oakland airport; the assistant port manager, Mr. Joseph G. Bastow, and the president of the port commissioners, Mr. LeRoy Goodrich, who administer that great establishment. I also have in mind other airports where we hope to have federally operated towers. These are Hayward Airport, in Alameda County, and Buchanan Airport, in Contra Costa County. Whereas, I, too, like the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] subscribe to true economy in Government, until perfecting arrangements as suggested by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], are put into effect, it would be more than foolish to abandon in the name of false economy the present system that works so well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for safety of the airways should, in my opinion, rest primarily with the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Without a question of a doubt a rigid, uniform system of traffic control throughout the country will go far toward improving the safety conditions under which military, commercial, and private pilots operate. I am not unmindful of the fact that the States and municipalities are in far better financial condition than is the Federal Treasury, and, for that reason, it seems to me that legislation should be brought before the Congress whereby the cost of this operation should be borne jointly on a cooperative basis. In the meantime, I am certain that the various subdivisions of government are not in a position to take over these control towers at the end of the present fiscal year, and, for that reason, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many wires in connection with this problem and, at this point, I should like to read a few of them:

CHEYENNE, WYO., *May 8, 1947.*

We are advised House committee eliminated appropriation for airport control towers. This will handicap Cheyenne Airport. We request your help in restoring if consistent.

JOHN J. MCINERNEY,
Mayor of Cheyenne.

CHEYENNE, WYO., *May 14, 1947.*

While am in entire accord with all moves to cut governmental expenditures am somewhat concerned as to effect of eliminating funds for control towers in CAA appropriation. Probably Cheyenne could support this essential activity itself but doubt that other fields in State could. If this function is to be terminated at the Federal level possibly we might be well advised to go about it more gradually to give other agencies time to prepare themselves to take up the work.

R. W. MARBLE.

CHEYENNE, WYO., *May 14, 1947.*
Attempted decrease in appropriation for CAA may result in stoppage of necessary installments of land and other safety devices at airports. Wyoming airports would be badly crippled by such stoppage.
WILLITS A. BREWSTER.

WHEATLAND, WYO., *May 13, 1947.*
We who are interested in aviation are very much opposed to any cut in CAA budget where it concerns radio, control towers, or safety. Understand hearing on budget today.
JOHN K. PHIFER.

DENVER, COLO., *May 14, 1947.*
Your assistance is respectfully requested to support legislation sponsored by Representative BAKEWELL to reinstate funds in CAA appropriation for fiscal '48 operation of traffic-control towers presently being operated by them. Tower operation is an integral and vital part of Federal airways system and discontinuance will greatly add to flying risk for commercial air-line operation. Majority of 148 cities now so served will be unable to support the operation thereof with their own funds. Control-tower function also important aid and being fully utilized by armed forces and individual fliers.
G. G. BROODER,
Assistant to President, Western Airlines, Inc.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Wyoming speak in support of the Rooney amendment. I intended to do the same thing for practically the same reasons as the gentleman from Wyoming as well as many other Members here have mentioned. I hope the amendment will carry as it did last year by an overwhelming majority .

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us about a month ago read about the accident of a commercial and a private plane somewhere in Georgia, 30 feet off the landing field. The report showed that the accident, in which some twenty-odd lives were lost, was occasioned by reason of the lack of a control tower. Just visualize these 140 key airports where we have control towers, if any substantial number of them should not be operated, the number of fatal accidents that we would have. Certainly, the life of one good citizen is worth the amount of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to settle once and for all this argument about who is going to operate these control towers. As far as I am concerned, I think that they ought to be operated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority this year and in the years to come, and particularly for these two reasons: Now, and in the future, these 140 key airports of the Nation are going to be used by Army and Navy planes, planes of the armed services, and of the Government. In the second place, if we follow a sensible defense plan, we must have a good air corps, and a mobile air corps. We must have an air corps that can operate on the various air routes across this country and he ready to repel any attack upon us in a minute's notice. Certainly these key airports and control towers, operated by proper personnel, play a very important part in our defense plans.

A third point is that in these days when we are learning more about radar, about electronics, and about methods of guiding planes in for landings under unfavorable situations, we ought to have a standard personnel, a personnel that is responsible to a central organization.

It is definitely in the public interest to have standard rules of operation promulgated by CAA, and it is also in the public interest to have personnel especially trained by the CAA to carry out the standard navigation rules. That being the case, I think the personnel should also be paid by the CAA. We all know that it is difficult to serve two masters. If the cities and municipalities are to pay the salaries of these operators, CAA will be without any effective means of seeing that they perform their work adequately and properly. Suppose the personnel were negligent in operating a control tower, the CAA, under this set-up, would have no power to discharge the negligent employee. This kind of situation would lead to confusion, to unsafe traveling conditions, and it should not be permitted. I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. I do not think we can justify economy in this instance. We are dealing with one of the fastest growing industries in the world and we are beginning to try to economize on it. The receipts from taxes levied on air traffic are growing each year, yet we want to economize on these increasing receipts. When an airplane comes into a local airport out of the skies, it often proceeds to tank up with gasoline. It pays a Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on the gasoline. If an airplane takes on 1,000 gallons it pays $10 in taxes. If it takes on 1,500 gallons it pays $15 in taxes. It takes off from that field, having been serviced there, and having paid a Federal tax upon the gasoline consumed. I do not think you can justify economies in a growing industry such as this when we levy a heavy tax upon it. I do not think you can justify economy when our tax receipts out of this industry are increasing. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if we consider as we did several months ago the tragic accidents we learned about over the radio and from the newspapers morning after morning, we must realize it is false economy to make a cut in this particular industry at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment increasing these funds and I am also in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, to begin with, we have no business at all considering any proposition to eliminate these funds. It is as much out of order as a hockey game in South Carolina in July. Unless and until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings in legislation for the elimination of these airports, I think the Appropriations Committee is taking an awful lot for granted.

I am one who favors States' rights, but I would not go so far as my friend from Virginia. He wants the States to take over interstate commerce. I say to you that this is interstate commerce, pure and simple. This is our baby. We gave birth to this baby, and it is very, very unfitting at this time for us to repudiate this baby or deny its parentage. I say to you, we cannot destroy this little baby and leave him or her on the doorstep of the municipalities now because we have an economy axe with two blades on it. We cannot do that. We must take care of this baby until he or she gets to the point that he or she can fly. To shear off her wings at this time when she is a fledgling would be not only an asininity but would border on criminal negligence.

My good friend from Mississippi very aptly brought to the attention of the Members how one sweats out—literally sweats out—an airplane. It is very difficult when one gets over an airport and wants to land and there is no control tower. How would you feel if there were Congressmen in that plane? I know that if I were in that group I would not feel very good about it.

I say to my good friend, and I do not believe he was serious when he said that this was a pork-barrel proposition, that this is a pork barrel—this is slaughter all right, but not pork-barrel slaughter; it is the slaughter of the American people. When such a thing as that is involved it comes under the head of being our business, and it is our business particularly if it is interstate commerce.

We can ill afford to wipe out this appropriation because, God knows, we need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am for the restoration of the item in this bill to cover the expenses of operating control towers.

It seems to me that pretty nearly everything has been said that can be said. I am for the Cole amendment and the Bakewell substitute amendment. Everyone knows that I am for economy, but this certainly has been a demonstration of how badly we need substantive legislation and a pattern which I trust the appropriate committee will soon bring to the Congress so that we can take the necessary and appropriate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma said that about everything has been said in support of this amendment that can be said.

I am one of those who always tries to go along with the Committee on Appropriations in solving these problems. I know that the gentleman from Nebraska has just as much interest in the support of the airport program as I have because I have worked with him on airport programs for many years. I think

it is unfortunate that it has to come back to us here again this year with the control towers eliminated when we had the same problem up a year ago. It is very heartening for me to know that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are going to try very early to work out a program whereby we can work this program out on an over-all national basis.

All of us know who have traveled in all parts of the world how important this matter is to every individual. We also know at the present time on the basis of the record that has been made by the Air Transport Command Service during the war that these towers cannot be eliminated with safety. I think that probably by next year, with the Appropriations Committee taking this position, it is going to bring the matter to a head.

I expect to support this amendment because of the fact that this is a young industry and I think we owe it to it to support it at the present time. We should not abolish these 138 control towers throughout the country, because if we do nothing else but support those, we ers throughout the country, because if we will be in the interest of the people of the entire country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

BUSINESS NEEDS ACCURATE INFORMATION TO PREVENT POSTWAR COLLAPSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

I want to make a few remarks, which have occurred to me, about the work of the Department of Commerce generally, and what seems to me to be a peculiarly benighted view of the Department's functions that has been taken in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

I refer specifically to the suggestion made by the committee that the Department is nursing business. As a matter of fact I am informed that only $11,675,000, or 4 percent, of the Department's appropriation has been requested for general services to business through the offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Now, we all know that American business does not need nursing, and I have enough confidence in Secretary Harriman to believe him when he says he knows that business does not want to be molly coddled. I know he has no intention of trying to spoon-feed business with a lot of pap. And I know that he is not naive enough to believe that he can discharge the duties of his office—to do all that can be done to promote the welfare of American industry and commerce—by the simple expedient of warming up a nursing bottle.

The Department of Commerce is the greatest statistical agency in the Government. Its functions were designed to meet specific business needs, for it is a fundamental truth that business and commerce may not long prosper unless the businessman has available in usable form reliable facts and statistics to enable him to cope intelligently with such problems as management, finance, investment, production, raw materials, labor, transportation, and distribution.

Now this is not news, I am sure, to the American businessman. But it is news, apparently, to some of the members of the Appropriations Committee. And I think it is important now to call attention to this lack of foresight.

It is true that a few generations ago the American businessman got along, and he got along very well, without having to bother very much about business statistics other than the most elementary type. In the simple, agrarian economy of those days statistics were not of major importance. But the businessmen of those days also got along, and they did very well, without telephones, without electric generators, without railroads, without accounting machines, and without combustion engines.

I maintain that it does not require any great imagination to understand that the supply of rubber originating in the southwest Pacific and controlled in London may greatly affect the affairs of manufacturers say in East St. Louis, Alton, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Belleville, Granite City, and Toledo; of assemblers in Chicago; and of dealers in all of our great cities. Similar examples could be cited to show the high degree of interdependence that characterizes our present economy.

It also seems obvious to me that modern businessmen and industrialists cannot operate efficiently unless they have a great body of reliable and easily accessible statistical information upon which they can base their actions. In our free-enterprise system this is particularly true. It is not enough for our Government to have this information, our businessmen must have it, too.

We can no more expect our businessmen to carry out successful enterprises and make intelligent decisions without adequate information than we can expect them to compete successfully in the modern world if we take away from them all modern means of communication, force them to use the horse and buggy, and to do their bookkeeping with a quill pen.

I submit that in this competitive, modern age it is not too much for the Department of Commerce to spend, as they have asked to do, $11,675,000 for general services to business, to help the businessman get the economic and statistical information he needs in his battle to survive.

This is especially true at a time like the present, when, after a period of wartime-necessitated control and regulation by government, we are reverting to our free-market economy. Many areas of our economy are still characterized by distorted supply-demand and price-cost relationships. In light of the recency of Government decontrol and present inflationary pressures, there has probably never been a period when business has had more need for information as a basis of forming sound policy and taking wise business action designed to prevent possible postwar collapse.

The dissemination of information vital to business should be strengthened and encouraged, not stricken down. To refer to programs of this type as "nursing business" seems to me to reveal a fundamental lack of understanding of a basic need. To curtail these appropriations, as has been proposed by the committee, is a step backward into the candlelight and horse-and-buggy era of our forebears.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment which seeks to restore certain funds to continue the tower-control service now rendered at Federal expense through the CAB.

Los Angeles airports handle one of the largest loads of any similar area in the United States. The safety of civilians and military personnel is involved in this unwarranted cut in funds. Unless these funds are restored, in my opinion, there will occur a great increase in airplane accidents and a decrease in air travel.

Our civic bodies are alarmed about this matter and have with telegrams and letters asked that this amount be restored.

I read at this point a telegram of great importance:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 13, 1947.*

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

We are gravely shocked to learn that the appropriation of funds for the operation of CAA air-traffic control towers may be discontinued in July. One of the greatest contributions to the increased safety of air transportation has been the efficient and uniform manner in which traffic-control towers have been operated by the CAA. The continuation of such a policy is not only justified on the basis of public safety but on the basis of national defense. To abandon this well-established program of uniform control over so vital a phase of the air-transport industry would constitute a grievous error in judgment at this time. It would jeopardize the lives of thousands of air travelers, millions of dollars' worth of equipment, and emasculate a well-established, smooth, and efficiently running program which is absolutely essential to our national defense. Accordingly we urgently request that you register immediate and vigorous protest to any deletion of funds from the CAA air-traffic-control program.

ROBERT L. SMITH,
President, Board of Airport Commissioners.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. Certainly at this time in our history we should do nothing that in any way impairs or impedes the continued growth and development of aviation.

All of us know that the aviation industry could not operate satisfactorily or safely without efficient control-tower assistance. I believe that it could be said that there is no other one element which is so important to safety in aviation as that which has to do with control-tower operations.

The suggestion that the municipalities, counties, and States take care of this problem is, in my opinion, impractical and unrealistic. I also feel that it is a failure on the part of the Federal Government to recognize its right and duty under the Constitution to govern and control interstate commerce. It is obvious that if each locality and municipality handled the control-tower operations at its own local airport there would be varying degrees and differing methods of operating these control towers. The result would be that a pilot, charged with the responsibility of safely transporting human lives in an airplane, would find it extremely difficult to remember the differing procedures and regulations established by each local community governing its airport.

Those of us who have attempted to drive from our homes to the Nation's Capital find it extremely difficult to go through an unfamiliar town where the stop lights are situated in positions unlike those in our own home town. Frequently we run by them, not knowing just exactly whether they are situated every other block or whether they are going to be in the center of the street or off to the side. However, in an automobile we can always stop and inquire when we are at a loss as to just what to do. Such is not the case in an airplane moving at around 200 miles an hour.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to read from Time magazine of May 5 an article which illustrates more graphically than I could ever say, the obvious need for continued Federal supervision of control-tower operations:

Over Georgia's Muscogee County Airport, 9 miles northeast of Columbus, a twin-engined plane circled and headed in for a landing. At the controls sat Delta Air Lines' operations vice president, George R. Cushing, 48, a veteran pilot. Cushing and seven other Delta men (including Legal Adviser Lindley W. Camp, 52, long-time political crony of the late Gene Talmadge) were inspecting a network of newly acquired Georgia-Texas routes.

But the Delta plane was not alone in the sunny morning sky over the field. In for a landing, too, came a small private plane, piloted by a Columbus beer dealer, Joseph C. Fussell, 42. Before either pilot saw the other, or had time to do anything about it, the small plane drove at right angles into the big one's tail. Only 30 feet off the ground, the two planes bucked up like broncos, then crashed together onto runway No. 5, burst into bright flame. Everyone in both planes was killed.

It was the first major United States airline crash in 14 weeks, and Delta's first since 1935. What accounted for it? The reason was shockingly obvious: the Muscogee County Airport, like some 300 other United States airports regularly used by commercial aircraft, has no control tower to regulate landings. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has barely enough funds to operate towers at 117 of the Nation's larger airports (minimum annual cost, $15,000 each). The Georgia crash might help get additional funds from Congress to operate more.

The lives of many of our citizens will be greatly endangered if the Federal Government fails to appropriate the money for these control-tower operators. I, for one, do not want to ride in an airplane which is going to land at several different cities en route to my destination, if one city has a traffic pattern working from the left around an airport, and another city has a traffic pattern working from the right; or where the signs and signals have different meanings. Particularly would I not want to travel by air if there was bad weather prevailing.

For this Congress to fail to appropriate money to keep the control-tower operations uniform and efficient throughout the country constitutes a flagrant failure of this Congress to recognize and perform its duty. To say that this is necessary under the name of economy is merely to prove that we are penny-wise and pound-foolish.

One other thought before my time is up. This country has developed in direct relationship to the progress and development of our transportation system. After the Civil War the railroad train became a practical and useful instrument of transportation. It was the railroads which bound our Nation together once again, permitted the development of our great reservoir of natural resources, and put this country back on its feet industrially and financially. After the First World War when the economy of the country was stagnated by reason of the war, it was the automobile industry which reinvigorated our national economy and started its wheels to turning productively again.

Now that World War II is over, we are trying to reconvert from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, and we find that the wheels of the peacetime economy are somewhat rusty and difficult to get started. I am confident that an expanding aviation industry will do more to reinvigorate and reenliven our peacetime economy than will any other element. It will be to us after World War II what the automobile was after World War I and the railroad after the Civil War.

We should not be so shortsighted as to make the mistake of trying to economize on this, the most essential and important factor in aviation, and by so doing shackle the growth and development of aviation at a time when its growth is essential to our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take very much of the Committee's time at this point. I think everybody has made up his mind in regard to the amendments now on the Clerk's desk. I shall accept the amendment to my amendment increasing the sum of $70,982,000 to $71,081,484 and urge the House to vote for it. However, I shall oppose the Bakewell substitute for my amendment and ask that it be voted down. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the committee, for 5 minutes, to close debate.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about safety involved in this amendment. In other words, the proponents of the Rooney amendment and the supporters of it would have blood dripping from the hands of the majority members of the subcommittee for eliminating the operation and maintenance of airport control towers. So that the record will be straight, I invite you to turn to page 802, where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] asked this:

Mr. STEFAN. Last year when we went into this item of towers, there was something said about safety. Would the element of safety enter into the operation of these towers if the salaries of these CAA employees were reimbursed to the CAA by the individual municipalities?

Mr. KLEIN—

Mr. Klein who is an experienced flier, who is a member of the CAA staff, who has the responsibility of safety of air transportation and air private flying, said this—

No, sir. It would not affect the operation. As you know, we already operate many towers that way. We are still operating, I believe, about six towers with funds provided by the municipalities.

Now, let us just remove the demagoguery from the argument against the action of the committee. There is no safety factor involved. Let us take away all impassioned pleas about safety and get down to basic facts. Safety is not involved. The question involved is this: With a $259,000,000,000 Federal debt, shall the States and municipalities assume some of the responsibility for this growing industry? There are presently 4,700 airports in the United States. In the projected future it is planned to have 6,300. On the basis of the facts shown on page 796 of the hearings, the average cost of operating these control towers is $32,000 each. This item will grow to an appropriation of $201,000,000 a year, for 6,300 airports, and that is not in the distant future.

You can talk all you want to about cutting the Federal budget, but you can see that with $201,000,000 annually charged to the Federal Government for this type of growing function started only last year that we never can balance the budget unless States and municipalities assume their fair share of responsibility.

The States and the municipalities should carry some of the responsibility.

I know you are all ready to roll the committee. The answer is obvious. On pages 797 and 798 of the hearings is a list of the airports where this $4,800,000 will be used for salaries of operation and maintenance personnel.

How many Congressmen are represented by those airports? I have a list of them. This morning I figured out there are over 200 Members representing districts in which those airports are located. I can understand how people from farm districts can go back home and say: "Oh, yes; we cut Labor and Federal Security appropriations." I can understand how people from the Midwest will say: "We were against the Greek-Turkish loan, but people from other areas broke down the economy program." I can understand how easy the

people from the cities would be able to economize on the Agriculture appropriation bill. I can understand how easy the gentleman from New York, the author of the pending amendment, can cut out all of the Grazing Service and make his economy record; but the real test of our economy is the courage we have to cut the waste and assume the local responsibility for Federal Government services in our own districts. Mr. Chairman, we all owe a responsibility to cut Federal expenditures in our own districts. We can butcher up the sacred cow of the other fellow, but when it comes to cleaning up our own front doorstep, will we fail?

I insert in the RECORD the names of Congressmen whose districts are affected by the Rooney amendment. You will notice many of the proponents of the Rooney amendment in the debate this afternoon are in the list of Congressmen who have 1 of the 149 airports in their district where the Rooney amendment money would be spent. In fairness I must say that some Members will vote against the Rooney amendment who have some of this list of 149 airports in their district. My hat is off to this group of economy Congressmen. The following is a list of 130 airports of the Federal control system and then the 19 to be added in the fiscal year 1948 if the Rooney amendment is adopted, with the Congressman's name in whose district they are located and party affiliation:

Established airport-traffic control towers (total, 130)

City	Republican	Democrat
Abilene, Tex		Omar Burleson (17).
Akron, Ohio		Walter B. Huber (14).
Albany, N. Y		William T. Byrne (32).
Albuquerque, N. Mex		Antonio M. Fernandez (at large).
Do		Georgia Lee Lusk (at large)
Amarillo, Tex		Eugene Worley (18).
Anchorage, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Anette, Alaska		Do.
Atlanta, Ga		James Curran Davis (5).
Augusta, Ga		Paul Brown (10).
Austin, Tex		Lyndon B. Johnson (10).
Bakersfield, Calif		A. J. Elliott (10).
Baltimore, Md		Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. (3)
Do		George H. Fallon (4).
Bangor, Maine	Frank Fellows (3)	
Big Spring, Tex		George H. Mahon (19)
Bismarck, N. Dak	Charles R. Robertson (at large)	
Do	William Lemke (at large)	
Billings, Mont	Wesley A. D'Ewart (2)	
Birmingham, Ala		Laurie Calvin Battle (9)
Boise, Idaho	John Sanborn (2)	
Boston, Mass	Christian A. Herter (10)	John W. McCormack (12)
Do	Richard B. Wigglesworth (13)	John F. Kennedy (11)
Bridgeport, Conn	John Davis Lodge (4)	
Bristol, Tenn	Dayton E. Phillips (1)	
Brownsville, Tex		Milton West (15).
Buffalo, N. Y	Walter G. Andrews (42)	
Do	Edward J. Elsaesser (43)	
Do	John C. Butler (14)	
Burbank, Calif. (same as for Los Angeles)		
Burlington, Vt	Charles A. Plumley (at large)	
Charleston, S. C		L. Mendel Rivers (1).
Charlotte, N. C		Hamilton C. Jones (10)
Cheyenne, Wyo	Frank Barrett (at large)	
Chattanooga, Tenn		Estes Kefauver (3).
Chicago, Ill	William G. Stratton (at large)	
Do	Richard B. Vail (2)	William L. Dawson (1).
Do	Fred E. Busbey (3)	Martin Gorski (4).
Do	Thomas L. Owens (7)	Adolph J. Sabath (5).
Do	Robert J. Twyman (9)	Thomas J. O'Brien (6).
Do	Ralph E. Church (10)	Thomas S. Gordon (8).
Cincinnati, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large)	
Do	Charles H. Elston (1)	
Do	William E. Hess (2)	
Cleveland, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large)	Michael A. Feighan (20)
Do	Frances P. Bolton (22)	Robert Crosser (21).
Columbia, S. C		John J. Riley (2).
Columbus, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large)	
Do	John M. Vorys (12)	
Corpus Christi, Tex		John E. Lyle (14).
Covington, Ky		Brent Spence (5).
Dallas, Tex		Frank Wilson (5).
Dayton, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large)	
Do	Raymond H. Burke (3)	
Des Moines, Iowa	Paul Cunningham (5)	
Denver, Colo	John A. Carroll (1)	
Detroit, Mich	George G. Sadowski (1)	
El Paso, Tex		Ewing Thomasson (16).
Evansville, Ind	Edward A. Mitchell (8)	
Fairbanks, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Fargo, N. Dak (same as Bismarck)		
Flint, Mich	William W. Blackney (6)	
Fort Wayne, Ind	George W. Gillie (4)	
Fort Worth, Tex		Wingate Lucas (12).
Fresno, Calif	Bertrand W. Gearhart (9)	
Grand Rapids, Mich	Bartel J. Jonkman (5)	
Great Falls, Mont	Wesley Abner D'Ewart (2)	
Greensboro, N. C		Carl Thos. Durham (6)
Harrisburg, Pa	John C. Kunkel (18)	
Hartford, Conn	William J. Miller (1)	
Helena, Mont		Michael J. Mansfield (1).
Honolulu, T. H	Joseph R. Farrington	
Houston, Tex		Albert Thomas (8).
Indianapolis, Ind		Louis L. Ludlow (11).
Jackson, Miss		John B. Williams (7).
Jacksonville, Fla		Emory H. Price (2).
Juneau, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Kansas City, Mo		Charles J. Bell (4).
Kansas City, Kans	Errett P. Scrivner (2)	
Knoxville, Tenn	John Jennings, Jr. (2)	
Las Vegas, Nev	Charles H. Russell (At large)	
Little Rock, Ark		Brooks Hay: (5).
Long Beach, Calif	Willis W. Bradley (18)	
Louisville, Ky	Thruston B. Morton (3)	
Los Angeles, Calif	Richard M. Nixon (12)	Helen Gahagan Douglas (14)
Do	Norris Poulson (13)	Cecil R. King (17).
Do	Gordon L. McDonough (15)	Chet Holifield (19).
Do	Donald L. Jackson (16)	Harry R. Sheppard (21).
Do	Willis W. Bradley (18)	
Do	Carl Hinshaw (20)	

Established airport-traffic control towers (total, 130)—Continued

City	Republican	Democrat
Lynchburg, Va.		James L. Almond, Jr. (6).
Medford, Oreg.	Harris Ellsworth (4)	
Memphis, Tenn.		Clifford Davis (10).
Miami, Fla.		George A. Smathers (4).
Milwaukee, Wis.	Charles J. Kersten (5)	
Do.	John C. Brophy (4)	
Minneapolis, Minn.	Walter H. Judd (5)	
Mobile, Ala.		Frank W. Boykin (1).
Nashville, Tenn.		J. Percy Priest (6).
Newark, N. J.	Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (10)	
Do.	Frank L. Sundstrom (11)	
Do.	Robert W. Kean (12)	
New Orleans, La.		F. Edward Hébert (1).
Do.		Hale Boggs (2).
New York (Floyd Bennett and LaGuardia)	W. Kingsland Macy (1)	John J. Delaney (7).
Do.	Leonard W. Hall (2)	Joseph L. Pfeifer (8).
Do.	Henry J. Latham (3)	Eugene J. Keogh (9).
Do.	Gregory McMahon (4)	Andrew L. Somers (10).
Do.	Robert Tripp Ross (5)	James J. Heffernan (11).
Do.	Robert Nodar, Jr. (6)	John J. Rooney (12).
Do.	Ellsworth B. Buck (16)	Donald L. O'Toole (13).
Do.	Frederic R. Coudert, Jr. (17)	Leo F. Rayfiel (14).
Do.		Emanuel Celler (15).
Do.	Vito Marcantonio, American Labor Party (18)	
Do.	Jacob K. Javits (21)	Arthur G. Klein (19).
Do.	David M. Potts (26)	Sol Bloom (20).
Do.		Adam C. Powell, Jr. (22).
Do.		Walter A. Lynch (23).
Do.		Benjamin J. Rabin (24).
Do.		Charles A. Buckley (25).
Norfolk, Va.		Porter Hardy, Jr. (2).
Oakland, Calif.	John J. Allen, Jr. (7)	George P. Miller (6).
Oklahoma City, Okla.		A. S. Monroney (5).
Omaha, Nebr.	Howard H. Buffett (2)	
Orlando, Fla.		Joe Hendricks (5).
Palm Springs, Calif.	John Phillips (22)	
Pendleton, Oreg.	Lowell Stockman (2)	
Philadelphia, Pa.	James Gallagher (1)	
Do.	Robert N. McGarvey (2)	
Do.	Hardie Scott (3)	
Do.	F. J. Maloney (4)	
Do.	George W. Sarbacher, Jr. (5)	
Do.	Hugh D. Scott, Jr. (6)	
Phoenix, Ariz.		Richard F. Harless (at large).
Do.		John R. Murdock (at large).
Pittsburgh, Pa.	John McDowell (29)	Herman P. Eberharter (32)
Do.	Robert J. Corbett (30)	Frank Buchanan (33).
Do.	James G. Fulton (31)	
Portland, Maine	Robert Hale (1)	
Portland, Oreg.	Homer D. Angell (3)	
Presque Isle, Maine	Frank Fellows (3)	
Providence, R. I.		Aime J. Forand (1).
Do.		John E. Fogarty (2).
Raleigh, N. C.		Harold D. Cooley (4).
Red Bluff, Calif.		Clair Engle (2).
Richmond, Va.		J. Vaughan Gary (3).
Roanoke, Va.		James L. Almond (6).
Rochester, Minn.	August H. Andresen (1)	
Rochester, N. Y.	Kenneth B. Keating (40)	
Sacramento, Calif.	Leroy Johnson (3)	
Salt Lake City, Utah	William A. Dawson (2)	
San Antonio, Tex.		Paul J. Kilday (20).
San Diego, Calif.	Chas. K. Fletcher (23)	
San Francisco, Calif.	Richard J. Welch (5)	Frank R. Havenner (4).
Santa Barbara, Calif.	Ernest King Bramblett (11)	
Savannah, Ga.		Prince H. Preston, Jr. (1).
Seattle, Wash.	Homer R. Jones (1)	
Shreveport, La.		Overton Brooks (4).
Sioux City, Iowa	Chas. B. Hoeven (8)	
South Bend, Ind.	Robert A. Grant (3)	
Spokane, Wash.	Walt Horan (5)	
St. Louis, Mo.	Claude I. Bakewell (11)	Frank M. Karsten (13).
Do.	Walter C. Ploeser (12)	Joseph B. Bryson (4).
Spartansburg, S. C.		
Syracuse, N. Y.	R. Walter Riehlman (36)	
Tallahassee, Fla.		Robert L. F. Sikes (3).
Tampa, Fla.		James H. Peterson (1).
Toledo, Ohio	Homer A. Ramey (9)	
Topeka, Kans.	Albert M. Cole (1)	
Tucson, Ariz. (same as Phoenix)		
Tulsa, Okla.	George B. Schwabe (1)	
Washington, D. C.		
West Palm Beach, Fla.		Dwight L. Rogers (6).
Wichita, Kans.	Edward H. Rees (4)	
Winslow, Ariz. (same as Phoenix)		
Winston-Salem, N. C.		John H. Folger (5).
Yakima, Wash.	Hal Holmes (4)	
Yakutat, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Youngstown, Ohio		Michael J. Kirwan (19).

New towers to be established in fiscal year 1948 (total, 19)

City	Republican	Democrat
Baton Rouge, La.		James H. Morrison (6).
Battle Creek, Mich.	Paul W. Shafer (3)	
Chicago, Ill. (see list above)		
Daytona Beach, Fla.		Joe Hendricks (5).
Duluth, Minn.		John A. Blatnik (8).
Erie, Pa.	Carroll D. Kearns (28)	
Greenville, S. C.		Joseph R. Bryson (4)
Lansing, Mich.	William W. Blackney (6)	
Montgomery, Ala.		George Mahlon Grant (2).

New towers to be established in fiscal year 1948 (total, 19)—Continued

City	Republican	Democrat
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	Walter G. Andrews (42)	
Ogden, Utah		Walter K. Granger (1).
Peoria, Ill	Everett M. Dirksen (16)	
Pocatello, Idaho	John Sanborn (2)	
Reading, Pa	Frederick A. Muhlenberg (13)	
Reno, Nev	Charles H. Russell (at large)	
San Juan, P. R		Antonio Fernós-Isern.
Texarkana, Tex		Wright Patman (1).
Wichita Falls, Tex		Ed Gossett (13).
Williamsport, Pa	Robert F. Rich (15)	

Let us not get away from the basic question. The issue is not abolition of control-tower operation. The committee seeks to have the States assume the responsibility for operation of all of the control towers. The committee thinks they ought to do it and that they are able financially to relieve Uncle Sam of the burden of these annual fixed charges after the Federal Government has constructed them on the pressure of the local communities and the States by and large. The Federal Government has invested a cool $100,000,000 in airports for the States. The interest charge on this much borrowed money—a part of the $259,000,000,000 debt—is $2,000,000 annually. The States and local subdivisions benefited do not pay one red cent of that. The Federal Government pays $57,000 annually in rental charges for space for Federal workers to keep the planes flying. This $57,000 annual rental is paid by the Federal Government for space in airports it built for the States and local subdivisions.

Now, let us look at the appropriations of the Federal Government in the 1947 and 1948 fiscal years for the aviation industry and private flying. These are fixed charges annually and not for airport construction:

	1947	1948
Civil Aeronautics Board	$2,490,000	$2,535,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration	79,038,120	87,007,000
Weather Bureau (for aviation only)	3,000,000	3,300,000
Total	84,528,000	[1] 92,842,000

[1] With the Rooney amendment the 1948 fiscal year total would be $4,800,000 more or a total of $97,642,000

With the Rooney amendment adopted the annual fixed charges paid to support aviation in the United States and its Territories will have increased $13,000,000 in 1 year. This is the year by the way that we promised the electorate we would cut Federal expenditures. Have we forgotten that pledge made last fall?

All the committee asks the States and local subdivisions of the country is to pay the small sum to operate the control towers on airports they wanted built. How do the States stand on finances compared to the Federal Government. The States have a gross debt of $2,500,000,000. The Federal Government has a debt of $259,000,000,000. The average State debt per capita is $18.50. The per capita Federal debt is $1,800. Shame on us if we do not require the several 48 States to carry the little portion of this annual fixed-charge burden.

I insert a list of the States with the gross debt, population, and the per capita debt for each in the following table:

State	Gross debt in thousands, end of 1945	Population, estimated July 1, 1945, excluding armed forces overseas	Per capita debt 1945
Alabama	65,769	2,812,301	$23.90
Arizona	3,339	630,298	5.30
Arkansas	139,783	1,779,817	78.54
California	172,929	8,822,688	19.60
Colorado	18,294	1,120,595	16.29
Connecticut	23,600	1,709,242	13.81
Delaware	4,502	286,832	15.70
Florida	1,304	2,385,917	.55
Georgia	15,180	3,191,766	4.76
Idaho	519	500,109	1.04
Illinois	115,163	7,897,291	14.59
Indiana	6,408	3,427,796	1.87
Iowa	1,353	2,259,526	.60
Kansas	11,549	1,740,379	6.64
Kentucky	6,057	2,578,179	2.35
Louisiana	162,744	2,456,057	66.26
Maine	19,178	847,222	21.46
Maryland	38,459	2,125,419	18.09
Massachusetts	70,288	4,316,721	16.28
Michigan	16,086	5,256,106	3.06
Minnesota	75,084	2,497,485	30.06
Mississippi	72,508	2,080,577	34.85
Missouri	73,499	3,556,693	20.66
Montana	11,746	457,624	25.67
Nebraska	970	1,198,492	.81
Nevada		159,804	0
New Hampshire	14,443	491,524	29.38
New Jersey	76,109	4,160,165	$18.29
New Mexico	22,998	535,220	42.97
New York	571,951	13,479,142	42.93
North Carolina	111,332	3,504,626	31.77
North Dakota	19,927	520,935	38.25
Ohio	10,870	6,907,612	1.57
Oklahoma	27,490	2,034,460	13.50
Oregon	20,332	1,206,322	16.87
Pennsylvania	178,041	9,900,180	19.56
Rhode Island	25,327	713,346	35.50
South Carolina	81,908	1,905,797	42.98
South Dakota	25,301	555,317	45.56
Tennessee	79,371	2,878,777	27.57
Texas	11,996	6,786,740	1.77
Utah	2,014	616,989	3.26
Vermont	3,374	359,231	9.39
Virginia	24,208	3,079,706	7.86
Washington	12,980	2,088,574	6.21
West Virginia	71,317	1,724,477	21.35
Wisconsin	3,943	3,137,587	1.26
Wyoming	3,194	246,766	13.94

Total State debt, $2,524,737,000. Estimated 140,000,000 population equals $18.03 per capita State debt. Estimated Federal debt March 1947, $200,000,000,000. Estimated population, 140,000,000 equals $1,817.14 per capita.

Bear in mind all of this debt does not accrue in the next year. A great portion of this debt I would assume was long-term indebtedness because most States have built up a surplus. While Uncle Sam spreads largess to the 48 States and spends himself to poverty the 48 States have been accumulating a huge surplus in their respective State treasuries to an aggregate total of $2,896,506,000. In 1943 this surplus was only $1,100,420,000 according to the Census Bureau. Is it not time for the States now to take on their fair share of responsibility?

I insert a table now showing the surplus by years by States for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946:

TABLE 1.—*Aggregate balances in State general, highway, and postwar reserve funds at end of fiscal year, by State: 1943-46*

State	Amount (in thousands of dollars)			
	1946	1945	1944	1943
Total	2,896,506	2,274,612	1,677,346	1,100,420
Alabama	30,838	12,193	7,426	1,185
Arizona	11,488	7,460	8,704	6,793
Arkansas	12,094	9,830	7,052	4,428
California	490,655	361,252	257,894	136,727
Colorado	22,563	18,457	13,942	9,388
Connecticut	20,797	38,081	29,929	24,866
Delaware	13,706	10,862	8,434	5,798
Florida	28,408	26,338	20,158	10,413
Georgia	15,396	17,570	12,861	8,025
Idaho	10,567	6,156	4,588	2,761
Illinois	188,282	156,050	118,241	86,163
Indiana	89,183	70,978	62,646	55,382
Iowa	49,101	29,743	28,605	22,449
Kansas	27,419	28,479	26,669	22,561
Kentucky	25,681	17,775	15,988	15,072
Louisiana	27,260	24,693	17,759	11,502
Maine	9,143	11,564	8,962	8,418
Maryland	33,414	28,483	19,176	16,714
Massachusetts	13,016	28,161	19,685	13,029
Michigan	84,673	61,765	48,182	44,265
Minnesota	29,696	29,165	28,665	22,489
Mississippi	22,743	19,646	10,544	20,611
Missouri	62,801	34,403	28,121	19,278
Montana	9,286	8,796	8,674	5,685
Nebraska	10,512	9,947	9,613	7,365
Nevada	5,425	4,176	3,414	2,280
New Hampshire	6,800	4,901	4,494	4,051
New Jersey	42,022	53,197	32,311	5,491
New Mexico	7,483	6,168	6,129	5,325
New York	501,481	323,158	163,061	68,962
North Carolina	98,717	72,221	47,541	72,750
North Dakota	17,104	13,915	12,403	7,869
Ohio	162,773	125,147	105,113	81,277
Oklahoma	26,909	12,569	8,318	9,082
Oregon	58,470	41,841	33,687	28,909
Pennsylvania	180,672	199,695	143,552	78,012
Rhode Island	6,288	4,038	4,455	4,436
South Carolina	18,856	21,943	16,930	10,932
South Dakota	15,914	11,384	9,155	6,552
Tennessee	32,427	25,297	19,339	12,073
Texas	55,385	31,098	4,353	−14,734
Utah	3,974	4,155	4,391	2,666
Vermont	8,100	8,264	6,981	5,150
Virginia	74,307	63,465	50,882	35,810
Washington	90,837	83,580	47,549	37,200
West Virginia	22,322	18,256	17,637	13,528
Wisconsin	93,558	71,912	58,754	39,057
Wyoming	8,530	6,575	4,377	2,575

Let us get economy from our own doorstep. Let the local and State governments pay this small $4,800,000 which the Rooney amendment would have the Federal Government pay. Let us get the weighted cost of the $92,842,000 allowed by the committee to service aviation annually from the air lines that is properly chargeable to them and put aviation on a sound basis in the United States. Aviation will not profit by the State and local governments, the commercial aviation industry chiseling Uncle Sam to bankruptcy. One by one let us remove the chiselers from Uncle Sam. Let us vote down the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendments may be read before they are voted on so we may have the benefit of hearing them again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the Cole amendment to the Rooney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Strike out "$70,982,000" and insert "$71,081,484"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] to the Rooney amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Missouri and Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 141, noes 84.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Hébert amendment to the Bakewell substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL: Strike out "$71,045,734" and insert "$71,081,484" and strike out "$4,877,734" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,948,484."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Hébert amendment to the Bakewell substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HÉBERT) there were—ayes 82, noes, 106.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 122.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

Page 45, line 18, strike out "$66,133,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$71,045,734."

And on page 45, line 23, strike out beginning with the word "That" down to and including the word "towers" on page 46, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That $4,877,734 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKEWELL and Mr. PLOESER) there were—ayes 45, noes 113.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as amended.

The Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri: On page 45, line 18, strike out "$66,133,000" and insert "$71,081,484"; and on page 45, line 23, strike out the proviso beginning with the word "That" and ending with the colon on page 46, line 1.

The question was taken; and, the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 179, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease or grant; personal services in the District of Columbia; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $17,638,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 which is hereby merged with this appropriation: *Provided*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for emergency repair and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm, not to exceed $125,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautical Administration," for necessary expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and from and within the Territories and possessions of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation, and not to exceed $500,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for necessary administrative costs; and the War and Navy Departments are authorized during the fiscal year 1948, to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, air navigation and communication facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

On page 46, line 14, after the word "and", insert the words "purchase of 21 and."

Line 15, strike out "$17,638,000" and insert "$36,308,000."

On page 47, line 1, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$910,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment concerns an item in the Department of Commerce section of this bill which is of the utmost importance to the people and to the security of our Nation. My amendment would increase the amount $17,638,000 for establishment of air-navigation facilities allowed by the majority members of the committee to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget and Civil Aeronautics Administration; namely, $36,308,000. The full amount $36,308,000 is urgently needed to purchase and install equipment which is absolutely necessary to insure the safety of the American people using the air lines. It is particularly necessary, as you know, because of accidents caused by storms and bad weather. Allowance of the amount which my amendment provides will make air travel in this country safe for the people of America.

In this particular instance the committee cut the item for establishment of air-navigation facilities to the extent of more than 50 percent. Let us see what the committee's reduction of the item proposes to do. Their reduction means the elimination of 38 instrument landing systems. It means the elimination of 38 high-intensity approach lights. The allowance of only the sum of $17,638,000 as provided in the bill in its present form means the complete elimination of 42 very high-frequency radio rangers. It means the complete elimination of all low-frequency high-powered omnidirectional radio ranges which have been planned by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It means a serious reduction in the program for the installation of ground-controlled approach radar which is so vitally necessary to the safety of aircraft in fog and in rain. It will require the reduction in plans for the installation of surveillance radar equipment which is used to prevent collisions in midair over the airports throughout our country.

Last year almost 13,000,000 Americans rode the air lines in the continental United States. Is it sensible economy to purchase that economy with the lives of a great many of the American public?

During the last quarter of a century we have invested approximately $1,000,000,000 in aviation. We have invested more than $10,000,000,000 in railroads, roads, and waterways. Our investments in railroads, roads, and waterways have all been fully repaid and proved to have been investments which were sensible and economical. So it is with reference to this item in this bill for establishment of air-navigation facilities. Two committees of this Congress, one the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate had this to say, after having held a number of hearings, after the serious air casualties were experienced by the air lines around the first of this year. I quote to you from a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House, dated February 19, 1947:

It appears, however, that there has been a certain number of accidents recently which might have been prevented had certain facilities been available. * * * It is the committee's opinion that the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible. * * * Your committee is encouraged to note the development of air aids to navigation, including aids to landing and take-offs that have been advanced in development during

the war, but is concerned by the delay in installation of such equipment caused by the war, and urges acceleration in the provision of the necessary funds so that these aids may be made fully available as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Now let me quote from a report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, investigating safety in the air:

The members of the subcommittee stress the urgency of the installation of all possible navigational aids as far as feasible before the winter of 1947-48. It is recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration plan this present program for completion within a period not exceeding 18 months.

The majority members of this subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee have proceeded diametrically opposite to the contention of the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when they cut an item such as the one to which this amendment refers, establishment of air navigation facilities, to the extent of $18,670,000.

I respectfully ask your favorable consideration of this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the beginning of numerous amendments that will be offered to restore all of the budget figures in this bill, or most of them. The committee should be on notice that we made these cuts with the recommendation of experts who have gone into every phase of safety aids to air navigation. We are appropriating in this bill $19,500,000 for CAA. If this particular item which the gentleman from New York seeks to increase is granted, they will have for expenditure this year $19,622,000, of which they have spent only $10,000,000. In other words, they have $10,000,000 on hand and we are allowing them in this bill $17,638,000. In other words, they will have $26,688,000 on hand for next fiscal year. Of course, we threw out 21 new automobiles and a lot of water that was in the estimate.

I hope you will vote down this and other similar amendments.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. I wonder if the gentleman from New York would sponsor a bill appropriating the sums of money needed for the railroads of this country to restore the safety devices which have been depleted during the war.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the answer is "no."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to place the committee on notice again that we are just as much interested as any one of you in safety in air navigation. The amendment to eliminate the control towers was a test, because somewhere along the line we have got to get private industry, the cities, the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government to cooperate in the matter of control towers that are needed by more airports not now provided for.

We have gone into every detail of the CAA. We know something about GCA, ILS, and the rest of the new safety aids. I do not know whether ILS and GCA are perfect or what new is coming. The experts say that ILS is not perfect. Experts tell us we have appropriated too much for GCA. But we do not want the CAA to come here and tell you that we are taking any aids away from them. We want them to have every one they want to make air navigation safe. We have provided for all phases of safety.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is the first of a number that are to be offered to restore every penny the Administration has asked.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming that the Congress provided five billions for the installation of safety aids, would that in any way guarantee my safety as an air passenger?

Mr. STEFAN. Money will not save your life in the air. Appropriations cannot do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly it will not. I would rather have the loyal and dedicated service of the air-transport personnel than all the safety devices you can conceive of. You can fill the country full of safety devices but unless you have a loyal staff on those planes, when a man, woman, or child takes a plane he places his life in jeopardy. I fly all over this country. I could be a great supporter for air-safety aids, but we need something besides air-safety aids. You cannot buy safety with money alone, you have got to have something else.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore the budget estimate. They had $19,622,000 of which they spent only $10,000,000. I repeat, they have $9,050,000 on hand. That plus $17,638,000 in this bill will give them a total of $26,688,000.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If the pending bill in any measure reflects the general thinking of the Congress then the mandate given it at the polls last November to reduce Government costs is being outrageously ignored. I say this with all deference to my colleagues, but the matter is so serious that it merits the use of strong words.

The report shows a saving of roundly $163,000,000 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Judiciary over the budget estimate for 1948 of roundly $699,000,000, but an increase of roundly $27,000,000 over the 1947 appropriation, so that instead of reducing the cost of these four departments, the bill would increase it.

I think a better picture can be had of what is taking place in the way of expenditures for the operation of these departments by comparing them with those of prewar years. For the period 1936–39, according to the Statistical Abstract, the total cost for operating the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments averaged about $80,000,000 annually. The pending bill calls for an expenditure of roundly $519,000,000 for those three departments for the year 1948, or approximately 6½ times more than the average for the prewar years mentioned.

The appropriation provided in the bill for the State Department deserves special comment. Judging from the mess this Department has helped to make of our international affairs the whole business ought to be liquidated and reconstituted by substituting quality for quantity. Yet this bill appropriates approximately $38,000,000 more for the Department of State than it was given for the present fiscal year and about 11 times more than it received on an average annually from 1936 to 1939.

The Congress is pursuing an impossible policy—attempting to reduce operating costs while retaining the governmental functions that came into being during the war and several years prior thereto, if it is not actually adding to those functions. No profounder fallacy could be imagined. Costs can be reduced only by eliminating functions. Common sense tells us this.

I am sure the voters in casting their ballots last November intended that Congress should drastically reduce the burdensome overhead of the Government, regardless of what might be required to accomplish this. My position is such that I cannot consistently vote for this measure.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, no one is more interested in safety in air navigation than I. In opposing this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York it is because with the $17,000,000 appropriated to them in this bill and the $9,000,000 unexpended balance they have, making a total of $26,000,000, it makes me believe that perhaps we have appropriated even too much money. I make that statement because in the course of its investigation of safety in air navigation my committee put out an interim report from which

the gentleman from New York has quoted, and then we proceeded on for a number of weeks more and are still continuing our investigation of air-navigation lanes. It is quite apparent that we may have spoken a little too soon. The enthusiasm of the moment, not realizing that war had produced these wonderful new gadgets for providing safety, has resulted in our overlooking a few things.

The CAA has been working for 15 years on what is known as an instrument-landing system. Until the radar business was developed by the Army that was the best system that had been devised; however, it has many faults, it has many difficulties, and I doubt that most of them can be overcome.

The ILS system has been installed quite extensively by the CAA in the United States. I have a report in my file which indicates that out of the 19 systems that were installed, I believe up to March, only a very few of them operated satisfactorily. Subsequently there have been an additional number installed, I think about 42 or some such figure. As I see it, that is enough of those systems in the United States for the time being at least, even though they work perfectly.

We need the ILS, the GCA, or any sort of system like those at only a relatively few airports in the United States and those few are the ones that have the heaviest traffic density. It would appear, though that the CAA has taken our committee recommendation quite literally and intends to install this very expensive equipment at every commercial airport in the United States, which is utterly ridiculous; it is absurd. These equipments are to enable landing of aircraft in congested airports and not in the cow pasture airports of the United States.

The same thing can be said for the so-called high intensity approach light system. That also is needed in only a few important airports of the United States, such as Chicago, New York, Washington, Dallas, Tex., San Francisco, Los Angeles, and perhaps three, four, or five more places in the United States, and it is only needed in those particular airports because of the importance of getting the aircraft down and into the principal terminal airports on time and safely. Where the traffic density is light those items of equipment are not seriously needed.

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that the committee take a look to see what the CAA is proposing to do here. I am surprised to find a budget presented in this great amount of money. I had not conceived in helping to write the recommendations made by our committee that they were going to spread this equipment into every airport used commercially in the United States. I trust that before we go to increasing the present proposals we may be permitted to take a look at how far this equipment is supposed to be spread over the United States. My committee will be very glad to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I concur in what the gentleman has said. Is it not true that these different types of approach systems are still in the experimental stage?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed they are, and certain of them have proven to be quite good and others not so good.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true also that there is quite a difference of opinion among the advocates of the different types of landing approaches as to which might accomplish the greatest objective toward safety?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is very true. The Army and Navy both are greatly in favor of the GCA system and they have supplied free 20 of these pieces of equipment to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Of course, the CAA has to modify them and install them. But let us take a look at this situation and see how it is going to work before we spread it out all over the country.

I must therefore oppose this amendment and I oppose it with the idea that the amount might be even a little bit less and we would still be in good shape.

So far as the installation of the high-frequency omnidirectional range system is concerned we do need that system over the heavily traveled routes, as for instance, from Chicago to New York and New York to Washington. But for the moment it is not so important that we spread it all over the whole United States. We must consider one question here, gentlemen, which my committee is trying very hard to resolve and find the answer to, and that is this, that with the ILS system, with the Army directional range system, very high frequency radio equipment, the private flier, the itinerant flier, can get no benefit from it at all, because he cannot load his airplane down with the weight of the equipment that is required for this system. We must find a proper piece of equipment for our airway system that will provide proper air navigational aid not only to the commercial air lines, but to the private flier, the itinerant flier, the nonscheduled air lines, and the Army and Navy fliers, both in the bomber classification and in the fighter types, and when we find that system which will suit all of those types of aircraft—and I think we will have it in very short order now, perhaps a matter of only a few months, why then we will really have something that will be of benefit to the United States in both peace and war. But, to go ahead with this present program the way it is proposed now I think is wrong. I am in favor of giving them money enough to equip the essential airports of the United States. I think they have already done it, and as far as the rest of them are concerned, I think we might as well wait and take a look to see how the present equipment will operate and whether it will be of real benefit. Therefore I take the position with the majority of the committee on this item. In looking over the balance of the bill, I agree with them on the other items in the bill and believe that the committee position should be sustained. I differ with them only in the matter of control-tower operation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago this Congress, under the Reorganization Act, took steps to work economy in government. I am in absolute harmony with that program. I doubt if I have failed to support the committee in its effort at economy at any time since we went into session. It is my intention to continue to support the committee, but I am vitally interested in an airport in my district. We have several, but there is one very large one in my home town of Dunkirk, N. Y.; it is, in fact, one of the finest airports in this country. It is built on a plot of 500 acres of ground, where there are no obstructions and it is in close proximity to the city. It is on the main air route from the east; that is, from New England west through to Chicago. There is an area along the Great Lakes where there are all kinds of hazardous weather conditions. The hazards there are very great. A plane in distress, we will say, in Buffalo, going west, or one in distress at Erie or Cleveland, traveling east, has only this airport at Dunkirk, N. Y., where it has an opportunity to land. We had a communication and weather station service there. It has been taken away from that airport. It is working great injury. I understand that, whether these amendments increasing the amounts are adopted or not, the Bureau has ample money to take care of such situations as we have in the city of Dunkirk.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I know the great concern that the gentleman from New York has in the airport at Dunkirk, and I am in sympathy with him because he has talked to me on numerous occasions about that, and he has talked to the Department. I want to call attention, however, to the fact, that the CAA has $71,000,000 this year for salaries and operating expenses in which this is included. They had only $55,000,000 last year. We are allowing them $71,000,000. It is an administrative problem over which we have no control. While I deeply sympathize with the gentleman from New York, that problem has to be solved between him and the people downtown.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the chairman for those remarks. I realize fully that that is the situation. I do not know whether or not the question of politics enters into the matter of removing these services, but I know that whenever you call that bureau or any other bureau about some service of which you are about to be deprived or have been deprived their invariable answer is, "Well, the fault is with Congress in not providing sufficient money." There is sufficient money here, and the reason I am taking the floor today is that I hold in my hand a protest on the part of every prominent businessman and every organization protesting against the removal of this service. I just wanted to take the floor so the facts could be brought out here. I still propose to go down the line of economy with the committee. I happen to be on a committee which is trying to raise the revenue to

run this Government and pay on our debt, so I am going along the lines of economy; but these people have the money, as the chairman has said, if they wish to administer it in the interest of the public at these airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 35, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical development: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, personnel, and operation methods, and personal services in the District of Columbia; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle and operation and maintenance of five aircraft; $2,000,000.

Mr ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 47, line 17, strike out "one" and insert "two"; and in line 18, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I propose would increase the amount allowed by the majority of the committee to the Civil Aeronautics Authority for technical development from $2,000,000 to $3,500,000, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Of all the fields in which to practice false economy, it is my considered opinion that aviation is the most dangerous; and of all the areas in aviation in which men should be free to seek improvement, technical development is the most important. Of course I realize that on this amendment just as on the last amendment for establishment of air-navigation facilities we will not find any more than one or two friends on the other side of the aisle.

The majority members of this committee have hit at the very heart of aviation progress in their cut of $1,500,000 from the funds of the CAA's Technical Development Service. This would be a wilfully blind and unthinking cut at any time. But at this time when we are emerging from a war, in which tremendous vistas of technical advancement have been unfolded which can be developed and adapted for civilian aviation use; and when the passenger mileage of United States scheduled air lines has reached the astounding figure of 7,000,000,000 miles, making it imperative that the highest standards of safety be maintained, a cut of 43 percent in a total budget request of a comparatively small $3,500,000 borders closely on the irresponsible.

Gentlemen, we have always been niggardly with the CAA in funds for technical development. This is different from invention and research. In technical development, we take a known and existing invention, or plan, or method, and bring it to the point where it is applicable to daily aviation needs. This is not in the field of pure research. It is the direct and practical answer to an existing need.

Here is a good example: Airplanes in flight are continually running into birds while in flight. Deaths have resulted when these collisions incapacitated pilots. A better windshield was needed, and a better one was developed—not invented—by the CAA. Today, your friends and relatives who travel by air are protected from this hazard.

There are dozens of other examples, such as instrument landing aids, better lights for night flying, gas tanks that will not burst and flame in the event of a crash, simple gadgets to warn the pilot when his plane is about to stall, fireproof brake fluid, and all the many and mysterious aids that come from the radio field.

Another is the constant study of fire discovery and prevention in the nacelle of the engines which power the aircraft both large and small. Such developments already have reduced the danger of fire but much more work is under way and must be completed.

Today we have the whole field of radar opened up for exploitation. Promising as radar was during the war, it will be of no value for many years in civilian flying without the development which every new electronics device requires. The cut which the committee has imposed on this service will eliminate all radar developmental programs and work on radio and fog-dispersing systems. These would make possible contact flight landing conditions in bad weather and reduce one of the greatest hazards to safe flying.

The cut also proposes to eliminate a complete program of better flying charts for the private flier which will advance the day when private flying will produce an industry of economic importance to this Nation. Better charts would increase personal flying, and better charts can be developed if funds are allowed for the purpose.

Radar charts for air navigation sound like a more distant objective. But it is exactly this kind of advance planning through which aviation gets its fastest growth. It is too new a field to accept what is available today and not seize every possible chance for improvement.

The CAA asked for only $3,500,000 for its total developmental program.

If we want to stop where we are in this matter of safety on the airways, we can ignore this kind of developmental work. If we want to go on with our announced program of safer airway aids, we must not starve that unit of our Government charged with this fundamentally important project.

I urge the Members on the majority side of the aisle to consider adoption of my proposed amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this is just another example of how an effort is being made to restore every penny of the budget estimates in this bill.

What is the story about this item of technical development in the CAA? You should know. This committee has not been deaf to the pleas of people to have technical development of aviation. Of course, we know that private industry does a great deal of that research too, much more will have to be done. But listen to what we have done about it. For technical development this year the CAA has $925,000, and we gave them $2,000,000 for the next fiscal year—more than double.

I hope that is of enough importance to indicate to you what this effort is, to increase these budget estimates.

I sincerely ask that you vote down this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to increase this appropriation by $1,500,000. After reading the hearings and after recalling the testimony that was presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the past 3 months, I seriously thought of introducing an amendment to further reduce the $2,000,000 item. Neither $2,000,000 nor $3,500,000 is any more than a drop in the bucket compared to what we will have to spend for development of aircraft and aircraft engines in the United States in the next few years if we are going to keep pace with the rest of the world. However, I do not think the Civil Aeronautics Administration is the proper agency to carry on that technical development and research work. I would like to see this taken completely out of the CAA and turned over to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, an agency created by the Congress for that purpose.

Reference has been made to the fact that units of the aviation industry are carrying on research work. Many of them are, but indirectly the funds which they spend for research must also come from the Treasury of the United States, for the reason that the industry has not the money needed to carry on all necessary research.

I think one of the most difficult problems this Congress will deal with in the Eightieth Congress is the determination of just how we are going to finance technical research and development. The aviation industry in this country today, two short years after the end of the war, has dropped down and down and down to almost nothing. There are only about 2 of the 12 major units in the aviation industry that are today operating in the black. I understand a resolution has been offered in the other body to study this whole question of providing adequate funds for these research projects within the industry, and through the Army and the Navy. So I do not think this $1,500,000 is going to be any contribution toward a solution. I think the more we have these agencies dabbling into it, spending a million here and a million there, the less real progress we will make. So I hope until the whole program can be considered intelligently, with due consideration to the importance of the aviation industry to national defense, we will not go on increasing these appropriations that will not do the job that must be done.

I agreed with the Committee on the amendment previously rejected, but before yielding the floor I just want to make this one remark: I hope the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. JONES], for whom I have a high regard, will, when he reads his remarks in the RECORD this evening, strike out that part that seemed to me impugned the motives of all of those who supported the amendment to restore the control-tower item. I do not think I have to say to the House that I, for one, was not influenced by the fact that there was a control tower or is a control tower within my congressional district. I voted for that item because I felt one of the most dangerous things we could do would be to break any link of the airport control-tower system that has been built up over the years. Saving lives and protecting property was my only interest.

I hope the gentleman made those remarks in the heat of debate, and in the cool of this evening that he will strike them from the RECORD.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 19, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), $32,500,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which $29,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said act, and $1,662,500 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,837,500 of the said $32,500,000 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses; including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of 15 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which $1,837,500 not to exceed $176,000 may be transferred to the "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," to provide for necessary administrative expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $26,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce": *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 is hereby merged with this appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

On page 48, line 8, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$65,000,000."

Line 9, strike out "$29,000,000" and insert "$58,000,000."

Line 11, strike out "$1,662,500" and insert "$3,325,000."

Line 13, strike out "$1,836,500" and insert "$3,675,000."

Line 14, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$65,000,000."

Line 17, strike out "fifteen" and insert "thirty."

Line 18, strike out "$1,837,500" and insert "$3,675,000."

Line 18, strike out "$176,000" and insert "$352,000."

Line 22, strike out "$26,000" and insert "$52,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns the item for the Federal-aid airport program which was discussed here yesterday and the day before. It is the amendment which concerns all those States and cities which I enumerated on the floor of the House and which you will find in the RECORD of last Tuesday. I do not have the page number immediately in front of me but it is somewhere in the vicinity of page 5195 or 5196.

Mr. Chairman, this Federal-aid airport program is not one under which the Federal Government expends on these airport projects the entire amount of money required to construct them. I believe the average contribution by the Federal Government is approximately 50 percent. At the present time, as shown on page 885 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee on the Commerce Department appropriation, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has received project requests from sponsors or proposed sponsors of airport projects totaling in excess of $585,000,000, of which approximately $235,000,000 would represent the Federal share.

The Department states that if they receive the amont they originally requested, $65,000,000, which was cut exactly 50 percent by the majority members of this committee, they can perform many very critical, badly needed jobs of airport improvement and airport development.

They state that the $65,000,000 which they request would be split generally as follows, as shown on page 886 of the hearings:

Forty-three million five hundred thousand dollars would be funds for State allocation in accordance with the regular area-population formula as prescribed in the act;

Three million five hundred thousand dollars would be for work in the territories of which only $175,000 is an administrative fund;

Fourteen million five hundred thousand dollars would be a discretionary fund which we have programed along with the regular State appropriation; and

Three million five hundred thousand dollars is for engineering, administration, and supervision of the program.

I take it for granted that every Member of the House is familiar with the Federal-aid airport program, and familiar with the fact that it applies to all these cities which I enumerated on the day before yesterday. I am quite sure that the gentlemen on the majority side of the aisle are not going to fail to respond to a single vote on this amendment as they did on my previous two amendments, which were so vitally necessary for the safety and development of the aviation industry in this country.

This item for our airport program, incidentally, is one that is vitally necessary in connection with our plan of national defense. If you flew over England during the war and saw how there was just one airfield after another, and how necessary their airfields were in the defense of their realm, you cannot but vote for the inclusion of the additional $32,500,000 in this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also restore the budget estimate for the Federal-aid airport program. Let us review the matter of airports. I endeavored to explain that the other day in my general statement but I will repeat it briefly at this time.

We have now 4,728 airports in all classes; that is classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and larger. You might be interested to know that we have 2,703 class 1 airports, 777 class 2 airports, 490 class 3 airports, and we have in the larger classes of airports, class 4 and above, 758, which makes a total of 2,728 airports.

As explained by previous speakers, our airport program is a goal of 6,300 approximately in a 7-year period. In the 3-year period we planned to include 4,400 airports. Of the larger airports we are getting many back from the Army and Navy. The Army and Navy have turned over to us about 400 of these larger airports which were built for war purposes and they are not included in this total of 4,728. They told us in our committee that the Army and Navy have 1,200 more of these gigantic airports to turn over as surplus, which will be available to the cities, the communities, and the States.

When we started the Federal-State aid airport program we figured we were going to spend about $500,000,000 over a period of 7 years to build new airports and help communities to construct them, matching the funds similar to the way we match funds for Federal aid to highways. So the CAA set up a plan. We implemented the authorization last year with $45,000,000 for the purpose of improving and constructing smaller airports. The President froze $41,000,000 of that amount, and the CAA has a discretionary fund of around $4,000,000 which they are using at this time. So the 1947 money is in the hands of the CAA for the small airports, but not one penny of it has been expended as yet; not one cent of it. They will begin spending it for the smaller airports soon, this $41,000,000 that has been frozen by the President. They are asking for $65,000,000 for the 1948 program which they originally intended for the class 4, or larger airports.

The committee reviewed the entire condition of this airport program, and we find CAA will have $73,500,000 on hand. We sent aviation experts into the CAA, pilots, technical experts, and budgetary officers who know something about budgets, who know something about airports, and who know something about the State situations, because they have learned that many of the communities cannot match these funds. So, we figured this program should be reviewed.

I am asked by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], to read you a paragraph of the hearings. Mr. Wright, the Administrator, in answer to a question about the

$41,000,000 that has been frozen by the President, said:

Yes, sir. In making this 1948 request which is before you now, the same sort of question was asked of us and it was agreed that for the fiscal year 1948, we could limit our expenditures out of the Treasury to $50,000,000 which would be involved in both the residue of the 1947 appropriation and the $65,000,000 appropriation for which we are asking for 1948.

I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see there are about six or seven people who wish to speak. I just wonder how much time that would give us.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. If this motion prevails, would that prevent any debate on any other amendment that might be offered to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. To this paragraph. The debate has to come within the 25 minutes.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Committee for the purpose of pleading with it to redeem the good faith of the United States in connection with which in excess of 300 municipalities in the United States have relied. This Government enacted only a short time ago authorized an airport program. I do not believe it is the intention of this Congress to go back on an implied contract with those municipalities made so recently for airport construction, under which municipalities of this country have provided themselves with funds in order to participate. There are in excess of 300 municipalities in this country that have already in reliance upon this program, either by taxation or by the floating and sale of bonds, raised money with which to match every single solitary cent the Congress promised them less than 2 years ago.

I speak of the case of my own city because I am more familiar with it than with any other. As recently as last October the city of Fort Smith in reliance on this plan called an election, and issued, and sold bonds to the tune of $750,000. We have that money lying idle in the bank there today, unable to use it because this program is being crippled by this proposed slice in this appropriation.

The 300 or more cities I have referred to are planning class 4 or larger airports. There are hundreds of others to which the $41,000,000 that has been carried over has already been allocated. All I am pleading for is the restoration of this appropriation to the amount promised, so that the construction of class 4 and larger airports under the program of the CAA can get under way, and so the United States Government will redeem its promise and show its good faith to the municipalities who have raised funds, and who are ready to proceed with this program as soon as the Government provides its share of the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to rise again, but as these reductions have been pretty generally on party lines, I wish to read a telegram I have here from a very distinguished Marylander who is now mayor of Baltimore, a Republican, who did not seek reelection. The telegram is as follows:

Baltimore has already completed master plan, acquired 25,000 acres of land, begun grading, draining and compacting operation for runways, taxi strips, and apron for great commercial airport on Friendship Church site. City has spent nearly $1,750,000 and has contracted to spend before end of year more than two million additional. Under CAA approved formula for Federal participation in project included in Federal airways program Friendship Church project, which has been recommended, rates upward to $2,000,000 in Federal funds this year. We believe progress made on this important project places it in different category from those in planning state where construction work not actually under way. Urge united effort Maryland delegation to restore cut in amount recommended for Friendship Church airport by CAA and President plus additional sum more nearly to comply with CAA formula. Your cooperation urgently solicited.

It is signed by Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this issue now before us that I do not think we have considered sufficiently, and that is, in encouraging and getting the various municipalities to embark upon a good airfield-expansion program. Several years ago the Congress undertook a difficult job because naturally there is a certain amount of lethargy on the part of various municipalities to get going on this very important program. But they did get going. They did make their plans based upon the representations of the Congress. Now the Congress cannot break faith with those municipalities.

Like many other cities, my city of Milwaukee did make those plans. I wish to read a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County. It is as follows:

Whereas there is presently pending in the Congress of the United States Senate Document No. 14, making appropriations for airport-construction aid for various airports throughout the United States which bill includes a sum of $650,000 to be appropriated for the improvement of General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee County's airport; and

Whereas Milwaukee County is presently spending millions of dollars for the enlargement and improvement of this particular airport and has secured approval of many additional schedules by transcontinental lines: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors in regular meeting assembled this 22d day of April 1947, That said board requests the earnest support of the abovementioned congressional bill by Representatives of the Fourth and Fifth Districts of Wisconsin, and by the United States Senators of Wisconsin; and be it

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and Congress Representatives CHARLES J. KERSTEN and JOHN C. BROPHY.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has stated a situation which exists throughout the United States. I hope the committee will take heed.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to explain this situation in 2½ minutes. I wish there were time to show how the gentlemen of the committee who reported this are wholly in error in their position.

In the first place, the 1947 fiscal year appropriation of $45,000,000 has already been allotted up to the amount of approximately $35,000,000 for class 1, 2, and 3 airports. The act which I helped to report out of our committee and which was passed by the Congress provided an allocation of the appropriation to each of the States. The amount allocated to one State cannot be used by any other State. If there are unexpended funds remaining in any appropriation or allocation, they must remain for that State.

Let me show you how that operates. In the 1947 appropriation for present fiscal year for classes 1, 2, and 3 airports, approximately $3,000,000 is left of the $41,000,000 yet to be allocated for additional projects. Only that $3,000,000 can be used for the development of class 4 and larger airports for future allocation. The gentlemen, however, would indicate to you that all of that $41,000,000 is unexpended and can be used for the 1948 program in the development of class 4 and larger airports. I say under the law, it cannot now be so used. It is important that this amount be restored.

In section 9 of the Airport Act, subsection (d), it is provided that all projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, and that approval shall be given only if at the time of approval funds are available for payment of the United States share of the allowable project cost.

In other words, until the appropriation is actually made, no negotiations or contracts for the development of projects in municipalities can proceed. Certainly you cannot use $73,000,000 withdrawal of funds from the Treasury in 1948. Certainly they are right when they say only about $50,000,000 would be actually spent and withdrawn from the Treasury. But the fact remains, if the appropriation is not made the program, under

the law, cannot proceed. What we are doing here is to say to the municipalities throughout the country, "You cannot proceed in carrying out the development program authorized in the act of 1946."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, my city of St. Louis had much the same attitude. We have a Republican mayor, similar to that which Baltimore enjoyed. The mayor and I are good friends personally and politically, but I have a dutiful course to follow in the necessary economy program. I have a wire here which I would like to read:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 7, 1947.*

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building:

St. Louis vigorously opposes action of House Appropriations Committee in reducing CAA grants to cities for airport development. Loss of almost $1,000,000 to St. Louis thereby constitutes serious blow to our aviation program. Also protest action by same committee in eliminating all funds for CAA operation of airport-traffic control towers. CAA is logical agency to operate towers, as they must be integrated with each other over the Nation for satisfactory and effective service. Operation of such facilities by municipalities would be a step backward and a detriment to aviation progress and safety.

ALOYS P. KAUFMAN,
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

But let me read to you the response to that wire:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 9, 1947.*

Mayor A. P. KAUFMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Reduction of Federal expenditures is not only desirable but imperative. Solvency of the Nation must be regained. The idea "cut everybody but me" will not work. The St. Louis Airport has done well. It is my duty to support reductions and the duty of everyone to support public frugality.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Member of Congress.

I think if a Representative from St. Louis, Mo., can take that attitude, then everybody else in this Congress can go along with the absolute need of reducing expenditures where they can properly be reduced—and this is the place. As a matter of fact, there will be $73,500,000 in the appropriation included with this bill for the fiscal year 1948. There is an agreement not to expend more than $50,000,000. So, regardless of the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas, there would be no more than $50,000,000 spent in the coming fiscal year. According to my way of looking at this, had I had the authority to state this appropriation, it would have been $23,500,000 less. I do not state that to criticize the committee, but I think they might have held that money in the Treasury. I do not believe in even letting the money be over there for a bureaucrat to flirt with. If you are going to criticize this committee, then criticize your President, who froze $41,000,000 of these funds last year and prevented their expenditure during 1947.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. No. I have only 2½ minutes.

I supported the amendment to restore the $4,000,000 on the airport control, with the statement that I hoped provision would be made by law that it becomes a reimbursable program in the following fiscal year. I think it is time for us to recognize that even subsequent to the date of many of these airport plans, the American public called for drastic reduction in Federal expenditures. I for one believe that every municipality should stand its share alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to get some information from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], with particular reference to an airport project in my own district, at Davenport, Iowa. It is listed in Senate Document 14, which is a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, giving the request of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for these projects. It is listed as a new project to be built in the Davenport-Moline area, on which the sponsor is to put up $1,020,000 and the Federal Government $1,000,000. I notice in a release by the Department of Commerce, dated May 7, a complete analysis of this appropriation bill. In attachment B thereto is listed for this project in Davenport a reduction of $580,000 in the Federal share of that particular project.

I wanted to ask at this point whether that indicated reduction means they are going to start this airport and delay its completion or whether they are going to build less than a class 4 airport. What effect will this proposed reduction in appropriation have on the plan as announced in this Senate Document 14? What will be the effect of the reduction of this appropriation from $65,000,000 to $32,500,000 on any new airport development such as that?

Mr. STEFAN. The CAA will have over $72,000,000 to expend on both classes of airports. It is up to the States and municipalities which have been allocated a certain amount as far as the 1947 allocation is concerned. They will not lose any of that. What proportion of the $32,500,000 they will get is a matter, of course, of administration. They will not, however, be able to spend anywhere near that amount this year. So the net result will be that such an airport will not lose anything at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Then the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations does not indicate an abandonment of a new airport project such as the one at Davenport, Iowa?

Mr. STEFAN. No. As a matter of fact, the entire program will ultimately be reviewed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. It does not indicate an indefinite delay?

Mr. STEFAN. No. The entire program will have to be reviewed for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, according to the evidence taken before the committee, the CAA will not spend, during the next year, more than $50,000,000. They have $41,000,000 already frozen by the President and are given $32,500,000 more here or a total of more than they propose to spend; therefore, it seems likely that this amendment will be defeated. Due to the imposed limitation of debate, however, and the fact that I probably will not have an opportunity to explain later an amendment I expect to offer, I rise at this time to call attention to it. My amendment is designed to put a limitation on the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics so that he cannot arbitrarily name certain airports for construction. This should appeal to all those Members who are affected by the list of airports which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has given us. As many of you who have called the Administrator know, he has said: "We are going to build such-and-such airports and we are going to eliminate such-and-such."

The reasons for his action are not for discussion here, but my amendment will provide that the appropriation made does not grant to the Administrator authority to undertake during the fiscal year any specific projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports unless express approval of Congress is hereafter granted. Under existing law, the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, unless we put this provision in this appropriation bill he will have just that leeway. I read from the law as follows:

In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States share of allowable project costs during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested—

Namely, to construct certain specific airports—

Unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law.

The purpose of the amendment which will be offered in the event of the defeat of this amendment will be to manifest a contrary intent, and to say to the Administrator that he cannot construct any airports which he may arbitrarily select in the class 4 and larger group, unless approval of Congress is hereafter obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not adopt this amendment. There has been no airport construction this year. Thirty-two and a half million dollars added to the $44,500,000, which is going to be left from the current year's appropriation, would make $77,000,000 available. Why that is not enough to start an airport program, I cannot understand. I believe it is far more than can be intelligently expended.

This House voted an intention to cut $6,000,000,000 from the total appropriations. I hope that as they approach this item the Members will realize that they

are not going to get anywhere by adding $32,500,000 to this appropriation. I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be rejected, and that we can go ahead along toward saving money in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CURTIS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the record is extremely clear on this matter and I shall take time enough to review what has happened. A year ago last Tuesday we passed the Federal Airways Act and this Congress in order to place that in operation appropriated $45,000,000 before we went home. Shortly after we left for home the President froze all but $4,000,000 of that money. Mr. Wright in appearing before our committee had this to say:

> The President desired as few disbursements from the Treasury as possible, particularly on public works items, for this year.

That is the year which we will complete on June 30. We have been assured that this money will be available on the first of July for disbursement.

We come now to the fiscal year 1948, still working under the act passed by this Congress which expends a half-billion dollars for airport construction over a 7-year period. Our subcommittee has agreed to this program.

What did the CAA do this year? They do not know exactly what they are doing either, because their first figure was a little in excess of $104,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. That is what they went to the Department with. The Department did not know what they ought to spend or how and they cut it down to $85,000,000. Then they went to the Bureau of the Budget which cut it down another $20,000,000 to $65,000,000. That is the item that appeared in the committee print before this subcommittee.

The CAA has already agreed that it will not withdraw more than $50,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for the construction of airports in the fiscal year 1948. Note that particularly. That is the agreement that is in the hearings not once but in two or three places. Against that commitment on the part of the executive department your subcommittee added to the $41,000,000 that will be available on July 1 the sum of $32,500,000. Perhaps we were wrong in the light of the commitments of CAA and the President, perhaps we were derelict in appropriating $23,500,000 additional, but in no event can I see any rhyme or reason to the amendment now before the committee.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. With respect to the $41,000,000 that the gentleman refers to as remaining available for airports, is it not true that upwards of $35,000,000 of that money has already been allocated to class 1, 2, and 3 airports, leaving only about $5,000,000 of that fund which could be allocated to class 4 and above airports?

Mr. HORAN. Of course, in the light of the CAA already having agreed to not withdraw more than $50,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for 1948, I do not see any wisdom in allocation other than to stir up individuals to appeal to the Congress.

Mr. CRAVENS. But that allocation has been made to class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. HORAN. Allocations mean nothing if there is an agreement that restricts the amount of expenditure.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point or order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 44, noes 79.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. STEFAN and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 46, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I understand has the support of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 49, line 2, after "appropriation", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the appropriation made herein does not grant the authority to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, any specific projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, unless express approval of Congress is hereafter granted."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this is a limitation upon the appropriation, which is in order. The law as it is today provides that the making of an appropriation shall be an approval of certain specific projects, unless a contrary intent of Congress is manifested. The purpose of this amendment is to manifest the contrary intent of Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, under the Federal Airport Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved on May 13, 1946, the authority under which this appropriation is being considered today, it is specifically provided in section 5 (d) for the annual appropriation of projects in the States.

In section 6 it is specifically provided how the fund shall be apportioned to the various States and it is also provided how the Administrator shall proceed in making an annual report to the Congress 60 days prior to the fiscal year under which the appropriation would be made for class 4 and larger airports.

In section 9 (d) it is provided how the approval of these airport projects may be made.

I should like to read wherein that authorization provides: "that all such projects"—meaning class 4 and larger airports—"shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if at the time of the approval funds are available for payment of the United States share of the allowable cost and only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of the act," and so forth.

Under the authorization of this act the Administrator is given certain authority, and if I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman it will change the specific authorization as provided in those sections just referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the basis of the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRIS. It is legislation on an appropriation bill. It changes the authorization of the Airport Act of May 13, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has failed to read section 8 of the act which provides for the filing with the Congress 2 months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year of the list of projects. Then, in the last sentence thereof, it says:

> In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States' share of allowable project cost during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested by law unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law.

This is the only time that the Congress can manifest its intent, and if it passes this appropriation bill simply appropriating the money and does not manifest the intent that is there stated, then they have approved of the action of the Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To make a brief observation, if the Chairman will indulge me.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly examined the text of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. While the language submitted is not in the form of the customary limitation on funds, it occurs to me that it is the equivalent of saying that no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the construction of class 4 airports. If it were stated in that way it would clearly be a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that this is not merely a limitation but that it is

legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 49, line 2, after the word "appropriation", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation made herein shall be used for the development of class 4 and larger airports unless approval of Congress is hereafter granted."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PRIEST. Just very briefly. It seems to me that the argument with reference to the other point of order would apply here. The Administrator, on February 19, 1947, has complied with the requirement of law and has made the required report to Congress.

In reading section 8 of the act, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], in commenting on the point of order made against the other amendment, it seems to me did not properly interpret the last part of section 8 of the act, and that the amendment actually would change the law by action on an appropriation bill, when the act specifically says:

In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States' share of allowable project costs during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested, unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by a law or by concurrent resolution.

This, it would seem to me, would be by amendment to an appropriation bill rather than by a law or by a concurrent resolution, and it would appear that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], this is clearly simply a limitation upon the amount of an appropriation, and it seems to me to be clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation, and the point of order is overruled.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 37, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAVENS:

On page 48, line 8, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$57,500,000."

In line 9, page 48, strike out "$29,000,000" and insert "$54,000,000."

In line 14, page 48, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$57,500,000."

Page 49, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and said merged appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed an expenditure of $40,000,000."

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Is it correct that under the limitation of debate that was adopted not long ago this amendment is not debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask the members of the Committee to agree to this amendment. It substantially restores the funds recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for carrying out the airport program which this Congress approved during the last session. The CAA has made surveys of the needs of the various cities and municipalities throughout the country. These cities, municipalities, and States have taken effective action to meet their share of the obligation which is provided for under the airport bill. They have taken this action in good faith, feeling that the Congress would approve its share of the funds for carrying out the program that has been agreed upon. The program is needed. I think it is a modest one. These airports definitely are in the public interest. CAA has eliminated all that are not.

In my home city of Chattanooga plans have definitely been made based upon the improvement of the airport which the people of the city had a right to expect after the passage of the bill in the last Congress. The airport building has been enlarged and modernized. Unless this amendment is passed, the lengthening of the runways and other improvements which have been recommended by the CAA will have to be curtailed.

I do not think Congress will be acting in good faith to cut down this modest program after the last Congress approved it and after the cities and municipalities affected have made their plans to go along with it. I urgently ask that the members of the Committee sustain this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEFAUVER) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill which would provide a permanent parity formula for agriculture. My Iowa colleagues in the House of Representatives, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE, Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER, and Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, authorize me to announce that they join with me in sponsoring this bill.

Briefly, the bill provides for a 90-percent of parity loan on the seven basic farm crops—cotton, flaxseed, wheat, rye, corn, oats, and barley—as determined by the relative price levels of farm products as compared to goods which the farmer buys, using the July 1, 1925, to June 30, 1929, period as a basis of 100.

It provides for a 35-percent permanent reserve to protect our livestock industry against liquidation because of drought periods.

The bill provides for a flexible tariff at the parity level on all farm products. If and when the world price is equal to the domestic parity price level, the tariff would be at zero.

Under the provisions of the bill exportable surpluses would be sold at world price levels, the differential between the parity price and world prices being assessed against the duties collected on imports of needed farm products.

Under the parity formula used, the bill would give the farmer approximately 7 percent above the price level established under the present formula.

The cost of surplus disposal would be automatically liquidated by the collection of import duties.

Most of the provisions of the bill are partially provided for under present legislation. The bill would correlate the various measures into a single program to provide permanent parity for agriculture.

With agriculture the governing factor in our economy in the approximate ratio of $1 of gross farm income to $7 of national income, passage of the bill would provide a permanent national income of approximately $160,000,000,000 to $175,000,000,000 as a foundation for permanent prosperity.

For a detailed analysis of a permanent farm program provided for in my bill, I refer you to the statement of Carl H. Wilson, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, on page 2244, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This bill, I hope, will focus the attention of all thinking people who are interested in the future of agriculture and a permanent program for agriculture. It may not be a perfect bill but I am sure it contains many suggestions which may ultimately be incorporated in a permanent farm bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal services and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, including the purchase of commercial and trade reports; temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public

Law 600), (not exceeding $50,000); $5,000,000: *Provided*, That expenses, except printing and binding, of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD:

Page 52, lines 10 and 11, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$5,015,000."

Line 12, after the word "surveys", insert a comma and the following: "including not to exceed $15,000 for field studies and surveys in the Virgin Islands of the United States."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, down in the Virgin Islands, possessions of the United States, we have a problem which involves a great number of people wherein the United States Government, acting through the Congress, will either have to let those people somewhat support themselves or permit them to have funds from the Federal Treasury in the form of relief aid.

This amendment is offered to provide $15,000 which can be used under the direction and supervision of the Department of Commerce for the establishment of some private industry operations there to be carried on by the people. It is possible—and I say this after having studied this question for a number of years and having made trips all through the islands on different occasions—for those down there to be largely self-sustaining.

We took away from them a great deal of their industry through putting into practice certain operations there under the Virgin Islands Company, a federally owned corporation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is that Virgin Islands Company about which the gentleman is talking the one Mr. Ickes set up to manufacture rum for the people of this country, a company in which everybody is a stockholder?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the company I am referring to.

What we need to do is to go down into the Virgin Islands and assist those people in getting back into business through their own efforts. The people in the islands can produce a great deal more of their food and make themselves less dependent upon foodstuffs imported from the United States; they can create a great deal of their own handwork in the way of small handcraft, in the way of needlework and in the way of the production of furniture from the woods that are available down in that section of the country. It is also entirely possible and practical for them to establish their own fishing industry and to turn out canned and smoked fish, disposing of it among themselves and among the Puerto Ricans who now import such a tremendous amount of their foodstuffs from northern areas such as Iceland and certain parts of Newfoundland where the fish are prepared.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the gentleman's intention with regard to the expenditure of this $15,000? For what purpose is it to be used?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This $15,000 will be used through the Department of Commerce, looking to the establishment of further food industries and fish industries and other activities in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the gentleman mean by that? Will that money be used for salary or salaries?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That money will be used by individuals who will go down there under the supervision of the Department of Commerce and set up this operation.

Mr. ROONEY. Does that include a certain gentleman?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know who this would include. I am not speaking for any particular individual. I am speaking on behalf of our putting into operation in the Virgin Islands individual efforts on the part of private individuals instead of having them fed out of the Federal Treasury. This would aim to make them self-supporting.

Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate the gentleman's great interest in the Virgin Islands, but I do not understand who is going to receive the $15,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I; and I am not concerned about that, because I do not come here to lobby for any particular individual, and if the gentleman knew me well enough he would not mean to insinuate that I am interested in the individual who may draw the salary. I am interested in stopping the flood of Federal checks going down there, paid by the taxpayers and the bond buyers of the United States, and flowing to honest, decent people who can make a living for themselves if the Congress and the Government of the United States will let them do so.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that the gentleman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions and that he has studied this problem for a long time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been on the committee for about 13 years, and for 12 or 15 years prior to coming to Congress I spent considerable time on matters pertaining to the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want the House and the gentleman to understand that, of course, I do not insinuate anything against him. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the able gentleman. However, I was wondering with regard to this $15,000 item why it is that the Department of Commerce cannot now use $15,000 of the amount contained in this bill for that purpose from their appropriation for field offices?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I do not know anybody on earth who would be better qualified to answer that question than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the Department can use it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This Department has full authority to proceed to use $15,000 for that purpose, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I would say so and ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether or not that is correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If it is correct I would like to know why Mr. H. B. McCoy, Director, Office of Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, would send a letter up here to me indicating that he needed this money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman from New York says that they can use this $15,000 for that purpose, if I were the gentleman I would withdraw my amendment and ask the gentleman from New York to see that the Department does use it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the gentleman from New York is not certain about his position at all.

Mr. TABER. I think, perhaps, for the information of the House, we should have before us the language of this paragraph. It says: "For personal services and other necessary expenses at the seat of government."

Therefore, it would not be an item that they could send down to the Virgin Islands. The following paragraph would be the one where they could do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if this amendment is adopted, then the paragraph to which the amendment applies would permit $15,000 to be used for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that the language would be contradictory. I expect, if you want that kind of language, it should go in the next paragraph.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The language of my amendment specifically provides that $15,000 should be used for studies and surveys in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. TABER. But the appropriating language is confined to the seat of government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, except as modified by my admendment.

Mr. TABER. No, because that is the only proviso, and the appropriating language is limited to the seat of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I have

great respect for the knowledge that the gentleman has regarding insular affairs. I believe he has visited every one of our insular possessions, not only part of them, but every portion of them.

However, this is an administrative matter and we believe that it should be so treated.

Also, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the answer of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I will say that he is absolutely correct. The amendment is in the wrong place. This money cannot be used for the purpose intended in this amendment. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly interested in whether we adopt the Crawford amendment or write into the bill a proviso that a certain amount of money shall be set aside and made available for making the people of the Virgin Islands more self-supporting than they are at the present time. You will recall that some 16 or 18 years ago President Hoover visited the Virgin Islands and he was appalled at the poverty of the people, the unfortunates who live on the three islands, and termed the Virgin Islands the Nation's poorhouse.

Now $15,000 may not seem very much, but a great deal could be done in the Virgin Islands with that amount of money toward making the people down there more self-sufficient. I have visited the Virgin Islands at least half a dozen times, and am confident that with some practical cooperation—and we have never given them any practical cooperation—we could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in money that we are now obliged to appropriate to keep things going down there.

I visited Haiti early in December for the first time since 1939 and was greatly impressed there with what one refugee from Europe had been able to accomplish toward making the Haitian people more self-sufficient. This individual had established, out of his own pocket, a trade school in Port-au-Prince where the natives have been taught handicrafts. As a result, they are now taking in thousands of dollars a year selling the products of that institution to tourists and others. The same thing can be done in the Virgin Islands. Such plans have a way of spreading and taking in others.

As I understand, the bill now before us calls for an appropriation of $5,000,000. Here we have an opportunity to take a very small gamble with $15,000, which may in a few years result in our being able to reduce the appropriation for the administration of the Virgin Islands from $5,000,000 to perhaps four or three million, or even less.

The Virgin Islands were practically self-sustaining during the time they were under the rule of Denmark. It was only when the Americans went in there with all their quirks for reforms, and one thing and another, that the fortunes of the people of the Virgin Islands began to slip downward and downward and downward, until today the living conditions on the islands are practically beyond description. They are appalling. Hogs out in the Corn Belt are better housed and much better fed than many of the unfortunates in the Virgin Islands. Why quibble over $15,000 when it may result in the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions over the years?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to have answered the question that was asked by the author of the amendment a moment ago, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], as to whether or not under the appropriation proposed in the language of the bill, either the $5,000,000 item or the $2,000,000 item in the next paragraph, this $15,000 could be spent by the Administrator for this specific purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that the amendment is offered to the wrong paragraph. It should be offered to the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. This may seem to be a trivial matter to some of you, but to me it involves the welfare of many thousands. It involves the well-being of the people of the Virgin Islands, and therefore I am very much interested. Their welfare should be close to our hearts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is not the place to offer that amendment. It should be offered to the next paragraph, and it should provide that of the $2,000,000 that is available for the field service $15,000 should be available exclusively for this study in the Virgin Islands. Then you would have a chance to get it done. If you should tie it into a paragraph where it does not belong, it can be spent only in the Department down here and cannot be made effective. I should like to see it made effective, instead of fooling away our time on it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman draft language that will permit the expenditure of $10,000 or $15,000 or whatever is necessary?

Mr. TABER. I have done so. That would be agreeable to me; but I would hate to see it done in a way that would not be effective.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not interested in the parliamentary situation, but I am intensely interested in what can be done to help the Virgin Islanders who need our help to make themselves self-sufficient.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say to the gentleman that a new amendment is at the Clerk's desk putting the amendment in its proper place.

Mr. KNUTSON. I shall not take any more of the Committee's time, except to express the earnest hope that we will at long last take some steps toward alleviating the deplorable conditions that exist in the Virgin Islands and which are yearly becoming worse. Let us not shirk our responsibility. After all, we are our brother's keeper in this instance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I have offered be withdrawn, and the substitute amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the Clerk read the paragraph on the field office service?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be necessary for the Clerk to read the next paragraph and then the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan may be offered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk on that same paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] asked unanimous consent that he be permitted to withdraw his amendment, and he offered a substitute amendment. I wonder if that is the status of the situation at the present time and what is the substitute amendment and to what section might it apply?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] expects to offer is on a paragraph that has not yet been read.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it would not be a substitute amendment, I would assume.

The CHAIRMAN. That is also the understanding of the Chair.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed $90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $2,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 52, line 20, strike out "$90,000" and insert "$110,000"; and on line 21, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$5,190,000."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, business is the lifeblood of this Nation. If business prospers there will be full employment, stable economy, a higher standard of living for more and more people—and the opportunity to reduce our national debt will grow accordingly. Anything we can do to help business help itself represents a measure of economy for this Government.

And business is eager to help itself. During the month of March 128,000 letters, phone calls and personal visits from businessmen flooded into the 78 field offices of the Department of Commerce. That is 128,000 in a single month, mind you. So what does the majority of the Appropriations Committee of this House propose? It proposes to wipe out one-half of these points where businessmen, and especially small businessmen, may contact the rich store of marketing facts which the United States Government has available for them through the Department of Commerce.

Unless the majority Members of this House come to the rescue of American business, 39 Department of Commerce offices will be closed. I would like to read you the list of the cities which will lose their offices if this House does not come to the rescue, and as I read this list I want you to remember that each of these cities is a center for wide areas of business which are as much affected as the cities themselves:

Birmingham, Ala.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Little Rock, Ark.; San Diego, Calif.; New Haven, Conn.; Boise, Idaho; Peoria, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans.; Portland, Maine; Worcester, Mass.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Jackson, Miss.; Butte, Mont.; Fremont, Nebr.; Reno, Nev.; Manchester, N. H.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Albany, Rochester, Syracuse, N. Y.—

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I may sound like a train announcer, but at least this pause which the Members seem to be enjoying gives them an opportunity to realize just exactly what I am saying and to fully understand which offices are going to be closed as the result of the action taken by the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman contemplate that reading the list of offices to be closed will so frighten everyone that we will vote for his amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. It might help.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, a reading of the list will be of great interest to the people of the country and those areas where the offices are abolished, as another piece of evidence of what constitutes false economy.

Mr ROONEY. Most certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand one of those offices is located in Indianapolis. I do not know whether the gentleman has read that place or not, but I understand the people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of this Federal expenditure in Indianapolis do not want the office. They want to get along without it, and they will.

Mr. ROONEY. How about the people in Evansville?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do you believe that by reading that list you will scare a lot of Members in voting for your amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. I have already answered that. Now, if I may be permitted to continue.

Mr. RICH. We are going to have more backbone than that.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman I can hear him

Fargo, N. Dak.; Columbus and Toledo, Ohio; Erie and Scranton, Pa.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Chattanooga and Nashville, Tenn.; San Antonio and Texarkana, Tex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Burlington, Vt.; Norfolk, Va.; Spokane, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and Cheyenne, Wyo.

The services which business, and particularly small business, has demanded of the Department of Commerce through its field offices this year required an appropriation of $5,190,000. Our Appropriations Committee has recommended that this figure be cut to $2,000,000, a reduction of 62 percent. It is incredible to me that the committee cannot see that marketing and other aids which business would receive through the expenditure of the $3,190,000 which it is proposed we refuse to appropriate would not be worth many times that amount to the American economy and therefore, in part, to the Treasury of the United States.

It is also incredible to me that the suggestion of this false economy comes in a period of our history when American business is readjusting itself to normalcy after the tremendous disruptions caused by the war and is in need of all the information that it can possibly obtain.

Furthermore, I want to point out that there is a tremendous difference between service in one spot and service on the spot. Businessmen should not have to take time to go to Washington or travel to a distant field office to get their facts and marketing data; and small businessmen, let us remember, cannot afford to do it. Time and money is too valuable to them. They should expect service reasonably near their places of business and as localized as possible to the situation in their particular city. They have a right to expect regional studies to aid them in their immediate marketing areas.

I fail to see why we should spend the money we feel well justified in spending to gather material the Federal Government can gather in the field of business and marketing information at home and abroad and then refuse to spend a matter of $3,000,000 more to see that it is widely and properly available and adapted to the use of specific areas.

If each field office is responsible for saving but one business in its trade center, then I submit that its existence, and the expenditure involved in its maintenance, is justified.

It is my firm opinion that the Department should be given every cent that it requested.

Businesswise there are critical times—pay rolls are pointed downward, business turn-over is less, and there are rumors of buyers' strikes all over the country. The businessman, especially the small businessman, needs help and encouragement, not a slap in the face such as that proposed in the pending bill.

The Department has been criticized for nursing business. Well, if the number of business failures can be reduced by nursing or by any other form of aid, then I am for it. I therefore propose that we give the Department funds to maintain all of the field offices now open, and more money to open more offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for 3 minutes to close debate.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that businessmen will not be required to come to Washington if the Committee stands fast with its Subcommittee on Appropriations on these field offices. The fact of the matter is the Bureau of the Budget at one time, not very long ago, requested the liquidation of all of these field offices. It was this committee that saved them. At one time they had only 23 field offices. They were operated very efficiently in my opinion. They had an appropriation of $350,000. We are allowing $2,000,000 for 40 offices.

Carlton Hayward, the Director of the Field Office Service, and Joe Mack I have known for a long time. I have discussed this matter with them pro and con. I have visited many many of these field offices personally. They do not object to the action of this committee.

My very very dear friend, the gentleman from New York, read a list of cities and towns. I may say to him that I have here in my hand letters from many of those places, both large and small, commending the committee on its action. I have one from Indianapolis, about which the majority leader was talking. This one is from the chamber of commerce thanking the committee for discontinuing the office at Indianapolis. I have other letters of a similar nature from cities and towns, large and small, asking us to discontinue them and give the chambers of commerce in the various localities a chance to give the businessmen a little service without interference on the part of these people.

The directors of the field offices here in Washington will be very very happy if the action of this committee is approved by the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] about Evansville, let me say that we do not want it in Evansville. I represent Evansville.

Mr. STEFAN. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other amendment which I offered may be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 52, line 21, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "Of which $15,000 shall be available exclusively for the study of economic conditions in the Virgin Islands."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last work and rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, throughout the years I have served in this body there has developed a strong feeling of respect for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. The reason for that respect is demonstrated by his very generous action today in thinking of the unfortunate people of the Virgin Islands and in offering an amendment out of which may come some good. The amount involved is negligible, but the moral uplift as the result of the adoption of the amendment will be great in conveying to the people of those islands the fact that they are not completely forgotten by the people of the United States.

I was very much impressed by the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. He, I, and other members of the Committee on Ways and Means well know from service on that committee of the trying economic conditions that exist in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

This amendment is confined to the Virgin Islands.

My purpose in rising was to add my weak voice to express the hope that the amendment will be adopted, and to support the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The people in those islands, the same as every other person, were not consulted as to where they were born. We were fortunate to have been born in America. The fact is they were not consulted when they were born in the Virgin Islands.

The Virgin Islands is one of our continental possessions and we owe an obligation to the people of those islands. The message that this action will convey to the people there is far greater than the amount involved. The results that may flow from it can be of tremendous value to the people of the Virgin Islands. This is for a survey, a field study, and I hope the recommendations might result in the establishment of new businesses down there, in showing the people down there how they might develop and utilize in a business way some of the natural resources of the Virgin Islands. In all the contents of this bill I am more touched by this amendment than I am with any other provision of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The remarks made by the gentleman merely confirm what I have known for years, that he has a big heart that always goes out to unfortunates. The gentleman knows that the condition of the Virgin Islanders has become progressively worse ever since we took them over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. KNUTSON. While they were under the control of Denmark they were in pretty fair shape; at least, the old-timers down there tell us that that is the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct. I just wanted to make a few remarks so that the RECORD will show the unanimity on both sides of the aisle to the amendment, and that the message to the people of the Virgin Islands will strengthen them, and to express the hope that whoever the Department of Commerce sends down there will appreciate the intent of the House and do everything possible with this amount of money to try and increase the business activities of the islands. If more money is necessary I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that the Congress will make the additional appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and the salary of the Commissioner at $10,000 per annum; temporary services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem (not to exceed $50,000); expenses of transporting to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents; travel; production by photolithographic process of copies of weekly issue of drawings of patents and designs, reproduction of copies and drawings and specifications of exhausted patents, designs, trade-marks, foreign patent drawings, and other papers, such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at such prices as determined by the Commissioner; photo prints of pending application drawings; and other contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography; $8,000,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 53, lines 10 and 11, as follows:

Such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at such prices as determined by the Commissioner—

That sentence is legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I refer the Chairman to the language appearing in the hearings on page 283. The Chairman very kindly requested the department to furnish the information. That language refers to the production or printing in the department and does not justify the fees for this printing. The Chairman was alert and attempted to raise this question, but the insertion later did not give the law that authorizes this expenditure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, of course I will have to concede the point of order. I know the gentleman fears that perhaps these words "and other papers" will give the Patent Office the right to charge more than 20 cents for papers. By authority of law the Patent Office is not going to increase the price of those papers they must get out for the attorneys, and so forth.

This refers to other papers, the kind they have no knowledge of what they are going to have. There might be none at all. I wish the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot, Mr. Chairman, withdraw my point of order. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: Page 52, line 25, after the semicolon strike out the word "temporary", down to and including "$50,000" in line 3, page 53.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very plain. It has but one purpose, namely, to clear out the $75 per day so-called experts that the Department down there wishes to have in the Patent Office. I think it is well to understand certain things that have gone on over in the Patent Office, which I have become acquainted with while serving with the Patent Committee, and some things I have learned since that time. I would like to call your attention to some of the practices occurring down there to emphasize that these experts are not needed at all. The so-called experts that can help down in the Patent Office are already there.

The Congress is concerned today with the Federal budget for 1948, and well may it be concerned because the total expenditures for operating the Government have exceeded its receipts so long and by

such huge amounts as to cause the public debt to reach a sum so fantastic as to arouse grave fears in the minds of many businessmen and economists that the country is on the verge of national bankruptcy. Unless we can balance the budget and balance it quickly, it is my view that we might as well prepare ourselves for economic chaos.

No useful purpose would be subserved by narrating how, during the free-spending years preceding the war, the adoption of the New Deal policy of tax and tax and spend and spend and spend, the public debt rapidly rose to a sum which theretofore was undreamed of and became a heavy tax burden on every wage earner in America. Expenditures during the war have multiplied that burden so that today the future earnings of workers yet unborn have been mortgaged for generations to come. I say to you that unless this orgy of spending is stopped and public expenditures brought within the receipts immediately, we will have failed in our duty as legislators and as protectors of the public interest.

The current budget presented to the Congress does not measure expenses by income expected to be received, although it was presented to the Congress as the minimum amount on which the Government could effectively operate. It will be my purpose to endeavor to show that such is not the case, and in doing so I will use the Department of Commerce as an example. At the outset, however, I desire to emphasize that what I am about to say is not intended as any reflection on the Secretary of Commerce. He is a new appointee, and I feel sure that he is not familiar with all of the details which I will mention or to which I will advert. Nevertheless, his entire budget is such, in my judgment, as to cast suspicion on it in its entirety.

Considering the personnel items of that Department, they have been increased by the addition of surplus employees to such an extent and on such a scale and in such circumstances as to furnish good grounds for the conclusion that the policy has been deliberately adopted of providing havens of refuge for deserving New Dealers. We will consider, first, the Patent Office. I was a member of the House Patents Committee for many years and am somewhat familiar with the operations of that Office.

The executive officers of the Patent Office provided for by statute are the Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner, and the Chief Clerk, the latter who is by law required to be qualified as a principal examiner. The Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner are Presidential appointees.

In utter disregard of the will of Congress, a perpetual Assistant Commissioner has been appointed, by transfer into the Office of a person for whom was created a new job known as executive officer. The salary of this person is that of an Assistant Commissioner, $8,180 per annum. Similarly, the financial officer, who is a career employee, has been moved out of his office to do the Chief Clerk's work for the purpose of making room for another transferee.

The personnel work of the Patent Office was always performed by three employees, the maximum salary of whom did not exceed $3,000 per annum. Now, since January 1, 1944, there are approximately 24 of them, the salaries of some of them being:

Chief personnel officer	$7,102
Employment relations officer	6,384
Personnel technician	5,208
Four classification analysts	14,000

There should also be included in the personnel division 8 to 10 stenographers, 2 of whom are in grade 7 at $3,397.20 per annum, and 2 in grade 5 at $2,644.80 per annum.

There has been created in that Office a new division consisting of nontechnical employees known as the Management Planning and Budget Division, consisting of 11 employees at a cost of $50,181 per annum. This Division has planned nothing more than how to keep their own jobs and create others for persons who were to lose or did lose their wartime jobs.

Last, but not least, and included in the above, there has been created in the Patent Office, as a part of the Management Division, a Budget Section headed by a budget officer at $6,384 per annum, an assistant budget officer at $5,153 and two stenographers at high salaries. The budget work of that office, before this so-called reorganization plan was put into effect, was done by the financial clerk in his spare time and at that it never took him over 2 weeks in any calendar year. All of these new jobs were created under Henry Wallace when he had authority to create them.

The same procedure was followed not only in the office of the Secretary but also in the other bureaus of the Commerce Department. In the Bureau of Standards alone, I am reliably informed, that 12 rooms have been taken over to accommodate this horde of surplus employees.

Perhaps the prize exhibit of them all is the National Inventors Council. That agency was organized during the war to receive and evaluate inventive suggestions submitted by the public. It was strictly a wartime agency and operated on a budget of about $150,000 per annum. Instead of closing up shop after the war, it was renamed as the "Office of Technical Services," its force was greatly increased and the salaries of all technical employees multiplied so that they are truly among the elect from a salary standpoint. This was done by the usual expedient of reclassifying jobs and by creating new jobs.

One of the jobs that agency is supposed to perform is to conduct scientific research.

Former Secretary Wallace tried to have enacted into law S. 1248 during the last Congress which would have enabled him to blanket the country with employees of his own selection and conduct scientific research. That bill never became law, but undaunted, the Secretary issued an order authorizing such research and promulgated rules and regulations for the guidance of employees of the Office of Technical Services who are engaged on that work. Such order and rules are published in the Federal Register. Thus, it will be seen that the work is conducted despite express authorization by Congress and not because of it. There is no authority of law whatever for this activity. By abolishing it, $1,700,000 would be saved to the taxpayers. This section of the bill has just been stricken from the bill on a point of order.

I think I have said enough to demonstrate the manner in which unnecessary employees have been included in the present budget. First, there have been employed for the first time budget officers in the bureaus and the Budget Bureau itself has been greatly overexpanded, to insure that jobs would be created in a strictly proper way and, second, the personnel groups have been greatly increased to insure that the job classification of the surplus employees would be presented in such manner as to insure the payment of the maximum salaries available. My thought is to wipe them all out.

My suggestion is to restore the personnel of the Government to what it was on January 1, 1944.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Did the Commissioner ask for any of those people, and has he said that any of them are of a bit of use to him?

Mr. ARENDS. Not that I know of.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out the item of $75 per diem for technical and expert advice to the Patent Office. The Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Ooms, came before us and made a very good case for this. He indicated he needs it and needs it badly, and we believe he does because it will save litigation and it will save money. The Patent Office has been down in Richmond, Va., and just recently moved back to Washington. We know the backlog there. Patent attorneys have complained against it. We went into the item very carefully. I feel that this amendment would cripple the effort on the part of the Patent Office to catch up with the backlog and eliminate the condition. It would cost the Government money if you would eliminate these experts. Some of the patent problems are very technical, so technical that it is absolutely necessary to employ technical experts occasionally. I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us how many applications are in arrears at the present time?

Mr. STEFAN. There is a tremendous backlog. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings he can find full information about it. I think there is a backlog of about 40,000 applications. They are catching up with them more rapidly in view of the fact that they have moved here from Richmond. The Richmond office resulted in a tremendous backlog of patents during the war. Necessarily we had to move the office there to make room for war agencies.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Can the gentleman answer the question in which I am interested, whether the Commissioner really wants them there? Has the gentleman taken that point up with him?

Mr. STEFAN. We certainly have taken it up with him.

Mr. OWENS. What did he say?

Mr. STEFAN. He indicated that he needs these experts very badly in order to get the expert advice the Patent Office must have. We think he is absolutely right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am in thorough accord with the contention of the gentleman from Nebraska, and I ask that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 49, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 67, line 19, after the amount "$350,000" and before the period, insert "together with $405,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 67, line 26, after the amount "$350,000" and before the period, insert "together with $325,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the act of June 28, 1946, Public Law 464."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 66, after line 17, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $1,833,500: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF-4), senior (CAF-5), or principal (CAF-6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF-7) or associate (CAF-8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P-1), assistant (P-2), associate (P-3), full (P-4), or senior (P-5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determiniation by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500.'"

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska reserve his point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the complete elimination of this item for miscellaneous salaries in the judiciary is the most glaring example of senseless economy in this bill. This is the instance where the majority raises a point of order in regard to an annual appropriation that is vitally necessary for the conduct and proper functioning of our Federal district and circuit courts. The requested sum of $1,833,500 is the same amount as allowed in the present fiscal year, plus the increases mandatory under Public Law 390, is for the payment of the small salaries of the secretaries and law clerks to the Federal judges throughout this country. There are about 113 Federal judges to whom are allowed in most instances $6,500 under a plan the same as clerk hire used to be allowed in that amount to Members of Congress and to the extent of $7,500 per annum in a few instances for the offices of senior circuit judges and senior district judges.

Is it good economy to say to the Federal judiciary: "You are now going to perform your functions without even a law clerk or secretary. You cannot have a secretary or clerk. You are going to have to write your official correspondence in longhand and you are going to have no help whatever in getting your important written opinions together and in carrying on the rest of the work of your court."

I rise at this time to offer this amendment to show the senseless economy which has been practiced in the entire important appropriation bill which we are now about to conclude. I trust that the proper legislative committee will promptly rectify this outrage.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. No, Mr. Chairman; I must concede the point of order. There is no authorization in law for this expenditure, although it has been in this bill year after year for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 99 words.

I ask for this time simply to call to the attention of the House the fact that the Judiciary Committee has, in accordance with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, prepared and approved a bill which is now on the calendar of this House to correct this situation, so that none of the untoward results will obtain in the future.

We beg that this action of the Judiciary Committee may be sustained at the earliest possible moment, in accordance with the report of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr CHENOWETH: On page 65, line 1, after the word "Washington", strike out the words "Pueblo, Colo."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment removes the city of Pueblo, Colo., from the list of places contained in this bill which are prohibited from receiving any of the funds appropriated in this bill to pay the cost of maintaining an office of the clerk of the United States District Court.

It has been the practice for several years to include in this annual appropriation bill a large number of towns and cities in such a list, but this year some new names have been added. I would be glad to have the chairman of the committee explain just why Pueblo, Colo., is included in this list.

Mr. STEFAN. I will tell you why. It is because we cannot discriminate one from the other. All of those mentioned in the bill have had less than 50 cases during the past two succeeding years, and we cannot discriminate one from the other. The fact of the matter is that this came to us on the recommendation of many of those who are interested in eliminating some of these offices which have had so little to do, for the sake of economy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do you not ordinarily leave that decision up to the United States district judge to determine whether or not he needs a clerk in certain offices?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the judicial council will approve of what we have done.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that Pueblo is the second largest city in the State of Colorado, with a population of about 80,000. It is 120 miles from the city of Denver, where the only other clerk's office in the State of Colorado is located. I think the gentleman recognizes that business in the Federal courts fluctuates. Courts will have a

small number of cases in one year, and a larger number the next year. No one can predict what the future volume will be.

Mr. STEFAN. The court continues its docket there.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I understand, but there will be no clerk there. I maintain that a city of the size of Pueblo should have a clerk of the district court, for the convenience of citizens desiring to do business with the court. I might state that this office also serves all of southern Colorado.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. GARY. There were 19 of these offices knocked out because during the years 1945 and 1946 not a single one of those offices had as many as 50 cases in either of those years. It so happens that two of those places were in Virginia. We are losing those two offices in Virginia.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What was the size of those places?

Mr. GARY. One was Charlottesville and the other was Bigstone Gap.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What is the population of those cities?

Mr. GARY. It was not a question of population.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What is the area covered?

Mr. GARY. It is a question of the number of cases that went through the courts. Less than 50 cases went through the courts.

The maintenance of these 19 offices cost the Government $33,000, for those few cases.

Let me say to the gentleman that if he is going to restore Pueblo I certainly will offer an amendment to restore Charlottesville and Big Stone Gap.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know anything about the gentleman's situation in Virginia but I do know our situation in Colorado. The only clerks of the district court in Colorado are in Denver and Pueblo. Colorado is a rather large State, and covers quite an area. The adoption of the committee amendment means that the people of Colorado will have to go to Denver to transact all their business in the United States district court?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. As I understand, we have an advisory council in the Supreme Court headed by Mr. Chandler. Would not the proper way be to make inquiry as to whether or not they have made such a recommendation? The distinguished gentleman from Colorado may be right in his claim.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know what the procedure is. The committee has not explained upon whose recommendation this action is being taken.

Mr. OWENS. That is the procedure.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I cannot understand the attitude of the committee and I most emphatically protest against including Pueblo, a city of 80,000 people, in the list of those places which are denied an office of the clerk of the district court.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a city of the size and importance of Pueblo is entitled to have the services of a clerk of the district court.

I urge that my amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into this matter very carefully after discussing it with Mr. Chandler, the Administrator, and some of the judges who appeared before us. Here are some places where there are only 50 or fewer cases a year. That has been the record for the past consecutive 2 years.

For the sake of economy, I urge that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there being no further amendments, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain telegrams and messages.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain telegrams.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the United States Air Services in tribute to Lieutenant General Eaker. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $230.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include three editorials and an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include telegrams and letters.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 176, Rept. No. 388), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, o has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 212, Rept. No. 389), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 49, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMPLETION OF VETERANS' TEMPORARY REUSE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 2780, to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." This is an open rule and provides for 2 hours' general debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is much controversy about this bill. It will be recalled that in 1945 we authorized the reuse of quite a number of temporary units for veterans and their immediate families, principally in connection with the colleges and universities. At one time it was estimated that they would provide about 200,000 units. Because of the increase in cost of construction they had to cut that program back, and it has been cut back further, so that when the stop order went through, due more or less, I believe, to the fact that they did not have the authorization in terms of dollars to complete the program, the President sent a message to Congress asking for $50,000,000 to complete what has become known as the Lanham reuse program.

There are involved 12,030 units. The committee decided that it would not authorize the completion of 3,730 of the 12,000 units on which less than 10 percent of the work had been done. So, figuring out mathematically that that amounted to something over $14,000,000, we reduced the amount of the authorization to complete this program from $50,000,000, as requested by the President, to $35,000,000, and then provided $500,000 to reimburse the colleges and the States, counties, and municipalities for the moneys which they had advanced in connection with these 3,730 units upon which no further work is to be done.

So the bill provides an authorization for $35,500,000 to complete the Lanham reuse program, and it will make available about 8,300 units.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand that there was allocated to every one of these projects an amount sufficient to complete them, but because of the way the thing was handled by the contractors, and the things that were charged up to the jobs, they were not completed; that if it had been done in a businesslike way, and honestly done, every single one of those jobs could have been completed within the allocation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was no testimony before the committee that there was any dishonesty with respect to the projects, but there was a great deal of testimony that the increase in the cost of construction of the projects made it necessary to stop them because they did not have money enough to build them. Now, this $35,000,000 is necessary if these 8,300 units are to be completed. It is necessary primarily because of the increase in construction costs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, whatever inefficiency there may have been in the picture, the fact does remain that the cost of material and labor has materially increased since this original appropriation was made. The further fact is that there is a great necessity for additional temporary housing. I am thinking now particularly of parts of California, especially southern California, where there is inadequate housing for thousands of these veterans. In Los Angeles County alone there are on file requests for some 15,000 housing units. They had to shut off the requests after they got 15,000 of them. How many additional thousands there may be we do not know. The proportionate share we will get of this $35,000,000 will supply only about 1,000 more units to take care of a demand of 15,000. I think it is very vital and necessary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say that this is probably the lowest-cost housing of any the Government has constructed. The average unit cost, other than the land acquisition and development, is $2,771, as opposed to the present average of something over $5,000. That is relatively low-cost housing.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will this legislation enable the universities and colleges that had to curtail because of the lack of funds due to increased cost of labor and the like to carry on their programs to take care of veteran students?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Generally speaking, that is correct. On page 19 of the hearings there is a table of all of these projects, showing where they are located, so in order to determine definitely whether any particular college will be benefited, reference should be made to that table. Perhaps they have a project on which more than 10 percent of construction has taken place. If so, that project will be completed and made available for GI students.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The University of Minnesota, under contract with the Government, has completed or is completing some units. It had put some $60,000 for additional units. Then suddenly they were ordered to stop construction. I understand this allows completion of all units that are 10 percent completed. If there are some units that are not 10 percent completed, what provision is there for such?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If 10 percent of the construction has not been completed, then they would not go ahead with the project, but the university would be reimbursed for any advances they had made.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Notwithstanding the fact that the project may not be listed in the schedule to which the gentleman has just referred, do I correctly understand that this bill provides that where units

have been constructed under this program more than 10 percent toward completion they will be included in this bill, that there is sufficient money for that purpose?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Those will be completed, but if less than 10 percent of the work has been done they will not be completed. There is a category within this category of 10 percent to which I should call attention; 1,622 of the 3,730 units have had no work whatsoever done on them. The other 2,108 units are in this position; the barracks, we will say, have been dismantled, have been razed, and are available to these projects. Some of that material has been transported to the site. Some of it remains on site in the camp from which it would otherwise be removed. But there has been no work done even to dismantle the old buildings on 1,622 of them, and there has been no actual construction work done on 2,108 of the units. Therefore, we stop that program because, frankly speaking, prices are so high now that to start from scratch on these projects would bring the cost per unit up to something over $5,000, and the committee thought that was pretty high-cost housing, especially where they were to be put to temporary use only.

Mr. HAND. Where construction has been 10 percent or more advanced to completion, those projects will be completed under the terms of this bill, notwithstanding the list that may appear in the report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct. The administration, the committee, and the Congress are not bound to complete only the projects named in that list If there are any projects where 10 percent or more of the work has been done, they will be completed under this program, and the $35,000,000 is sufficient to complete them notwithstanding the fact that they do not appear on the list.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. With reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota concerning the project at the University of Minnesota, I just want to add that our uncompleted units come within the third category which I will bring out at the time the bill is considered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that if that project is in the third category which lists units where more than 11 percent and less than 25 percent of the work has been done, they will be completed. As a matter of fact, if more than 10 percent of the construction has been done the units will be completed.

Mr. MACKINNON. The committee report shows that the third category includes projects where expenditures have been made for unloading, rough grading, utility work, or erection of foundation posts or piers. I understand from the reading of that report if any one of these things has been accomplished they fall in the third category.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If in the aggregate more than 10 percent of the work has been done they will be completed.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. There has been considerable complaint received concerning the inadequacy of subsistence allowances for veterans attending college. Can the gentleman tell me whether the passage of this bill will to some extent relieve that by making cheaper housing available for these veterans at universities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I believe it will. It will make available low-cost units for the GI's who are attending universities. The average rental on all of these projects is $30 a month.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I notice in the report the item totaling $14,668,499 for completing projects on which no actual construction work has been done has been eliminated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; because less than 10 percent of the work has been done on them.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I understand that all of the projects, other than those, which amount to about $35,000,000, will receive the full amounts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They shall. I might refer the gentleman to the list of projects in the hearings as a guide to whether any particular project he has might or might not be completed under this bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I notice here the three projects in Wyoming are in the 26- to 50-percent category, so they would get the full amount under the $50,000,000 proposed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Are we to understand that the 12,030 additional units contracted for will use up—and I quote from the report—"all the publicly owned temporary structures, such as military barracks, dormitories, and temporary war housing," or will that aggregate number not use up all of that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Generally speaking, it will use them up.

Mr. JAVITS. So we would appropriate for three-thousand-and-some-odd units less? So when we fail to appropriate for the additional 3,000 units, we are not utilizing all those temporary structures which are available?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that is substantially correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I donated a great deal of time and interest to this very matter that is now before us. I remember that early in January the mayors of the various cities in the United States met here in Washington and passed a unanimous resolution setting forth the plight in which they found themselves and in which the veteran found himself. As a result of that, I waited and watched with keen interest hoping some action would be taken immediately. After a period of 30 days, nothing having happened I then began conferring with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] my minority leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] as well as other leaders of the Democratic Party. I am happy to report I received their full cooperation and they deserve the full credit for bringing the matter to the personal attention of the President of the United States, who in turn, recognizing the importance, the emergency nature of the problem, submitted forthwith a message to this Congress requesting that we take the action which is set forth in the present legislation.

Two days later, on March 3, I introduced H. R. 2340 which contains the identical provisions of the bill now before us. I am deeply appreciative that the committee has now come out with this bill. It is of vital importance to the municipalities.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I can vouch for the statement that the gentleman has made—that he has been constantly in contact with those in position on the minority side in connection with the veterans' housing. The gentleman has personally spoken to me on at least a dozen occasions. The people of his district, and particularly the veterans, are to be congratulated on the very vigilant manner in which the gentleman from Colorado has been looking after their interests.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I take no personal pride in the authorship of this particular bill. I am very much pleased that now, for the first time, we have done something toward helping the veteran in the critical housing problem with which he is faced. I believe it should be emphasized, however, that this legislation for temporary housing for veterans, important as it is, is only a drop in the bucket compared with the problem that we should be acting upon.

It has also been gratifying to me that the able, learned, and esteemed Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been ably sponsoring this legislation in the Senate and I am informed it has recently been passed by that body. I sincerely trust that the Members of the House will act expeditiously in this matter as important time has already been lost. I know that the committee has reduced the $50,000,000 increase in authorization as contained in my original bill to $35,500,000. I think such a reduction is unwise and will vote in favor of an amendment restoring the original amount of $50,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2780, with Mr. MCGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes to answer any further questions which there may be. I think the subject was covered pretty generally in the debate on the rule, but I yield myself 5 minutes for the purpose of answering any further questions.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As I understand the measure, all these units which are more than 10 percent on the way to completion will be completed with the funds which will be authorized under this measure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is a very fine bill, and is presented in the usual fine form by the gentleman's committee. Can the gentleman tell me when the bill to allow veterans' priority to purchase homes will come out?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A bill, H. R. 3492, was introduced today after several days of open hearings and executive sessions. I assume the gentlewoman refers to the Lanham permanent housing program?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is hoped that we will be able to report that bill out of committee tomorrow, and it is possible that we will be able to take it up next week, although I am not sure about that.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. I would like to clarify the meaning of the language under which the completion of suspended units is authorized. This authorization appears in section 2 of the bill. In the committee report, on page 4, you describe six categories of projects.

The second category of projects includes those which are 1 to 10 percent complete. The report states that in these projects only dismantling or dismantling and transportation has been done. That is the same language which appears in the bill in lines 14 and 15.

In dealing with category 3, the report states that this group of projects includes those which are 11 to 25 percent complete; and the report states in addition that it includes unloading, rough grading, some utility work, and erection of foundation piers or posts on the projects.

Now as I consider that language, projects in the third category are considered as authorized under the language of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and it was so intended. Unless the project falls within a category, as has been explained where less than 10 percent of the work has been completed, part of which might represent dismantling or dismantling and transportation, then the project will be completed.

Mr. MACKINNON. And that if any one of the factors of unloading, rough grading, utility work, or the erection of foundation posts or piers has been expended for that the project then falls in the third category?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Let me further explain that page 4 of the report, subitem 2, explaining this 2,108 units as distinguished from the 1,622 under category 1 means that there has been dismantling or dismantling and transportation; in other words, it means that the barracks or dormitories have been dismantled and perhaps transported to the new site but no construction work has been done in the program; so the other category which the gentleman mentioned, outside of dismantling, or dismantling and transportation, would be we will say credited as work done. If it brings the work done over 10 percent, then the project will be completed.

Mr. MACKINNON. I have particular reference to the project at the University of Minnesota, but there is a disparity between the date of the report December 14, 1946, and the language of the bill, which has to be April 1, 1947. I understood the committee chairman to state that the effective date, of course, was the language in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It would have to be, of course.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the section of the bill that provides $500,000 for reimbursement to cities, counties, and educational institutions, I am wondering if the amount is sufficient. There is a project in my county where the site preparation costs considerable, and there is a balance of unused site which runs into some $300,000, which is more than half the amount the bill provides.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is two-hundred-and-some-odd thousand, I believe.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It is $297,000.

We are so pressed for housing in that section of the State we are certain that this money will be returned to the State, and the site will undoubtedly be used for the building of units that are on the job knocked down but have not gotten into the 10 percent completion category.

We want to be certain that the $500,000 is sufficient to take care of the entire Nation, including the nearly $300,000 we are entitled to. I understand the estimates from the FPHA have been so fragmentary and doubtful that there is a question as to whether the $500,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Within the 10 percent category it was estimated that there were advances made by the colleges and municipalities of $481,000. We provide that they were not to use more than $500,000. We gave them the other $19,000 as further assurance that there would be sufficient authorization to take care of all of them. The gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] is going to offer an amendment to strike out certain language in the bill which would broaden these provisions so that if they did not proceed with the work there would be no question but that the college or municipality which has advanced the money would be reimbursed. So we can be assured that the projects will be completed and thus make available these units to the municipalities or to colleges or they will get the cash back and they may use the cash to build the dormitories or construct any additions. That would bring the bill in conformity with a similar Senate bill that has been passed. The Senate struck that language out. It accomplishes that purpose but gives us a little more latitude or removes any doubt whatsoever that we want to reimburse the municipalities for the advances that they have made.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I had in mind amending that $500,000 and increasing the amount to $750,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman called that to my attention and knowing what the gentleman wants to accomplish and checking this against the Senate bill, I think the Senate language will do that and be sure it will be done, so, personally, I have no objection to striking out that restriction. If it is done there should be no question at all but that the municipalities or the colleges will get the units or the cash to build the units.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman mean sufficient for all their demands, outlay, and for site preparation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They will be reimbursed for what advances they have made unless in consequence of those advances and work that has already been done the project is completed; then, of course, they would get the benefit of it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If the gentleman believes that the Senate bill provides for that, and with the amendment that is going to be offered by a member of the

committee, I will withhold my amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am certain it does. I am sure that is the intent of the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER], a member of the committee, in offering the amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. There are 136 of these units in group 1 and 234 in group 2 in my State. I want to commend the committee for bringing out this legislation because it means a great deal to the veterans, especially the married veterans who are attending units of our universities. We have canvassed every possible way to get funds to complete these units, including donations from businessmen in the towns. The passage of this bill will mean a great deal in completing the units and making them available for the single veterans, and the married veterans in particular, in my State.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have in my district five colleges and universities vitally interested in this legislation. May I ask the gentleman whether consideration has been given to how the barracks and other temporary structures which are available but will not be used under this program will be put to use for housing in view of the fact that housing is so urgently necessary, despite the expense?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are being used at the present time. Does the gentleman mean those which have been completed?

Mr. JAVITS. No. I mean the remainder of some 3,000 which will not be taken up should this bill pass. They are simply temporary structures which will not be used under this program. Has the gentleman considered whether they will be put to some use?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. There are some 3,000 units.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There are 3,000 units and they are being used?

Mr. JAVITS. They are not being provided for under this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They must have been provided for under other legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is excluding them from this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what way? We are not excluding them if they have been constructed or if they were more than 10 percent constructed.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman said they were available as temporary structures but they would not be moved elsewhere and put up under this bill. The number of 12,000 units has been cut to 9,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is referring to the barracks and dormitories which are now up and which would be dismantled if we went ahead with the whole program.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that case, I believe, the barracks or the dormitories or whatever the temporary war housing is, would have to be disposed of under the general provisions of the Lanham Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Or under some other act, but not within the confines of this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I believe that would be inconsistent inasmuch as I know something about the construction game. It costs two and one-half times as much to tear down these barracks and set them up as it would to erect new ones. As far as Quonset huts are concerned, of course, that is a different situation, but as soon as they have served their usefulness I hope they shall be removed, especially in my district.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wish to commend the gentleman and the committee for the bill, and I have particular reference to that portion which makes possible the reimbursement to educational institutions for expending their own funds and completing units which otherwise would have been suspended due to lack of funds. That particular part of the bill is really significant to us in the State of Connecticut, and we are anxious to see that the University of Connecticut is reimbursed for the funds they have expended for the benefit of the veterans there. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side, but I merely wish to say that in this legislation it seems to me the faith and credit of the Federal Government is involved. The Federal Government through these agencies has made contracts with various subdivisions agreeing to furnish these houses if the local subdivisions will furnish the land, the streets, sidewalks, and public-utility facilities. I think it is the duty of the Congress to carry out these contracts. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts, and certainly that high degree of fidelity to contract that is imposed on the States should apply to the National Government.

I do not think we have anything to do but carry out the contracts that have been made with these subdivisions. This is an emergency measure, but those that decide whether the emergency exists are the representatives not of the Federal Government but of the local subdivisions. They decide whether they want these houses or not. I think they will serve a very useful purpose at this time. They will provide the colleges with facilities for taking care of the overflow. Many of the cities know their needs, and have asked that they have the privilege of having these houses, which are owned by the Government and could not be used for any other purposes unless they were transported to the place where they would be of greatest use and erected there.

The title to the personal property, that is, the buildings after they are torn down still remains in the Government. I wish we could all have permanent housing, but under the emergency that exists, the emergency that will be declared by the local subdivisions, this is a very useful program and one that I think will help tide over the great need for housing at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the temporary reuse program under title 5 of the Lanham Act has made a very significant contribution to the amount of rental housing for veterans and their families at rentals they can afford to pay during the past year.

The President in transmitting a request for additional appropriations makes the following observations:

Under this program, Army barracks and other military or civilian wartime structures are converted into temporary dwellings. Many of these are reused on their sites; others are moved and set up on the campuses of universities for the use of student veterans. Still others have been placed on new sites in cities where the housing shortage is desperate.

These educational institutions, municipalities, and other public bodies have used their own funds to provide sites for these temporary reuse homes. In many cases, also, they have provided the necessary utilities. The Federal Government, through the Congress, made two appropriations, totaling $445,627,000, to finance its part of this program.

Originally, it was planned to convert war structures into 200,000 temporary units under this program. This would, of course, have provided accommodations for many more than 200,000 persons. Rising costs of labor and building materials, as well as rising costs caused by the increased time required for completion due to shortages, have made it necessary for the Government several times during the past year to cut back the temporary reuse program.

Prior to February 1, 1947, allocations had been made for 158,834 units, but the rising costs of building and the scarcity of materials made it necessary recently to suspend 8,357 of these. With cut-backs, which had been ordered earlier, it now appears that it will be possible, out of Federal appropriations, to provide for only about 150,000 units or approximately 25 percent fewer than was planned. Of these 95,451 units have been completed and around 55,000, including suspended units, are under construction.

No more allocations out of the funds available under the Lanham Act can be made. Prior to the time cut-backs and suspensions were ordered, as a result of the approaching exhaustion of funds, however, many local groups such as city governments and educational institutions, already had obligated or spent considerable funds of their own as required under the Lanham Act. This was done to acquire sites, provide utilities or community facilities to accommodate the

housing which they confidently expected would be set up. In some instances they also spent funds on a reimbursable basis, to provide utilities and perform other necessary work in connection with these houses. When it became obvious that some temporary reuse units could not be completed at Federal expense, many local bodies set aside funds of their own in order to bring these units to completion.

The President asks for further appropriation by the Congress of $50,000,000. The committee has recommended unanimously $35,500,000 to fulfill its contractural obligations.

These obligations fall into four categories:

First. Completion of all units now under contract, including approximately 8,357 units suspended since December 14, 1946.

Second. Completion of approximately 4,869 units which were canceled in previous cut-backs.

Third. Reimbursement of public bodies for expenditures of their own funds for the completion of approximately 400 units which otherwise would have been canceled.

Fourth. Reimbursement of public bodies for the cost of utility and other on-site work performed by them in connection with veterans' temporary housing on a reimbursable basis.

The Federal Government must carry out contractual obligations accepted in good faith by educational institutions, municipalities and other local bodies.

It is recommended, by the committee therefore, that the authorization contained in section 502 (d) of the Lanham Act be increased by $35,500,000 and that the funds subsequently appropriated under the increased authorization be available to meet the four obligations specified above.

Over and above these contractual obligations, we have obvious responsibilities to those who served their country in the armed forces. Under our program about half of the temporary reuse housing is made available to colleges and other institutions of learning to house veterans while they are studying under the terms of the GI bill of rights. The other housing is set up in crowded cities, where otherwise many of our returned servicemen would be unable to find accommodations. Rentals of these temporary structures average $30 per family unit. I am sure I do not need to stress the urgency of the completion of this program to alleviate the stringent housing shortage faced by so many of our veterans.

In the city of Pittsburgh, provision was made for 750 emergency homes for veterans. The program is still 75 units short of the 750 contemplated and contracted for in March 1946. Of those erected only about one-half are ready for occupancy. Those completed are now housing 376 families.

I urge the Congress to support the committee's recommendation and carry out our obligations to the veterans.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits of the program, I think this is a solemn contract between the Government and the municipalities of this country, and between the Government and the colleges of this country. I feel that they ought to carry out these contracts. They are serving a useful purpose, and the main purpose is to get homes for the returning veterans of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1572 (a)), is amended by striking out "$410,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof "$460,000,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$460,000,000" and insert "$445,500,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RILEY to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out "$445,500,000" and insert "$454,000,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2780, as reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency would authorize the appropriation of funds to complete all suspended units covered by remittent contract with educational institutions and local agencies except those on which the Government has expended no funds, an estimated 1,622 units, and those on which the Government expenditures have been incurred only in dismantling or transportation, an estimated 2,108 units. This amendment would restore the funds for those 2,108 units. There is still no provision for the 1,622 units.

These 2,108 housing units have been dismantled. Parts of them are in one place and parts in another. The various colleges and communities have prepared the land and provided the utilities—on the sites—they have made their plans to use these houses. The housing, which this amendment would provide, is largely for the use of veterans who wish to complete their education at either high school or college. With the married veterans, time is of the essence. They have to obtain their education now or forego the opportunity. They cannot wait a year or 2 years or 3 years, because their increasing family responsibilities will necessitate their going into gainful employment.

In addition to the expense of providing sites, the colleges and schools have made plans for the increase of their faculties in order to take care of these men. It is not merely a question of reimbursing them for the money they have expended in the actual preparation of the land and providing the utilities, they have had to make plans to increase classroom facilities, engage additional instructors, and program their courses.

Under the GI bill of rights we made provision for these boys to have an education, yet we turn to them and say, "You cannot have it because you have no place to live." The married veteran today under the amount that is allowed him to go to school can barely get by. Under this housing you will be giving him adequate housing at an average cost, as testified, of $30 a month. I should like to know where else he could get a house for $30 a month to live in and go to school. I do not see why we should mislead these veterans and say that we will give them an education and then turn around on the other hand and say, "You cannot have it because we will not provide you a place to live."

The 1,622 units that have not been dismantled might be used for some other purpose, but those that have been torn down and transported, the Government having paid for that, should be utilized and put into effect for these veterans.

All of you who have had any experience in demolishing houses and rebuilding them realize that the material is worth almost the cost of tearing them down and transporting them to the new place. I want to know if you are going to throw away all this material that is so scarce—electric wiring, plumbing, and other building materials—and then reimburse the cities for the utilities and the streets, and just let the unfinished buildings stand as monuments to contracts broken by the Government.

I hope the amendment will be adopted and that 2,108 additional veterans will be provided the means of going to school and obtaining an education. Perhaps 2,108 others can go the next year, and the year after. This will pyramid into several thousand veterans getting an education. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] to increase the funds in this legislation because I am fearful that we cannot fulfill the Government's contract with many communities on the amount approved by the committee.

In several cities in my congressional district there are unfinished veterans' temporary-housing projects—not because the local community did not meet its end of the deal but because they were caught in a curtailment of the Nationwide program when the original appropriation was exhausted. I want these projects to be completed.

Without increasing this appropriation many communities will suffer. It may be that in my own district the projects are far enough advanced to qualify in category 3, listed in table 11 in the committee's report, and I believe that they will, but I am thinking primarily of the veteran and I want to see him get the maximum benefit from this temporary-housing program. I feel that all allocations made under the original act should be fulfilled and that those 3,730 units coming under categories 1 and 2 should also be completed.

I know something of the great increase in cost of the projects over the estimates and I can sympathize with the Federal Public Housing Administration in the problems which it has faced in connection with this program.

In my district, the citizenry has been justly aroused because of the exorbitant cost per unit—so much so that an investigation is now under way to determine the reason—and I believe that every precaution should now be taken to hold down this cost. It may well be that if the projects now being held up are again started toward completion this high cost per unit will be considerably whittled down. There is no question but what the cost per unit was greatly affected when the majority of the units were not completed.

It will also be noted in the committee's hearings that the cost of the units increased on a Nation-wide scale before the program was well under way and that was a major reason for the high cost which drew such unfavorable criticism throughout the country.

Which is all the more reason why this House should give the FPHA the additional funds asked in the gentleman's amendment. Let us try to avoid another break-down in the program which will leave further bad taste with the public.

This is an important matter to many veterans. We have not gone near far enough in trying to get at an honest solution of the housing program. Every veteran cannot afford to build or buy a house—as a matter of fact very, very few can at the present cost. We must provide this temporary, low-rental housing for him in as great a volume as possible.

The units allotted throughout the Nation under the original appropriation were few enough—it is unthinkable that this Congress will not see to it that at least this small number of units are completed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am definitely in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, because I think there is a definite and positive need for additional money that this bill does not supply for these temporary units. I am speaking from experience in my district. I do not know how it affects you in your less densely populated areas. But where we have some 15,000 student veterans going to college in Los Angeles County in southern California, where we have more than 15,000 making application for homes and we cannot find them, where the projects that were originally started under the original bill are only one-third completed, and this bill will hardly finish the job, and where the funds provided in this bill do nothing at all for the projects that are knocked down and have not come to the 10 percent completion category, I think additional funds are needed.

For what little we can get out of it I am speaking also for the need in other parts of the Nation. As much as we want to practice economy here, I am certainly not for economizing where these boys and their families do not have a place to live. When I said that, I mean that if they do have a place it is a very inadequate trailer or in the back of a car or some makeshift chicken coop.

The Governor of our State was here this week and he informed us that the population increase in the State of California is 25 percent of the total population increase in the United States since 1940, which is about 2,500,000. Of that 2,500,000, at least 50 percent are in southern California. We sent 700,000 men into the war. We have 900,000 veterans in the State of California at the present time. 200,000 of them are from all States in the Union. We want these boys taken care of. We do not care where they come from. They do not have sufficient housing there.

As much as I prefer that this should be a permanent housing project rather than a temporary housing project, I think the expediency of the situation requires immediate action, and we should not be so close to the line that we cannot do whatever we can with these projects that are 10 percent completed.

With reference to this particular project that I referred to, it will not be completed sufficiently under the terms of this bill. There are many, many units that are knocked down and half completed and are, of course, not completed to the extent of 10 percent, and they will be on the ground rusting away.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. The gentleman referred to permanent housing. It is going to be several years before the colleges can have permanent housing and in the meantime these married veterans will have passed out into the world to earn their living and they will be deprived of their education.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I am certainly wholeheartedly in favor of everything he has said. Is it not true that the State of California and the city of Los Angeles have to date expended about $534,000 on site work relating to these projects?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is a very important point, and I am glad the gentleman mentioned it. There has been no penny pinching as far as the State of California is concerned in preparing for these sites. I understand that we have spent not that amount, but $834,000 has been spent out of the funds of the State of California. There is now a bill before the State legislature to complete temporary building units in the event the Federal Government failed in its contract that they made with us when this original bill passed. I think it is a sad commentary on the responsibility of the Congress. I do not disagree altogether with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when he says that there is inefficiency in the administration of it, but there is also a necessary expediency to be met.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes to which I am entitled at this time. I want to wholeheartedly endorse the raising of this amount. It applies not only to the district of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] but to districts all over the Nation, including my own. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] will offer an amendment to which the committee has agreed.

I want to thank the committee because I realize it means a great deal to us in California who have at this time, according to our senatorial housing survey report of the State Senate of California, a shortage of 743,000 units. Twenty-five percent of those are estimated to be units which would be available for veterans.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. It is true we appreciate the contemplated action of the committee, but nevertheless we doubt very much whether that will be a sufficient amount to finish up the number of houses which are needed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am afraid it would not be, but I am sure it will finish many units which are vitally needed at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are 400 at Fort Devens in my district. They will not be available to the veterans unless the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I will take only a minute. The chairman of the committee has told us there are about 3,700 structures which will not be put up, althought the walls and necessary physical structure are available, because it costs too much. We know very well that if these structures are not erected under this program it is not going to be done for a long time, because some other way must be found by these institutions to do it.

I have communications from my district pleading for housing for student veterans. I think this is no time, in the interest of the veterans of this country, to stop because it will cost a couple of thousand dollars more to build each unit. The important thing now is to get these accommodations. Therefore, I intend to support this amendment on that ground. It is a question of getting the housing for the veterans when it is available, because if it is not gotten now it will be wasted.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. The gentleman is referring to Camp Shanks, is he not? I mean the colleges that use Camp Shanks?

Mr. JAVITS. I include the needs of all the five great colleges and universities in my district.

Mr. GAMBLE. Well, that is included here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would virtually restore the 3,730 units which we have taken from the program. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], I assume, inasmuch as he increases the amount by $9,000,000, contends that the program can be completed with $9,000,000, whereas the FPHA requests $15,000,000 to do that job. Now, it is very uncertain whether it could be done with $9,000,000. I wonder if we would want to do it for the reason that this construction is very costly construction. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD] called attention to the fact that in the process of demolition, transportation, and reconstructing them there was additional cost. Now, have in mind that these projects were stopped because of the unusually high cost of rebuilding them as temporary structures. Now, why? Let us compare the cost per unit of this temporary program with the unit cost of the permanents which we have built. The permanents today, including not only the physical properties, the building itself, but the real estate, were constructed for an average of $4,461 per unit. This program was stopped because, if we were to go ahead with these 3,730 units, the construction of the temporary units alone would average $4,100. So, taking into consideration the value of the land, site improvement, and so forth, upon which these temporaries were located, it would bring the cost of these temporary units up to something over $6,000. That is why it was stopped to begin with. We feel we can justify going ahead with 90 percent of this program because so much work has been done on the 90 percent that it is merely investing for the purpose of saving the money we have already spent.

The estimated average cost of completing these units, the 90 percent of them, is only $2,725. It just cannot be justified that we appropriate any part of the $15,000,000 in the hope that we can complete these 3,730 units for as little as we can construct permanent homes; and our objective, of course, is to provide permanent homes for these veterans, not temporary shacks. Some of them are little better than shacks.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Are the figures the gentleman quoted on the Quonset hut type of construction? Certainly the Quonset hut type does not cost as much as the gentleman quoted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was giving the average.

Mr. McDONOUGH. All right, but take the Quonset hut, and many of them have been constructed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have to deal with averages. We cannot deal with separate units. Congress has not the time to take each separate building project apart and put it together again to see if it is economically sound.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But if funds are not provided, there will be not hundreds but thousands of veterans without homes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Our interest and objective is the building of permanent units for veterans.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; but we are not doing it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But we can provide for it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is no provision for it in this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no reason why we should expend more money than is economically sound. It can be done in some cases. We find that in the case of these houses that we can spend on the average of about $2,000 more and provide permanent housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We have a lot of veterans who are without adequate housing waiting for the present program. That is not here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Nobody is more concerned with providing housing for veterans or anybody else than I and this committee. Tomorrow we expect to report out a bill which will make many thousands of units available to veterans. I think the gentleman will be very well satisfied with our endeavors when we get through with the program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee action on this bill gave any consideration to a number of other bills that are pending with regard to the fact that when these houses were demolished and removed and reconstructed in these municipalities, and particularly at colleges, that the title to that housing as reconstructed might remain in those colleges? Because it would probably cost more to demolish them as now required by the Lanham Act than it would to let them remain.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know what the gentleman has in mind, but we must remember that in the case of these particular structures some were erected on leased property. We did not take a fee title to the property but they were put up as temporary structures on leased property and we have a guaranty in the lease contract that we will restore this property to its original condition. That means the houses must be demolished. Otherwise we have got to get fee title. That is something that will take more time than we have to devote to it here today. We cannot decide that in 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the committee is giving consideration to it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assure the gentleman that the committee will give consideration to that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDONOUGH and Mr. RILEY) there were—yeas 26, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "$460,000,000" and insert "$445,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the additional funds herein authorized shall be available to carry out the purposes of sections 501, 502, and 503 of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, but shall be available only for necessary expenses in (1) completing the provision of temporary housing (including dwelling units not under construction) for which a contract in writing with any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency or nonprofit organization had been made prior to the enactment hereof pursuant to title V of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and (2) reimbursing any such educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization (a) for funds expended by it in completing any such temporary housing (exclusive of the costs of site acquisition and preparation, or the installation of streets and utility mains), or (b) for the cost of utility and other work in connection with any such temporary housing performed by it for the Administrator on a reimbursable basis pursuant to section 502 (b) of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "(including dwelling units not under construction)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 9, strike out "amended" and insert "amended: *Provided*, That such additional funds shall not be available for completing suspended units with respect to which, prior to April 1, 1947, no expenditures were made by the Administrator or the only expenditures made by the Administrator were for dismantling or dismantling and transportation,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 24, strike out "amended" and insert "amended, and (3) making payment, in an aggregate amount not exceeding $500,000, to such educational institutions, States, or political subdivisions thereof, local public agencies and nonprofit organizations of amounts equal to actual expenditures made by them prior to April 1, 1947, for costs of site acquisition and preparation, or installation of streets and utility mains, with respect to suspended units referred to in the proviso in clause (1) above."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLETCHER: Page 2, line 25, after the word "payment" strike out the words "in an aggregate amount not exceeding $500,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the FPHA unwittingly gave the Banking and Currency Committee the wrong details regarding the projects and amount of money needed to complete projects under discussion. After the FPHA had more time to thoroughly go into the question it found several hundred thousand dollars, more or less, might be needed to reimburse the various cities and political subdivisions for money spent on projects that were not completed—that is, the projects not within the 10 percent of completion—which we were striking from the bill. It was the intention of the committee to completely reimburse the political subdivisions, the cities, and educational bodies for the moneys which they had spent in the preparation of sites and utilities.

The bill which is the companion to this one in the Senate is identical with our bill with the exception of this particular phrase. They have not this $500,000 figure in the Senate bill, and I offer this amendment to make the House bill come in agreement with the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," pursuant to House Resolution 199, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 854, a companion bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the provisions of the bill H. R. 2780 just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 2780 was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday for the Committee on Appropriations to file a privileged report on the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce the program for next week.

On Monday we will have memorial services here in the House of Representatives, and I express the hope that as many Members as possible will be in attendance.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar and then will take up the Navy Department appropriation bill. It is expected that the consideration of that bill will continue through Wednesday and possibly Thursday.

After the completion of the Navy Department appropriation bill we expect to take up S. 814, the so-called wool bill, and also H. Res. 176, which is an investigatory resolution for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Conference reports on H. J. Res. 153, the so-called foreign relief bill, and H. R. 3020, the so-called labor bill, will be in order at any time if such reports are ready for consideration.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman have any information at this time in regard to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which we understood was coming up Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say when that will come up, but I will say it will not be on the program for next week

TENTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the tenth quarterly report covering the operations of UNRRA and the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

During the quarter under review—October 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946—estimated shipments of supplies from the United States to UNRRA receiving countries amounted to approximately 1,813,192 tons, valued at approximately $182,732,000. Cumulative world shipments by UNRRA as of December 31, 1946, were approximately 19,885,870 tons, valued at approximately $2,311,225,000. Of these totals, shipments from the United States were approximately 14,890,685 tons, valued at approximately $1,664,082,000 or, respectively, 75 percent and 72 percent of the total.

The approximate value of supplies remaining to be shipped on January 1, 1947, was a world total of $660,000,000.

Two developments at the turn of the year impelled the Central Committee of UNRRA to make adjustments in the categories of supplies still to be shipped from the United States. The first was a critical shortage of food, affecting particularly Austria, Poland, and Greece. The second was the fact that certain items being procured in the United States could not be delivered in time for shipment to Europe by March 31, 1947, or to the Far East by June 30, 1947. As a result the proposal of UNRRA was adopted by the Central Committee on February 3, 1947, for the establishment of an emergency food program in the amount of $35,000,000. This amount was to be obtained from contracts which could not be shipped before the dead lines

to the value of $25,000,000 an amount of $4,000,000 from the Director General's reserve, and an amount of $3,000,000 from the Czechoslovakian program on the basis of information that Czechoslovakia's relative recovery far exceeded that of other recipient countries. The food program was distributed so that Austria would receive $20,000,000, Poland $11,000,000, and Greece $4,000,000.

Thus UNRRA, by shifting its remaining resources, was able to meet a serious food deficit in the first quarter of 1947. I mention this particular fact to illustrate that the specter of hunger is still close to the peoples of many liberated areas. It is this condition which it is intended that the United States will help to relieve through a 1947 United States relief program. We cannot allow our vast efforts through UNRRA and through other means to remain incomplete. It will take a relatively small amount in 1947 to help assure that most liberated countries finally will be able to meet their own needs without free assistance from outside sources.

In addition to its task of providing supplies to devastated countries, UNRRA has carried out a second major responsibility, that of caring for displaced persons. Several hundred thousand displaced persons will be unrepatriated on June 30, 1947, when the resources available to UNRRA will be exhausted. The United Nations has voted to assume the responsibility for these displaced persons through an International Refugee Organization to be composed of member nations. I have recommended to the Congress that the United States join the IRO and that we appropriate the sum $75,000,000 as the United States share of the operating fund which is required for the care of these unfortunate people.

The Congress now is considering a joint resolution which provides the sum of $350,000,000 for relief assistance by the United States to the people of countries devastated by war. This sum is comparatively small in relation to amounts already made available by this Government through various means. It is an amount, however, which is of tremendous importance in completing the vast efforts we already have made. Other countries which can make contributions for relief assistance in 1947 have been consulted through the Secretariat of the United Nations and through other channels.

The United States has the resources needed by war-devastated countries to carry them through this year into a new year in which most of them may hope that they will achieve economic recovery. The peace of the world can be realized only when people are free from the fear of hunger.

The goal is close. The United States can help many countries reach that goal in a few more months through the supplies which the joint resolution on relief assistance will provide. I have no doubt that the American people desire that we finish what UNRRA has so well begun.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1947.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to include certain tables in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter to the President written by him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole a telegram from a civic body in Los Angeles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 5 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested in a brief report of a visit which I made to the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly which considered the terms of reference and constitution of the 11-member Special Committee on the Palestine Question just appointed. This session served to crystallize for me the Palestine issue and the relationship to it of the United States in such a way as may prove of interest to the House. The representatives of the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine both testified. The Jewish Agency representative claimed that the establishment of the Jewish national home was to have been the process, while the Jewish commonwealth would be the consummation of Jewish aspirations in Palestine. He asked for an open door to immigration and land settlement in Palestine for the displaced and utterly desperate Jews in Europe. But the Arab position was of special interest due to its peculiar intransigeance.

The representative of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee said that the Arabs will not consider or even discuss the meaning of the Jewish national home, that they want immediate and complete stoppage of all immigration into Palestine and refuse, in advance, any solution—like partition—impairing or diminishing Arab sovereignty in the whole or any part of Palestine.

My experience here reported follows an exchange of correspondence on Palestine with Secretary of State Marshall by 30 Members on the Republican side of the House of whom I was one. We asked Secretary Marshall three questions, all directed toward ascertaining the United States policy with respect to the instant proceedings before the United Nations Assembly on Palestine. The Secretary of State answered in substance that "it would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the substance of this question in such a way as to limit the full utilization of that committee's"—the United Nations Special Committee—"recommendations and its report."

This reply and what I observed at the United Nations session induced in me the conviction that our Government was giving, though probably unwittingly, a distinct impression to the people of the United States and to the nations of the world represented in the United Nations, that we may be abandoning our long standing and often reiterated policy in favor of the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, for an attitude of cool neutrality. Such an impression should not be permitted to be created or to persist.

All of us know that a decision on Palestine without United States support will not be worth much, and that the United States must take a hand in implementing a decision if it is ever to be carried out. Unless we give that assurance now, the special committee will decide little if anything. The United States attitude, therefore, will determine whether or not the Palestine problem will be solved by the United States.

From what I have seen already, it is not too early to call for a three-point program for United States action on Palestine in the United Nations. First, that the United States shall say now unequivocally that the United States policy has not changed, that we support the promise of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the opening of Palestine to full Jewish immigration compatible with its economic capacity, and that we will state before the United Nations Special Committee of Inquiry just what the United States will do to implement a solution. Second, that we will take a part in a Palestine settlement. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, for example, made a number of recommendations regarding the equalization of standards of living and standards of education between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. It recommended plans for large scale agricultural and industrial development in Palestine. Such plans will take money—the Jews of the world will put up a good deal of it, but the United States even with modest contributions for this purpose could help enormously in the certainty of the result. Again, the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry suggested a trusteeship under the United Nations to see Palestine through a transitory period until a commonwealth could be achieved. Will the United States consent to be one of the trustees and to participate in the negotiation of a trusteeship agreement? Third, the focal point of disaffection in Palestine and in the world regarding Palestine is the stoppage of immigration. The United States could urge upon the special committee that it make interim recommendations for immigration into Palestine until a final solution is agreed to. Declarations on these questions would be policy and would look much different to the people of the United States and the people of

the world than the statement in Secretary Marshall's letter of May 5 that "it would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the future government of Palestine."

The United States insisted in the United Nations on a neutral committee of nations. If we are to take the State Department and the United States delegate at their word, then the United States should have been a member of such a committee because it is neutral. I do not imply any criticism of either our distinguished Secretary of State to whom I pay the greatest honor, or of our eminent and gracious delegate to the United Nations. I feel rather that it is our fault in the Congress and among the people that we have not made our position so crystal clear on Palestine, that our Secretary of State and our delegate to the United Nations would speak out without hesitation at this session of the general assembly for the redemption of the promise of the Jewish national home, and for Jewish immigration into and close settlement on the land of Palestine.

We have had other experiences with this kind of dealing by the United States Government regarding Palestine which could happen here again. At almost the same time that the President was giving assurances regarding Palestine to the Jews in the United States late in 1944 and in 1945, he was on April 5, 1945, writing to ibn-Saud, the King of Saudi Arabia, that the United States would take no action on Palestine "without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews," or "which might prove hostile to the Arab people." This declaration arose to plague President Truman when he was advised on October 5, 1946, by King ibn-Saud that the Government of Saudi Arabia considered his demand for the admission of 100,000 Jewish displaced persons into Palestine to be a contradiction "of previous promises made by the Government of the United States," certainly not a pretty position for the United States to be placed in.

The United States policy on Palestine is clear, and it must be emphatically stated, certainly to the Arabs, and to the world. On December 19, 1945, the Congress in Concurrent Resolution 44 stated that—

> The United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish National Home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The President clearly stated the executive policy in his letter to King ibn-Saud of October 26, 1946. He said that—

> The Government and people of the United States have given support to the concept of a Jewish National Home in Palestine ever since the termination of World War I which resulted in the freeing of a large area of the Near East, including Palestine, and the establishment of a number of independent states which are now members of the United Nations.

This followed a long line of similar declarations, beginning in 1919, by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt. Not only does this represent the official policy of the United States, but it reflects the understanding of all our people. On July 2, 1945, a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress in a communication to the President said:

> We earnestly request you to use your influence with the Government of Great Britain, the mandatory for Palestine, to open forthwith the doors of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization; and we hope that you will urge all interested governments to join with the United States toward the end of establishing Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth at the earliest possible time.

On the same date in a petition to the President, the Governors of 40 of the 48 States joined in the same policy pronouncement as follows:

> We believe that the time has come when concrete measures must be taken to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish mass immigration and colonization and to bring about the earliest transformation of that country into a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and we most earnestly urge you to take such action as will contribute to this end.

There can be no question about the international covenant undertaken to the Jewish people. The Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, said:

> His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object.

This declaration was incorporated in the mandate granted to Great Britain by the League of Nations which said:

> Whereas the principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on the 2d of November 1917, between the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said powers in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.

And in article 2 continued:

> The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home.

The United States is a party to this international covenant. In the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924, it was stated:

> Subject to the provisions of the present convention, the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above.

Yet, in the face of these solemn international covenants and commitments, Great Britain promulgated its infamous white paper of May 1939, arbitrarily cutting off the right of the Jews to settle closely upon the land of Palestine and to make it their Jewish national home. Britain has persisted in this action since that date with the result that Palestine is a police state, ridden with terror, deprived of elementary civil rights or the equal protection of the laws, and barring from its gates hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees and DP's, the remnant of the martyred Jews of Europe.

At the session of the United Nations Political Committee, to which I referred, I was amazed to hear not only the intransigeance of the Palestinian Arab Higher Committee, but the threats and belligerency of the other Arab countries. The delegate of Iraq, declared that Jewish immigration into Palestine as guaranteed by the mandate would be a declaration of war, and an invitation to fighting. He said such immigration would show the aggressive intentions of the Jews against the Arab countries. These words sounded strangely reminiscent of Hitler who declared against the aggressive intentions of the Poles and the Jews at the same time that they were being gassed and cremated. The Arabs demanded the immediate independence of Palestine—a palpable effort to freeze the status quo of an Arab majority without any reference to the fact that an illegal British policy barring Jewish immigration had left out the 500,000 Jews from Europe, who the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry estimated would emigrate from Europe to Palestine if allowed to do so. This number alone would give the Jews parity in population with the Arabs.

The question we face is whether the democratic nations will permit themselves to be bullied by feudal princes and landowners holding millions of Arabs in abject subjection in their own countries. Who is making these threats against the peace of the world and accusing the unfortunate displaced Jews of aggressive intentions? Palestine consists of 10,000 square miles of territory while 1,000,000 square miles were conquered from the Turks by the Allied Powers in World War I, and established as territory of the future Arab states which have all now come into being. Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan, and Saudi Arabia are all the results of that action. Anyone who has been in the Middle East, as I have, knows that the Arab countries have not begun to approach the development, even as sovereign nations, which Jews in a little over a decade have accomplished in a mandated Palestine. Yet I am sure that the people of these countries and their more enlightened leaders want a better and more secure life fully as much as do the Jews of Palestine.

But we find in many Arab countries a high rate of illiteracy, a ghastly rate of infant mortality, a short life expectancy for the ordinary people, the crudest conditions of life, and a society in which 2 percent rule the 98 percent with an iron hand. Millions of dollars in oil royalties have, for instance, gone into certain of these countries, but has there been any appreciable improvement in schools, hospitals, roads, sanitation, housing, or other attributes of a modern civilization for the people? Of course not.

In view of the threats of the delegate from Iraq we have a right to inquire as to the competence of such threats in the Middle East. The Iraqian Army numbers about 25,000 men without motorized equipment to cross the Arabian Desert separating Iraq from Palestine. The Egyptian Army numbers 60,000 trained for police duty and without equipment

to cross the desert of Sinai separating Egypt from Palestine. The Syrian and Lebanese armies number at the most 20,000 trained for police duty. The Saudi-Arabian Army consists of a few thousand regulars, and otherwise of tribal levys difficult to muster into a military force. The Trans-Jordan Army totals 16,000 and is a creation of the British and under British officers. I believe that the Jews of Palestine, given half a break on equipment, will be perfectly ready to rest on their own ability to cope with all Arab forces which may be directed against them formally or informally. I would doubt very much that any of the belligerent Arab spokesmen, who know very well that the Palestinian Jew knows how to fight and how to die, believe themselves that they are scaring anybody. And this is quite apart from the fact that no Arab nation or group of them would seriously attempt to challenge the authority of the United Nations.

The fundamental problem in the world and the problem upon which we voted the other day in the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan, is whether we will have an open or a closed world. In an open world international covenants undertaken to the Jewish people who are in desperate need will be honored. In a closed world they will be dishonored. The greatest threat of communism in the whole Middle East rests in a perpetuation of the semi-feudal social system and in the economic exploitation which exists there making it ready soil for Communist agitation. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry called the civilization which they found in the Middle East semifeudal.

The delegate from Iraq at the United Nations when I was there the other day said that his government would not "adhere" to any plan for a "bridgehead" into the East of the type of civilization represented by the Jews. That gave the game away better than anything else. The real hope of Western civilization lies in the gradual opening of this area to improved standards of living and an understanding of Western ideas which will enable the Arab peoples to become democratic in organization and aspiration. The real threat of communism in the Near East and the Middle East lies in leaving these feudal princes and landlords to sit on the inferno of a social and economic caste system, ready material for the torch of communism. The Jews, the Arab rank and file and the more enlightened leaders among the Arabs, have completely common interests.

The delegate of the USSR to the United Nations has not hesitated to recommend specific solutions for his government, first coming out for an immediate independent Arab state in Palestine and now recognizing the Jewish case to the extent of suggesting a bi-national state or even partition. Yet the USSR is a newcomer to the Palestine question while the United States which has been deeply concerned with it since 1917 takes no specific position at all before the General Assembly. This is certainly a challenge to the failure of the United States to restate to the General Assembly its historic policy on Palestine.

In the next few months there will be weighed in the balance the bona fides of all the protestations of support for the Jewish National Home made by our Presidents, our Congress and our people since the issue was first opened in 1917. The smaller nations of the world will be watching not the words, but the performance of the United States on this Palestine question. Either international covenants to people in desperate need and without armies and navies will be honored, or the world is still entirely ruled by threats and power politics.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 938. An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

683. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

684. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

685. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of three newly issued publications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

686. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $29,500 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $75,000,000 for surplus property, care and handling overseas (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

688. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $92,107,800, together with an increase of $38,400,000 in contractual authority, for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. 252); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

689. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc No. 253); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

690. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations which was approved by the General Assembly by a resolution adopted on February 13, 1946, proposing the convention for accession by each member of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 176. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 212. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr HÉBERT:

H. R. 3479. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr LANE:

H. R. 3480. A bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3481. A bill to amend section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr CAMP:

H. R. 3482. A bill to amend section 403 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3483. A bill to amend section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3484. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3485. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain patents which expire during 1947 and 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 3486. A bill to amend section 701 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1943 with respect to the effective date of subsection (1) (1) (E) of the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3487. A bill to abolish the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., to authorize and direct the restoration to the former owners of the land comprising such refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 3488. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such

citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3489. A bill to amend and supplement various Federal statutes, as amended, having for their purpose to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities; to provide administrative agencies to be responsible for the carrying out of this act and existing laws pertinent thereto; to promote the greatest normal economic exchange of goods and services among the people of the United States and with the people of other nations; to protect the people of this country and their property from the recurring evils of world-wide inflation and deflation; to stabilize the purchasing power of money; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 3490. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, with particular reference to Intercoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote River, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3492. A bill to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3493. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3494. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant its consent to uniform taxation of certain Indian properties which are taxed by the Federal Government and which are immune or claimed to be immune from State taxation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to certain bills on the subject of canceling the authority of the city of Los Angeles to purchase certain public lands in Mono County; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the rate of interest on land sales, and requesting the Congress of the United States to approve amendments herein set forth of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Corp. Joseph B. Konkolewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

517. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Rehoboth Lodge, No. 36, B'nai B'rith, New York City, urging immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal forthwith of the discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish national home; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

518. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Irish Freedom League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to England's occupation of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

519. Also, petition of the National Pan Hellenic Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the appropriation bill for the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, when we get sick of ourselves, ashamed of our littleness, our selfishness, and the petty things that irritate us, then let it be the beginning of spiritual health by making us willing to have Thee create in us clean hearts and renew right spirits within us. Hold us steady lest we lose our poise. Blunt our speech lest by cutting words and careless deeds we hurt our colleagues and the cause for which we speak. Where we differ in approaches to a problem, may we ever be open to consider another and a better way, guided, not by whether it be popular, or expedient, or practical, but always whether it be right.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, and help us, through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 854) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate today is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 16, 1947, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be subsequently proposed, to the amendment proposed to the bill S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947, by Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MCGRATH), on page 14, after line 8, relating to mandatory amounts to be distributed to the various States, and upon the said amendment, whether or not amended.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under a further unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, according to the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at yesterday, the Senate will vote at 1 o'clock on the pending amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. In continuation of the debate of yesterday, I desire to say a few words on the amendment, but I shall be happy to yield to other Senators who may desire to speak

on the subject. I regret that there are so few Senators present on the floor at this time, and I should like to raise the question with the distinguished majority leader whether there should not be a quorum call in order that the debate from now on may be heard by our colleagues. I am not making the suggestion myself, but I am asking the majority leader whether that would not be a desirable procedure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, of course, the time consumed in calling the roll and ascertaining the presence of a quorum would come out of the time allotted for the debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be divided between both sides.

Mr. WHITE. Very well. I shall be glad to do whatever the Senator from New Jersey wishes, and I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, if that is his desire.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to have the absence of a quorum suggested.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Lodge	Sparkman
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McGrath	Thye
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is unavoidably detained.

I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will state his inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Chair rule at a later time on the question I desire to submit. The situation in which Senators find themselves, under the unanimous-consent agreement, makes it important for the junior Senator from Oregon to ascertain whether or not, after the hour of 1 o'clock, following the vote on the Kilgore amendment, it will then be in order for the junior Senator from Oregon to ask to have considered and voted upon his amendment, which has many points in common with the Kilgore amendment, but which also, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon, differs substantially from the Kilgore amendment in certain respects. I therefore send the two amendments to the desk, and ask that the Chair rule, at a later time, on the point I raise.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair's decision, of course, will depend entirely on whether there are substantial points of difference between the two amendments. The ruling will be made, pursuant to the request of the junior Senator from Oregon, when the issue arises.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, since the Senate is to vote on the pending amendment at 1 o'clock, approximately 20 minutes is left to each side for debate. I shall open debate on our side by recalling a little history with regard to the amendment now pending, as well as with respect to the bill itself. I say this especially for the benefit of those who have not been present at the debate during the last 2 days, and who will be called upon presently to vote upon the pending amendment.

As the RECORD shows, Mr. President, the question of a National Science Foundation has been under discussion before both Houses of Congress during the past 2 years. A great many witnesses have been called before the committees of both Houses. Differences of opinion have arisen as to certain of the issues involved, and one of those issues is presented by the amendment which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] offered yesterday. It is a question of how to deal with the funds which the Foundation may have to distribute.

I have personally, Mr. President, taken pains, through my acquaintance with institutional leaders and persons engaged in scientific pursuits, to consider this approach, and I want to state briefly what the issue is. The question simply is whether there shall be distributed to all the States of the Union on the basis of population certain of the funds which may be appropriated each year for scientific research, so that each State may have an opportunity to participate in such funds. That is a very worthy objective, of course, but I have tried to point out that the purpose of the Scientific Foundation is not to advance the cause of education generally. That objective is being taken care of by other legislation which is now being considered by subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The purpose of the Foundation is to discover projects of research in basic science which are important for the future of the country and on which concentration should be had in order to promote the progress and advancement of science. The other purpose, of course, is to train promising young scientists wherever we may find them in order that they may be developed for doing research work in the future.

The issue which faced the committee which studied this matter and, indeed, faced all who are interested in the proposal—and we are all very sincere in our approach to it—was whether the best results could be obtained by distributing funds through all the States of the Union, in which event, of course, the Foundation would have to be more limited than if it could concentrate on important projects, or whether provision should be made to enable the President to select a group which would be wise enough and have sufficient knowledge of the whole field of scientific research to discover projects which the country needed to have developed particularly, and to concentrate the available funds, certainly in the opening years of the work, on such projects. It is the conclusion of those who have introduced this bill that the wise approach to this matter is to create a Foundation sufficiently broad in scope and possessing such judgment and knowledge and having such contacts as will enable it wisely and efficiently to locate the desirable projects.

We have therefore provided in our bill not for the distribution geographically of funds, but for placing in the hands of the Foundation, consisting of 24 members appointed by the President, the definite responsibility of determining the policy to be pursued and selecting the projects which in a given year should be studied for the purpose of using most effectively the funds which may be appropriated. It must not be forgotten that the 24 members are to be appointed by the President after receiving nominations from the sicentific societies of the country, from the land-grant colleges, from the associations of State-supported institutions, such as our State universities, and from private institutions, such as our private universities.

Mr. President, we must bear in mind that each year the Foundation must present, through its executive committee and its Director, to the Director of the Budget Bureau and to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate, the specific projects they have in mind and ask specifically for the appropriations needed to carry on the projects for the particular

year. That is, in our judgment, the wise way to administer the funds which we hope to have appropriated, both for the research work itself and for finding and developing the type of young students, either on the scholarship level or on the fellowship level, who can best carry on the research work.

So the issue, Mr. President, is one of judgment as to what is the most effective way to bring about the accomplishment of the purpose a foundation such as the one proposed must have in mind.

I desire further to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in setting up this National Science Foundation we are perpetuating in peacetime and on a broader scale, on a scale which is aimed to develop scientific research wherever it can be developed in this land of ours, the specific kind of research that was done during the war by the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and which, of course, because of the war, had to concentrate its scientific research upon certain very specific projects which were deemed essential at that time. I refer, of course, to the atomic energy project and other projects, such as radar, and so forth, which, as we know, were developed very effectively under the organization we had in existence at that time.

It is our belief that in dealing with this matter through a foundation, representing as far as possible all corners of the country, all types of scientific and educational institutions, and made up of the very best talent obtainable, and entrusting to the foundation so created the formulation of policy and the determination of the program to be followed, we are providing for a much wiser way of expending the funds which may be appropriated for this purpose than we would by providing a flat formula for scattering the funds to the various States of the Union. As worthy as that cause is, I submit that that is not the way to deal with a foundation of this kind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator has concluded, I wonder if we might not utilize 5 minutes of the time between now and 1 o'clock to accept the so-called Hickenlooper amendment. I should be glad to agree to it.

Mr. SMITH. I understand the Senator from Iowa desires to offer his amendment as soon as the vote is taken at 1 o'clock.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If Senators have completed discussion on the pending amendment, I thought we could proceed to act upon the so-called Hickenlooper amendment by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH. I do not think we are through with the discussion. I wish to say a few words more on the pending question, and I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment, in order to make it clear that the committee understands the purpose of that amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise to ask whether I shall have time to be heard for a few minutes before the Senate votes at 1 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH. I understand the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has charge of the time on behalf of those who favor his amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I assure the Senator from Wyoming that he will be given the time he desires.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have said about all that it is necessary to say in addition to what already appears in the RECORD, both of Wednesday and Thursday, on this particular subject. It is a question of determining which is the right way to handle this matter. In the judgment of us who are favoring the provision in the bill and who are opposing the pending amendment, the method proposed in the amendment would simply open the door to pressures from every State of the Union for the development of all sorts of projects which might or might not be worthy. We would be in danger of having constant political pressure, if you will, applied to us, whereas we are trying our very best to avoid that result, by placing the determination of policies and projects, and so forth, into the hands of men who are not at all interested in politics. We want to try to find out where the legitimate projects are, and seek by every means to search out promising young men in every State of the Union. Every State will have a chance to put in its case. No one will be shut out. We are providing very broadly for the kind of representation there should be on a Science Foundation, and I submit that on this particular phase of the issue the program we have suggested is sound.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield a few minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], if he cares to speak on this subject, because he collaborated with me on the bill. I think he has some ideas on the subject, and coming from a great institution like Harvard University, I am sure he has a contribution to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH. I yield 5 minutes or more.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey has 9 minutes remaining to his credit. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has 21 minutes to his credit. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized within the 9 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be rejected. The important point to bear in mind is the purpose of establishing the National Science Foundation. We have just been through a war during the course of which there have been brought about immense scientific improvements, some of which have been used for our destruction. We want to turn those scientific improvements to our benefit in the days of peace. If we are to do that, we must make provision for the development of scientific study and research and the perfection of scientific inventions which may be of advantage to us and, indeed, to all the world. I became interested in the pending bill during the past year through two different channels— first, I was approached by friends who had been engaged in the scientific field during the war. I refer to men like Dr. Compton, Dr. Conant, Dr. Bush, and others, who came to me and asked me to take an interest in this question.

The other way in which I became interested was from listening to scientists who had visited Russia and had seen with their own eyes what Russia, as one government, was doing with all its government resources by way of promoting scientific development. If we are to compete, if we are to make the most of our free industry and give it the greatest benefits from the basic research carried on in our institutions and laboratories, we must concentrate the funds which are appropriated for this purpose on that one endeavor.

I for one am profoundly interested in the problem of education. A few days ago I read of the bill which had been reported from the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We want to assist education in this country. We must do so if we are to keep our free government as we have it today. But if we are going to assist education, let us do it directly. Let us not do it indirectly through trying to establish a science foundation and dissipating its funds in small amounts among the various States and among institutions which may be located within their borders.

The manner in which the pending amendment would distribute the funds of the Foundation would to a large extent injure the purposes for which the Foundation is to be established. I give two examples which I have worked out, and which may not be strictly accurate. Under this amendment the State of Massachusetts would receive approximately $90,000. The State of Nevada would receive $26,500. If the money is to be spread out in that way, how effective will it be in promoting scientific investigation and research? I believe that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia should be rejected, and that the bill should be enacted in such form as will leave a broad scope of discretion in the directors and in the executive committee of the Foundation.

Then let us take up the subject of education through the medium of some of the pending bills on that subject, and see what we can do toward helping our educational system. Let us see what we can do toward helping veterans obtain an education in college. But let us not try to do it indirectly when we are trying to get the greatest benefit from the scientific leaders at a time when science means so much to the future development and security of this country.

We all have memories of the past war and of what happened to us in that war, and we have some idea of what science can do to us if another war ever comes. Let us be in the forefront in scientific activity. Let us not permit any other nation, by concentrating its governmental funds, to surpass us. We have the know-how in industry. We have the scientific leaders. Let us give them a chance. In order to do that, we should

defeat the amendment upon which we are to vote at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] if he would like to say a word on this amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that I care to speak. Let us hear from the other side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from West Virginia has 21 minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday and today the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Jersey have been quoting figures. I should like to know whether those figures are based upon an assumed appropriation of $20,000,000, or whether they are based upon estimates of future appropriations for the Foundation. The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Massachusetts speak of certain figures for certain institutions. No one will deny that in wartime scientific research, many parts of the research, were farmed out to various institutions. As the Senator knows, the research work upon the atomic bomb was farmed out to many institutions all over the country.

I think it is misleading to say that a certain university may receive $28,000, and that it can spend the $28,000 only on a particular project. The work which it does may be only a part of a great foundation project, and other parts of the work may be done at many places throughout the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures which I used were based upon an appropriation of $20,000,000. Twenty-five percent of that figure would be $5,000,000; and the figures which I used were based upon estimates which were arrived at on the basis of the provisions of the amendment.

That does not mean that more money could not be used by the Foundation. I have just been talking with the Senator from Washington. The question of obtaining oil from shale in Alaska is now being considered. Perhaps we might wish to spend $1,000,000 in Alaska in 1 year to solve the problem of obtaining oil from shale; but if the funds were dissipated we might not be able to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have mentioned the figure of $4,800 for the University of Alaska, on the basis of a $20,000,000 appropriation. If the Foundation wished to conduct a project in Alaska costing $500,000 to obtain oil from shale, there is no reason why it could not add the half million dollars to the $4,800. I think the Senator should understand that we are not talking about anything mandatory. The only thing the amendment does is to place the onus on the universities themselves to see if they cannot find research projects. That is exactly what we wish to do.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to comment on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

To whom does the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it in order now to ask for a ruling on my inquiry as to whether or not the Kilgore and Morse amendments are sufficiently different in substance as to warrant my offering my amendment later?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not prepared to rule. The amendments are being analyzed. As soon as the analysis is complete a ruling will be made.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think that what has been said today by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Massachusetts constitutes about as strong an argument as could be made in support of the amendment. The Senator from New Jersey, in closing his statement a few moments ago, stated that this program is to be placed in the hands of men who are not at all interested politically, and that to those men would be delegated the full power to regulate and control the program.

It is precisely upon that ground, Mr. President, that I stand for the amendment; and I believe that if Senators will give attention to the implications of the bill before us they will see that the amendment is designed to balance a program of central power with a program of distributed power. If there is any one thing that has made America great, it is that America has preserved, until recently, the broadest possible opportunity for individuals everywhere. We are, however, Mr. President, upon a great stream which is hurrying this Government and every other government toward central power. We take the floor in the Senate and in the House; we take the stump in political campaigns and decry the growth of big government; we decry the concentration of power in the hands of monopoly upon one side and in the hands of Government upon the other side; and yet day by day in the Congress we are creating more and more central power in Government.

Mr. SALTSONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I said anything that would indicate in any way that I was not interested in fostering the smaller institutions of learning, I say now that there is no one who would help more than I in fostering them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that is true of the Senator. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts does not want power concentration, and I know that the Senator from New Jersey does not want it. What I am pointing out is that we are drifting steadily toward concentrating political power at the very time that we pretend to be against it.

There is created in the very first section of this bill a National Science Foundation. The Foundation is to have 24 members; an executive committee of 9 members, and the executive committee will operate through a quorum of 4. The executive committee will meet how often? My recollection is that the bill provides that the executive committee shall meet not less than six times a year. There is some limitation upon that. Paragraph (c) of section 5 provides:

> The executive committee shall meet at call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

What does the committee report say with reference to the powers of the director? I read from the committee report, describing the provisions of section 6:

> Subject to the general supervision of the executive committee, the administrative affairs of the Foundation will be controlled—

Observe the word. How perfect that word is to describe the progress toward central power. It is a director who shall control the activities of this Foundation. I read further:

> The administrative affairs of the Foundation will be controlled by a full-time, paid director appointed by the committee, with the approval of a majority of the Foundation. The director will perform such functions as may be assigned to him by the executive committee and follow the policies established from time to time by the committee and the Foundation.

I turn to the bill itself to read what the powers of those persons in the Foundation will be. The authority of the Foundation is described in section 10, as follows:

> (a) to prescribe such rules and regulations—

Here we have another example of the constant practice of setting up new divisions of Government and clothing them with the power to make rules and regulations. What are the standards? Senators who are opposing the amendment say, "You can depend upon these wise men to whom we will give this power to recognize the various States. They will not shut you off." But the history of concentrated power is that those who exercise it speedily acquire the notion that they are all-wise as well as all-powerful, and when they get that notion the opportunity for the rank and file to secure the benefits under such laws is immediately narrowed.

I read further:

> (b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Here, again, we set up a new Government agency and give it the authority to spend as much money as it deems necessary. Of course, it has to go before the Appropriation Committees of the Senate and the House from year to year. That is taken care of in another provision of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

So, Mr. President, I conclude by saying that the importance of this amendment is that it imposes an obligation upon the Foundation to accept or receive and entertain suggestions from universities and colleges in the various States. This is the way by which we can stimulate activity in scientific research in the various States. I have no reason to believe, for example, that the University of Wyoming would be recognized by the director, the executive committee, or the broad Foundation of 24 members. A body of 24 men is too small a number to be able to erect a fence around scientific development in the United States.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield a few minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take much time, because it is impossible at this stage of the proceedings for me to present the matters which I wish to present in connection with the principle involved in the Kilgore amendment. The principle which is involved is very similar to that involved in my amendment, but the procedure and certain rights which are involved in my amendment are sufficiently different so that at a later time I shall argue what I consider to be the right of the Senator from Oregon to present his amendment at a later hour. However, because I am interested in the principle which is involved in the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators, I want to say, in the closing minutes of this debate, that I think Senators ought to check with the science faculties of the respective universities in their States and with the presidents of universities before they vote down the principle of the Kilgore amendment. At a later hour today I shall discuss this matter at some length, depending upon the ruling of the Chair. But I want to say now that I have on my desk not only letters from the presidents of the colleges and universities of my State, but a letter from Mr. Compton, president of a college in Washington. The name "Compton" of course coincides with sound scientific judgment in the United States. I also have a letter from the president of the University of Maine, urging the adoption of the principle of the Kilgore amendment, although favoring my amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know whether the Senator has the answer; but is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that at the outset the faculties of the scientific colleges, particularly those in the State universities, were opposed to the idea of the establishment of such a scientific foundation because they feared it would impede them? Has the Senator talked with any of them about that point? It was only when they felt sure that a provision like the one in my amendment would be included that they went along wholeheartedly.

Mr. MORSE. I am aware of that point of view. Let me say that I have a letter from Mr. Edmund Day, president of Cornell University, strongly supporting the principle of the amendment which I offered on April 2, and which has been lying on the desks of Senators ever since.

I simply say that because of the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are laboring, we now are faced with the handicap that we shall not be able to present in detail the information which I think should be presented to the Senate before the vote is taken at 1 o'clock. So I urge the Members of the Senate to take a position at 1 o'clock in favor of the principle of the Kilgore amendment, hoping that during the afternoon we shall be able to work out certain procedural rights and safeguards which I think will be over and above the provisions of the Kilgore amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I simply wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that there was no intention yesterday, in connection with the adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement, in any way to jeopardize the position of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. As a matter of fact, I was under the impression that the two amendments were sufficiently different so that a vote on the Kilgore amendment would not jeopardize the position of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. There was no intention to jeopardize its position, and the unanimous-consent agreement was directed solely and specifically to the Kilgore - Aiken - Magnuson - McGrath amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hoped the Senator did. I regret that at the time when the unanimous-consent agreement was under consideration, we did not consider how closely the two amendments were related. If we had, we would not have asked for the agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I think the two amendments should have been considered together, because it places me at a considerable disadvantage to have a vote taken on the Kilgore amendment, without even having my amendment discussed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time is remaining at my disposal?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is yielded 4 minutes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I rise to express the hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] may receive the support of the Senate when the vote is taken at 1 o'clock. I have joined with him in sponsoring the amendment, largely at the request of the president of my State college. I believe we have been considering this proposal largely from the point of view of the money involved, rather than on the basis of the great moral support that can come to the National Science Foundation by having every land-grant college in the United States feel that it is a part of the program and that it has a responsibility to come forward with constructive suggestions and projects on which it can work.

I listened to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts recite the figures in regard to the amounts of money that would be involved in respect to several of the States. I myself have not looked into the figures; but judging from what the Senator from Massachusetts has stated, I believe that my State probably would not be entitled to more than $8,000 or $10,000 under this program. We could well do without the $8,000 or $10,000; but we do not feel that we could do without being a part of this undertaking.

I think it is most important that at the beginning of this Foundation, every one of the land-grant colleges should feel its responsibility in the matter, regardless of the amount of money that may be involved. I believe the impression has been created here that our colleges are not sufficiently interested. In view of that situation, I communicated this morning with the President of the Rhode Island State College, and asked him to tell me frankly if there is really a sincere interest on the part of the land-grant colleges of the United States in being made a part of the program. His answer was that there certainly is, and that he believes that the president of every one of those institutions is in favor of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

So, Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I hope the Senate will consider this question, not from the point of view of the dollars involved, but from the point of view of the great moral contribution in support of this program which can be made by the colleges of the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the amendment which we propose to the bill.

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. McGRATH) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 14 insert before line 9 the following new section 12 and renumber all ensuing sections:

"MANDATORY AMOUNTS TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE VARIOUS STATES

"SEC. 12. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research and development activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: One-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census, of the amount apportioned to each State at least one-half shall be expended only for carrying on research and development activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges,

within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements made by the Foundation under this section. The balance of the amount for each State shall be expended only in nonprofit colleges or universities in the States. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research and development projects, but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless it submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may, after receiving the advice of the Board, establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to sum up our position briefly. In the first place, at the outset of the discussion, two difficulties arose in connection with the idea of founding a scientific research institution. The first difficulty was the notion that we were merely after inventions and new discoveries, only. The other difficulty was the suggestion that the purpose was to develop in the United States a research organization on a Nation-wide basis, capable of rapid expansion.

We had the example of what was done in Britain after the last war, when the British Government built laboratories in various small places throughout the British Isles, in an endeavor to increase their research facilities. Incidentally, that was done with money loaned by the United States. In dealing with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, we found that they knew about only a few laboratories, and that there were only a few such places to which they would assign work to be done and projects to be carried out. Those laboratories were vastly expanded, but the educational institutions of the United States were unable to contribute the fair share which they thought they should contribute.

Mr. President, my primary motive in connection with this matter is to promote the development of scientists as well as the development of research. The two go hand in hand. At the outset of the discussion of this program, all the colleges were afraid of it, fearing that, under it, what happened during the war would again happen to them, namely, that private laboratories, even nonprofit private laboratories, would benefit from the program to the exclusion of the universities and colleges. Mr. President, if the pending measure merely proposed the granting of money to the States, I would not go along at all with the State educational institutions in the position they have taken; but we agreed at the meeting over which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] presided that we would protect and promote the development of scientists, not only at the present time but 15 or 20 years from now, by seeing to it that the various educational institutions throughout the United States were assigned some research projects to work upon, so that there would not be a sequestration of such work.

The opponents of the amendment speak of dire results which will follow from distributing this money to the States. I wonder if they realize the grave weakness of the bill as it now stands, namely, that it contains no provision in regard to where the work shall be done. So it might happen, as was the case with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, that the scientists doing the work under the program would feel that only a few private laboratories were capable of doing the work. The bill will provide no protection against such a development, unless it is amended as we propose. If the bill is amended by the adoption of our amendment, it will guarantee a distribution throughout the States, not only of scholarships but of projects which will be available to boys who wish to work their way through school.

Mr. President, one of the valuable inventions developed during the war was a method of determining the value of native mica as insulation. That development was made at an expenditure of $17,000, so we see that a great deal of money is not required for the development of some of the new methods or to make some of the discoveries.

Our position is that each State should have an opportunity, in connection with its own projects, to make explorations in the field of science, and in connection therewith to receive some help from the Federal Government through the Foundation. Let us provide for that and let us also make sure that such assistance will not be taken away from the colleges and universities of the country if they have meritorious projects which fit in with the program.

Mr. President, in any event, the last word will be with the Board. Under the amendment, only 25 percent of the funds would be apportioned among the States, and the Board would have complete discretion and control in regard to the remaining 75 percent. Even so, the 25 percent apportioned among the States would be used for the development of scientists, which is the most important of all the matters we are considering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], for himself and other Senators. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as a quorum call has just been had, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request that a quorum call be made.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Connally
Ball	Butler	Cooper
Brewster	Byrd	Cordon
Bridges	Cain	Donnell
Brooks	Capper	Downey
Buck	Chavez	Dworshak
Ecton	McClellan	Russell
Ellender	McFarland	Saltonstall
Ferguson	McGrath	Smith
Fulbright	McKellar	Sparkman
George	McMahon	Taft
Green	Magnuson	Taylor
Gurney	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Hawkes	Maybank	Thye
Hayden	Millikin	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Moore	Umstead
Hoey	Morse	Vandenberg
Holland	Murray	Watkins
Jenner	Myers	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	White
Kem	O'Daniel	Wiley
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Williams
Knowland	Reed	Wilson
Lodge	Revercomb	Young
Lucas	Robertson, Va.	
McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself and other Senators, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, before line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section 12, and to renumber all ensuing sections.

MANDATORY AMOUNTS TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE VARIOUS STATES

SEC. 12. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research and development activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: One-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census, of the amount apportioned to each State at least one-half shall be expended only for carrying on research and development activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements made by the Foundation under this section. The balance of the amount for each State shall be expended only in nonprofit colleges or universities in the States. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research and development projects but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless it submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may, after receiving the advice of the Board, establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that if the Senator from New York were present he would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Ohio is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Vermont is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina if present would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. The junior Senator from New York is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the junior Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the senior Senator from New York if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who would vote "nay."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chavez	Kilgore	Murray
Connally	Lucas	Myers
Downey	McClellan	O'Conor
Fulbright	McFarland	O'Mahoney
George	McGrath	Russell
Green	McKellar	Sparkman
Hayden	McMahon	Taylor
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Maybank	Umstead

NAYS—49

Ball	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hatch	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Jenner	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Kem	Thye
Butler	Knowland	Tydings
Byrd	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cain	McCarthy	Watkins
Capper	Malone	Wherry
Cooper	Martin	White
Cordon	Millikin	Wiley
Donnell	Moore	Williams
Dworshak	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ecton	Reed	Young
Ellender	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Robertson, Va.	

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Ives	Stewart
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Tobey
Capehart	Langer	Wagner
Eastland	McCarran	
Flanders	Overton	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE on behalf of himself and other Senators was rejected.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 55)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $10,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper), to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NEWLY ISSUED PUBLICATIONS BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting three newly issued publications by that Commission entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies in the United States"; "Preliminary Report on Electric Energy Production, Generating Capacity, and Fuel Consumption of Electric Utilities in the United States"; and "Natural Gas Company Plant Investment Units" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BUILDINGS FOR BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES FROM EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the members of the Union Park Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlando, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of members of the Union Park Townsend Club, No. 1, and the members of the Bradenton Townsend Club, No. 1, both of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 81 citizens of Cherrydale, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

A petition signed by 219 citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference, and to have printed in the RECORD, New Jersey Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9, adopted by the two branches of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing Congress to restore the American Republic and the 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

This resolution shows what the people back home are thinking about in connection with the centralization of power and bureaucratic government in Washington.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 9

Concurrent resolution calling upon New Jersey's Representatives in the National Congress and the legislatures of the sister States and all good citizens to restore the American Republic and the 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Preamble: New Jersey needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Garden Staters, like the people of our sister States, were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as "Federal" aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

1. We respectfully petition and urge New Jersey's Congressmen and Senators to vote

to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

2. *Resolved, further,* That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1135. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 176);

H. R. 1844. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 178); and

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 177).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 309. A bill designating American Indian Day; with an amendment (Rept. No. 179);

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the 9th of October of each year as Leif Erikson Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 180);

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as Constitution Day; with an amendment (Rept. No. 181); and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution designating April 5, 1947, as Booker T. Washington Day; with amendments (Rept. No. 182).

MILDRED R. JOHNSON ET AL.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 110, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on May 5, 1947, and I request its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 110) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mildred R. Johnson, widow, Jeannette J. Moore, sister, and John M. Johnson, brother, of Goldsborough M. Johnson, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances, to be paid as follows: To John M. Johnson, $250, the remainder to be divided equally between Mildred R. Johnson and Jeannette J. Moore.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1299. A bill to prevent loss of lump-sum payments by certain Army, Navy, and marine aviators who, at the request of the President, volunteered for service with the Chinese National Air Force (Flying Tigers) and later returned to service in the American forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1300. A bill to permit the naturalization of persons, irrespective of race, whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the armed forces of the United States; and

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1302. A bill to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. BALL):

S. 1304. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1305. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 1306. A bill relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente Aqueduct; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for referenc to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 678) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing certain medical aid to needy and other individuals, which I introduced on February 24, 1947.

This proposed legislation has as its objective amendment of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to the States in furnishing medical aid to needy individuals.

I request that a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD. This statement will explain my reasons for submitting this substitute to Senate bill 678.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

At the time I introduced S. 678, I characterized it as a "humble first step" toward an inspiring goal: The goal of making certain medicines and services available to people who cannot afford to pay for them. I recognized that mechanically the bill was not perfect and I have, since that time, received and welcomed suggestions and criticisms from experts in the field of public medicine.

Every person with whom I have discussed this bill has agreed that its objective was highly desirable. But certain objections to some of its administrative aspects have been raised. I have studied these objections with great interest and care and have also had informal discussions with officers of the Public Health Service. These people have been very helpful, and the net result has been constructive. I have accepted these criticisms in the same cooperative spirit in which they offered, and as a result, I have incorporated certain changes in the substitute amendment.

In the interest of clarity, it seems simpler to submit an entirely new substitute for the bill, although the changes are mostly of a relatively minor nature. I believe that it might be helpful if at this point I summarized the changes I have made and the underlying reasons therefor.

1. As originally written, the bill would have limited Federal assistance to the furnishing of drugs and services "to needy persons and at a minimum cost to other persons." I have come to the conclusion that this method for dispensing these medicines and services would be cumbersome and of dubious validity. The substitute would make these services and drugs available to "such persons as may require them." This would leave the matter of detail to determination by the States. Hence, we would rely on a State's own financial self-interest as a safeguard against extravagance.

2. The bill prohibited a State from imposing any residence requirement in excess of 1 year upon applicants for assistance under the act. Objections have been raised that this requirement could well be reduced, since a great many persons requiring assistance might have difficulty in meeting such a requirement. Therefore, I have reduced the period from 1 year to 3 months. This I believe to be sufficient to prevent any "running across the border" type of activity.

3. Another change which was recommended and adopted involved the agency which would administer the various State plans. It has been pointed out to me that the Public Health Service prefers to deal with the State health agency in the administration of a program of this type. Therefore, the substitute provides that the State shall designate its State health agency as the local administrative agency.

4. There has been added a clause which is common to many grant-in-aid statutes and which provides for approval by the Surgeon General of methods of State administration and requires selection of State personnel under a merit system. I believe that such a provision is a good one and should assure a better administration of the program as a whole.

5. It has been thought wise to give the Surgeon General authority to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to the administration of the act. This would give him the authority to exercise supervision and control over methods of State administration. It would likewise give him the necessary authority to control, as the situation indicated, exactly what services and drugs, consistently with the spirit of the act, should be made available. Therefore, under his general authority to issue regulations, the substitute specifies that the Surgeon General shall have authority to expand or restrict the various services and drugs which are defined in the act under the term "medical aid."

6. I have also added a new provision which requires consultation with State health officers in advance of the issuance of regulations pertaining to grants-in-aid to the States under the act. This is a fairly common provision in this type of legislation, and I believe its inclusion here will improve the administration of the act. The general authority to issue regulations would also give the Surgeon General authority to control the dispensation of the drugs in question so that they would not be administered

otherwise than on prescription of a qualified practitioner. There is certainly relatively little danger that State and local officers would permit any improper practice of this kind, but it is important to state that the Surgeon General's general authority is intended to cover administrative matters of this kind.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

WAYS TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Ways to Industrial Peace," delivered by the Honorable Louis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, before the National Textile Seminar on May 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATOR WHO WALKS ALONE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BEAUMONT ENTERPRISE

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senator Who Walks Alone," written by Robert W. Akers and published in the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOLDIERS' CEMETERIES OVERSEAS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Visits to Our Dead," published in the Washington Post of May 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stealing a March," published in the Washington Post of May 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly called to consider the Palestine problem, by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, president of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine; Mr. Moshe Shertok, head of the political department of the agency; and Mr. David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish agency, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PERSISTENT DREAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Persistent Dream," published in the Washington Star of Friday, May 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR DIFFICULTIES OF COTTON FARMERS AND COTTON MANUFACTURERS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by me before the American Cotton Manufacturers Association at Augusta, Ga., on May 2. In this speech I called attention to some of the disturbing factors ahead with which those connected with cotton will be faced, whether they be manufacturers, workers, or farmers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your representatives in Congress are well aware of the postwar difficulties that have already been encountered by the cotton farmer and the cotton manufacturer. These difficulties will increase with the return of more normal crops and larger textile production outside of the United States. Realizing fully the obstacles ahead, particularly in dealing with foreign countries, those of us representing the cotton sections of the South and West held a meeting of 30 Senators and determined upon a concentrated bipartisan approach to the problems of the cotton interests. Senator GEORGE was elected chairman ex officio, and the committee appointed consisted of three Democrats, namely, Senators EASTLAND, SPARKMAN, and myself, and two Republicans, Senators KNOWLAND, of California, and KEM, of Missouri.

This committee was instructed by the Cotton States Senators to confer with the State, War, and Agriculture Departments in connection with the exportation of cotton and to prepare proper legislation to protect American cotton exports and other matters related to cotton.

After several conferences this committee has the assurance from the Departments that American dollars appropriated by the Congress either directly or indirectly will not be used in the purchase of foreign cottons to be shipped into American-occupied areas for use by the cotton mills in these areas of Germany, Japan, etc. But all purchases will be of American cotton for this calendar year.

It is expected through this December that we will ship some 35,000 bales of cotton per month for consumption in Germany and 65,000 bales for consumption in Japan. It is expected next year that perhaps these shipments and consumption may increase. However, it is the desire of the committee working with the War Department in the occupied areas that the consumption should be limited to approximately the amount of goods that can be sold.

The sale of textiles today is a little more difficult in foreign lands than it was some months ago due to the easing of prices and to the lack of credits due principally because of the confused political situation in the Dutch Indies and in India. This we hope will be adjusted.

We have been in constant touch with those in charge of the occupation through the State and War Departments, and it is my purpose to speak to you today and to discuss your situation so that this speech can be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that all the Senators of the United States may be fully aware of our problem.

We know today that many of our most capable spokesmen are busily engaged in working for the peace of the world and it is my fervent hope that they may be successful in establishing a permanent and lasting peace. We should do everything in our power to support them in their efforts to restore order out of chaos and to bring about the establishment of a type of peace which will successfully bring men of all nations to understand each other better, and to work sincerely for the good of the whole with a minimum of hardships for all, and without a disproportionate cost to any one group or groups.

As we contemplate the world's future and weigh the effect of the new world order of tomorrow upon our individual interests and efforts, it is, of course, perfectly natural for each of us to try to anticipate the result of the world changes upon the constituents which we serve and whom we represent. It behooves each of us to honestly and faithfully keep our attention, on the one hand, centered upon the building of a better world, and on the other hand concentrated upon the parts which each of our own States can play in the vital changes which face us and the effect of these changes upon the commonwealth for which we strive.

In South Carolina, the land of cotton, the welfare of our people is dependent directly or indirectly upon the world's most widely used natural fiber.

Therefore, I am thinking and speaking today of the thousands of citizens in my State who are affected directly or indirectly by cotton.

In our State of South Carolina there are 1,923,344 people.

Of this number approximately 1,000,000 are dependent directly or indirectly upon the income which results from the production, sale, or processing of cotton and its products.

Of this number, approximately 140,000 are directly engaged as workers in the production, ginning, and selling of raw cotton, and 113,900 are engaged in making it into yarn, cloth, garments, and other textiles.

I am particularly thinking of the cotton farmers and the cotton-mill workers in my State, who with their families, total approximately 1,000,000 people, and approximately 13,000,000 people in all of the United States. They are responsible for hundreds of millions of dollars of the income from cotton and its products which goes to make up the high standard of living of which we are so proud in America. This is no small part of our total economy. We can ill afford to jeopardize the permanency of such a great asset upon which such a large percentage of our people is dependent.

As a background for this reasoning I would call your attention to a few basic facts which deserve consideration.

First, the United States of America still is the largest single producer of raw cotton in the world, and also still occupies a very important relative world position in the manufacture of textiles and garments from cotton.

Second, during World War II nearly the entire world depended upon us for its cloth as the textile industry and raw-cotton production of the United Kingdom, India, China, and Russia were severely restricted or destroyed. It was the American cotton interests that clothed and produced the necessary cotton goods for our victorious allies. This is the record of emergency service of which we should be proud.

Third, I must remind you, however, that prior to World War II many of the nations which were later forced to decrease their production of cotton and cotton textiles were successfully increasing their production of cotton and manufacture of yarn and cloth.

Fourth, I must further remind you that each of these countries will quickly resume their increase in production of both raw cotton and textiles as soon as the circumstances affecting their economies return to normal. Many have already resumed the large-scale raising of cotton and manufacture of cotton yarns, cloth, and garments.

Fifth, I would emphasize the fact that the textile wages in the United States are the highest in the textile world.

Comparable figures throughout the world for textile workers before, during, and since World War II are inadequate for a complete picture, but the available statistics make it possible for us to take national pride in the fact that in the United States we pay the highest textile wages in the world. However, we cannot afford to overlook the consequences of too great a difference between our wage scale and foreign wages if our exports are to continue.

Sixth, I must draw attention to the fact that though textile methods in the United States are by far the most efficient in the world, and though productive efficiency per man-hour in the United States is greater,

there remains a net disparity in labor costs between the United States and the balance of the world which places our workers at a disadvantage. We must use our every effort to protect these workers and their wages by prohibiting the importation of cheap textiles, and, if necessary, subsidizing our exports.

Seventh, we must remember that the high standards, of living of which we are so proud in this country, are attended by comparatively high average incomes which enable us to afford automobiles, electric refrigerators, and the other commodities of higher unit cost, as well as the food and clothing items which are to be had for lower unit prices.

This contrasts sharply, however, with the many foreign countries which have lower standards of living, lower average incomes and who can only afford the purchases which represent smaller unit costs such as the bare essentials of food and clothing.

The net result of these basic facts is that there is a market for automobiles, electrical equipment, and other items of higher unit costs in the United States. This standard equipment is considered essential in this country, but in foreign countries they are so far beyond the income of the average person that there is little market for such products. Hence there is less likelihood of the development of a competitive industry for the manufacture of such products in most foreign countries. For years to come our American manufacturers of these lines of higher unit costs, particularly durable goods, are secure against world competition.

On the other hand, with staple foods and clothing the opposite is true. As shown, most of the foreign countries can raise cotton. Some of them can and will make their own synthetic yarns where they have been dependent upon cotton in the past. Practically all of them can make cotton yarns, fabrics, and garments, and with most of them there is a domestic market for such small unit-priced products as to justify an increase in raw-cotton production or synthetic-fiber production, and to encourage the building of their own domestic-textile industry. In fact, many of them are in process of doing just that today.

The conclusion which I draw from these basic facts is that American-raised cotton and American-made cotton yarns, goods, and garments will have a hard time meeting the severe world competition in which there is such a disparity in costs, both on the farms and in the mills, and in which there is developing such world competition as will encourage severe competition in every nation in the world.

It means that during the years immediately ahead, unless we are particularly careful, we are in danger of spreading the center of raw-cotton production all over the world and transferring the leadership in this essential agricultural activity from the farmers of the United States to foreign farmers all over the world.

It means that we are in danger of depriving our cotton-textile workers in South Carolina, and in the other textile States in the United States, of their jobs by the thousands and turning over those jobs to workers in Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, France, and the other nations of the world. Hence again I repeat, we must insist that no American dollars will be used for the purchase of foreign cottons or textiles and that we must subsidize our cotton and textile exports if necessary to assure our workers full protection.

My fears for the future are reflected clearly in the figures of the past. We are now, and for over a quarter of a century have been, in process of reducing our textile industry.

In 1923 we had in operation in the United States 36,300,000 spindles. By 1939 the number had decreased to 23,700,000. By February 1947, in spite of the war impetus, the number had decreased to 22,950,000. The total decrease for the 23-year period was 14,350,000 spindles or 39.5 percent.

Now you may quite properly point to the fact that during the war our textile industry arose to the emergency and produced more yarn and cloth than ever before in its history. That is true; but the production was made possible by an increase in third shift operations and by a great increase in overtime operations. Normally, through the years ahead, if the industry continues even its present rate of production, which is considerably below war production levels, it will soon produce more goods than America alone can consume. When the textile industry in foreign countries gets back into its normal production our own textile mills will be forced to depend almost entirely on the domestic consumption plus a little trade with the islands nearby and trade with our Central and South American neighbors.

It is clearly evident that unless something is done to rectify the situation our competitive foreign mills will entrench themselves in the world market, with the advantage of cheap labor, and soon be making encroachments upon our own American market as the Japanese did so skillfully before World War II.

It is my painful duty to admit that in the light of present trends our American textile industry and our southern raw cotton business are anything but secure.

I am deeply concerned about the textile industry; we can ill afford to lose its pay rolls and the millions of dollars which our National, State, and local governments derive from the taxes paid by the industry. I'm much concerned with the position of capital, although it can usually follow the trend and transplant its investment somewhere else where industrial possibilities are more favorable. It moved once from Old England to New England, and then from New England south. I am also concerned, for the cotton farmers who, by the thousands, will be unable to buy the expensive machinery which is needed for mechanization to reduce the costs of their cotton production, and they will thus be unable to meet the world cotton prices.

They will be thrown out of business and into other fields of endeavor if the new world order makes it easier for foreign farmers to sell cotton at prices far below the relatively high cost of American production. Furthermore, if the liquidation of our textile industry in the United States continues, where will these farmers go for new jobs? Heretofore, the cotton mills nearby have offered them employment at shorter hours and higher wages than they could make on the farms and thousands of them have found their solution there. Such is not likely to be the opportunity in the future.

Employment in the textile mills in the United States in September 1946 was 1,212,000, and this compares with 1,075,000 in 1945 and 1,130,000 in 1944. It is the highest since the peak war year of 1943.

We must be seriously concerned about the faithful textile workers of the United States if we are to continue to liquidate American spindles. These loyal American workers must be the center of our thoughts and we must not permit any international agreements or policies that would in any way deprive them of their jobs.

If our world policies result in depriving our American textile workers of their jobs and in transferring the employment to foreign workers, where will our surplus textile workers find employment in America? Most of the farms in the Southeast offer an income which is inadequate. If we lose over a fourth of our productive machinery to foreign countries, it means the loss of over a fourth of our textile jobs to foreign workers. That may be good for a new world order and for the foreign workers who find new and remunerative employment, but what of our own American workers who lose their jobs as a result? It is ideal to be a benevolent promoter of world welfare but what if we cripple ourselves permanently in helping others?

I would not for anything, promote international selfishness, and I am confident that the people in America are willing to carry more than their share of the cost of world rehabilitation, but I would be neglectful of my duty if I did not draw to your attention the dangers of changes which may encourage the promotion of industry elsewhere at the expense of our own.

The supplying of funds by our Government to help other governments may be questionable in itself as a world philanthropy for we may not know enough about the purposes to which such funds would be put. If, however, we know that in the step we will be promoting foreign industry and agriculture to compete with our own, it becomes a highly questionable venture.

Now I am well aware of the desirability of having adequate dollars in the possession of foreign countries to enable them to buy and pay for our surplus products; but when we supply the dollars therefor, either by gift, loan, or by financing the development of foreign industry and agriculture what do we gain by the step?

As a matter of practical business experience is it not a fact that there is only one workable and permanently profitable way in which impoverished nations can be rehabilitated, and that is by helping themselves, by returning to work and by getting off the dole? If, with limited capital this will take more time, what of it? Has it not taken centuries for our democracy to obtain maturity and strength, and did we not earn our security by hard work and privation, and against almost impossible odds? Certainly we in the South only advanced the hard way after reconstruction.

There is in process of completion today the charter of a new world order to be called the International Trade Organization. What it will finally contain is yet undetermined. It is a safe guess, however, that the wealthiest nation in the world will be called upon to finance most of it for the benefit of the poorer nations, and it also seems certain that it will likely work serious hardships upon those segments of our agriculture and industry which are least capable of protecting themselves against free trade and world competition.

In conclusion, let me express my deep appreciation for the excellent work you have accomplished in developing the cotton-mill industry of this country. It has been a pleasure for me to have been with you and I wish to assure you that I shall be alert at all times to the interests of cotton, its products, and the textile business which you represent. As a representative of a Southern State, I shall use my every effort on every occasion when I believe that the cotton farmer, the textile worker, or the cotton manufacturer is threatened in this changing world with unwarranted competition which would be provided by our own tax money in the many international organizations now in the process of creation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, since delivering this speech I have received several letters from England regarding the cotton situation, and request that one of these letters be printed following my speech. The serious circumstances now prevailing are set forth in this letter, which shows that the British Government is withholding all dollar credits from anyone desiring to purchase American cotton. It further shows the confused situation which has resulted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIRS: During the past 2 months, business for the importation of American cotton

to United Kingdom has been at a standstill. The cotton controller, board of trade, Liverpool, has been unable to consider any offers as a result of the action of the British Treasury withholding dollars for the purpose of purchasing raw cotton. Just how long this situation will continue, it is impossible to forecast.

Offers continue to be made, and some exceedingly cheap offers have been noted. It is understood that some American shippers have been offering for resale a number of China contracts which have been canceled. Even these exceptionally cheap offers have not induced the Treasury to allocate dollar funds for cotton buying. The following very erratic quotations are submitted as a guide to current offers:

MAY–JUNE SHIPMENTS

Strict Middling, 1 1/16-inch staple, 250 on July, New York.

Strict Middling, 15/16-inch staple, 200 on July, New York.

Middling, 7/8-inch staple, pass July, New York.

Strict Low Middling, 15/16-inch staple, 40 on July, New York.

CHINA RESALES—PROMPT SHIPMENTS

Middling, 15/16-inch staple, 130 off May, New York.

Strict Low Middling, 15/16-inch staple, 250 off May, New York.

Strict Low Middling, 7/8-inch staple, 570 off May, New York.

NEW CROPS—OCTOBER–DECEMBER SHIPMENT

Strict Middling, 1 1/16-inch staple, 355 on December, New York.

Strict Middling, 1-inch staple, 320 on December, New York.

Middling, 15/16-inch staple, 240 on December, New York.

Middling, 7/8-inch staple, 100 on December, New York.

We shall be pleased at all times to submit your offers to the cotton control, and trust that we may in due course have the pleasure of reopening your account in Liverpool.

Yours faithfully.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald-Tribune, which is self-explanatory. It refers to a bill passed by the British Parliament which deals the death blow to the Liverpool Cotton Exchange and cotton manufacturers of Liverpool and Manchester. This again will have a serious effect on raw cotton, as there will be no British competition. The Government will be the sole buyer. It will also adversely affect the price of all products made or concerned with cotton.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH COTTON BILL SET FOR KING'S SIGNATURE

LONDON, May 13.—Except for the formality of King George's assent, a bill banning private importation of cotton and closing down the famed Liverpool Cotton Exchange became law tonight.

The bill, already passed by the Commons, was given final passage in the Lords without a vote after Conservative Lord Rea, leading a last futile attack against the measure, declared 80 percent of Britain's cotton spinners opposed it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that certain tables referred to in the speech delivered by me before the American Cotton Manufacturers Association at Augusta, Ga., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Textile wages in other countries

Country	Hourly rate	Date
	United States cents	
Belgium	26.52	August 1945 (skilled workers).
Brazil	14.6	June 1946.
Canada	55.1	September 1946.
Chile	20.1	June 1946.
India	(1)	May 1946.

[1] $190 average annual earnings.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor.

Production of raw cotton in the United States, foreign countries, and the world, 1945 [1]

Country:	*1,000 bales* [2]
United States	9,015
Foreign—total	12,635
India	2,900
Russia	(3)

[1] Preliminary for crop year.

[2] Bales of approximately 478 pounds net weight.

[3] Comparable data not available.

Country—Continued

Foreign—Continued	*1,000 bales*
China	[4] 1,660
Brazil	1,950
Egypt	1,091
Peru	320
Mexico	428
Argentina	355
Uganda	218
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	210
Korea	163
Turkey	166
Iran	71
Total world	21,650

[4] Includes Manchuria.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Production of raw cotton, United States and foreign countries, 1940–45

[Thousands of bales] [1]

Year	United States	Total foreign nations
1940	12,566	17,964
1941	10,744	16,476
1942	12,817	14,208
1943	11,427	13,953
1944 [2]	12,230	12,385
1945 [2]	9,015	12,635

[1] Bales of approximately 478 pounds net weight.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

World's cotton spindles (active and idle), 1930–39

[Thousands of spindles]

Country	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
United States	34,025	32,673	31,709	30,893	30,942	30,093	28,147	26,988	26,372	25,261
Great Britain	55,207	54,246	51,991	49,001	45,893	42,688	41,391	38,753	36,879	36,322
Continent:										
Germany	11,070	10,591	10,233	9,850	10,109	[1] 10,109	[1] 10,109	10,236	11,074	12,967
France	10,250	10,350	10,144	10,144	10,170	10,157	9,932	9,783	9,794	9,794
Russia	7,612	7,612	9,200	9,200	9,800	9,800	9,800	10,050	10,050	10,350
Italy	5,342	5,397	5,384	5,338	5,493	5,483	[1] 5,483	[1] 5,483	5,395	5,324
Czechoslovakia	3,636	3,638	3,622	3,627	3,627	3,618	3,562	3,445	3,330	1,558
Belgium	2,172	2,164	2,156	2,087	2,106	2,090	2,009	2,004	1,986	1,984
Spain	1,875	2,070	2,070	2,070	2,070	2,070	2,070	2,070	2,000	2,000
Poland	1,554	1,555	1,706	1,818	1,696	1,688	1,707	1,693	1,748	1,704
Switzerland	1,446	1,381	1,346	1,303	1,295	1,265	1,241	1,269	1,241	1,249
Holland	1,167	1,215	1,213	1,224	1,236	1,219	1,220	1,191	1,209	1,241
Austria	817	768	767	758	774	760	773	776	(2)	(2)
Sweden	617	613	596	595	602	589	592	584	557	561
Portugal	503	503	453	446	452	459	466	469	490	444
Finland	262	262	263	263	271	284	310	313	310	310
Hungary	199	190	217	258	283	289	304	317	305	317
Yugoslavia	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	158	150	152	154	(2)	(2)
Denmark	99	99	100	100	100	99	99	99	(2)	(2)
Norway	60	58	56	58	48	47	48	44	(2)	(2)
Other Continent	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	1,615	1,600
Continent total	48,681	48,466	49,526	49,139	50,200	50,176	49,877	49,980	51,104	51,463
Orient:										
India	8,907	9,125	9,312	9,506	9,572	9,613	9,705	9,876	9,731	10,054
Japan	7,072	7,312	7,708	8,209	9,115	9,944	10,867	11,880	12,550	11,502
China	3,829	4,054	4,285	4,585	4,680	4,810	5,010	[1] 5,071	4,390	4,000
Total	19,808	20,491	21,305	22,300	23,367	24,367	25,582	26,827	26,581	25,556
Elsewhere:										
Canada	1,277	1,276	1,245	1,240	1,187	1,155	1,110	1,108	1,137	1,159
Mexico	767	791	830	832	862	862	862	869	830	884
Brazil	2,775	2,690	2,690	2,620	2,702	2,709	2,712	2,714	2,725	2,765
Argentina	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	310	310
Other countries	1,562	1,642	1,716	1,729	1,639	1,711	2,054	2,241	1,310	1,315
Total	6,381	6,399	6,481	6,421	6,390	6,437	6,738	6,932	6,312	6,433
World total	164,102	162,275	161,002	157,754	155,882	153,761	151,735	149,480	147,248	145,035

[1] Figure for Germany is as of July 31, 1934, figure for Italy is as of July 31, 1935, figure for China is as of Jan. 31, 1937. Later figures not available.

[2] Included in other continent.

[3] Included in other countries.

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Average weekly earnings, textiles and cotton manufactures

[Month of January 1940–47]

Date	Textile-mill products and other fiber manufactures	Cotton manufactures, except small wares
January:		
1940	$17.07	$15.18
1941	17.93	15.60
1942	22.33	20.40
1943	26.85	24.22
1944	28.19	24.66
1945	30.80	27.78
1946	32.45	29.01
1947	39.29	37.06

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Employment in textiles and cotton manufactures, 1940–46

[Thousands of production workers]

Year	Textile-mill products and other fiber manufactures	Cotton manufactures, except small wares
1940	1,124	411.8
1941	1,283	478.0
1942	1,285	505.9
1943	1,237	486.5
1944	1,130	439.5
1945	1,075	414.7
1946	1,195	[1] 449.1

[1] Preliminary.

Source. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Production of cotton in the United States

(Thousands of bales, 478 pounds net)

1940	12,566
1941	10,744
1942	12,817
1943	11,427
1944	12,230
1945	9,015
1946 [1]	8,482

[1] Estimated as of Dec. 1, 1946.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

United States exports of cotton cloth and yarn, 1940–46

Year	Cloth	Yarn
	Thousands of square yards	*Thousands of pounds*
1940	357,925	18,807
1941	593,074	24,431
1942	452,661	20,199
1943	546,562	16,389
1944	646,433	13,478
1945	679,506	13,595
1946	778,185	[1] 18,876

[1] Estimated.

Source: The Cotton-Textile Institute, Inc.

Cotton consumption, 1940–46

[Thousands of bales [1]]

Crop year ending July 31	United States consumption of American cotton	World consumption of American cotton [2]	United States consumption of all cotton	World consumption of all cotton [2]
1940	7,655	12,876	7,784	28,496
1941	9,576	11,867	9,722	26,542
1942	10,974	12,160	11,170	25,456
1943	10,930	12,243	11,100	24,205
1944	9,829	11,129	9,943	22,496
1945	9,448	10,948	9,568	21,030
1946 [3]	8,969	10,969	9,166	23,158

[1] American in running bales (counting round bales as half bales) and foreign in bales of approximately 478 pounds net weight.

[2] Preliminary and partly estimated.

Source: Compiled from reports of the Bureau of the Census, the New York Cotton Exchange Service, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and estimates by the Department of Agriculture, as contained in the Cotton Situation published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Number of active cotton spindles in the United States, 1923–46 [1]

1923	36,260,001
1924	35,849,338
1925	35,032,246
1926	34,750,266
1927	34,409,910
1928	33,569,792
1929	32,417,036
1930	31,245,078
1931	28,979,646
1932	27,271,938
1933	26,894,860
1934	27,742,462
1935	26,700,946
1936	24,664,428
1937	25,419,110
1938	24,774,004
1939	23,731,050
1940	23,585,938
1941	23,389,454
1942	23,607,508
1943	23,429,252
1944	23,018,828
1945	22,674,852
1946	[2] 22,586,512
February 1947	21,954,340

[1] Year ending July 31.

[2] Comparable figures for 1946 not available. This figure partly estimated by the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce; the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

Productivity and labor costs in principal textile countries

Country	Productivity	Labor costs
	Lbs. per man-hour	*Pence per lb.*
Japan	3.1	0.53
United Kingdom	4.5	2.20
United States	5.6	3.33
Germany	4.3	2.91
Switzerland	3.4	3.49
Italy	3.3	2.89
France	3.2	3.16
Netherlands	3.2	3.84
India	1.0	2.43

Source: International Labor Office, The World Textile Industry, Geneva, 1937.

Production of cotton textiles in the United States, 1940–46

Year:	*Millions of square yards*
1940	9,602
1941	11,328
1942	12,205
1943	11,569
1944	10,572
1945	9,779
1946	10,171

Source: The Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

United States imports of cotton textiles, 1940–46

Year:	*Thousands of square yards*
1940	84,344
1941	61,148
1942	17,643
1943	19,764
1944	11,188
1945	79,879
1946	44,514

Source: The Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

Number of spindles and looms operating, quantity of cotton used, and quantity of yarn and fabric produced in Japanese textile mills for specified months since the end of World War II [1]

Date	Spindles operating	Looms operating	Cotton used	Production	
				Yarn	Fabric
1945	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Bales* [2]	*Thous. of lbs.*	*Thous. sq. yds.*
November	(3)	(3)	(3)	2,066	4,999
1946					
January	[4] 364.8	[4] 33.4	[4] 4,293	3,069	5,621
April	490.4	35.6	5,837	4,052	5,769
July	824.4	40.0	20,027	8,290	12,957
October	1,624.3	54.0	52,196	20,930	39,435
1947					
January	1,734.7	74.9	66,009	26,980	47,047

[1] Data taken from reports of Civil Affairs Division, War Department except January 1947 from Mar. 5 issue of New York Journal of Commerce.

[2] Pounds of cotton reported used converted to bales by dividing by 478 pounds. January figure estimated.

[3] Not reported.

[4] Figures for February substituted as January data were not reported.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

COMMUNISTS—ARTICLE FROM TIME MAGAZINE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Communists," published in the May 19 issue of Time magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISTS

"CALL ON ME"

Pennsylvania's 67-year-old Senator EDWARD MARTIN was wounded, gassed, and decorated (DSC) in World War I and wound up his military career a major general of Pennsylvania's Twenty-eighth Division of the National Guard. He also acquired a soldierly bluntness, and last week he had an opportunity to use it.

In Washington for a 2-day encampment were some 450 Communist veterans of World War II. Reinforced by such articulate nonveterans as Singer Paul Robeson and Party Secretary Eugene Dennis, the Red vets denounced Greek-Turkish aid and demanded a Federal-works program. They also started a program of calling on home-State Congressmen. Most Congressmen refused to see them. But not MARTIN. In his office he listened to the spokesman for Pennsylvania delegates and then exploded:

"I respect the veteran and all that his uniform stands for. But when you come here representing the Communist Party you have no right to claim the respect and treatment due to veterans. No one can be faithful to American ideals and accept the teachings of communism.

"Is there any doubt what would happen if men like you convened in Moscow, in Russian uniform, to criticize the Soviet Government? * * * The lucky ones among you would be those who faced a firing squad and died quickly. The others of you would go in chains to the slave camps to toil and starve till you died the slow, hard way.

"That is Soviet communism in action. Yet, you have the colossal effrontery to tell the American Congress how you want things run. There is a place for those of you who prefer to live under communism. I suggest that you go there and stay there. If I can help to speed your departure, call on me."

The Pennsylvania Communists went away quietly.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] as they appear in the article I have just placed in the RECORD. If more men in high places had the intestinal fortitude to speak out on the dangers of various "isms," there would be less agitation for a change in our form of government.

Mr. President, it is high time that we turned at least a part of our attention to our own social and economic status and less to the theory that we can purchase the loyalty of foreign nations.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] submits an amendment dealing with the same general subject covered by the Kilgore amendment, and asks the Chair to rule whether it is in order. The Chair has had the Morse amendment analyzed by the Parliamentarian, and agrees with the Parliamentarian that the differences are sufficient to make the amendment in order. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census; and the amounts so apportioned to each State shall be expended only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects, but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless such institution submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), an additional amount of not less than 25 percent shall be expended in the facilities of nonprofit organizations without regard to the above limitations relating to State quotas or the tax-supported character of the organization. In meeting the requirements of this subsection, the Foundation may take into account whatever funds may be expended by it for facilities to be operated by the land-grant, tax-supported, or other nonprofit organizations, even though the title or ownership rights of such facilities remain with the United States.

FREIGHT-CAR CRISIS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to take about 10 minutes only, in order to make a very brief report on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dealing with the freight-car crisis in the United States. I am asking that copies of the statement I am about to make be placed on the desks of Senators, so that each Senator may have it before him when I shall have concluded.

Railroad freight traffic is being loaded into freight cars at a faster rate today than in any period since the lush year of 1929. For the first 17 weeks of 1947 the railroads loaded 13,759,962 cars. This is a larger number of cars than were loaded in the same period of any of the war years of 1943, 1944, and 1945. The shortage of freight cars, especially boxcars, will be more pronounced this year than it was last year.

At present there is a minimum of complaints from shippers about the shortage of cars. However, through the late spring and early summer months there is a lull in freight traffic offered the railroads. The heavy period of freight loading begins with July and continues into November. October and August are the heaviest freight-loading months in the year. It is in those months that complaints of freight-car shortages by shippers become the most pronounced.

The principal factor in increasing freight car demands from July to October over any other period in the year is the movement of the grain crop. The wheat crop demands more transportation than any other item of agricultural production. The wheat crop estimate for this year is for the largest crop ever raised. The forecast for the winter-wheat territory, which extends from Pennsylvania to Colorado and into the extreme northwestern part of the United States, is for 1,025,000,000 bushels. This will be by far the largest winter-wheat crop ever produced. Up to this year the whole United States has produced over a billion bushels of all kinds of wheat in 4 years only. These years were 1915, 1944, 1945, and 1946. Normally there is about 250,000,000 bushels of spring wheat produced, which is added to make the total production in the country.

This year the spring-wheat crop is late in being planted and no reliable estimate can be made of the probable production.

I am informing my colleagues in the hard winter wheat territory of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado, that the wheat crop estimate for these States is by far the largest that has ever been made. Final estimates on May 1 were as follows:

	Bushels
Kansas	263,243,000
Texas	112,425,000
Oklahoma	98,715,000
Nebraska	98,578,000
Colorado	47,147,000

The total in these five States alone will be 620,108,000 bushels. Wheat harvest in Oklahoma and Texas begins this week. By the middle of June the harvest in northern Oklahoma will be assuming major proportions and reaching over into southern Kansas. Northern Kansas, Nebraska, and eastern Colorado wheat harvest comes along in July. There is no transportation problem in the United States that swells to such gigantic proportions so quickly and requires so much transportation as movement of the wheat crop out of these States. The loading of 360,000 freight cars of the highest grade owned by any railroad will be required to move the complete wheat crop out of these States. In fact, more cars than that will be required.

Kansas is not only the largest wheat-producing State, but it is also the largest flour-milling State. For every two cars of wheat that moves into a flour mill three cars must be provided to move out the flour and feed products. The total movement from these States of wheat and flour will require not less than 450,000 boxcar loadings. I do not mean to say that all of this movement comes at one time. I speak of the total amount of transportation measured in car loadings required in a crop season. I repeat, however, that the movement of the wheat crop from these States provides the railroads with the most baffling transportation problem encountered anywhere especially as far as boxcar loadings is concerned. The size of the crop this year will present more difficulties than ever before.

The freight-car situation in the country is far from satisfactory. The railroads have about 1,750,000 freight cars of all types and descriptions. They have something over 700,000 boxcars of all grades of loading efficiency. Not over 40 or 50 percent of this freight-car supply is suitable for the movement of bulk grain.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate set up a subcommittee under Senate Resolution 47 on January 14 of this year to investigate the whole freight-car problem. That committee has held extensive hearings and still has some phases of the question to inquire into before it can conclude its work. Some of these matters had to wait for certain developments before we could conclude our labor. Let me briefly summarize the freight-car situation:

New freight-car construction fell to a minimum during the war years. Even after hostilities actually ceased, there was still a failure on the part of Government authorities to allocate sufficient materials to meet freight-car requirements. During 1946 the contract car-building companies built only about 30,000 cars. About 12,000 more freight cars were built in railroad-car shops. As against this total of 42,000 new cars, 65,000 freight cars were retired because of obsolescence.

The railroads testified before the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee they would retire 5 percent of their present rolling stock, which number, as I previously pointed out, is over 1,700,000. This would mean an average of 85,000 freight cars retired in each of several years.

The subcommittee found that the so-called expanded freight-car program was to build 7,000 freight cars a month, which would mean fewer new cars a year than

the railroads would retire. The committee was not satisfied with what it had heard, so it invited representatives of the railroads and of car-building companies and of steel companies to a conference. On February 26 the subcommittee held a most satisfactory conference in which 19 of the largest railroads in the United States were represented either by their presidents or vice presidents. All the car-building companies were represented by their executive officers. All the largest steel companies, including United States Steel Corp., sent top-ranking officials.

Steel is the bottleneck in freight-car building. At the end of the day all the steel companies present joined in an agreement to provide sufficient steel for the manufacture of 10,000 new freight cars monthly. Something over 4,000 new cars were turned out in April. That number should be expanded in May. In June, I hope that the number carried in the first program, 7,000 cars a month, will be reached. By July or August, we hope that the new cars will come out of the car-building and railroad shops at the rate of 10,000 monthly.

About half of these new cars will be boxcars. It will require, in my judgment, a construction program at this rate to be carried on for 24 months before the country is relieved of a definite freight-car, and especially a boxcar, shortage. It is my opinion that the railroads should have not less than 200,000 new freight cars. Not less than 100,000 new boxcars should be built. Only when that sort of a program reaches a successful conclusion will the country have a reasonably satisfactory railroad-car supply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas with respect to the very acute shortage of boxcars and other freight cars. All the agricultural areas are tremendously concerned about this problem. I know the shortage of boxcars is very acute in the wheat-growing areas for the reasons stated by the Senator from Kansas. An acute shortage exists with respect to cars for movement of crops which mature at one time and which require a great number of cars for transportation. The freight-car shortage is also very acute in my section of the country. We grow a great many peaches and watermelons in my State, and those crops simply cannot wait for cars to be assigned. They will spoil almost immediately they are picked.

I regret that I can secure so little encouragement from the statement of the Senator from Kansas, though the Senator shows great diligence in pursuing the facts. If I correctly understand his conclusion, it will be at least 2 years before we will have any substantial relief, and I apprehend that there will be a great deal of loss to the farmers of the Nation as a result of this freight-car shortage. If I correctly understood his statement, cars are being worn out and retired now more rapidly than they are being constructed, so the shortage is increasing instead of being remedied.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REED. It is a fact that freight cars are being retired presently more rapidly than new cars are being built. I did not intend to leave with the Senator the impression that there would be no moderation of the shortage for 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand the Senator to say that there would not be any moderation, but I understood him to say that the shortage would not be relieved for some time.

Mr. REED. It would not be completely relieved, of course. When we come to the time when 10,000 freight cars will be turned out each month, which I hope will be by August and certainly not later than September of this year, then the situation will be ameliorated every month thereafter in proportion to the addition of 10,000 new freight cars to the available supply. But I do not think the over-all freight-car supply of the country will come to the point where I would consider it to be completely satisfactory, for 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am pleased to know that the Senator from Kansas has applied his energies to this subject. I wonder if the Senator happened to see in the newspapers a statement made by Mr. Robert Young, the president of the C. & O. Railroad, that if Congress enacted into law the Bulwinkle-Reed bill, which the Senator from Kansas is espousing so earnestly, it would perpetuate the freight-car shortage, and that shortage would never be remedied.

Mr. REED. I did not see that statement by Mr. Young, and it would not have made any difference if I had seen it, because that is not the fact. There is absolutely no foundation in truth for such a statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I saw such a statement from Mr. Young in one of the Washington newspapers, which he made when he attended a Press Club luncheon in Washington. He was asked what effect he thought the Bulwinkle-Reed bill would have on the freight-car shortage as well as on removing discriminatory freight rates. He stated that in his opinion the enactment of the bill would perpetuate discriminatory freight rates as well as a shortage of cars.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I question whether or not Mr. Young made such a statement, because I cannot understand why any responsible railroad official, particularly the president of a railroad or the chairman of the board, as Mr. Young is, should make such a statement. There is no possible relation of that kind between the so-called Bulwinkle bill and the freight-car supply.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that there is one thing which I think the railroads could do to help themselves in the present situation and which they have done to such a minor degree as to be negligible.

The railroad rule is that the railroad having another railroad's car on its rails must pay the owning railroad a charge for the use of the car. This charge is known as the per diem charge. Initially it was $1 a day. Then it was raised to $1.15 a day.

There has been much pressure from those familiar with the subject to raise the so-called per diem charge. As a matter of fact, it is cheaper to pay $1.15 a day rental for a car than to own it. Therefore, an important number of railroads have not built a sufficient number of new cars to keep up their proportionate share of the general freight-car pool. One of the things which our committee has developed is that the per diem charge should be raised. That proposal was considered by the Association of American Railroads, and recently the association announced that it had raised the per diem charge from $1.15 to $1.25 a day.

Mr. President, that is as piffling an action as I have ever seen—so piffling that the Association of American Railroads ought to be ashamed to pay such slight attention to the freight-car situation.

We had before the committee the superintendents of transportation of all the western railroads, whom I happen to know quite well personally. They are the most skilled men in the country on this phase of operations. Of the 13 superintendents of transportation who were before the committee, 12 thought the per diem rate should be raised. Those 12 thought it should be at least $1.50, and some of them favored as much as $2 a day. If a railroad not owning enough cars should have to pay $2 a day instead of $1.15 a day, that railroad would be forced to build more new cars. Many railroads are building new cars. There are about 100,000 new freight cars now on order; but the action of the Association of American Railroads in raising the per diem rate from $1.15 to $1.25 is so trifling, so insignificant, so incomplete, so far from being an incentive to correct the situation, that the association ought to be ashamed of itself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before I surrender the floor I take this opportunity to join the Senator from Kansas in any criticism he might care to make of the Association of American Railroads. I think it is a monstrosity within a democracy to have any such organization as the Association of American Railroads. They have more power over the transportation system of this Nation than has the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Congress of the United States, or any other branch of the Government.

I confess I am impressed by Mr. Young's statements. It appeared not to make any impression on the Senator from Kansas. But Mr. Young has somewhat captured my admiration by the forthright declarations which he makes, evidencing a very real desire to see the transportation facilities of this country brought up to the requirements of our modern age. In my judgment, Mr. Young is as refreshing as a spring breeze in the general railroad picture. His attitude is so different from the "public-be-damned" attitude generally encountered in that area.

Mr. REED. Why does not the Senator say a Georgia peach?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that he is quite that good, but he is an extraordinary man. I heartily commend Mr. Young's attitude toward the traveling public and the shipping public. I think he is making a tremendous contribution toward the improvement of the transportation facilities of this Nation, in seeing that the railroads discharge

their proper function in our society, and that they are regulated by the Government rather than controlling the Government. He may be in the hair of his fellow railroad magnates, but his interest in improving traveling conditions is making a place for him in the hearts of the people.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia takes his seat I wish to say that I have criticized the Association of American Railroads whenever it has needed it, which has been more or less frequently. But I do not share the view of the Senator from Georgia, and I do not wish to leave any impression that I share the view that the Association of American Railroads, by and large, is a danger, or is oppressive of the railroads. I do not think it is. It is organized for a necessary function, and it does a reasonably good job. Whenever I find the Association of American Railroads doing such an insignificant thing, so ridiculous so far as the effect of its action upon the problem is concerned, I have never failed to utter my sentiments about that great association.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly did not wish to leave the impression that the Senator from Kansas associated himself with my views on the Association of American Railroads. I was merely expressing my delight at having the opportunity to join him in what I thought was a very valid criticism. I should be delighted to have him reciprocate and join me in some of my criticisms, to which he probably does not subscribe. I was delighted to have him express himself as he did with respect to the picayune action taken by the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. REED. To that extent I join the Senator from Georgia most heartily.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am moved to say a word about the work done by the Senator from Kansas in connection with the car-shortage problem. I speak because of the fact that, for the time being at least, I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The problem was presented to us in all its gravity. It was referred to a subcommittee of which the Senator from Kansas was chairman. In all the time during which I have served in the Congress, I have known of no instance in which a matter was more thoroughly, patiently, and intelligently considered than this subject was considered by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Kansas. I think he has made a great public contribution in helping to settle the agreement between the interested parties—the railroads, the manufacturing companies, and the car operators—under which the enlarged production of freight cars—and boxcars in particular—is to be provided.

I wished to say that much in the presence of the Senator from Kansas for the purposes of the RECORD.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the kind remarks made by the Senator from Maine. I believe that the shortage of freight cars, and especially of boxcars, is the most important crisis confronting our people today. It is useless to produce unless the commodities produced can be transported. Next to production itself, transportation and the facilities for transportation are the most important factors in our whole economy.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Kem	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Lodge	Sparkman
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McGrath	Thye
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to discuss the amendment which is pending, I wish to discuss another matter for a few minutes, because I desire to have the RECORD perfectly clear as to my position in regard to unanimous-consent requests.

The present occupant of the chair, as well as other Members of the Senate, I am sure, is aware of the fact that during the Seventy-ninth Congress I made very clear, I think, that as a matter of general practice I did not look favorably upon unanimous-consent requests to limit debate or to fix a time certain for voting on particular questions.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAXES (REPT. NO. 173)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments be made the unfinished business at the beginning of the session of the Senate on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether he intends to have that done, even though the National Science Foundation bill now before the Senate is not disposed of before that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, under all circumstances I would have the tax bill made the unfinished business, for immediate attention when the Senate assembles on Monday.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I would have to object to such a request, because I wish to have final action taken promptly on the National Science Foundation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey object?

Mr. SMITH. I would object, if the Senator from Colorado means to have the tax bill displace the position of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I had understood that the National Science Foundation bill was taken up with the understanding that it would not displace the tax bill on Monday.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, I hope the National Science Foundation bill will be disposed of today. But if it is not, and if it goes over until Monday, I would not wish to have it displaced by the tax bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say that is contrary to my understanding. I had thought it very clear that the matters which would come in after the main vote was taken in the middle of this week would not interfere with the tax bill on Monday.

Mr. SMITH. I did not so understand. If the Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent to have the tax bill made the next order of business, after the completion of action on the National Science Foundation bill, I would have no objection. But I should think we should complete our action on the National Science Foundation bill before we turn to other matters.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, my understanding was that if any other business was commenced this week and was not finished this week, it would go over until action on the tax bill was completed.

Mr. SMITH. I did not so understand.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, am I to understand that the Senator from New Jersey objects?

Mr. SMITH. I object, if the effect of the proposed agreement will be the displacement of the present position of the National Science Foundation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey object, or does he not object?

Mr. SMITH. I object to the request in the form in which it is made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make an inquiry: If the tax bill is made the unfinished business on Monday, will the Senator from Colorado object to having the Senate return to consideration of the National Science Foundation bill after the preliminary

speeches and explanations in regard to the tax bill have been made?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been my understanding that I have not agreed that the tax bill should be interrupted for anything. I deferred bringing up the tax bill previously, so that some interim measures could be disposed of. But my clear understanding was that there would be no interference with bringing the tax bill up on Monday. That is my purpose in asking unanimous consent, under my understanding of the situation.

I ask unanimous consent to submit the report of the Senate Committee on Finance on House bill 1, up to midnight tonight, so that it may be printed and be placed on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The bill to supply deficiencies in veterans' appropriations has been reported and is on the calendar. There are deficits in the appropriations for some departments, at least they are "up against the gun," so to speak, and to insure orderly operation of the departments and bureaus affected it is important that we take the bill up this afternoon. I do not think there will be any major objection to the bill, and I hope that in the course of the afternoon permission will be given to bring it up for rather quick action. I think I can assure the Senator from New Jersey that it will not take a great deal of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator from New Hampshire is addressing a remark to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRIDGES. With the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon, I have stated that there is on the calendar a deficiency bill which contains emergency items for departments and bureaus, some of which are "up against the gun" on account of lack of money with which to meet current expenditures. I do not think there will be any difficulties in connection with the bill; at least I think we have ironed them out pretty well, and a little later in the afternoon I should like to take a few minutes' time to have the bill considered and passed, if the Senator from New Jersey will have no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I see no objection, at the moment. I would not want the Senate to get into a long debate which might prevent our finishing the consideration of the pending bill today, because we have been attempting for 3 days to complete debate on it.

Mr. BRIDGES. If any major fight on the deficiency bill develops, I shall withdraw it, and not try to complete it today. My only thought is to keep the various departments of Government functioning in an orderly way, and enable them to make their plans. I for one shall not feel bad if they have to squeeze along for awhile, but I am trying to have provision made so that the departments may be conducted in an orderly way, and I do not think there will be any major objection to the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not a fact that the bill is very short?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. I doubt if consideration of the bill would take more than half an hour at the outside.

Mr. SMITH. I should be glad to accommodate the Senator. Did I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to say that he would bring the bill up later?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; when a convenient lull occurs.

Mr. SMITH. There are only a few amendments to the pending bill left to be acted on. I do not think the consideration of any of them will take a long time after the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has completed his remarks. It had been our hope to complete the matter today and have the slate all clean for Monday. I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator from New Hampshire so that he may bring up his bill, if it will take only a reasonable time to dispose of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I return to a very brief discussion of my position in regard to unanimous-consent requests. I can imagine no more appropriate time to make these comments than now, in view of the request made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and that made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—two requests which are quite different in nature—one going to the question whether we will proceed, while we are considering another measure, to take up a deficiency appropriation bill, and the other seeking to have the pending unfinished business laid aside in order to proceed with the consideration of a major piece of legislation.

I wish to discuss today, in connection with the unanimous-consent problem, two matters: First, my views as to the policy underlying unanimous-consent agreements of certain types; and, second, the procedure which I think should be followed in the Senate, by unanimous consent itself, let me say, to protect the interests of each Member of the Senate.

I wish to point out that, so far as the rules are concerned, the only rule I have been able to find on the subject is rule XII, appearing on page 16 of the Rules of the Senate, which reads:

> No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the presiding officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present; and when a unanimous consent is thus given the same shall operate as the order of the Senate, but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted in the manner prescribed above upon 1 day's notice.

In other words, the existing rule does not afford as a matter of right, protection by way of a quorum call when a unanimous-consent agreement is asked for a vote on any pending amendment to a piece of legislation. Under the rule, our rights can be protected only in case the unanimous consent, as the rule says, calls for the taking of a final vote, on a specific date, upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution.

I wish to have it clearly understood that such objections as I am raising in these comments to a practice of the Senate are not raised on the basis of any contention on my part that the rights of Members of the Senate are being violated by the practice that is growing in the Senate so far as the rules are concerned. But I desire to say that I think the practice which is being followed in regard to unanimous-consent agreements has on many occasions, and will on more, if it be continued, do injustice to the interests of various Members of the Senate when the legislation pending is of concern to them, and the unanimous-consent agreement provides for a vote at a certain hour, on an important amendment.

I point out that very often a vote on an amendment, so far as differences of opinion on the floor of the Senate are concerned, may be more important than a vote on the bill itself. Very frequently, when we are considering legislation in the Senate, the real fight on the floor is over amendments rather than over the bill itself.

Yet, particularly in this Congress, in the name of speeding up business of the Senate, more and more unanimous-consent agreements have been sought without quorum calls. Once before in this session, when I was summoned to answer a long-distance telephone call, and the particular matter before the Senate was of vital concern to me, a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into—though not deliberately with the idea of getting action while I was out of the Chamber, as I made clear at the time—when, had I been on the floor, I would have objected, or had a quorum call been had my interests in the matter would have been fully protected, because I then would have been present and would have objected.

As I was saying, in the Seventy-ninth Congress I tried to make clear, and I want to reiterate it here this afternoon, why I think, as a matter of general practice, we should not enter into unanimous-consent agreements, except under extraordinary circumstances, and that whenever unanimous-consent agreements are proposed on any matter of substance there ought to be a quorum call in advance of the agreement. It is clear, Mr. President, that Senators are not entitled to such a procedure as a matter of right, under the rules, although I think we ought to be able to come to such an understanding, a sort of gentlemen's understanding, about it on the floor of the Senate, without any change in the rules.

I shall be very glad to submit to the Committee on Rules and Administration, however, such an amendment to the rules as I am now discussing. I am having such an amendment prepared and will submit it in due course of time.

Why do I think that unanimous-consent agreements to vote as of a certain time are, as matter of policy, bad? Primarily, Mr. President, because I think one of the greatest safeguards to be found anywhere in our representative-government set-up, is the precious right of unlimited debate on the merits of an issue in the Senate of the United States.

I shall not repeat at any length the distinction I draw, and the distinction I drew in the last session of Congress, between a discussion on the merits of an issue and a filibuster. I think the difference is perfectly clear. But I do take the position, Mr. President, that we should not limit debate in the Senate on the merits of an issue, by a unanimous-consent agreement, in the absence of a quorum call; because the right to walk on to the floor of the Senate and discuss a question as long as any Member of the Senate believes it should be discussed, is a right which belongs, in my judgment, not so much to us as Senators, but to the people of the United States. It is one of their great safeguards. It is one of the best checks they have against the development of abusive practices in government. I think that no attempt should be made in the Senate, either by practice or by rule, to limit that right, or to put Members of the Senate in a position so that they entertain the feeling that if they rise to protect that right they will bring down upon their heads the resentment of certain of their colleagues. Any tendency in that direction—and there is such a tendency, Mr. President—ought to be stopped and stopped now.

I fully appreciate the fact that by clinging to this view of mine concerning the importance of protecting unlimited debate in the Senate, I have not made myself particularly popular in certain quarters in the Senate. I think it is only fair that I serve notice this afternoon that, although I shall continue to pass judgment upon the merits of each unanimous-consent request that is submitted, I shall as a matter of practice, if the unanimous-consent request involves what, in my opinion, is a question of substance, always request a quorum call; and unless it can be clearly shown to me that there is no inclination on the part of any Senator to debate further the merits of the issue, I shall as a matter of general policy object to such unanimous-consent requests.

Too frequently, Mr. President, after a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, an entirely new angle of the issue will develop, and it will be found that there is no opportunity then, because of the agreement that has been entered into, to explore that angle of the issue. Furthermore, in recent requests, the time has been fixed at 1 o'clock. On three occasions, Mr. President, when the Senate convened at 12 o'clock with a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 1 o'clock, it has required from 15 to 30 minutes to obtain the presence of a quorum. This afternoon it required several minutes after the absence of a quorum was suggested, before a quorum was obtained and the discussion could proceed on the merits of the Kilgore amendment, which was then pending before the Senate.

The situation today was in my judgment particularly unfortunate, because there has been on the desks of the Members of the Senate an amendment, the amendment which I am about to discuss, since April 2. I intended to discuss it at some length yesterday afternoon. However, I was called from the floor by constituents from my State to discuss a very important problem which has reached critical proportions, namely, the disposition of a great shipyard now held by the War Assets Administration, known as Swan Island. My constituents wanted to know from me what the status of the Swan Island case was, and so we went down to the restaurant to have coffee while I explained to them what the records in my office showed to be the situation in regard to Swan Island. To my great astonishment, the bell started ringing while I was carrying on that conversation. The Senate had recessed. I rushed back to the floor of the Senate and discovered that a unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into to vote on the Kilgore amendment at 1 o'clock this afternoon.

It is true, Mr. President, that, as the Chair has ruled, there is sufficient difference between the Kilgore amendment and the Morse amendment so that even after defeat of the Kilgore amendment my amendment remains in order; but as we proceed through the discussion later this afternoon on my amendment it will be seen that the basic principle of the two amendments was identical, the same principle running through both amendments. The differences that justified the ruling of the Chair were the difference in the amount of money, the formula that should be used in the distribution of the money to the States, and one particular provision in my amendment, not found in the Kilgore amendment, in regard to the allowance of money for the installation of scientific facilities in nonpublic institutions. So we were confronted with the situation in which both those amendments should have been considered together. I fully expected they would be considered together, so that a choice could be made, at the time we voted on the Kilgore amendment, and so that a full understanding of the reasons why I thought my amendment was superior to the Kilgore amendment would be in the minds of Members of the Senate before they voted at 1 o'clock. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into within the rules; I do not question that; but it was entered into without a quorum call. I say I think that, unintentionally, the proposers of the unanimous-consent agreement did me an injustice, so far as my amendment is concerned, because I think I should have been allowed the opportunity to discuss my amendment prior to a vote on the Kilgore amendment.

There must be, it seems to me, a spirit of accommodation in the Senate. All Senators may not share my views on the unanimous-agreement problem, but they are my views, from which I have no intention, so long as I am in the Senate, of retreating. I believe that by implementing and effectuating those views I shall make a contribution to preserving without any question the unlimited right of debate on the floor of the Senate. Of course, until an amendment can be made under rule XII so as to provide that no unanimous-consent agreement can be entered into in the absence of a quorum call the only protection I have, so far as my view is concerned, will be a spirit of comity, if it exists in the Senate—and I am sure it does—a spirit of accommodating ourselves to the differing points of view of other Members of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I here and now, this afternoon, officially and formally want to say, through the RECORD, to the majority leader, that it will be the desire of the junior Senator from Oregon, when he is off the floor—and he is seldom off the floor, Mr. President, unless he is engaged in official business—but if he is off the floor because he is out of town, then the request he now makes is not to be heeded, because he feels that any Senator who is not present in the Senate because he is out of town in connection with his own private affairs has no right to any protection from the Senate insofar as his views are concerned on such a subject as the Senator from Oregon is now discussing.

The other day when I was away making a speech in a nearby town I was reached on long-distance telephone, and the question was asked me as to whether or not I would object to fixing the time for debate as of the next day at 1 o'clock, and, as my colleagues know, I said, "I am not entitled to raise any such objection over the telephone. If I want to make any such objection as that I should be on the floor of the Senate to make it. But it so happens that this is a long-standing engagement, and I cannot be present in the Senate today, so if a vote is had today pair me; and so far as tomorrow is concerned, if the Senate enters into a unanimous-consent agreement this afternoon respecting tomorrow, I feel it is no concern of mine while I am off the floor."

That is the position I take as a matter of principle, Mr. President, but I want the record to be made perfectly clear that when I am within the precincts of the Senate it is my desire that the majority leader, or whoever is occupying the chair of the majority leader, give me the benefit of a quorum call before a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, because I think it can be presumed that usually I shall object to such unanimous-consent agreements unless such conditions as I have heretofore discussed in my remarks can be complied with under the agreement.

Mr. President, that does not mean that the majority leader is not going to secure from the junior Senator from Oregon a great deal of cooperation in regard to unanimous-consent agreements. I think I have demonstrated in the present

session of Congress that I have been exceedingly cooperative in regard to unanimous-consent agreements. I think, however, that we are abusing the unanimous-consent agreement procedure. I think we have been entering into too many of them. I think we have been limiting debate too much. I think there have been too many occasions on which, because of unanimous-consent agreement, we have not been able, because of developments after the agreement was entered into, completely to explore the merits of a given proposition, and make a full and complete record on the proposition for the benefit of other Senators, so they could judge for themselves whether they wanted to vote the pending piece of legislation up or down.

I intend to continue to cooperate as I would have here this afternoon with respect to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire. I would not have objected to that request. The request of the Senator from Colorado, however, it seems to me, was on a matter of such substance that it should have required a quorum call, and had the request not been objected to by the Senator from New Jersey I would have asked for a quorum call. I myself had no personal objection to his request, but because the matter was one of substance, it seem to me that I owed it to any other member in the Senate who might, if he were in the precincts of the Senate, have been brought to the floor by a quorum call, to protect his interest in the matter by giving him an opportunity to object if he cared to.

Mr. President, I hope this statement will make perfectly clear the view of the junior Senator from Oregon. I repeat, I take this position out of firm conviction and belief, not out of any desire not to cooperate with the leaders of my party in the Senate. Cooperation works both ways too, Mr. President. It is a two-way street. Holding the views I do in regard to this matter, I do not think it is unreasonable, when such a situation arises as arose yesterday afternoon, that I may be extended the courtesy of a roll call, so that I may prevent such an unfortunate result as that which, in my judgment, followed the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into yesterday afternoon.

Now, Mr. President, I turn my attention to the pending amendment. I want to read the first part of it and comment on it, and then later in my speech I shall discuss the second part of it. The amendment provides:

> Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census; and the amounts so apportioned to each State shall be expended only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements.

I pause, Mr. President, to point out the important language in the latter part of the sentence just read:

> Pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements.

In other words, they do not secure the money automatically. Under my amendment they are going to have to enter into suitable contracts with the Foundation, make satisfactory financial arrangements with the Foundation, before they will be entitled to any funds.

> In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects, but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless such institution submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the terms "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, I do not know how an amendment could be surrounded with greater protection and safeguards, so far as the Foundation is concerned, than are provided by the language I just read. What it means, in effect, is that not a single dollar automatically goes to any tax-supported institution or land-grant college as a matter of right, but any tax-supported institution, university, or college, or land-grant college, if it can enter into satisfactory contracts and financial arrangements with the Foundation, and if it "submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act," shall then be entitled to funds.

I think we ought to take note of one realistic fact in this picture. Senators may indulge in all the discussion they want to, as has already been carried on by my distinguished colleagues, to the effect that the Foundation is not to be set up in any spirit of discrimination against land-grant colleges or State-supported universities. Senators can make all the statements they want to to that effect, but they cannot get away from the fact that there are many educators and many scientists in State universities and land-grant colleges who fear that that will be the result. That is their fear. I am going to put evidence in support of that assertion into the RECORD later on. I believe that, if the National Scientific Foundation itself is going to accomplish the great objectives it has in mind, it must take into consideration that fear on the part of many educators and many scientists. Senators will find from my later remarks that I enthusiastically support the objectives of the National Science Foundation; I enthusiastically support such a Foundation; but I think my amendment would strengthen the National Science Foundation because it would remove the suspicion now in the minds of a great many college administrators and scientists on the faculties of our universities and land-grant colleges that the bill as proposed, as the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out earlier today, concentrates too much power and control in a very small group of men over the scientific development and research program so needed, it seems to me, if we are going to keep pace with scientific developments all over the world.

The witnesses whom I shall introduce this afternoon by way of correspondence are witnesses of very high standing, equally comparable in their national standing in the scientific world with any of the witnesses who have been presented as proponents of the bill without change. It seems to me that when we have such a division of opinion among the college administrators and scientists of America as to the administrative procedure which should be followed by the National Science Foundation under the law creating it, we ought to try to arrive at a compromise of those differences. We ought to try to do away with any basis of suspicion or question as to whether or not scientific research in our land-grant colleges would, in fact, suffer as a result of the bill unless such an amendment as the one I am proposing were enacted.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the language of my amendment would protect the Foundation. It would give to the Foundation control over contracts and financial arrangements. It would give the Foundation the right to pass upon the particular scientific experiment or project proposed by a given college. If the project were found to be sound, the provisions of my amendment would apply. I think it is very desirable—and that is why I have so provided in the amendment—that there should be an obligation on the Foundation when it comes to formulate its scientific budget and its plans for the expenditure of that budget, to make arrangements to spend two-fifths of it in the States on such an apportionable basis as the language of my amendment provides, if the institution in the States can come forward and meet the remainder of the requirements of the amendment.

If my amendment were enacted into law I believe it would provide a great stimulus to scientific research in the small laboratories in many of the small colleges of America. If we look into the history of American scientific research, it will frequently be found that in the laboratory of some little college a keen scientist will bring forth a great discovery for the benefit of mankind. As an example, I cite the great experiment which was conducted in the chemistry laboratories of the University of Oregon a few years ago by one of the great chemists of America, now with the University of Texas. His name is Roger Williams. I shall read a quotation from him shortly. He made a great discovery in the field of chemistry. His discovery was the forerunner of many subsequent findings in regard to vitamins.

I think also of the work which was done on heavy water in the chemistry laboratory of the University of Oregon by Professor Stafford, a great chemist who is now deceased.

On practically every campus in this land there are great scientific minds

which ought to be encouraged. They should not have to be faced, as so many of them have been faced in years past, by a lack of funds in going forward with their scientific research, which benefits all of us. I think the scientists in the land-grant colleges and tax-supported schools all over the country need encouragement.

It seems to me that the argument that if this type of amendment is adopted the result will be so to dissipate the available funds that no substantial result will flow scientifically from their expenditure is weak from two standpoints.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator thought of the effect on our national security of concentrating our scientific work in a few centers? It seemed to me—and that is one reason why I was one of the sponsors of the amendment just voted down—that we should not concentrate our scientific brains in half a dozen colleges, but should spread them out all over the country, in the interest of national security if for no other reason.

The Senator may recall that during the hearings on the education bills many witnesses placed strong emphasis on the contention that we should first of all help public schools and publicly operated and supported colleges. It developed in the course of those hearings that 61 percent of the veterans who are attending college under the GI bill of rights are attending State universities or land-grant colleges and only 39 percent are attending privately operated colleges. It seems to me that decentralization is vitally important in the interest of national security, if for no other reason.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the contribution of the Senator from Vermont to this discussion. He raises a point which I intended to raise, but he has covered it so much better than I could that I am very glad to have his observations in the RECORD at this point. I shall pass over the point with the comment that I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Vermont.

I believe that under the terms of the bill in its present form the result would be to have such concentration of scientific research as to constitute a great mistake. From the standpoint of national security I think it is important that research be spread out over the land, and that all our scientific research laboratories be kept humming at top speed.

That brings me back to the point which I was making in regard to the arguments which the proponents of the bill have been making on the floor of the Senate, namely, that if we adopt such an amendment as the one I propose, there is danger that the money will be so dissipated and spread out so thin that no really great contribution will flow from the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. President, I do not believe that experience will support that view. After all, it overlooks one of the most important features of scientific research. Scientific research is really done for the most part in small segments. One does not walk into a laboratory and dump a big research problem into the laboratory. That is not the way good scientific research is done. Minds working on small segments of a problem in all parts of the country and all parts of the world reach their findings as to that particular phase of the problem. Then we find scientists gradually putting together, as one would put together the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, the findings as they come in from the many laboratories of the world. The final result is some great research contribution, such as the atomic bomb. After all, the atomic bomb was not developed in World War II. The atomic bomb has been developing for decades as a result of the work of physicists and chemists all over the world. It was speeded up during World War II. Great strides were made in World War II. During that time there were brought to bear the results of research on many segments of the problem which had been carried on for many years in hundreds of laboratories all over the world. So I do not think that the contention of the proponents of the bill is that it is necessary to be able to concentrate a huge sum of money in some one laboratory in order to do a stupendous piece of research work is sound. I do not believe that is the best way to carry on research.

I think the second weakness in that argument, Mr. President, is that it seems to assume that the research fund will be static. Let me say that I have no idea today how much money will or should be spent for research within as short a time as 3 years from the present time. Certainly not 5 or 10 years from today. I think we should enact a law which would put to work the scientists of America in every laboratory in America, I care not where they may be located, who can come forward with a sound research program that will meet the terms and conditions of this amendment. It seems to me that the only limitation that should be placed on scientific research in America is the limitation of sound proposals for research. These are days, Mr. President, when, if we are to think of the future generations of America to any extent, we should recognize that we must appropriate whatever amount of money is required in the years immediately ahead in order to carry on scientific projects that may be presented to the National Science Foundation for work in the laboratories of the University of New Mexico, in the State college in Minnesota, in the State college in Oregon, or any other place in this land. In my judgment, it certainly would not be in the interest either of national security or the prosperity of the people themselves to adopt a very economical point of view in regard to expenditures for research.

So I say, in leaving this point, that my amendment provides the safeguards necessary to protect the National Foundation from the dissipation of its funds, because it will not have to make available any of the funds under the so-called two-fifths allocation of its budget unless the scientists in the colleges can come forward with a research project which meets the standards of the Foundation.

The second part of the amendment I understand is one about which some Senators have some doubt. I am making no offer now by way of an amendment to my amendment, nor am I making any offer to strike the language which I am about to read. But it has been told me, since noon, by several Members of the Senate—three, to be exact—that if I would agree to strike the language in line 16, on page 2, beginning with the word "Of", to the end of the amendment, they would vote for the other part of the amendment.

I think the Chair knows that I try to be very reasonable in compromises on proposed legislation. If I cannot have all in a bill that I think should be in it, but can get some of it, and the language that remains in the bill is good, I am willing to enter into such compromises. So I want to say that from now on, during the remainder of the afternoon, until a vote is taken on my amendment, if any Members want to whisper in my ear to the effect that they will go along with the first part of my amendment but will not go along with the second part of it, if I can reach the statistical conclusion that by counting noses the adoption of the first part of my amendment will result, I think I would be open to reason on striking the second part. But it seems to me that the second part is desirable, and I want to read it. It is as follows:

> Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), an additional amount of not less than 25 percent shall be expended in the facilities of nonprofit organizations without regard to the above limitations relating to State quotas or the tax-supported character of the organization. In meeting the requirements of this subsection, the Foundation may take into account whatever funds may be expended by it for facilities to be operated by the land-grant, tax-supported, or other nonprofit organizations, even though the title or ownership rights of such facilities remain with the United States.

Of course, Mr. President, the purpose of that language is to provide the necessary laboratory facilities and equipment for some of our keen scientific minds that are working frequently under great handicaps in some of our small colleges in which the facilities are not adequate for them to do the job as fast as they could do it if they had the facilities, or, sometimes, as accurately as they could do it if they had better facilities and equipment.

Again, I want to be perfectly honest about that provision of the amendment. It does provide a form of scientific aid by way of physical facilities and equipment to colleges and universities and nonprofit research organizations which do not now have facilities of as high a quality as they may need for a job which they have the scientific brains to do. After all, we can have the best scientists—and we do have very good scientists in many of the small colleges—but if a scientist does not have the tools with which to work he cannot produce the desired result.

Let me be frank about it from another angle, Mr. President. The tendency—and it is a desirable one—to give governmental support to scientific research is having and will have an increasingly devastating effect on the science faculties

of many of our universities and small colleges and, in turn, will have a very unfortunate effect upon our college students, because there will naturally be an ever-greater tendency for good scientific minds to leave the small colleges and universities and go to larger institutions which may be more favored and, I think, will be more favored under the bill as it is presently written. So I want to make a plea to protect the personnel of the science faculties of our land-grant colleges and universities throughout the country, because it is only human that if they see that Congress has passed a National Science Foundation Act and, through the administration of that act, it becomes more easy for a man at Massachusetts Tech or Harvard or Princeton or Columbia or Yale or the University of Michigan, the University of Pennsylvania, or Cornell, or some of the other larger universities to get financial research assistance, then there will be rather "easy pickings," shall I say, for the larger institutions when it comes to "pirating" them away from the faculties of our small colleges and universities because of the research advantages offered them under the bill as proposed. I say, Mr. President, it is not fair to the college students of America. We need to keep on all of our faculties exceedingly able scientists, because, after all, they are not only research men themselves, but they are teachers and inspirers of young scientific minds who catch a vision from those great teachers, and then dig in and go on to do graduate work in science, and later themselves become great scientists.

I say it is only a part of the argument—but in my judgment it is a part which cannot be overlooked—that unless we make provision in this bill at least to give the scientists in our smaller educational institutions a better chance, by way of some such amendment as mine, to receive a share of the funds that are to be appropriated for scientific research, the tendency will be for those men to leave those faculties, and go to the larger scientific research centers and universities; and then they will be lost to the field of scientific education. Mr. President, let me say that if we in the Senate this afternoon are compelled to make a judgment in regard to relative values, it seems to me it will be rather difficult to determine which is more important, so far as the future of this country is concerned, immediate research or the training of young scientific minds in larger number, so that 10 or 15 years from now such young people can be scientists of repute. I think that point has been too much overlooked in this whole discussion.

I think the provisions of my amendment will give the protection which the smaller colleges and the administrators of smaller colleges need in encouraging men of ability to accept teaching positions on their faculties, in order to make it possible for young Americans to be trained soundly in science, and to give them, through the provisions of such an amendment as mine an opportunity to do research work in the laboratories of those colleges. To the extent that those colleges need help in securing scientific equipment and laboratory equipment, I think the amount of assistance provided by my amendment is not unreasonable

Mr. President, let us consider the statements of the educators and the scientists themselves. Let me say now that, for the most part, the remaining part of my speech will consist of a discussion of letters which I have received from college administrators who feel that the amendment I am offering is vital insofar as the passage of a sound National Science Foundation bill is concerned.

On April 9, 1947, I received a letter from the president of the University of Oregon, Dr. H. K. Newburn, one of the distinguished educators of the United States. He wrote as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, April 9, 1947.

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which came today from President Virgil M. Hancher, of the University of Iowa, who is secretary-treasurer of the National Association of State Universities.

I should like to add my testimony to that which is undoubtedly coming to your desk from others, to the effect that I should like to see S. 526 amended to take care of the allocation of research funds to States, in order that a university such as this may be assured of some part in these funds.

Sincerely yours,

H. K. NEWBURN,
President.

Mr. President, that is the view of the president of the State University of Oregon, and he sets forth the view of the president of the University of Iowa, who is secretary-treasurer of the National Association of State Universities.

Now, let us examine the memorandum to which he refers. It is signed by Virgil M. Hancher, and it reads as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE UNIVERSITIES,
Iowa City, Iowa, April 4, 1947.

To the Members of the National Association of State Universities:

I understand a communication has gone out to the members of the Association who are also members of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities pointing out that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended for passage an amended version of S. 526 to create a National Science Foundation. I shall not duplicate that letter, but am writing to those institutions which are not members of the Land-Grant Association.

S. 526 as amended does not provide for distribution of research funds by States. Instead it names the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the National Academy of Sciences as organizations whose nominations for the Foundation will be considered by the President. Inasmuch as these are to be considered with those of other educational and scientific organizations, the provision is not likely to be particularly effective.

Apparently allocation of research funds by States is regarded by some members of the Senate and House as "pork barrel" legislation. The arguments against concentration of research in a few institutions and in favor of stimulating research in many diversified institutions are too well known to you to require repetition here.

However, it would be desirable for you to get in touch with your congressional delegation promptly—your Senators immediately—and give them the benefit of your views. It is thought possible that S. 526 can be amended from the floor if there is sufficient evidence of public interest in an amendment.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGIL M. HANCHER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. President, it was perfectly clear from his letter that Dr. Newburn, president of the University of Oregon, after receiving Mr. Hancher's letter, went into the matter, found himself in agreement, and wrote to me under date of April 9 as I have already stated.

Not because I think my views are entitled to anywhere near the weight of the views of the college administrators whom I shall now quote, but because my views do have a little bearing, being based upon 21 years of experience as a teacher on the faculties of some American universities, I want to testify here and now that I think there is a great need throughout this land for Federal aid to scientific research in the college laboratories of the United States. As dean of the law school at my State university, I sat for many years on the research council of the university, the council that had the administrative task of allocating to men of science on our faculty the limited research funds we had in our university budget. I wish to say that many times I was saddened when I thought of the great contributions which could be made, but would not be made because we were not able to allocate to some chemistry professor or some professor in physics or some professor in one of the other sciences, $1,000 or $1,500 or $2,000, to enable him to go ahead with a particular research project. I am sure that the president of the University of Iowa and the president of the University of Oregon know what they are talking about when they make this appeal to the Senate, through me, this afternoon, to have this National Science Foundation bill amended so that at least some provision will be made in it for the allocation of funds to these institutions, when they can show, by way of a contract offering and a financial arrangement, that they can meet the standards of the National Foundation.

I think the president of the University of Iowa is quite correct when he says it is not enough to say that representatives of these associations shall sit with the group that prepares the nominations. Certainly that is not enough. They need more assistance than that. Let me repeat the statement made in his memorandum, because I think it is rather determinative. He said:

S. 526 as amended does not provide for distribution of research funds by States. Instead it names the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the National Academy of Sciences as organizations whose nominations for the Foundation will be considered by the President. Inasmuch as these are to be considered with those of other educational and scientific organizations, the provision is not likely to be particularly effective.

Mr. President, I think the president of the University of Iowa is 100 percent correct in that conclusion. I wish the Members of the Senate, before they finally vote on the bill now pending before the Senate, would take the time to communicate with the presidents of the universities and colleges in their respective States and with the scientists on the faculties of the institutions in their respective States, because if they do, it is my honest judgment that they will find an overwhelming majority of them will express approval of my amendment.

Oh, yes; it can be said, "Well, they would do that because they would be voting out of self-interest." That charge can be made if anyone wants to make it, but I know scientists too well to believe that they are going to vote for my amendment out of self-interest in the sense that such a charge would be made. Self-interest in this sense, yes, that they know that if effective scientific work is to be carried on in the laboratories of our universities and colleges, the funds will have to be made available for the scientists on the campuses to do the work, or they will have to leave the campuses for other laboratories more adequately financed by the larger institutions, which, in my judgment, when it comes to the administration of the law, will get the lion's share of the funds appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. President, after receiving the letter from Dr. Newburn, I replied on April 30, as follows:

Thank you very much for your letter of April 14. I shall bring it to the attention of our committee when the bill comes up for committee consideration.

But on March 31 I wrote to Mr. Boots, assistant counsel in the Office of Legislative Counsel, as follows:

DEAR MR. BOOTS: Dr. Newburn, of the University of Oregon, has suggested that S. 256 be amended so as to include the same language as was found in section 5 (c) of S. 525, which I understand provides for distribution of funds on a geographical basis.

I shall be grateful if you will prepare such an amendment for me for introduction on the floor, as I am informed the bill is now on the calendar.

The committee had already taken action on the bill, and after I found that out I submitted on the floor of the Senate on April 2 the amendment carrying out the suggestion of the president of the University of Oregon and the president of the University of Iowa, and that is the amendment now pending before the Senate.

I had a discussion with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who, after my amendment was presented, came to me and said he would like to send me a letter in regard to it which he would appreciate my, in turn, making available to those who were asking me to press for the amendment which I had offered. The letter of the Senator from New Jersey was written to me under date of April 7, 1947. I told him that such a letter would be very helpful to me, because all I was seeking to accomplish was to develop the best National Science Foundation program that could be developed, and that my present thinking as of that time was that we ought to work out some allocation arrangement.

I have studied the problem since, and I am all the more convinced, in spite of all that has been said on the floor of the Senate, that the amendment I am offering is vital to the successful administration of a National Science Foundation.

I want the RECORD to show—because I always try to present all the facts, pro and con, of a matter in which I am involved, such as the one now being discussed—that on April 7 I received a letter from the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], as follows:

I am writing you, in compliance with your request, with regard to the amendment you offered a few days ago to the National Science Foundation bill.

A copy of S. 526 as amended, together with the committee report is enclosed. You will notice from page 2, item II of the report that the committee gave careful consideration to the allocation of grants. It seemed wise for us not to attempt to provide for a geographical allocation in a bill whose fundamental purpose was to encourage basic research in the fundamental sciences. Any attempt to distribute funds on a state allocation basis might result in so diluting the funds available that its main purpose might be defeated.

I have no doubt that the Ways and Means Committee in their budgetary consideration would not view with favor any appropriations based on this premise.

I digress, Mr. President, to say that what the Ways and Means Committee might think does not concern me a particle, at least until it made a full analysis of the proposition. I am seeking this afternoon to try to give them the other side of the picture that relates to my amendment, because I think that if they had it, the Senator from New Jersey might find himself in error as to the final judgment of the Ways and Means Committee.

I proceed with the letter of the Senator from New Jersey:

The land-grant and State universities have been alerted and there is apparently a concerted "write your Congressman" drive from these sources to establish a preferential percentage allotment to these institutions.

Mr. President, one may call it alerting the universities, or a concentrated write-to-Congressman drive, but what happened? Officials of the association, represented by the State of Iowa, studied the bill as originally proposed, and seeing the effect of it upon scientific research in the universities and colleges of the country, did alert their administrators and the scientists on their campuses. And well that it was so, because I think that as a result of that we have had presented to us some very sound arguments by these scientists and by these administrators for a modification along the lines of the amendment I am proposing this afternoon.

Continuing the letter of the Senator from New Jersey:

May I suggest that in your reply you forward a copy of the bill and the report, directing attention to the comment in the report on page 2, item II relative to the committee's decision on allocation of funds, and to the participation in the bill, under section 3 (a) of the land-grant and State universities in the recommendation of nominations to the President for members of the Foundation. Section 15 (h) pages 18–19, further emphasizes the intent of the bill.

That is all very true, Mr. President, but I think the president of the University of Iowa answers that completely when he points out that that is not enough, when he points out that that will not be a sufficiently effective safeguard to the scientific interests of the other colleges and universities.

The last paragraph of the letter of the Senator from New Jersey reads:

It was the opinion of the committee that these groups enjoying the memberships on the Foundation, which they undoubtedly will have, can call to the attention of the Foundation specific research projects in need of Federal aid for which they are particularly well qualified.

Do not hesitate to call on me for any further assistance.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Yes; they would sit on the nomination board, Mr. President, and on the nomination board they could bring up any number of very sound scientific research programs, but they would not have, as a matter of right, any allocation of funds for research in their institutions, such as is provided for in my amendment if projects meet the standards of the Foundation. It is such allocation that the president of the University of Iowa is seeking; it is what the president of the University of Oregon is seeking; and it is what the other college presidents are seeking, because they know that is essential if we are to protect the interests of the colleges in maintaining scientists of high caliber on their faculties.

Mr. President, I think one of the results of the bill, and, in my opinion, a very unfortunate result, would be that it would serve as a very effective weapon for scientific piracy on the part of the large institutions, seeking to get away from the small institutions their top scientists, because they will not be able to give them any assurance that funds will be available to enable them to carry on scientific research on their campuses.

I sent out the letter of the Senator from New Jersey and received some replies. President Newburn, of the University of Oregon, replied on April 11 as follows:

I have your letter of April 9 and the copy of Senator SMITH's letter to you under date of April 7, both referring to the National Science Research Foundation legislation. I am pleased to know that you did submit the amendment to this act, S. 526, which would permit a portion of the funds to be distributed on a geographical basis to the several States.

I am sorry to learn that Senator SMITH's committee feels as it does that such a distribution would not be wise.

You asked for the reaction of our science staff toward the possible modification of the proposed bill. I believe I can say that practically every member of our science staff would agree with me that it would be better if certain portions of the funds available for such research were allocated on a geographic basis. This might at first seem to be a selfish reaction and I suppose, in part, it is. On the other hand, we believe very definitely that the future development of basic research in science would be better served, if there

were a more widespread possibility of good men scattered around over the country participating in this program. The tendency will be, if such an amendment is not placed in the bill, to concentrate such grants around those institutions which already are well equipped in both the tools of research and the other facilities, including human personnel, to do the job. There are many good men with outstanding ability scattered around over the country, in places where it is less easy to free them for these research activities. The distribution which you propose in your amendment would assure that such individuals would have a better opportunity to participate in this program, and thus contribute more adequately to the general welfare, through the development of basic techniques and discoveries. I believe that, in the long run, such a proposal would benefit our Nation more definitely than the present proposed legislation.

We appreciate deeply your interest in this legislation.

That is followed by a personal comment of well-wishing, Mr. President.

I think that is very good argument, presented by the president of the University of Oregon. It bears out similar observations made by the president of the University of Iowa. I repeat, Mr. President, if my colleagues in the Senate would only take the time to check the administrators of the colleges in their respective States, and with the scientists working in the laboratories of those universities and colleges, they would find that an overwhelming majority of them would take positions identical with the position taken by the president of the University of Oregon and the president of the University of Iowa.

Mr. President, I heard also from Dr. A. L. Strand, president of Oregon State College. I may say that Oregon State College is one of the great educational institutions of the West and has a remarkably fine faculty. It has a magnificent record of research in applied science, and in recent years, with the establishment of the School of Science on the campus, it has made important contributions in the field of pure science; in fact, men of science in Oregon State College and at the University of Oregon are making some of the outstanding research findings among the universities of the country. However, these two institutions are an excellent example of the type of those that need the protection of the amendment which I am offering.

Oregon State College is a member of the National Association of Land Grant Colleges and the University of Oregon is a member of the Association of State Universities. The presidents of both these institutions support my amendment, and, because of my familiarity with the problems of these institutions, I am more than convinced that my amendment, which is backed by the associations to which these institutions belong, is a very deserving amendment.

In his letter to me under date of April 26 Dr. Strand, president of Oregon State College, stated:

Since receiving your letter of April 9—

I had sent to him a copy of a letter from the Senator from New Jersey, addressed to me under date of April 7—

Since receiving your letter of April 9, in which you enclosed a copy of S. 526 and your proposed amendment, I have had our School of Science study both of these measures. In brief, the school is in favor of the new National Science Foundation bill, but also requests the adoption of the proposed amendment which you have written, if this can be done without jeopardizing the bill itself.

We are all gratified you are taking an interest in the National Science Foundation proposals and hope that an agreement can be made which will give much better support to the scientific research that the country should be carrying on.

I replied to him under date of May 6, and, without reading the letter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 6, 1947.

Dr. A. L. STRAND,
President, Oregon State College,
Corvallis, Oreg.

DEAR DR. STRAND: Thank you very much for your letter of April 26 in regard to the National Science Foundation bill. I am in complete agreement with the over-all objectives of the National Science Foundation bill because I think our Government, as a government, must not delay in giving whatever support is needed for a sound program of scientific research in this country. I don't think that this is any time for us to adopt any penny-pinching policy in connection with this particular matter.

If we do not keep ahead of, or at least abreast of, the rest of the world in scientific research, I think we will be guilty of selling short the future of this country. Hence, if it develops that the National Science Foundation bill in its present form is the best bill that we can pass in this session of Congress, I most certainly shall support it.

However, I find that a good many scientists, as well as college presidents, think that the bill would be greatly strengthened by the addition of my amendment. They point out—and I think rightly—that research in science should be encouraged in all little as well as the big laboratories of America, including those in the little colleges as well as the big ones.

On the other hand, Senator SMITH argues that my amendment will dissipate the funds and produce inadequate scientific results from their expenditure if they are apportioned according to the provisions of my bill.

On the other hand, Senator THOMAS of Utah, who is a member of SMITH'S committee, believes that my amendment would be a great inducement to a much broader program of scientific research.

What I intend to do is listen to the pros and cons of the issue and then cast my vote in support of whatever program I think will give us the best scientific research program for which we can get the support and approval of the Senate.

With best regards,
Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Mr. MORSE. On April 26, 1947, I received a letter from the president of the University of Maine, Dr. Arthur A. Hauck, as follows:

This is to express in behalf of the National Association of State Universities our appreciation for your sponsorship of an amendment to the National Science Foundation bill (S. 526) incorporating the principle of geographic distribution of a portion of the research funds

He then makes certain personal comments, based upon a past meeting I had with him. The president of the University of Maine favors the amendment I am offering, and he writes as a member of the National Association of State Universities. In fact, Mr. President, I have no question that a preponderant majority of the presidents of State universities, who are members of the association, are strongly in favor of the amendment I have offered, for reasons which I earlier set forth in my remarks.

On April 15 I received a letter from Dr. Edmund E. Day, president of Cornell University, a man who has taken a very active part in working for the development of the National Science Foundation and whose standing in the educational world cannot be questioned. He is "tops," so to speak, among American educators, one of the most outstanding and best recognized in the entire country. In his letter to me of April 15, he states:

I have been much pleased to learn of the amendment to S. 526 recently offered by you from the floor of the Senate. I am myself convinced that incorporation in S. 526 of section 5 from S. 525 is highly desirable from many different points of view. I recently undertook to prepare a statement of the case for partial geographic distribution of funds made available to the proposed National Science Foundation, and venture to enclose a copy of this statement, since I think you will find it of interest.

If there is any way in which the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities or the National Association of State Universities can help materially in gathering support for your proposal, I hope you will let me know. Chancelor Gustavson, of Nebraska, and I have been formally designated by these two associations to represent them in matters concerning National Science Foundation legislation. I can assure you that Chancelor Gustavson and I are eager to help in any way we can.

It will be noted that in his letter, Dr. Day points out that my amendment has the support of such men as the chancellor of the educational system in the State of Nebraska, and also the support of the educational associations he mentions. I have a communication from the chancelor of the educational system in Nebraska, which I shall come to later.

With his letter Dr. Day sent to me a memorandum which he thinks, and I agree with him, supports the case for partial geographic distribution of research funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation. The memorandum is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE FOR PARTIAL GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation bill (S. 525), introduced by Senator THOMAS of Utah, provides in section 5 (c) that not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated to the Science Foundation for research and development activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense) shall be apportioned among the States on an objective formula (set forth in the bill) and subsequently expended through the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges. This provision of the Thomas bill has been dubbed by certain scientists, notably those connected

with the large private institutions of the East, as a "pork barrel proposal." This smearing description of the provision fails completely to recognize two very important purposes which were in the thinking of those who originally suggested this plan. It is highly important that these purposes be at least considered in the effort now being made to create as sound a national research agency as can be devised.

The first of the purposes leading to the proposal of a partial geographical distribution has to do with the threat of later Federal domination. The National Science Foundation, if established, is bound to exercise great influence. If, as is altogether likely, it becomes some day possessed of large funds, this influence may become a dominating one in the promotion of fundamental research throughout the country. The desirability of any such domination can be seriously questioned on several different counts. Fundamental research needs to be free, and it is not likely to be so if it is substantially directed out of any single Federal agency. One of the surest ways to set up adequate safeguards against any such drift of excessive power into Federal hands is to make certain that a substantial part of the funds are so distributed as to free their subsequent use of any specific control by the Federal authority. If at least 25 percent of the funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation were distributed to the States, as proposed in the Thomas bill, it would be quite impossible for the National Science Foundation ever to straitjacket the total program of basic research financed by Federal funds. In view of the persistent gravitation of power to the Federal Government during recent decades it can fairly be argued that this safeguarding provision of the Thomas bill will prove in the long run to be essential to the national interest.

The second purpose which was in the thinking of those who originally sponsored the principle of partial geographic distribution has to do with the political pressures to which the operations of the National Science Foundation are certain to be subject. Without any question whatever, efforts will be made by various partisan interests to get research funds allocated to institutional programs in all sections of the country. This will be especially true if the Foundation undertakes to support scientific developments not only in terms of specific projects of unmistakable scientific promise, but also institutional developments which are designed to create in time a national network of scientific activities. Such a network is of great importance for the long haul. It can be created, however, only in terms of criteria which do not relate exclusively to present scientific excellence. A program of this design will be especially exposed to political pressures. The wisest way to protect the Foundation from such political pressures is to provide in the act itself for a partial allocation of funds to the States.

That, Mr. President, is what I am seeking to do by my amendment.

I continue to read the memorandum submitted to me by Dr. Day, president of Cornell University:

If this is done the Foundation can reasonably take the position that the requirements of Nation-wide distribution of the Foundation's support of basic research have been provided for in the provisions of the act itself. The officers of the Foundation can then concentrate their activities largely on the promotion of specific projects and programs which are thought to meet the most exacting requirements of immediate scientific promise and significance.

It has been reasoned in some quarters that these arguments are cogent but should not lead to arrangements under which the funds distributed to the States on the proposed objective formula go solely to the tax-supported colleges and universities. In terms of practical administrative procedures, however, there is no alternative to this limitation. The States are already familiar with the problems involved in determining relative support of the tax-supported and land-grant colleges and universities. No new machinery should be required to determine equitable apportionment among these institutions at the State level. Any effort to include other institutions would present State authorities with totally unfamiliar and unmanageable problems of State administration. Moreover, it is to be recognized that only a portion of the funds made available to the National Science Foundation would be subject to distribution to the States. The remainder of the funds could be employed by the National Science Foundation to correct any inequities that might arise, under the formula of distribution to the States, as between the tax-supported and private institutions.

These are all matters to be carefully weighed in determining the best possible setup for the National Science Foundation. It will be a serious mistake to give no consideration to the provisions of section 5 (c) of Senator THOMAS' bill on the score that they embody nothing more than a self-seeking move on the part of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities. These two organizations would not have backed the proposal for partial distribution to the States had they not thought the proposal essentially in the national interest. Most of the institutions in these two associations have had long experience with the practice of Federal support of research in peacetime and are convinced that the principle of distribution of Federal funds to the States on objective formulas set forth precisely in the basic legislation is a principle that is eminently sound and one forwarding the interest of research in those areas in which it has been applied.

As officially appointed representatives of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities, we respectfully request that those who are sponsoring the National Science Foundation bills before the Houses of Congress give further thoughtful consideration to the proposal these two national organizations have sponsored, namely, that a part of the funds made available to the National Science Foundation be distributed to the States on an objective formula embodied in the basic legislation.

The memorandum is signed by Edmund E. Day, president of Cornell University, and by R. G. Gustavson, chancelor of higher education for the State of Nebraska.

Mr. President, I think that is a very potent argument. I think the views of those men and the views of the associations they represent and the arguments they present in that memorandum brief are arguments which every Member of the Senate should study before he votes on the bill. As I look at the attendance in the Senate Chamber I am somewhat discouraged about the arguments being studied unless consideration of the measure can be put over until Monday so Senators may have an opportunity to make the study. I am satisfied that if Senators walk into the Chamber at a later hour this afternoon and proceed to vote on my amendment without having studied the views of outstanding educators and educational associations, they are likely to come to me some days hence and say, "Well, we certainly wish we had known that before we voted," for I am inclined to think that the educators and the scientists in their respective States will in many instances call to their attention that the facts were available to them prior to the vote. So I repeat my conviction that if the Members of this body would study the views I am presenting this afternoon in support of my amendment, and then would check upon those views with the presidents of the universities and colleges in their respective States and with the scientists on the faculties of those colleges, they would find the overwhelming opinion to be that my amendment should be adopted, not because of any selfish pork-barrel interest on the part of the institutions themselves, but in order to assure the soundest program for National Science Foundation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Apropos of the Senator's statement that the attendance in the Senate Chamber is not very great—and I agree that he has every reason to make that statement—I should like to observe, in order to keep the record straight, because the other day it was called to our attention from the other side of the aisle that the attendance on this side of the aisle was not very great, that the attendance on this side of the aisle at present is exactly 11 times as great numerically as on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the observation of the Senator from Iowa. I hope an opportunity will be given to absent Senators to read these arguments, not because they are my arguments, but because they are arguments which are being made by the educators of the country, and which I am presenting to the Senate this afternoon. Hence I hope that the Senate will not vote on the amendment this afternoon, but will vote on it on Monday, so that at least I can place absent Senators in such a position that they can say to their constituents, "I read the RECORD before I voted." They will not be able to do so if we vote this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the interest of accuracy, I wish to observe that since I made my last remark the percentage of differentiation and comparison has been exactly halved.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my good friend the Senator from Iowa that before he entered the Chamber I had presented for the RECORD the views of the president of the University of Iowa. Those views are in support of the amendment which I have offered.

I turn now to a letter which I have received from Dr. Wilson Compton, president of the State College of Washington, at Pullman, Wash. He sent to me a copy of a communication dated March 18, which he addressed to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and to the committee, and in addition he sent a note to me.

I am sure that I do not need to identify my witness. I think we can almost take judicial knowledge of the fact that

the name Compton, when related to any of the Compton brothers, is almost synonymous with high authority to judge in the field of education and science. I do not know of any better witness I could offer the Senate this afternoon than one of the Compton brothers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Compton to whom the Senator is referring a brother of Karl Compton of MIT?

Mr. MORSE. He is.

Mr. SMITH. Karl Compton differs 100 percent with the position the Senator is taking.

Mr. MORSE. I understand.

Mr. SMITH. The Compton brothers are not in agreement any more than we are.

Mr. President, a majority of the Senate is in favor of the committee bill. I merely call that to the attention of the Senator while we are continuing this debate. I would appreciate it very much if I could ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from New Jersey has brought out the fact that the Compton brothers are not in complete agreement. The one who is connected with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology seems to favor the development of a National Science Foundation whereby no funds will be made available to the laboratories throughout the country as a matter of right——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. No; I wish to finish my sentence, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Dr. Karl Compton seems to favor the development of a National Science Foundation whereby no funds will be made available to laboratories throughout the country as a matter of right so far as the allocation of funds to State institutions is concerned. I believe that the so-called eastern attitude on the part of some educators in the leading institutions of the East is one of the reasons which is building up suspicion and doubt among scientists and educators in other sections of the country. In order to resolve that difference—because I think it is an unhealthy condition to have develop—I am trying to have adopted an amendment which I think is a fair and reasonable compromise, and will accrue to the benefit of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as well as to the benefit of laboratories in smaller institutions such as that headed by Wilson Compton in Washington.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, to my mind the Senator is implying bad faith on the part of those who have been advising with us on this subject. There is no idea of trying to corral research activities. The attempt is to try to do a job in the field of basic scientific research. We have reviewed the question for 2 years. We have gone over and over the many arguments. I have seen letters of the same type as those which the Senator has read; and I have seen letters on the other side. I have seen as many on one side as on the other. There is a difference of opinion.

Earlier in the day the Senate came to the conclusion that the approach of the committee is the approach which the Senate wishes to take.

Mr. President, at 2 o'clock the Senator told me that he was going to speak for three-quarters of an hour and no more. It is now half past 3 and he is still speaking, and we are prevented from reaching a vote on the amendments tonight. It is desired to consider the tax bill on Monday. I was compelled to object to a unanimous-consent request to have it made the unfinished business Monday morning because I did not feel that we should discontinue consideration of the Foundation bill until it was settled. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that if we do not settle the question of the Science Foundation bill before other bills are proceeded with, it will be a "dead duck" this year. It is a disgrace to the Senate that we cannot get through with it without this long debate.

Mr. President, I regret that I must speak in this manner, but I think we are doing a great wrong in rearguing a question which was settled earlier in the day by a vote of 49 to 30, a leeway of 19 votes. There is no distinction in the Senator's amendment, except that he would divide the funds on a basis of two-fifths and three-fifths instead of 50–50.

I have such a high regard for the Senator from Oregon that I regret very much having to state that I feel that he is doing a great disservice to the cause represented by this bill by prolonging the discussion when he knows that the only answer to his amendment is that we shall have a vote and defeat it by the same margin that we defeated the other amendment. In reality it is the same amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey. He states that he regrets that he finds it necessary to make them. I wish to say that I resent his making them, because he is attempting to put in my mouth words never spoken by me. I shall take up one by one the statements made by the Senator from New Jersey.

First, at no time today did I ever tell the Senator from New Jersey that I would speak only 45 minutes and no more. I think the Senator from New Jersey knows that I did not tell him any such thing. The Senator from New Jersey came to me and asked me how long I thought I would talk. I said I thought I would talk for about 45 minutes, and that I did not think I would talk longer; but I did not tell him that I would not talk longer.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Jersey well knows that when a Senator arises on the floor of the Senate to begin the discussion of a matter involving as detailed consideration as does the issue before us he would be foolish to pledge to any other Senator that he would not speak for longer than a certain period of time. I made no such statement to the Senator from New Jersey, and I resent the implication.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I regret exceedingly if I have misunderstood the Senator. I had the impression that the Senator made the statement as I have related it. If the Senator thinks he did not make the statement, I obtained the wrong impression, and I am extremely sorry that I irritated him.

Mr. MORSE. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. SMITH. I understood the Senator to say that he expected to speak for three-quarters of an hour, and I assumed that that was the time he would take.

Mr. MORSE. The second statement made by the Senator from New Jersey, which I wish to correct in the interest of accuracy, is the implication that I am charging bad faith against Dr. Karl Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I am not charging bad faith against anyone. I am simply saying that I cannot ignore the fact that there is a feeling within the American educational world that the bill as it is presently drafted would result in an undue advantage accruing to institutions which already are large and wealthy and have great research facilities. I tried to bring that out in the first part of my remarks this afternoon. I am not charging anyone with bad faith. I am not interested in motives. I am simply saying that I think the views of these men ought to be carefully considered by Members of the Senate before a vote is taken on my amendment.

There is one other comment which the Senator from New Jersey made, as I understood him, and that is that there is very little difference between my amendment and the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia. I think there are important differences between my amendment and the one proposed by the Senator from West Virginia. I think the provision which is in my amendment in regard to making available funds for scientific research facilities in colleges on the basis of a 25-percent allotment is quite different from the provision in the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia; and I ask the Senator from West Virginia, who is on the floor, whether he agrees with me that that is a vital difference between his amendment and mine.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, so firm is my conviction that I assured the Senator, even before the Chair had ruled, that I felt there was so much difference between the two amendments that there was no question but that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon should be considered after the consideration of the amendment which I offered.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, Mr. President, before I return to the letters, I think the incident on the floor of the Senate in the past few minutes again demonstrates how important it is to have a full, complete, and thorough debate on these matters before we become involved in any agreement to vote as of a certain time. Speaking only for myself, I want to say that it is my feeling and my impression that at the present time there is in the Senate a drive to have measures voted upon quickly, as fast as possible,

without allowing adequate time for debate. That is what I had in mind, among other things, when I spoke earlier this afternoon about unanimous-consent rules.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I shall not be steam-rollered or pressured into a quick vote on the ground that if I do not agree to such a vote I shall earn someone's displeasure. I intend to discuss on the floor of the Senate as long as I want to any issue in which I have a vital interest. Let the leadership understand that. I am performing no disservice to science by this discussion this afternoon. I shall let American scientists evaluate my discussion of the issue in comparison with the discussion by the Senator from New Jersey or anyone else.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say to the Senator from Oregon and to the Senate that one thing which impelled me to go into this fight—and I think the Senator from Oregon knows about it—was a certain promise made to the colleges and universities about which the Senator from Oregon has spoken and about which I have spoken, a promise which was taken up in conference at the last session in which various men now opposing this bill participated, and in which the very proposal being discussed by the Senator from Oregon was threshed out and agreed upon. I felt under obligation to those various institutions, because at the time I first proposed a bill I found opposition on their part on the ground, which I urged yesterday and which the Senator from Oregon has urged today, that they felt they would be unfairly treated. For that reason this protective clause was placed in the bill which was offered in the Senate.

I think the Senator from Oregon should be advised of the agreement. I will say that I consulted with most of the western universities and their scientific faculties, representatives of which were among the 115 who testified. They were willing to testify in favor of the bill only after an agreement which would give them a certain minimum which they could devote to research, because they felt they had been discriminated against from Washington in previous activities. I think I owe it to the Senate to make that statement.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for his contribution to the discussion, and I am glad it will appear in the RECORD.

I do not know how much longer I shall take. As I proceeded, as I thought of the implications involved in the pending legislation and what it means to the institutions of higher learning and to the future development of a scientific-research program, I felt it important that I expand some of the arguments as I went along. In view of the fact that some Members of the Senate are not present, and I think the amendment which I have offered is vital to their respective States, I intend to make as full a record as I think necessary, so that it will be available to them in making up their minds as to how they finally want to vote. Whatever period of time it requires, Mr. President, I propose to use.

I referred to a letter dated March 18, 1947, written by Wilson Compton, president of the State College of Washington, to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], in which he said:

THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON,
Pullman, Wash., March 18, 1947.
Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Science Foundation, S. 525.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: In the consideration of pending bills proposing the establishment of a national science foundation, I hope that you will urge strongly the importance of inclusion in the final legislation of a provision comparable in principle and in substance to section 5 (c) of your bill S. 525, providing for certain geographic distribution by States and by population of portions of the proposed research funds.

If this is not done, the trend will be toward a monopoly of research in a few institutions which at present are most favorably situated, and other institutions will be under a permanent and not only a temporary handicap. The trend of research has already gone far enough in that direction, and it is not a wholesome trend.

Yours sincerely,
WILSON COMPTON,
President.

Copies to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

That is a very good exhibit, I think, Mr. President, in support of the statement which I made earlier in my argument that there is a growing feeling among educators of the country that there is too great a tendency to concentrate scientific research in a few institutions, and a feeling that it has "gone far enough," as Mr. Compton says.

I think we should enact legislation with the idea in mind of having it so fair and acceptable that these institutions can work together without friction and without feeling that perhaps some institutions wil get more than their share of funds which may be appropriated by the Congress. I think we should check those feelings. If we do so, it will be to the benefit of American education and scientific research. I think my amendment would accomplish that. As I said earlier this afternoon, the safeguards are there, so that no money will be spent on a worthless project.

That does not mean that an institution will be entitled to have a certain amount of money and spend it for anything it wants to and call it scientific research. All the safeguards and standards are maintained by my amendment; and if an institution cannot meet the standards it simply does not get any money; but, on the other hand, it is provided that at least 25 percent of the total allotment shall be set aside for land-grant colleges and State tax-supported institutions which can meet the scientific standards.

I think that is fair. I think it is a very reasonable compromise, just as I think the second part of my amendment, which was not even in the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia, is fair. It provides for an arrangement for the expenditure of some funds for scientific research facilities.

What we are asking—and the Senator from New Jersey and I have the same objective—is legislation which will make it possible to attain the best development of scientific research. He and I differ as to whether it can be better done by his bill without my amendment or with my amendment. When anyone can marshal the authorities and the qualified witnesses in the respective States that I am marshaling this afternoon in support of my amendment, I think we had better not pass over them very hastily. A little expenditure of time on our part over the week-end, in regard to this matter, may prevent us, I think, from making a grievous mistake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point another letter from Dr. Wilson Compton, president of the State College of Washington, which was addressed to the committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON,
Pullman, Wash., March 18, 1947.
TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The attached copy of a letter addressed to Senators SMITH, REVERCOMB, MAGNUSON, SALTONSTALL, and FULBRIGHT with respect to pending National Science Foundation proposal, S. 526, will, I hope, have your attention and your consideration.

Yours sincerely,
WILSON COMPTON,
President.

THE STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON,
Pullman, Wash., March 18, 1947.
Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Science Foundation, S. 526.

GENTLEMEN: I hope you will consent to the inclusion in your bill, S. 526, at some appropriate place of a provision substantially similar to section 5 (c) of S. 525 introduced by Senator THOMAS.

Such an amendment if made would require a portion of the Federal funds granted for the purposes of research to be apportioned equally among the States and a further amount to be apportioned on the basis of population.

This is important if institutions in all sections of the country are to be given reasonably comparable opportunity to participate. If something of this sort is not done, research will tend to become a "monopoly" of a few institutions favorably situated. The trend already has gone far enough in that direction.

Yours sincerely,
WILSON COMPTON,
President.

Copies to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier in my remarks this afternoon, I said that the chancelor of the State system of higher education of the State of Nebraska, R. G. Gustavson, favors the

amendment I am offering this afternoon. Under date of April 17, he wrote me, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., April 17, 1947.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was delighted to learn that you have presented the amendment to S. 526 which I learned of through President Day of Cornell University. There is no question in my mind as to the advisability of this amendment. May I say to you that if the National Association of State Universities can be helpful in any way we shall be only too glad to serve you.

Sincerely,

R. G. GUSTAVSON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the points where I discussed them, all the letters to which I have heretofore referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] very correctly has pointed out, there are educators and scientists in other institutions who do not believe that any of the funds should be allocated or set aside for tax-supported institutions and land-grant colleges. I make no charge about their motives; but Mr. President, I am a lawyer, and as a lawyer I shall look at the various interests the witnesses have; because they, too, like every Member of the Senate, have their biases, their points of view, and very often they turn in a direction that is determined to some extent by their interests. So I wish to say that there are two categories of witnesses in connection with this matter. Of course, we shall find exceptions on both sides of the line, in the case of the categories to which I shall now refer; but, by and large, the witnesses can be put into two categories. In one category I may refer to educators and scientists who are administrators of or professors or teachers in such great institutions in the United States—and they are great—as Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Yale, Princeton, for the most part the large institutions of the East, as well as in some similar institutions which are located elsewhere in the country. I say that by and large, we shall find that most of the witnesses who have that background are in favor of the bill proposed by the Senator from New Jersey; whereas other witnesses, of equally high standing in the field of education and science, witnesses who are connected with the land-grant colleges or the tax-supported universities in the respective States, and who have had many years of experience in the very difficult work of developing research in the State-supported institutions, which are finding it difficult to retain qualified scientific men on their faculties, who can both engage in research and teach the scientists of the next generation—I say that men with such backgrounds tell us, with deep sincerity and honest conviction, that the adoption of the amendment I am offering this afternoon is necessary if we are really to develop a nationally strong science research program, and that we should not pass the bill as proposed by the Senator from New Jersey, without including in it an amendment similar to the one I have offered.

Mr. President, as between those two categories of witnesses, we can take our choice; but it seems to me that the procedure which we should follow should be to resolve the differences of opinion as between those two schools of thought, and in that connection, let me say that I think my amendment is a conscionable compromise in resolving the differences.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator from Oregon can well understand the concern of those who happen to be connected with some of the institutions which at the present time do not have the publicity or the facilities that other, more favored institutions have. Not only would the bill as it now stands handicap them in the already unequal struggle which they are forced to wage with the more fortunate institutions which have large endowments, and which undoubtedly will get all the money proposed to be appropriated unless some protection similar to that provided by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, is made; but without some such amendment, the bill would result in the creation of a further inducement to students to attend the institutions where the research work is now being carried on. Without some protection against institutions such as those in the Ivy League—protection similar to that which would be afforded by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon—the bill would further handicap the other colleges and educational institutions of the Nation, because students would seek to attend the institutions which would be the recipients of this great endowment.

Without some protection similar to that afforded by the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon for the smaller institutions, I would not be able to support the bill on final passage; because I think that passage of the bill without some such amendment would constitute a great calamity and would create a still further unbalance between the various educational institutions of the United States, by tending to create still greater differences between the opportunities for education and research which are afforded by them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Senator from Georgia for what he has stated. The institutions to which I have referred are, as I have said, fearful of the result of passage of the bill if it is not amended in a way similar to that proposed by the amendment I have offered. They fear that the result of the passage of the bill as it is now written would be to make it even more difficult for them to attract and maintain the proper faculties, because there would always be a tendency for the members of their faculties to gravitate to the larger, more prosperous institutions which might receive the funds, and which, I say, would receive funds out of all proper proportion. That is why I say I think in one aspect the bill, if it is not amended as I think it should be, would serve as a weapon of piracy, the larger institutions taking prominent men of science from the smaller colleges and institutions which do not now have and would not in future have large facilities for scientific work.

Mr. President, I speak, as I have stated, out of an experience of 21 years of service on the faculties of several universities in the United States; and I say again that if the bill as it now stands is enacted into law, there will be a great danger of lowering the standards of education in many of our educational institutions if they are unable to retain on their faculties men who are qualified in the field of education and science and are able to inspire students to embark upon scientific careers; because, after all, such faculty members not only carry on research projects, but also inspire young minds to take a greater interest in science, thus leading up to careers in scientific research.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding. May I say to the Senator from Oregon and to the Senator from Georgia, for both of whom I have great respect, that I believe the conception which they entertain of this fund is wrong. I say that very respectfully, because their conception is so different from that I have of the use of the money. We should focus on one point, and one point alone, namely, that the purpose of the fund, the purpose of the Foundation, is to promote scientific knowledge and to develop scientific research.

The Senator from Oregon has mentioned the Massachusetts Institute of Technology several times. I am not a member of the board of that institution, I have never been to the institution as a student, but I do know something about it, and Dr. Compton is a good friend of mine. For example, they have a wind chute there now. During the war they developed to about the limit of their capacity. Assume the proposed Foundation is set up and the money becomes available an institution such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology cannot get advantage of the funds, because it cannot enlarge itself sufficiently to enable it to carry on the work required.

Let us consider Harvard University, about which I know something. Harvard University today is handicapped because it has not the funds with which to pay salaries which many of the State universities pay. Capable men go to Harvard, not because of the money which can be paid them, but because sometimes there is more equipment in their lines with which they can operate.

Assume the Foundation bill becomes law, assume its money becomes available; not a great deal of it can go to Harvard because Harvard cannot extend its facilities to use it. It cannot do more research than it is doing now.

As I see the picture, ultimately much of the funds will have to go to some of the institutions which the Senator from Oregon is talking about. Some of their

facilities have to be built up. Some of the leaders in some branches of scientific knowledge are in those institutions now, and this money is going to those institutions. I do not want to see the money dissipated year by year in places where it cannot be put to the best advantage for developing scientific knowledge.

If we put 25 percent of the fund into the respective States and then on top of that give them more money here and some more money there, based on the formulas provided, and if then there is a requirement that 25 percent more of the funds available in any one year may go into bricks and mortar, as the amendment of the Senator from Oregon provides, we will not be making the best use of the Government's funds for the research we are attempting to make possible by the bill.

I have listened to several scientific gentlemen, learned gentlemen, if you will, who have visited Russia, and seen what Russia is doing. Russia, according to their evidence—and that is all I know about it—is concentrating its Government funds for purposes of research. One of the considerations that induced me to support the bill was that research has become too large a subject for private institutions to handle. Private institutions cannot handle the development of atomic energy; they are not large enough. Many of the private institutions cannot handle the development of the jet plane, for instance; they are not sufficiently large. They have to have Government help. They have had the help of the Army and the Navy in many things. The Navy is going into cancer research as a part of the health program.

All the pending bill does is to make an effort to concentrate the best minds of the country and to disseminate into places into where they can be most helpfully used, Government funds which are to be used for the purposes specified.

One more thought and I shall be through. There is a dearth of scientists in this country at this time. It is necessary for us to get the best of the young brains into scientific research. One of the purposes of the bill is to encourage young men of intellectual quality, no matter whence they may come—Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, or Georgia—and train them in science, and start them out on research work. There is a dearth of scientists in this country, as I have said, and a dearth of doctors. What we want to do is to improve our scientific knowledge in the best possible way, and we should keep our eyes focused on this one idea.

Mr. President, that is why I am for the bill. That is why I am against the amendments of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Oregon. When they say the effort is going to be concentrated, when they say that the large institutions are going to be pirates on the small institutions, I think they are absolutely wrong, according to my concept of the bill, and according to the words of leading educators with whom I have talked.

Mr. KILGORE, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I shall reply to the Senator from Massachusetts for a moment, then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from West Virginia, and the Senator from Washington.

I am very glad the Senator from Massachusetts has put these arguments into the RECORD at this point, because I think they focus attention very clearly on the difference of opinion between us. I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when it comes out in the morning, will show that the remarks I made earlier this afternoon express my contrary point of view on every point the Senator from Massachusetts has made.

When he states, as I understood him, that the Senator from Georgia and I do not understand the situation, I reply that I think we understand it very well. But our understanding of it is quite different, from the standpoint of the results that might flow from the passage of the bill, from the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Oregon agree with me that the purpose of the bill is to promote and develop scientific knowledge, increase our security, strengthen our defense, and improve our industrial know-how by scientific research, and by encouraging the development of young scientists? That is the purpose of the bill, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. Absolutely, and the Senator from Oregon says that purpose will be accomplished much better with his amendment in the bill than without his amendment in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will that purpose be better accomplished by putting the money into bricks and mortar in 48 different States every year, or will it be better accomplished by concentrating the bricks and mortar, and by concentrating the intellectual effort, in one year, we will say, in one place, where a specific program can be carried on? Will the purpose be better accomplished by dissipating the fund every year over 48 States?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to analyze the question of the Senator from Massachusetts. Of course, the question is in the form of an argument, and when he uses the word "dissipate," he proceeds to assume a premise, and I am not going to assume that premise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Oregon is a distinguished law professor. He knows the law. Perhaps the question was argumentative, but it was seeking facts.

Mr. MORSE. With the qualifications I shall put in my answer, I shall cover the question.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I think a scientific research program must be an ever-expanding program for a good many years to come.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. If it is to be an ever-expanding program, we will have to provide the facilities for enlarging our laboratories, for making available to the scientists on the small campuses, and in the small universities, the equipment by which their scientific brains can be put to the maximum productive use. So I think the second part of my amendment is very important. But I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts was present when I said earlier this afternoon that it had been suggested to me that perhaps I ought to consider splitting the amendment, possibly dropping the latter section and getting a vote first on the first part of my amendment. Before I close, I shall pose a parliamentary inquiry, as to whether I can divide my amendment into two parts, leaving the provision as to equipment as a separate amendment for a separate vote.

I do not think that my amendment will result in the dissipation of the funds, because I have this difference, among others, with the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, I do not accept his notion that modern scientific research has to be done in big chunks, so to speak. The atomic-bomb research was not done in big chunks, except in its latter stages. It was really a combination of thousands upon thousands of research studies in very little projects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was not the original appropriation requested by Dr. Bush for the atomic-bomb research $500,000,000?

Mr. MORSE. I think it was at least that. That is as I recall.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That money was put out in various places where it could be best utilized—in the State of Washington, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the State of Tennessee, and so on—but it was not required to be divided among 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say in all fairness to the Senator from Massachusetts, I do not think he has given sufficient attention to one feature of my amendment. My amendment does not require that the money be put out on a 48-State basis. Not a dollar, under my amendment, will go to any institution, unless it can meet the research standards required by the Foundation; but I say, if Mr. Compton's college in Washington has on its faculty an outstanding chemist, for example, who can lay out a blueprint for a sound piece of research in chemistry which meets the standard of the Foundation, a portion of the fund should be available to him. There ought to be set aside, in order to protect the scientists in the small institutions, a reserve fund, so to speak, whereby they can be assured that they will get some share of the total allotment awarded by the Congress for the Foundation. That is where we separate company. I may say to the Senator, it may be that Russia is concentrating its research, but I do not think that principle is a sound one for this country. Russia is a police state; Russia is a monopoly state; Russia is a dictator state. Certain of the educators to whom I have

referred this afternoon, such as Day of Cornell, Newburn of Oregon, the president of the University of Iowa, the chancelor of the educational system in Nebraska, all point out in their communications the danger of the type of concentration of scientific research to which the Senator from Massachusetts alludes. I think it a mistaken principle to follow. I think it is very important to make such provision in the pending bill that scientists in small colleges will feel some assurance that if they can meet the standards of the Foundation they will receive a portion of the funds with which to carry on scientific research. So we do not follow the scientific concentration of the research program in Russia. I think that is good for a police state and a totalitarian state but highly undesirable in a democracy based upon a system of free public education such as ours is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I want to make myself clear to the Senator from Oregon. What I meant when I spoke about Russia was not the concentration of scientific research by localities. I do not know whether it is concentrated or whether it is spread over the whole of Russia. What I meant, and what I mean, is that it is a concentrated effort in the use of government funds for scientific research, not permitting them, we will say, to be dissipated and to be used indirectly for other purposes. I shall not interrupt the Senator further, except to say——

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator interrupt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we are to help education—and we must help education—if we are going to keep a free country and a free system of government, it should be done by sending government assistance, whether it be local, State, or National, through the front doors of educational institutions, and not through the back doors. If we are going to help science, let us help science through research efforts in the best possible way, wherever that can be done, whether it is to be in Alaska on shale oils or in Puerto Rico on sugar, or in the State of Washington on the atom bomb, or in Massachusetts on the cyclotron, and so on. Let us put it where it can be used best. That is my only concern.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the view of the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not agree with his view when it is premised on the idea that the amendment is going to result in a dissipation of funds. I think it is going to result in a most economic and efficient use of the fund. I think it is necessary to face the fact that research cannot be carried on without proper equipment, and I think it is important that we make available to the public-supported institutions money for research equipment necessary in order to carry on the research itself. Research cannot be conducted without a laboratory.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with that.

Mr. MORSE. It cannot be carried on without the necessary equipment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with that.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, it seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts is overlooking the point I made this afternoon as to the question of the amount of the appropriation that is to be made for research. I think, as I said earlier this afternoon, that in the interest of national health and public welfare we must recognize the importance of spending much more money for research than has been discussed heretofore on the floor of the Senate. Within the next 10 years, in my opinion, we shall have to spend many times the amount which many Senators now think we will have to spend for research, if we are to keep pace with the scientific development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry; I told the Senator from Georgia I would yield to him. Then I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I view the situation, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, or any similar amendment, instead of meaning a dissipation of the funds, means a wider dissemination of scientific activity. Knowing the Senator from Massachusetts as I do, I would be the last to challenge the high idealism which prompts him to vote against the amendment. I know that the reasons voiced by him are those which will move him when the vote is taken. However, I could take that position with a great deal of equanimity, if I had within the confines of my State two great institutions such as MIT and Harvard University. I was interested to hear the Senator's statement that those two great institutions could not cooperate with the Government in this project at the present time. They have shown amazing resiliency in the past in assuming obligations. They are two of the greatest institutions in all the earth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that I may correct a statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not want to create a false impression. I do not say that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology or Harvard would not take some of the funds and would not take some of the projects, but they cannot take them so extensively that they would be pirating from other institutions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I unhesitatingly put in the RECORD the prediction, here and now, that within 6 years after the pending bill shall have been enacted into law, in the absence of an amendment of this nature, the two institutions referred to will be receiving more funds than all the educational institutions in at least 12 States west of the Mississippi River and south of the Potomac; I will stand on that prediction, and we shall see. Senators who vote in the fond delusion that institutions in their States are going to get any money under this bill will be compelled, after vainly trying to get a few dollars for eminent scientists in their States, to go back and tell the presidents of the institutions in their home States, "I could not do anything about getting money for our university, because it has all been absorbed by MIT and by Harvard and by four or five similar institutions." I put that prediction in the RECORD and if I am here 6 years from now, I shall be perfectly willing to have it confront me, for I think it will be verified.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator from Georgia. I yield now to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to pursue the thought suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts a moment ago, when he was referring to the atomic bomb. It is not my idea that the purpose of the pending bill is to further research in connection with the atomic bomb, or similar projects. In the hearings on the pending bill, over a year ago, Mr. Oppenheimer was one of the witnesses who, I think, stated that what had happened during the war in the development of such things as the atomic bomb and proximity fuze was not fundamental research at all. It was what he called applied research. He said, "What we did was this: We shook the tree; we utilized knowledge that had been accumulated in the course of many years." The important thing—and the development of the atomic bomb is a fairly good illustration—is that the basic principles which were used to develop it were discovered by people working in small places all over the world. There were such well-known scientists as Dr. Niels Bohr, in Denmark; and, of course, Dr. Lise Meitner, in Germany; Sir James Chadwick, in England, and so on. It was not done as one great undertaking, with a working fund of $500,000,000. Of course, any list of scientists engaged in the work on atomic fission must include Einstein, who was generally called the father of the idea back 40 years ago. Senators have all read the story of Einstein's connection with the work.

My idea of the purpose of the bill is that it should foster what we would call pure science research. The fact is that in the development of the principles which were applied to such projects as the atomic bomb and the proximity fuze, many of the greatest contributors were in small places, in small laboratories, where scientists were working on their own, and it was not a great concentrated effort, such as took place in the actual building of the bomb. I believe no one should think of the bill as designed to undertake the type of work which the Army did in building the atomic bomb. Such an idea I personally believe to be erroneous. What we propose to do under the bill is to discover and train young men who will do the basic research, and then pick the fruits thereof when we need it. That is what we have done previously, and that is the real reason why the country was so successful in developing the atomic bomb and the proximity fuze and other instruments. The Government shook the trees which had been growing, for lo, these many years, in little out-of-way places in which the Senator from Oregon is interested. I

think it is well to keep in mind the distinction between applied research and the actual basic research.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator from Arkansas has said. If I created a different impression by using the $500,000,000 atom-bomb experiment as an illustration, I will say that I did not mean to create such an impression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Massachusetts did leave the impression that that was what we were undertaking.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These funds are to be used for basic research spread out in different places, and primarily for basic research rather than applied research.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I do not quite see why the Senator from Massachusetts has so much objection to the amendment. The amendment, from my point of view, is significant when coupled with the administrative set-up proposed by the bill, as opposed to the administrative set-up contained in the bill we had under consideration last year. If the administration of the Foundation were to be like that proposed in the bill considered last year, I would not be nearly so much interested in the amendment. But the bill would place the administration of the Foundation into the hands of an autonomous body completely dissociated from any control by the Government, into the hands of a small group of scientists, and yet the Senator objects to such a provision as that contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I think the amendment is much more important under the kind of administration proposed in the pending bill than it would have been in the bill considered last year.

I do not know whether the Senate will vote to change the form of administration. I intend to vote to change the administrative set-up. I told the Senator from New Jersey in the beginning that while I was in favor of the bill and willing to sponsor it, I reserved the right to disagree respecting the administrative set-up contained in it. The Senator from Massachusetts acted as chairman in the conference last year when we worked out the compromise on that very point. I remember very well that the Senator from Massachusetts was there at the time and I thought we had reached an agreement respecting the administration of the Foundation. As I previously said, the proposed set-up makes the amendment particularly significant.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply to the Senator from Arkansas I will say that the reason I object to the amendment is because it requires for every year at least 50 different set-ups at 50 different places where the fund must be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not agree with that statement. The amendment does not contain any such requirement. The distribution is subject to the approval of the Foundation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully say to the Senator from Arkansas and to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment as drawn provides that:

> Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares.

And then the amendment proceeds with other language. That language, in my humble judgment, means that including Puerto Rico and Alaska there shall be 50 equal apportionments made before distribution of the first quarter of the fund is made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts is quite wrong on that point. I believe the remainder of the amendment makes very clear that applicants for funds must meet the standards laid down by the Foundation before they receive a dollar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully calls the attention of Senators who are on their feet to the fact that rule XIX provides that no Senator shall interrupt another Senator without first addressing the Chair. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield in a moment, but before I do so I wish to address myself to the Senator from Arkansas who comes to us from having been the president of a great State university. I think his valued judgment on such matters as that now pending before us is entitled to very great weight, because he has had first hand experience with the administrative problem in trying to develop a science faculty and a scientific research program on the campus of the State university. I should like to say that in my opinion the Senator from Arkansas has just now made one of the finest contributions that have been made to the debate on the pending bill. I should like to ask him a question. Does he agree with me that, without my amendment, there will be very great danger that science teachers on small college and university campuses will be encouraged to leave them and go to institutions which are more adequately financed as the result of appropriations made to them by the National Science Foundation which is provided for in the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do agree with that view. As I stated, that would be especially true in view of the administration of the fund. If the bill contained the check which I believe existed in the administration of the Foundation which was provided for in the bill before us last year, then the institutions interested at least could present their case and know that they would have a hearing. But in view of the provisions of the pending measure, what the Senator says respecting his amendment is especially appropriate. His amendment is particularly significant in connection with the bill as it is now written. That is not a reflection on anyone's motives. In the nature of the case the more adequately financed institutions would act as magnets. Necessarily the ambitious young men and those best qualified would be dragged toward the most adequately financed institutions. That is the nature of the bill itself.

Mr. MORSE. That would have an effect on the educational standards of the institutions, and it would have the effect of drawing students to the most adequately financed institutions, would it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, before yielding to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who desires to have an appropriation bill considered, that I have only three other items I wish to present, and then I shall have concluded, unless I am interrupted by Senators with a running debate. I think I shall close in a very few minutes if I am allowed to proceed with the three items I have on my desk.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wished to point out again, as I did yesterday, that not only would that magnet attract the students, but we had the same experience during the war in the allocation of scientific research contracts. We drained practically all the scientific talent from smaller institutions. That was all right, because we were approaching a different goal and we wanted to get the job done. Now, in peacetime, we are trying to develop the peacetime scientific potential. As the Senator from Arkansas says, it is an entirely different thing.

Constantly in the debates there is the implication that it will be mandatory to send funds to the States. It should be again called to the attention of the Senate that under the Kilgore amendment, or my amendment, or the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, none of the funds would be expended in any State unless the program fitted within the policy of the Foundation. That is why I cannot see any objection to the amendment.

Let me add that this question was before the Senate last year. The Senator from Oregon is surely consistent, because he made a similar argument last year, as did former Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], myself, and others. The question was threshed out in the Senate and settled. This provision was placed in the bill last year after a long series of conferences with scientists and other witnesses, after representations from the land-grant colleges and from the State universities as well as other universities. It was decided that this was the best way to administer the funds, so that educational institutions could go along with the bill and urge its passage.

This year the Senate committee held no hearings. It was not necessary. But the new bill does not make this provision. That is the history of this part of the legislation. Last year after all the hearings everyone was agreed. The land-grant schools agreed to support the bill because of its basic principles, with

this type of amendment in it. The heads of universities and other institutions in every State of the Union said it was a fine bill with that provision in it. They said, "We want to participate in making America scientifically great." Why the provision is not in the present bill I do not know. I heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon that either his amendment or the Kilgore amendment should be in the bill. It would make it a much better bill, which would command more nearly universal support in all the educational institutions of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I heartily agree with what the Senator from Washington has said. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], based upon his experience as the head of a great university.

It has been my experience in the past, in connection with questions of research in my own State university and others, that all too frequently work has been started which needed a little additional encouragement and help so that it could proceed. There have been contributions from State university funds, and some outside help in carrying on programs of basic research on certain subjects peculiar to the area in which the university was located and the territory to be served. At the same time, the youth of that area were trained to take care of the scientific needs of the industries of the area. Has not that been the Senator's experience?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I must confess that we have not had much in the way of funds for research in our State.

Mr. KILGORE. That is true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yesterday I mentioned a very unusual example of research in nutrition by a man supported by the general educational fund at the university. I am sure that each State has its own peculiar problems. The effect which the Senator has in mind is the inspiration of our young men in all the States to undertake this type of work. If it is only a small project they quickly become familiar with it. I know that that is not being done now. The effect of the bill without such an amendment as is suggested would be to make it less likely that such a program would be carried on in the smaller State universities.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator. For the benefit of the Senate I wish to relate an experience in my own State.

The State university has naturally been interested in coal. It has been handicapped in carrying on the necessary basic research. About 2 years ago Mr. Ickes, who was then Secretary of the Interior, made available a small sum for research work in the laboratories on coal, particularly in the field of reducing it to liquid fuel. I believe the sum made available was $40,000 or $50,000. Some really fine results were accomplished, and some excellent workers in that field were developed with a relatively small amount furnished by a Federal agency to stimulate the work and to hire a couple of good men to help the staff which had already been at work. It also furnished a little extra equipment which was necessary, and which previously available funds could not provide.

The research field could well be helped from local sources with proper encouragement; but without encouragement there will not be such help. We shall find research work for Arkansas, for example, being shipped to Massachusetts, and the Arkansas students will have a tough time getting in to carry on the research, whereas they could easily get into the University of Arkansas.

In addition, we could build up seedbeds of scientists in each of the universities, which would produce young scientists from all over the country, rather than in a few hothouses.

As the Senator well knows, the ability to take students in scientific courses is based upon the size of the laboratory, because every student requires so much space. If we can scatter them and let them take care of local problems, I think we can go farther. That is why I am so much in favor of making this amendment a part of the bill.

The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the change of controls. I do not believe that the State universities and the land-grant colleges knew of the changes which had been made in the bill. I think they thought the bill contained the same provisions as the bill we voted upon last year.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has another engagement to keep later this evening, and I am glad to yield to him on condition that I do not lose the floor by so yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized upon the terms mentioned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the second deficiency appropriation bill. I make that request for one reason only. The report of the Appropriations Committee is unanimous. The bill contains funds for some departments which are in immediate need of funds. For example, in the Post Office Department and in some other departments the situation is urgent. I do not believe that there are any controversial issues in the bill, and I think it can be disposed of in a comparatively few minutes. I therefore make the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was there any discussion in the committee as to the item relating to the Selective Service System?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. We went into the subject of the selective service records.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was that item reduced?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. It was included as requested for the purpose of completing the liquidation and establishing new State agencies for the storage of the records in 54 centers throughout the country, so as to make them available for service work. The committee went into the subject at some length and granted the request of the Selective Service System for the amount asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply raise the question whether the unfinished business, which is being temporarily set aside, will, immediately upon conclusion of the bill which the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to have considered, be resumed, so that it will keep its place on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

Mr. SMITH. If that is understood, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with; that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

Salaries, officers and employees, Senate, fiscal year 1947, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, fiscal year 1947, $100,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

For an additional amount for miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1947, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

For payment to Florence I. Gerlach, widow of Charles L. Gerlach, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Office for Emergency Management," on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for traveling expenses, fiscal year 1947, is hereby increased from "$50,000" to "$70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices," on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Veterans' educational facilities: For an additional amount for the completion of construction and installation of veterans' educational facilities, fiscal year 1947, $20,000,000, to be available until expended, but not to be available for new projects after September 30, 1947, of which amount not to exceed $750,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Penalty mail costs: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Penalty mail costs", $2,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "General expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 16, to insert:

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1947, for the operation and maintenance of the Office of Selective Service Records as authorized by the act of March 31, 1947 (Public Law 26), including personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at a cost not exceeding $2,000; $5,103,000, with which amount the funds made available to said office by said act shall be merged, of which total amount not to exceed $44,000 shall be available for printing and binding, and not to exceed $19,100 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by the act of June 28, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 11, to insert:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Salaries and expenses, The Tax Court of the United States," $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 7, after line 20, to insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

On the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge $641,832,080.64 of the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes in such amount issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 4, to insert:

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Supply and distribution of farm labor: The funds provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued available through January 30, 1948, for carrying out the purposes of said act, as amended, and the act of April 28, 1947 (Public Law 40, 80th Cong.), an act providing for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program; and, in addition to the amount continued available, there is hereby appropriated for such purposes the sum of $6,000,000 to be merged with the funds hereby continued available. Not less than $2,400,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944. In addition to the amounts heretofore made available for administrative expenses pursuant to section 3 of such act, there is hereby made available out of said funds the sum of $300,000 for such purposes: *Provided*, That not to exceed $310,000 of the total funds remaining as of January 30, 1948, shall be available until June 30, 1948, for administrative and other expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, incident to the settlement of growers' and workers' contracts and accounts, the collection of reimbursements due the Government, the payment of transportation and other obligations outstanding, and the handling of other necessary fiscal and administrative work in the final liquidation and disposition of Government assets and liabilities under the program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the receipts derived from sales of labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities under the provisions of section 2 (d) of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 731), as amended, shall be available for the payment of costs of the liquidation of such labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and any appropriations or other funds from which such costs have been advanced may be reimbursed therefor from any such receipts, the net proceeeds of such sales to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask what is the amount of the appropriation for this item?

Mr. BRIDGES. Six million dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if that is the new budget estimate or the old one?

Mr. BRIDGES. The budget estimate was not before the Senate committee when this item was considered, because we were endeavoring to get it into this bill in order to take care of the farm-labor situation. The amount originally requested was $10,000,000. As the Senator recalls, the amount which we discussed yesterday afternoon was six and one-half million dollars, and we agreed on the $6,000,000 figure as a reasonable solution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is a new item for which a budget estimate has not yet been received?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. It is on the way up; but when the committee acted on it, it did so without the substance of a budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Are there any other items in the bill in that status?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; that is the only one we acted on without a budget estimate, and that was due only to the emergency of the situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I might say that the community facilities item was based on a previous budget estimate. It was $20,000,000. That was not in this particular bill. It had been provided for previously.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was a budget estimate which was submitted in connection with the first deficiency bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. And was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was a budget estimate for that item?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Are there any new estimates as to any other items which were not included in the President's original budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This $6,000,000 item is the only one?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to committee amendment on page 8, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to return to the selective-service record amendment. It seems to me it is quite unusual these days to give an agency exactly what it asks for. This involves quite a lot of money, merely to liquidate an agency. This might be a very good place to save a little money. I am not under the impression that the efficiency of the organization in my State justifies giving them everything they want. This is one of the few items in which a Government agency has been given what it asked.

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the Senator from Arkansas, I have always, as the Senator knows, been on the side of pruning down, and in general the criticism would be that I think Government agencies have too much money. But as to this item, as the evidence showed, that following liquidation it would be necessary to provide storage places and agencies in the States so that the records could be serviced for a period of 5 years. When we started the hearings certain Senators on the committee felt, as the testimony unfolded, that as there were some 15,000,000 men in the service, as there were a great many more who were rejected and who did not get into the service, and as from time to time the Selective Service received thousands and tens of thousands of requests for checking on service records, General Hershey and others testified that the records must be kept alive and that each State should have a central agency and records should be stored there so that they could be referred to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How many employees will there be?

Mr. BRIDGES. Approximately 2,000 in the whole country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Simply to look after records which are not active ex-

cept as someone may write in concerning them?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was one of the purposes of the Senator from New Hampshire to cut down on personnel.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is. It is not very often that any Senator can stand on the floor and criticize me for being too generous with the Government's money, but in this instance I thought the witnesses made a case for keeping the records in such shape and for servicing them in such a way as to make them available not only to governmental agencies but to others. We may have been too liberal; I do not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not also true that this service is not under the War Department but is an independent agency not subject to any other department, and that General Hershey has the last word? In other words, it is his domain?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It struck me as being a little strange that with all the cutting which has been done this is practically the only item which has not been cut at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. The principal item of liquidation is the terminal leave of the employees of Selective Service due to an act of Congress, which is an item which must be taken care of, as long as we have it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that it could be handled for considerably less than the amount provided. I know they have retained a very large force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will say that the matter was under the charge of the Committee on Armed Services. The item is included as a terminal-leave item for employees of the Selective Service System. The Senate passed a bill to keep various stations in all the localities until July 1. The House cut out that item, so that when the Selective Service was terminated the local offices were terminated as of March 31. The records will all be stored in State houses or in State capitols of the 48 States. That requires help. The records are left in the respective States because of various State bonus laws and because of various demands made in connection with the men's service records. If my memory serves me correctly, it will require 2,000 employees throughout the entire country to service these records and to put them in such shape as to make it possible to answer the questions in regard to the bonus laws which still are coming in in very substantial numbers, particularly from States such as Illinois.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are only 48 offices, and I understand that 2,000 persons are required to answer those questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are 48 offices, plus the office in Washington, which is the centralized office; and the employees are required in order to make it possible to get these records in proper shape. I believe the number provided for is the smallest possible number, and is as small as the Committee on Armed Forces recommended to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, but the number was reduced by the action of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand, it was the amount which General Hershey requested.

Mr. BRIDGES. It was the appropriation requested in the Appropriations Committee.

Let me say that approximately 80 percent of the $3,934,442 is to be paid out in a lump sum for terminal leave, in order that we may fulfill our obligation to the current employees. So, because of a previous act of Congress, we have no control over approximately 80 percent of the amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator ever consider putting this matter under the jurisdiction of the Army, now that we are in peacetime? It would seem to me that that would be a wise thing to do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, Congress passed the act, as the Senator knows; and we on the committee had nothing to do about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 10, after line 2, to strike out:

Establishment of air navigation facilities: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Establishment of air-navigation facilities", $600,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what the amendment will do to the Office of Civil Aeronautics. I notice that the amendment would delete an appropriation of $600,000. What will be the effect of that action on the Office of Civil Aeronautics?

Mr. BRIDGES. It will delay, of course, or stop the purchase of certain additional equipment for air transportation facilities which was recommended for purchase at this time. The amendment will not do away with any existing facilities; it will simply defer such purchases.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the amendment will not cripple the Office of Civil Aeronautics and will not prevent it from proceeding with its work; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; but the amendment will stop that Office from obtaining additional facilities, which it has recommended for acquisition at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I think one of the most important activities of the Government is to foster and give aid to the expansion of civil aeronautics. For that reason, I made my inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire, because I am hopeful that we shall give all possible aid for the expansion and development of civil aeronautics, inasmuch as it is one of the great industries and enterprises susceptible and capable of development now that the war is over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am interested in this item and in what the Senator has said about it and what he said yesterday, namely, that the Appropriations Committee in considering the bill next year may well consider the increase in costs. I point out that before the war two airports under municipal control were operated at a cost of $15,000 and $18,000, respectively, but the cost of operation after the war has been $30,000 and $36,000, respectively, with approximately the same number of planes being operated; and it was further found that in the case of an airport operated at another city, the cost of operation before the war was $18,000, and since the war the cost has been $36,000. In other words, the cost of operation has apparently doubled, due primarily to the expansion which occurred during the war.

However, the testimony was that all the airports have now reduced their operations by approximately 60 or 70 percent in respect to the number of planes which are being operated, as compared to the number of planes which were being operated prior to and at the time of the end of the war.

I think the whole matter must be most carefully examined in respect to whether it is necessary for us to continue at this highly accelerated scale. I am not referring to the matter of facilities, which constitutes another problem which we must wrestle with as best we can, although I think we must see to it that the existing airports are properly equipped, before we begin to build more of them.

The President set aside $40,000,000 which had been appropriated for use before July 1, and he did so in order that additional airports would not be built. I think the Appropriations Committee might well consider how far it should go in respect to providing more money for this purpose, before it is decided to use the $40,000,000 which already has been appropriated and now is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have the highest confidence in the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and in his committee. I simply make the point that we should take great care in respect to making appropriations for the expansion of civil aeronautics.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree. I may say that if there is any question as to this matter, the regular appropriation bill will soon be before the Senate; and if we make a mistake in any way in regard to the action we take now, it can be corrected in connection with the regular appropriation bill, when the entire subject will be under consideration. Inasmuch as only a month and a half or a month and a quarter remain before the end of the present fiscal year, I do not think any serious situation will develop as a result of our present action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 5, to strike out:

Maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities," $160,000, of which not to exceed $8,000 may be transferred to "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—(out of the postal revenues)," on page 13, after line 10, to insert:

FIELD SERVICE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Rural Delivery Service: For an additional amount for Rural Delivery Service, fiscal year 1946, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 14, after line 7, to insert:

Clerks, first- and second-class post offices: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks, first- and second-class post offices," $7,100,000, and, in addition, $2,900,000 to be derived by transfer in the following respective amounts from the appropriations "Salaries, Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," $16,000; "Salaries, Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," $10,000; "Salaries, Office of the Chief Inspector," $12,000; "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts," $32,000; "Salaries of inspectors," $75,000; "Post-office inspectors, travel and miscellaneous expenses," $5,000; "Contract station service," $200,000; "Clerks, third-class post offices," $200,000; "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices," $50,000; "Special-delivery compensation and fees," $300,000; and "Rural Delivery Service," $2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 25, after the word "carriers", to strike out "$28,018,800" and insert "$28,800,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say that all these post office items arise as a result of the increased volume of mail over previous estimates made by the Post Office Department. Although, in my judgment, perhaps in some instances there has been certain laxity and perhaps there has been overemployment, and so forth, yet these items seem to represent the rock-bottom increases with which the Department can get by and still maintain the service up to June 30, because of the general increase in the volume of mail, which has been very substantial during the past few months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 14, in line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 15, line 2, after the figures "$721,000", to insert "and, in addition, $152,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Domestic Air Mail Service.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, after the figures "$10,000,000", to insert "and, in addition, $2,500,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Domestic Air Mail Service.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 8, after the figures "$4,554,800", to insert "and, in addition, $3,090,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Domestic Air Mail Service.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 11, after the figures "$11,691,000", to insert "and, in addition, $3,273,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Domestic Air Mail Service.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 14, to insert:

Railway mail service, travel expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Railway mail service, travel expenses," $13,000, to be derived by transfer from "Domestic air-mail service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to insert:

Domestic air-mail service: The limitation on the amount available for supervisory officials and clerks at field headquarters is hereby increased from "$106,000" to "$124,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 16, line 3, after the words "one year old", to strike out "$127,000" and insert "$441,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 16, line 9, after "Vehicle service", to strike out "$2,996,700" and insert "$3,506,700, and, in addition, $30,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Transportation of equipment and supplies.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 14, to insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT

CIVIL FUNCTIONS

The Panama Canal

Sanitation, Canal Zone, Panama Canal: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Sanitation, Canal Zone, Panama Canal," $450,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 3245 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding for the consideration of the deficiency bill. In my opinion, it is a public service to get the bill through this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. It was a great pleasure to yield to the Senator. I understand, however, that some have suspected me of filibustering. I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that I shall soon be through with my remarks on the merits of the amendment now pending before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am grateful to the Senator for having yielded.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next piece of evidence I wish to offer in support of the amendment is a letter received from the president of the University of Maine, Arthur A. Hauck, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES,
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
Orono, Maine, March 20, 1947.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The members of the National Association of State Universities have gone on record as heartily approving the establishment of a National Science Foundation. They believe that the objects of such a foundation can best be achieved if the principle of geographic distribution by States of a portion of the research and development funds is incorporated in the legislation. The National Association of State Universities, therefore, strongly urges that there be included in the final bill provision for the geographic distribution of funds along lines suggested in section 5 (c) of Senate bill 525.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR A. HAUCK,
President.

Earlier this afternoon I offered another letter from the president of the University of Maine in support of the specific amendment which I have offered.

As my next bit of evidence, I wish to offer a statement of the Washington Association of Scientists, as follows:

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the near future you will be called upon to consider S. 526, a bill to establish a National Science Foundation. The Washington Association of Scientists has carefully analyzed Report No. 78, submitted to you by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare along with the bill. We should like to take this opportunity to commend the committee on the careful consideration it has given to this legislation. We are in agreement with all but four of its recommendations. This letter expresses our considered opinion on these four points.

We feel that the primary purpose of the National Science Foundation should be to expand the facilities and personnel now available to science. Your committee has stated

that research contracts should be placed "wherever facilities and manpower offered the greatest hope of success." This policy, if pursued exclusively, will channel major benefits to already well-supported activities but will fail to develop potential facilities and personnel in presently undeveloped areas. Scientific talent is likely to be found anywhere and may remain undiscovered and unutilized unless suitable training opportunities are widespread. We think, therefore, that a portion of each year's grants should be earmarked for aid to scientific traning and research on a geographic and population basis. We agree with the statement that the bill is not primarily aimed to "subsidize educational and research institutions throughout the country." But the purpose of the National Science Foundation, as stated in the preamble of the bill, is "to promote the progress of science." We wish to urge most strongly that the progress of science depends upon the support of scientific training and research in educational institutions. Training facilities and research opportunities must be accessible to potential talent everywhere if the latter is not to be wasted. With these thoughts in mind, we recommend acceptance of the amendment to S. 526 submitted by Senator MORSE on April 2, 1947.

We are also concerned about the proposed administration of the National Science Foundation. S. 526, as it now stands, provides a part-time board of 24 members, steered by a 9-member executive committee, supervising a full-time director. Your committee's justification for this form of organization is that it offers the benefits to be derived from "the collective wisdom of a part-time board of scientists, educators, and men of public affairs." We fear, however, that this provision will result in divided responsibility and buck-passing within the Foundation, while, at the same time, make of it a virtually autonomous agency. We think that the Foundation should have a more centralized administrative authority and a direct line of responsibility to the President and Congress. Therefore, we favor a single administrator or a small commission. The advantages claimed for a large part-time board can be retained by providing a large, part-time board in a purely advisory capacity. It seems contrary to good public policy to place in the hands of part-time personnel the control of large sums of public money, particularly when the administrative personnel are at the same time potential beneficiaries. With a single administrator, effective action may be expected and Congress can accurately fix responsibility.

We feel that the position of your committee on the status of the social sciences is ambiguous. On the one hand, the committee "is cognizant of the impact of fundamental science on modern society and of the need for social science studies." On the other hand, it "rejected the proposal that the social sciences be included as a division of the Foundation at this time" because "the disciplines of the social sciences are not at this time sufficiently well-defined." Since the importance of the social sciences is acknowledged, the lag in their development constitutes the strongest argument for their support. The Washington Association of Scientists commends and supports the latitude given to the Foundation in establishing its divisional structure, but believes that if divisions for any of the sciences are to be specifically established in the bill, one for the social sciences should also be specifically established. Otherwise, support for the social sciences, so essential to the intelligent utilization of the advances of the natural sciences, may be regarded as a secondary matter and fail to receive proper attention.

We agree with your committee that science legislation should not contain patent provisions which tend "to establish a broad patent policy of the Government for all agencies." But we also believe that the Congress should not give over its responsibility for establishing patent policy to the National Science Foundation. Congress would do this under the present provisions of S. 526.

Congress should establish patent policy for the specific problems likely to arise under the Foundation. We suggest that the bill be amended to provide that any invention, discovery, or finding produced in the course of research financed by the Foundation should be made freely available to the public and should, if patented, be freely dedicated to the public. This will simultaneously assure that the people as a whole, and not special groups, will be the beneficiaries of publicly financed research, and will discourage the withholding of scientifically valuable information pending the establishment of patent rights. Your committee argues in terms of the wartime experience that the granting of patent rights may be necessary to obtain cooperation in certain types of projects. This should not, however, be necessary in times of peace, and particularly in the fields of fundamental research which the Foundation is primarily to sponsor.

In summary, we recommend the passage of S. 526, amended as follows:

1. Distribution of a portion of the funds on a geographic and population basis.
2. Administration by a single administrator or small commission.
3. Recognition of the social sciences as of equal importance with the natural sciences.
4. Public dedication of patents resulting from Foundation-supported research.

We believe that these amendments are in the national interest and urge their introduction and support.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD M. EMBERSON,
Chairman, Washington Association of Scientists.

Mr. President, there are one or two points in the memorandum that I desire particularly to stress. I may say that I am not so much concerned as this group of scientists appear to be from their letter about a Foundation composed of 24 men, if, as the Senator from Arkansas pointed out, and I think also the junior Senator from Georgia and the Senator from West Virginia, we protect the institutions in the several States from what I think could very well develop into rather arbitrary action on the part of the National Foundation; because it is true—I think there is a great deal of merit in the argument made by the Senator from Arkansas—that when we create the Foundation, we do not retain very much control over it except for the amount of money we may appropriate. In other words, the control of Congress over it becomes very much a control of appropriations. I am not sure that that is a very sound procedure to follow; it certainly is not sound if there is not included anywhere in the law creating the Foundation some protection to the colleges in the respective States from arbitrary action on the part of the Foundation. For example, the Foundation, like all other institutions, is going to be composed of human beings. I think we owe it to the colleges and universities in our several States to give them the protection the two great national educational associations are asking for, in the evidence that I have submitted this afternoon, against the danger of being frozen out by the National Foundation, so far as allocating to specific projects in the State schools of scientic research the funds with which to carry on the projects.

It makes no difference how much proclaiming is done on the floor of the Senate; we cannot get away from the fact, by the record I have built up here citing the views of one educator after another, outstanding scientists, that there are many educators and many scientists who fear the effects of the bill in its present form if the amendment I am proposing is not adopted.

The next authority I want to cite, Mr. President, is Roger J. Williams, now professor of chemistry of the University of Texas. He has been one of the leading men of science in this country during the last 15 years, recognized in all chemical groups as one of the great chemists of America.

With respect to my amendment, he says this:

> I think your amendment is an excellent one, and would favor its adoption on its merits, because it tends to decentralize research activity. During the war certain favored institutions were badly overcrowded with contracts, while others were entirely left out in the cold.

That is repeating, in a little different language, the views of another great American scientist who expresses the very fear to which I have directed attention, that the bill in its present form will result in unfair discrimination in the allotment of money—as he says, the fear that certain favored institutions will get more than their fair share of the fund.

I think it very unfortunate to enact legislation which will be looked upon by many men of science and many men in the field of education, in institutions which my amendment would affect, as a bill that is unfair to them. We have a good chance, it seems to me, by the adoption of the amendment I am proposing, to eliminate that cause of friction and misunderstanding among men of science and among various educators.

Mr. President, I wish, before summarizing my remarks, to propound a parliamentary inquiry. It is the desire of the junior Senator of Oregon to divide his amendment into two amendments. He would like to have a vote on the first part, that part ending on page 2, line 16, after the words "Puerto Rico," and he would then like to have the language starting on line 16 with the word "Of," and continuing through the rest of the amendment, considered as a different amendment. Is it necessary for the junior Senator from Oregon to move to divide his amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the judgment of the Chair, the Senator has control of his own amendment, and may ask for a division.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment divided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be divided.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would that mean that the first part of the amendment would be considered first?

Mr. MORSE. That would be my desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be the usual procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment is divided into two sections, will not the first section, or the first half of it, be the same, in some instances, as the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, on which the Senate has already voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No, the amount of the fund is different, in the opinion of the Chair, and the Senator is entitled to submit a divided proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to summarize the position which I have taken on the amendment, under the following points:

First, I have this afternoon submitted the views of the officials of two great educational associations of this country, the Association of State Universities and the National Association of Land Grant Colleges, which associations make very clear in the statements I have submitted in their behalf that they desire to have my amendment accepted and to become a part of the bill.

Mr. President, during the short period while the deficiency bill was being considered by the Senate I was informed by certain Members of the Senate that they really had not known what the issue was until I made the presentation which I did this afternoon and called to their attention the views of various educators. Therefore, I think it is very important that the Members of the Senate be given the opportunity to look over the statements of these educators and scientists which I placed in the RECORD this afternoon, check with them in their respective States, and see whether I am right or wrong when I say, as I have said several times this afternoon, that if the Members of the Senate will check with the college presidents and the men of science on the faculties of the universities of their respective States, they will find that an overwhelming majority of them believe that in the interest of sound scientific research my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I observe in the amendment, Mr. President, the following language:

Not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares.

I assume and understand from that language that the smallest State in the Nation could receive the same amount, so far as that part of the Senator's amendment is concerned, as will the largest State. Then the amendment proceeds:

And the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States.

The inquiry to which I ask the Senator to address his attention is this: Let us suppose there is a State which has no institutions that are properly fitted for carrying out this type of work, do not want to do the work, have no inclination to do it, and yet this amount comes to the State ipso facto and automatically. Does not the Senator feel that his amendment thereby would make it possible for a waste of money to occur as to that specific State to which in such a case, since funds would go to the State, even though they were unwanted, and even though the State might not be able to handle the situation properly when the funds arrived?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not share that interpretation of the amendment, but if the amendment is subject to that interpretation I am perfectly willing to accept modifying language so that such a result will not be brought about. That is not the intent of the amendment. The intent of the amendment, as I said earlier this afternoon, is to make funds available if and only if the State institution can come before the National Science Foundation and offer the necessary financial and contractual arrangements and meet the scientific tests of research, the criteria that the Foundation sets up for carrying on a research program. Unless they can do that they will not receive any funds. I shall be glad myself to write language in the amendment which will carry out that purpose more clearly, if the Senator from Missouri thinks it is not now quite clear, or I shall accept language proposed by the Senator from Missouri to make the amendment clear that if in a year the institution does not make such arrangements and showing to the National Foundation, then the money will revert to the Foundation and will be available for other distribution, and not accrue to the benefit of such institution. That is what the Senator from Oregon has in mind. If the amendment is not clear, I want it clarified.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the desire of the Senator, and his frankness and courtesy in responding. I may say in passing that I have not prepared any other language. I simply have read the language of the amendment, but it seems to me that it is subject to the objection which I make.

Mr. MORSE. I shall clarify it.

Mr. DONNELL. I may read the sentence which I think makes it absolutely mandatory that money shall go to the States regardless of their ability, regardless of their inclination. The language to which I refer is as follows:

Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census—

Then follows this language—

and the amounts so apportioned to each State shall be expended only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements.

Mr. President, it appears to me, and I respectfully submit to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the concluding clause of the sentence to which I have referred does not remove the fact that the money will go to the States regardless of their respective desires, regardless of their respective abilities to handle it after it has been received. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not agree with my view of the proper construction to be placed upon that sentence?

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I think his point is well taken in that the language which he has read, in my judgment, is ambiguous and needs to be clarified. I shall clarify it by adding a proviso clause just as soon as I finish this speech and get a chance to write out a proper clause, but it will be to the effect, I can assure the Senator from Missouri, that the result which he thinks might flow from the language presently used will not flow.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further observation?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not want the Senator to labor under the impression from what I have said that I am by this series of queries committing myself to vote for his amendment. I have not determined which way I shall vote upon it. But I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator and his frankness in his comment with respect to my inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position very accurately and definitely, and I want to thank him for raising this point, because I have only one objective, and that is to have passed the best possible National Science Foundation bill, one which will give the greatest impetus over the years to scientific research in this country. As I stated earlier this afternoon, I think it is fundamental to our national security, and I submit that, in view of the evidence I have offered, I do not think the bill in its present form will best promote that objective. I think it would promote that objective much better if we took the precautions I am proposing by way of my amendment, adopted the amendment, and put at rest the fears, the suspicions, and doubts which exist in the minds of many well-qualified educators and scientists as to what the effects of the bill will be without the amendment. I think we owe it to them. I think we should pause long enough in the Senate over the week end to do a little checking in our home States, make a few telephone calls to our college presidents and our men of science. Senators can check up on whether or not I have presented a point of view which is that of most of the college presidents and the men of

science in our State institutions. It is easy to do that over the week end. I believe if Senators will do it they will find that an overwhelming majority of these men will say, "MORSE is right about it. He is representing the point of view of the men of science in our institutions." It is only because of my desire to have the best possible national science bill passed by the Senate that I have taken the time this afternoon to spread on the RECORD arguments and evidence which I think it is very difficult to answer.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one very brief observation and inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator has rendered an exceedingly valuable service this afternoon in his presentation, regardless of what the outcome of the vote may be, and regardless of how any other Senator or how I may vote on his amendment. He has given to us the views of eminent educators, and, notwithstanding the difference of opinion between the Compton brothers, to which reference was made, I take it that the Senator has contributed greatly to the information of the Senate as to the views of responsible and leading educators.

The inquiry to which I ask the Senator's further attention relates to a question of fact. There was recently held in Washington, within the past 10 days or 2 weeks, a conference of university presidents. I am not certain whether they were all presidents of State universities. I happen to know that Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, president of the University of Missouri, was present. I should like to know whether the Senator is informed as to whether that gathering, which I think occurred in the Raleigh Hotel passed upon this question and resolved as to its views concerning this particular measure?

Mr. MORSE. I am not informed whether they took any action on this particular measure. On the basis of the resolutions previously passed by the officers of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and the Association of State Universities, which I have placed in the RECORD, and in which they ask for the adoption of my amendment, I take it for granted that if there had been any change in the policy of either one of those associations they would have so notified me. The letters which I have placed in the RECORD are of very recent date. The latest communications which I have received from college presidents have been to the effect, "Adopt the amendment you have proposed." Those are the requests which I have received from them.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Missouri has excited my curiosity to a considerable degree. I was wondering whether he had some State university or college in mind which he thinks might be unwilling to accept the $41,000 minimum which this bill would provide. Unless he has some particular land-grant college in mind, I think he is unduly alarmed, although I think it would probably be well to iron out any ambiguity in the terminology of the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no such information, Mr. President; but it occurs to me that the mere fact that a particular institution in the State might be willing to accept money does not at all establish that that institution is qualified to spend the money adequately. As I see it, the amendment is defective in that, regardless of the ability of the State, regardless of the ability of the institutions within the State, there is a mandatory requirement that funds shall be paid to the State—in the first instance, in equal amounts, regardless of the population of the State, so that Nevada, Wyoming, and the more thinly populated States would receive identically the same proportion, as to that part of the fund, as would the more thickly populated States; in the second place, there is a further distribution based upon population, but without any reference whatsoever to whether or not the institutions are either willing or qualified to perform the work. I assume that many of them would be willing to accept allotments, and possibly all of them would be.

I am not unmindful of the fact that no services can be procured by the various institutions except pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements as specified in the amendment; but that still does not remove the fact, as I see it, that the money would go into every State, regardless of its ability, leaving aside for the moment the question of its desire to receive the money. The money will go into every State, regardless of its ability to expend the funds properly after so receiving them. I think the point is well taken, and I understand from the previous expression of the Senator from Oregon that he thinks there is at least something to the point.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to make inquiry of the Senator from Oregon as to the provision of the bill as it now reads. Would it be possible for the university of a State, or a college within a State, to make application for any part of the fund for any worthy research project it might have under way?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. THYE. If the University of Minnesota had a project under way or in contemplation, if it could convince the authorities having supervision of the fund that the project was worthy, would it not be possible for the University of Minnesota to receive a part of the fund for such a research project?

Mr. MORSE. Only if the National Science Foundation decided to make an allotment of funds. That raises a very important point which goes to one of the important objections to the present bill on behalf of educators.

I recognize that it is a very difficult point to discuss on the floor of the Senate, because a human equation is involved. But as the evidence I have submitted this afternoon shows, many educators and scientists are fearful that if we concentrate in the National Science Foundation Board all the power the bill would concentrate in it, the practice will be to discriminate against land-grant colleges and small colleges out in the "sticks," as they say to me in private conversation.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that their fears are based on some experience. We have some great private philanthropic research foundations in this country. That is as far as I will go by way of identification, because I am only expressing the charges, fears, or feelings of educators and men of science with respect to the policies of such foundations. Having served over a period of years on the Pacific coast regional board of one of such foundations, I must confess that at least with regard to that particular organization, I think there is a basis for the fear that, given two scientific projects of equal standing, one proposed by a chemist, we will say, in X University, and one proposed by a chemist in a very large university, or, as some of these letters say, on the list of the favored few institutions, the chemist in the university on the list of the so-called favored few will, judging from the experience of many educators, stands a much better chance of receiving the grant. Many educators tell us that that has been the record of the so-called scientific foundations which have had huge sums of money to dispense for scientific research purposes. There has been a natural tendency on the part of the boards having charge of the funds of those foundations to give money to the scientists in the so-called favored institutions to an extent out of all proportion to what they give to scientists in the smaller institutions.

With that as an experimental background, we find college presidents and scientists in our land-grant colleges and State universities giving us this warning, through me this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, not to pass a bill which would make it possible for the National Science Foundation to continue the policy of discrimination which they say has been their experience, to which I will attest on the basis of such limited experience as I have had as a member of the Committee on Scientific Research of my own State university, and as a member of a regional board which has the work of making recommendations with respect to a great many scientific projects.

I think there is a basis for their fear, but whether there is or is not, I think we ought to remove the fear, because, in my judgment, the very fear itself is a serious inhibition to the successful operation of this bill if we pass it without the amendment.

Further, I urge my amendment because I am satisfied that it would be a great stimulus to research in many colleges and State universities, and that in the absence of my amendment there would not be such stimulus.

The argument has been made on the floor of the Senate that the problem is not solved by either of the two arguments which have been made on this question. The first argument, made by the proponents of the bill in its present form, is, "We have given representation on the board itself to the Association of State Universities and to the Association of Land-Grant Colleges." The presidents of those colleges, the scientists, and the faculties of those colleges, on the evidence that I have submitted will say, "That is not enough. That will turn out to be only a matter of form and not of substance. That will not protect us. There is a 24-man board. We need more protection than that, so far as the problem we are presenting to you is concerned."

I think they are right about it, and with the type of correction which the Senator from Missouri has suggested we can give them protection and will make a worth-while contribution through our action in carrying on a better scientific research program than can possibly be carried on under the legislation as proposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to clear up in the mind of the Senator from Missouri the question of whether the Association of College Presidents endorse the bill. Last year all of the associations, including the Association of American Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, endorsed it. That bill included a similar provision to that presented by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator that I have a statement which I have received from Dr. Day, chairman of the group to which the Senator has been referring, saying he approves the bill but would like to see the number of members of the Foundation reduced to nine, and that the Director of the Foundation——

Mr. MORSE. I want to apologize to the Senator from New Jersey for not having heard what he said, but I was paying attention to another matter, and I cannot very well pay attention to two things at once. Will the Senator repeat his statement?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be very glad to. I said that Dr. Day who, as the Senator knows, was appointed chairman of the group of scientists to which the Senator referred—I had a long talk with him regarding these controversies—is in favor of the bill. He says:

I am glad to be able to send you the following report:

The Inter-Society Committee on a National Science Foundation endorses Senate bill S. 526 and the companion House bills, with the recommendation that the bills be amended in the following two respects:

These are the amendments he would like to see made to the bill:

1. That the number of members of the Foundation be reduced to nine.

2. That the Director of the Foundation be appointed by the President, after consultation with the members of the Foundation, by and with the advice of the Senate.

He does not include the point which the Senator is now making. I do not know whether he has abandoned that position or not. He says the intersociety committee wants those two amendments.

Mr. MORSE. What association is it?

Mr. SMITH. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C. The intersociety committee on a National Science Foundation was a committee which was appointed by the same group to study the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon does not deny that the American Association for the Advancement of Science favors the bill which the Senator has submitted, but in view of the fact that the Senator has raised the subject of Dr. Day's attitude in the matter I shall confer with Dr. Day over the week end and will have available, when the Senate convenes on Monday, his position on my amendment. The recent correspondence which I had with him—I grant it is not as recent as the letter from which the Senator from New Jersey quoted—the recent correspondence which I put into the RECORD states categorically that he favors my amendment. I am sure that if I confer with him over the week end he will say, "I am still in favor of the amendment."

The committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science may be for the bill in its present form, but I am satisfied that Dr. Day, as a witness, will testify on Monday, just as he testified in the letters which I have introduced this afternoon, that he believes it would be a better bill if it contained my amendment.

Let me make clear to the Senator from New Jersey that Dr. Day and all the other scientists and educators whom I have cited this afternoon would take the position, as the junior Senator from Oregon certainly would, that the bill proposed by the Senator from New Jersey should be passed rather than no bill at all. I want the Senator from New Jersey clearly to understand that, because earlier in the afternoon he seemed to think that I was seeking to perform some disservice to science. I want to say to the Senator that there is not a Member of this body, including the Senator from New Jersey, who is more desirous of having passed a National Science Foundation bill than am I. I am seeking only to amend it in a way which I think will make it a better bill. I would agree with Dr. Day or any of the others whose testimony I have put into the RECORD this afternoon that of course we want the bill introduced by the Senator from New Jersey rather than no bill at all. But when the question is put to Dr. Day clearly over the week end—and I assure the Senator from New Jersey that I shall quote him verbatim in regard to this matter—I am positive that the president of Cornell University will say, "I still think we ought to have your amendment attached to the bill."

Mr. SMITH. I should like to call attention to the fact that he signs himself "Edmund E. Day, chairman, Inter-Society Committee." He says:

I am glad to be able to send you the following report.

He signed it as chairman of the committee. I read:

The Inter-Society Committee on a National Science Foundation endorses Senate bill S. 526 and the companion House bills, with the recommendation that the bills be amended in the following two respects:

If he was so keen about the Senator's amendment, why did he say that?

Mr. MORSE. If I may interrupt, and then I shall be glad to yield further, let me say that he wrote that letter, as I interpret it, as a member of the committee of the American Academy of Sciences, or whatever the title is—

Mr. SMITH. No, it is a committee which met in Washington. It is the only committee about which he has been writing me. It is called American Association for the Advancement of Science. It is the Inter-Society Committee of that whole group. It is the same group with which I have been in touch. We have been over this matter again and again, both last year and this year. It disturbs me to have this argument reiterated, after we have covered the matter so thoroughly.

Let me call attention to a letter from the chairman of the Engineering College Research Council of the American Society for Engineering Education. The letter is signed by Thorndike Saville, chairman, and it reads as follows:

ENGINEERING COLLEGE RESEARCH
COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN
SOCIETY FOR ENGINEERING EDUCATION,
May 12, 1947.

Dr. JOHN H. TEETER,
Staff Assistant, Majority Policy Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. TEETER: There has come to me as chairman of the committee on legislation of the Engineering College Research Council a copy of your letter of April 7 to Dean Dawson of the University of Iowa. I am distressed to learn that representatives of the State and land-grant colleges have apparently undertaken a campaign to have Senate 526, as amended, further changed to include percentage allocation of funds to State and land-grant institutions. I feel fairly confident that no such letters as you mentioned, or at least very few, came from engineering college officials. Various engineering college administrators of the land-grant and State institutions have assured me personally that they were opposed to such provisions.

You will remember that in my testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I undertook on my own initiative, and not as a representative of the Engineering College Research Council, to indicate strongly my view that there should not be any such allocation with specific reference to State and land-grant institutions. I was naturally happy to see that the bill as amended omitted this element.

Dean Dawson has asked me to report on up-to-the-minute developments in National Science Foundation bill matters at the meeting of the Engineering College Research Council in Minneapolis the middle of June.

May I request, therefore, that you send me information as it may develop between now and then. The engineering colleges, as you know, are vitally interested in this bill and are desirous of helping its prompt passage through the Congress.

I have been in the West on business for the last 2 weeks, and therefore am somewhat behind time in my information. Can you inform me as to whether or not this full-dress debate that you mention in your letter to Dean Dawson is still to take place, and let me know the present situation generally.

As you will doubtless learn from Dean Dawson, he has sent out a circular letter to members of the Engineering College Research Council asking that they endorse S. 526, as amended. I am sure that many have done this, and I have myself.

Yours very truly,

THORNDIKE SAVILLE,
Chairman.

The Dean Dawson referred to in the letter is the same person to whom the Senator from Oregon has referred today.

Mr. President, we are in considerable difficulty here, inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon is in receipt of letters in which certain groups take one position, and I am in receipt of letters in which other groups take the opposite position. I have used my utmost sincerity in trying to obtain the best and most correct answer to this problem and in trying to obtain the conclusions of the most qualified men throughout the United States. My conclusion is that the safest procedure is to have on the Board of the Foundation men whom the President appoints, and to let them determine how the funds shall be used. The difference between the conclusion I reach and the conclusion which the Senator from Oregon reaches is a comparatively small one; it is that I think it is wiser to let the men who are placed on the Foundation determine how the research shall be carried out and where it shall be conducted, rather than to have the work scattered among the universities in the various States. That is the difference between the position of the Senator from Oregon and my position.

Let me say that I trust the scientific men of America with all my heart and I believe that they wish to see the best possible scientific research work performed, and I believe they wish to see it done in the places where it can best be done, rather than to have it scattered around on a geographic basis, more or less indiscriminately insofar as the greatest efficiency is concerned. I am sure they wish to see the utmost progress made in connection with scientific fields of endeavor, in which this country needs so sorely to have progress made.

I fear to have the amendment of the Senator from Oregon adopted because I am afraid it will result in scattering and distributing in an inefficient way the work which will be done. There is no question that I give the Senator from Oregon credit for being entirely sincere in the position he takes. I simply think he is wrong, and I feel sure that I am correct; and I shall do all I can to persuade my colleagues to support the position which I and those who view the matter as I do have taken in regard to it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Jersey has stated the difference between the position he takes and the position I take, but it seems to me the difference is very important. Of course, I freely admit that there are two different schools of thought in regard to this feature of the measure we are considering. It is obvious that the Senator from New Jersey would have us believe that the great preponderance of the qualified men are in accord with his view of the matter and the provisions which he advocates. I freely admit that the question is whether an amendment similar to the one I have proposed should be incorporated in the bill or should not be incorporated in the bill. I merely state, as I have previously tried to point out, that unless we take care of the problems which the amendment which I have offered would cover, it seems to me we would do a great injury to the National Science Foundation before it ever has a chance to begin to function.

I say to the Senator from New Jersey that when the Senate convenes on Monday, I shall have available, and shall make available to him, the last-minute statement of the president of Cornell University. I am satisfied that when Senators examine the letter which I put into the RECORD today they will find that he said in substance, "I personally believe that this amendment should be put into the bill." I presented that letter as the view of Dr. Day, as president of Cornell University, and in no other capacity.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let us emphasize that point. Dr. Day personally has said that to me; but he has also met with his committee, and his committee has considered the evidence; and he has reported honestly, as he should, as chairman of the committee, that the committee has come to the other conclusion. That is the point I wish to bring out. He may have his own personal views, but he had to present the views of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Of course. I take the position that I think his own views are entitled to a great deal of weight.

Mr. SMITH. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. The committee to which the Senator from New Jersey has referred does not represent either the Land Grant College Association or the Association of State Universities. Those two great organizations stand opposed to the bill in its present form; and I am urging that the Members of the Senate get in touch with their State college officials between now and Monday, so as to ascertain whether I am presenting the views of the great majority of the presidents of those colleges.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will further yield to me, let me inquire whether he is suggesting that between now and Monday the Members of the Senate take a telegraphic poll to determine this question.

Mr. MORSE. Of course not.

Mr. SMITH. After all, we spent 2 years studying the best way to deal with this problem. Consequently, a snap judgment based on a last-minute telegraph poll would not be the best way to deal with the question. I can produce from my files various letters, some taking one side of the issue and some taking the other side. I admit that it is a contentious subject.

Mr. MORSE. I submit that the Members of the Senate, many of whom have not yet come to grapple with the problem insofar as determining the views of the officials of their respective States is concerned, should check with those officials to determine whether I have correctly presented the facts as to the views of the educators and faculty members of the colleges and universities of their States; because before Senators vote on the amendment and on the bill, I think they should ascertain definitely and with certainty the effect which the amendment and the bill will have on their States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator means that he would have Senators ascertain what the effect will be in the opinion of certain people. I think that under the bill as it is written, the projects which should receive help and which should be developed as far as possible will receive far more aid than they would if the distribution of funds were made on a geographical basis. In short, I think the interest of scientific advancement will best be furthered by the method proposed by the bill, rather than by a geographical method of distribution of the funds.

Mr. MORSE. That is the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, I respect the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey. I am simply trying to point out to my colleagues that I do not think they should accept the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey until they first do some checking in their respective States to ascertain the opinions of the educators and scientists in their States in regard to the effect of the bill as proposed by the Senator from New Jersey on the scientific research work and on scientific education in their States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE In respect to the question of opinion and experience in this matter, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I still have callous spots as the result of being criticized in regard to various bills of this kind. Finally, last year, we had a meeting with all interested parties, and at that time we agreed upon certain component parts of the bill which the Senate passed last year. At that meeting and in respect to those views, the land-grant colleges, the State College Association, the engineering societies, the sciences in general, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Senate were represented. I have been puzzled throughout this entire debate because, to be perfectly frank, I still cannot understand why the provision we have been discussing was left out of the bill after all that agreement was had, because the amendment we have been discussing is in conformity with the majority of the views which were expressed at that meeting, as shown by the minutes of the meeting. That meeting was held in Washington. The subject before the meeting was not this question but the

question of administration. The assembly voted 41 in favor of a single administrator to be appointed by the President; 22 in favor of a part-time board, such as would be set up under the provisions of the bill as it now stands; and 32 in favor of a full-time board; 18 of those who attended the meeting expressed no preference. So I do not understand how it can be said that a certain view is in accordance with the sentiment of that entire Inter-Society Committee. After all, a majority—41—were in favor of having a single administrator, to be appointed by the President.

Mr. President, we have had to work on this subject and whittle down the provisions in the course of the consideration of seven successive bills. The situation I have just stated is the one we found in connection with the bill which the Senate passed last year. But under the provisions of the bill as it is now before us, the decisions which were made last year would be ignored, and other provisions would be made.

I take the same position that the Senator from Oregon takes. I do so with the utmost respect for the Senator from New Jersey, whose integrity and honesty in this matter I would not even think of questioning. But I take the position, as does the Senator from Oregon, that when it is discovered that certain provisions have been left out of the bill as it is now before us, there will be strong criticism from many of the engineering colleges. Some Senators say that our concern should be, not with the engineering colleges, but with other colleges and institutions; but I respectfully submit that the Senator from Oregon should get in touch, not only with the president of Cornell University, but with the dean of the College of Engineering at Cornell University, who himself suggested, last year, the method we propose for handling the matter. I wished to explain that situation and have a complete statement made in regard to it, because my experience with the deans of various engineering colleges last year was that all of them favored the legislation which we have suggested, but with the modification that nothing should be spent for building, of course. They wanted such a provision omitted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to that matter, let me say I think it is significant that the amendment which the Inter-Society Committee desired to have incorporated in the bill would have quite a bearing on the question of administration. They desire to have such an amendment included in the bill. I should like to know whether the Senator from New Jersey is disposed to accept the amendment which Dr. Day has suggested.

Mr. SMITH. No. I told Dr. Day that his first point was covered very clearly. He wanted to have a committee of nine appointed, and in the bill an executive committee of nine is provided for, and also a director is provided for. He wanted to have a director appointed by the President. That matter will be brought out on Monday by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I shall discuss it at that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My point is that the Administrator set up under the pending bill makes more necessary than ever the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I think the fact that they had in mind at least the Administrator appointed by the President might have had some influence.

Mr. MORSE. I think the point made by the Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct, and I have covered that matter heretofore in my remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One other point. I am impressed with the fact that these educators had the other bill under consideration for over a year, they are all thoroughly familiar with the bill, and I still think their favorable attitude toward the proposed legislation is primarily based on their familiarity with the bill of last year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a unanimous-consent request, at the suggestion of Members of the Senate, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday May 19, 1947, at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the amendment proposed to the bill S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947, by Mr. MORSE, on page 15, after line 10, relating to apportionment of funds to the various States, and upon the said amendment, whether amended or not.

This has to do only with the so-called Morse amendment, or any amendments which might be offered thereto, and the hour is 2 o'clock Monday afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McMAHON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I inquire what amendment is to be voted on at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Any amendment that might be offered to the Morse amendment could be offered and could be debated until 2 o'clock. After that time we would start voting. This has to do only with the Morse amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. This is simply a limit of debate on one amendment, the one offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or any amendment thereto, and does not apply to any other amendment to the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct; up to 2 o'clock.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the hour for a final vote on the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not suggesting that yet. This refers only to the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. The order would be that we would vote on any amendment at 2 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. On the Morse amendment only.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh; very well.

Mr. CAIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia, as I ponder the request of the Senator from Nebraska. Is there any essential difference between what has been known as the Kilgore amendment, which was voted upon this morning, and the amendment known now as the Morse amendment, which we are considering voting on at 2 o'clock Monday?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. The President pro tempore decided there were important differences between the amendments. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] contains part of the amendment I offered this morning, but with some stricter limitations and additional matter. It is a decidedly different amendment from the one on which the Senate voted this morning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it proper to enter into this agreement without a quorum call?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; because it does not relate to the vote on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is the point I wanted to raise, and it is the only objection I have to the proposal. I am perfectly willing to go along with the agreement as to my amendment being voted on at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon, but I do not think it should be entered into without a quorum call, because I do not know that all Senators share my view about it, and, as I said in my speech earlier this afternoon, I intend to protect the interests of Senators by a call for a quorum, because I know how it feels to be out of the Chamber when such a request is acted upon. If the request is submitted, I shall ask for a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to express a word of appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his frankness and for his consistency with respect to the quorum-call matter. He announced earlier today his position, and he is standing by it, and I think he is to be commended for his courage in so doing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to state that he emphasized the fact that, so far as the rule of the Senate is concerned, a quorum call is required only on a request for a final vote on a bill or joint resolution. The rule does not require a quorum under the existing circumstances; but of course the Senator is free to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. I know that what the Presiding Officer says is true, and I pointed that out in my speech earlier this afternoon, but, as I said, I think we are going too far in the trend toward having unanimous-consent agreements without quorum calls, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would withhold his suggestion for a moment. I have been pacing the Chamber

for 2 days trying to present an uncontested and unobjected-to amendment to the bill, which I should like to have disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his point?

Mr. MORSE. I withhold it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of an amendment which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 15 of the bill it is proposed to add a properly designated paragraph, as follows:

The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say, briefly, that the amendment was submitted to every sponsor of the bill, and everyone else who was interested in the bill I could find, who could take time to read it, and it has met with the approval of all of them. It meets with the approval of people outside who are interested in the Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission, and the members of the committee to whom I have taken it think it will amply take care of the situation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I presume this amendment refers, in the main, to military security, and is not intended to extend controls over the Foundation that are not also equally applicable to any other Government agency such as the Army, the Navy, or the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is correct, as I understand it.

Mr. SMITH. The only matter I wish to protect is the freedom of research in areas where the national security is not protected. Of course, I have never raised any question that any legislation we pass in this connection should be subject entirely to the act to which the Senator has referred. I am not opposing his amendment, but I should like to get into the RECORD a few remarks on the proposed amendment relative to the relationship of the Foundation to the Atomic Energy Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has brought up something that is always difficult, that is, the maintenance of security without infringing upon the freedom of research. That was one of the problems we had to resolve in drawing the Atomic Energy Act last year. I want to make certain that there is attached to this amendment no congressional history which would indicate that if the Atomic Energy Commission were to register their protest to a grant-in-aid for atomic research the protest would not be listened to, because I think it should be listened to. What is the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. SMITH. I am willing to read, for the benefit of Senators present, the statement which I have prepared very carefully, under advice, in order that we might have in the RECORD an understanding of what we are doing by the amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not wish unduly to prolong the debate, but I think in view of the importance of the subject, the matter referred to should not be placed in the RECORD without our hearing it. We should hear anything that is to become a part of the legislative history of the act.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be very glad to read the statement so the Senator from Connecticut may comment on it and add any thought he may have; likewise, the Senator from Iowa.

It will be recalled that the Atomic Energy Act was carefully drawn in order to protect the public and the world at large from the misuse of this new power source by controlling the production or acquisition of fissionable materials in dangerous quantities. That act was not intended to extend Government control to either basic or applied research in nuclear physics.

I pause to ask if that is a correct statement.

Mr. McMAHON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. SMITH. I continue:

In all our discussions of Government-supported research, particularly in connection with this National Science Foundation, it has been impressed upon us that, to be fruitful, research must be free from dictation from any source, and particularly from a central government agency. That is one reason why in this Foundation we have provided that the real responsibility and authority shall be vested in a group of part-time civilians who will neither desire to exercise such direction and control nor have the time to do so. This principle in very clearly set forth in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. I call your attention particularly to section 3 (a), which provides that "The Commission is directed to exercise its powers in such manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in the fields specified below by private or public institutions or persons and to assist in the acquisition of an ever-expanding fund of theoretical and practical knowledge in such fields. To this end the Commission is authorized and directed to make arrangements (including contracts, agreements, and loans) for the conduct of research and development activities relating to (1) nuclear processes; (2) the theory and production of atomic energy; (3) utilization of fissionable and radioactive materials"; and other matters concerning nuclear physics. The important part of this section is that it clearly contemplates freedom by any institution to conduct research in this field. The Commission is directed to "insure" that that is done and to "assist" in the doing of it, not to control it. Moreover, in numerous other portions of the bill exemptions from the requirement to secure licenses from the Commission are given with respect to research and development. I do not wish to take your time in order to read these provisions. Let me just refer to them by number. They are sections 4 (c), 4 (e), 5 (a) (2), 7 (a), and others. It is clear therefore that this amendment—

That is, the amendment which the Senator from Iowa has just offered—

will leave the Foundation, with respect to research in the whole field of nuclear physics or atomic physics, in the same position as are all other Government agencies and private research organizations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in order that I may address a question to the Senator from Iowa, I should like to have the RECORD made clear at this point. As I understand the amendment which has been presented by the Senator from Iowa, there is no change made in the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission in dealing with this subject under the provisions of the so-called McMahon Atomic Energy Act, which we passed last year. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for the purpose of my making an inquiry of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator from Iowa has the floor. He yielded to me for the purpose of permitting an explanation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for an inquiry?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I may yield, I do so.

Mr. DONNELL. The inquiry I would like to address to the Senator is twofold. In the first place, the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa says that the Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, without first having obtained concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. The question I desire to present to the Senator is this: In his opinion, is the field of atomic energy susceptible of being set off into one watertight compartment, or are there numerous other chemical and scientific phases which might be considered by the Atomic Energy Commission to be within the atomic energy field, and yet might not be considered to be so, by the Foundation? I am not familiar with the scientific facts, but I shall try to make my question a little clearer. In the opinion of the Senator, is the provision against support of any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy apt to result in such a situation that the Foundation will start upon a certain line of research and development activity, thinking that it does not involve at all the atomic energy field, yet the Atomic Energy Commission may rise up and say that it is in the atomic energy field? In that event, the judgment of which one of those organizations would control?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me that the act of last year, of which he was the author, has gone to great lengths in attempting to define the field of atomic energy and of

nuclear chain reaction; that it is an extremely well-defined field, and should be a well-understood field, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. I have no fear that it is sufficiently well defined and sufficiently well set apart so that inadvertent invasions of that field would be very difficult, indeed. A reading of the act will show that research foundations and research groups can, within certain limits, and with substantial freedom, engage in certain basic research in these fields, without too much control by the Atomic Energy Commission. The point of the Atomic Energy Act and its safeguards is that they are largely pointed—one might almost say exclusively pointed—toward the security against the wrongful use of atomic energy as an explosive or as a weapon.

The preliminary fields are very great, where freedom of science is large indeed. This amendment, which is a very mild amendment, was written with the idea of not unduly curtailing the Foundation in its activities. It merely says that if the Foundation wants to support or get into the field of atomic energy, they shall first get a concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission, that what the Foundation proposes to do or to support will not adversely affect the common defense and security. That means a concurrence between the two, if the Foundation wants to invade this field. I anticipate no conflict, no difficulty; but I think the very interests of safety in the explosive field demand that the Atomic Energy Commission, which is so specifically charged with safeguarding the atomic energy field, shall know what somebody else is doing, and shall concur in their extensive researches or development, so that the defense of the country and our national safety shall not be adversely affected. I feel that the proposed amendment assures that. I feel sincerely, and I know that various others do, who have carefully thought this out, that it does not unduly curtail the Foundation, but it protects the common defense and security.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further brief inquiry?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the great importance of the subject, and I share fully the sentiment and the view of the Senator from Iowa as to the importance of safeguarding the atomic-energy field from invasion by some other branch of our Government, or by an activity chartered or authorized by our Government. I should like to ask a further question. I think in part it has been answered, but I should like to get a somewhat more specific answer, if the Senator will give it to me. Suppose that the Foundation should consider that a certain particular activity was not embraced in the atomic-energy field. The Foundation thereupon engages, by contract, the services of certain educational institutions to carry on the research along that particular field. Then, up rises the Atomic Energy Commission and says, "We have secret information which we cannot reveal to you. We say that this is within the field of atomic energy."

My question is twofold. In the first place is it necessary that the Foundation shall first submit the project in which it intends to engage to the Atomic Energy Commission for the determination by the Commission as to whether the atomic energy field is being invaded?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The answer is "No."

Mr. DONNELL. In the second place, may I ask, if there is a difference of opinion on the part of the Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission, does the Atomic Energy Commission have the absolute right to determine whether or not what the Foundation deems not to be an invasion of the atomic energy field is nevertheless such an invasion?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is picturing what could be called a most hypersensitive twilight zone in one assumption, and in another he is projecting a very practical problem. I can imagine this thing reaching such a strained point of fine distinction as to whether the making of a particular type of pipe or valve which may be used for water transmission or which could be used for atomic energy purposes, was actually an instrument of research or a development in the atomic energy field in which they might draw hypertechnical distinctions. I say to the Senator, however, that I am convinced we must rely on the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission could not and would not attempt to define something as specifically in the atomic energy field which was not clearly demonstrable as being in that field. If there is evidence that any foundation or any group is too far invading the atomic energy field, then I think the Atomic Energy Commission has the last word.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Would it not be better and safer if in line 2 of the amendment, after the words, "the field of atomic energy", a clause were inserted so the language read as follows:

> The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy for military purposes without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am afraid that by the addition of those words we might be getting into a very undefinable ground. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that this matter has been battled out during the last couple of days with the Atomic Energy Commission and some of the people interested directly in the proposed Foundation, and the Atomic Energy Commission feels that my amendment provide a proper and an adequate safeguard. It is what is generally considered, I think, as a mild amendment, not snubbing up the Foundation too close, and yet giving concurrence on the question of common defense to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. I am not disposed to press the matter, except to say that in the Atomic Energy Act which is now on the statute books we were very careful not to put any restrictions on research, and likewise in the bill now pending I do not like to see any unnecessary restrictions on the right of research. For instance, suppose the Foundation were to finance a study of, let us say, photosynthesis, that is the growth of foods by artificial methods, the production of foods by artificial methods. That is in the field of atomic energy. Literally I suppose the Commission could prohibit it, and, of course, the Foundation should not be permitted to do so. I presume the answer is that the Atomic Energy Commission, under the act, is entrusted with such great powers that we must more or less trust to their common sense.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the Atomic Energy Commission is admonished and directed in the act to give the greatest possible assistance and afford the greatest possible leeway to research and development. There is a mandate in the act to that effect, as the Senator knows.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. I think probably the answer is that in working under this bill, if a disagreement should arise, we will hear from either the Commission or the Foundation in years to come.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to say, before the adoption of the amendment, that while I read the statement presented by the Senator from New Jersey a moment ago, and I think it expresses in general my understanding of the act, my examination was somewhat curtailed, but I believe that with that summation the Senator has expressed the idea quite well.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is now as follows. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a unanimous-consent request, whereupon the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Oregon withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum and permit us to proceed and act upon the unanimous-consent request, or is it still the purpose of the Senator from Oregon to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that the unanimous-consent request has not been acted upon, I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn, whereupon the Senator from Oregon will advise the Chair whether he wishes to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator from Oregon withdraws his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum is withdrawn.

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I raise the question whether or not I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator from Oregon does not have the floor.

Mr. MORSE. My understanding was that when the Senator from Iowa interrupted I yielded to him so that he might bring up his amendment, with the understanding that I would not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it makes little difference. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have only one request and one statement to make and I am through. I now ask permission to have my amendment reprinted so that it will appear in two parts, so as to avoid confusion on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MORSE. My last sentence on the topic I was discussing Mr. President, is that I sincerely hope the Members of the Senate over the week-end will read the evidence I have placed in the RECORD this afternoon setting forth the views of outstanding educators and scientists respecting my amendment, because I think if they do they will vote in favor of my amendment on Monday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 19, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles J. Little, of New York.
Paul H. Norgren, of Massachusetts.
Hector C. Prud'homme, of Connecticut.
R. Smith Simpson, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Leonard Lee Bacon, of New York.
Walter Galenson, of New York.
Paul L. Guest, of California.
John B. Lynch, of New Jersey.
Charles B. Marshall, of Massachusetts.
Charles H. Owsley, of the District of Columbia.

Eugene Desvernine, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas W. Ainsworth, of New Hampshire.
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John W. Burnett, of Texas.
Richard H. Courtenaye, of California.
Oliver S. Crosby, of Pennsylvania.
Harold J. Edelson, of New York.
David H. Ernst, of Massachusetts.
Richard B. Finn, of New York.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Herbert Gordon, of New York.
Grant G. Hilliker, of Wisconsin.
Rogers B. Horgan, of Massachusetts.
John D. Iams, of Oklahoma.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
John F. Leich, of Indiana.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
Arthur D. Weininger, of New York.
Joseph O. Zurheilen, Jr., of New York.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 19, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. Leslie Glenn, D. D., rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries for them, for us, and Thy whole church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 16, 1947:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 132. An act to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes;

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 460. An act to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

On May 19, 1947:

S. 273. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 191 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CEILINGS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended March 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Montana Oil and Gas Producers' Association, Shelby,

Mont., endorsing the joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing the State of Montana to lease State lands for the production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons for such periods of time and on such terms and conditions as may be provided by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Petitions of the members of the Griffin Townsend Club, No. 1, and the members of the Macon Townsend Club, No. 1, both in the State of Georgia, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee for fishery investigations of the University of Hawaii and the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry, Territory of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and the development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The memorial of E. A. LaVergne, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor-relations bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 50

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to preserve the continuity of the United States Marine Corps in enacting legislation to merge the armed forces

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps, founded in 1775, is the oldest branch of the armed forces; and

"Whereas its history is replete with deeds of bravery and daring from the founding of our Nation to the glorious struggles for Iwo Jima and Okinawa; and

"Whereas the United States marines have fought to make our country's flag respected in every part of the globe and by their presence and readiness to sacrifice have made the seven seas safe for American travelers; and

"Whereas thousands of Wisconsin's sons have served ably and well and many have gallantly lost their lives in the uniforms of the United States Marine Corps; and

"Whereas legislation has been proposed in the Congress of the United States to merge the armed forces, and among the proposals are bills which would give to administrative officers in other branches of the service the sole power to wipe out by a scratch of the pen the existence of the Marine Corps; and

"Whereas such extinction of the United States Marine Corps would be a grave injustice to the brave men who have for 172 years written its glorious tradition with their life's blood: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide by legislation for the continued existence of the United States Marine Corps as a branch of the armed forces in any merger of such forces; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the clerks of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from Wisconsin with the request that they strive to preserve the continuity of the United States Marine Corps."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 49

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to remove discriminatory Federal income-tax burdens on citizens of noncommunity income States, including Wisconsin

"Whereas the citizens of 10 'community income' States of the United States are accorded the privilege of reduction of Federal income taxes by making returns based on a division of income between husband and wife and by the resulting application of lower brackets of graduated surtax, which privilege is not extended under present Federal law to the citizens of the other 38 States, including the State of Wisconsin; and

"Whereas the failure to extend an equivalent privilege to citizens of such 38 noncommunity income States results in imposition upon them of more than their fair and just share of the Federal income-tax revenues and costs of the Federal Government, and such discrimination against them should be remedied: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation which effectively removes such discrimination, by extending to married persons throughout the United States a uniform privilege of division of income between them for Federal income-tax purposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin member thereof."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Commitee on Finance.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to grant its consent to uniform taxation of certain Indian properties, which are taxed by the Federal Government and which are immune or claimed to be immune from State taxation

"*To the honorable the Congress of the United States of America:*

"Whereas there remains nontaxable 2,785,477 acres of Indian-owned lands located within the State of Oklahoma, and whereas, by recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, there has been a general revision of the trend toward holding instrumentalities of the Federal Government free from State taxation; and

"Whereas the Federal Government itself imposes inheritance and income taxes against the trust funds and earnings of trust funds and all of the earnings from the sale of mineral resources, including oil and gas production from Indian lands and trust funds and securities held in the Treasury of the United States, in trust for Indians; and

"Whereas, as to the Five Civilized Tribes, the Supreme Court in the case of Oklahoma versus United States has recently held that all personal property, all cash and securities held in trust by the Government for full-blood Indians, and all real estate, except that real estate which is exempt from ad valorem taxes, either by act of Congress or by provisions in trust deeds or patents, is subject to the inheritance, gift, and transfer tax laws of the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas there are many other tribes of Indians, the taxability of whose property is still in doubt and will result in a large amount of litigation; and

"Whereas it is within the power of Congress to make provision for the taxation of such Indian properties and the income therefrom should be the subject of State taxation; and

"Whereas in the absence of such action on the part of Congress the State is put to much expense, trouble, and inconvenience in trying to impose taxes on the same properties which are taxed by the Federal Government, and whereas, as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the above-cited case, as follows:

" 'Congress cannot have intended to impose Federal income and inheritance taxes on the Indians and at the same time exempt them by implication from similar State taxes.

" 'Congress has passed laws under which Indians have become full-fledged citizens of the State of Oklahoma. Oklahoma supplies for them and their children schools, roads, courts, police protection, and all the other benefits of an ordered society. Citizens of Oklahoma must pay for these benefits. If some pay less, other must pay more. Since Oklahoma has become a State it has been authoritatively stated that tax losses resulting from tax immunity of Indians has totaled more than $125,000,000. If Congress intended to relieve these Indians from the burden of a State inheritance tax as a consequence of our national policy toward Indians, there is still no reason why we should imply that it intended the burden to be borne so heavily by one State.

" 'Restricted cash and securities and lands not specifically exempt by acts of Congress from direct taxation and miscellaneous personal property and insurance, all belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, held not exempt by any existing legislation from State estate taxation': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein)*:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to immediately pass a uniform act in which the rights of the States to tax the same properties belonging to restricted Indians, which is taxed by the Federal Government, and that such act be made to apply alike to all Indian tribes and individual restricted Indians located within the State of Oklahoma.

"SEC. 2. Provided, that nothing herein is intended to levy any tax on the allotted or selected homesteads of any restricted Indian and provided that the State disavows any purpose or intention of providing any tax lien against any restricted real estate of Indians within the State of Oklahoma, which would result in the levying of any process or execution against such properties as would interfere with, or molest the rights of occupancy and enjoyment thereof by such Indian citizens of the State of Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the senate the 3d of May 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of May 1947."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary laws to continue the hot-lunch program for school children

"Whereas the hot-lunch program inaugurated by the United States Government has been a very successful program and of great

benefit to the school children of this State; and

"Whereas it assures a nutritious diet to the children of poor parents, many of whom would suffer from malnutrition if such hot-lunch program is not continued in cooperation with the school districts of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to enact the necessary laws, and to make the necessary appropriations to continue the hot-lunch program for school children.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of this senate be, and he is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of March 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 29th day of April 1947."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass House Resolution 2410 by Congressman TOBY MORRIS, relating to the establishment of a Federal old-age pension program

"Whereas the present old-age assistance program in Oklahoma has failed to adequately take care of our needy, and under our present case-worker system the aged mothers and fathers in this State are being treated unfairly and unjustly; and

"Whereas more than $2,000,000 collected each year for the purpose of supplying the needs of the aged, are being consumed in the payment of high-salaried case workers; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a resolution known as House Resolution 2410 by Congressman TOBY MORRIS, relating to the establishment of a Federal old-age pension program, and which is intended to correct the above evils: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That we memorialize Congress to adopt and pass said House Resolution 2410 by Congressman MORRIS, relating to the establishment of a Federal old-age pension program.

"SEC. 2. It is hereby directed that a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to each of the Senators of the State of Oklahoma and to each of the Congressmen of our State, and that each be requested to use his best efforts to accomplish the purpose to which the House resolution above-mentioned is directed.

"Adopted by the senate the 29th day of April 1947.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 1st day of May 1947."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 14

"Resolution requesting that the regional headquarters of the War Assets Administration in the city of Tulsa not be moved from said city

"Whereas it is rumored that the regional headquarters of the War Assets Administration located at this time in the city of Tulsa, Okla., is to be moved to a point outside the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas it is believed that it would be a disservice to the people of this State and to the people of the region that said headquarters services for said headquarters to be moved at this time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That it is the sense of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma that it would not be in the public interest for the regional headquarters of the War Assets Administration, located in Tulsa, Okla., to be removed therefrom, and General Littlejohn, Administrator of the War Assets Administration, Washington, D. C., is hereby requested not to move said regional headquarters from the city of Tulsa, Okla.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to General Littlejohn, War Assets Administrator, Washington, D. C., and a copy to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate, April 16, 1947."

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2868, transferring the horses, property, and program of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas H. R. 2868 now pending in the Congress of the United States has for its purpose the transfer of the horses, property, and program of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas the program of the Remount Section of the United States Army has been to raise thoroughbred horses, and to distribute stallions throughout the country in such manner and on such basis as to improve the quality of horses generally; and

"Whereas it would be in the public interest for such programs to be continued through the United States Department of Agriculture rather than for the horses and the property of the Remount Section to be sold and the program discontinued: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact H. R. 2868 now pending in the Congress, having for its purpose the transfer of the horses and property of the Remount Section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture, and the continuance of the program which has resulted in improving the quality of horses throughout the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 1st day of May 1947."

DEVELOPMENT OF CLARKS HILL POWER PROJECT—RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of South Carolina urging the continuation of ample appropriations for the development of the Clark's Hill power site on the Savannah River as a public-power project and setting forth the benefit the people of South Carolina and the people of Georgia will derive from the development. I may state that the resolution was introduced by more than 100 members, and there was not a dissenting vote against its adoption.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to continue ample appropriations for the development of the Clarks Hill power site on the Savannah River as a public project

Whereas the Clarks Hill project on the Savannah River is in the process of construction by the United States engineers, same having heretofore been authorized by an act of Congress, and more than $5,000,000 having been appropriated to the engineers and allocated to this project; and

Whereas there is being circulated the report that the people of this territory are not in favor of the construction of Clarks Hill as a public project, but would like for it to be developed by the Savannah River Electric Co., a private corporation; and

Whereas the resources of the Savannah River for flood control, power development, navigation, recreation, and other benefits which would flow from the development of the project have been neglected for many years; and

Whereas the Savannah River Electric Co. many, many years ago acquired large property holdings, including the dam site, and, in 1928, procured from the Federal Power Commission a permit to build a power dam at the Clarks Hill site, which said permit was voluntarily surrendered by said power company in 1932, at which time the power company announced that it would never again build another power plant on the Savannah River; and

Whereas the said power company, having surrendered its permit and having announced that it did not intend to go ahead with any further projects on the Savannah River, undertook to, and did, actively aid and assist the people of South Carolina and Georgia in petitioning Congress to authorize the development as a public project; this activity and support of the public project having lasted for a period of more than 10 years; and

Whereas this project having been authorized by Congress by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and supported by subsequent appropriations, and now after the project is actually under construction by the United States engineers, the Savannah River Electric Co. seeks another permit from the Federal Power Commission on said site, the result of which would be to stop the public development of this project; and

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the construction of Clarks Hill as a public project, and by an act of the legislature of 1945 created the Clarks Hill Authority, which said Authority was authorized and directed to promote public development of the project by the United States Government and to make compacts with the Government and with the State of Georgia with respect to said development, and to appear before Congress and other agencies of the United States Government in support of the development as a public project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged to continue sufficient appropriations with which to carry on this public development, and the Governor of South Carolina, who is actively supporting this development as a public project, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey this resolution to the proper committee or committees in Congress and/or to such other agencies or departments of the Government as is proper.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR.

I, J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing concurrent resolution and certificates thereto are forwarded to the committees of the Congress of the United States and the agencies of the Government interested in the subject matter thereof, under the authority contained in said resolution directing the Governor to transmit this resolution to the proper authorities.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor of the State of South Carolina.

MERGER OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 27, passed by the Illinois State Leg' 'ature. The resolution has to do with the attitude of the legislature toward the merger of the armed services and its effect upon the marines.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 27

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has protected and defended American interests in all parts of the globe ever since its inception; and

Whereas in every military venture which the United States has undertaken the achievements of the Marine Corps have always typified the ultimate in heroism and self-sacrifice; and

Whereas it would be a shocking travesty for the people of the United States to sound the death knell of an institution which has served so nobly; and

Whereas legislation pending before the Congress of the United States, if enacted as presently constituted, would bring to an end the existence of the Marine Corps as an independent unit: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring therein), That we urge the Congress of the United States not to approve any legislation unifying or merging the armed forces unless there is contained therein assurance that the Marine Corps will be retained in its present form; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, April 29, 1947.

Concurred in by the senate, May 7, 1947.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present four petitions from Mrs. Carrie M. Snyder, president, Frances Willard Centenary Union, WCTU, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of the so-called Capper bill, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

These petitions bear, respectively, 233 signatures, 155 signatures, 162 signatures, and 115 signatures, all in the State of Colorado. I ask that the petitions be received and that they be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 603. A bill to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries; without amendment (Rept. No. 183); and

H. R. 1288. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a private right-of-way to Roscoe L. Wood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 184).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Peyton Ford, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General; and

Bryce R. Holt, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina, vice Carlisle W. Higgins (term expired).

BANKHEAD-FLANNAGAN EXTENSION WORK FUNDS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from H. A. Praeger, State president, Kansas Farm Bureau, in which he urges approval of the third increment of the Bankhead-Flannagan funds for extension work.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS., *May 16, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support third increment of Bankhead-Flannagan funds for extension work. Would assist materially in increasing benefits from the extension program in Kansas by employing 4-H Club agents. Home demonstration agents in a number of Kansas counties not now having these positions. Also would provide for further development of balanced farming and home-living program. Thanks.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
H. A. PRAEGER, *President.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1307. A bill for the relief of Edward Trapier Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1308. A bill to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unlading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1309. A bill to prohibit the holding of radio station licenses by Members of Congress and their wives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1310. A bill to amend and supplement various Federal statutes, as amended, having for their purpose to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities, to provide administrative agencies to be responsible for the carrying out of this act and existing laws pertinent thereto; to promote the greatest normal economic exchange of goods and services among the people of the United States and with the people of other nations; to protect the people of this country and their property from the recurring evils of world-wide inflation and deflation; to stabilize the purchasing power of money; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1311. A bill to provide a permanent civil-service status to certain Federal employees and reinstatement rights to former employees who have been discharged from the service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Jewett M. Branaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1314. A bill providing for the taking over by the United States Government of the Confederate cemetery at Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WATKINS (by request):

S. 1315. A bill authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1316. A bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1317. A bill to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to change the dates for the making of committee reports on the legislative budget and the filing of the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 114) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 54, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 17, 1947 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), is hereby increased by $85,000.

INVESTIGATION OF PROFIT-SHARING AND INCENTIVE-PAYMENT SYSTEMS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling for a study by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the incentive or profit-sharing plan.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 115) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the maintenance of the profit system is essential to the preservation of the American competitive capitalistic system under which the United States has attained the largest measure of general economic welfare enjoyed by any people in the world; and

Whereas the exploration of all available means for extending the direct benefits of the profit system to the largest possible number of citizens is highly desirable and important; and

Whereas in 1938 a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee held extensive hearings and made a report to this body relative to profit-sharing plans then in operation or which had been in operation up to that time, which information was of great value: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete study, covering the period from 1938 to date of hearings, of all existing profit-sharing and incentive-payment systems between employers and employees now operative in the United States, and to report to the Senate with a special view (a) to the preparation of an authentic record of experience which may be consulted by employers who are interested in voluntarily establishing profit-sharing plans; (b) to the consideration of what advisable contribution, if any, may be made to the encouragement of profit sharing by the Federal Government; (c) to the consideration of any other recommendations which may prove desirable in pursuit of these objectives; and be it further

Resolved, That for the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION AND SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President. I request that a statement I have prepared on this subject, together with a copy of a letter dated May 10, 1947, which I addressed to James E. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be received, lie on the table, and will be printed; and, without objection, the statement and letter presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT BY SENATOR WILEY TO PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION BILL

I am submitting today an amendment to the Senate bill 564, relating to Presidential succession.

This bill provides for succession in the office of the Presidency (in the event that both the President and Vice President are unable to discharge the duties of that office) of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, followed by the members of the Presidential Cabinet.

My amendment would enable the highest-ranking military or naval authority on active duty to fill the functions of the office of the Presidency in the event that all of the above individuals were unable to discharge the duties of that office.

CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRING AMENDMENT

The principal circumstance under which my amendment might become operative might be an atomic attack upon the United States Capital, which could, in one blow, exterminate all officers of our Central Government, including the Congress, the Cabinet, and the principal executive agencies. Under such circumstances, it would obviously be advisable that the highest-ranking military or naval authority, wherever he might be, take command of the situation in both civilian and military capacity, in order to meet the threat to the national security.

My amendment provides that this military or naval man would not be required to resign his particular military or naval post in order to fill the functions of the office of the Presidency (and Commander in Chief). His continuity in active military control would obviously be necessary. (Other officials, it should be noted, like the Speaker of the House or a Cabinet member, would be required to resign their positions in the event that they assumed the functions of the office of the Presidency.)

NEED FOR PREPARING AGAINST ALL CONTINGENCIES

The circumstances of atomic attack may seem fantastic, Buck Rogerish, and absurd to some people now. But we have learned that the fantasy of yesterday has become the proven invention and condition of today.

In this shrunken world where time and space exist no more, it is obvious that we must be prepared for emergency government with the speed and adequacy necessary in this atomic age. Every preparation against a war emergency makes that emergency less likely to happen. Ours is a government of laws. We must by definite law lay down succession rules so that there will be no dispute about rank in the event of a national emergency.

CHECKS AGAINST DICTATORSHIP

While some may say that my amendment would result in military dictatorship of the country, I want to point out: (1) That in the circumstances I am assuming, there would be martial law throughout the land anyway, which is equivalent to military control, and that (2) the ranking military or naval authority could exercise his functions under my amendment only so long as either the President, Vice President, Speaker or President pro tempore could not take over the office. Thus, in the event of an atomic attack, if part of the Congress were wiped out, the remainder of the Congress might re-form itself at some particular location and appoint a Speaker or President pro tempore. Either of these two officers would thus automatically become President, and displace the military or naval official from that office.

AMENDMENT OF STATE CONSTITUTIONS

It should be borne in mind that under our Constitution, only vacancies in the Senate can possibly be filled temporarily by Governors' appointments. All our States should have such provision in their State constitutions rather than to allow the present condition to continue wherein elections must be held to fill a Senate vacancy in some States. How could an election be held under conditions of atomic attack?

Serious consideration should be given to constitutional amendment to permit representatives to be appointed temporarily also by Governors in the event of vacancies.

ANTIMILITARIST TRADITION

Militarism and military control are absolutely repugnant to America's civil traditions, and to my personal beliefs, but it is obvious that, in the total emergency which will confront this Nation should war ever again come to us, military leadership would be required and would, in fact, be instituted whether my amendment were enacted or not.

PREVIOUS SUGGESTIONS

My amendment is but one of a series of suggestions which I have made from time to time on ways and means by which American defense and offense may be adequate in this atomic age. While we are making every opportunity to achieve peace and understanding in international relations through the United Nations, it is clear that we must be vigilant for our own security.

On February 9, in a radio address, I made certain suggestions such as plans for "government by remote control," and, yes, perhaps for "legislation by television," if necessary, in the event of atomic attack.

NEED FOR OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

A major shortcoming of existent legislation is that, under our Constitution, with Presidential elections required every 4 years, there is no provision for the suspension of such elections in the event of an invasion or similar emergency. What would happen, for example, if, in an election year, in October, America were attacked and the Constitution, as at present, required that there be an election in November with the President to take office in January? Obviously, such an election could not be held, because, were the citizenry to assemble in polling places, they would be subject to enemy extermination.

Under such conditions, it would obviously be wise for the ranking military or naval authority to continue leadership until such

time as he or the remainder of the Congress, if there were any, could indicate the need for a national election.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 10, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: For some time I have contemplated the grave menace of our country's security resulting from over-concentration in Washington, D. C., of all major Federal activities. It seems to me that the time is long overdue for a program for progressive decentralization from the Nation's Capital of Government agencies.

This, as I see it, would bring about advantages not only to community life in the Capital but would also bring Federal agencies closer to the people in the grass roots and would be basically a national defense measure.

It seems that the war-time decentralization from Washington has been reversed with most agency units being returned to town.

I would very much appreciate your answer to these questions:

(a) Do you regard such decentralization as I have mentioned as advisable and feasible in the near future? Of course, I do not mean a decentralization of a hundred or a thousand employees, but in terms of major fractions such as one-third or one-fourth of the total number of Government employees here at present.

(b) What would you regard as the steps and the means by which Congress might promote such decentralization, e. g., what form of legislation enacted, if any, would be required?

Any comments which you might care to make on this subject would be greatly appreciated. Moreover, I would appreciate your answers to the above matter at the earliest possible date at your convenience.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL TO INCORPORATE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR ALL WAR WIDOWS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to incorporate the National Committee for All War Widows, and for other purposes, introduced on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and that the bill be indefinitely postponed. This morning I asked the Judiciary Committee to indefinitely postpone action on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be indefinitely postponed.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 261)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5490.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have been appointed to take part in the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of President Allen of the University of Washington. I therefore ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate until May 28.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT V. BRYAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, May 23, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee Room, Room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Albert V. Bryan, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Hon. Robert N. Pollard, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], Chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD R. MEDINA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, May 23, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Harold R. Medina, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Samuel Mandelbaum, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE GRADUATING CLASS OF NATIONAL SERVICE OFFICERS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on May 17, 1947, before the tenth graduating class of national service officers, conducted by the Disabled American Veterans and other veterans' organizations in the American University, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS, AN AMERICAN—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Josephus Daniels, An American," written by Drew Pearson, and published in the Washington Post of May 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT ALEMAN'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters, relative to the visit to the United States of His Excellency Miguel Aleman, President of Mexico, one letter by Antonio Espinosa de los Monteros, Ambassador of Mexico, and the other by Hon. Josephus Daniels, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING NEEDS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial "Americans Without Homes," published in the New York Times of May 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF JED JOHNSON—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Rotten Business," published in the Washington Star of Monday, May 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Echoing Richard Whitney," published in the Washington News, May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLD STUFF (AND NONSENSE)—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Old Stuff (and Nonsense)," published in the Washington News, May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREEK PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Greek Program," published in the Washington News of May 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF PHILIP PERLMAN—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Perlman Should Be Confirmed by the United States Senate," published in the Baltimore Sun, May 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAND MONOPOLY—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Land Monopoly," published in the Washington Post of May 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may be permitted to sit during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration may meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee, and such if any members of another subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, as may desire to attend, may hold a meeting this afternoon during the present session of the Senate. The subcommittee to which I refer are the subcommittee on the nomination of J. C. Collet to be a member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and Marvin Jones, to be chief justice of the United States Court of Claims. I ask unanimous consent for such meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works may hold a hearing for a little while today, beginning at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope we may continue the consideration of the unfinished business. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Pepper
Baldwin	Hoey	Reed
Ball	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Sparkman
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Cain	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Wagner
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gurney	Morse	Williams
Hatch	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Conor	Young
Hayden	O'Daniel	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair may state that the pending question is on the first half of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Chair would like to inquire if the Senator from Oregon has changed the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I was about to ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me so I could make a statement with respect to that matter. I have this morning had placed on the desk of each Senator a mimeographed copy of the two parts of my amendment in their final form. The changes which have been made are designed to clear up the ambiguity in the language of the amendment in its original form, as pointed out on the floor Friday afternoon by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. Except for a change by way of clarification there is no change in the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to perfect his own amendment. The pending question, therefore, is on the first of the amendments submitted by the Senator from Oregon, in its perfected form.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet this afternoon at 1:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask what the request was?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet at 1:30 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senate was to have met this morning at 11 o'clock and that it took from 11 o'clock until almost 25 minutes after 11 to induce 49 Senators to answer to their names. I have no doubt that some Senators who answered answered in a very low voice which only the clerk could hear by reason of his extraordinary hearing facilities. The reason we are not obtaining attendance upon the floor of this house is due principally to the fact that many committees are holding hearings during the session of the Senate. It is a practice which is totally and completely contrary to the spirit of the Reorganization Act. It was the intention of that act that committees should meet while the Senate was not in session, and that when their reports were made to the Senate there would be the largest possible attendance of Senators in order to make sure that proper attention was being given to the subjects which were under debate. That is not being done.

I am not going to object to the request of the Senator from Utah, except that I want to couple with it an additional request. I ask unanimous consent to amend the request of the Senator from Utah by asking that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to make a report to the Senate of the number of committees and subcommittees which are operating now during the session of the Senate by unanimous consent granted either today or heretofore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming submits a supplementary unanimous-consent request, which he has stated, and which does not require repetition. Is there objection?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that I did not want to get into this controversy, but I think a mountain is being made of a molehill. I do not know of any more important work the Senate does than in committees. In my judgment it is much more important than the average work done on the floor. Furthermore, so long as we have no limit on debate it frequently occurs that a Member of the Senate will feel called upon, as he has the right to do, to speak for 2, 3, or 4, or 5 hours. Personally I have much work to do as an individual Senator, and I should like to be excused so that I could get some of the work done.

The Committee on Armed Services, of which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is the chairman, has been holding meetings now for about two solid months, giving everyone a chance to be heard on the very controversial merger bill. It so happens that the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, meets almost simultaneously with the Committee on Armed Services. The Senator from South Dakota is also a member of the Appropriations Committee, as is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators who find themselves daily being called to sessions of two committees meeting at the same time.

If the Congress wishes to get its work done, some way must be found so that the committees can transact business. Personally, I feel that one of the oversights, perhaps, in the Reorganization Act was to compel Members not to have committee meetings while the Senate is in session. There are many sessions of the Senate when all Senators ought to be present. There are many sessions of the Senate when I do not feel that a Senator can render any real service if a Member is speaking for 3 or 4 hours on the floor of the Senate, when we could be devoting ourselves to considering and preparing for submission to the Senate constructive and needed legislation. So, while I am generally in accord with my good friend from Wyoming, and while he can point to the fact that the law is on his side, as a matter of getting the Nation's business done, I think we shall have

to have meetings of the important committees, such as the Appropriations Committee and others, while the Senate is in session. Otherwise we shall not have appropriation bills ready during this session of the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I usually listen with a great deal of agreement to what the Senator from Maryland has to say. However, I wish to point out that there is no more important work than that which is done upon the floor of the Senate, because it is upon the floor that the final decision is made as to whether or not a committee report shall be accepted.

I have been looking around the Chamber since the Senator from Maryland began to speak. The quorum call showed 49 Senators present. At this moment there are only 22 Senators in the Chamber, including the Presiding Officer. The result will be, as it has been many times in the past, that after the discussion has taken place on this all-imporant National Science Foundation bill, Members of this body who are absent from the Chamber because they are in attendance upon the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee, or some other important committee, will, when the bill reaches a vote, come rushing to the floor without the slightest knowledge of the issues which are before the Senate, and they will run to one or the other spokesman upon the Republican side or the Democratic side, and say, "How shall I vote upon this subject." The vote will be cast not in accordance with the judgment of the absent Senator who comes back merely at the call of the bell, not upon his weighing of the issues as described in the debate, but upon the basis of a suggestion made to him by the chairman of the committee, the Senator in charge of the bill, or the ranking minority Member.

That, I submit, is an absolutely wrong way in which to conduct the business of the Senate, because it results in minority control. It results in decisions affecting the welfare of the people which are rendered by only a fraction of the membership of the Senate.

Mr. President, my supplementary request still stands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming has stated the facts substantially as they are with respect to attendance on the floor of the Senate, and I think he has assigned, in large part, the reason for the small attendance which confronts us day after day and hour after hour as we undertake to transact business.

Of course the Reorganization Act sought to cure the situation, or at least to better it. I am distressed by my conclusion that up until now we have not found the solution of the difficulty.

Manifestly committees must meet and must make their studies if the Senate is to have information when it acts. Manifestly the Senate cannot function while four or five or six committees draw the attendance of Members from the floor of the Senate to committee rooms. I do not know what the solution is—whether it is to go back to the original attempt to stagger our sessions by having 3 days a week of sessions of the Senate and 3 days reserved for committee sessions, or whether it is to increase the membership of our committees. But certainly the situation is grave, and demands consideration.

I would not want to be compelled to undertake to solve the problem by snap judgments on the floor of the Senate today. I think it is a subject which should have the consideration of the Committee on Rules and Administration, as well as that of the policy committees of both the majority and minority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that no attempt is being made to render snap judgment on the floor today. In making my unanimous-consent request I have not attempted to change the procedure, but merely to call attention to the result of the present procedure.

The unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was that a certain subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to sit during sessions of the Senate. My supplemental request was merely that the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to report to the Senate the number of such outstanding consents which are at this moment in operation, so that the Senate may be informed.

With respect to the Senator's query as to what the solution might be, he is quite correct in stating that this is a matter for the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, one suggestion which could be carried out very effectively, I believe, would be to adopt a rule with respect to irrelevant debate. If we had a rule banning irrelevant debate upon questions which are before the Senate, it would be impossible in most cases to have the 2- or 3-hour speeches to which the Senator from Maryland objected. I suggest that the Senator permit my modest request to go through, and that the Committee on Rules and Administration devote its attention to the underlying problem.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it is unwise to enter into any unanimous-consent agreement on this subject at this time. There is present in the Chamber at the present time only a minority of the Senate. I shall object to both the original request and the amended request or supplemental request of the Senator from Wyoming. I think it is highly important that we get back to legislation before the Senate and proceed with it as best we can and as rapidly as we may. I am wholly in sympathy with the suggestion for a study of the whole problem. I believe that an effort should be made to find some solution, or at least a palliative. I object to the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I should like to make a suggestion with reference to a practical cure for this situation, without materially interfering with the existing procedure. I suggest that we adopt a rule providing for an automatic limitation on debate of 1 hour or less on any bill or any amendment to a bill, which would allow an hour on the amendment and an hour on the bill, unless within 5 hours after the bill is called up in the Senate for discussion and consideration at least six Senators file a notice that they object to the limitation, in which event the limitation would not apply.

For example, if there were under consideration something like the poll-tax bill or some other measures with which we have previously had difficulty, we all know that we could not obtain unanimous consent to limit debate. However, with respect to the general run of bills which come before us for consideration, if we had an automatic limitation unless five or six Senators filed a petition asking that the automatic limitation not apply, we would have, in effect, a quicker way of transacting the business of the Senate. I would also add a requirement that during the time that such a bill is under consideration all remarks be germane to the bill.

Maybe I have not suggested the perfection which we all desire, but I believe that we can evolve a program or formula which will make the decisions of the Senate more representative of the wishes of the Senate, to confine debate on an issue which is before the Senate and limit debate to a reasonable length of time. If that can be done in the case of the vast majority of matters, it will certainly expedite the business of the session. My experience has been that we receive very little information from a speech that take 5 or 6 hours to deliver without interruption. The average Senator can make his whole speech in 30 minutes, or certainly in an hour; and I am not going to remain on the floor, unless the Sergeant at Arms brings me in, and listen to the floods of oratory which we frequently hear on measures about which we all know in advance and on which most of the Members of the Senate have already reached a conclusion as to which side of the issue they will take.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may be excused to go with me and attend a committee meeting, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with appropriations for the Department of the Interior be permitted to sit and hold hearings on this day and the remaining days of this week while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The supplemental request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] having been objected to, the pending question is the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to sit this afternoon. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] objected to both requests.

Mr. WHITE. I did not object to the request with reference to the meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do object to the supplemental request of the Senator from Wyoming, and I do it regretfully.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Maine regretfully objects to having the Senate advised as to how many committees are now in session in order that we might profit by being present to listen to the discussion by the Senator from New Jersey on the all-important measure affecting the National Science Foundation. I shall be amenable and shall not exercise my prerogative regarding the request of the Senator from Utah, inasmuch as I think this discussion has amply made clear the very unfortunate situation in which the Senate finds itself with respect to the transaction of the public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The question now is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet at 2 o'clock p. m. today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, before I commence by remarks with reference to the pending amendment I should like to ask unanimous request that a correction be made in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] so that it will read, on page 2, in line 18, "Association of American Colleges."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. SMITH. That the name of the organization be changed from "Association of American Universities" to "Association of American Colleges."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed on Friday last there had been some question as to the attitude of various individuals and institutions with reference to the pending amendment. The pending amendment, I remind those present, has to do with whether the funds which may be appropriated for the National Science Foundation shall be distributed on a geographical basis. That amendment was passed on earlier on Friday in another form. The Chair ruled that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was sufficiently different from the one which had been rejected as to justify offering a further amendment. The Senator from Oregon has now divided his amendment into two parts, and, as I understand, we will debate those parts separately and vote on them separately.

In line with the policy which I have adopted since I began taking the responsibility for this proposed legislation, on last Saturday I called Dr. Conant, of Harvard, and yesterday I called Dr. Day, of Cornell, and discussed the pending legislation with them. I think I am correct in saying that both those distinguished scientific leaders feel that the matter of most importance is passing a National Science Foundation bill. They both recognize the differences of opinion with reference to the way to allocate and distribute the funds. If I am correct in my impression, Dr. Conant, the president of Harvard University, feels that the plan proposed in the bill is a desirable one. Dr. Day, from his personal standpoint, thinks the geographic distribution is preferable, as the Senator from Oregon stated on Friday. Dr. Day pointed out, however, that that was his personal view and that he was in rather an embarrassing position because he was occupying a dual capacity. From the personal standpoint, he thought that geographical distribution was the preferable way of dealing with the funds, but he is chairman of the Inter-Society group, and they have declined to take a position on the issue because there is a wide diversity of opinion.

So the question comes down to which is the more desirable method of distributing funds. The land-grant colleges of the United States would like to see the funds distributed on a geographical basis, because the land-grant colleges primarily have looked to the Federal Government for aid for the work they are doing. Let me remind the Senate in that connection that during the current year and within the past few years the land-grant colleges are and have been receiving Federal aid to the extent of $40,000,000 a year. They are the main recipients of Federal aid. It seems to me that what we are considering now amounts to what might be called a drop in the bucket compared with the over-all Federal aid the land-grant colleges throughout the country are receiving. We are considering starting this experiment with $20,000,000. Under the program proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] last Friday, which was voted down, and under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], only 25 percent is asked to be distributed to colleges, which would amount to $5,000,000.

I have had a break-down made, which I shall not read into the RECORD, because the difference is so small as compared with the amount that they are receiving from the Federal Government.

I should like to call attention to the fact that the land-grant colleges which are now receiving $40,000,000 a year from the Federal Government total only 69 in number. The State-supported institutions receiving State money are 133 in number, and all other institutions of higher learning are 1,756 in number. We are dealing with 1,756 institutions of learning and deciding where the funds should be placed to bring the results that we want. I have felt it necessary to check up with the Association of American Colleges because they are not included in the land-grant group or in the State-supported group excepting insofar as they are members of the Association of American Colleges.

I have received a letter from Mr. Guy E. Snavely, with headquarters in Washington, in reference to this matter. He says:

> DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On behalf of the 623 member colleges and universities of the Association of American Colleges—

Mr. President, I emphasize the figure 623 colleges and universities which his association represents, as compared to the 69 land-grant colleges and the 133 State-supported institutions—

> I am expressing the earnest hope that favorable action will be taken by the Senate on S. 526 calling for the establishment of a National Science Foundation. As one who served on the committee of educators, headed by President E. E. Day, of Cornell University, which made a very careful study of the proposal and voted to give it unanimous endorsement, I feel sure that the interests of institutions of higher education, both great and small, will be carefully protected by a broad board rather than a mandatory distribution.
>
> Attached is a copy of our membership list. You will note that the membership is composed of the chief officers of the member colleges and universities.
>
> Faithfuly yours,
>
> GUY E. SNAVELY.

Mr. President, I shall not read many telegrams into the RECORD, but I wish to read a few because, as I stated on Friday, I want to indicate that in respect to this matter there is a real difference of opinion, and we recognize that there is a choice of methods. I think it is perfectly proper to place in the RECORD a telegram from an old friend of mine, Dr. Robert C. Clothier, of New Brunswick, N. J., president of Rutgers, urging support of the Morse amendment. Dr. Clothier's institution is a member of the land-grant college group, and he urges support of the Morse amendment. He says in the telegram:

> Referring to our earlier correspondence. Urge your approval and acceptance Morse amendment National Science Foundation legislation. Providing specific recognition of land-grant colleges and State universities by allocation to these institutions of portion of any funds appropriated to Foundation.
>
> ROBERT C. CLOTHIER.

Mr. President, I am glad to report his views, even though he takes a stand contrary to my position. Nevertheless, he is a man in whom I have the highest confidence. His telegram shows that men of Dr. Clothier's caliber simply differ in their views with Dr. Conant, of Harvard, and Dr. Dodds, of Princeton.

I am also in receipt of telegrams representing the other side of the issue. The one I shall now read is a telegram on my side of the argument. It comes from the secretary of the American Medical Association. This morning I received a telephone call from the American Medical Association, which is most profoundly interested in the amendment providing for research in respect to cancer, which amendment the Senate has already

adopted. The telegram reads as follows:

American Medical Association urges passage of National Science Foundation bill without amendments. This bill is in keeping with association's national-health program.

GEORGE F. LULL,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I desire to read another telegram which I have received. I shall not read many of the telegrams, because I do not wish to encumber the RECORD. This telegram is signed by Homer W. Smith, of New York University, New York. Dr. Smith has telegraphed me as follows:

I aided Dr. Bush in preparation of his report on medicine and served as secretary of committee supporting Bush report. Am now representative of American Physiological Society on Dr. Day's intersociety committee.

That is the same committee to which we have referred in our discussion of Dr. Day.

The remainder of the telegram is as follows:

Passage of S. 526 is urgent. Personally believe that mandatory allocation of funds will not -repeat not—be in best interest of either land-grant colleges or endowed institutions, and urge passage of bill without this amendment.

HOMER W. SMITH,
New York University.

So, Mr. President, we have that point of view from Dr. Smith, who is on Dr. Day's committee.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a telegram I have received from Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a telegram from Edward L. Gordy, chairman, Chicago Chapter, American Institute of Chemists, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This message is in response to invitation from Office of Land Grant College Association to present my views regarding proposed amendment for National Science Foundation to provide geographic distribution of funds to land grant and State institutions. Although I am president of a land grant institution I do not believe any provision desirable which would legislate portion of these funds to any specific group, type, or location of institution. I believe most effective use of funds would be achieved by full freedom to allocate in accordance with need, merit, and opportunities in best judgment of foundation. Administrators subject, of course, to review and check year by year through appropriation and legislative machinery of Congress. Land grant and State institutions are very useful, at most are of excellent caliber and in general have justified their special Federal support. Of no less national significance are other great institutions like Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Northwestern, Washington, Tulane, Stanford, California Institute of Technology, and other leaders. There is also impressive record of first-class young scientists coming from the hundreds of small colleges throughout the country. Believe therefore National Science Foundation program should be truly national and unrestricted as to opportunity based on merit and promise. Similar telegram sent Senators SALTONSTALL and WAYNE MORSE.

KARL T. COMPTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 20, 1947.*

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate:

Have read CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, May 16, and am amazed and distressed to find that considerable influence in important legislation apparently wielded by irresponsible people. Senator KILGORE should be well aware that vote he quoted page 5436 and elsewhere was informal off the record vote, not even supposed to be reported in newspapers and had that status because of unrepresentative nature of meeting. For example, biologists outnumbered chemists 10 to 1 and the American Chemical Society with 50,000 members was not represented at all. Its representatives which have had same number of votes as social scientists speaking for only a few hundred members. Therefore suggest dealing with great skepticism all action taken by inter society committee.

Chicago Chapter, American Institute of Chemists, passed resolution Friday night unqualifiedly endorsing S. 526 as originally reported out of committee.

EDWARD L. GORDY,
Chairman, Chicago Chapter,
American Institute of Chemists.

I have referred to the conference which was held, and I wish to emphasize that institutions from all over the United States have worked for 2 years on this matter. I have been concerned, together with other Members of the Senate, in discussing and considering this matter from the point of view of the land-grant colleges, the State-supported institutions, and the private institutions. We are endeavoring to develop a plan by which specific research projects can be allocated and by which it will be possible to locate budding young scientists who may be supported, in order to train the large group of scientists our country will need in the future.

It is the judgment of those of us who support the committee bill, which has a very simple and direct purpose, that in connection with this matter we shall gain more by aiming a rifle at a target rather than by shooting scattering birdshot through the air in the hope that we might hit a "bird" which might come down—and might prove to be an eminent scientist. It is our belief that this case is one which requires, not scattering broadcast throughout the land in a haphazard fashion, but locating the specific projects and locating the specific people whom we feel justify receiving the support of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate. I sincerely hope that we can deal today with the amendment of the Senator from Oregon and with the other amendments which are before the Senate, to the end that this proposed legislation may be passed by the Senate before it concludes its session today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senate will hear me through and will analyze the data which I placed in the RECORD on Friday, as well as the data which I proposed to add to the RECORD today, I am convinced that on the merits of the issue now pending before the Senate, my amendment will be adopted by a substantial majority. However, we are faced with a situation in which I fear that many Members of the Senate will not take the time to analyze the data before they vote, because the impression has unfortunately been successfully created in the minds of many Senators that the amendment I am offering apparently means a mandatory distribution of funds among the several States, irrespective of the quality of the research projects for which they request funds from the National Science Foundation.

At the outset of the debate today I think it very important that we understand what the two amendments I am offering are in detail, because they speak for themselves, and I think their own terms constitute a substantial rebuttal of most of the arguments which have been made against them.

On Friday last the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] raised a question in regard to my first amendment, and I told him that over the week end I would clarify its terminology and present it today. I wish to do so at this time, but at the same time I wish to comment upon the language of the amendment itself. It is the first mimeographed sheet which Senators will find on their desks. It is marked "(c)," and reads as follows:

(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned—

I interrupt the reading of the amendment, Mr. President, to point out that it specifically says that not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned. The amendment does not say that the respective States shall automatically receive such funds, but it provides that they shall have the right to receive 25 percent of the funds, if certain conditions are subsequently complied with, and the conditions are set forth in the amendment as clearly, I think, as the English language can be used to set forth any matter.

I wish to say at the outset that the impression has been created in the minds of some persons that what I am asking for is some kind of pork-barrel legislation. However, there is nothing in the amendments which I am offering that in my judgment would support such a conclusion. On the contrary, this amendment seeks to assure that when research can be conducted in the small colleges and universities of the United States which meet the scientific standards for research laid down by the Foundation itself, then they shall be entitled, as a right, to their share of an apportionment of the 25 percent of the funds.

Now returning to the amendment—

not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census. The amounts so apportioned to each State shall, except as hereinafter provided—

Mr. President, it is not possible to escape the proviso clauses of this amendment if one is to understand the meaning

of the amendment, and it is the proviso clauses of the amendment which take it entirely out of the realm of any pork-barrel legislation—

The amounts so apportioned to each State shall, except as hereinafter provided, be available for expenditure only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities (including the land-grant colleges) within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each college or university the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects. Notwithstanding the fact that funds may have been apportioned to any State under the provisions of this subsection, the Foundation shall obligate itself by contracts or other financial arrangements with the tax-supported colleges or universities within such State to expend only such part of the funds apportioned to such State as the Foundation determines may be expended, pursuant to proposals submitted by such colleges and universities, in a manner which is consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act.

Mr. President, I have been just as careful as one can be to see to it that the final control rests with the Foundation in ascertaining that any project which any college seeks to carry on meets the criteria and the standards of research of the Foundation. So I say, Mr. President, it simply is not fair to my amendment to undertake to create the impression that it seeks to take away from the Foundation control over these funds and that it would be possible under my amendment to carry on wasteful and unworthy scientific research projects. Not at all can that be accomplished under the amendment.

Knowing a little something about the problems of scientific research, I have been very careful to see to it that the money is not to be wasted on unworthy projects, but that the determination of criteria and standards shall be left with the Foundation. I think that is fair and proper, and it seems to me that those who are opposed to my amendment are overlooking that very important fact.

They are overlooking another fact, Mr. President, namely, that they are not going to help the cause of the National Science Foundation at all if they start its operations under the fear and the suspicion and the distrust of a good many segments of the scientific element in this country, and under the criticism of a good many educators. That is what I meant when I stated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago that we should try to work out a reasonable compromise of the differences which have developed over the issue involved in the bill. I believe that if the proponents of the bill itself would take the time to study the provisions of my amendment they would see that the Foundation was adequately protected, and I think they really should accept certainly the first part of the amendment, without any question.

I continue with the amendment:

Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter be available for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator intend, in case the amendment shall be adopted, to have the provision just read apply to the cancer research and the heart research committees provided for in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]?

Mr. MORSE. It will cover 25 percent of all funds the Congress appropriates for the National Science Foundation for scientific research in the United States.

The provision just read, Mr. President, I inserted to clear up the ambiguity which the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] very properly pointed out in the language of the original amendment. I think it leaves no room for doubt of what will happen. To use a hypothetical case, let us assume $50,000,000 may be appropriated to the Foundation for Scientific research. Under the amendment, $12,500,000 of it would be earmarked for 9 months, and during the 9 months' period the land-grant colleges and the tax-supported institutions would have the right to offer to the National Science Foundation blueprints, so to speak, of projects they would like to carry on by way of scientific research. If, in the opinion of the National Science Foundation Board, those projects met the required standards of excellency, the qualifications and criteria for research, then those institutions might get a share of the funds with which to carry on the projects. But if, on the other hand, it was the opinion of the National Science Foundation that an institution had not submitted qualified research projects, it would not get a single dollar. I think that is perfectly fair. So, in my opinion, the argument that the amendment would make possible waste in the carrying on of unscientific research programs simply falls to the ground of its own dead weight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator wait a moment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. But in order to make doubly sure of my interpretation of my amendment, to make doubly sure that it carries out my intent, I asked the Office of the Legislative Counsel to prepare for me a memorandum setting forth their interpretation of the amendment from the standpoint of its legal meaning, and I wish to read the memorandum. It is signed by John H. Simms, assistant counsel of the Office of the Legislative Counsel for the Senate, and it reads:

As requested by you, I have prepared the attached redraft of the first proposal contained in the amendment which you offered on April 2, 1947, to S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill.

In the debate which occurred on the floor of the Senate on May 16, 1947, Senator DONNELL indicated apprehension concerning the possibility that the first portion of your amendment of April 2, 1947, was so worded that it might result in the waste of funds apportioned to the States. As you pointed out in the debate, the Foundation would be able to prevent the waste of such funds because of its power to establish criteria which the research projects proposed by the various State colleges and universities would be compelled to meet before the Foundation would make contracts and other financial arrangements with them.

It seems to me, however, that the first portion of your amendment does contain provisions which might tend to cause the Foundation to approve some research projects submitted by the tax-supported colleges and universities which would be of dubious value by comparison with other projects which the Foundation might support. Your amendment provides that certain funds shall be apportioned to the States. This does not mean that the funds then automatically go to the States. They are, however, then available only for carrying on research activities in the tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State. Consequently, unless the Foundation enters into contracts and financial arrangements providing for the expenditure of the full amount of the funds apportioned to a State, the unobligated funds would revert to the United States Treasury. To avoid such a reversion of funds, the Foundation might tend to approve research projects of doubtful value submitted by the tax-supported colleges and universities.

The attached redraft of the first proposal contained in your amendment of April 2, 1947, provides for the apportionment of at least 25 percent of research funds (other than those for national-defense research) to the States. The money so apportioned to any State would then be available for expenditure pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with the various tax-supported colleges and universities in such State. The research projects proposed by such colleges and universities will not be approved by the Foundation unless they are consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. If the tax-supported colleges and universities in a State do not, within 9 months after any research funds are apportioned to such State, submit research projects which meet the standards of the Foundation, the Foundation will then be able to spend such funds for the purpose of carrying on any other research projects which it may desire to support, whether or not such latter research projects are carried on by tax-supported colleges and universities.

I think, Mr. President, the legislative counsel has interpreted very clearly the meaning of my amendment, and I say it cannot be subjected to any other interpretation. It protects the standards of research, and it seems to me it makes perfectly clear that the amendment will remove the one great objection which has split men of science and educators on the question of a National Science Foundation bill.

I digress to say, Mr. President, that I think it is somewhat unfortunate that apparently this morning certain scientists and educators are laboring under the mistaken notion that unless my amendment is defeated there is no

chance of passage of a National Science Foundation bill at this session of Congress. I say that that impression is without foundation in fact, because those of us who have been urging the adoption of the amendment, without exception, so far as I know—I am not aware of a single Senator who has filed exception to the statement I now make—will vote for the National Science Foundation bill without amendment, if we cannot have it amended in a manner which we think will make it a bettter bill.

To those educators and scientists who seem to feel that the fight that we are putting up for fair amendments is going to jeopardize the bill, I state from this desk this morning that they have been sold a bill of goods so far as that charge is concerned, Mr. President, because in my judgment there is no danger at all of a science foundation bill not being passed. But those of us who are seeking to amend it want to make it the best possible bill that we can pass.

We feel that the amendments we are proposing will make it a much bettter bill than if we pass the bill giving no assurances whatever to the tax-supported institutions that, as a matter of right, if they come forward with sound research projects, they will be able to get a proportionate share of the funds in accordance with the terms of my amendment.

Mr. President, we are dealing with tax funds in the pending bill. We are dealing with funds that belong to all the people. In the administration of the proposed National Science Foundation, as I said Friday, great power, without congressional check other than the check of appropriations, is given to a group of private individuals. We are placing at the disposition of those private individuals whatever funds belonging to the people of the United States we decide from year to year to appropriate to the Foundation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not heard the entire argument of the able Senator from Oregon, but I should like to clear in my mind one proposition, as to whether or not the amendment he has offered is not covered by the present wording of the bill. On page 2 the amendment provides:

> Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter be available for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation.

In other words, the amendment really places a 9 months' period on the Foundation; it requires them to do a certain thing within 9 months; otherwise, the program is to be carried on in the same manner prescribed by the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. May I say to the Senator from Michigan, as I said earlier in my remarks, before the Senator arrived on the floor, that I have sought by this amendment to give every possible protection to the Foundation in making absolutely certain that no scientific research project can be carried on by the use of the funds appropriated unless the project meets the standards and the criteria laid down by the Foundation. In other words, the amendment leaves to the Foundation the power to determine whether or not a project for which funds are requested, by Michigan State College, for example, a tax-supported institution, meets the research criteria of the Foundation. What I am seeking to do by my amendment is to give assurance to tax-supported institutions that if they come forward with a project that meets the standards and the criteria of the Foundation, then, as a matter of right, they will have a 25 percent apportionment of the funds earmarked for such research projects carried on by State tax-supported institutions. The difficulty in determining this controversy, it seems to me, grows out of the fact that a good many Members of the Senate have not yet given sufficient weight to the fear—and I think the evidence that I shall place in the RECORD later in my speech this morning will remove any doubt about the existence of the fear—entertained by many scientists and educators in tax-supported institutions have, that unless some such protection as I am seeking to give them in my amendment is afforded them, the National Foundation will develop a concentrated research program to the benefit of all the Foundation institutions, rather than make available funds for all tax-supported institutions that can meet the scientific standards of the Foundation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it, from the first sentence of the Senator's amendment, that the apportionment must be made within 9 months after the appropriation. If, today, Congress should appropriate $20,000,000, the Foundation would have 9 months within which to select the various universities. If it did not select them within the 9 months' period, then the bill would apply, and the money would be appropriated to particular States. Let us take the State of Michigan, for example, whose share, we will say, would be $2,000,000, and let us assume that $2,000,000 is appropriated to that State, or two-fifths, according to population and according to a certain other requirement; what would happen to the $2,000,000? How would it ever reach a particular college, if the Foundation did not specifically put it there, even after the 9 months?

Mr. MORSE. I shall take the Senator through the three steps which I think would be involved. First, following the passage of the bill, the formula provided by the amendment would be practically self-executing. It would be a very simple matter for the Foundation to apply it. The moment the money is appropriated, then under the application of the formula every State would automatically know what its allotment would be, depending on how much money was appropriated. So that if we pass the bill today, tomorrow morning each State will know, under the automatic operation of the formula, how much money will be available to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say to the Senator that I do not think his statement is quite correct. What is done by the pending bill is to provide an authorization for an appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. I said "after the appropriation had been made."

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well; after the appropriation had been made.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Now, let us consider step No. 2. The National Science Foundation would then know that in the spending of the money which is appropriated by the Congress to it for a particular year 25 percent is to be apportioned and made available to the States, if the State institutions come forward with projects which, in the opinion of the Foundation, meet the high scientific tests applicable to all other projects. In other words, the Foundation, as I think is generally agreed, must lay down certain criteria—certain standards—before any State or any institution can obtain any funds. The Foundation will allocate the funds in accordance with the particular projects of which they approve during the first 9 months. If at the end of 9 months, in the State of Michigan, for example, the institutions have not come forward with blueprints for scientific research projects which meet the approval of the National Science Foundation, the money not actually allocated at the end of the 9-month period will go into the general funds of the National Science Foundation, and the Foundation can spend the money as it would spend any money which was not in the first instance earmarked in any way. That is the way the provision will work.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, in the hypothetical case I have suggested, by reason of nonaction on the part of the Foundation, the $2,000,000 otherwise going to Michigan would automatically go to the colleges of other States. That would be so by reason of the nonaction of the Foundation in not allotting any p. rt of the $2,000,000 to any institution in Michigan. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; if the Senator wishes to use the expression "nonaction." But we do not have to worry about nonaction on the part of the Foundation. If the funds were given to the Foundation and it were told that the money was to be spent for worthy projects proposed by State institutions, and it then proceeded to defeat the will of the Congress as expressed in my amendment, there would certainly be plenty of difficulty caused by any tendency on the part of the Foundation to sit on any project proposal. I am not worried about that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; gladly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the same results obtain under the terms of the bill as it is now written? If the State of Michigan were not allotted any funds,

under the terms of the bill the funds would automatically go to other States. Nonaction on the part of the Foundation would, under the Senator's amendment, have the same result, would it not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. If Congress should say to the Foundation, "This is the policy we want you to follow in the in the expenditure of the funds," and the National Foundation should ignore that policy, of course, I am sure I need not tell the Senator from Michigan we would hear about it, and in due course Congress would take action to see to it that the Foundation carried out the spirit and intent of my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Congress, then, would really be placed in the position that later it would have to determine that the blueprint laid down by a certain college was one upon which the Foundation should have acted favorably. I wonder whether Congress desires to place itself in such a position? Should Congress place itself in the position of being the judge of whether a certain institution is a proper one to conduct scientific research?

Mr. MORSE. That was not included in the Senator's hypothetical question. The Senator put to me a hypothetical case in which the Foundation took no action, simply sat on the project. It either has to vote it up or down. My amendment leaves in the Foundation the authority to determine whether or not the project does or does not meet the standards and the criteria of the Foundation. But there would certainly be no justification on the part of the Foundation taking no action whatsoever, because the institutions, under the apportionment, would be entitled to have their projects either accepted or rejected. It seems to me that what the Senator is overlooking is that under the bill as now drafted the National Science Foundation—and this is the fear of many scientists and college professors, as the Senator will see if he listens to the testimonials I shall offer later—will concentrate the grants to a few institutions rather than spread the money out over a great many institutions.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us assume that the amendment is adopted and made a part of the bill; let us assume that the Foundation during the 9-month period after the appropriation is made of, let us say, $20,000,000, allots all the money to 10 universities or 10 colleges; that specific action is taken with respect to 10, and what I speak of as nonaction is taken with respect to other institutions. Would not the Foundation then be fully complying with the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, decidedly not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why not?

Mr. MORSE. Because under my amendment the Foundation must first apportion the amount to the individual States. The individual institutions then have a right to come forward and make their cases for given projects before the National Science Foundation. If the institutions meet the standards of the Foundation they are then, as a matter of right, entitled to funds from the apportioned amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which lays down any standards by which any college could say "We have met these standards, and therefore we are entitled to so much money"?

Mr. MORSE. I have been very careful not to include anything like that in the amendment, because, as I said earlier in my remarks, we want to give the National Science Foundation all possible discretion, but at the same time to make perfectly clear in the policy of our amendment that we want the Foundation in the exercise of its discretion to use the apportionment formula we have set out in order to stimulate research on all the campuses of the country which can come forward with worthy projects. That is all the educators and scientists are trying to obtain. I am not trying to put the National Science Foundation in a strait-jacket; quite to the contrary. But it is quite a different thing to leave the bill in its present form in which the National Science Foundation, to use an extreme hypothetical case, could spend all the funds on three institutions, rather than enact a bill which includes the principle of my amendment, which provides that, as a matter of policy, the Foundation shall distribute its funds according to the formula provided in the amendment. If, judged by the Foundation's own standards of research, institutions in Michigan, institutions in Oregon, in New Mexico, in Nevada, can come forward with sound individual research projects which meet those standards, then, as a matter of right, they are to have a certain portion of the funds within the 25-percent bracket.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; gladly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that good practice would require the Foundation to lay down certain standards. But is there anything in the bill which requires them to lay down a standard by which Congress or anyone could ascertain later whether or not they were living up to the standard which they laid down? Suppose the Foundation were to think it better practice not to lay down a standard, but to determine as the cases come up from day to day which college is entitled to an appropriation for doing research work.

Mr. MORSE. No such standards are stated in the bill, and they are deliberately not stated in the bill because we want to give to the National Science Foundation the discretion to establish standards and to keep abreast of scientific changes in research, which are taking place at such a rapid pace these days.

Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that with the assurance in the bill that the State-supported institution projects shall be recognized by the National Foundation we do not have to worry about such projects being recognized. Making this the policy of the Congress, I am satisfied, is as far as we need to go or should go. Once we make that the policy of the Congress, the National Science Foundation will carry it out, because the Foundation will be composed of men of great integrity, and they will lean over backward to see to it that the policy is carried out. However, if abuses should develop within the National Science Foundation, we would certainly hear from the presidents of our State institutions, and we would then have available to us such data as we might need in carrying on any investigation of the National Science Foundation that should be carried on. The National Science Foundation, like other institutions of similar nature, is going to avoid any question as to whether or not it is carrying out the intention of the Congress, because it will be dependent upon the Congress for appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Foundation is composed of men of the caliber indicated by the able Senator from Oregon—and I believe that they should be men of high caliber, men who are willing to carry out the intent of the legislature, men who are trained in science and who know where to expect certain experimental work to be done—is it not reasonable to suppose that the same result would be accomplished under the language of the bill as it is written, without the apportionment according to population and the other requirements?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Michigan is satisfied that the bill would have the same effect without the amendment, he should not object to the amendment. My amendment would eradicate the fear and suspicion which a great many scientists and educators feel. It seems to me that what we ought to do is to arrive at a fair compromise of the great difference which has arisen over this proposal. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I am personally satisfied, if we adopt the amendment which I am proposing, that it will be found that a great many of the educators and scientists who are now urging the passage of the bill without the amendment would heave a great sigh of relief and say, "At least we have that question settled now. We are adequately protected under the language of the Morse amendment, so we do not have to approve any unworthy project. We can now go ahead and administer the National Science Foundation with all sides working in cooperation." I think this is a very important step which we ought to take today. I am sure the Senator will agree with me after hearing some of the testimony which I shall present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has offered two amendments. One amendment provides for an allotment or apportionment of 25 percent, and the other amendment also provides for a 25-percent apportionment. If the two amendments are to be adopted, according to his theory there

would be a total allotment of 50 percent. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but, of course, the second amendment is national in scope. It is not based upon any apportionment according to States. Under the second amendment, for example, if the Edison Co. had under way some very important research in submarines and the National Science Foundation were to say, "We would like very much to have you carry on this project," if the Edison Co. said, "We simply do not have the facilities for it," the National Science Foundation, out of the 25 percent which is set aside, could appropriate the necessary funds for facilities to carry on that particular research project.

But that is not upon a State basis. Shortly I shall explain the second amendment. For the time being I should like to confine my remarks to the first amendment. When I reach the second amendment I shall again point out that the National Science Foundation is amply protected, because if the project for which funds are asked by any institution which seeks money does not meet the standards which the National Science Foundation lays down, the foundation is not required to appropriate the money. In turn, at the end of 9 months, it will revert to the general fund and be available for expenditure as though the amendment had not been adopted.

Mr. SMITH. I shall postpone discussion of the second amendment until it is reached.

Mr. MORSE. I would appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH. I merely call attention to the fact that we are thinking in terms of earmarking 50 percent of the funds. I only wish the Senator had discussed these proposals with us before the bill reached the floor of the Senate, because they involve very interesting approaches.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that I submitted my amendment on April 2.

Mr. SMITH. Apparently the latest proposal was not in that amendment.

The whole theory of the bill is that the Foundation is a part of the Government departments. It must come before the Congress every year with a specific set of projects for which it requests appropriations. According to the Senator's theory, after it has been determined that projects A, B, C, D, E, F, and G and scholarships X, Y, and Z are to be in the bill for the year 1947–48, the amount of the appropriation must be doubled, because of the two 25-percent allotments for which the Senator is asking. In other words, the Senator is asking that whatever budget figure the Foundation arrives at and presents for approval by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House be doubled in order to take care of the mandatory requirement of the Senator's proposal, as I see it.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from New Jersey is completely in error in making such an interpretation of the amendment. I do not see how such an interpretation of the amendment could be arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. What will be the cost of this enterprise?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if I may answer the question of the distinguished Senator, I estimated in my opening remarks that for the start of this work we contemplate an appropriation of approximately $20,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any limit?

Mr. SMITH. It will expand as we feel our way and as the work becomes effective. The whole theory is that the Foundation, composed of 24 chosen members, will determine the policy, the projects, and the manner in which the program is to be executed. It will come before the Congress every year and ask for appropriations to cover specific projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any limitation on the amount the Government will be asked for?

Mr. SMITH. The Foundation must prove its case every year, except that we provide that in certain cases projects may cover 3 or 4 years. That is a proper provision in a research bill. No limitation is placed on the Foundation. However, on the other hand, there is no floor, either. Unless the Foundation can prove its case, Congress can turn down its requests for appropriations. The Foundation must prove that it has a program worth spending public money for. That is why I raise the question with the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to whether it is not inevitable, after the program has been approved, that we shall be compelled to consider projects in all the States and add to the program already approved and presented by the Foundation. It seems to me that the amendments proposed by the Senator would inevitably double what we are asking for.

Mr. MORSE. Let me take a hypothetical case and show how greatly in error I think the Senator from New Jersey is. Let us assume an appropriation of $50,000,000——

Mr. SMITH. There will be no blanket appropriation for research. All the items must be specified.

Mr. MORSE. Whatever the total amount of the appropriation is, under my amendments 25 percent would be apportioned—not spent, but apportioned—for projects which meet certain standards.

Mr. SMITH. At the expense of which project—A, B, C, or D?

Mr. MORSE. That is for the National Science Foundation to decide.

Mr. SMITH. That is where the confusion arises, and that is why the committee concluded that we could not deal with this question on the apportionment basis.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator is laboring under the misapprehension that I am laying down a blueprint or standards for the National Science Foundation to follow, he has not read my amendments with the idea I have in mind, because the language is not subject to the interpretation stated by the Senator.

What we are saying to the National Science Foundation is, "You shall apportion 25 percent of your funds to be used by the States if they can meet the tests or standards which you lay down."

As to the second amendment, we consider the Nation as a whole, because it is very important that funds be made available to provide the facilities needed for research. There, again, we say to the National Science Foundation, "You shall make available 25 percent of the funds if you think the colleges have facilities which meet the standards and criteria that you lay down." It is a perfectly simple formula.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield further, I still do not see how the formula he proposes will successfully operate. Suppose a project in Oklahoma or some other place will cost so much money which it is desired to give to a certain institution. Does the Senator want to take 25 percent of that amount and apportion it among the States, or does he want to leave it to the institution itself to qualify for the particular research work We are interested in specific projects, not mere exploring. That will be done in a preliminary way. That is why I am confused, and that is why the committee felt that any ultimate apportioning of this money would inevitably lead to competition among the institutions to present their programs and say they were entitled to undertake the project whether it was worthy or unworthy.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator under the impression that the scientists of the country are confused about it at all? They recognize, as I think is self-evident, that under the provisions of my amendment, if a project meets the standards, the program then becomes self-executing.

Mr. SMITH. I shall not labor the matter further. I do not see how we can deal with it otherwise than to go to the Appropriations Committee and say we must have 50 percent more to take care of the situation under the Senator's amendment. If we are to take care of all these things the amount will have to be added to if we are going to take care of the adjusted apportionment among the States.

Mr. MORSE. There will be, as the years go by, a file of blueprints, so to speak, for scientific research projects, cataloged obviously on the basis of States. For those projects in New Jersey, Iowa, and California, for example, which will meet the tests, it will take a certain amount of money, and if there are projects in the respective States that meet the standards laid down, they will pull one of the projects out and say, "We can allow you $5,000 for this project." Five thousand dollars awarded to some chemistry professor in a university in New Mexico, for instance, may bring forth, as past history shows, some great scientific discovery in chemistry. What the Senator is doing by his bill is to build up a great obstacle of discouragement in the way of scientists and chemists in America. That is why the college presidents are so much concerned about the effect of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I merely want to make the comment that one of the things we regret is the implication that a Foundation set up under the terms of the bill, a Foundation whose membership represents State-supported college and land-grant colleges and other institutions, is

not going to look out for them and try to be of service to them. I think that is a wrong implication regarding the scientists who may be asked to serve on the Foundation.

Mr. MORSE. I am very sorry that the Senator from New Jersey is disturbed about the implications, but he cannot escape the fact that the implications happen to be determinative of the operative facts in this whole matter, and the reason that so many educators are urging the adoption of the Morse amendment is that they entertain the very fear which the Senator from New Jersey thinks is regrettable. The Senator from New Jersey cannot eliminate that fear from the minds of educators and scientists by telling the Senate that the fear exists or that the implication is there. I have tried to make it very clear that it is there, that it is one of the great obstacles to the successful operation of the Foundation, and that the insertion of my amendment in the bill will remove the very fear which the Senator regrets.

Mr. SMITH. In the opinion of the Senator from New Jersey, we cannot legislate fear out of the mind by an amendment of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. We shall be removing the cause of fear by agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been concerned about the amendment and the theory of it. I have been of the opinion, frankly, that to earmark a definite portion of this fund for scattering over the United States on a population basis might result in the drumming up of projects by various institutions throughout the country. That has been discussed heretofore and has been canvassed pretty well, I think, in argument. I certainly do not wish to discourage worthy and zealous research. I have the feeling, although I do not know any more about this than does anyone else, that research is a matter of development through individual or institutional zeal, and that it is not necessarily something that can be created by the writing of a check or the offering of money. Therefore, I have approached this subject from the standpoint that we cannot merely earmark so much money for this State or that State and provide magical research development, especially basic research.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. As I read the bill it proposes that the Foundation members shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. Then it provides a list of institutions which are to make recommendations to the President for appointment to membership on the Foundation, and among those are the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and, I believe, another group added by amendment last week.

To me it seems inconceivable, Mr. President and it is difficult for me to understand the Senator's view on this matter—that with that widespread group of organizations recommending to the President membership on the Foundation there will not be adequate representation of sectional views and State views expressed and that, under that provision the available funds will be confined to a few restricted institutions who will control this foundation. It seems to me that the bill is protected against such control.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator that a great many educators completely disagree with his conclusion, including the president of the University of Iowa. They point out that the provision for representation on the Foundation is not sufficient; that if we are to prevent the danger of concentration of research in a few institutions they ought to have the right to come forward and show a worthy projects, and that certain funds for their use should be earmarked if they can make such a showing, because they are very much frightened about the danger of development of a scientific research monopoly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield again, let me say that I have talked at some length with the President of the University of Iowa this morning by telephone. We canvassed the whole situation. Frankly, he expresses the fear that in some way these funds may become centralized in certain institutions. I did not understand from him that he thought the bill as it now stands assured such a centralization, but there was that fear. I also did not get from him any concrete explanation of how a flat 25 percent allocation would necessarily correct the situation. We referred to the fact that any project, whether it be under the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon or the bill as it stands, must meet the standards of the Foundation. That is a fundamental in either case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me interrupt at this point to say that I am perfectly willing to let President Hancher's telegram, which I shall soon place in the RECORD, speak for itself regarding his position, along with the statements made by him which I submitted Friday afternoon in the course of the debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am not disputing the fact that President Hancher, of the University of Iowa, supports the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. That was the very gist of our conservation this morning by telephone. But I should like to submit at this time an unsolicited telegram which I received this morning from Dean F. S. Dawson, of the Engineering State University of Iowa, and who is also president of the Engineering College Research Council. In the telegram he states that:

> While I do not believe National Science Foundation should be restricted in expending its research funds, I feel strongly that importance of legislation for Foundation transcends this consideration. Therefore, I urge you to take whatever steps will insure passage of National Science Foundation bill without Senator MORSE's amendment.

Dean Dawson is a very distinguished engineer, a man who has done a great deal of scientific engineering research work. So we find, on the one hand, that the president of my own university advocates support of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, and, on the other hand, that Dean Dawson, who is an eminent scientist and an eminent engineer, and is president of the Engineering College Research Council, says we should pass the bill without the Morse amendment. I think many of us are troubled by this situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the dean of the Engineering State University of Iowa does not say he would be opposed to the bill with the Morse amendment a part of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; not at all.

Mr. MORSE. Inasmuch as the Senator from Iowa has referred to unsolicited telegrams, I wish to state that over the week end a number of engineering schools apparently have been alerted in regard to this matter, and I shall place in the RECORD a series of telegrams from numerous engineering schools. I think the Senator from Iowa will discover that their interest in this matter is not so unsolicited as he things it is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know what stimulated Dean Dawson to send a telegram to me this morning. I say that not by the remotest stretch of the imagination have I contacted Dean Dawson, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that. But I think the Senator from Iowa will find that today the deans of many educational schools are laboring under the fear that unless my amendment is defeated no National Science Foundation bill will be passed. I think that is an unfortunate misapprehension to have created because, as I have tried to make crystal clear, I shall support this bill if my amendment is rejected; but I am satisfied that if the Members of the Senate will take the time to study my amendment it will not be rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A moment ago the Senator said he was proposing this amendment for 25 percent by way of either admonition or the expression of a policy of the Congress. So far as I am concerned, I dislike in a bill of this kind to earmark 25 percent in a mandatory fashion, and I submit that is exactly what the amendment does. It says they shall allocate 25 percent.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Iowa is quite in error. Under the language of the amendment it is not mandatory unless the National Science Foundation finds that a given scientific project meets the criteria and standards of the Foundation. In other words, we leave to the discretion of the National Science Foundation the determination of whether a given project meets the standards of the Foundation. If it does not, it does not receive a single dollar; and if a single State does not come forward with a single project which meets the standards of the Foundation it will not get a single dollar under this 25-percent apportionment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator whether the purposes of his amendment would be completely accomplished and just as meticulously followed by the Foundation if the amendment were limited merely to a statement that it shall be the policy of the Foundation to disseminate this money and these research projects as widely as possible, giving due and full consideration to populations and territorial areas and the States, and also an expression that the purpose is to encourage basic research in the State institutions. Why would not that be sufficient—and say nothing about a mandatory 25 percent. I understand what the Senator has in mind when he says it is not mandatory; but as I read the amendment it says that 25 percent shall be allocated.

Mr. MORSE. Subject to certain conditions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; certain conditions are stated at the end.

Mr MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa, able lawyer that he is, knows that when we use "shall be" language and follow it with language of limitation, the "shall be" language then ceases to be completely mandatory.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to pursue this line of thought for a moment, please.

Let me say that I fail to see why the objects the Senator from Oregon has in mind would not be accomplished by an amendment of the type I have suggested. I should be perfectly willing to support such an amendment, which would express the policy of directing the Foundation to give heed to these considerations. But I dislike to provide for the allocation of 25 percent, because I fear that under such a provision, projects which would not necessarily be meritorious in every instance would be dug up.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me, Mr. President, that in one breath the Senator from Iowa says he fears my amendment will cause the National Science Foundation to approve unworthy projects, and then in the next breath the Senator says he wishes to let the National Science Foundation be entirely free to do just what it wishes to do. I say that we must strike a fair, middle-of-the-road compromise in connection with this matter; and the language which the Senator from Iowa has suggested will not in any way remove the fears of the educators and scientists who want at least to have the right to get some money for sound scientific research if they can meet the standards of the Foundation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not have that understanding, although apparently the Senator from Oregon thinks I have. I understocd the Senator to say that the major purpose of the amendment is to place in the bill this admonition as a policy. If he seeks to provide for an admonition and a policy, I ask him why he will not accomplish the same thing by leaving out the provision relative to the 25-percent rigid allocation.

Mr. MORSE. I not only want it stated as a matter of policy, but I want the bill to provide for a procedure whereby the policy will be carried out if the institution or project meets the standards of the Foundation. The Senator from Iowa wishes to say that we want to give some money, but that we shall not make sure that the money will be absolutely earmarked for those institutions or projects if they meet the standards. But my amendment is written for the purpose of making sure that it will meet the fear of various educational institutions in the United States that, even though they may meet the standards, they will not receive the funds.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, do not the provisions on pages 18 and 19 of the bill provide an adequate yardstick in the case of approved enterprises or projects and approved institutions?

Mr. MORSE. They do not furnish any assurance to the President of the University of Iowa, for example, that if he submits a project of his chemistry department and if there is in that department someone who is ready to develop a great scientific discovery in the field of vitamins, let us say, $2,000 or $3,000, or $4,000 will be made available for that chemistry professor, so that the University of Iowa will be able to keep him there, rather than to lose him to Harvard or Massachusetts Tech or some other institution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit that the Senator's amendment does not do that either, because even under his amendment, as he argues it, the project must be approved by the Foundation and must receive the blessing or the approval of the Foundation.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am very careful so to provide. In other words, I am not taking a position of opposition to the Foundation. I am particularly pointing that out, and I wish that to be clearly understood. I am just as anxious as is the Senator from Iowa to have established a sound National Science Foundation, and I am telling him there will be a better Foundation with my amendment in the bill, which will receive the cooperation of all groups of scientists and educators, than if the Senator and his associates get through their bill without the amendment in it, because in my opinion, by their bill they would buy the distrust and the suspicion and the bad feeling of a good many scientists and educators of the United States. We should not do that when, by an amendment such as I have offered, we can give the Foundation all the necessary protection, and at the same time relieve the whole situation of the distrust which would otherwise exist.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is there a basis for the distrust when every major educational institution group in the country participates in the recommending group which is to constitute the Foundation?

Mr. MORSE. They say so, including the President of the University of Iowa. They say that without the amendment in the bill it is bad.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If that is the case, then the very people who have the power to set up the Foundation by recommendations must entertain great distrust and fear of themselves.

Mr. MORSE. It is a human institution, composed of human beings; and scientists and educators, knowing that it is a human institution, desire exactly the type of protection I am offering them in the amendment against possible human frailties in the administration of the Foundation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I have not participated in the debate on the pending bill, because of my total ignorance of the scientific subjects being discussed, and I did not want to get in over my head, as I would by wading out more than 2 feet from shore.

I received a telegram this morning from the president of the Kansas State College, which was formerly known as the Kansas State Agricultural College, and which is a land-grant college. This is President Eisenhower's telegram to me:

> Urge your favorable consideration Morse amendment to Science Foundation bill per my letter to you several months ago.

I went to my files this morning and got out President Eisenhower's letter of March 17, and, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I shall read a portion of it into the RECORD. Under date of March 17 President Eisenhower, of the Kansas State College, which is one of the half dozen superior agricultural colleges of the country, along with those of Iowa and Minnesota, I may say to the Senators from those States whom I see before me, wrote me as folows:

> 1. The need for economy is, I think, greater than the obvious needs for intensified research in the United States; hence, I should think the Congress ought to wait a year or so before passing final judgment on this matter.
>
> If, however, such legislation is to be passed, I hope you will insist upon a provision which would assure the allocation of some of the funds to the research laboratories of our State colleges and universities. There was such a provision in S. 1850, which passed the Senate last year, but there is no such provision in S. 526.

Now under consideration in the Senate.

President Eisenhower closes his letter with this statement:

> There is a very great danger that a central government board or administrator would, if there were no such provision in the bill, allocate all funds to the larger research laboratories * * *, but experience has shown that research at institutions in the Midwest are equally meritorious, if not actually superior in getting results.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement as to the views of educators and scientists. I pointed out that it was my understanding that the American Association of State Universities and the National Association of Land-Grant Colleges favored a geographical distribution of the funds in accordance with the principle of my amendment. I said that today

I would find out whether on last Friday I had presented the up-to-the-minute views of these associations. So I sent a telegram to the offices of those associations, and also a telegram to Dr. Day, of Cornell University. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegrams printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 17, 1947.*

Dr. M. S. EISENHOWER,
Kansas, President, Association of Land Grant Colleges,
Dr. ARTHUR A. HAUCK,
University of Maine, President of National Association of State Universities,
Dr. E. LYMAN JACKSON,
Secretary, Association of Land Grant Colleges,
Dr. R. V. GUSTAVSON:

My amendment to National Science Foundation bill in which I propose partial distribution of Foundation funds on geographical basis in accordance with the principle supported by the National Association of State Universities and of the Association of Land Grant Colleges is now before the Senate.

In a very vigorous debate in the Senate all of yesterday afternoon I succeeded in blocking the move of Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, to force a vote on my amendment last night. I knew it was very important that we not vote on the amendment until Monday because I could see that an increasing number of Senators were recognizing for the first time that many college presidents and scientists in our State universities and land-grant colleges are very fearful that without my amendment the best interests of scientific research in our State universities and colleges will not be served by the National Science Foundation bill. I feel that it is very important that between now and Monday the officials of the National Association of State Universities and of the Association of Land Grant Colleges place in my hands further endorsements of my amendment because I fought all yesterday afternoon in support of the previous position taken by these two associations in support of my amendment. As I pointed out many times yesterday afternoon I am convinced that if the Members of the Senate would check with their State college administrators and science faculties they would discover that I am clearly right when I argue that an overwhelming majority of State college and university presidents and science faculty members favor my amendment. However, Senator SMITH, I am sure, left the impression yesterday afternoon that there is a considerable division of opinion among State university and college officials and scientists on my amendment. I pointed out that the only differences of opinion of any substantial degree as far as my amendment is concerned is to be found among college administrators and scientists on the faculties of some of the institutions such as Harvard, MIT, Yale, Columbia, Princeton and other institutions of that type which I fear will be favored institutions under the National Science Foundation bill unless my amendment is adopted. I do not know whether I will be successful in putting my amendment across Monday but I can assure you that I have a good fighting chance and that chance will be greatly improved if you can place in my hands by Monday morning a series of wires from you and the other officials of the National Association of State Universities as well as from officials of land-grant colleges and, if possible, from some of the presidents of universities in the association, making perfectly clear that you favor the adoption of my amendment. I have made very clear in the debate that I shall vote for the National Science Foundation bill even though my amendment is defeated and that the National Association of State Universities and the Association of Land Grant Colleges would also favor the passage of the bill even though my amendment were defeated but that these two associations believe that the bill would be a much stronger bill and would provide a much sounder scientific research program if my amendment were a part of the bill. I hope you will do everything you can today and tomorrow to secure for me a good number of indorsements of my amendment which I can use on the floor of the Senate Monday afternoon because I think that if I can succeed in driving home the point to the Members of the Senate that the universities and colleges in their respective States want my amendment it will have a very good effect on the final vote. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

MAY 16, 1947.

Dr. EDMUND DAY,
President, Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.:

I shall send to you special delivery tomorrow morning copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering debate on floor of Senate this afternoon on my amendment to National Science Foundation bill. I quoted from your correspondence and from memorandum brief signed by you and Chancelor Gustavson, of Nebraska, in which material you expressed your personal preference for the principle of my amendment calling for a partial distribution of the funds of the National Science Foundation on a geographical basis. I quoted at length from letters I have received from other college presidents and scientists in support of the principle of my amendment. In the course of the debate Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, challenged my statement of your views and quoted from some letter which he has received from you as the chairman of some committee of scientists in which you recommended certain changes in the science bill but did not include a recommendation in favor of my amendment. You will see from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I shall send you tomorrow exactly what SMITH said and my reply to him. In my reply I told him I would wire you for a statement which I could use on the floor of the Senate Monday as to your present position on my amendment. I told him that it was my understanding that you had sent to me your personal views in support of the principle of my bill and as far as I knew you were of the same opinion still. Our debate this afternoon was a very vigorous one and a considerable number of Senators have come to me and told me that they did not understand the situation prior to my discussion this afternoon. I do not know whether or not I will be successful in passing my amendment but I think I have a very good fighting chance. Therefore I think it is very important that the officials of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and the officials of the Association of State Universities make known to me their final position on my amendment for the debate on Monday. I particularly would like to have statement from you in view of SMITH's challenge in the debate this afternoon to my statement of your personal views concerning my amendment. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

MAY 17, 1947.

Dr. VIRGIL M. HANCHER,
President, University of Iowa,
Iowa City, Iowa:

My amendment to National Science Foundation bill in which I propose partial distribution of Foundation funds on geographical basis in accordance with the principle contained in your letter of April 4, 1947, to the members of the National Association of State Universities is now before the Senate. In a very vigorous debate in the Senate all of yesterday afternoon I succeeded in blocking the move of Senator SMITH of New Jersey to force a vote on my amendment last night. I knew it was very important that we do not vote on the amendment until Monday, because I could see that an increasing number of Senators were recognizing, for the first time, that many college presidents and scientists in our State universities and land-grant colleges are very fearful that without my amendment the best interests of scientific research in our State universities and colleges will not be served by the National Science Foundation bill. I feel that it is very important that between now and Monday the officials of the National Association of State Universities and of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges place in my hands further endorsements of my amendment because I fought all yesterday afternoon in support of the previous position taken by these two associations in support of my amendment. As I pointed out many times yesterday afternoon, I am convinced that if the Members of the Senate would check with their State college administrators and science faculties they would discover that I am clearly right when I argue that an overwhelming majority of State college and university presidents and science faculty members favor my amendment.

However, Senator SMITH, I am sure, left the impression yesterday afternoon that there is a considerable division of opinion among State university and college officials and scientists on my amendment. I pointed out that the only differences of opinion of any substantial degree as far as my amendment is concerned is to be found among college administrators and scientists on the faculties of some of the institutions such as Harvard, MIT, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, and other institutions of that type, which, I fear, will be favored institutions under the National Science Foundation bill unless my amendment is adopted. I do not know whether I will be successful in putting my amendment across Monday, but I can assure you that I have a good fighting chance and that chance will be greatly improved if you can place in my hands by Monday morning a series of wires from you and the other officials of the National Association of State Universities, as well as from officials of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, and if possible from some of the presidents of universities in the association making perfectly clear that you favor the adoption of my amendment. I have made very clear in the debate that I shall vote for the National Science Foundation bill even though my amendment is defeated, and that the National Association of State Universities and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges would also favor the passage of the bill even though my amendment were defeated, but that these two associations believe that the bill would be a much stronger bill and would provide a much sounder scientific research program if my amendment were a part of the bill. I hope you will do everything you can today and tomorrow to secure for me a good number of endorsements of my amendment which I can use on the floor of the Senate Monday afternoon, because I think that if I can succeed in driving home the point to the Members of the Senate that the universities and colleges in their respective States want my amendment it will have a very good effect on the final vote. I am sending an identical wire to Dr. R. G. Gustavson, chancelor of the University of Nebraska.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also mailed to Dr. Day Saturday morning, air mail, special delivery, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, so that he would have before him the verbatim report of what took place on the floor of the Senate.

I have today telegrams in this matter which I think are of great evidential value. They are of such weight, in my judgment, that if the Members of the Senate will pause long enough to consider the point of view of these college presidents and scientists, I think they will have to admit that the merits of these arguments are in favor of the Morse amendment to the science bill.

First let me say that I received a telegram from the president of the University of Minnesota, J. L. Morrill, in which he said:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

As I have written and have said personally to both Senators BALL and THYE, the University of Minnesota urges earnestly the principle of limited geographical distribution of funds to States in pending national science foundation legislation as embodied in your amendment. Deeply believe this principle of encouragement to science and research at grass roots will increase enormously the outcome which the legislation is intended to accomplish.

J. L. MORRILL,
President, University of Minnesota.

I am going to ask, as I read all these telegrams, that on the basis of one unanimous-consent understanding they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has very kindly pointed out the position of Edmund E. Day, the president of Cornell University, in connection with the matter before us. I think what was said in the closing minutes of the debate last Friday appears as a little confusing in the RECORD, as to whether or not the point of view I had earlier in the afternoon presented as being Dr. Day's point of view was still his point of view. I have the following telegram from Dr. Day, which I wish to read into the RECORD at this time:

ITHACA, N. Y., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Association of State Universities and Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities of both formally on record favoring principle embodied in your proposed amendment to S. 526. Chancellor Gustavson and I am officially designated representatives of these two associations have strongly urged adoption of your amendment. Am myself convinced that chances of sound and successful administration of National Science Foundations will be materially enhanced if provision is made for partial distribution of funds to the States and an objective formula incorporated in the basic legislation. Have already let you know the grounds upon which I hold this opinion as chairman of the executive committee of the intersociety committee for National Science Foundation. It was not in order for me to report an opinion regarding partial geographic distribution since the intersociety committee decided not to consider the subject and hence develop no attitude toward it. Will undertake to telephone you from New York city Monday morning to make doubly sure that my position in the two connections is perfectly clear.

EDMUND E. DAY.

Mr. President, let me state again, as I said Friday, that Dr. Day, who is one of the recognized educators and scientists of the United States, expresses it as his present view and also as the view of the Association of State Universities and of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, of both of which he is one of the officially designated representatives, that my amendment should be approved by the Congress and made part of the bill.

I shall make another position clear. He communicated with the Senator from New Jersey in regard to the Intersociety Committee of Scientists appointed to study the problem involved in the bill, and he makes clear in this telegram, and he made doubly clear in a long telephone conversation with me this morning, that that society did not take a position for or against my amendment, for the simple reason that this Intersociety Committee was divided in its point of view, and it was its desire to send to the Senate of the United States only those recommendations on which it had practical unanimity, and on which it could agree. But because it could not agree on my amendment, it set it aside, and it is recommending neither for nor against the amendment. I think that is a very important point in this matter, Mr. President, which leaves Dr. Day in the position, as president of Cornell University, and as the designated representative of two of the great educational associations of the country, of making known to the Senate, through me, that he and the associations that designated him to speak for them favor the adoption of my amendment. That is Dr. Day's position as of this date; and it has been, so he tells me over the telephone, his consistent position. He, too, like the junior Senator from Oregon, wants to see the National Science Foundation bill passed, but he believes we ought to pass the soundest bill we can pass, and that it would be a sounder bill with my amendment in it than without it.

I want to read a telegram which has been received from Irvin Stewart, president of West Virginia University:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

While concentration of scientific research during war was essential, widening of base is now desirable. Federal funds for West Virginia University will expedite time we can have a more adequate scientific research program. Hope you will support Morse amendment imposing statutory requirement of geographic distribution of part of support for research in pending Science Foundation legislation.

IRVIN STEWART,
President, West Virginia University.

Next I read a telegram from H. L. Donovan, president of the University of Kentucky:

LEXINGTON, KY., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

The principle of geographical distribution of a portion of National Science Foundation's funds is fundamentally sound, it will be a mistake to omit this from the bill creating National Science Foundation urge your support of this principle.

H. L. DONOVAN,
President, University of Kentucky.

The next telegram which I desire to place in the RECORD is from Alexander G. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan:

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
United States Senate:

Sincerely endorse principle of geographic distribution of National Science Foundation funds in accordance with your amendment.

ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN,
President, University of Michigan.

I read now a telegram from Dr. A. N. Jorgensen, president of the University of Connecticut:

STORRS, CONN., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Trustees and administration of University of Connecticut urge amendment providing for geographic distribution of portion of research fund of National Science Foundation. Reasons reduced to minimum: a. Federal control of research; b. Political pressure for allotment of funds; c. Criticism of those institutions fortunate enough to secure funds on nongeographic distribution basis.

A. N. JORGENSEN,
President, University of Connecticut.

I next present a telegram from George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois:

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

On April 12, wrote Senator LUCAS endorsing geographic distribution of funds assigned to National Science Foundation. Regard your amendment as important and in interest of public welfare.

GEORGE D. STODDARD,
University of Illinois.

I next read a telegram from Hugh P. Baker, president of the University of Massachusetts:

AMHERST, MASS., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

University of Massachusetts favors strongly your amendment National Science Foundation bill S. 526. This amendment has approval Association Land Grant Colleges, Universities, National Association State University. Original bill should not discriminate against land-grant colleges. Am asking Massachusetts Senators favor your amendment.

HUGH P. BAKER,
President, University of Massachusetts.

The next telegram is from Gibb Gilchrist, president of A. and M. College of Texas:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly urge including geographical distribution portion funds in National Science Foundation bill.

GIBB GILCHRIST,
President, A. and M. College of Texas.

I read another telegram, that certainly should make clear to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that the fear I discussed a few minutes ago exists in the minds of college presidents. I may say, Mr. President, that when I am engaged in debate on the floor of the Senate, I am going to insist that the Senate have all the material that comes to me, pro or con, on any matter for which I am

fighting. I have telegrams from certain engineering schools this morning indicating reservations as to my amendment. I have earlier said that I think it is unfortunate the impression seems to have been created in certain quarters that my amendment might block the passage of any National Science Foundation bill at all. The telegrams from certain engineering schools seem to make very clear the existence of such an impression. I want the record to be complete, and I want to read those telegrams. First, I read a telegram from S. W. Dudley, dean of the School of Engineering of Yale University:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Urge action on S. 526 either with or without Morse amendment. Prefer unamended bill, but amendment acceptable.

S. W. DUDLEY,
Dean, School of Engineering,
Yale University.

Mr. President, I say to you it is my judgment that if the deans of the engineering schools in this country were to pass in review here, it would be found that a majority would take the position taken by the dean of engineering at Yale; that is, they would prefer the bill without the amendment, but the amendment would be acceptable to them. Of course, it is acceptable, Mr. President, because it is a very fair amendment, protecting all the standards of the National Science Foundation, and leaving to the Foundation the last say as to whether or not funds shall be allocated to a given project, a question which will be determined on the basis of whether or not the project can meet the criteria and the standards laid down by the Foundation. What could be fairer?

Let us now consider the position of the dean of engineering of the University of Iowa, referred to by the Senator from Iowa. Does his final position differ particularly from the position taken by the dean of Engineering of Yale University? I think not. I think his telegram, received this morning, so indicates. I read:

While I do not believe National Science Foundation should be restricted in expending its research funds I feel strongly that importance of legislation for Foundation transcends this consideration—

I may say, digressing, indicating that the impression has been created that, for some reason, my amendment, and my fight for the amendment, may block the passage of any science foundation bill at all; I think it regrettable that such an impression exists—

Therefore I urge you to take whatever steps will insure passage of National Science Foundation bill with or without Senator MORSE's amendment.

As the telegrams from the deans of engineering are read one finds a certain uniformity running through them. Comment was made this morning about unsolicited telegrams. I have been perfectly frank; I said that, on the basis of the discussion on Friday afternoon, I spent the week end trying to find out what the educators and scientists of the country think about my amendment. I think the Senate should have that information before it votes. But I also think it is very clear that the deans of engineering have been alerted on the problem, and the telegrams rather uniformly make clear that the deans of engineering will take the bill, with my amendment in it; they have no serious objection to the amendment. The telegrams speak for themselves on that question; they are my best evidence.

I read now a telegram received from J. D. Williams, chancelor of the University of Mississippi:

OXFORD, MISS., *May 19, 1947.*

WAYNE C. MORSE:

The best interest of the United States will be served if a portion of National Science Foundation funds are distributed geographically in accordance with terms of the Morse amendment.

J. D. WILLIAMS,
Chancelor, University of Mississippi.

The next telegram is from S. R. Scholes, dean of New York State College of Ceramics:

ALFRED, N. Y., *May 18, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

Please avoid prolonged debate that might jeopardize bill S. 526. The matter is of such importance to research that we would accept almost any compromise.

S. R. SCHOLES,
Dean, New York State College of Ceramics.

That is an interesting telegram. It is along the line of some telephone conversations I have had over the week end with some of my best friends in American education, who have put to me the question whether or not there is any danger, in my opinion, of a bill not being passed, as the result of debate upon my amendment. When I have told them that in my judgment the creation of such an impression is assured, they have replied, "If there is no danger of that, then by all means press for your amendment." I think the telegram from the dean of New York State College of Ceramics shows that he is under the impression that apparently time is of the essence in this matter, and that we should not go into so full a debate as I think we should in order to make sure the Senate has all the facts on the issue before we vote. I am going to make the record, Mr. President; but, because I want the evidence to be in the RECORD, I do not intend to let the record be inadequate because of pressure for an immediate vote.

I read now the telegram of Gerald A. Rosselot, director of the engineering experiment station of Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request that your attempt to amend S. 526, National Science Foundation bill, not be allowed to jeopardize passage of the entire bill at this time. It is imperative that some form of National Science Foundation bill be passed now, even though it may not be perfect. Otherwise we concur with you in your attempts to secure amendment providing for distribution of part of funds to State universities and land-grant colleges.

GERALD A. ROSSELOT,
Director, Engineering Experiment Station, Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

I next read a telegram from M. A. Hunter, dean of the faculty of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute:

TROY, N. Y., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute could accept either version of S. 526 for National Science Foundation, but would not insist in your amendment if such action is likely to kill the entire bill; would request under the circumstances that your amendment be withdrawn.

M. A. HUNTER,
Dean of Faculty.

I next read a telegram from Roy M. Green, dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Nebraska:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Believe S. 526 even without the amendment requiring 25 percent research funds be expended through universities and land-grant colleges to be desirable. Could you support the bill regardless of amendment if amendment cannot pass?

ROY M. GREEN,
Dean, College of Engineering,
University of Nebraska.

I next read a telegram from W. A. Koehler, of the engineering experimental station at the University of West Virginia:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Willing accept either version of S. 526 if to act otherwise would jeopardize passage of entire bill.

W. A. KOEHLER,
Engineering Experimental Station,
West Virginia University.

I next read a telegram from Harry Rubey, acting dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Missouri addressed to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]:

COLUMBIA, MO., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator FORREST DONNELL:

Even though we favor Senator MORSE's amendment, urgently recommend acceptance either version of S. 526 if to act otherwise would jeopardize passage of entire bill.

HARRY RUBEY,
Acting Dean, College of Engineering,
University of Missouri.

Here, Mr. President, is a member of one of the greatest schools of technology in all the country, the director of the engineering station of the Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga. What is his fear? Does he have any opposition to my amendment? Quite to the contrary. He is for my amendment. Here we have a representative of an engineering school who is unequivocally in favor of my amendment. His fear is that discussion of the amendment may jeopardize the final passage of the bill. Again I express my regret that such an impression has been created. But I think we have to read the filed statements from the engineering schools in the light of the express impression contained in their telegrams to me, Mr. President. Oh, no; most of them are not against my amendment. They are laboring under the fear that debate on it may prevent the final passage of the bill.

Next I read a telegram from Fred T. Mitchell, president of the State College of Mississippi:

STATE COLLEGE, MISS., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
Mississippi State College strongly supports amendment to National Science Foundation legislation. The amendment was approved by Association of Land Grant Colleges in last annual meeting. Your support is anticipated and appreciated.

FRED T. MITCHELL,
President.

There, Mr. President, we have from Mr. Mitchell, president of the State College of Mississippi a pretty unequivocal statement as to where the land-grant colleges stand on my amendment. His telegram shows clearly what his stand is on my amendment.

I read a telegram from Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Tech:

ATLANTA, GA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Favor your amendment to Science Foundation bill. Have asked Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL to support it.

BLAKE R. VAN LEER,
President, Georgia Tech.

There we have a great engineering school which gives me evidence quite contrary to a view which I think has been expressed during the debate in the Senate that apparently the engineering schools of the country are uniformly against my amendment. When Georgia Tech lines up in favor of my amendment it is entitled to a great deal of weight alongside the views of some who seem to think that this type of amendment involves some sort of a pork-barrel arrangement, an implication, Mr. President, which simply cannot be borne out by the facts.

I digress for a moment to say that I thoroughly disagree with the memorandum which was issued by George H. E. Smith, staff director of the majority policy committee, when in part he said, speaking particularly of the Kilgore amendment:

The prime end of these amendments is to inject political control into a science foundation, which should be free of all political pressures.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the record of this case that supports such an accusation. To the contrary, what we are trying to do by these amendments, Mr. President, is to eliminate the distrust and the fear and suspicion of political pressures which will prevail if my amendment is not adopted. Without my amendment college presidents and scientists in small colleges of America will be found indulging this fear, and we are going to continue to hear from them the charges that they are not receiving a fair break in the expenditure of funds for scientific purposes. If any Senator wants to help remove the danger of political pressure from the National Science Foundation, he ought to support my amendment. So I say that the conclusions reached by Mr. Smith, in my judgment, simply will not stand up under analysis in this debate.

I now read a telegram from the president of Rutgers University:

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., *May 18, 1947.*
SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Rutgers University strongly favors and urges incorporation, in pending National Science Foundation legislation, of your amendment which stipulates that land-grant colleges and State colleges and universities shall receive portion of any funds appropriated to Foundation in accordance with principle that geographic distribution will further basic objectives of the Foundation. Over the years, State-supported institutions to which I refer have established distinguished record in many fields of scientific research even though handicapped by inadequate funds. At Rutgers, the discoverer of streptomycin (among numerous other discoveries of great public value) was made possible in part by Federal financial support for scientific research at the college of agriculture and experiment station. Nationally such Federal support has strengthened tremendously the research (and educational) programs of all land-grant colleges, thus serving and advancing the public interest. Specific recognition of the land-grant colleges, and State universities, as your amendment provides, will unquestionably enable them to further strengthen and broaden their research activities, particularly programs of basic research. The national interest would be served by acceptance of your amendment.

ROBERT C. CLOTHIER,
President, Rutgers University.

Mr. President, mention was made earlier in the debate today that Federal aid in large amounts is now going to land-grant colleges. The record will speak for itself respecting the amount, but I think it was $40,000,000 or thereabouts. But what is not pointed out, Mr. President, on that point is that that money does not go primarily for the type of research projects in pure science which we are seeking to develop through the National Science Foundation. It goes for extension work. It goes for adult-education work. It goes to make it possible for the land-grant colleges to provide services for the farmers in connection with soil conservation, crop rotation, and the many experiments which are carried on by the agricultural divisions of the land-grant colleges. It is true, that some of the money is applied to scientific research, but very little of it goes into the type of creative research in pure science which we are seeking to foster in the National Science Foundation bill. Therefore, to point out that money is appropriated primarily for other purposes seems to me not be a sound argument against earmarking, under my amendment, funds for research in pure science.

Next I read a telegram from C. E. Brehm, acting president, University of Tennessee, as follows:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Am in full agreement with your amendment Senate bill 526, providing for distribution of funds of the National Science Foundation through land-grant and State institutions. Sincerely hope you can have this amendment enacted.

C. E. BREHM,
Acting President, University of Tennessee.

I read a telegram from Frank D. Graham, University of North Carolina, as follows:

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *May 17, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your wire received and am wiring all members National Association of State Universities as requested. I endorse principle of geographic distribution of portion of research funds in accordance with principles set forth in your amendment to National Science Foundation bill and hope amendment will be incorporated in final bill.

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
President, University of North Carolina.

I read a telegram from Carl R. Woodward, president, Rhode Island State College, as follows:

KINGSTON, R. I., *May 18, 1947.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you support amendment to National Science Foundation bill providing geographical distribution of portion of funds for use at State colleges and universities to assure balanced research program and stimulate Nation-wide scientific effort under most democratic conditions.

CARL R. WOODWARD,
President, Rhode Island State College.

That is an excellent telegram, Mr. President. It states in a little different language the fear which, as I have suggested from time to time during the course of the debate, exists in the minds of college presidents and scientists. It shows very clearly, I hope, to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that that fear does exist, and that the only effective way of removing it and placing the confidence of these educators in the National Science Foundation is to adopt the amendment I am proposing.

The next telegram is from Virgil M. Hancher, president of the University of Iowa and secretary-treasurer of the National Association of State Universities:

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *May 17, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your wire received and am wiring all members National Association of State Universities as requested. I endorse principle of geographic distribution of portion of research funds in accordance with principles set forth in your amendment to National Science Foundation bill and hope amendment will be incorporated in final bill. President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, is new president of association, and I continue as secretary for coming year.

VIRGIL M. HANCHER.

There we have testimony from the University of Iowa. It is an out-and-out endorsement of my amendment by the president of the University of Iowa who, I am sure, Mr. President, it will be found is speaking for the great majority of the scientists of that campus. He, in fact, more than supports the statement from the dean of engineering on the campus of the University of Iowa who urges the passage of the Smith bill with or without my amendment.

In other words, my amendment is acceptable to him. The adoption of my amendment is urged by the president of the University of Iowa. He is more than

the president of the University of Iowa. He is secretary of the National Association of State Universities, which by resolution has approved the principle of my amendment.

The next telegram is from L. N. Duncan, president of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute:

AUBURN, ALA., *May 18, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute urges your support of the geographic distribution amendment to National Science Foundation coming to vote Monday, May 19. This provides research funds to land-grant colleges and State universities, and is the only way to guarantee equitable training of scientific personnel throughout the country.

L. N. DUNCAN,
President, Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

I digress to reemphasize the argument which I made Friday, that one of the things which disturbs these college presidents very much is their difficulty in holding together good science faculties. The problem of scientific piracy in America is a very serious educational problem. It seems to me that unless we can give them some assurance, such as my amendment gives them, more and more college presidents will be faced with the problem of losing some outstanding scientist because he has an opportunity to work on a research project under funds of the National Science Foundation allocated to a more favored institution than his home institution. That will have a very detrimental effect on our whole American educational system.

So we now have the president of Georgia Tech and the president of Alabama Tech urging the adoption of my amendment. It seems to me that this is pretty strong rebuttal evidence against the argument which has heretofore been cited in this RECORD, that if we were to check with the engineering faculties of the country we would not find them in favor of my amendment.

I deny that. To the contrary, I think it will be found that a great many of the deans of engineering will take the position taken by the dean of engineering at the University of Iowa. They will take the bill with or without my amendment. It will be found that a great many educators, such as the president of Georgia Tech and the president of Alabama Tech, are all-out in support of my amendment.

The next telegram is from John J. Tigert, president of the University of Florida:

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *May 18, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Buiding,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly favor geographic distribution of portion National Science Foundation fund according your amendment. Urge passage accordingly.

JOHN J. TIGERT,
President, University of Florida.

The next telegram is from Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado:

BOULDER, COLO., *May 18, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly endorse amendment to apportionment National Science Foundation funds on principle of geographic distribution, but bill should be passed without amendment if that is only alternative.

ROBERT L. STEARNS,
President, University of Colorado.

As I have stated many times in this debate, that is my position, too. If we cannot have the amendment in it, I shall vote for the bill without it; but the amendment would make it a much better bill. The amendment conforms to the desire of the long list of college presidents and scientists which I am citing. I am doing this because I want Members of the Senate to know of the care to which I have gone to double-check in order to make certain that the representations which I made on Friday afternoon are in accordance with the present views of college presidents and scientists. I am now in a position where I am able to reaffirm every singe argument I made on Friday on this particular point. I shall not repeat those arguments, other than to say to the Senate that on Friday I gave the facts, and I am reaffirming them today.

The next telegram is from J. W. Harrelson, chancelor of North Carolina State College, at Raleigh, N. C.:

RALEIGH, N. C., *May 18, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

North Carolina State College strongly supports the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in urging the adoption of the proposed amendment to the National Science Foundation bill which provides for a distribution of portion of the funds to land-grant and State institutions.

J. W. HARRELSON,
Chancelor.

The next telegram is from John O. Mosely, president of the University of Nevada:

RENO, NEV., *May 17, 1947.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe in the principal of geographic distribution and wholeheartedly endorse the Morse amendment to the National Science Foundation bill. Urge your aggressive efforts to put through principle of distribution of part of these funds in order to raise level of scientific instruction and research throughout the Nation.

JOHN O. MOSELY,
President, University of Nevada.

This telegram again emphasizes the point which I made Friday as to the importance of our encouraging scientific research in all the laboratories of the country located in our universities and land-grant colleges.

The next telegram is from J. E. Buchanan, president of the University of Idaho:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We favor providing geographic distribution of part of National Science Foundation funds. Under date March 29 we wrote Senators TAYLOR and DWORSHAK and Representatives GOFF and SANBORN favoring geographic distribution principle without which low-population-density State like Idaho could not receive consideration merited by importance of its raw material and undeveloped resources.

J. E. BUCHANAN,
President, University of Idaho.

The next telegram is from the dean of engineering of the State University of Iowa and the president of the engineering colege research council:

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

While I do not agree that National Science Foundation should be restricted in expending its research funds, I feel strongly that importance of legislation for Foundation transcends this consideration. Therefore, I urge you to take whatever steps will insure passage of National Science Foundation bill with or without your amendment.

DEAN OF ENGINEERING, STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, AND PRESIDENT, ENGINEERING COLLEGE RESEARCH COUNCIL.

We have had three telegrams from this educator this morning, and in each of them he follows a consistent policy. As I interpret his words, he expresses his personal preference for a bill without my amendment, but he states that the bill would be acceptable to him if my amendment were added.

The next telegram is from Harold W. Stoke, president of the University of New Hampshire:

DURHAM, N. H., *May 19, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of method of geographical distribution to State and land-grant colleges and universities for research funds, National Science Foundation. Such distribution will avoid overconcentration of research activities and personnel and assist in developing publicly controlled research.

HAROLD W. STOKE,
President, University of New Hampshire.

Again let me say to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who raised some question in regard to the fear held by college presidents, that the fear exists, as shown again by the president of the University of New Hampshire. These educators feel that some such apportionment as I am pleading for here today in my amendment would avoid a concentration of research activities and personnel, and assist in publicly controlled research.

These men are openly against it when it comes to holding together good science faculties. I think it can be said by way of generalization that in this day and age a university, so far as its overall standards are concerned, cannot be much better than the standards of its science faculty, because we are living in a scientific age. We have a great educational job in America in getting young college students to understand the implications of a new scientific age. I believe that the National Science Foundation can be a great instrumentality for promoting that educational program, if we provide in the National Science Foundation bill an apportionment of funds which will give to college presidents some reasonable assurance that they will be able to keep outstanding scientists on their faculties by having made available to them funds for approved scientific research projects.

Homer J. Dana, director of the engineering experiment station, and Stewart

Hazlett, chairman of the research committee, Pullman, Wash., have telegraphed me as follows:

PULLMAN, WASH., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Washington State College willing to accept either version of S. 526 rather than to jeopardize passage of entire bill.

HOMER J. DANA,
Director, Engineering Experiment Station.
STEWART HAZLETT,
Chairman, Research Committee.

I notice the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the floor. A few minutes ago I read a telegram from the president of Georgia Tech, a very good one, offering rebuttal to what already appears in the RECORD on the debate of last Friday that apparently the engineering schools are not in favor of my amendment. I said a few minutes ago that not only are some engineering schools strongly for it, such as Georgia Tech and the University of Alabama, but that when I receive telegrams from the so-called engineering schools they say, almost uniformly, "We are for the bill, with or without the Morse amendment."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Knowing the president of Georgia Tech as I do, and from my knowledge of his understanding of the problem, I am not at all surprised to know that he favors the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. I strongly favor the Senator's amendment and hope that the Senate will get the proper grasp of this situation. If it does, I do not think there is any question that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the junior Senator from Georgia that I agree that if we can only get the Members of the Senate to study the RECORD of last Friday and the RECORD of today—although I should like to get a vote on it today—they will vote for my amendment by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they fail to do so, I think they will have occasion in the future to lament the fact.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know about that, but if they fail to do so they will not give the country the best Scientific Foundation bill that it should have.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is his opinion that under the bill itself the Foundation could make the same allotment or allocation of funds which is proposed by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It could; but we have no assurance that it would. I see present the two Senators from Minnesota. A while ago I read a telegram from the president of the University of Minnesota urging the adoption of my amendment, because he also feels that my amendment gives the colleges and universities assurance that the money will be made available to them if they can meet the standards laid down by the Foundation. My amendment does not provide for an automatic grant of funds. I hope I can drive the point home in this debate. It provides for an apportionment of the fund to be granted only if an institution can meet the standards laid down by the Foundation.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has gone a little further than the point to which my question was directed. I should like to ask him whether under the bill the Foundation could make an appropriation based upon population in the same manner as proposed by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. They could if they wanted to.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator believe that a group of men who have great technical knowledge in this field could develop a more flexible program than one which the Congress might impose, one which is rigid and cannot be changed except by enactment of the Congress?

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that I think my amendment provides the most flexible program the National Science Foundation could have. In my judgment, when we leave the final determination in the Foundation regarding the individual project offered as the basis for a grant, we have guaranteed the principle of facility and have also helped the principle of flexibility by giving assurance to the college presidents and tax-supported institutions that if they can make a good case, as matter of right, under the principle of my amendment, they are entitled to favorable consideration from the Foundation.

Mr. COOPER. I have heard a great deal of the Senator's speech and have read it. I have myself served as a trustee of a State university for many years, and I know this argument has been made. Does the Senator base his argument upon the ground that it would be best to make a free appropriation of funds in order to have a wide development in the scientific field, or is it based upon the idea that the Foundation will not make a fair apportionment of the funds? I think there is a great deal of difference between those viewpoints.

Mr. MORSE. I urge my amendment in order to promote the widest possible development of scientific research. In the second place I offer my amendment because it gives assurance that the National Science Foundation cannot fall into the error of concentrating research in a few favored institutions. I submit to the Senator from Kentucky that, rightly or wrongly, the feeling exists that there will be danger of a concentration of the funds for expenditure by a few favored institutions, unless the principle of my amendment is adopted by the Congress and made crystal clear to the Foundation.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator will agree, however, that there is a great deal of difference between the argument that there is a fear the right thing will not be done and the argument that a wide distribution of funds would promote a broader development of science.

Mr. MORSE. Both arguments support my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if those who advocate the bill as it is, without amendment, would be willing that agricultural experiment funds should be left wholly to the discretion of a board appointed by the President, the funds to be allocated by law to the different States of the Union, or whether land-grant college funds should be left in the hands of a board to be appropriated where the Board felt they would do the most good.

Mr. MORSE. They will have to speak for themselves; but if anyone made such a proposal on the floor of the Senate the little debate I am having over my amendment would look like a hundred-yard dash as compared with the marathon of an argument there would be over such an amendment as that.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the answer is "No," but the principle is exactly the same.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a telegram from Leo Joseph LaSalle, dean of the College of Engineering, and director of the engineering experiment station of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College. It reads as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Your amendment to S. 526 is, I feel, eminently fair and very desirable; however, if it fails to win a majority of the Senate vote we believe that S. 526 should still be passed at this time; for it is a vital cog in the mechanism to keep our country in the forefront of scientific progress and development which is essential to the national safety and welfare.

LEO JOSEPH LASALLE,
Dean, College of Engineering, and Director, Engineering Experiment Station, Louisiana State University and A. and M. College.

There is another great college of engineering which favors my amendment, but expresses the same fear indicated by other telegrams which I have received that possibly the bill itself may be jeopardized if the amendment fails. I repeat, that I shall vote for the bill with or without my amendment, but I hope that my amendment will be added to the bill, because I think it will make the bill stronger.

I read a telegram from Donald B. Cook, secretary of the Association of New York Scientists, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 18, 1947.*
WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We support National Science Foundation bill S. 526 but favor amendment for Presidential appointment of Administrator; also favor provision for distributing portion of funds on geographical basis.

DONALD B. COOK,
Secretary, Association of New York Scientists.

I now read a telegram from S. H. Graf, director, engineering experiment station, and W. Weigner, dean of the graduate school, Oregon State College:

CORVALLIS, OREG., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Engineering experiment station and research council at Oregon State College favor your amendment to S. 526 as this would assure more equitable distribution of needed

support of research. In spite of this we hope insistence will not be carried to the point of jeopardizing passage of bill. We have worked for years to secure Federal assistance and believe that at this time national security and other considerations demand every possible support for engineering and science research.

S. H. GRAF,
Director, Engineering Experiment Station,
W. WEIGNER,
Dean, Graduate School.

Last Friday I put into the RECORD a telegram from the president of the Oregon State College favoring the principle of my amendment.

I now read a telegram from the director of the bureau of engineering research of the University of Texas, which is as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
While favorable your amendment national science foundation bill providing 25-percent funds expended State universities and land-grant colleges urge passage of bill be not jeopardized by amendments.

W. R. WOOLRICH,
Director, Bureau of Engineering Research, University of Texas.

Mr. President, the more I hear from these engineering colleges, the clearer it becomes that apparently the majority of them would favor my amendment outright, and practically none of them are so opposed to my amendment that if it were made a part of the bill, they would not want the bill to be passed, their position being, "We will take the bill, either with the amendment or without it."

Let me read another telegram in favor of the amendment:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Have requested West Virginia Senators to support your amendment for statutory requirement for geographic distribution of part of support of scientific research in pending science foundation legislation.

IRVIN STEWART,
President, West Virginia University.

The following telegram comes from Walter S. Neuman, of Virginia Polytechnic Institute:

BLACKSBURG, VA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Virginia Polytechnic Institute believes highly important that amendment to National Science Foundation providing geographic distribution of portion of funds be enacted into law. Will appreciate your continued support in this direction.

WALTER S. NEUMAN,
Acting President,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

That is another great engineering school, and it takes an out-and-out position in support of my amendment, and is not opposed to it.

The following telegram has come from Roy Green, president of Colorado A. and M. College.

FORT COLLINS, COLO., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Favor National Science Foundation bill with geographic-distribution amendment as best, but favor bill with or without amendment.

ROY M. GREEN,
President, Colorado A. and M. College.

That is another great technological school, and it supports my amendment outright, and again takes the position that the bill should be passed, either with or without having the amendment included as a part of it.

William S. Carlson, president of the University of Delaware, sends the following telegram:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly endorse Morse amendment National Science Foundation legislation calling for geographical distribution of funds.

WILLIAM S. CARLSON,
President, University of Delaware.

Ralph E. Adams, acting president of the University of Alabama, sends the following telegram:

TUSCALOOSA, ALA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly endorse your stand for distribution of a portion of Federal research funds on a geographical basis. This is a national rather than a regional problem.

RALPH E. ADAMS,
Acting President,
University of Alabama.

J. H. Longwell, president of North Dakota Agricultural College, sends the following telegram:

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly favor amendment to National Science Foundation providing distribution portion of funds to land-grant institutions.

J. H. LONGWELL,
President,
North Dakota Agricultural College.

H. W. Barlow, dean of engineering at Texas A and M. College, sends the following telegram:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Adoption National Science Foundation bill strongly advocated. Although your prepared amendment providing 25 percent spent through colleges recommended, are willing accept either version S. 526 if to act otherwise would jeopardize bill.

H. W. BARLOW,
Dean of Engineering,
Texas A. and M. College.

That is another great engineering school, Mr. President, and the dean of that school favors my amendment, but is willing to have the bill passed either with or without having my amendment included as a part of it.

A. Atkinson, president of the University of Arizona, sends the following telegram:

TUCSON, ARIZ., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
University of Arizona favors Morse amendment to National Science Foundation bill.

A. ATKINSON,
President.

Harmon Caldwell, of the University of Georgia, sends the following telegram:

ATHENS, GA., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Officials and faculty of University of Georgia strongly endorse amendment sponsored by you providing for geographic distribution of a portion of National Science Foundation funds.

HARMON CALDWELL.

I. D. Weeks, president of the University of South Dakota, has telegraphed to me, as follows:

VERMILLION, S. DAK., *May 18, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge amendment providing geographical distribution of a portion of National Science Foundation funds.

I. D. WEEKS,
President, University of South Dakota.

Paul Cloke, director of the Maine Technology Experiment Station, has telegraphed to me, as follows:

ORONO, MAINE, *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:
Willing to accept either version of S. 526 rather than lose entire bill.

PAUL CLOKE,
Director, Maine Technology Experiment Station.

R. D. Hetzel, president of Pennsylvania State College, has telegraphed to me as follows:

STATE COLLEGE, PA., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:
Favor principles of geographic distribution of portion of National Science Foundation fund.

R. D. HETZEL,
President, Pennsylvania State College.

Mr. President, the following telegram has come to me from Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Kansas State College, and president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, who is recognized as one of the great educational minds in all America:

MANHATTAN, KANS., *May 19, 1947.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:
Strongly support your amendment to Science Foundation bill.

MILTON S. EISENHOWER,
President, Kansas State College.

Mr. President, I might read other telegrams, among them another telegram from Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina; telegrams from institutions in South Dakota, Rhode Island; and a telegram from Syracuse University—all favoring the adoption of my amendment; but I think I have built up my case sufficiently, and so I shall not read those telegrams into the RECORD. Accordingly, I now ask unanimous consent to have the telegrams to which I have just referred, but have not read, printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The telegrams clearly show that the presidents of those institutions, those scientists, and most of the deans of engineering schools or the presidents of engineering schools which have telegraphed to me, favor outright the adoption of my amendment; and those who do not favor its adoption outright, say they would be in favor of having the bill passed either with or without the adoption of my

amendment—showing that they have no serious objection to the amendment.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPEL HILL, N. C., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Strongly endorse Morse amendment National Science Foundation bill in the interest of basic scientific research and equitable geographic distribution of portion of fund.

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
President, University of North Carolina.

BROOKINGS, S. DAK., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Favor amendment National Science Foundation bill dealing with geographic distribution of funds.

FRED H. LEINBACH.

KINGSTON, R. I., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Since we believe in the application of principles of democracy in operation of National Science Foundation bill, S. 526, we strongly urge support of Morse amendment for geographical distribution of funds.

T. STEPHEN CRAWFORD,
Acting Dean of Engineering,
Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Although we favor provisions for equitable distribution of research funds we strongly urge compromise if necessary rather than jeopardizing passage of S. 526 at this time.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
LOUIS MITCHELL,
Dean of Applied Science.
RALPH E. MONTONNA,
Director of Research Institute.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We favor amendment National Science Foundation geographic distribution portion funds to land-grant and State institutions. Will appreciate your support.

R. R. RENNE,
President, Montana State College.

LARAMIE, WYO., *May 19, 1947.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon:

We at Wyoming endorse wholeheartedly your amendment providing for geographical distribution of a portion of the National Science Foundation funds and hope you will be able to get the amendment inserted.

G. D. HUMPHREY,
President, University of Wyoming.

COLUMBIA, MO., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Even though we favor Senator MORSE'S amendment urgently recommend accepting either version of S. 526 if to act otherwise would jeopardize passage of entire bill.

HARRY RUBEY,
Acting Dean, College of Engineering,
University of Missouri.

PRINCETON, N. J., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Consider it vital that S. 526 be passed with or without Morse amendment.

K. H. CONDIT,
Dean of Engineering,
Princeton University.

LOGAN, UTAH, *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Officials Utah State Agricultural College strongly urge passage of your amendment to provide geographic distribution of funds under National Science Foundation as endorsed by Association of Land-Grant Colleges.

FRANKLIN S. HARRIS, *President.*

EUGENE, OREG., *May 19, 1947.*
WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate:

For reasons outlined in earlier letter we strongly favor your amendment proposing distribution of 25 percent of Foundation research funds on geographic basis.

H. K. NEWBURN,
President, University of Oregon.

NORMAN, OKLA., *May 19, 1947.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States:

The faculty of the college of engineering favors passage of the Senate bill 526 with or without amendment. Your support is solicited.

W. H. CARSON,
Dean, College of Engineering,
University of Oklahoma.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in summarizing my position in regard to this first amendment—and at this time I shall limit my remarks to the first amendment—I wish to say that I think the record overwhelmingly supports the amendment. If what we wish to do is to establish a National Science Foundation which will have the confidence of all American science and education, avoid the dangers of concentration of scientific research in the United States, and encourage the smaller laboratories and the less widely known scientists of the United States, then this amendment should be adopted. In fact, Mr. President, in the drafting of the amendment I have been so careful to protect the standards of the National Science Foundation that I am at a complete loss to understand why the proponents of the bill do not accept my first amendment and make it a part of the bill.

I close this part of my remarks by asking unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a memorandum dated May 18, which I received this morning from the Washington Association of Scientists. In the memorandum they set forth again their present position, which agrees exactly with the position they held in the brief which I read into the RECORD Friday; but I wish to remove any doubt, if any exists, as to whether I accurately presented the point of view of the Washington Association of Scientists, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1947.

Memorandum, Senate debate of May 14, 15, 16 on S. 526.

Analysis of the debate on S. 526 reveals a conflict between two basic philosophies. One philosophy is that science is a national resource; that the raw material of this resource is the Nation's scientific manpower; and that, as a vital national resource, its furtherance should be entrusted to an authority directly responsible to the elected representatives of the people—the Congress and the President. The other philosophy is that science is an auxiliary to the development of industry and the national defense; that the raw materials are the existing organizations and facilities for research; and that these organizations should further the development of science with a minimum of control by the elected representatives of the people.

If the objective of national science legislation is to develop science as a national resource, careful consideration indicates that its provisions would be drawn to insure the following:

(a) Long-range planning for the whole field of science.

(b) Encouragement and support for the most widespread scientific activity throughout the Nation.

(c) Close supervision and control by the elected representatives of the people.

(d) Denial to special interests of disproportionate influence in formulation of policy, or of disproportionate benefits.

On the other hand, if the objective of national science legislation is to support science as an auxiliary to industry and national defense, consideration indicates that its provisions would be drawn to insure the following:

(a) Close coordination with, and control by, the recognized authorities in science, industry, and national defense.

(b) Relative independence of science from the people and their representatives in the interests of security, immediate efficiency, and avoidance of political regimentation of science.

(c) Concentration or support in existing organizations and centers where concrete results may be rapidly attained.

Both philosophies hold that there shall be a foundation for the development of science, but conflict on the form of administration and the basis for its distribution of funds. Those who regard science as a national resource desire a single administrator appointed by the President and assisted by a part-time advisory board. They favor distribution of a portion of the funds on a geographic and population basis. Those who hold to the opposing philosophy desire a large part-time administrative board steered by a small executive committee, supervising a full-time director. They see no need for a specific provision as to the distribution of funds on a geographic or population basis.

In our opinion, we cannot, as a Nation, afford to regard the National Science Foundation as other than a means to the development and control of science as a national resource. We are led to this conclusion by the events of the past decade and by analysis of the debates in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses on national science legislation.

With reference to the specific points at issue, the testimony of these debates has shown:

1. The diffusion of administrative responsibility through the mechanism of a large board, with a small executive committee supervising a director, eliminates the direct line of responsibility to Congress and the President. It reduces public ability to examine the performance of the board and assess individual responsibility. On the other hand, a single administrator or very small commission will provide a direct line of responsibility to the Congress and President, and will make possible ready removal of the responsible individual in case of maladministration.

2. In public administration it is necessary to distinguish sharply between the adminis-

trative and advisory functions. In a large board combining administrative and advisory functions, on the one hand, the adviser cannot be sufficiently detached; on the other, the administrator cannot be sufficiently effective.

3. A part-time administrative board permits the same individuals to serve in private organizations and to determine the disbursal of public funds in which these organizations may be interested. It does not eliminate private interest from the administration of public funds. On the other hand, a single administrator or very small commission, backed by an advisory board, would be in the public interest. Members of such an advisory board could serve while retaining private connections. The part-time advisory arrangement would permit much wider use of industrial and university personnel without prejudice to the public interest since they would not be actually disbursing public funds.

4. Distribution of a portion of the available funds on a population and geographic basis is desirable for the following reasons:

(a) Since scientific talent is likely to be found anywhere, training and research opportunities should be equally wide-spread.

(b) Concentration of research, like concentration of industry, is undesirable from the point of view of national defense.

(c) Since scientists frequently function in the dual capacity of teachers and researchers, geographic concentration of research support will draw off teachers as well as scientists from the less well-supported areas.

(d) Many research problems, especially of a biological nature, are essentially local in character, and cannot be performed in large centers.

Since the structure now to be established for the development of science as a national resource will greatly influence the welfare of the country for generations to come, it is critical that in framing the National Science Foundation the above recommendations on the form of administration and method of fund allocation be adhered to. America has a long history of wasteful use of its natural resources. It is to be earnestly hoped that this greatest of all resources will be carefully nurtured.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask the Senator whether, by the amendment to be inserted on page 15, between lines 10 and 11—namely, subdivision (c)—if within the 9 months' period contracts or other financial arrangements are entered into by the Foundation with tax-supported colleges or universities within a certain State, covering only a portion of the amount of the allocation of that State, is it the intention of the Senator that the funds which have not been so contracted for within the 9 months may thereafter be used by the Foundation solely in that State; or may they be used in some other State?

Mr. MORSE. They will then revert to the general fund of the Foundation, and may be used by the Foundation along with all other unearmarked funds.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will further yield, with the distinct understanding that by my inquiry I am not necessarily indicating assent to the Senator's amendment——

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. DONNELL. My present judgment is that the amendment does not clearly express the Senator's intention as he has just indicated it. Let me call his attention, in the first place, to the fact that the amendment provides that—

(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States—

As thereinafter set forth. It is subsequently provided that—

The Foundation shall obligate itself by contracts or other financial arrangements with the tax-supported colleges or universities within such State to expend only such part of the funds apportioned to such State as the Foundation determines may be expended, pursuant to proposals submitted by such colleges and universities, in a manner which is consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act.

Then there is this provision:

Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter be available for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities—

And I call the Senator's attention to this language—

in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation.

The point I make is that it seems to me that the language I have just quoted distinctly provides, and very clearly, that if the Foundation does not obligate itself to expend money in the State of Missouri, for illustration, within 9 months after the date the funds are apportioned, those funds shall thereafter be available for expenditure other than under such contracts or financial arrangements entered into in Missouri with tax-supported colleges or universities, but that the fact still remains that under the amendment the apportionment has been made to the State, and the amendment merely says that thereafter funds shall be available for expenditure in conducting activities "in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation." The amendment does not remove the restriction of the allocation.

I am not sure whether I have made my point clear, but it is that the amendment makes an allocation and apportionment to each given State, to the State of Missouri, for illustration, in the one instance. It then says that if within the 9 months after such allocation has been made the funds shall not be contracted with institutions of learning of the type mentioned, thereafter the funds shall be available for expenditure by the Foundation in the same manner in which the activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds. But the amendment does not remove the fact that there has been an allocation to the State of Missouri.

I think, I say with respect to the distinguished Senator, who has devoted so much thought, so much more than I have, to this subject, that his amendment does not remove the apprehension that the funds which are required to be allocated must of necessity be used within the particular State to which allocated, and I think that in order to remove that apprehension it would be necessary to insert, in next to the concluding sentence of the amendment, some language which would make it clear that the funds shall be available for expenditure by the Foundation within or without that State, "for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation."

I think this is not a hypertechnical or overcritical comment, but I believe it is of importance that the Senator should bear the suggestion in mind, if—and I know it is his intention, as he suggested—he intends that after the 9 months have passed, funds which have been allocated to a given State are thereafter intended to be released for use in any other State.

I thank the Senator for listening to my suggestion and comment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. Although I do not agree with his interpretation of the language of the amendment, nevertheless I am willing to accept any modification which will leave no room for doubt in the mind of any Member of the Senate. Therefore I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the language I am about to suggest which might clarify his doubt. If it does not, and if he has any other language he would like to suggest to me, I shall be very glad to incorporate it in the amendment, because he has set forth accurately my intent and purpose. If it is not carried out in the language now contained in the amendment, I am perfectly willing to put in any language which will make it unequivocally clear. I invite the attention of the Senator from Missouri to page 2 of the mimeographed print of the amendment, the fifth line from the bottom, and I suggest including—and I thought of this language as the Senator was talking—after the word "thereafter," the words, "shall revert to the general funds of the Foundation and."

Mr. DONNELL. Again, Mr. President, I want the Senator to understand that I am not committing myself to his amendment by my suggestion. I should like to suggest this consideration, however, that there be inserted immediately after the word "available," in the fifth line from the bottom on page 2, a comma, and the words, "either within or without such State or both," and a comma, so that the language will then be, in substance, that the funds shall "thereafter be available, either within or without such State or both, for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities," and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator suggest that in lieu of my suggested language, or in addition to it?

Mr. DONNELL. I would personally suggest it in lieu of it.

Mr. MORSE. Understanding the Senator's position as he has stated it, I accept the language suggested by the Senator from Missouri in modification of the amendment on page 2 of the mimeographed print, after the word "available," appearing in the fifth line from the bottom, to insert the additional language, "either within or without such State or both."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one minor suggestion?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Again I repeat, I am not binding myself to support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. DONNELL. In line 5 from the bottom on page 1, I observe there is a slight typographical error, the word "of" instead of the word "or."

Mr. MORSE. I have already called attention to that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator be willing, for the record, to insert the telegram that was sent to the different institutions?

Mr. MORSE. It is in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator a compilation of how many of the 69 land-grant colleges he heard from, and how many of the 123 State-supported colleges he heard from?

Mr. MORSE. I have put in the RECORD everything I have received. When the Senator realizes that the messages went out Saturday night and yesterday morning, I think he will agree it is remarkable that I have received the replies which have come in.

Mr. SMITH. No such telegram was sent by anyone supporting the committee version of the bill. We did not try to get opinions from institutions which would express the other view. I wish to make that clear. Frankly, I think that a attempt to poll at the eleventh hour in a matter of the kind before us, which has been debated for 2 years, is not the right way in which to determine such an issue. I think it is valuable to have the opinions in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I think each one of us would have been much better informed, when we came to pass upon the bill which the Senator from New Jersey is advocating, if we had had in the RECORD the views of the college presidents and the scientists from the tax-supported institutions in our respective States. That is why I thought it of great importance to obtain the views of the presidents of the institutions in Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, and the others I have put into the RECORD.

Let me make clear to the Senator that I did not telegraph the individual college presidents. I telegraphed to the officials of their associations, and those officials in turn got in touch with the presidents of the colleges.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator in the RECORD the telegram sent to the officials?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that is in the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator inquired of me a moment ago whether I would suggest the language which he consented might go in in lieu of or in addition to the language which he suggested. I have been somewhat disturbed over that since taking my seat, and I will ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to read again the language which he himself suggested.

Mr. MORSE. I suggested that after the word "thereafter," in the fifth from the bottom line on page 2, there be inserted the words "revert to the general funds of the Foundation and."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think I should like to revise my suggestion, so as to make my language supplemental to the language suggested by the Senator. I think it is quite well that, from the standpoint of the amendment, there be a reversion, so that there can be no doubt. I should like to change my suggestion, therefore, not to withdraw the language which the Senator already consented to insert but also suggest that if the Senator still believes it advisable to put in this language beginning with the word "revert" it would be well for both phrases to be inserted.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be much clearer. Therefore, let the RECORD show that, starting on page 2 of the mimeographed print in the sentence beginning "Any funds," the complete sentence will read as follows:

> Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter revert to the general funds of the Foundation and be available, either within or without such State or both, for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Oregon has reworded his amendment, to incorporate the language suggested by himself and also the language suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks a letter dated May 17, 1947, which I received from W. A. Higinbotham, executive secretary of the Federation of American Scientists. I should like to have the full letter published, but I want first to call attention at this time to one or two excerpts. In the previous debate, on Friday, I had cited the Washington Association of Scientists as favoring my amendment. Mr. Higinbotham says:

> The Washington association stands by their views as expressed in the letter quoted. These views may be assumed to be typical of those expressed by our other member associations and by socially conscious scientists as a class.

He points out in the letter that there are 17 scientific groups that form the Federation of American Scientists. He says, further:

> At the council meeting March 15, and again May 4, the federation resolved to support S. 526, but to urge adoption of a single administrator and geographical population distribution of funds.

I ask to have the entire letter incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1947.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On Friday you quoted from a letter drafted by the Washington Association of Scientists and signed by Dr. Richard Emberson, chairman. The Washington Association of Scientists is one of the 17 local groups which make up the Federation of American Scientists. The Federation is one of the members of the Intersociety Committee for a National Science Foundation.

The Washington Association stand by their views as expressed in the letter quoted. These views may be assumed to be typical of those expressed by our other member associations and by socially conscious scientists as a class.

The intersociety committee represents almost all the important technical and scientific societies. The chairman of the executive committee is Dr. Edmund E. Day, of Cornell. I think you should know that the committee did not poll its membership or take a stand on the subject of geographical distribution of funds because of the fact that Dr. Day had been such a strong proponent of this position in the past. Lack of action by this group should not be taken to mean that they are opposed, but simply that they have not considered it.

It should be admitted that there is considerable difference of opinion among scientists about specific provisions of a bill. They are virtually all interested in passage of some form of legislation. They are not especially well informed about the significance of the administrative set-up or provision for geographical distribution. I enclose a copy of a questionnaire that was circulated by the Federation. The results of this poll are given in the accompanying report. This poll will not be of help to you, but I would call your attention to the official position of the federation as expressed in the letter to Senator SMITH, especially page 7 of the report. At the council meeting March 15 and again May 4, the federation resolved to support S. 526 but to urge adoption of a single Administrator and geographical and population distribution of funds.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. HIGINBOTHAM,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL QUESTIONNAIRE

(Prepared for the guidance of the administrative committee)

1. Should the primary aim be to get a bill, regardless of its form? (That is, a legitimate bill to support basic research in science and discovery and development of talent, as opposed to one that merely proposes to study the situation.) Yes___. Maybe___. No___.

2. (a) Should we be concerned with the method by which a Foundation would be administered? Yes___. No___.

(b) Do you favor a full-time administrator and advisory boards? ___. Part-time board appointing administrator(s)? ___. Full-time board? ___. Other? ___.

(c) Should the United States President (1) have a free hand in the appointment of administrative officials, (2) be required to make appointments from a slate of nominees prepared by some scientific organization, or (3) is this unimportant? (1)___. (2)___. (3)___.

3. Do you think the Administration in the Science Foundation (1) should be given authority to determine what divisions should exist, (2) that this should be specified in the bill, or (3) have you no opinion? (1)___. (2)___. (3)___.

4. Would you like to see the social sciences (1) explicitly included, (2) explicitly excluded, or (3) implicitly included? (1)___. (2)___. (3)___.

5. (a) Would you prefer some specification of allocation of funds to certain activities, such as health, military, and so forth? Yes___. No___.

(b) Would you prefer to have the bill make some specifications about distribution of funds by States? Yes___. No___.

6. What responsibilities do you think the Foundation should have?

Check the items below:

(a) The support of pure research. ___.

(b) The support of directed research. ___.

(c) The support of development work. ___.

(d) The support of military research or development, or both. ___.

(e) The coordination of military research or development, or both. ___.

(f) The coordination of all Government research or development, or both. ___.

(g) The operation of its own laboratories. ___.

(h) The provision of undergraduate scholarships in science only. ___.

(i) The provision of undergraduate scholarships, not restricted. ___.

(j) The provision of graduate followships in science. ___.

(k) The maintenance of a roster of scientific and technical personnel. ___.

(l) The publication of scientific and technical works. ___.

(m) The continuing study of Government and non-Government science.

(n) The study of classified and unclassified work. ___.

(o) The study of unclassified work only. ___.

7. Should we be interested in the patent provisions? Yes ___. No ___.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1947.

Memorandum to member associations.

From: W. A. Higinbotham.

At the February 1 meeting of the council, a questionnaire was given out to learn the attitude of the associations on science legislation. Although we requested answers before the meeting of the intersociety committee on February 23, the replies were very slow in coming in.

We have now had replies from six associations and correspondence from two others. This response would indicate that the federation does not feel strongly about the specific provisions of the legislation.

As a result of the discussion at the last council meeting, March 15, I wrote a letter to Senator SMITH of New Jersey.

This memorandum includes:

I. The answers to the questionnaire and conclusions.

II. Senate votes on science legislation and confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

III. Letter to Senator SMITH.

IV. Senator SMITH's answer.

V. Results of northern California poll.

VI. Position of AORES executive committee.

I. ANSWERS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL QUESTIONNAIRE FROM 6 MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

Question	Cornell [1]	Pittsburgh [2]	Wisconsin [3]	Eastern Iowa [4]	Philadelphia [5]	New York [6]	
1	4	O	O	X	X		25
	2	X	X	O	O		3
	2	O	O	O	O		8
2a	8	X	X	X	X		36
	0	O	O	O	O		1
2b	6	O	O	O	2		28
	1	O	O	X	1		2
	2	X	O	O	O		4
	0	O	O	O	O		0
2c	5	X	X	O	X		10
	1	O	O	X	O		20
	2	O	O	O	O		4
3	6	O	O	X	X		19
	2	X	X	O	O		17
	1	O	O	O	O		0
4	6	O	X	X	O		21
	1	O	O	O	O		6
	0	X	O	O	X		12
5a	1	O	O	O	O		23
	7	X	X	X	O		11
5b	3	X	O	O	O		7
	5	O	X	X	X		24
6a	8	X	X	X	X		37
6b	8	X	X	X	X		32
6c	1	X	X	X	(?)		28
6d	0						11
6e	0						14
6f	3		X	X			27
6g	4		X				21
6h	6	X	X		X		12
6i	2			X			25
6j	8	X	X	X	X		24
6k	7		X	X	X		32
6l	7		X	X			30
6m	3	X	X		X		28
6n	8		X				25
6o	3				X		1
7	7	X	X	X	O		32
	0	O	O	O	X		3

[1] Cornell—vote of executive committee.
[2] Pittsburgh—consensus of executive committee.
[3] Wisconsin—consensus of executive committee.
[4] Eastern Iowa—not specified.
[5] Philadelphia—not specified.
[6] New York—vote taken at general meeting—32 members and 5 nonmembers.

Conclusions:

1. Virtually all scientists are agreed on the need for Federal support of science.

2. Most scientists are interested in the details of the bill but are quite ready to accept anything reasonable.

3. A majority, perhaps two-thirds, prefer direct appointment of the full-time administrator or administrators, but virtually all will go along with any reasonable proposal.

4. A considerable majority favor inclusion of the social sciences. It seems odd to me that this is not more nearly unanimous.

5. A majority would prefer that the bill would not be too specific, but rather that the administration, set up by the bill should be able to exercise its best judgement.

6. Most scientists are interested in the patent provisions but do not feel that they are a primary consideration.

7. Those in favor of legislation agree that it should support fundamental research and education, both undergraduate and graduate.

8. Most scientists feel that the Foundation should also support directed research. A majority favor support of development work. A majority favor inclusion of classified, as well as unclassified, projects. The Association of Oak Ridge Engineers and Scientists and some other associations are strongly opposed to support of development work and classified projects. Only AORES has suggested opposing inclusion of a division of national defense.

It does not seem to me that these results justify opposition to the present bill. Rather, continued bickering among scientists may jeopardize the chance of getting any legislation. We have gone on record and stated our preferences. Now, in the best interests of science and the welfare of the country, I believe we should give full support to the bill S. 526, which has such illustrious backing in Congress, but urge amendment. Serious opposition to features of that bill should have been started last fall. I cannot believe that opposition at this late date will find much support among scientists as a whole.

II. SENATE VOTES ON SCIENCE LEGISLATION IN THE 79TH CONG. AND CONFIRMATION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IN THE 80TH CONG.

KEY TO SYMBOLS

A—Smith substitute for S. 1850, July 2, 1946.
B—Substitute board for director.
C—Substitute for patent provisions of S. 1850.
D—Hart amendment to cut out social sciences.
E—Hart amendment to cut out scholarships.
F—Passage of S. 1850, July 3, 1946.
G—Bricker proposal to recommit nominations of Atomic Energy Commission, Apr. 3, 1947.
n—No.
y—Yes.
O—Did not vote.
X—Not in Senate in 79th Cong.

Senator	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Aiken, Vermont	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Ball, Minnesota	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Baldwin, Connecticut	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Barkley, Kentucky	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Brewster, Maine	O	O	O	O	O	O	y
Bricker, Ohio	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Bridges, New Hampshire	O	y	y	y	y	n	y
Brooks, Illinois	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Buck, Delaware	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Bushfield, South Dakota	O	O	y	y	O	O	y
Butler, Nebraska	O	O	O	O	O	O	y
Byrd, Virginia	y	y	y	y	y	O	y
Cain, Washington	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Capehart, Indiana	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Capper, Kansas	n	y	y	y	y	n	n
Chavez, New Mexico	O	n	n	n	n	y	n
Connally, Texas	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Cooper, Kentucky	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Cordon, Oregon	O	O	O	O	O	O	y
Donnell, Missouri	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Downey, California	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Dworshak, Idaho	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Eastland, Mississippi	O	y	n	y	n	n	n
Ecton, Montana	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Ellender, Louisiana	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Ferguson, Michigan	n	n	y	n	n	y	y
Flanders, Vermont	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Fulbright, Arkansas	n	n	n	O	n	y	n
George, Georgia	n	y	n	y	n	y	n
Green, Rhode Island	n	n	O	O	n	n	n
Gurney, South Dakota	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Hatch, New Mexico	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Hawkes, New Jersey	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Hayden, Arizona	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Hickenlooper, Iowa	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Hill, Alabama	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Hoey, North Carolina	n	y	n	y	n	y	n
Holland, Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Ives, New York	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Jenner, Indiana	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Johnson, Colorado	n	n	n	y	n	y	n
Johnston, South Carolina	n	n	n	y	n	y	n
Kem, Missouri	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Kilgore, West Virginia	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Knowland, California	y	y	n	y	n	y	n
Langer, North Dakota	y	n	n	n	n	y	n
Lodge, Massachusetts	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Lucas, Illinois	O	n	O	n	O	y	n
McCarran, Nevada	n	n	n	n	n	y	y
McCarthy, Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
McClellan, Arkansas	y	y	y	y	n	y	y
McFarland, Arizona	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
McGrath, Rhode Island	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
McKellar, Tennessee	n	n	n	y	n	n	y

II. SENATE VOTES ON SCIENCE LEGISLATION IN THE 79TH CONG. AND CONFIRMATION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IN THE 80TH CONG.—continued

Senator	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
McMahon, Connecticut	n	n	n	y	n	y	n
Magnuson, Washington	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Malone, Nevada	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Maybank, South Carolina	n	n	n	y	n	y	n
Martin, Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Millikin, Colorado	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Moore, Oklahoma	O	y	y	y	y	n	y
Murray, Montana	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Morse, Oregon	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Myers, Pennsylvania	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
O'Conor, Maryland	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
O'Daniel, Texas	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
O'Mahoney, Wyoming	O	O	n	n	n	y	n
Overton, Louisiana	n	n	n	y	y	y	y
Pepper, Florida	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Reed, Kansas	O	y	y	y	y	O	y
Revercomb, West Virginia	y	y	y	y	O	O	y
Robertson, Virginia	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Robertson, Wyoming	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Russell, Georgia	n	y	n	y	n	y	n
Saltonstall, Massachusetts	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Smith, New Jersey	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Sparkman, Alabama	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Stewart, Tennessee	n	y	O	O	O	O	y
Taft, Ohio	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Taylor, Idaho	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Thomas, Oklahoma	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Thomas, Utah	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Thye, Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Tobey, New Hampshire	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Tydings, Maryland	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Umstead, North Carolina	X	X	X	X	X	X	n
Vandenberg, Michigan	O	O	O	O	O	O	n
Wagner, New York	n	n	n	n	n	y	n
Watkins, Utah	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Wherry, Nebraska	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
White, Maine	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Wiley, Wisconsin	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Williams, Delaware	X	X	X	X	X	X	y
Wilson, Iowa	O	O	y	y	O	n	y
Young, North Dakota	n	n	y	y	n	y	n

III. LETTER TO SENATOR SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, DATED MARCH 26, 1947

MARCH 26, 1947.

The Honorable Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Science is in need of Federal support. This need has been adequately described in "Science, the Endless Frontier," and many other places. Fundamental scientific research and scientific education are the important fields that especially need support. They are the supply of knowledge and manpower that our technology is based on.

The situation is acute because both these fields were neglected during the war. In addition, Europe, which used to lead the war in fundamental research, is now bankrupt.

The obvious and easy avenues of nature have, to a large extent, been explored. As a result, research becomes increasingly expensive and more thorough training of scientists is needed. At the same time the private support of fundamental research has grown steadily less.

Although the United States has led the world in schooling up to the college level, advanced training has always been the privilege of the few. As society depends more on science it is necessary to exploit all the scholarly resources of our population.

Government support of science is not new. Agriculture, health, and cancer are a few of the fields that are now subsidized. There are many Government laboratories and special projects. But there is no agency to concern itself with the health of science in general.

Science is the frontier of 1947, in a very real sense. Just as Federal encouragement of exploration and settling frontiers has paid off in the past, support of science will pay off in the future. It cannot be ignored without jeopardizing the health and strength of the Nation in the near future.

The following estimate is given in "Science, the Endless Frontier" on the cost:

	First year	Fifth year
Medical research	5,000,000	20,000,000
Natural science	10,000,000	50,000,000
National defense	10,000,000	20,000,000
Scholarships and fellowships	7,000,000	29,000,000
Administration, etc	1,500,000	3,500,000
Total	33,500,000	122,500,000

The budget should be considered separately from the bill, but it is worth noting the following factors in this connection:

1. The GI bill of rights, together with the accumulation of scholarships and fellowships.

2. The armed forces recognized the need for support of the natural sciences. They have already instituted many projects in fundamental research. Thus, many of the more expensive items in this division have already been budgeted. Presumably, the services would turn these projects, with the funds, over to the Foundation. The amount of these grants is between twenty and forty million dollars.

3. It is entirely likely that much of what might fall in the Division of National Defense is also provided for. It is not evident how much of this might be turned over to the Foundation and how much might better be continued under the present agencies.

Many features of S. 526 are excellent and have our wholehearted approval. Among these are the emphasis on fundamental research and education, the flexibility in the divisional structure, provision for international cooperation, the phrasing used throughout which would permit support of those aspects of the social sciences which are truly "scientific" in character.

The Federation of American Scientists is opposed to the board type of administration which is proposed in S. 526. We believe the reasons for the board structure are:

1. To avoid political appointments.

2. To provide for long-range continuity of program. This is an important point because research and education cannot be expected to bring results on a short-range basis.

We are opposed to the board structure because:

1. Under the proposed structure the authority rests largely with the Foundation which is liable to be unwieldy and delay making important decisions.

2. There is no clear line of responsibility. This may encourage buck passing. It would be nearly impossible to change a poor appointment. The administrator is only responsible to the Foundation, not the President or Congress.

3. The board might be made up of individuals interested in the same institutions which would receive some of the grants. This would be embarrassing all around.

The council (the policy body) of the federation, unanimously prefers direct appointment of an administrator or a full-time commission. They feel that it would be an improvement to decrease the size of the board.

The federation would prefer patent provisions similar to those in S. 525. We would not like to see the possibility of getting a bill jeopardized on this account and recognize that the patent situation as a whole should be reviewed.

The Government and the services are employing many young men whose education and training were interrupted by the war. We would recommend adding to section 9 a provision enabling Government employees to take advantage of the fellowship program without losing their status and seniority.

We hope that the War Department and the Navy Department will be able to turn over research contracts and funds to the Foundation. If this is not possible under the present wording of the bill, such provisions should be made.

Some question has been raised by our membership as to the need of a Division of National Defense. Any fundamental research may or may not be of interest in this respect. Once the application is definitely established, however, the research is applied rather than fundamental. Then, for effective development and for security purposes it might be better to turn the project over to the services. We realize the need for liaison and exchange of information with the military. It is clear that they must be in a position to learn of any developments which would be of interest to them.

We feel that it is especially important that grants be made in such a way as to insure the wholesome growth of scientific centers throughout the country. This means that the grants should not tend to build up the presently strong institutions but, while supporting them, it should also aid and encourage institutions throughout the country. We would favor some specific provision that would assure that a substantial part of the grants would be made on a geographic and population basis throughout the country.

We do not have complete unanimity on such questions as these. We recognize that we are not especially qualified to speak on administrative matters. But our organization has a fairly representative cross section of scientific opinion, old and young, liberal and conservative.

We are very interested in getting a National Science Foundation bill passed and in getting a bill as satisfactory as possible to those who will support it, work under it, and benefit from it.

Very sincerely yours,

W. A. HIGINBOTHAM,
Executive Secretary.

IV. SENATOR SMITH'S ANSWER TO PRECEDING LETTER

MARCH 28, 1947.

DEAR MR. HIGINBOTHAM: I am indebted to you for the profund exposition of the need for a National Science Foundation contained in your letter of March 26.

Congress has given a very considerable amount of time to the study of this legislation. Over 150 witnesses have been heard during the last 20 months.

In addition to this testimony, many letters and resolutions have been received, some of which represent free and unbiased evaluations, and some of which are actuated by small but aggressive political-action groups. It is the duty of Congress to weigh this data, but there also comes a time when it is the prerogative of Congress to decide the issues in legislature debate.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported S. 526, as amended, with the unanimous bipartisan support of the committee. Senators THOMAS, CORDON, REVERCOMB, SALTONSTALL, MAGNUSON, and FULBRIGHT joined me on the Senate bill and expressed confidence that all scientific groups will recognize the need to support a single bill.

I am hopeful that the Federation will put the need for a Foundation above their personal preferences.

Sincerely yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

V. RESULTS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POLL

1. Should Congress establish a National Science Foundation? 179 yes; 3 no; 1 undecided.

2. Prefer bill similar to S. 1850. 109 yes; prefer bill similar to H. R. 6448. 47 yes; other, 6 yes; undecided, 4 yes; abstain, 17.

3. Some provision for patents should be included. 163 yes; 6 no; 4 undecided.

4. Include some provision for social-science research. 136 yes; 30 no; 3 undecided; 14 abstain.

VI. THE POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF OAK RIDGE ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS IS GIVEN IN THE FOLLOWING LETTER TO DR. E. E. DAY, CHAIRMAN OF THE INTER-SOCIETY COMMITTEE, DATED MARCH 27 (A FEW SENTENCES HAVE BEEN OMITTED)

Dr. EDMUND E. DAY,
Chairman, Inter-Society Committee for a National Science Foundation, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Detailed examination of the two principal bills, S. 526 and S. 525, has led the committee to question that the enactment of either of these bills in their present form would implement the objectives of scientists. Our concern centers on the inclusion of basic research and military development in a single bill. The executive committee passed the following resolution:

The executive committee of the AORES favors the passage of National Science Foundation legislation which provides for the support of research and scholastic aid in all scientific fields which can be expected to promote the general welfare.

It should be the stated aim of the National Science Foundation to foster that type of scientific activity generally referred to as basic research. The distinction between basic research and developmental research will require continuing redefinition by responsible boards in the various fields of science.

The support of developmental research, including industrial and military, should not be the responsibility of the National Science Foundation.

Requests for support by the National Science Foundation should be considered only for nonprofit organizations, such as universities, colleges, and civilian agencies of the Government; the military branches of the Government should be specifically excluded from such support.

All work and findings supported by National Science Foundation funds should be unpatentable, unclassified, and fully published.

We believe that a great majority of scientists agree with our position in principle. Our executive committee has considered carefully the reasons which prompt many scientists to regard the support of at least one of the pending bills necessary, even in their present form. We know that to some scientists, almost any kind of a National Science Foundation appears preferable to the present state of affairs, in which university research is being largely subsidized by the Army and Navy. If this premise be accepted, tactical considerations might dictate a compromise on the inclusion of military research. We feel, however, that science may be losing more than it gains by such a compromise.

Following are some of the considerations on which our conclusions are based:

1. Basic research, from which stems all developmental research, flourishes only when there is free exchange of information. On the other hand, military research—which is usually developmental in nature, is necessarily secret. Both require Federal support, but the interests of each are best served by keeping separate the administration of such support. The following differences illustrate the propriety of this separation: The function of the supervisory agency in a research institution is generally that of sponsorship and provision of services, rather than that of management, control, and regulation. Moreover, in an organization devoted to either military or industrial development, ideas and methods frequently originate from the top and filter downward. The organization is generally designed to facilitate this flow. In a research institution on the other hand, ideas originate throughout the organization.

2. Under the pending bills, the secrecy regulations and provisions for classification of information which are appropriate to military research, will tend to be carried over to the basic research supported by the Foundation. The best way to avoid this is to keep the two distinct.

3. If the scope of the National Science Foundation should be confined to basic research and education, we may be confident that the needs of military research will not be neglected by the Congress. On the other hand, if under present world conditions, the support of military research should be included as a function of the Foundation, there is real danger that military considerations will tend to dominate.

4. The military could continue to employ civilian scientists, as they are now doing. They could also keep abreast of important advances in basic research without being directly connected with the Foundation, since the results of all basic research would be published freely.

5. In the legislative mill a bill is often crippled by damaging amendments. A Science Foundation bill which includes provisions for military research is particularly vulnerable to ill-considered amendments prompted by concern over military questions. This danger would be lessened if the scope of the bill were confined to science and education.

Mr. MORSE. I have also received a letter from Mr. Richard M. Emberson, who is president of one of the scientific groups who went over the record of the debate of last Friday, and who made very clear to me, in a letter received this morning, that he approves of the stand I took in the debate at that time. He points out that the position taken by me represents the point of view of the scientists of his association. I ask to have his letter incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1947.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building.

DEAR SIR: enclosed is a copy of an informal memorandum prepared by a committee of the Washington Association of Scientists relating to the Senate debate on S. 526 during the past week. We regret that circumstances made impossible our offering you a more presentable typescript, but we felt the matter to be urgent enough to dispense with formality.

We hope that the memorandum may be of some assistance to you in the splendid fight you are making for an effective National Science Foundation Act.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD M. EMBERSON,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now close the debate on the first amendment, because I think the two branches of my amendment should be kept separate. I am sure, from what they have told me, there are certain Senators who will vote for the first branch of my amendment, who will not vote for the second branch. Therefore, I should like to proceed to a vote on my first amendment. I close, by saying that I have, as I think anybody who wants to take the time to study the RECORD will agree, demonstrated unquestionably that the great majority of our college presidents and our scientists in the State universities and land-grant colleges feel it is essential, if we are going to have a sound National Science Foundation program, that the bill contain the first amendment, which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the first branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The Senator from Oregon has reworded and divided his proposed amendment. The question is now on agreeing to the first branch, wherein on page 15, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert certain language, which the clerk will state.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Pepper
Baldwin	Hoey	Reed
Ball	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kem	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Sparkman
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Cain	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Wagner
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gurney	Morse	Williams
Hatch	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Conor	Young
Hayden	O'Daniel	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask permission to be excused from the Senate on official business in connection with a conference with State officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the request is granted.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, we stand at the threshold of a new era of achievement in scientific research. Almost every field of science has at hand the basis for rapid advance. Even some of the less spectacular byproducts of scientific research can be the starting point of new experimental methods and

even of whole new sciences. The production, in significant quantities, of radioactive isotopes opens up a vast new field of research in biology, chemistry, medicine, and industrial sciences. I have listened enough to the scientists to realize that the production of a radioactive isotope of carbon can make possible experiments which will plunge deep into the innermost secrets of physiological processes, and of the behavior of organic chemicals. But the cost of such isotopes is so great, that only Federal support can supply the funds which will make such experiments possible. Here is a clear case where the very progress of science depends on the establishment of Federal support of basic research.

John Quincy Adams, in his first message to Congress in 1825, said:

> In assuming her station among the civilized nations of the earth it would seem that our Nation has contracted the engagement to contribute her share of mind, of labor, and of expense to the improvement of those parts of knowledge which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition.

Now, as the boundaries of knowledge are being rapidly pressed back, it is our obligation to provide the means for solving those problems which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition. I do not mean that we must find a substitute for the labors of individual scientists, for this is the very essence of scientific research. Rather, I believe that the Federal Government must provide whatever the individual scientist needs to make his efforts bear fruit.

I know there are some who say that science has now become such a terrible instrument of destruction that we must now call a halt to its advancement. No scientist can support such an idea, and history has shown that every such attempt to restrain human progress is doomed to failure.

Rather, I think we must face the issue squarely. If we have now learned how to harness the very forces of the sun, if we can now achieve such scientific miracles, then certainly it lies within our power to solve the economic and political problems which threaten to turn our knowledge into destructive channels. This is an obligation which all of us must meet. Scientists have begun to play an ever more critical role in this great project. I think the people of our Nation should be proud of all the men of science who have begun to find the means of explaining to the world that scientific progress and human progress cannot follow separate paths.

It is my firm purpose to do what I can, within the Congress, to provide for all science and for all scientists the support which they need and deserve. The proposed Science Foundation can be a national investment that may yield undreamed of returns in knowledge, in wealth, and in human progress. But its immediate value may be dwarfed if it will also make science a more vital part of our Nation's heritage—if it draws scientists ever deeper into the stream of democratic advance that has made our Nation great.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon will improve the National Science Foundation Act. I wish to emphasize that this is a very important program, and it is necessary for the Senate to be very careful in creating the Foundation so that it follows sound democratic lines which will assure the Nation the fullest possible benefits.

It has been said on the floor, Mr. President, that the Foundation which is to be established will be very careful in seeing that the funds are equitably distributed throughout the Nation, and that therefore no mention of the way in which the funds shall be distributed need be made in the legislation.

Mr. President, some of us from the sparsely populated States are very happy to have the proponents of the measure as it is tell us that they will take care of us; but if they intend to do so, we would just as soon have such a provision in the bill itself, so that we can be certain.

I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is reasonable. Two-fifths of the 25 percent allotment of funds is to be allocated to the States equally. In the State of Idaho we probably have no scientific equipment worthy to undertake some vast project; but, as I understand, the very name of the proposed institution describes its purpose. Its name is the National Science Foundation. While I realize that the word "Foundation" is not used in that sense, nevertheless, we are laying the foundation for a broad program of scientific research. It is not a question of being at war, when we must apply the money where facilities are available at the moment to get the quickest possible result. It seems to me that the object of this institution—at least I hope so—is actually to lay the foundation. If we are to do that, as has been pointed out, some of these funds should go to all the States, including the little States which do not have great institutions of learning, so that we can make a start, at least, and contribute our share to the scientific advancement of our Nation and mankind in general.

Mr. President, I hope that both amendments of the Senator from Oregon will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WHITE, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk was about to state the amendment. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

> (c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bears to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census. The amounts so apportioned to each State shall, except as hereinafter provided, be available for expenditure only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities (including the land-grant colleges) within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each college or university the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects. Notwithstanding the fact that funds may have been apportioned to any State under the provisions of this subsection, the Foundation shall obligate itself by contracts or other financial arrangements with the tax-supported colleges or universities within such State to expend only such part of the funds apportioned to such State as the Foundation determines may be expended, pursuant to proposals submitted by such colleges and universities, in a manner which is consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall revert to the general funds of the Foundation and thereafter be available either within or without such State, or both, for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire merely to say that the same reasons which moved me to support the amendment which was offered last week by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] impel me to support this amendment. I think no one can look abroad in the world today without realizing that one of the great difficulties of our time has been the development of the principle of central management. We have the managerial complex in business and we have it in government. If there is any conflict of ideology in the world to which Americans should open their eyes it is the conflict between the managerial state, upon the one hand, and, on the other, the free competitive enterprise which has been the philosophy of America since its foundation.

The reason why I believe this amendment should be adopted is that without it we shall have in the bill an exemplification of the principle of central management. Senators who have opposed adoption of this amendment apparently resent every suggestion which is made that perhaps the Directors of the Foundation may not consider the applications of every college and university in the Nation. But the history of the development of all phases of our industrial, commercial, and scientific discovery has shown not only the concentration of managerial power but the disposition of those who exercise that power not to extend recognition to those who are outside the particular circle.

The United States and the people of the United States have become great and prosperous because they have preserved opportunity. This amendment will be a provision to preserve opportunity by laying a positive direction upon those to whom will be given almost plenary pow-

er with respect to the management of science in the future to recognize applications which come from institutions within each of the States.

The trouble in the world is centralism—centralized authority in business and centralized authority in government. Unless we adopt provisions of law which will guarantee decentralization we cannot escape the corroding influences and effects of continued centralization. Unless this amendment is adopted, it will be within the power of the directors of this organization to say where, when, and by whom new scientific opportunities may be taken advantage of.

We are told that we should trust ourselves to the good will of the wise and good men who will be selected. No one knows who they will be. We have a fond hope that they will be men of the highest conceptions of public service and of devotion to the public interest. But some officials who have been appointed in the past have fallen below that high estate. We know that to be a fact. What purpose can there possibly be, then, to write into the law a rule by which we shall guarantee to keep the door of opportunity open in the field of science in each one of the States? Decentralization, Mr. President, is of the greatest importance; and if in this bill of all bills we overlook it, we shall be creating an instrumentality whereby science can be made a device for promoting centralization.

The study of science, the development of great inventions and discoveries, is a matter which requires the highest technical skill. The man in the street cannot hope to judge what is right or wrong with reference to the action of a scientist. It is beyond his grasp. If we do not have a standard set down in the law, we may be certain that those who are to have control over the National Foundation will be under constant temptation to deny opportunity to those who are growing up in the various States. If there is one thing which the war proved to us, Mr. President, it seems to me it is that in every community in the land, in every little village, in every county there are young men and young women of the greatest natural capacity. It was the resourcefulness of the soldiers of the United States that made them irresistible upon the field. It was the resourcefulness of our men in the Navy that made such an all-conquering power. These men were men of intelligence and individual capacity. It seems to me, Mr. President, that no one can doubt that opportunity should be extended to them.

I shall certainly give my support to both amendments.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am impelled to say a few words in connection with the pending question.

We have a new president at the University of West Virginia who was one of the executives working on the atomic bomb. He worked on the entire Manhattan project in an executive capacity and also as scientist during the development of the program. After that he went to the University of West Virgina. He had never been previously connected with it. Naturally, I feel that a suggestion coming from a person of his background merits serious consideration. The suggestion in the form of a telegram was received by me this morning urging my unqualified support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or some amendment which would set aside at least a portion of the funds to be used in publicly supported educational institutions throughout the United States in such a manner that they could not be diverted therefrom.

Another thing which impels me to speak is the apparent utter lack of understanding of the purpose of the proposed Foundation. I think I have a right to speak regarding such lack of understanding. I have been working on this subject for more than 5 years. I have consulted all the leading educators. As I previously stated, I conducted hearings and heard all the 150 witnesses, including leading scientists and leading educators of the United States, as well as a great number of businessmen, all of whom, excepting one, recommended the bill which was passed by the Senate last year which contained features incorporated in the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. Dr. Jewett was the exception. He is opposed to any work of this kind. He was opposed to any Government research program of any kind.

Mr. President, the lack of understanding was also plainly evident on Friday by the fact that all the debate and all the questions opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon went only to the question of the results of research in terms of discoveries and inventions. In support of my own amendment I spoke and explained that that was not the purpose of the Foundation; that the primary purpose of the Foundation was to develop the brains, the research ability, and research personnel adequate to meet our problems.

Mr. President, if an invention is required, let a sufficiently large reward be offered and the invention will be provided. If there is an abundance of research-trained men in the country it is not necessary to offer a reward or to make any special drive. Their brains will produce the inventions sought.

I was very much interested a while ago in talking to the Capitol physician, Captain Calver, who has been interested in research along medical lines for years. He made a criticism. He said, "I think many of those who are debating this question are wrong. They are talking about inventions instead of talking about the development of people to make inventions."

We are lacking at this time approximately 60,000 research workers due to the fact that we drafted all our scientific students during the war. This is probably the only country in the world that did that. We have to make up that shortage.

The question before the Senate in connection with the amendment is, Are we seeking to subsidize the development of a few inventions to be privately patented and exploited at the expense of the people who pay for them, or are we seeking to develop the personnel to overcome a shortage which was manifest during the war and which had existed before the war, but which had never been called to our attention? Are we going to develop scientists or are we going to develop a few serums, a new paint or two, or possibly a new type of stick-fast lip stick, or something of that kind? That, in my opinion, is the point which is before the Senate. If we follow the bill as drafted, without amendment, there are no restrictions. It may mean the subsidizing of one single commercial laboratory with the entire sum of money provided, because there is nothing in the bill which says that that cannot be done. We could spend every cent of the entire amount on one privately owned commercial laboratory, and not permit one cent to go even to MIT or Harvard, or any other institution. But, Mr. President, where can we find scientists to go ahead with that private laboratory 10 or 12 years from now, in view of the fact that all the top-flight men of science have said that it is the young scientist, the man under 35 or the woman under 35 years of age, who is the real basic research worker, who forges ahead and discovers things in the unexplored field of natural laws.

Mr. President, that is where this proposal for a National Science Foundation is being misrepresented, in that the public is being informed that we seek a new wrinkle relative to the atomic bomb, or a new hull line for a ship, or a new fuel, or a new invention of some kind—perhaps a new refrigerator. But such things will not do us much good. What is really important is, not the actual invention but the ability to produce inventions when necessary or to make discoveries when necessary. Such ability is the foundation of the strength of a nation. I have always maintained that the strength of a nation lies in the will and ability of its manpower to make accomplishments. Even though we might be the most powerful industrial nation in the world, if we had only a small manpower or a manpower that was not trained to defend itself or was not susceptible of such training or had no desire to defend itself, our Nation would collapse, just as France, Belgium, and Holland did in the days of crisis.

On the other hand, if we have sufficient manpower in the realms of science, and if they possess adequate skill and training and inquiring minds, they will meet any crisis which may arise. But our Nation will not be in that situation unless we make sure that people all over the United States are trained along those lines. For instance, if the University of West Virginia were asked to do research in connection with the propagation of lobsters, those who engaged in the research would not be very greatly interested in it. Similarly, if Bowdoin College in Maine were asked to do certain research in respect to coal, the persons at Bowdoin who did that work would not be particularly interested in it. On the other hand, the scientists at the University of West Virginia would have a keen interest in research in coal and the scientists at Bowdoin College would have a keen interest in research relative to lobsters, and in both cases the faculty and scientists engaged in such work

would do their utmost to achieve the maximum of accomplishment. In short, Mr. President, the best results will be obtained, all other things being equal, by having the research work done in localities in which there is a natural interest in the fields under consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, and I should like to know when I shall have an opportunity to vote upon it.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator will have such an opportunity in several minutes, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, by my recent remarks I have been attempting to cure the utter misapprehension which exists in regard to the application of the funds to be controlled by the Foundation. There has been widespread misunderstanding of the theory in regard to the Foundation, and there has been an erroneous belief that the funds might be improperly diverted to such an extent that eventually the Foundation would be unable to continue, and the necessary work, of vital importance to the Nation as a whole, would not be done.

Mr. President, I say that if we are not careful the Foundation will eventually be destroyed. Accordingly, I expect to support the amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

I have been greatly interested in the presentation of the amendment by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I have been impressed not only with his sincerity but with the great volume of work and research which he has done in connection with the amendment. I have been considerably in doubt as to whether the amendment should be supported.

I have now reached the conclusion that I shall not vote for the amendment, and I should like to state briefly one of the reasons—I believe it is the predominant reason—why I shall not vote for it. I have tried to look at the operation of the amendment from a practical standpoint. Mr. President, let us suppose that the amendment is adopted. It provides that certain funds shall be apportioned among the States, and it makes mandatory provision that they shall be, while providing that a certain power of veto, so to speak, shall reside in the Foundation. So let us suppose that the amendment is adopted, and that thereafter an institution in a certain State makes to the Foundation a proposal which, on its face, meets with the prescribed standards laid down by the Foundation. Obviously, if the institution presents a very convincing argument, prima facie, that the funds have been apportioned to the State in which it is located, it seems to me that from a practical standpoint that institution will have a beneficial presumption in its own favor that it is entitled to the appropriation it seeks, provided only that it makes a case, which upon the record, will indicate that it is capable of carrying out the contract. So it seems to me that when, following the adoption of the amendment, such an institution within a given State makes such a proposal to the Foundation, the Foundation immediately will be confronted with very great difficulty in rejecting the proposal without reflecting upon either the honesty or the ability of the institution which makes the application. Notwithstanding that the institution may be honest and may present standards or may be in compliance with standards which are in harmony with those of the Foundation, nevertheless it may well be that such an institution would not actually be qualified to perform the work. In such case, suppose the Foundation took the bull by the horns and rejected the proposal. Does it not seem perfectly clear that if it adopted that policy throughout the United States as to institutions in various States which it might think did not meet the specific qualifications, the almost certain result, in the long run, would be that the institutions whose proposals were rejected would have hard feeling and distrust and positive hatred against the Foundation?

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment is based on a fallacy, in that from a practical standpoint the amendment would make it exceedingly difficult for the Foundation to administer the fund while maintaining the freedom of judgment to which it seems to me it should be entitled.

I, for one, believe that in view of the safeguards which are prescribed in the bill itself, we can rely upon the Foundation to make the proper allocation of the funds, and that under those circumstances there is no necessity to impose the restrictions which the amendment would apply.

It will be recalled that the bill provides that the persons nominated for appointment shall first be appointed by the President. That in itself is some safeguard. The bill further provides that they shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Certainly that is some safeguard. In addition, the bill requires that those who are appointed must be recognized leaders in the field of engineering or education or public affairs, and shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service, and without regard to political, social, or religious factors, and shall be so selected as to provide a representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the United States. In addition to that, Mr. President, the President of the United States is requested, in connection with making nominations of persons to be appointed as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nominations which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations. It is difficult to conceive how more effective and powerful safeguards can be thrown around the determination of the character and quality of members of the Foundation than the bill has thrown around them. I, for one, am willing to take the chance, if you please, at least for the time, of seeing how the Foundation will work. As a matter of fact, this is not an irrevocable bill. If we find, in the course of a year or two, or 5 years, or any number of years, that the Foundation is not showing that fairness with respect to the administration of its trust which we would expect from persons of this high character and standing, the Congress of the United States can then remedy the error into which we shall have fallen.

Bearing in mind the suggestions which I have made, I have come to the conclusion that I shall vote against the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census. The amounts so apportioned to each State shall, except as hereinafter provided, be available for expenditure only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities (including the land-grant colleges) within such State pursuant to contracts of other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each college or university the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects. Notwithstanding the fact that funds may have been apportioned to any State under the provisions of this subsection, the Foundation shall obligate itself by contracts or other financial arrangements with the tax-supported colleges or universities within such State to expend only such part of the funds apportioned to such State as the Foundation determines may be expended, pursuant to proposals submitted by such colleges and universities, in a manner which is consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter revert to the general funds of the Foundation and be available, either within or without such State or both, for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair

to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present and voting the junior Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably detained

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the senior Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—42

Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Lucas	Russell
Downey	McClellan	Sparkman
Ecton	McFarland	Stewart
Fulbright	McGrath	Taylor
George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Umstead
Hoey	Morse	Wagner
Holland	Murray	Wilson
Ives	O'Conor	Young

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bricker	Jenner	Taft
Bridges	Kem	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Knowland	Thye
Bushfield	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cain	McCarthy	Watkins
Capper	Malone	Wherry
Cooper	Martin	White
Donnell	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Moore	Williams
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—13

Aiken	Eastland	Myers
Barkley	Flanders	Overton
Buck	Green	Reed
Byrd	Langer	
Capehart	McCarran	

So the first branch of Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the vote by which the first branch of the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. LUCAS. I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the second branch of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, following the amendment just agreed to, inserting subsection (c) between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall, except as hereinafter provided, be available for expenditure, pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements, only for the purpose of carrying on research activities in the facilities of nonprofit organizations (whether or not tax-supported) or for the purpose of furnishing facilities (including laboratories and other buildings, equipment, and supplies) to nonprofit organizations to enable such organizations to conduct research activities. Funds expended for any such purpose shall not be required to be expended in accordance with any apportionment among the States. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Foundation shall not be required to enter into any contract or other financial arrangement with any nonprofit organization providing (1) the carrying on of any research activities which the Foundation determines would not be consistent with, or would not be carried on in a manner consistent with, such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act; or (2) the furnishing of any facilities to such nonprofit organization unless the Foundation determines that such nonprofit organization has need for such facilities and the furnishing of such facilities is advisable in the interest of carrying out such general program. Any funds available for expenditure in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this subsection which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after such funds become available to be so expended, obligate itself to expend in accordance with such provisions shall thereafter be available for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of carrying on research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with any other funds of the Foundation.

(e) No apportionment or expenditure by the Foundation pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) or subsection (d) of this section shall be counted as an apportionment or expenditure for the purpose of determining whether it has complied with the other of such subsections.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in support of the second branch of my amendment, I shall insert a memorandum which I have received from the Office of the legislative counsel explaining the meaning of the language I propose. It shows that what I said on Friday would be accomplished by my amendment is what unquestionably would be accomplished by it, particularly in view of the final form in which I have submitted the amendment today. I ask that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR MORSE

As requested by you, I have prepared the attached redraft of the second proposal contained in your amendment of April 2, 1947, to S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill.

The second proposal contained in your amendment of April 2, 1947, provided that not less than 25 percent of the funds appropriated to the foundation for research activities (other than national defense research activities) should be expended "in the facilities of nonprofit organizations." The amendment went on to provide "In meeting the requirements of this subsection, the foundation may take into account whatever funds may be expended by it for facilities to be operated by the land grant, tax supported, or other nonprofit organizations, even though the title or ownership rights of such facilities remain with the United States."

The discussion which occurred on the floor of the Senate on May 16, 1947, particularly that between you and Senator SALTONSTALL, indicates that this portion of your amendment was interpreted as providing that the funds so apportioned should be expended for the construction of facilities, in other words for "brick and mortar."

While this portion of your amendment is somewhat ambiguous, it seems to me that it does not require that the money so apportioned be expended exclusively for "brick and mortar." I believe that the correct interpretation of the amendment's provisions is that at least 25 percent of the funds appropriated would have to be expended pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements made by the Foundation with nonprofit organizations. The amendment provides that the funds shall be expended "in the facilities of nonprofit organizations." I believe that the last sentence of the amendment has the effect of permitting the Foundation to enter into contracts or other financial arrangements with such nonprofit organizations providing either for the carrying on of research projects or for the furnishing of facilities to such nonprofit organizations.

The attached redraft of the second proposal contained in your amendment of April 2, 1947, provides that at least 25 percent of the funds appropriated for research activities (not including national defense research activities) shall be available for the purpose of entering into contracts or other financial arrangements with nonprofit organizations providing either for the carrying on of research projects by such organizations or for the furnishing of facilities to such organizations. In the case of research projects, the Foundation would have to determine that such projects are consistent with "such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives of this act." In the case of contracts and financial arrangements providing for the furnishing of facilities, the Foundation would have to determine that the nonprofit organization "has need for such facilities and the furnishing of such facilities is advisable in the interest of carrying out such general program." If nonprofit organizations did not, within 9 months after research funds become available for expenditure, submit a sufficient number of worthy projects to use the funds apportioned to such nonprofit organizations, the Foundation would then be free to expend such funds for any research projects which it might desire to support.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN H. SIMMS,
Assistant Counsel.

MAY 19, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the second branch of the

amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the second branch of Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to Senate bill 526, which is offered for myself, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 9, it is proposed to strike out section 11 and in lieu thereof to insert:

USE AND DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

SEC. 11. (a) The Foundation shall make and maintain an inventory of all current federally financed research and development projects. In cooperation with the Commissioner of Patents, the Foundation shall establish a central register of all inventions, discoveries, patents, patent rights, and findings, including references to related data, in which the United States or any agency thereof has any right, title, or interest, or which pursuant to this section have been freely dedicated to the public. The Foundation shall record, collect, index, and promptly publish or cause to be published significant data on all inventions and discoveries and other findings produced in the course of federally financed research and development activities, or arrange with other Government agencies for such publishing, recording, collecting, and indexing. In consultation and collaboration with the Library of Congress and other Government agencies, the Foundation shall take such steps as it may deem necessary to make such information and other available significant scientific and technical information accessible to the public, including the preparation and distribution of reports, periodic catalogs, inventories, abstracts, translations, bibliographies, and microfilm and other reproductions thereof; and for such purposes the Foundation may utilize the facilities of Government agencies and other organizations to the extent that it deems necessary or desirable, and may contract for the expenditure of funds for such purposes without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section II of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; U. S. C., title 44, sec. 111).

(b) Each contract or other arrangement for federally financed research or development entered into between any Government agency and any organization shall provide that such organization will make available to such agency full data on all inventions, discoveries, patents, patent rights, and findings produced in the course of such research or development, including such reports with respect thereto as may be required by such agency. Each Government agency, upon the request of the Foundation, shall make available to it such data and such reports with respect to research and development activities financed by such agency, as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

(c) All inventions, discoveries, or findings in which the United States (or any Government agency), now or hereafter, hold any rights, including patent rights, shall be made available to the public on a nonexclusive and on a royalty-free basis to the extent the United States or such agency is entitled to do so under the rights held by it. Except as provided hereafter in this subsection and in subsection (d), any invention, discovery, or finding hereafter produced in the course of federally financed research and development shall, whether or not patented, be made freely available to the public and shall, if patented, be freely dedicated to the public. The requirements of this subsection, to the extent that they require modification of contracts or other financial arrangements already entered into by the United States (or any Governmental agency) shall not go into effect until 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) The head of any Government agency financing by contract, or otherwise administering, federally financed research and development activities, may, by stipulation in the contract or by other advance agreements with any organization, provide for the retention by the organization, or by the inventor, or by their assignees of such patent rights based on discoveries, inventions, or findings produced in the course of such research and development as the head of such Government agency deems fair and equitable, and consistent with the national interest: *Provided*, That (1) the head of such Government agency shall, before entering into any such contract or agreement, make a finding that the agency has made every reasonable effort to arrange for the conduct of the necessary research and development without entering into a contract containing such provision; (2) the organization shall contribute or shall have contributed substantially to the development of the particular inventions, discoveries, or findings for which patent rights are retained through earlier or current research and development activities financed by the organization; (3) in every case, the contract or agreement shall provide for at least an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license for governmental purposes to the United States; and (4), in the case of any nonprofit organization, the head of such Government agency further determines (A) that the research and development is essential in the field of national defense or in such other fields as the President may specify for such purpose and, (B) that the patent rights retained will not be used to serve the special benefit of any organization conducted for profit or of any individual, and will be made available or licensed to applicants on a nonexclusive, uniform, and reasonable royalty basis.

In the administration of the provisions of this subsection, the head of any Government agency shall be guided by such rules and regulations as the President may deem necessary and prescribe by Executive order.

(e) The Foundation shall make a quarterly report to the President and to the Congress concerning contracts and agreements containing the provisions authorized by subsection (d). This report shall include a list of all contracts and agreements containing such a provision entered into by any Government agency during the preceding quarter, the reasons supporting the approval of such provision in each case, the amount of Federal funds expended or to be expended under each contract or agreement containing such a provision, the name of the organization with which the contract or agreement was made, and the general nature of the patent rights reserved for private use in each case. The report shall also include a list of all inventions, discoveries, or findings in which patent rights were permitted to be retained pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) and which were first recorded or finally authorized during the preceding quarter, identification of the contract or agreement under which such inventions, discoveries, or findings were produced, and the nature of the right retained. The report shall also include the Foundation's recommendations, if any, for such further Executive or legislative section as it may deem necessary.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President, or any person designated for that purpose by him, may exempt from the provisions of this act relating to dedication to the public, publication, dissemination, or making available, any scientific or technical information, data, patents, inventions, or discoveries produced in the course of federally financed research or development or in which the United States holds any rights, if and so long as the President or such designated person determines that such exemption is essential in the interest of national security.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the amendment offered to the bill by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself is, merely a reoffering of the text which was made a part of the bill passed by the Senate last year. It has been represented to the public and in the Senate that this is an amendment affecting patent law. I may say, Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate that the amendment was prepared at the request of a conference of Senators, scientists, and teachers by one of the leading patent attorneys of the United States under the strict injunction that it should not in any way amend the patent law, and it does not do so. Any statement to the contrary arises either from an attempt to misrepresent the effect of the amendment or from an ignorance as to its import.

The amendment simply follows the policy adopted by every private research laboratory and by every industrial corporation maintaining research in the United States of America, with but one exception. By the amendment patenting of a discovery, except where permitted by special contract with the Foundation, is prohibited. In the private research laboratory and the private corporation the patenting of a discovery is permitted, due to the fact that a corporation cannot obtain a patent except by purchase, so it requires its employees, or the person or persons with whom it has a contract, to patent the invention or discovery, and then to sell the invention or discovery so patented, to the laboratory or the company for, in most cases, $1, and in one case I know of, for $25.

We simply do away with the fiction of $25 and live in the theory that the Foundation is designed to promote science and promote research in the United States, not for profit for any individual, but for profit for all; that the people who pay the bill shall have the benefit.

Mr. President, I see no reason why the taxpayers of the United States, who furnish the funds to make a discovery, should then have to pay through the nose. After having furnished the funds and the equipment and everything else needed by the scientist who makes a discovery, the taxpayers should not also have to pay a huge royalty when it becomes necessary for them to use the invention.

It is said, Mr. President, that a large part of the work done by the Foundation will not be patentable. But if the Members of this body would take the time to read some of the hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs about 2 years ago they might learn of the history of the Wisconsin Foundation, which took several million dollars out of the pockets of people in the United States who could not afford to pay it, for vitamins which were discovered. It was merely a natural law

that was discovered by a couple of public servants on a public pay roll, who were cold-blooded enough to say later that they did not patent their discovery or invention; that they simply turned their invention over to someone who got it patented; and it was said by the Foundation that it could not even reduce the price, despite the inordinately high price charged for the vitamins. Out of that grew one of the grandest examples of a misguided monopoly this country has ever seen.

So, Mr. President, in drafting the proposed legislation we took care not to disturb existent patent laws, because the manifest inequities of present patent laws are before the people now, and a committee has made a deep study of them, as has the Department of Justice, and recommended a great number of changes. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has made a deep study of patent laws, and we hope the actual patent laws themselves will come up for discussion in the Senate.

The pending amendment, Mr. President, merely requires the publication of the results of research, the careful cataloging in conjunction with Government agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the Patent Commissioner, and the dissemination of the information to the scientific institutions of the United States for their use.

It would not prohibit a patent, for instance, on a process for producing a certain material discovered under the proposed Foundation provided the process had not been discovered at the expense of the Government. It is an endeavor to have the Government to do what the people think it does. The people of the United States maintain research facilities, thinking that they benefit from them, and they do benefit after paying a nice toll in the form of a royalty.

The amendment also sets a pattern for Government agencies. At the present time one agency, the Navy, encourages its research workers to patent inventions discovered at Government expense providing they do not charge the Government a royalty on them. I find, however, that the Government usually pays a sufficiently large price to the manufacturer so that no royalty is needed.

The Department of the Interior forbids the patenting of discoveries made by its employees. During the last war, for instance, a squabble over a patent for the production of magnesium from magnesite blocked magnesium production in the States of Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and several others. A Department of the Interior engineer had developed a process of producing magnesium from magnesite, but because of a squabble over who was going to obtain some royalties from the patent on the discovery which had been made on Government time, in a Government installation, with Government money and Government equipment, the entire magnesium program was made much more expensive to the people of the United States, and that process was never used. Magnesium development in those areas where magnesite was plentiful was held up. There were similar incidents occurring constantly throughout the war. The idea embraced in the amendment grew from that experience of the Government.

Mr. President, in brief, the amendment would require a constant survey by the Foundation, in conjunction with the Commissioner of Patents, respecting all new discoveries based on the funds provided by the Government. It would require periodic publication of those results and of the methods used to be made available to the scientific institutions and others within the United States who might want the information. It would permit the Foundation, however, to contract with private laboratories where public laboratories could not do the work, and that would particularly apply to the Army and the Navy where most of the work is applied research. It would permit the contracting with them of such agreements as might be most expeditious for the Government, and the taking of patents. It would submit all inventions and discoveries of the Foundation to a screen to see whether they were necessary in national defense, and if they were necessary, publication would be prohibited so that no other nation would obtain the information. That is an additional advantage for a number of reasons. I cite a concrete example of one reason. In Germany immediately after VE-day I found a pair of German binoculars made by Zeiss. I compared them with a pair of our own binoculars made by Bausch & Lomb. They were an exact duplicate of Navy's 7.5 binocular, which was produced by Bausch & Lomb on Navy design, and when we entered the war, was thought to be a secret, because others were using 6.3 binoculars not quite as good. But Bausch & Lomb, under their cartel arrangements with Zeiss, had shipped the designs and engineering data to Germany, and the entire German Army was equipped with the latest instrument we had in the way of a binocular of our own design.

This amendment would prohibit the giving away of information determined to be of a critical nature in the national defense. It would prohibit publication and patenting except under such terms as the Foundation might approve.

My principal interest arises from the many experiences I had as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and also of the National Defense Investigating Committee, with the abuses, under the name of patent, of Government inventions and Government discoveries, until I reached the conclusion that in fairness to the people of the United States we should not make them pay five times for the same whistle. We should not require them to pay for developing something, and then make them pay about five times a fair royalty for the privilege of using what was developed with their money.

I know it is said that we must encourage the inventive genius of the United States. I have heard that statement made by so many hypocrites—and I apologize for the use of the word—who themselves contract with scientists day after day and prohibit them from having the benefit of their discoveries; and yet they expect those scientists to produce good work for them. I have talked with the heads of laboratories, and when I called to their attention their own employment contracts they never answered. Such contracts require that the results of invention be given to the employer. In this case the employer is the people of the United States.

I have another interest in this subject, Mr. President. A study of international and national monopolies, some of which are called cartels, will show that one of the three major foundations for a monopoly is the patent system. One of the three major ways in which to keep people from using something they need, or else making the price almost prohibitive, or limiting production in such a way that all of them cannot have it even when they can afford to pay for it, and by limited production to force up the prices, has been the abuse and misuse of the patent system.

Had it not been for the pooling of patents between I. G. Farben and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, we would have been in the synthetic rubber business for about two-thirds of the price we paid, and a great deal sooner. We would not have had all the trouble we had over tires. Our gas-mask industry and other rubber uses could have built up their production long before they did.

In the hearings held before the National Defense Committee, Mr. Howard, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, in charge of operating their patent pool and their patent agreements with I. G. Farben, stated that they were very sorry that they could not furnish the know-how to the United States, because although Farben had agreed to furnish it to them, Farben had said it could not furnish it because Germany was afraid. The German Government objected. Later it developed that the letter from Farben had been written at the request of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, in order to give them an excuse for not producing rubber at that time and enabling them to get a more profitable contract from the United States Government for the production of synthetic rubber.

In the early part of the war we had no ammunition. Patents on one basic constituent of high explosive powder were held up because our own manufacturers refused to produce and sell to the powder manufacturers this necessary component of powder, because of objections filed by the German Government through I. G. Farben. I. G. Farben could not have raised the objection, and our corporation could not have raised the objection, but for the use of patent pools.

I am not urging that we do away with patents. If John Jones can make a good mouse trap let him make it and patent it. If a man can develop a new serum, let him make it and patent it, and let him derive a profit from his work. But I resent the fact that the people of the United States, paying the men to do the development work—and sometimes educating them—have been forced to pay through the nose when they tried to buy something which one of those men invented.

I remember that sometime ago one of our great companies published a number of statements in the press about a new

substance which it had developed for converting softwood into hardwood. It was not until some of us called attention to the fact that that was a development of the Forestry Bureau of the Department of the Interior that they shamefacedly admitted that it was. They had absent-mindedly picked it up and patented it.

Let me show a picture of how this situation affects us and how we must protect the National Science Foundation if we are to organize it for national defense. I read from the indictment of Farben officials. The indictment shows how they operated. Suppose they could get some of their old colleagues to do this research work, under the old arrangements. Where would we be if a war should come? One paragraph in the indictment reads as follows:

Farben's prewar activities were carefully designed to weaken the United States as the arsenal of democracy. Through its cartel arrangements Farben retarded the production within the United States of certain strategic products, including synthetic rubber, magnesium, synthetic nitrogen, tetrazene, atabrine, and sulfa drugs.

This was done through the cooperation of the cartel partner. I call attention to the fact that that cartel has not yet been abridged, and is still in existence. Suppose those laboratories should get our money to develop something else, and later an agreement with a foreign country which goes to war with us should prohibit us from using that discovery. Where would we be?

We had to use atabrine to fight malaria, and the shortage of it in the early days caused many American boys to become so thoroughly impregnated with the malarial germ that they will be years getting over it.

The Farben officials are now being indicted for their prewar activities, which were admittedly based upon an exchange of patents and based upon an agreement to control patents. Now they want to let us spend our money and allow anyone who works on a project to have the benefit of the discovery and be permitted to enter into an agreement with some foreign company to hamstring us in connection with the very inventions for which we pay.

The next paragraph of the indictment reads as follows:

54. In the case of magnesium a cartel arrangement between Farben, Aluminum Co. of America, and Dow Chemical Co. greatly restricted production within the United States and prohibited exports from the United States to Europe except to Germany and in negligible amounts to Great Britain. Thus Great Britain and the rest of Europe became completely dependent upon Germany for its magnesium. As a result Great Britain was in a desperate situation with respect to magnesium at the outbreak of war. Meanwhile Farben expanded its own magnesium production for war as rapidly as possible.

That is all based on a patent. As the Senate knows, magnesium is the basic constituent for incendiary bombs. We can imagine the situation of England, with no magnesium.

55. When the British Purchasing Mission tried to buy tetrazene primed ammunition in the United States in early 1941, the sale was prevented by a cartel agreement between a subsidiary of du Pont and a subsidiary of Farben—

Another result of patents—

56. When the Japanese captured Java they captured the bulk of the world's quinine resources. The only substitute to combat malaria was atabrine, a synthetic drug discovered by Farben. A single patent controlled by Farben dictated the terms by which this essential drug could be manufactured in the United States, and prevented its production in the United States prior to Germany's declaration of war against the United States.

So we had to start to make atabrine. Although we had a license to make it, we could not make it until we could break that cartel arrangement of the patent. Suppose we were to invent something better than atabrine and it were privately patented and developed with taxpayers' money, and then we reached the point where there was a cartel in connection with it. We might find it being said, as said by one official connected with an American patent in a cartel, "Certainly, our dollars worked for Germany in Germany, and they worked for the United States in the United States." A very patriotic idea.

The pushing and shoving to get the right to patent the results of Government-financed research must be stopped, else all that is worth anything will be in the hands of foreign cartels, and the results of the work of the research Foundation which we are now seeking to establish will be largely nullified and we will find we have created a terrific expense to the buying public of the United States who have financed the research upon which results were founded.

Mr. President, leaving the bill in its present condition, without accepting the amendment which I have offered and which has also been urged by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], would be a tragic error. It would permit a subsidizing of private research for private profit; it would permit the use of Government development by private contract to block us in time of war. It would do all the things which we are seeking to prevent by the passage of the bill, unless the amendment is agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia for himself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Fulbright
Baldwin	Chavez	George
Ball	Connally	Gurney
Brewster	Cooper	Hatch
Bricker	Cordon	Hawkes
Bridges	Donnell	Hayden
Brooks	Downey	Hickenlooper
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hill
Butler	Ecton	Hoey
Byrd	Ellender	Holland
Cain	Ferguson	Ives
Jenner	Millikin	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kem	Murray	Thye
Kilgore	O'Conor	Tobey
Knowland	O'Daniel	Tydings
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Umstead
Lucas	Pepper	Vandenberg
McCarthy	Reed	Wagner
McClellan	Revercomb	Watkins
McFarland	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo.	White
McKellar	Russell	Wiley
McMahon	Saltonstall	Williams
Magnuson	Smith	Wilson
Malone	Sparkman	Young
Martin	Stewart	
Maybank	Taft	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I realize that many Members of the Senate are busy attending various committees, rather than attending the sessions of the Senate, as I said at the outset of the session this morning. I myself would much prefer to be in attendance at the meeting of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill, which has been meeting daily for more than a week, rather than to be here in the Senate discussing this amendment. Yet this amendment is of such vital importance that I cannot permit it to go to a vote without saying a few words which seem to me to be necessary to be said in order to emphasize another phase of the tremendous change which has taken place in our economy by depriving the individual of the economic freedom he used to have, and transferring it to organizations.

There is no doubt in my mind that the bill, as it has come from the committee, including section 11, will only serve to emphasize the control which now is exercised by concentrated economy over the industrial life of the United States. I am sure that the members of the committee which reported the bill, including this section, had no such purpose in mind. The danger from which we are suffering does not proceed from the deliberate acts of our legislature, or perhaps from the deliberate acts of economic leaders. It proceeds from the fact that we seem to be utterly blind to the effect upon the American system of life of the process of concentration of economic power.

Section 11 of this bill provides the following, in paragraph (a):

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

Mr. President, that language contains not the slightest standard by which the discretion of the Foundation will be directed. It will be wholly and completely within the power of the Foundation to determine what is in the public interest. This is merely a fortiori language, a polite request to act in the public interest, without the slightest attempt on the part

of the Congress of the United States to indicate what in its belief is the public interest. I ask Senators to observe that the contracts which are to be made to protect the public interest are also to be made to protect the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

Mr. President, what is the meaning of the word "organization" in that connection? The reason the world today is in turmoil is that we have witnessed the powers and the freedoms of individuals passing into the hands of organizations, and yet we have done nothing to prevent it. For 50 years the power of organizations over individuals has expanded, throughout the world, and that process has inevitably resulted in the development of concentrated arbitrary government. Individuals are being deprived of the elementary freedoms which, under the American system, our Constitution and laws were supposed to protect and preserve. As those freedoms have been lost, we have seen big government grow bigger and bigger.

I see the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] now on the floor of the Senate. I am reminded of the fact that his distinguished father, while President of the United States, in 1912 sent to the Congress a message in which he pointed out some of these dangers, particularly the dangers with respect to patents. In that message in 1912, he called the attention of Congress to the fact that large corporations had secured such a position of dominance with respect to the ownership and use of patents and of industrial products that the inventors no longer had any possibility of obtaining a market except at the hands of the corporations which occupied that dominant position. Mr. President, that is a fundamental aspect of the problems which is affecting the entire world, and that problem brought about both World War I and World War II, and it has brought about such a condition that even governments like the Government of Great Britain are abandoning the old principles and theories of individual liberty and individual economic independence, in favor of various forms of concentrated authority.

At the last session of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina put into the RECORD a dispatch from London, pointing out the fact that only the assent of the King of England is now required in order to confirm a new act of Parliament which puts an end to individual commerce insofar as cotton is concerned. They have practically done it already, so far as wool is concerned, and they are doing it with respect to other commodities. All this, Mr. President, is merely a phase of what is going on throughout our whole economy. It is going on here. The amendment which has been offered and is now before the Senate is designed to make certain that discoveries and inventions which are brought about as the result of the expenditure of public money shall be devoted to the public interest by making them a part of the public domain, so far as patents are concerned.

Let us consider for a moment what the principle of the patent law was. The reference to patents is the only monopoly provision that is written into the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution authorized Congress to pass a law to grant to inventors or discoverers for a limited time the exclusive right to use of their inventions and discoveries. The words were "for a limited time." In other words, the intention, was that Congress should pass a law which would, by granting a limited monopoly, encourage an inventor to use his intelligence and his ability to invent or discover new processes, so that he would have an opportunity for making a profit; secondly, so that the producer of the commodity would have an opportunity to profit; and, finally, so that the consumers of the United States would have the benefit which would arise from the discovery and the production of inventions, devices, scientific methods, and the like. Certainly that was a perfectly wise and sound procedure.

But we have lived to see the time when the individual has become less and less and less important, and the organization has steadily become more and more and more important, and under our modern patent law the grant of a privilege under the Constitution has been used in greater and greater degree to establish monopoly, to restrict production, and to restrain opportunity of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, if we are to set up a scientific foundation which will be supported by public funds, and if we are to authorize the directors of that Foundation to enter into contracts with organizations, I think we have to be very certain that the inventions and discoveries which come about as a result of such a Foundation shall in fact be used for the public good, by making certain that they shall become a part of the public domain.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that under the theory of individual authority we have a system—and this is the constitutional plan—by which the individual person receives his limited monopoly for the purpose of encouraging production and promoting the public welfare, whereas the dominant aspect of the operation of the patent law insofar as the organization is concerned has been the establishment of a narrow field of industrial control. We shall have to make our choice between these two separate matters.

I have in my hand the testimony of the Honorable William C. Clark, who was United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, which testimony was given to the House Committee on Patents in 1935 or 1936. I wish to read one or two extracts from this testimony. Judge Clark came from the district of New Jersey for the purpose of pleading for a more liberal patent law, and he undertook to point out that in his experience of many years trying patent cases he remembered only one or two cases in which the inventor had any interest whatsoever, because under our modern system, by reason of the growth of the industrial corporation, the inventor has become less and less important, he works at a salary for the corporation, and the minute he gets his invention patented he is under obligation to sell the patent to the corporation. The result has been, over and over again, that patents issued in this manner have been used, not to extend industrial operation, but to narrow it, and to hold control in the hands of the concentrated industrial group.

Judge Clark began his statement:

> As I wrote your chairman, I consider my appearance before your committee a privilege. In my 10 years in the consideration of patent causes, it has been impossible not to become cognizant of the very serious evils of our patent system as it is now operating. Those evils have seemed to me so glaring that I have felt compelled to advert to them in opinions filed in my court. What I am about to say to you is, therefore, not put together for this occasion, but in most part, at least, the result of a deliberate, although perhaps feeble, judgment.
>
> The issuance of letters patent is a function of Government and the principles of political science are accordingly applicable thereto. The most fundamental of all such principles is the one expressed by the famous phrase, "The greatest good of the greatest number." What that "greatest good" may be in a particular case is often a matter of vigorous difference of opinion.

Mr. President, the reason why I am supporting the pending amendment is that I am absolutely convinced that the greatest good of the greatest number is to be served by guaranteeing that inventions and discoveries, under such an expenditure of public funds as is proposed shall be dedicated to the public domain.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator in favor of abolishing the patent laws of the country?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have heard the able Senator condemn the practice of employers entering into contracts with their employees to take over the discoveries the employees may make, and I think the position is well taken; we are not in disagreement on that. But is the able Senator consistent when he supports this amendment, which in effect requires the Government to take over the inventions and the discoveries of those who may make them, in any enterprise or undertaking when Government funds are used, not to take them for the purposes of the Government, not to take them away from the man who invents them merely to deprive him of his patent and the right to the use of his own discovery, but to give them to the public, to all the world, so to speak? Who is going to profit by that, I ask the able Senator? Is it the public? No; not the public, but those who may use the devices, namely, the manufacturers, who had nothing whatsoever to do with bringing the discoveries into being. They are the ones who will profit.

So is not the able Senator arguing, first, that it is wrong to take from a discoverer the benefits of his discovery, and then, secondly, arguing for taking those discoveries away and giving them to the

public? Is not that the effect of the able Senator's argument?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been pointing out, if I may remark, that under the system as it is now operated, corporate organizations follow the policy which I think the Senator has condemned. I think he has expressed agreement with me in that regard. He challenges my position upon the ground, as I take it, that because in this bill the public provides the means and sets up the method and furnishes the money by which the invention and the discovery are made, the invention or discovery should not, under section 11, as it is written, be handed over to some organization.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say that I go this far with the proposition, that any invention that may flow from any Government aid should be given to the Government for governmental use in its proprietary capacity; but the amendment goes beyond that. It is required; the word "must" is used—that the Government must then take those discoveries and give them to the whole public; which means, give them over to manufacturers, to makers of articles, to profit on them to the exclusion of the discoverer himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A discoverer who is operating with public funds is an agent of the United States Government and, therefore, of the people of the United States, when that is done.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. There is nothing at all new in the proposal to make discoveries which are brought about through the use of public funds the property of the public. The Senator may recall that last year we passed the Agricultural Research Act, which provides that the Federal Government may cooperate with private industry or individual farmers or State officers, in research work connected with agriculture, the purpose of which is to promote agriculture in the United States. This law very strictly provides that any new discoveries which are made, either through contract with private industry or with anyone else, an individual or a corporation, must become the property of the public, if they are brought about through the use of public funds. I do not, for the life of me, see why the Federal Government should spend a great deal of money in cooperating with someone who makes a new discovery, and then let him have that discovery for his exclusive use. Furthermore, I do not see why we should have one policy for agriculture, saying that the farmer's discovery must be made available to everybody, when an industrialist's discovery, which is brought about by the use of public funds, can be kept for his own personal use. We would not be consistent if we had one policy for agriculture and another for industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator from Vermont made that comparison.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in line with the question or suggestion recently made, is it not the Senator's opinion that the free publication and the free use by industry in general of the results of this research is in line with the theory of free enterprise, upon which democracy is based?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course it is.

Mr. KILGORE. It is in line with the theory of free enterprise, rather than letting one monopolize discoveries which the people, including industrialists, have paid for?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point is, as the framers of the Constitution said, that the "exclusive" right to the invention should be a distinctly limited right—and the word "limited" is used in the Constitution—and that at the expiration of a limited period the invention would then become a part of the public domain.

That purpose and procedure have been upset by the modern industrial organization, and now the period during which the exclusive right is held, not by the inventor but by his assignee, is extended and reextended and reextended, by securing improvement patents upon devices and upon discoveries. That is the vicious thing which narrows the field of production. What this country needs more than anything else, and what the world needs more than anything else, is the stimulation of production. Nothing else will solve our problem; and the wider we make the field of productive opportunity the closer we shall be to a successful solution of the problems which are bringing this country to the brink of the same sort of disaster which has overtaken the countries of Europe, the erection of arbitrary central power.

What Senators fail to see in this case is that we have here a bill which erects a new central authority and clothes it with all sorts of discretionary power, including the power to make contracts as it pleases, not with individuals alone, but with organizations, respecting the use and utilization of patents. That, Mr. President, it seems to me, is a power which should not be granted without some standard. It may be, as the junior Senator from West Virginia has suggested, that the amendment before us is not perfect; I do not contend that it is perfect. But I say, Mr. President, that it is immeasurably superior to the language of the bill. The language of the bill is an open door to a continuation of concentration. I suggest that if the junior Senator from West Virginia is not satisfied with the amendment, the remedy is to perfect the amendment, not to reject the only standard which has been presented to the Senate to protect the public interest in the result of the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the junior Senator from West Virginia say, in all kindness, that he opposes this amendment because he sees in it an inroad upon, if not a breaking down, of the patent laws the effect of which will be to take from a person who is entitled under the patent laws to the right of his invention for a limited time, and to disseminate it really for the benefit of manufacturers and producers who had no part in its creation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the mistake the Senator makes is in stating that under the law as it now exists the inventor receives the benefit of his inventions. The testimony of Judge William C. Clark, part of which has been read, is all to the effect that the inventor under the present law does not receive the benefit. Judge Clark quoted the language of another distinguished citizen of New Jersey, language which I recommend to the attention of my able friend, the Senator from New Jersey, who is in charge of the pending bill. Judge Clark quoted from the testimony of Thomas Edison given before one of the committees of Congress which was studying the patent problem. This is what Mr. Edison said, as quoted by Judge Clark:

> Unhappily, there is absolute certainty that under our present patent laws the poor devil of an inventor would never receive any reward.

I submit that testimony from Thomas Edison to the junior Senator from West Virginia, and say to him that if he believes that under the present law the inventor receives the benefit, he is in complete disagreement with Thomas Edison, who, I submit, knew quite a little about the distribution of benefits under the patent law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that I have expressed the view that I think this measure should under any circumstances protect the rights and benefits to which the actual inventor is entitled under the patent laws. But the point I would make is that in defending the amendment the Senator from Wyoming is taking from the inventor the right of patent and giving it, as he says, to the public.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Only because it is the only method that seems to be presently available to curtail the grant of power which this new central agency would be authorized to give by the proposed law to organizations. Let me quote some additional words uttered by Thomas Edison when he testified before the Oldfield committee. Mr. Edison said:

> The long delays and enormous costs incident to the procedure of the courts have been seized upon capitalists to enable them to acquire inventions for nominal sums that are entirely inadequate to encourage really valuable inventions. The inventor is now a dependent and hired person to the corporation.

There is some reason for that, of course, the reason being that with the progress of technology it becomes more and more difficult for an individual to produce that which he invents. There can be no doubt about that. But here we have a system under which the new organization to be created is being empowered to strengthen the drift toward concentration, and I think that is some-

thing we should not do, because this concentration of economic power is proceeding in every line of our activity.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take any further time of the Senate. Because the procedure under which we are working many Members are absent from the floor of the Senate attending committee meetings. The Senate seems to be disposed to permit them to continue to attend committee meetings. The able majority leader earlier today even declined to allow the Senate to have information in one spot in the RECORD of the number of committees which are now in session. But during the day I have been present on the floor while at least three spokesmen for three separate committees have asked unanimous consent for permission that their committees may sit during the session of the Senate. The members of those committees are not present. There are less than 20 Members of the Senate upon the floor now. Why should I waste my energy and strength in trying to convince the Senators present, every one of whom has already reached a conclusion on this matter? The decision, however, will be made, and I want the record of this day's proceedings to show that while we are discussing this fundamental policy of the growth and development of concentration of power, the Senate has but a handful of Members present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to say a word on this subject, without very much further prolonging the debate. There is no desire on the part of the proponents of the bill to prevent all adequate protection of patent rights, the protection of both the Government and the public. Two things should be borne in mind, however. One is that the Foundation aims to support basic research in science which fundamentally is not a patentable thing. Basic research is seeking out the principles, and the application comes later.

Our feeling is that if we are going to have a revision of our patent laws—and it may be necessary to have such a revision, and I have no opposition to it—the revision should be made through patent-law procedure. The revision of the patent laws should not be made in connection with a bill of this kind. Consequently we have provided in the manner set forth in page 3 of the report:

> S. 526 provides that the Foundation shall protect the interests of the Government and the equities of individuals by operating within the existent patent practices of the Government until such time as Congress or the President revises them.

It seems to me that that is the way this matter should be dealt with. Consequently we placed in the bill section 11 (a) which provides, as the Senator from Wyoming has read, but I will read it again so the whole matter will be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

As I stated, it is not contemplated that there will be very much work done in the field of applied science by this Foundation, but if it is done, then this provision is aimed to hold the fort, so to speak, until we see what changes or revisions have to be made in our regular patent laws. I read further section 11 (b):

> (b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I am glad to yield to answer a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to have the Senator tell me in what way the proposed amendment changes the patent law.

Mr. SMITH. I cannot develop that point. But my point is, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, that if he is going to make his proposed changes apply to this field or any other field, it seems to me that the right place to make the changes is in the patent laws themselves. The matter should go before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and not before the committee which dealt with the National Science Foundation. Such changes should not be carried in the pending bill, which is aimed to accomplish a totally different purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. The point I have made all the way through is that our proposed amendment does not amend the patent law. It does lay down a standard to apply to recipients and users of Federal money only, but in no way does it amend or change the patent laws of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the Senator's explanation. What we felt was that the way to deal with this matter was in the simple manner in which the bill deals with it. I can say to the distinguished Senator that without exception the scientists with whom I have talked, who are trying to set up a Foundation which will produce something entirely new in our whole national outlook, some sort of science foundation that will employ the principles of research in basic science, are much disturbed over this proposal. They are very much concerned over having the bill contain intricate patent provisions which seem to apply to every field, without any proper study having been made or thought given to the matter.

I feel that the proposed amendment does not belong in the bill. I have no objection to seeing such a proposal made with respect to changing our patent laws. I feel that the patent provisions which are in the bill are adequate. I have checked this question with many persons, lawyers and others, who feel that the provision now contained in the bill is adequate to protect the situation until Congress sees fit to legislate further, possibly as a result of experience which may come to us through the National Science Foundation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to amplify for the Senate his belief as to the type of contract which would be made with an organization under the terms of section 11.

Mr. SMITH. The language which is used here is exactly the same language which was used during the war when the OSRD had to make arrangements with various concerns in developing the various war applications of science. I will ask the distinguished Senator whether there were any abuses of the patent situation during the war, as the administration was carried out through the OSRD?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made no investigation. I have had no opportunity to make an investigation. I do not know of any abuses. Perhaps the Senator from New Jersey knows of none. But the fact that neither he nor I can cite an abuse now is no guaranty that there were no abuses.

Mr. SMITH. In that connection I might say to the distinguished Senator that no language we could write in any law would assure us against the danger of abuses. What I am trying to do is to get a simple law to stimulate workers to enter the field of scientific research instead of saying, "It is too complicated for us; we are going back to our laboratores. We are going to stay in our home towns."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question remains unanswered. What sort of contract does the Senator believe would be written under section 11 with an organization with respect to patents?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot answer the Senator's question, because I do not know what the organization is, but I will say to him that if I were on the Foundation and were dealing with organization X, and knew what kind of work it was to do, I think I have sufficient legal training to write such a contract. I do not know the answer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is precisely the point I have been trying to develop. In the modern system the work of invention is done by huge laboratories, such as the Bell laboratory, for example, or the General Electric laboratory. With private funds they employ thousands of persons, and when those persons make inventions the inventions become the property of the assignee named by the Bell Laboratories, the General Electric Laboratories, the General Motors Laboratories, or whatever they may be. My contention is simply this: When the inventions are made with funds of the public of the United States, the result of such research should be dedicated to the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. I have just had called to my attention the testimony of Dr. Bush before the House committee on this question. A similar question was asked him. I quote from Dr. Bush's testimony on page 139 of the hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Dr. Bush said:

The Office of Scientific Research and Development had those same two responsibilities throughout the war. We had no detailed instructions as to how to carry out those responsibilities; but in accordance with those general principles, i. e., we placed patent clauses in our contracts aimed at preserving the public interest and aimed at being entirely fair and equitable. We proceeded satisfactorily.

Continuing, Dr. Bush said:

I believe the new Foundation, in common with the Army and Navy or any other department or agency which is contracting for research and development, given those general responsibilities, will carry them out and will handle their patent affairs adequately and with proper patent clauses.

That answers the question very much as I answered it a moment ago. I said that if I were on the Foundation, as a lay member, and were asked, because I had some legal experience, to arrange patent agreements with the organization undertaking to explore some particular subject, I think I would have imagination enough to devise clauses in a contract, which would protect the contracting parties and everyone else concerned.

I know that that answer is not satisfactory to the Senator; but if the distinguished Senator is asking for book and page, it cannot be written by anyone, either under these clauses or under the clauses in the Kilgore amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the language of section 11. What is the power we are talking about?

Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder.

I submit to the Senator that there is not a single line or phrase or word in this section which guides the discretion of the Foundation. It may make contracts to dispose of inventions which are the result of the contribution of the money of the people of the United States. I say "the money of the people of the United States." I have not said the taxpayers' money, as is so frequently said in connection with these matters. Inventions will be produced by the money of the public; and we are giving away, without the slightest guide or standard for the Foundation, complete power to dispose of inventions and to make contracts.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should say that if we were in the desperate situation of not being able at least to trust the fundamental honesty of the group to be appointed by the President of the United States to engage in scientific research, we ought not to pass the Science Foundation bill at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not a matter of trust.

Mr. SMITH. The attempt to curtail the activities of that group, chosen from all over the country to try to develop and raise a newborn babe, when we do not even know the color of its eyes, is astonishing to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we were to enter into a discussion about the system of Government of the United States, I know that the Senator would enter into great encomiums about the checks and balances of our system—how, in order to prevent abuses, we have the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches, one to check upon the other. Who will challenge the good faith and honesty of the men who have been in the past or may in the future be elected President of the United States? They are wise and good men. The Senator from New Jersey is merely arguing that we should trust our destiny to unnamed persons. They are wise and good men who know better than the people what is good for the people. It is the old doctrine of benevolent despotism.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am opposed to benevolent despotism. We stand here with the whole experience of the human race behind us. We must lay down standards for the exercise of power, or power will inevitably be abused.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is speaking in terms of power with respect to something that has not even been discovered as yet. I make the plea that we should at least get the discoveries. Unless we can interest scientists in making discoveries, with freedom from too great restrictions, we shall never have discoveries. After we have made progress and made discoveries, I will go the whole way with the Senator when we can see the dangers. Such dangers do not yet exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have seen the invention of the atomic bomb, with its tremendous possibilities for evil as well as good. When we know that across the threshold of genius there may be other inventions—and probably are—far more destructive than even the atomic bomb, are we to say, "This is the day to throw all control out the window?"

Mr. SMITH. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that we did not have such restrictions while we were discovering the atomic bomb. But after we had discovered it, we established the kind of commission which we thought would take care of that problem. We shall find as much variation in the new discoveries as there was between the atomic bomb and previous scientific discoveries. I am only asking for freedom so that our boys can really make discoveries, without being so curtailed that they will not be interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This amendment, if adopted, would not upset the Science Foundation. It would merely protect scientists and the public against the abuse of power.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from New Jersey is distburbed about the amendment. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if the effect of the language of section 11 (a) of the bill, of which the Senator from New Jersey approves, is not to permit the Foundation to write a new patent law for every corporation for which it makes a contract. The section reads as follows:

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

Does not that section give the Foundation the right to write virtually new patent conditions covering anyone with whom they engage in any transaction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, under existing patent law; but science is so complex, and the complexities of inventions and discoveries are so great that it is difficult, I think, for the ordinary person to understand that what the Senator says would be the case.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not section 11 (a) conflict with the patent laws to a greater degree than would the proposed amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That would be my opinion.

Mr. SMITH. Answering the point raised by the Senator, let me say that the provision is the same as the one we have had with respect to the Army and Navy for years.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it has been my intention to address the Senate——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator from New Mexico if he is not asking to change the subject which we are discussing. I should like to have the debate on the bill completed tonight. I have agreed with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that if the bill is not finished tonight we will set it aside to take up the bill of which he is in charge, which is very pressing and very important; but I do not want to be put into the position of having the pending bill go over. I think it is very important that we finish the discussion of the bill tonight. I have asked the party leaders to go on with an evening session, if necessary. I do not want to keep Senators here unnecessarily. I do not want to interfere with what the Senator from New Mexico wants to do. I know that he has a right to make an address on any subject; but it is a matter of getting along with the unfinished business. This is the fourth day of debate, and we are trying to dispose of this bill. There are only a few more amendments regarding which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] intends to make very short statements. Therefore I ask the Senator from New Mexico, before I yield to him, if there is any way in which we can get together so that we can continue the consideration of the pending bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he yields to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it not expedite the consideration of the bill if the Senator would be good enough to accept this amendment?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's humor. It is one of the Senator's pleasing characteristics. Unless we keep our sense of humor in these difficult times we can hardly get along at all. I thank the Senator for giving us a smile on this occasion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I listened for several hours to the discussion on the subject of patents last year. At first I agreed entirely with the position which the Senator from Wyoming has taken today, and then I changed my position to that which the Senator from New Jersey has taken, for the following reasons:

First, that the patent laws are so complex that we should not try to amend them in a bill creating a Science Foundation.

Second, the amendment which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] proposes and which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] supports applies to all Government departments and not merely to the Science Foundation. If the amendment proposed is agreed to, the patent laws in relationship to research conducted by Government agencies may be changed and altered.

I agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said, that the patent laws probably should be improved and modernized, but not through the medium of a bill providing for the establishment of a Science Foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he approves of the policies of the Government being as different as they are in various bureaus and departments, being changed every time the head of the department changes, which condition has been going on for a long time, or would it be better to have a uniform policy in Government agencies?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from West Virginia will recall that I discussed this matter with him last year in the committee room. I think there is very much in what he says. But changes in the patent laws should be brought about with the assistance of patent attorneys and the Patent Office, and not in a Science Foundation bill. If the Senator would present his proposal in that light and in that manner, I, for one, would very seriously consider supporting it.

Mr. KILGORE. If I may ask the Senator a further question, would it be possible under that sort of a bill to affect a Research Foundation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; I think it would be possible; because that kind of a bill would relate to the patent law that applies to all Government departments and agencies, and the Science Foundation would be one of them.

Mr. KILGORE. The method or modus operandi of the various departments and divisions is not in the patent law. It is merely established by directive of the bureau head or subbureau head who decides to change it. When Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior he changed it to forbid patents, but some of the heads of the departments later changed it to permit them. The War Department has one policy, the Navy Department another one, and the Department of Agriculture prohibits all patents from their employees. We have a heterogeneous mess in the Government, and we propose to put a still worse heterogeneous mess into a Foundation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think so, because the method suggested in the bill is the method which Dr. Bush himself developed and which applied throughout the war, and I believe we can continue it until the laws can be changed, if they should be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarthy	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
Gurney	Millikin	Wiley
Hatch	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], for himself and other Senators, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the present section 11, beginning on line 10, page 13, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

USE AND DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

SEC. 11. (a) The Foundation shall make and maintain an inventory of all current federally financed research and development projects. In cooperation with the Commissioner of Patents, the Foundation shall establish a central register of all inventions, discoveries, patents, patent rights, and findings, including references to related data, in which the United States or any agency thereof has any right, title, or interest, or which pursuant to this section have been freely dedicated to the public. The Foundation shall record, collect, index, and promptly publish or cause to be published significant data on all inventions and discoveries and other findings produced in the course of federally financed research and development activities, or arrange with other Government agencies for such publishing, recording, collecting, and indexing. In consultation and collaboration with the Library of Congress and other Government agencies, the Foundation shall take such steps as it may deem necessary to make such information and other available significant scientific and technical information accessible to the public, including the preparation and distribution of reports, periodic catalogs, inventories, abstracts, translations, bibliographies, and microfilm and other reproductions thereof; and for such purposes the Foundation may utilize the facilities of Government agencies and other organizations to the extent that it deems necessary or desirable, and may contract for the expenditure of funds for such purposes without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section II of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; U. S. C., title 44, sec. 111).

(b) Each contract or other arrangement for federally financed research or development entered into between any Government agency and any organization shall provide that such organization will make available to such agency full data on all inventions, discoveries, patents, patent rights, and findings produced in the course of such research or development, including such reports with respect thereto as may be required by such agency. Each Government agency, upon the request of the Foundation, shall make available to it such data and such reports with respect to research and development activities financed by such agency, as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

(c) All inventions, discoveries, or findings in which the United States (or any Government agency), now or hereafter, hold any rights, including patent rights, shall be made available to the public on a nonexclusive and on a royalty-free basis to the extent the United States or such agency is entitled to do so under the rights held by it. Except as provided hereafter in this subsection and in subsection (d), any invention, discovery, or finding hereafter produced in the course of federally financed research and development shall, whether or not patented, be made freely available to the public and shall, if patented, be freely dedicated to the public. The requirements of this subsection, to the extent that they require modification of contracts or other financial arrangements already entered into by the United States (or any governmental agency) shall not go into effect until 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) The head of any Government agency financing by contract, or otherwise administering, federally financed research and development activities, may, by stipulation in the contract or by other advance agreements with any organization, provide for the retention by the organization, or by the inventor, or by their assignees of such patent rights based on discoveries, inventions, or findings produced in the course of such research and development as the head of such Government agency deems fair and equitable, and consistent with the national interest: *Provide*, That (1) the head of such Government agency shall, before entering into any such contract or agreement, make a finding that the agency has made every reasonable effort to arrange for the conduct of the necessary research and development without entering into a contract containing such provision; (2) the organization shall contribute or shall have contributed substantially to the development of the particular inventions,

discoveries, or findings for which patent rights were retained through earlier or current research and development activities financed by the organization; (3) in every case, the contract or agreement shall provide for at least an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license for governmental purposes to the United States; and (4), in the case of any nonprofit organization, the head of such Government agency further determines (A) that the research and development is essential in the field of national defense or in such other fields as the President may specify for such purpose and (B) that the patent rights retained will not be used to serve the special benefit of any organization conducted for profit or of any individual, and will be made available or licensed to applicants on a nonexclusive, uniform, and reasonable royalty basis.

In the administration of the provisions of this subsection, the head of any Government agency shall be guided by such rules and regulations as the President may deem necessary and prescribe by Executive order.

(e) The Foundation shall make a quarterly report to the President and to the Congress concerning contracts and agreements containing the provisions authorized by subsection (d). This report shall include a list of all contracts and agreements containing such a provision entered into by any Government agency during the preceding quarter, the reasons supporting the approval of such provision in each case, the amount of Federal funds expended or to be expended under each contract or agreement containing such a provision, the name of the organization with which the contract or agreement was made, and the general nature of the patent rights reserved for private use in each case. The report shall also include a list of all inventions, discoveries, or findings in which patent rights were permitted to be retained pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) and which were first recorded or finally authorized during the preceding quarter, identification of the contract or agreement under which such inventions, discoveries, or findings were produced, and the nature of the rights retained. The report shall also include the Foundation's recommendations, if any, for such further Executive or legislative action as it may deem necessary.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President, or any person designated for that purpose by him, may exempt from the provisions of this act relating to dedication to the public, publication, dissemination, or making available, any scientific or technical information, data, patents, inventions, or discoveries produced in the course of federally financed research or development or in which the United States holds any rights, if and so long as the President or such designated person determines that such exemption is essential in the interest of national security.

Mr. SMITH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If the Senator from Iowa were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois, if permitted to vote, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	McClellan	Russell
Chavez	McFarland	Sparkman
Connally	McGrath	Stewart
Downey	McKellar	Taylor
Fulbright	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	Maybank	Tydings
Hayden	Morse	Umstead
Hill	Murray	Wagner
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	
Kilgore	Pepper	

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Jenner	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Cain	Kem	Thye
Capper	Knowland	Vandenberg
Cooper	Lodge	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Wherry
Donnell	Magnuson	White
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Ecton	Martin	Williams
Ellender	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	

NOT VOTING—17

Barkley	George	O'Conor
Buck	Green	Overton
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Lucas	Tobey
Eastland	McCarran	Wilson
Flanders	Myers	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE on behalf of himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following order be entered:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 20, 1947, at the hour of 3:30 p. m. the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be subsequently proposed, to the bill S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947, and upon the final passage of the said bill.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 3:30 o'clock be equally divided between the proponent and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. The meaning of that is, Mr. President, that we are to begin voting on the amendments at 3:30?

Mr. WHERRY. We will begin voting at that hour on any amendments then pending. If an amendment were voted on before that time, it would, of course, be out of the way, but any amendments then pending to the bill would be voted on at 3:30 o'clock, and then the bill itself would be voted on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it still be in order, under the agreement, to offer further amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a further amendment to send to the desk, and I should like to do that at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment, which will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that in view of the fact that we have just completed a yea-and-nay vote, and in view of the fact that, so far as I can see, Senators who were here for the vote are still on the floor, I shall not ask for a quorum call, though ordinarily at this point I would ask for a quorum call, because I intend, as I said on Friday, to see to it that Members of the Senate are protected by way of a quorum call when a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate is requested. Under the circumstances, I do not think it necessary, and therefore I do not ask it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair considers the recent roll call to have been in the nature of a quorum call, and that it fulfills the requirement of the rule. Otherwise the Chair would have insisted on a quorum call. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the unanimous-consent request correctly, any amendment can be voted on prior to 3 o'clock, but the bill itself will not be voted on before 3:30?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct; together with any amendments that may be pending at that time. The vote on the amendments and the bill will start at 3:30.

Mr. LUCAS. The vote would come at that time?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it to be understood that we are to meet at 11 o'cock tomorrow, or 12 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest to the majority leader that we reconvene at 12 o'clock, if that is agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request submitted relative to a time for voting? The Chair hears none, and the order is made accordingly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. For what purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. To enable me to explain my vote.

Mr. HATCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I voted "nay" on the so-called Kilgore amendment. I want the RECORD to show, however, that my vote is in no way indicative of my feeling toward the basic principles underlying the Kilgore amendment. During the hearings on the bill last year, and also this year, it was the consensus that the patent features should not be incorporated as a broad part of scientific legislation. I should be glad to support the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] at the proper time, if a separate bill were introduced embodying the features of his amendment. I voted against its amendment today because I do not think it proper to enact such a provision as an amendment to the pending bill. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

EXTENSION OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923—REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has had under consideration Senate bill 490, a bill which would extend certain provisions of the Classification Act of 1923 to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The members of the committee have discussed the bill, and while they are of the opinion that its objective is generally meritorious, they believe that since it has the effect of extending the classified service considerably it would be advisable to have the Senate Committee on Civil Service study the bill and make a recommendation as to its merits. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the following order be entered:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 490) to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, and that it be referred to the Committee on Civil Service, with instructions to make a study thereof and report to the Senate; and that when reported the said bill shall again be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator inform me whether the Committee on the Judiciary studied the bill?

Mr. WILEY. The Committee on the Judiciary today discussed the matter, and were of the unanimous opinion that in view of the fact that it involved an extension of the civil service, it should be referred to the Committee on Civil Service for study.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. HATCH. I do not care to interrupt Senators, but I had yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin under the apprehension that no discussion would be precipitated. If there is going to be any discussion at all, while I have been trying to cooperate with Senators in charge of the bill, I do not want to lose the little time I was to occupy in the discussion of another matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I object at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois objects.

MOTIONS TO TABLE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been considering several matters which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate. I think they are all important and worthy of consideration, and I should like to address the Senate for a very short time.

The first matter I had intended to discuss was the practice of making motions to table. I have mentioned that subject before, because I have thought that the use of that motion is being unduly extended.

I have heard, Mr. President, that when the tax bill comes before the Senate, and the Democratic leadership, or whoever decides to do so, makes the motion which it has publicly been said would be made, to postpone consideration of that measure until after the appropriation bills shall have been acted upon, a motion to table that motion would be made immediately, and debate would be cut off. Mr. President, that, I said, was merely rumor. I myself did not give any credence to that rumor or report. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is on his feet anticipating what I now am about to say, which is that I have learned since I came to the Chamber this afternoon that it is not contemplated to follow such a course as that. Am I correct?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is not in contemplation. I feel very sure such a motion will not be made.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had previously told me the same thing. So I shall forego my discussion of that particular subject and pass to another subject which I think is of even greater importance.

INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTEES BY FBI

Mr. President, when the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal was being considered on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] made a motion that that nomination be recommitted to the committee until an investigation could be made by the FBI. Now, mark, Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Ohio was that the investigation be made. Even then the thought struck me as I sat on the floor that we might be establishing a dangerous precedent by that action, and I so voiced my fear very briefly at that time and pointed out the danger that would lie in such course of action.

Mr. President, I unfortunately used some words at that time which gave offense to certain persons in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, although I tried to make it clear that I was not critical of the Bureau; that my criticism was directed against Members of Congress for proposing to take such action. I said I had the highest regard for the Federal Bureau of Investigation so long as it performed and operated in its own field, but I did not think the Congress should delegate to that Bureau the power, or what seemed to me to be the power, of requiring an investigation. It seemed to me that such action would amount to first requiring the advice and consent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. President, I did not dream then that I would stand here on the floor today and say that the very thing I then pointed out has come to pass in the Congress. I doubt whether any Senators present realize what has taken place in a bill recently passed by the Congress. It is that to which I refer, and any criticism I now make goes against the Congress, not against the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In a bill recently passed, the relief measure providing $350,000,000, there was added in the House of Representatives an amendment which I doubt whether Senators know about. I read that amendment. This is it exactly:

Provided, however, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just asked, "The word was 'investigated,' was it not?" Mr. President, that is not the word that was used. The word that was in the legislation was "approved" and that is the exact quotation taken from the bill this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the House did insert the word "approved" and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations opposed it very vigorously. It opposed the idea of the use of the word "approved." So we changed the language to "investigated", and I thought that language had been retained in the conference. I am sure it was.

Mr. HATCH. I am speaking now of the language. Such language was adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. I have not seen the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. The conferees on the part of the Senate objected most strenuously to the use of the word "approved." I particularly made strong objection to it.

Mr. HATCH. I wonder if we might have the conference report, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. I objected to Congress delegating the authority to "approve" to the FBI. I am very much against such a thing. But as a compromise we finally struck out the word "approved" and inserted the word "investigated." I am sure that the word "investigated" was retained in the conference report.

I do not disagree with the Senator from New Mexico. I am in hearty agreement with the idea advanced by him. There is a disposition in both branches of Congress to idealize the FBI. Those who are in the FBI are people just like we are. Their blood runs through their hearts and goes through their bodies. They eat. They wear clothes. They are simply human beings. There is nothing sacrosanct about the FBI. If they possess any facts, they can submit them. But I thoroughly agree with the Senator that we should not turn over to the FBI the approval or disapproval of individuals nominated by the President and who must be confirmed by the Senate. If they have important facts to report, let them submit them, and then it is up to the Senate to decide whether or not to confirm nominations as we see fit.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator's remarks. I did not pursue this matter through the conference report. I would not have opposed the conference report on this particular measure. I believe it was the relief measure. Whichever measure it was, the Greek-Turkish loan or the relief measure, the need was so urgent, was so great that notwithstanding such a provision as I first mentioned I would have voted for the conference report.

Mr. President, I find that the Senator from Texas is correct in his statement. In the conference report the word "investigated" is used instead of the word "approved." But what I am pointing out is that the very thing I mentioned in connection with the Lilienthal nomination did later come to pass when the House of Representatives inserted the word "approved." I am not critical of the House, because I am quite sure the House did not realize the effect of that provision. But it did actually pass a measure which required certain civilian personnel to receive the approval of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. President, I say again, today, as I said previously, that that is a dangerous trend in government, and one which should be stopped. Not even an investigation should be required before we exercise our constitutional duties, powers, and functions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. For a good many years we have heard on the floor of the Senate and in the other House suggestions about the delegation of our constitutional powers. That is practically what we are doing in this instance so far as the approval of certain personnel is concerned. Confirmation of nominees has always been a function of the Senate of the United States. If any nomination is to be approved or confirmed or rejected, the action should be taken here in the Senate of the United States. What the Senator has just said shows that others are beginning to delegate or attempt to delegate the Senate's power.

Mr. HATCH. As I see it, it is an absolute delegation of the power of the Senate to advise and consent to a nomination. What the House did would almost require the advice and consent by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, an abandonment of the powers of the Senate. I say that is a dangerous trend, one which ought not to be continued. I am not making a political argument in respect to this matter. What I say is not being said in a manner critical of the majority party at all. I am simply pointing out the dangers which can arise, which do arise, and against which Congress must ever be on the alert.

APPROPRIATION FOR THE GRECO-TURKISH LOAN

Now, Mr. President, I wish to speak of another matter which has come to my attention. During this week end another thing which disturbs me greatly, has occurred. I do not want to be too much disturbed and utter too many warnings. I do not wish to be a Jeremiah. But the bill which authorized assistance to Greece and Turkey, and which was duly passed by both branches of the Congress today awaits only the President's signature to become law. That measure was initiated by the President of the United States in the discharge of his constitutional powers in connection with our foreign affairs. No bill was more thoroughly debated. No measure was more thoroughly discussed. Its purposes were so well defined that every person in the United States knows or should know what the purpose of the bill is.

Mr. President, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a new practice he inaugurated in connection with that bill. He propounded questions to the Department of State—not his own questions, but any questions any Senator wanted to ask. More than 100 such questions were asked about the purposes of the particular loan, and the whole subject was explored as fully as possible.

I commend the Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for his enlightening replies to every one of those questions. The questions and answers were both published, and every Senator had access to them. I repeat that no measure was more thoroughly explored than that one.

Yesterday I heard over the radio, and I believe I read in the newspapers—I am not sure about having read it in the newspapers, but I think it was in the press—that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, has announced that his committee may not make the requisite appropriations to carry out the policy of that measure. Again, Mr. President, I want to confine myself within the rules of this body. I hope the majority leader will not have to call me to order; but if I go outside the rules I shall be very happy to be called to order. I am not critical of the House of Representatives. I am not critical of the chairman of that particular committee. However, it strikes me as most unusual, and a strange usurpation of authority, for any committee in either House of Congress to attempt to exercise a veto power over both branches of the Congress and the President of the United States. If that can be done in this instance it can be done in all instances. It would give to one particular committee—and again I say I do not care what committee it is, or in which branch of the Congress it is—the power to nullify the action and will of the two Houses and the President, which must be taken to be the action and will of the people of America.

Mr. President, I submit this as another warning to point to the dangerous trend which the Congress may take if it permits itself to be dictated to by its own committees.

Mr. President, there is another subject which I wish to discuss——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that I am quite clear on the question of one House trying to veto legislation. Will the Senator make a little more clear what statement was made?

Mr. HATCH. As I stated, I do not wish to be critical. I do not wish to criticize the other House, and I do not wish to criticize any committee at this time. However, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, publicly announced that the bill to authorize aid to Greece and Turkey, which the Congress had passed, and which awaits only the President's signature, and would have been signed this morning had it not been for the unfortunate condition of the President's mother, has yet to run the gantlet of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able Senator from New Mexico has been a member of the Appropriations Committee, has he not?

Mr. HATCH. Never.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was not the Senator a member of that committee at one time?

Mr. HATCH. I have never been a member of that committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Perhaps I am thinking of the Senator's colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. HATCH. He was formerly a member of that committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question arises continually, If congress enacts legislation authorizing an appropriation, is it absolutely binding upon the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, and are the Appropriations Committees thereafter foreclosed from looking into the question? Are they compelled to be merely rubber stamps in approving the appropriations? We often hear the statement made on this floor in respect

to a bill authorizing an appropriation that it is only an authorization and that naturally the Appropriations Committee will look into the matter. I think the time has come when both Houses of Congress will have to determine whether or not the Appropriations Committees are merely rubber stamps, or whether they have a duty to look into every appropriation.

We cannot appropriate money without authorization. Therefore, if every time the Congress enacts an authorization bill, it is to be regarded as binding upon the Appropriations Committees, the Appropriations Committees will not be able to perform their function of looking into each and every appropriation.

As I understand the statement of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, it was to the effect that the committee would look into the details of the appropriation. When I spoke on the loan to Greece and Turkey on this floor, I stated that there were billions of dollars worth of war material in the Near East and on the Continent, and that we should look into the question. I stated that the Appropriations Committee would look into it to determine whether or not such material could be used, or whether $400,000,000 of new money of the American taxpayers would be used for that purpose. I, for one, believe that we ought to look into that question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, with all respect to the Senator from Michigan, the time is limited, and I have been hurrying as fast as possible to try to conclude.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no limit on the time of the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I know, but it is late in the afternoon, and I do not wish to detain the Senate any longer than necessary. If any Senator wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to yield. But I do not wish to yield for a speech. I shall be happy to have the Senator speak in his own time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. As I understood the statement attributed to Mr. TABER, it was that the Committee on Appropriations would not act on this particular appropriation until it had detailed estimates of what the money was to be used for, and that as yet he had seen no such estimates. That seems to be an entirely proper statement. I do not think the Senator should attribute to him the statement that he intends to veto the action of Congress in enacting an authorization bill, because of such a statement.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, that was a most unusual question.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that the Senator's understanding of what Representative TABER said?

Mr. HATCH. I will accept the amendment and call it a question.

Mr. President, I wish to make one point clear. I am talking about a specific bill—namely, the measure providing aid to Greece and Turkey—a measure which was thoroughly debated, and all the details of which are understood. It involves a policy of Government touching our dealings with other countries.

I am not criticizing the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations for any particular statement. I am raising the question whether in connection with a bill of this nature and importance, which has received the consideration which this measure has received, any committee has the power to say, "We will nullify the entire act of Congress and destroy the policy which was laid down." This is not the ordinary appropriation bill to build a dam, or something of the kind. The welfare of the whole world and the policy of the Government may be involved in this procedure. I wonder if it is the proper parliamentary procedure for the House Appropriations Committee to say, "You must write a bill of particulars for every dollar that is spent before we will appropriate the money." Or am I correct when I say that there is danger that the Congress may give a committee the power of veto to nullify and destroy the policies of the Government itself?

I wish now to pass to another subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the able Senator from New Mexico contend that if the Congress, through its Appropriations Committees, desires to nullify this legislation, it cannot be changed by a new bill even after it comes from the Appropriations Committee, that committee having failed to appropriate the money, or are we to understood that once we authorize it we are forever barred from changing the authority?

Mr. HATCH. That is not my statement. I have not made that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does it not amount to that?

Mr. HATCH. No; it does not. I am talking about a Federal grant-in-aid to Greece and Turkey, a measure which far transcends any ordinary bill. I am not speaking about such a general proposition as the Senator has suggested.

VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM

Mr. President, I should now like to pass to another matter very briefly. It is a matter as to which I have deep concern. I think it is of great importance. I refer to what is commonly referred to as the Voice of America program. I want to say, lest my friends think I am going far afield, that it is not at all my purpose to debate the merits of that program. Again I shall refer to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER. I shall do so without any intention of giving offense; I shall do so with the utmost courtesy. Mr. TABER has been and is now the chief critic and opponent of this program. His opinions, which have been publicly stated—and he is very forthright in his statements, and I think he is strongly convinced that he is absolutely correct—have been based largely upon the quality and content of the program. He refers to it as an extravagant waste of money and questions whether or not it could be better carried on through private agencies than through the Department of State or any other governmental agency.

Those are some of the objections which have been raised, which I think are the main objections. I should not reply to any of them and shall not discuss them today, but later, when the measure is before the Senate, I expect to discuss them. I may say, however, that the State Department has requested $31,000,000 to carry on the entire program. All of that amount is not used for radio broadcasting, by any means. In fact, only approximately $8,000,000 of it is included in radio broadcasting. A part of it is for the installation of facilities, which item will not recur in the future. The other funds are expended for other activities, some of which have long been established in the Department of State. They have become traditional. Included in the $31,000,000 are the funds for those long-established activities. There are also included programs, such, for example, as the exchange of students, and other programs, all of which have been and are a part of our dealings with other nations. Yet that entire item has been eliminated from the bill which is before the House. If that decision stands, the whole service will be discontinued. To me, that is an unfortunate and unwise thing. But I do not now propose to discuss the wisdom or lack of wisdom of that procedure.

I have been giving considerable study to the situation for some time, how it is conducted, its reception abroad, whether it could be better operated by private industry. There is a mass of material on that subject, which is nearly all one way, namely, that it cannot be done by private industry. I am daily receiving additional information. Yesterday I received an interesting communication from a lady who had recently returned from India, giving facts about the Voice of America, with reference to libraries, and what it means in that country. I am constantly learning more about the service. Other Senators may know all about it; Members of the House of Representatives may know all about it, but my own experience impels me to the conclusion that there is a doubt that Congress has sufficient information and sufficient knowledge to say whether or not the program should be continued as a permanent program of the Government. Certainly we do not have sufficient information to say that we should arbitrarily cut it off and destroy it.

It is my considered judgment that a study for the purpose of obtaining sufficient information has not been made, and that Congress itself should make a survey and study of the entire field to determine for itself what should be done. This is my conclusion, and this is the suggestion which I want to make. I hope the suggestion falls upon receptive ears, especially among members of the majority party in this Chamber, and in the other branches of Government. In view of the importance of the issues involved in this program—not merely

broadcasting—I am of the opinion that to cease operations, even for a limited time, might result in our losing our frequency and the whole program being destroyed. Therefore I believe that what Congress should do is, first, to pass the Mundt bill in the House, which seems to be receiving approval, or some similar measure giving necessary authority. The point of order has been made that there has never been proper authorization for this program. If that be true, I think Congress should grant the necessary authorization and get away from the technical question involved.

That is suggestion No. 1. It could be carried out quickly and without too much controversy, in the light of what I shall next suggest. This program is of much importance and there is danger, especially in the radio field, of losing frequencies which might never be regained and of having the Library Service discontinued. The dissipation of all the facilities ever for a short time, I am told would perhaps cost $50,000,000 and it would take 3 years' time to resume the service.

In the light of that situation, pending my further suggestion, I think Congress could well appropriate the entire $31,000,000 for this year alone. Then, Mr. President, as a part of the same program, in order that we may act intelligently and know what we are doing, I suggest that a joint committee of the Congress be established. I would suggest that that committee be composed of 10 Members, 5 from this body and 5 from the House of Representatives. Of course 3 from each body would be from the majority party and 2 from each body from the minority party. The committee, so constituted, would be given adequate funds to employ experts and would be fully authorized to do whatever might be necessary to explore the whole field covered by this operation.

With the type and quality of program I have nothing to do. There has been much controversy regarding that subject. Some programs I have seen and have approved; I have seen some from other lands of which I could not approve; but there is considerable ground for differences of opinion. If there is any question as to personnel, certainly the joint committee should have full knowledge of the men who are conducting the service, their qualifications, and their affiliations. Are they leftists? That charge has been made. I cannot conceive of programs being sent out publicly of a nature which would be destructive of our Government, for the reason that everything done by the agency in the matter of publicity and broadcasting is open to the whole wide world. They cannot broadcast without the world being advised of what is going on. The very furor that was created because of the broadcast regarding Mr. Wallace is evidence that the light of day which constantly shines on these programs is in itself a very good protection against improper use. I have no objection to the activity being investigated. If there is anyone connected with the service who is "off color" in any way, certainly a complete investigation should be made. I would welcome that sort of an investigation.

Let me say for Mr. Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, against whom some criticism has been made personally, that he has been in this work longer than has any man in this country. He has been in it for 17 months. Perhaps the best recommendation of him—a great many people are always talking about businessmen in Government—is that Mr. Benton made a success of his own business, much of which was similar to the work in which he is now engaged. That in itself is a pretty good recommendation for Mr. Benton. But, Mr. President, I am not here to praise or to blame any of the personnel today. I am suggesting what the committee might well do. Certainly it would be highly proper to have all the personnel investigated, and then there could be an investigation regarding the general question of whether the job can be done by private agencies. Certainly that question should be investigated.

I have said that I had information on that subject. I did. I heard representatives of seven radio organizations—those owning short-wave facilities—declare that they could not do the job, that the Government had to do it; and I heard General Sarnoff, of the Radio Corp. of America, a man who knows, and whose business it is to know, say that the appropriation of $8,000,000 was entirely inadequate for the radio work alone, and that for that service there should be an appropriation of at least $15,000,000 or $20,000,000.

Mr. President, no one can persuade me that men like General Sarnoff and the heads of the other major organizations in the radio industry are not devoted to private enterprise. Their whole system has been built upon the system of private enterprise, and I do not believe for a moment that men like that would consent to Government activities in a field which is their own proper field. Yet I heard those men make those statements. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding that, I would be glad to have the proper congressional committee fully investigate the entire subject, including that of private enterprise.

The proposal which I have made is to set up such a committee as I have suggested; make the appropriation now, confined to 1 year, and let the service continue for a year. It has been going on for 17 months now, and no great harm will be done by continuing it for another year. So, let the service continue this year, and let the committee be appointed, and let the survey and study be made, and let the committee be required to report to the Congress at the beginning of the next session.

I wish to say that that suggestion is my own; I have not conferred with the State Department about it, and I do not know whether the State Department would favor it. But I am trying to find a reasonable, intelligent way by which the present controversy, which I think is doing our country no good whatever, can be ended, and so that we can intelligently consider this entire problem.

Mr. President, a while ago I said that some of these activities are long-established ones. I have in mind now the radio bulletins which go to our embassies abroad, and have been going there for more than 10 or 12 years, and have furnished most valuable information to our embassies, as is known by all of us who have been abroad and have seen those bulletins. That service, which now is of more than 12 years standing, will require more than $500,000 or $600,000 or $700,000 of the $31,000,000 appropriation which already has been eliminated; and there are other services of that kind, which I mention at this time merely to point out that we in the Congress have not as yet informed ourselves sufficiently to be able to reach a point where we can intelligently destroy the entire program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield, although I have nearly completed my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand. I simply wish to inquire whether sufficient money has been appropriated to permit the continuation of the service until June 30 of this year. I understand that is the case, and that the discussion relates to the question of a new appropriation for the fiscal year 1948. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. I think that is correct. But I say that the time between now and June 30 is insufficient to permit the making of the study and investigation about which I am talking.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. But there is time for the Senate to act upon this question, for instance.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes; and one reason why I now bring this matter to the attention of the Senate is to have the Senate consider it and take action promptly.

Let me say that I have no pride of authorship in the suggestion which I make. I have not even drawn up a bill on the subject. I may say in all seriousness that many times since the present session of Congress convened, I have been told that if a Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle was deeply interested in the passage of a certain measure, it would be much better for him to have some Senator on the other side of the aisle introduce it. I am perfectly willing to have that done; I wish some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will take the suggestions and thoughts which I have inadequately and too briefly presented today; and will work them into a measure and will submit it in their own names. I make that proposal because this matter is not a partisan one; it relates to the standing of our own country and her relationships with other countries.

Mr. President, it is most important that the peoples—not the governments, but the peoples—of other nations truly understand America and the American way of life. I wish to emphasize how important this service is and how important it is that it be continued; over and through "iron curtains," if necessary, for this service knows no borders or boundaries; it can and does reach directly to the people and into their homes. Today there are 20 nations with which not one of the three great news agencies has any direct contact. Among those nations, where the people have no direct access to news from the United

States, are the Soviet Union, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and others where it is most important that the people know about our country and what we truly are. That is why I am so anxious and to determined to do everything I can do to have this service continued into those lands, but especially to the people and into their homes. Mr. President, in order to improve the service, to strengthen it, to investigate it, and to do everything possible for those purposes, I shall join in every legitimate endeavor in that connection, but I shall oppose every method which would kill and destroy it.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointments in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of oath of office:

Henry C. Schumacher

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Mabel L. Ross

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Margaret K. Schafer

IN THE ARMY

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 3, 1947, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 23 and 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1947

Corps of Engineers

Richard Herman Allen
Merlin Willard Anderson
Calvin Leland Bass
Roger Redmond Bate
Arthur Andrew Becker
Ralph Harold Beuhler
Shelton Brant Biles, Jr.
Junius Jay Bleiman
Frank Coulter Boerger
Philip Thomas Boerger
Jerome Boris Christine
William Carl Ciamprone
Paul J. Curry
James Franklin Fraser
Bernard Michael Greenberg
Edwin Borchard Greene
Raymond Richard Hails, Jr.
Kenneth Martin Hatch
George LeRoy Haugen
Carroll Christian Jacobson, Jr.
James Allen Johnson
Peter Karter
James Byron Kennedy
George Levenback
Richard Freeman McAdoo
John Wayne Mastin
Milum Davis Perry, Jr.
Melvin Alfred Rosen
Norman Robert Rosen
Howard Leroy Sargent, Jr.
William Jackson Schuder
Sam David Starobin
Richard Joseph Steinborn
Marvin Henry Stock
Jack Mathew Thompson
Albert Archer Van Petten
Carlton Juan Wellborn, Jr.

Signal Corps

Albert John Geraci
Harold Walter Grossman
Henry William Hill
John Elwood Hoover
Richard Motley Hutchinson, Jr.
Graham Gunther Kent
James Philip Mattern

Cavalry

Joseph John Addison
Robert Jacob Baer
Hugh James Bartley
Theodore Chester Bielicki
Jean Prosper Burner
Donovan Finley Burton
William Fortune Coghill
James Christopher Cosgrove
John Delistraty
Jack Van Dunham
James Eugene Edington
James Betts Egger
John Carter Faith
Herschel Everett Fuson
Robert Miller Garvin
John Love Gerrity
Warren Robert Gossett
William Douglas Grant
Alexander Meigs Haig, Jr.
Rolland Valentine Heiser
Dandridge Featherstone Hering
Robert James Kennedy
George Anthony Lynn
William Gabriel McGee
Robert James McNeil
Arnold William Mahlum
Robert DeWayne Peckham
John Brooks Reese
John Joseph Sullivan
Frank Leonard Taylor
William Loyd Webb, Jr.
William Irvine West
Meade David Wildrick, Jr.
Richard Lytle Yates

Field Artillery

Thomas Edward Benson
William Donald Brown
Robert Thornton Curtis
Bernard Figueredo de Gil, Jr.
Donald Marvin Dexter, Jr.
Richard Earl Dunlap
Milton Leland Haskin
Wayne Otis Hauck, Jr.
Thomas Francis Hayes
George Duane Heisser
William Sylvester Henry, Jr.
Willis Hickam Knipe
Robert Joshua Koch
Richard Alan Littlestone
Robert Ewing McCord
Charles Stuart Todd Mallett
Robert Miller Montague, Jr.
Wallace Eugene Nickel
John Guilford Paules
Tom Judson Perkins
John Richard Rantz
Kermit Dean Reel
James Russell Robinson, Jr.
Thomas Edmund Rogers
Robert Warren Short
Theodore Solomon Spiker
William Michael Sullivan

Infantry

Bernard William Abrams
Harry Polk Ball
George Earl Bland
Otis Evan Branon, Jr.
William Albert Carpenter, Jr.
Robert Bernard Coleman
William Edmond Conger, Jr.
William Lamble Cooper
William Bernard Cronin
Stanley Warfield Crosby, Jr.
John Edward Culin
Glenn Woodward Davis
Robert Francis Draper
Gordon James Duquemin
Henry Everett Emerson
Robert Bruce Fahs
Stuart Gregory Force
David Welty Gibson
Robert Haldane
William Donald Hirschfield
Julius Frederick Ickler
Leon Joseph Jacques, Jr.
Wilber Glenn Jones, Jr.
Robert Adair King
Donald Warren Krause
Wells Brendel Lange
John William Lauterbach, Jr.
Melvin Vernon LeBlanc
Alexander Lemberes
Selby Francis Little, Jr.
Walter Patrick Lukens
John Warwick McCullough, Jr.
Oliver Louis McDougell
Henry Tomlinson MacGill
Robert Anthony Mahowald
LeRoy Emil Majeske
George Aloysius Maloney
Martin Michael Maloney
John More Miller
Charles Augustus Munford, Jr.
John DuBose Naill, Jr.
William Wallace Nairn, 3d
Robert Lynn Ozier
Carl Kamp Russell
Norman Junior Salisbury
James Emerson Smith, Jr.
Gordon Malin Strong
James Bernard Tatum
Harold Stan Tavzel
Gerald Ross Toomer
Wallace Francis Veaudry
William Dawes Williams, Jr.

Quartermaster Corps

Thomas Long Flattery
Bernard Jay Gardner
Bennet Norman Hollander
Burton Katz
Robert Peter Lane
Harrison Franklyn Meadows III

Chemical Corps

Paul Charles Callan

Ordnance Department

James Lee Bushnell
Willis Howell Clark
John Griffin Gaddie
Henry Cantzon Paul
Louis Rachmeler
Hal Clyde Richardson, Jr.
Donald Verner Schnepf
Richard Henry Sforzini
William Smith
Ira Warren Snyder, Jr.
Donald Harry Steininger
Joseph John Williams

Air Corps

Anthony Allan Alfano
John Jamison Anderson
Leland George Anderson
Howard Brown Arnold, Jr.
Robert Paul Babbitt
Earle LeRoy Bathurst, Jr.
Robert Allan Beckelman
Milton Bellovin
Ralph Locker Bentley
Buford Fernell Biggs
Felix Anthony Blanchard, Jr.
James Montgomery Breedlove
Herbert Owen Brennan
William Spencer Carpenter, Jr.
Milton Jay Chamberlain
Leland Dale Christensen
Arthur Emmett Coates, Jr.
Egbert Haldane Cofield, Jr.

James Edward Colburn
James Smith Coolbaugh
John Edward Cottongim
John Martin Coyne, Jr.
Albert William Cretella, Jr.
Forest Willard Crowe
George Martin Dell
Gordon Kendrick Dicker
David Michael Dunham
Harold Jacob Eberle
Robert Maxwell Ehrlich
Angelo James Ellis, Jr.
James Walter Enos
Kenneth Howe Farrier, Jr.
Gonzalo Fernandez
John Frost
Cecil Edward Fuchs
Homer Perry Gainey, Jr.
Edson Leonard Garrabrants
Dean Stevens Gausche
Jesse James Gilliam, Jr.
George Joseph Goldsborough, Jr.
Alan Henry Gould
William Wright Gray
Edmund Mortimer Gregorie, Jr.
Robert Blake Griffith
Wallace Hull Griffith
John Thompson Guice
Robert Maurice Haas
Robert Fletcher Halligan
George Fred Harrington
James David Heironimus
Donald Clement Heiling
Park Brown Herrick, Jr.
Edwin Connery Hightower, Jr.
Charles William Hill
Robert Earl Hoffman
Andrew Leon Hudgins
Frederick Gray Hudson III
Frederick Walter Jacoby
David Jarvis
Walter Edward Johnson
Joe Dean Johnston
Kermit Clifton Kaericher
Harry Richard Kain
Robert Edward Keck
John Leroy Kennedy, Jr.
Robert Eugene Kettner
Marcos Emmet Kinevan
John Jay Kirby, Jr.
Frederick John Knauss
Frank Joseph Kremser, Jr.
William Thomas Kuykendall
Conrad Normand Lajeunesse
Frank Joseph Lamattina
Kenneth Moore Landis
Hewitt Chemnitz Larsen
Allen Franklin Learmonth
Charles Kennicott Leech
John Kenneth Lerohl
Hubert Horace Lewis
J. Robert Lilley
Donald David Litt
John Joseph Lowry
Elnar Glenn Lundy
Richard Alexis McClure
James Crawford McKim
John Stevenson Mallory, Jr.
John Edwin Mock
Thomas Vincent Monahan
Robert Burns Moore
Willard Noble Munroe, Jr.
John James Murphy
Ralph Calvin Murrin
David Newcomb
Joh Novomesky, Jr.
Patrick Joseph O'Connell
David Anicker Odell
Jack Merrill Palmer
Jack Vernon Pearce
Francis Raymond Perry
John Franklin Piepenbrink
Jack Francis Pierce
Herbert Carson Pinkerton, Jr.
George Barney Poole
Jack Harris Ray
William John Reckmeyer
Clyde Calvin Reynolds
Donald Oren Robb
Edwin Wales Robertson II
James Edward Ryan
Alan David Sapowith
Robert Sattem
Lee Geoffrey Schlegel
Winston Ousley Scoville
Brent Scowcroft
William Jennings Sharpe
Charles Edward Shields
King D. Simon
Leonard Anthony Staszak
Leslie Robert Stevens
Charles Carrington Stewart
Daniel Lisle Tate II
Young Arnold Tucker
Stewart Meldred Vockel, Jr.
Douglas Crowther Weaver, Jr.
Robert Wilson White
Gerald Joseph Wojciehoski
William James Woldenberg
Frederick Malcolm Wright
John Mackay Young
Clifford George Zimmer, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 19, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom all secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

May 19, 1947

Prelude, sacred selections (11:30 to 12)---
United States Marine Corps Orchestra
Presiding officer---------- The Speaker
Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.
Invocation---------- The Chaplain
Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Solo: There Is No Death (O'Hara)--------
Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania
At the piano---- Musician Irving Filler
Scripture reading and prayer-- The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members------- The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence.
Address---------- Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE
Representative from the State of Wisconsin
Solo: Beautiful Isle of Somewhere (Ferris)
Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT
At the piano---- Musician Irving Filler
Address--------- Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD
Representative from the State of Montana
Taps---------- Musician Robert De Hart
Benediction---------- The Chaplain

The Members of the House rose and stood while the relatives of the deceased Members were escorted to seats in the House Chamber by the Committee on Memorials, preceded by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The Speaker presided.

INVOCATION

The Chaplain: O Divine Redeemer, we wait in the eternal ways. As the earthly door closes and the heavenly door opens, fix our faith upon the hills, from whence cometh our strength. Our strength cometh from the Lord. With the light of Thy sovereign wisdom, look through our limitations and command our understanding, and keep us in the way everlasting.

Merciful God, the sands of life run swiftly; we know not when the silver cord will be loosed, the golden bowl be broken, but so long as faith and hope and love shall live, so long is the immortality of the soul assured. Be this the comfort and the hope of the sorrowing ones of our deceased Members, in whose memory we have gathered. May they go forward with patience and fortitude, and at the last, as our earthly eyes close, do Thou bear us up the stairway, through the darkness, to the Father's house, to the Father's love, and we shall go out no more forever. In the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

SOLO

Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT, accompanied by Musician Irving Filler, sang There Is No Death.

SCRIPTURE READING AND PRAYER

The Chaplain:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

And yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

CHAPLAIN'S PRAYER

Serene I fold my hands and wait,
Nor care for wind, nor tide, nor sea;
I rave no more 'gainst time nor fate,
For lo! my own shall come to me.

I stay my haste, I make delays;
For what avails this eager pace?
I stand amid the eternal ways,
For what is mine shall know my face.

Asleep, awake, by night or day,
The friends I seek are seeking me;
No wind can drive my bark astray,
Nor change the tide of destiny.

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the coming years;
My heart shall reap where it has sown
And gather up its fruit of tears.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea;
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.

He leads me in no darker room
Than he himself went through
And in our path is laid no stone
He would not carry too.

Blessed be His holy name.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Alney E. Chaffee, reading clerk of the House of Representatives, read the following roll:

CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia: Born January 4, 1858; printer; reporter; editor; publisher; student of private and public schools; member, board of visitors, University of Virginia, 1898–1906; member State senate, 1899–1903; delegate, State constitutional convention, 1901; Member, House of Representatives, Fifty-seventh to Sixty-fifth Congresses; Secretary of the Treasury in President Wilson's Cabinet; declined reappointment by President Franklin D. Roosevelt; Member of the United States Senate, under appointment and election from February 2, 1920; died May 28, 1946.

JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, a Senator from the State of Alabama: Born July 8, 1872; lawyer; graduate, University of Alabama, 1891, and Georgetown University, 1893; president, Bankhead Coal Co., 1911–25; major, Alabama National Guard, 1901–3; member, State house of representatives, 1904–5; trustee, University of Alabama, 1917–19 and 1931–46; elected United States Senator, 1930, 1936, and 1942; died June 12, 1946.

CHARLES OSCAR ANDREWS, a Senator from the State of Florida: Born March 7, 1877; soldier; lawyer; judge; attended South Florida Military Institute; graduate, State normal school, 1901, and University of Florida, 1907; captain, National Guard, Spanish-American War; secretary, State senate, 1905–7, and 1909–11; judge of the Criminal Court of Record, Walton County; 1910–11; assistant attorney general, 1912–19; circuit judge, seventeenth judicial circuit, 1919–25; general counsel, Florida Real Estate Commission, 1925–28; member, State house of representatives, 1927; city attorney, Orlando, 1926–29; State supreme court commissioner, 1929–32; elected United States Senator 1936, 1940; died September 18, 1946.

JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY, a Senator from the State of North Carolina: Born September 14, 1873; editor, lawyer; attended Raleigh Academy; graduate, Wake Forest College, 1893; editor Biblical Recorder, 1893–1907; member, State board of agriculture, 1896–1900; Presidential elector, 1908; collector of internal revenue, 1913–21; member, constitutional commission, 1915; trustee, University of North Carolina, 1930; elected United States Senator 1930, 1936, and 1942; died December 15, 1946.

WILLIAM JAMES GALLAGHER, Third Congressional District of Minnesota: Born May 13, 1875; clerk; graduate, North High school, Minneapolis, 1894; employee of Hennepin County, 1927–42; Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress; died August 13, 1946.

WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, Fourth Congressional District of New York: Born July 21, 1902; lawyer; graduate, New York University, 1925, and New York University Law School, 1929; assistant district attorney, Queens County, 1932–33; special United States attorney, Department of Justice, 1933–35; Member House of Representatives, Seventy-fourth and succeeding Congresses; died October 20, 1946.

ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, Second Congressional District of Wisconsin: Born February 9, 1890; banker; student, University of Wisconsin; State treasurer, 1931–35; Jefferson Municipal Water and Light Commissioner, 1939–44; State banking commissioner, 1940–44; Member, Seventy-ninth Congress; Member-elect, Eightieth Congress; died November 20, 1946.

FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, Third Congressional District of Washington: Born March 21, 1882; merchant; graduate, Martinsville (Ill.) High School; member, Raymond (Wash.) City Council, 1916–18; member, Washington State House of Representatives, 1910–20; State senate, 1925–26; president, Southwest Washington Good Roads Association; director, White Pass Cross State Highway Association; elected to the Seventy-eighth and Eightieth Congresses; died April 18, 1947.

CHARLES LEWIS GERLACH, Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania: Born September 14, 1895; businessman; educated in the public schools of Bethlehem; chairman, organization committee Republican clubs Lehigh County; Republican State committeeman, 1936–37; elected to the House of Representatives, Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses; died May 5, 1947.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, and aided by Camellio Melchiorre, a page of the House of Representatives, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

DEVOTIONAL SILENCE

There followed a period of devotional silence, during which the Members stood.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting and proper that we set aside 1 day each year when we can pause for a time, and in the quiet and serenity of our garden of memories, reflect upon the life and work of our colleagues whom God in his infinite wisdom has called to eternal rest.

In vain we call the roll. They have left us. Never again will we hear the familiar voice or see the cheering smile or feel the sturdy handclasp. It seems only yesterday that they were here among us, and yet difficult as it is to realize the fact of death, we are comforted in the thought that each faced that great adventure without fear and with the assurance of St. John, who recorded "for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

It is indeed a grand tradition that permits us in this hour to engrave upon the imperishable records of the Congress the love and respect which we all have for the memory of our deceased colleagues.

Is this a time only for sorrow? Should our thoughts turn only to the mysteries of death? Should we think only "of the stern agony and shroud and pall and breathless darkness and the narrow house?" All nature rebels at the very suggestion. On every side, God's handiwork bids us think not of death but of life. As has been so well said by the poet: "Whether we look or whether we listen, we hear life murmur or see it glisten. Every clod feels a stir of might—an instinct within it that rises and towers and, groping blindly above it for light, climbs to a soul in grass and flowers."

Mr. Speaker, I like to think of the struggle of people all over the earth—the mothers and fathers of all races who in a mad and confused world, grope blindly but prayerfully for peace. Like the poet's insensible clod, there is an instinct within the heart of man that, pray God, will rise and tower and some day burst forth into a soul of love and world peace.

Our colleagues served their country during the most exciting and dramatic period in the world's history. They heard the agonized pleas of the little people of the world who cried out for peace, people who knew of the chaos and destructiveness of war and who wanted nothing except liberty and freedom.

We recall the world events that precipitated the recent international tragedy. History has now recorded the noble phrases that defined America's moral objectives in a world torn by war.

We recall the promises to the little people of the world that America would forever carry the torch of freedom—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

We recall the numerous steps short of war that were allegedly designed to stop aggressors and to protect peace-loving nations.

We recall the August 1941 conference aboard a battleship in the Atlantic, and we recall the nobility of thought and purpose expressed in the proclamation of the Atlantic Charter, which, when proclaimed to the world, gave hope to lovers of freedom and liberty and peace.

We recall those promises which committed two great nations of the world; first, that we seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, they proclaimed their eternal devotion to self-government for all people to equal access of all to the trade and raw materials of the world, to improved labor conditions, to a peace which will afford assurances that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want; and finally, they avowed that the nations of the world must abandon the use of force.

Thus was hope extended to people of the world, whose enjoyment of the privileges of peace and liberty and freedom seemed crushed by the ruthless heel of a cruel dictator.

We recall how the heart of America swelled with just pride in the thought that we seek nothing except to give to

all people the rights so beautifully proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter. We recall how inexorably events led us to active participation and to final victory in the late World War.

Two years have passed since VJ-day. Two years since agonized and weary people throughout the world prayerfully thanked God that at long last the firing had ceased and peace and freedom and liberty were on the immediate horizon.

What has happened to the noble principles of the Atlantic Charter? What of the little people whose voices we heard crying out for peace and for liberty and for freedom? Now that we have made the greatest sacrifice in the history of the world, are they to be abandoned forever to exist as mere pawns in the hands of new and ruthless dictators?

In the confusion of Tehran, Yalta, Moscow, Potsdam, Casablanca, and Lake Success, have those noble principles that graced our banners been smothered and wiped out?

As Americans, we rebel at the very thought that such might be the case. They must be revitalized and reestablished and reasserted as dynamic, living principles to guide the conduct of men. Millions of people throughout the world hopefully and prayerfully look to the United Nations as the vehicle through which ultimately the principles for which we fought may be realized.

Two years since VJ-day. Is there freedom from fear in the world? Ask the little people of Greece, of Italy, Rumania, Poland, Lithuania, Indochina, or India.

Is there freedom from want? Ask the hungry and starving people of Japan and China, of Austria and Hungary, Germany, Greece, Poland. Even ask the people of England. Ask the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons wandering in fear and want throughout Europe. Ask the millions of men who as so-called prisoners of war are, in violation of all international and moral laws, relegated to the crushing and debasing role of slaves.

Is there peace in the world today? The reverberation of gunfire in Palestine, China, Indochina, and Paraguay provides daily evidence that few, if any, of the problems that affect the lives of the little men and women of the world have been solved.

The threat of atomic destruction, of guided missiles, and germ and poison warfare stalks the world.

Everywhere men complain of the uncertainties of life. Young people and old complain of insecurity. Fear in the hearts of men everywhere—2 years after the official close of the shooting war that was fought to make men free.

Will we go from war to war, killing, maiming, and destroying? Has the world become so debauched that there is no answer to the prayers of those who pray for peace? Have we nothing better to offer the present and future generations? Has God permitted us to unlock his last great treasure house and given us the secrets of atomic and cosmic energy, only to use them to kill and destroy?

The answer is clear. We have not lost faith. There must be a great moral and spiritual awakening in the hearts and souls of men. There must be a gigantic crusade, guided by faith in God and inspired by the eternal principals of the Golden Rule and Christ's Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Speaker, the light of the torch of freedom and liberty has been growing dim throughout the world. As recorded in holy writ: "For everyone that doeth evil, hateth the light; neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth, cometh to the light that his deeds may be manifest that are wrought in God."

God has placed in the custody of the people of America that torch of freedom. We must rekindle its flame and, burning fiercely, lift it on high and carry forward that it may light up and destroy all the dark recesses and forces of hate, bigotry, and intolerance on this earth.

And so, my colleagues, in this hour of communion with the spirits of our departed friends, may we experience a renewal of faith and an inspiration for a continued life of devoted service to the ideals of Christian brotherhood.

SOLO

Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT, accompanied by Musician Irving Filler, sang Beautiful Isle of Somewhere.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, a Representative from the State of Montana, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we meet today in memory and in honor of our dear departed dead—those Members of the Senate and the House who have this past year gone to their eternal reward. They were our brothers, our colleagues, our friends; and to them we owe a debt we can never repay. Coming here as we do once a year for remembrance is to participate in a ceremony which not only honors our departed friends but in a small way shows our appreciation for those who by their example give us courage to continue to fight for the ideals which motivated them as men, as Americans, as representatives of Americans.

In other countries, other people have different means of honoring their dead, but in all of them this recognition has been given whole-heartedly. Since time immemorial man has seen fit to render some sort of tribute to those who were no longer with them. We find, for example, that the Mayan Indians of Central America garbed their dead in fine garments, stored utensils of various kinds in the burial place, and sacrificed a dog for the occasion. The utensils were to give to the deceased a continuation of the things to which he had become accustomed; the garments were to keep him warm on his journey; and the dog was to lead his master along the path and into the land to where all good people go. In China the policy of ancestor veneration has been in practice for over 2,500 years and the memories of those who have passed away are never forgotten. Rather the good which they performed was always remembered, and the institution of the family was forever aware of the honor to be accorded to its members.

Just these few historic examples point to the fact that what we are doing here today is a continuation of that custom which has been followed by all men, in all countries, in all times.

As we gather here in this sad, sweet, tender hour of memorial, we should not mourn for those who are now at peace, for those who are now receiving just reward for work well done. Instead we should see in their passing the completion of their life's cycle and a transposing of the striving and yearning of their spirit to the land that "no eye hath seen" where they can continue their aspirations on a spiritual level. We who are left behind, should be imbued with their goodness, for the works of the spirit never die, and find encouragement, hope, and inspiration to finish in the here and now the task they began. If we were to stand here with the belief that their passing from this life was the end of it all—that the grave was really the goal, then I say we would have true cause to mourn. But everything around us points to the continuity of life. We all accept the laws of physics—the conservation of matter. We know that no physical matter is destroyed, but only transformed. The rose blooms, dies, nourishes the ground which produces the new rose. The clouds lift in their arms the waters of the seven seas and carry them to let fall on the parched earth, whose rivers and streams in turn carry them again to their mother ocean.

If we accept all this—these things we see with our eyes, know with our senses, then surely we must also accept the indestructibility of those spiritual things in man, his thoughts, personality, soul. From time immemorial, man has looked upon the order of the universe—the change of seasons, the pathways of the stars, the cycle of life from birth to death—and of the necessity born of reasoning attributed these wonders to a source, a first cause, a God.

It is inherent in the nature of man to feel his own immortality. The wonders of Nature and the thoughts of man are sparks from the Supreme Intelligence who creates everything and destroys nothing. With this belief, we thus feel that our departed comrades and we ourselves become a part of the somehow oneness of all existing things. They continue to exist on a higher plane; we grasp the torch they fling us in passing and endeavor to carry on their highest aspirations and ideals on this earth. By so doing we keep alive the ties of humanity, that ever-ending chain which encompasses all eternity.

All of those who comprised the links in this chain were not without fault, but it is perhaps because of their faults that we appreciate their virtues the more. Man was not born to be perfect—that is God's prerogative only—but man has constantly striven toward perfection. The frailties which beset our departed friends are the frailties of those still left behind. Therefore, we should write their faults in sand and their virtues on tablets of love. It is as if they asked us to dig a little hole in our hearts and bury them there and lay the fresh flowers of

understanding and remembrance on them often. It is not difficult for us to remember them in kindness and charity for we can say with Longfellow:

We may build more splendid habitations, fill our rooms with paintings and with sculptures, but we cannot buy with gold the old associations.

Words cannot express how much they will be missed by family and friends. It is not in the power of man to know the influence of another man's life. To each is given specific talents and graces and thought processes, which go to make up his personality and make him unique among his associates. Each deed he performs in his very own and has its influence where not even he sometimes knows. As we glance back in memory at the faces of former Congresses we remember one man for his deeds and great words of courage, another for his intense devotion to the duties of his office, another for his skill in debate; and still another for his high integrity and moral purpose. We may miss a friend for something as simple as a cheering smile, a word of encouragement, the greater wordless depth of his understanding. We will miss the pleasure of still another's hearty handshake, buoyancy, and love of life. The man whose little hidden kindly deeds that were known but to us alone, we shall miss most of all.

When we consider the traits of personality and character which endeared our departed friends to us, we should pause to weigh how many opportunities for fellowship and understanding elude us who are left because we are engrossed in our own particular spheres of duty. We are often too busy with our usual workaday lives to enlarge our understanding and to enrich our own characters by wholeheartedly giving of ourselves in sincere friendship. Here in this Congress sit men from every State and Territory in our grand old Union. From the forests of Washington, and Maine, and Oregon; from California's sunny clime; from Kansas' waving plains and Mississippi's cotton fields; from New York's manmade canyons and my own Montana's shining mountains; come our colaborers with the wealth of their knowledge. Here we can exchange information about commerce and industry and agriculture and mining. We can have first-hand information about these from those who know them best—for you who sit here represent these infinite and various fields that make up the vast panorama that is America. As we stand here in recollection of our former colleagues, maybe wistfully wishing that we had taken time in one case to lend a helping hand or in another to say a word of praise, let us resolve that we will not fail to cement the bonds of friendship offered here now.

At this hour of remembrance we like to remember our comrades as men who, coming to this great legislative body, were moved with the desire to be of service to their fellow citizens. They assumed obligations not alone because of the personal benefits to be derived, but because of the contributions they felt they could give to the welfare of their community, State, and Nation. As legislators it was their constant duty to answer their country's needs, and in so doing, they tried to keep alive in this land the principles of peace, freedom, and equality. Yes, this is the way we think of them. We can say that it was their hourly care, as men and Americans, "to do that which their hands findeth to do with carefulness, unaffected dignity, humanity, freedom, and justice." Each of these departed ones labored to make this a better, a more abundant, and a more beautiful world. Their good deeds live after them. Each act of kindness, of humanity, of courage, of wisdom, of justice which they performed somehow makes less burdensome our present task of taking up their work where they left off. Good never dies. It permeates our present and makes possible our future. Let us therefore take pride in the lofty endeavors of our departed colleagues and keep their memory fresh by carrying on their ideals.

I can think of no better way to show our respect to our dead or our duty to ourselves and to the future citizens of our country than to live up to the ideals of charity, justice, fidelity, and democracy which motivated the lives of these departed Members being honored today. It seems to me that the very foundation of our lives and Nation depends on the practice of such ideals. Today with our democracy being threatened on all sides, it is imperative that we live in bonds of closer understanding and unanimity. We should adhere to the precepts that actuated them as good Americans: to be democratic in our daily lives, to live and let live, to practice charity and tolerance, to allow free speech, the practice of one's own religion, and freedom of organization and assembly. They lived for democracy, fought for it, each in his own way, and practiced it so that we who remain behind can continue in the rights and privileges which they loved so much and treasured so dearly. Their heritage to us is something which we shall forever cherish because it is our connection with them. They served during difficult times. They met the problems confronting them with courage and fortitude, thus giving us hope that we may solve those that now face us—internal troubles which will take our greatest efforts, and external ones which make us apprehensive. They fought vigorously and fervently for peace, and now they have that peace which surpasses all understanding. We feel therefore, that they can, from that eternal land to which they have gone but where they still live, inspire us to carry on their work for peace on earth and good will among men.

They gave their lives as truly as any soldier on the field of battle and they exemplified in their persons that duty to God and country so characteristic of the membership of this great body. In the words of the poet, Joyce Kilmer, I should like to greet the departed ones:

Farewell!
Comrades true, born anew, peace to you!
Your souls shall be where the heroes are
And your memory shine like the morning star.
Brave and dear,
Shield us here.
Farewell!

TAPS

Musician Robert De Hart, United States Marine Corps, sounded taps.

BENEDICTION

The Chaplain pronounced the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The relatives of the deceased Members were escorted from the Chamber by the Committee on Memorials.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess, the Speaker called the House to order.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 15, 1947:

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.).

On May 16, 1947:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

On May 19, 1947:

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

HENRY BIG DAY—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 262)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 2199, "Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to

Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation."

This bill appears to have been passed under a misapprehension as to what its effect would be if enacted. The legislative history indicates that it was understood as being a bill that would authorize the Indian owners of certain property, held in trust for them by the United States, to sell that property, subject to the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In particular the committee reports state that "title will ultimately pass to Mr. Kopak either in exchange for an equitable amount of other land, to be appraised by officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or for cash, whichever proves of greater benefit to the heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, as determined by the Bureau." If this were the effect of the bill, it would have simply restated existing laws, since general authority for the sale, under supervision, of trust or restricted Indian property is contained in the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855, 25 U. S. C., sec. 372), as amended, and other statutes. While unnecessary, such repetitive legislation would not have been objectionable.

On the other hand, the actual effect of the bill is to make mandatory the issuance of a patent in fee for the land involved. Such a patent would discharge the property from all restrictions and would eliminate the safeguards which existing laws afford the Indians against short-sightedness on their own part or over-reaching on the part of others. Particularly in the situation here involved, I believe it would be most unwise to abrogate these safeguards. The record indicates that a prospective purchaser of the land, rather than the Indian owners, is the moving party for the sale. The owners have not been found competent to manage their business affairs, as required for the issuance of a patent in fee under the general law, nor is it clear that all or a majority of them desire to receive such a patent. Some of the owners are minors, and, assuming a sale of the land would be to their best interests, the issuance of a patent in fee might hinder, rather than facilitate, the proposed sale by necessitating, for conveyance of their shares, court proceedings that would not be requisite in the case of a sale under supervision pursuant to the applicable statutes.

Finally, approval of this bill might result in the Indians being forced to accept whatever price is offered them for the land in order to avoid losing it through tax sale, since issuance of a patent in fee would terminate the present tax exemption.

A patent in fee should not be forced on an Indian who does not want one, and Indian property should not be sold in disregard of Indian interests. Under existing laws, the land covered by this bill may be sold or partitioned for the benefit of the Indian owners upon application by them, provided their interests or those of their tribe would not be prejudiced thereby. I believe the procedures established by these laws are sound and that the land problem sought to be met by the bill before me can be resolved justly and fairly by resort to those procedures.

In all the circumstances, I am constrained to withhold my approval from H. R. 2199.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 17, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The bill and objections thereto will be printed as a House document and spread at large upon the Journal. Without objection, further action on the veto will be postponed until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 261)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Healthy citizens constitute our greatest national resource. In time of peace, as in time of war, our ultimate strength stems from the vigor of our people. The welfare and security of our Nation demand that the opportunity for good health be made available to all, regardless of residence, race, or economic status.

At no time can we afford to lose the productive energies and capacities of millions of our citizens. Nor can we permit our children to grow up without a fair chance of survival and a fair chance for a healthy life. We must not permit our rural families to suffer for lack of physicians, dentists, nurses, and hospitals. We must not reserve a chance for good health and a long productive life to the well-to-do alone. A great and free nation should bring good health care within the reach of all its people.

In my message to the Congress on November 19, 1945, I said that every American should have the right to adequate medical care and to adequate protection from the economic threat of sickness. To provide this care and protection is a challenging task, requiring action on a wide front.

I have previously outlined the long-range health program which I consider necessary to the national welfare and security. I say again that such a program must include:

1. Adequate public-health services, including an expanded maternal- and child-health program.

2. Additional medical research and medical education.

3. More hospitals and more doctors—in all areas of the country where they are needed.

4. Insurance against the costs of medical care.

5. Protection against loss of earnings during illness.

I am pleased to observe that important advances were made by the last Congress toward realization of some of the goals which I set forth in my earlier message. But we must not rest until we have achieved all our objectives. I urge this Congress to enact additional legislation to authorize the program I have outlined, even though the fulfillment of some aspects of it may take time.

Our public-health services—Federal, State, and local—provide our greatest and most successful defense against preventable diseases. But in many States, cities, and counties in America, limited funds reduce the work of our public-health services to a dangerously inadequate level. Public services related to maternal and child health were expanded by the Seventy-ninth Congress, through amendments to the Social Security Act. This action was gratifying, but the long-range need for additional health services for children and expectant mothers, and for care of crippled or otherwise physically handicapped children, should be carefully studied by the Congress.

The Nation's medical-research programs must in the future be expanded so that we can learn more about the prevention and cure of disease. The Congress has already recognized this by providing for research into the causes of cancer and mental diseases and abnormalities. Further dividends will accrue to our Nation—and to our people—if research can point the way toward combating and overcoming such major illnesses as arthritis and rheumatic fever, and diseases of the heart, kidneys, and arteries.

We still face a shortage of hospitals, physicians, dentists, and nurses. Those we have are unfairly distributed. The shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses can be met only through expanded educational opportunities. The shortage of hospitals will be met in part through the action of the last Congress which provided Federal aid for the construction of hospitals.

In the last analysis the patient's ability to pay for the services of physicians or dentists, or for hospital care, determines the distribution of doctors and the location of hospitals. Few doctors can be expected to practice today in sparsely settled areas or where prospective patients are unable to pay for their services. Doctors tend to concentrate in communities where hospitals and other facilities are best and where their incomes are most secure. The unequal distribution of doctors and hospitals will plague this Nation until means are found to finance modern medical care for all of our people.

National health insurance is the most effective single way to meet the Nation's health needs. Because adequate treatment of many illnesses is expensive and its cost cannot be anticipated by the individual, many persons are forced to go without needed medical attention. Children do not receive adequate medical and dental care. Symptoms which should come early to the attention of a physician are often ignored until too late. The poor are not the only ones who cannot afford adequate medical care. The truth is that all except the rich may at some time be struck by illness which requires care and services they cannot afford. Countless families who are entirely self-supporting in every

other respect cannot meet the expense of serious illness.

Although the individual or even small groups of individuals cannot successfully or economically plan to meet the cost of illness, large groups of people can do so. If the financial risk of illness is spread among all our people, no one person is overburdened. More important, if the cost is spread in this manner more persons can see their doctors, and will see them earlier. This goal can be reached only through a national medical-insurance program, under which all people who are covered by an insurance fund are entitled to necessary medical, hospital, and related services.

A national health insurance program is a logical extension of the present social-security system which is so firmly entrenched in our American democracy. Of the four basic risks to the security of working people and their families—unemployment, old age, death and sickness—we have provided some insurance protection against three. Protection against the fourth—sickness—is the major missing element in our national social insurance program.

An insurance plan is the American way of accomplishing our objective. It is consistent with our democratic principles. It is the only plan broad enough to meet the needs of all our people. It is—in the long run—far less costly and far more effective than public charity or a medical dole.

Under the program which I have proposed patients can and will be as free to select their own doctors as they are today. Doctors and hospitals can and will be free to participate or to reject participation. And a national health insurance plan can and should provide for administration through State and local agencies, subject only to reasonable national standards.

Finally, I should like to repeat to the Congress my earlier recommendation that the people of America be protected against loss of earnings, due to illness or disability not connected with their work. Protection against temporary disability is already provided by two States and is being considered in others. Comprehensive disability insurance should exist throughout the Nation. It can and should be a part of our social insurance system.

The total health program which I have proposed is crucial to our national welfare. The heart of that program is national health insurance. Until it is a part of our national fabric, we shall be wasting our most precious national resource and shall be perpetuating unnecessary misery and human suffering.

I urge the Congress to give immediate attention to the development and enactment of national health and disability insurance programs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1947.*

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 179, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

691. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

692. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

693. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending March 31, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

694. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

695. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfers to various municipalities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

696. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 259); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

697. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $1,000,000 for the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3493. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3448. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. House Joint Resolution 196. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; with an amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committeee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 993. An act to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GAVIN: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3501. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3502. A bill to authorize the establishment of Old Fort Caspar National Monument, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3503. A bill to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3504. A bill authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 3505. A bill authorizing the appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 3506. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 3507. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3508. A bill to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the States to relieve the critical shortage of housing for veterans of World War II, to provide subsidies to aid in the construction of such housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3509. A bill to authorize the construction of a class IV airport for the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a public highway or bridge from the city of Fairbanks to the

location of the airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3510. A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3511. A bill to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3512. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVE:

H. R. 3513. A bill to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retiremdent and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3514. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 with respect to reenlistment leave of enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3515. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3516. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H. R. 3517. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), as amended, so as to provide an equitable adjustment of retired pay for certain naval officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3518. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the East Side Levee and Sanitary District, of Madison County and St. Clair County, Ill., for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3519. A bill to provide for permanent postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3520. A bill to amend the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 by removing therefrom certain inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3521. A bill to provide that bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 shall be negotiable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 3522. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 213. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and study the distribution and sale of new and slightly used automobiles; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to preserve the continuity of the United States Marine Corps in enacting legislation to merge the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to remove discriminatory Federal income-tax burdens on citizens of non-community-income States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Walt W. Rostow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Natalio Caria, Nevika Caria, Tania Caria, and Igor Caria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Dr. Donald S. Thatcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

520. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Anna L. Gormley, and 88 other residents of Linn County, Iowa, endorsing S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

521. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive committee for fishery investigations of the University of Hawaii and the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry for the Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to provision for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and the development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

522. Also, petition of the Montana Oil and Gas Producers Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the leasing of Montana State lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

523. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society, of St. Albans, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expediting House Concurrent Resolution 32 and House Concurrent Resolution 4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

524. Also, petition of G. W. Remer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable consideration and support of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

525. Also, petition of the Senior Holy Name Society, St. Mary Parish, Griffith, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigating alleged subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly, within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

526. Also, petition of the Gary-Aberding Settlement House, of Indiana, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigating alleged subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly, within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

527. Also, petition of the St. Lukes Holy Name Society, of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigating alleged subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly, within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

528. Also, petition of the membership of the Bradenton Townsend Club, No. 1, Bradenton, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

529. Also, petition of the membership of the Union Park Townsend Club, No. 1, Union Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program, and endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

530. Also, petition of the membership of the Dover Townsend Club, No. 1, Dover, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

531. Also, petition of the Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

532. Also, petition of members of the Macon Townsend Club, No. 1, Macon, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

533. Also, petition of members of the Griffin Townsend Club, No. 1, Griffin, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

George Albert Smith, president, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, offered the following prayer:

Our Father which art in heaven, with grateful hearts we present ourselves in this Chamber this morning, and thank Thee for our citizenship in this great Nation. We are grateful to Thee for the blessings we enjoy and for the opportunity and privilege of having liberties that many of Thy children in the world have never known. We are grateful for the knowledge that Thou art our Father and that Thou art interested in us and we can draw near to Thee as Thy children. We thank Thee for the great men and women who have lived in the past and who have bequeathed to us so many of the favors and blessings we now enjoy. We pray, Heavenly Father, that we may so adjust our lives day by day that we may be worthy of Thy blessing, realizing as we do that righteousness is the price of happiness.

Wilt Thou bless those who serve in this Chamber, that they may have the spirit of love and fellowship and kindness and a desire to be helpful to all mankind. Bless this great Nation that

it may continue to grow and spread abroad in strength and power for good. Grant that the people of this land may realize that this is not our country, but is Thy country, that we are only tenants here, and that our happiness in this world is conditioned upon our faithfulness to the rules and regulations ordained by Thee.

With all our hearts we thank Thee, our Father, for the fellowship we enjoy and ask that Thy peace may abide with us and our loved ones and all those who dwell in this land and all Thy children everywhere; and we ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 19, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO MUNICIPALITIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of municipalities which have requested donations from the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 39

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress for a continuation of the school-lunch programs

"Whereas Congress heretofore enacted the law known as the National School Lunch Act, approved June 4, 1946, to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs; and

"Whereas the wisdom of the declared policy of Congress in enacting this law as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, has been amply demonstrated by the favorable results obtained in improving the health and efficiency of the school children of this State; and

"Whereas there is danger that this beneficial program may have to be closed in several States, including the State of California, before the end of the present school term because of the exhaustion of the appropriation for the current fiscal year, thereby throwing the full financial load on the States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That Congress and the President of the United States are memorialized and urged to provide the necessary funds for the continuation, without reduction, of the said school-lunch programs for the next fiscal year and to make a deficiency appropriation sufficient to carry the same through the current school year; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

The petition of Howard L. Minker, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to relieve the distress of the people and the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from Frank Bane, transmitting a statement of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Ill., relating to the bill (S. 1308) to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the twelfth annual meeting of the Delta Council of Mississippi, Cleveland, Miss., relating to labor legislation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the diocese of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to include lay employees of religious organizations under Federal laws providing Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the diocese of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to admit into the United States up to 400,000 displaced persons by reopening unused immigration quotas back to 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the diocese of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WHITE:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a shining example of faithful and efficient service to our Nation for 172 years; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a source of strength whenever our Nation has been threatened; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps, alone of all the elements of our armed services, possessed the vision to develop the science of waging amphibious warfare, which knowledge permitted our Nation's offensive might to be carried to enemy shores and which proved to be the key to victory in global war; and

"Whereas 4,141 of the young men of this State of Maine have served our Nation in the United States Marine Corps; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps is threatened with extinction if the merger bill is passed in its present form; and

"Whereas the abolition of the Marine Corps would be a disastrous loss to our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Maine is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Maine.

"House of representatives, received by unanimous consent, read and adopted without reference to committee May 1, 1947; sent up for concurrence.

"In the senate chamber, received by unanimous consent, May 2, 1947; read and adopted in concurrence."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 141 citizens of Duluth, Minn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 50. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 185);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 193);

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 194);

S. 514. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco; with an amendment (Rept. No. 186);

S. 882. A bill for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk; with an amendment (Rept. No. 187);

H. R. 236. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; without amendment (Rept. No. 188);

H. R. 428. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Bemis; without amendment (Rept. No. 189);

H. R. 444. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 190); and

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of the estate of Nellie P. Dunn, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 192).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 191).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submittted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Andrew N. Overby, of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, vice Harry D. White, resigned.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Dean G. Acheson, resigned;

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general; and

Charles J. Little, of New York, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George Atcheson, Jr., of California, and sundry other persons for promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1318. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1319. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. MCGRATH) introduced Senate bill 1320, to provide a national health insurance and public health program, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. KEM, Mr. MALONE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ECTON) introduced Senate bill 1321, to decontrol sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1322. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF CERTAIN TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on May 16, 1947, the President pro tempore referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a letter from the Secretary of the Interior addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], dated May 16, 1947, with proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell timber within the Tongass National Forest. The Tongass National Forest is located in Alaska and is evidently a forest reserve created from the public domain. It is my understanding such legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Lands and certain members of that committee have agreed to that concept. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the matter and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARMY AND NAVY MERGER—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Militarists" published in the Chicago Tribune of May 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF LAST SESSION OF THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE—SPEECH BY PAUL E. FITZPATRICK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered on May 8, 1947, by Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State committee of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE EVANSVILLE (IND.) PRESS

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Handicap to Economy," published in the Evansville (Ind.) Press for May 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the time until 3:30 o'clock is under the control of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at the special request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and I have agreed to allow him 20 minutes, taking 10 minutes off the time of each side, to present a matter of major importance. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, under those conditions, at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes, the time to be charged equally to both sides.

KANSAS CITY VOTE FRAUDS—AGAIN

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is my unpleasant duty to bring to the attention of the Senate the painful fact that vote frauds on a large scale have again occurred in my home city of Kansas City, Mo., and that there apparently has been a dereliction of duty on the part of the Attorney General of the United States in failing to prosecute the guilty persons.

The frauds appeared in the last Democratic primary election in which Roger C. Slaughter, then Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, was defeated for the Democratic nomination by Enos Axtell, who was backed by the Pendergast machine.

SOME LOCAL POLITICAL HISTORY

To present to the Senate a picture of the situation which now exists, it is necessary to recite some local political history.

For years, Kansas City has been disgraced by one of the most ruthless and corrupt political machines that ever besmeared American politics. That machine, headed by the notorious Tom Pendergast, ruled Kansas City in strict gangster fashion. The machine saw to it that election returns in Kansas City were reported in such fashion as to insure the election of machine-sponsored local and State candidates.

In the elections of 1936 the returns from Kansas City showed unbelievably large majorities for the machine-sponsored candidates. A thoroughly aroused public, led by a militant United States district attorney, Maurice M. Milligan, and Missouri's Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, decided that something had to be done. No help could be expected, and none was forthcoming, from the Pendergast-controlled State law-enforcement agencies. However, Mr. Milligan, with the backing of the United States Department of Justice, undertook an investigation of the alleged election frauds. At the time he started his investigation he had nothing on which to base his contention of fraud except the fact that the election returns in Kansas City were lopsided in favor of the machine-sponsored candidates, and were out of line with the returns from the rest of the State. All that could be said at the time was that it seemed likely that fraud, miscounting, and ballot-stealing had occurred. The investigation consumed almost 2 years' time. A Federal grand jury was called, ballot boxes and election returns were seized, opened and carefully examined. It was necessary to have protection from the FBI for witnesses appearing before the grand jury. Every possible obstacle was thrown in the way of Mr. Milligan by the interested politicians. However, as a result of the investigation a total of 259 persons were indicted and convicted of illegal conduct in connection with the elections of 1936. Every case that was prosecuted resulted in a conviction.

As a result of the prosecutions and convictions, the elections in Kansas City became for a time representative of the people's will. The people demanded better city government, and as long as the ballots were counted as cast, they got better government. A distinguished citizen was elected mayor of Kansas City on a nonpartisan ticket, and Kansas City started on the road to recovery from one of the most sordid political scandals in the history of our country.

Tom Pendergast, the leader of the machine, was sent to prison for income-tax evasion, and is now deceased, but the

powerful machine he controlled and ruled, staggered and shaken by the imprisonment of so many of the henchmen, survived. Jim Pendergast, Tom's nephew and protege in machine politics, picked up the fallen reins of power and quietly bided his time to drive the machine back into full control of governmental affairs in Kansas City. Of course, the first and necessary step to control the community was to control the elections.

FRAUD BREAKS OUT AGAIN IN 1946

By 1946, most of those who were convicted and imprisoned in the Federal penitentiary for vote frauds in the 1936 elections had served their terms, or had been released by virtue of executive clemency, and were back in Kansas City. The Pendergast machine's fight to oust Maurice Milligan as United States district attorney had been successful.

In the Democratic primary in 1946, in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, Roger C. Slaughter, then a Member of Congress, was seeking reelection as the Democratic nominee. He was opposed by two other Democratic candidates, Jerome Walsh and Enos Axtell. Axtell had the approval and support of the Pendergast machine. This election, by reason of the stated intent to purge Roger C. Slaughter from Congress, assumed national importance. There were also candidates for the various county offices. It was vital to the comeback of the Pendergast machine that the candidates receiving its blessing be nominated as the Democratic candidates for the county offices and also for Representative in the Congress of the United States.

The election resulted in the nomination of every machine-backed candidate, including Enos Axtell for Congress. The picture made by the returns looked like 1936 again. In the machine wards the returns were lopsided in favor of the machine-backed candidates. In some precincts the machine candidates, on the face of the returns, received over 300 votes, while the candidates without machine support were allotted 5 or 6 votes. The people of Kansas City and of Missouri were astounded—and aroused. Election frauds were again rampant. The Kansas City Star, always a strong exponent of honest elections and good government, undertook a private investigation. The Star employed some young, aggressive veterans of World War II, most of them students, to canvass some 8,000 voters to see how they really voted. These young men checked the official returns, talked to people who were present at the election polls on election day, and interviewed the voters. No attempt was made to canvass the entire city, but samples were taken.

A HOUSE COMMITTEE STEPS IN

The House of Representatives Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, appointed by the Speaker pursuant to House resolution, agreed to July 19, 1946, conducted an investigation of the Democratic primary election in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri held August 6, 1946. Two investigators were sent to Kansas City. The evidence obtained by them and by the Kansas City Star was turned over to the Attorney General with a report which stated:

The investigators obtained a sufficient quantity of evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures to justify the committee's referring the entire report to the Attorney General.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

On January 14, 1947, soon after becoming a Member of this body, I had some correspondence with the Attorney General in which I urged that he direct his Criminal Division to proceed without further delay to prosecute those persons responsible for the alleged election frauds. The Attorney General took the position that the evidence available to him did not disclose a basis for jurisdiction to prosecute nor did it establish any violation of Federal law.

My letter of January 14, 1947, addressed to the Attorney General, is as follows:

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The report of the Special House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1946, indicates that investigators for the committee found numerous instances of irregularities in the conduct of the election in the Missouri Fifth District in the Democratic primary election held August 6, 1946.

This report states: "The investigators obtained a sufficient quantity of evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures to justify the committee's referring the entire report and file to the Attorney General."

According to public information, the agents for the FBI made an investigation of these irregularities immediately following the inquiries by the House committee agents. A preliminary report was made by the FBI investigators to the Department of Justice, but no public information has been made available concerning their findings.

Election irregularities by the Democratic political machine in Kansas City is an old story to Missouri voters who have a justifiable fear of the return of the dishonest election practices which were, for the time being, cleaned up by representatives of your Department several years ago.

There has been no statement from your office since the report of the House committee was filed and since the FBI made its preliminary report.

I am sure you will agree with me that the people of Missouri are entitled to know what action is contemplated by your Department. I would appreciate a prompt and detailed report of what you have done and expect to do to bring to justice all those guilty of violation of the statutes enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM.

The reply of the Attorney General on January 22 is as follows:

Hon. JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEM: I have your letter of January 14, 1947, inquiring as to what action has been taken by the Department of Justice as a result of the investigations of alleged irregularities in the conduct of the Democratic primary held in the Fifth Congressional District for Missouri on August 6, 1946.

The Criminal Division has carefully considered all information and material submitted by the House Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for 1946 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which conducted lengthy and detailed investigations into the charged irregularities. Information compiled by the Kansas City Star upon which was predicated the original complaint to the Department has also been thoroughly analyzed.

It is our conclusion that no basis exists for prosecution of anyone for violation of the Civil Rights Statutes (secs. 51 and 52, title 18, U. S. Code) which are the only Federal statutes under which prosecution for primary-election fraud lies. As you perhaps know, Federal jurisdiction in such cases is limited to protecting the personal right to vote for candidates for Federal office and having the vote counted as cast. Miscellaneous irregularities or frauds occurring in connection with primary elections, but not with respect to candidates for Federal offices, are without Federal criminal jurisdiction.

At my direction all files were forwarded to the United States attorney at Kansas City with a request that he also analyze same and give us his opinion. He made a thorough study of all the available evidence and has advised me that no basis for Federal prosecution exists.

Should you have any further questions or wish to discuss the limits of Federal jurisdiction in such cases, I shall be glad to have the attorneys who have handled the matter for the Department, call upon you at your convenience.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

I was not satisfied with this reply and I wrote him again on January 27, 1947, as follows:

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am in receipt of your letter of January 22.

The alleged vote frauds at Kansas City on August 6, 1946, involved an election at which candidates were to be chosen for the offices of Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States. I do not understand from your letter whether a decision not to prosecute these cases is based upon supposed (a) lack of Federal criminal jurisdiction or (b) insufficiency of the evidence to warrant prosecution.

As to (a), the acts are clearly the subject of Federal criminal jurisdiction under ruling decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299); *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649). While these decisions in my judgment make Federal jurisdiction too clear for serious argument, I shall be glad to discuss the question of jurisdiction with you or with the attorneys handling the matter in the Department if you or they wish.

As to (b), the investigators for the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1946, of the House of Representatives found evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures. This evidence is reinforced by much documentary evidence accumulated by investigators employed by a local newspaper. This evidence is substantial, and in my judgment should be presented to a court of competent jurisdiction, where the rights of innocent parties will be fully protected.

You will agree that honest elections are the very foundation of our form of government. In view of our past unfortunate experiences in Missouri, any further attempts

to violate the sanctity of the ballot are viewed by the people of our State as a source of grave danger to our free institutions. As stated by Mr. Justice Douglas in *United States* v. *Classic*, supra;

"The acts here charged, if proven, are of a kind which carries that threat and are highly offensive. Since they corrupt the process of congressional elections, they transcend mere local concern and extend a contaminating influence into the national domain."

I feel very strongly on this subject. I believe that this feeling is shared by thousands of our fellow citizens, Democrats and Republicans alike, who are insisting that the law be permitted to take its course to the end that responsibility for the alleged frauds be determined by Federal courts of competent jurisdiction. I hope you will direct your criminal division to proceed without further delay. Will you please advise me further.

Let me say in conclusion that I have not at any time suggested, nor do I now suggest, that you take any action involving (to quote from your letter) "miscellaneous irregularities or frauds occurring in connection with primary elections, but not with respect to candidates for Federal offices." These may be eliminated from any further discussion between us.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senator.

His reply dated February 10, 1947, reads as follows:

Hon. JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEM: I have your letter of January 27, 1947, in which you make further inquiry as to the basis for my conclusion that the Department of Justice has no jurisdiction over the alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary held in the Fifth Congressional District for Missouri on August 6, 1946.

As I previously advised you, the Federal Bureau of Investigation at my instance conducted a full investigation into the charges of fraud in this primary. A careful and thorough review of the results of this investigation has been made and no evidence of a Federal violation was established. While it is true that candidates for the offices of Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States were nominated at the primary in question, investigation does not show that any irregularities which may have occurred affected the vote for Federal candidates in any way.

The statement which you have quoted from the report of the House Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for 1946, that the committee's investigators found evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures is not supported by the file submitted to the Department by the committee insofar as it implies that such evidence revealed violations of Federal law. Likewise the information accumulated by Kansas City Star investigators does not establish any activity affecting the congressional or senatorial contest which would afford this Department jurisdiction to prosecute.

I fully share your opinion that honest elections are the very foundation of our form of government; yet as you know, the authority of the Department of Justice to insure the honesty and integrity of primary elections is limited to the prosecution of those who violate the civil-rights statutes. Where fraud and irregularity attending a primary election are not shown to nullify the vote for Federal candidates, neither the Department nor the Federal courts has the power to prosecute or punish.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

P. S.—I am advised the United States judges at Kansas City are familiar with this matter. Perhaps you would wish their reactions.

EVIDENCE IN HANDS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

I invite particular attention to the fact that the Attorney General states that the material furnished him does not, in his opinion, contain evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures that revealed violations of Federal law, and that there was no activity affecting the congressional or senatorial contest which would grant Federal jurisdiction. After these letters were received from the Attorney General, I requested and received permission to examine the material in the office of the Attorney General furnished him by the Kansas City Star and the House special committee. This examination was made by Mr. U. G. Lewellen and Mr. Alden A. Stockard of my staff, both able lawyers. They were not permitted to examine any part of an investigation made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, though the members of the Attorney General's staff admitted that such an investigation and a report had been made. Although the investigation made by the Kansas City Star was directed primarily at election frauds affecting the contest for two county offices, that of prosecuting attorney and presiding judge of the county court, the material in the hands of the Attorney General was found to disclose election frauds affecting candidates for two Federal offices, that of Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, and the United States Senator. Material pertaining to only 10 precincts was examined in the Attorney General's office. This is some of the evidence found in his files:

First. In one precinct only, there were statements from 22 persons that they did not vote, but the election records indicated that ballots were cast in their names. There is evidence in the files that this procedure was followed in most of the precincts covered by the investigations.

Second. Many statements appear in the file from persons who worked at the polls and from voters that persons who appeared to vote were handed ballots already marked.

Third. Many statements appear in the file from persons who worked at the polls and from voters that election officials marked the ballots for a large number of the voters in violation of law and frequently without inquiring from the voter for whom he wanted to vote.

Fourth. Several statements appear in the file made by persons working at the polls, and one made by a policeman, to the effect that ballots were counted illegally, incorrectly, and for the wrong candidate.

Fifth. Several statements appear in the file to the effect that voters were paid money for their vote.

Sixth. There is evidence that ballots were cast for persons who were dead at the time of the election.

Seventh. There is evidence that ballots were cast in the names of persons who were out of town and the State on the day of the election.

Eighth. There are statements from persons to the effect that when they went to vote they were told that a ballot had already been cast for them.

Ninth. There is evidence that ballots were cast for persons who were in the hospital on the day of the election.

Tenth. There is evidence that Democratic precinct captains assisted in counting the ballots.

Eleventh. There is evidence that a Democratic challenger assisted in counting the ballots.

Twelfth. There is evidence that a Democratic challenger acted as a Democratic election judge while the judge went for luncheon.

Thirteenth. One election judge gave a statement in which it is stated that there were about 250 Democratic ballots cast and only about 80 or 90 marked their own ballot.

Fourteenth. There is evidence that when one voter gave his name he was challenged by one of the Republican judges because the name he gave was that of a brother-in-law of the Republican judge. The Democratic challenger then called out another name for the voter and he was permitted to vote.

Fifteenth. There is evidence that many ballots were cast for persons who could not be found at the addresses on the register books and in many cases people at the listed residence stated the person had moved away long before the date of the election.

The file in the office of the Attorney General contains evidence of other violations of law and misconduct on the part of the election officials and others. I disagree wholly with the Attorney General that the evidence in his possession does not establish any activity in violation of Federal law or that would affect the congressional or senatorial contest. The United States Supreme Court has held that section 4 of article I of the Constitution authorizes Congress to regulate primary as well as general elections where the primary is by law made an integral part of the election machinery, and has sustained a conviction of election officials brought under the conspiracy statutes where election officials were charged with willfully altering and falsely counting and certifying the ballots cast in a primary election (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)). An unsigned document lying in the Attorney General's files contains this interesting and significant conclusion:

It is not intended that any reflection should be cast upon the character of any one individual. However, when it is considered that old and influential members of the Pendergast machine held such strategic positions as chairman of the board of election commissions and district attorney, plus the open endorsement of the machine candidate by the national head of the Democratic Party, it would seem to necessarily follow that election judges, precinct captains and ward

bosses might be lulled into a sense of false security and feel that there was tacit approval from higher up to obtain certain ends, regardless of the means employed.

STATE AUTHORITIES FIND EVIDENCE OF FRAUD

Where the Department of Justice could find no evidence to justify action, the State authorities have found in the same primary election evidence aplenty. James G. Kimbrell, the prosecuting attorney of Jackson County, has presented evidence of election frauds occurring in the primary election last year to a State grand jury. There have been 42 indictments returned against 39 individuals on the basis of evidence presented concerning illegal acts in only 9 precincts. The grand jury has made a recount of some of the ballots and released the results of the recount in 6 precincts of the Fifth Congressional District. These figures show that Roger C. Slaughter, seeking reelection as a nonmachine candidate, had been given a total of only 54 votes in the official returns, but that he actually received 118 votes. Jerome Walsh, also a nonmachine candidate, had been allotted only 55 votes on the official count, but he actually received 170 votes. Enos Axtell, the Pendergast machine candidate was credited with 1,501 votes on the official count, but he actually received only 1,319 votes. The net change in result from these 6 precincts totals 361 votes or an average of over 60 votes per precinct. This takes into consideration only the change resulting from an honest count of the ballots as they were marked. It does not take into consideration that apparently many of the ballots were marked contrary to the wishes of the voters as the result of a conspiracy between the persons at the polls to have ballots marked by election judges. It also does not take into consideration the probability of ghost votes.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SHOULD INVESTIGATE

It is apparent from the foregoing that the Attorney General has had the benefit of three reports of separate investigations concerning violations of law in the primary election in Kansas City last year, namely, the report made by the House Investigating Committee, the report made by the FBI, and the report made by the Kansas City Star. I have called upon him to take action as shown in the foregoing correspondence. The Kansas City Star, on April 24, in a lead editorial addressed, "Attention, Tom Clark," concluded as follows:

Mr. Attorney General, we have had a fraudulent election in Kansas City. A local prosecutor and a local grand jury are doing the whole job with the skimpy help that can be provided by county funds. They aren't even receiving the technical help from the FBI that is usually given local governments in case of emergency.

Isn't this the time for action?

I have been reluctant to speak publicly of this matter. It now is clear that the Attorney General does not intend to take action. I know that I would be remiss in my public duty if I failed to bring this critical situation to the attention of the Senate.

Free elections, with ballots freely cast and freely counted, are the bedrock of our free institutions. The moment we cannot defend and maintain the sanctity of the ballot box from evil forces, our freedom is lost. It was not Philip, we are told, but Philip's gold that took the cities of Greece.

Boss Pendergast, the First, said in effect to the people: "So long as I count the ballots, what are you going to do about it?" The answer in 1936 was a stern and relentless enforcement of the law by the law officers of the United States.

Ten years later, in 1946, Boss Pendergast, the Second, again said in effect to the people: "So long as I count the ballots, what are you going to do about it?" The answer of the law-enforcement officers of the United States in 1946 and since has been inaction—total and utter inaction. They have done nothing.

And so, Mr. President, I submit a resolution the purpose of which is to authorize and direct the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to ascertain if the laws of the United States have been enforced with reference to the primary election in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri in the year 1946, and, if not, why not.

The resolution (S. Res. 116) submitted by Mr. KEM was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation concerning the failure of the Attorney General of the United States and the Department of Justice to act with respect to alleged irregularities in the Democratic primary election held in the Fifth Congressional District for Missouri on August 6, 1946, with a view to ascertaining whether the Attorney General and the officers of the Department of Justice have properly performed their duties with respect to the investigation and prosecution of any violations of law which may have occurred in connection with said primary election. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

First. An editorial from the Kansas City Star dated April 24, 1947, entitled "Attention—Tom Clark"; and

Second. Excerpt headed "Fifth Congressional District of Missouri" from House Report No. 2739 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Report of the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1946, of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Pursuant to House Resolution 645."

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of April 24, 1947]

ATTENTION—TOM CLARK

Just a suggestion to United States Attorney General Tom Clark:

Maybe it is time for a second look at the Kansas City vote frauds of the last August primary.

We realize, Mr. Attorney General, that the Federal Government can't be responsible for frauds in local political races, although it does sometimes let the FBI give a little technical help. A local grand jury has already showed that one local nomination was stolen in just nine precincts and there is no longer any real doubt that a few more precincts will prove that a second nomination was stolen.

But we know you will be interested in the Kansas City race for Congress, because that involved a Federal office. Just six precincts in Roger Slaughter's district, reported by the grand jury, show that Enos Axtell was given a net advantage of 361 votes by false returns. Now 361 fraudulent votes in six precincts averages around 60 per precinct, and that is quite a slug. Precinct by precinct the frauds on the congressional race have held up very well with the frauds on local races.

Out here in the hinterland most people seem to think the local grand jury has already turned up enough evidence to justify you in turning loose the FBI for a thorough Federal investigation.

The local grand jury investigation has only started. At this rate it might possibly disclose enough frauds to show that Roger Slaughter was actually nominated for the United States Congress and that the nomination was stolen for Enos Axtell. This happens to have been the No. 1 race in the national congressional headlines. Wouldn't that be an embarrassing situation for an attorney general sitting back in Washington and insisting that there is nothing here to justify a Federal investigation? Wouldn't it be much better to let the FBI go to work and give the Federal Government credit for helping to clean up the mess?

We realize that to make vote fraud cases in Federal court you must be able to show conspiracy, but that isn't a very impressive obstacle to the people of Kansas City. You see, we have been through all this before. Several years ago another attorney general saw evidence of fraud and turned loose the FBI to find out whether or not there had been any conspiracies to defraud the voters. They were found by the scores. The previous attorney general didn't wait for a local grand jury to show him what the score was. You have the benefit of a local grand jury that is going right ahead to do all it can.

For a reflection of local attitude we need only point to the statement of the county chairman of your own political party who said that the principle of free elections cannot be violated without the guilty persons suffering the consequences. And he added, "I am proud to say that the Democratic Party as such neither condones nor tolerates fraudulent elections."

Mr. Attorney General, we have had a fraudulent election in Kansas City. A local prosecutor and a local grand jury are doing the whole job with the skimpy help that can be provided by county funds. They aren't even receiving the technical help from the FBI

that is usually given local governments in case of emergency.

Isn't this the time for action?

[From H. Rept. No. 2739, 79th Cong.]

FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Two investigators were sent to Kansas City, Mo., to investigate the Democratic primary election in the Missouri Fifth District, which was held August 6, 1946, in response to a telegram received from one of the unsuccessful candidates for nomination and numerous newspaper articles which appeared in the only daily newspaper published in that city, alleging excessive expenditures, the improper counting of ballots, impersonation of voters by unknown individuals, illegal influencing of the vote, and names of persons being voted who should have been stricken from the list of voters by reason of change of address, death, and other causes. The investigators found numerous instances of irregularities in the conduct of the election. Persons interviewed unanimously agreed that an improper method of counting the ballots was employed in many polling places.

The method used was commonly known as the straights and splits. This is a procedure by which, after the vote is completed, ballots are divided into straight tickets, which are supposedly ballots cast for machine candidates, and splits, which are ballots cast by voters who desire to deviate from the machine ticket.

These ballots, after being separated, are then counted by one or two of the four election judges and tabulated by the clerks, instead of all ballots being counted by all judges, as is required by law.

Another method employed was to have the Republicans count the Republican votes and the Democrats count the Democratic votes, which is not in accordance with the Missouri law. The investigators obtained a sufficient quantity of evidence concerning improper methods of counting, coercion, and fraudulent procedures to justify the committee's referring the entire report and file to the Attorney General.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the time remaining between now and the hour of 3:30 o'clock is equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The bill is before the Senate, and is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer, and ask that it be stated down to line 5, and I ask that the remainder of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD, after which I shall proceed to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment down to line 5.

Mr. KILGORE's amendment entire is as follows:

Strike out all of section 3, all of subsection (b) of section 4, and all of section 5.

Renumber as section 3 the present section 4.

Strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 4. The Foundation shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Administrator shall serve at the pleasure of the President. All the powers and duties vested in the Foundation shall be exercised and carried out by the Administrator, subject, however, to the conditions prescribed in section 6."

Renumber present section 7 to section 5.

Strike out all of present section 8 and insert in lieu thereof:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD AND DIVISIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator, in exercising his authority under this act, shall consult and advise with a National Science Board, and through the directors of the several divisions, with divisional scientific committees, on all matters of major policy, program, or budget. The Board shall consist of nine members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons who are especially qualified to promote the broad objectives of this act, plus the chairmen of the several divisional scientific committees. The scientific committee for each division, except the Division of National Defense, shall consist of not less than 5 and not more than 15 members appointed by the Administrator, with the advice and approval of the Board, except that the initial members of each such divisional scientific committee shall be appointed by the Administrator with the advice and approval of the Board members appointed by the President.

"The scientific committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of not more than 40 persons, of whom at least half shall be civilians appointed by the Administrator, with the advice and approval of the Board, and the remaining members shall be divided equally between such chiefs of such services and divisions of the War Department and such chiefs of such bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, may from time to time designate. There shall be within the divisional scientific committee for the Division of National Defense a five-man executive committee consisting of the chairman of the divisional scientific committee, as chairman; two civilian members elected annually by the civilian members of the divisional scientific committee; together with one Army officer, and one naval officer, each of whom should be charged in their respective Departments with the coordination of research, designated by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

"Each divisional scientific committee shall be reasonably representative of the major scientific interests and functions of its division. Members of the Board appointed by the President and members of the divisional scientific committees appointed by the Administrator shall serve for 3-year terms, except that (1) at least one-third of such members originally appointed shall be appointed for 1-year terms, and at least another third for 2-year terms, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. No person thus appointed to serve as a member of the Board or any divisional scientific committee shall be eligible again to serve as a member of the same group until the expiration of 1 year after his term has expired, except that a member appointed for a term of less than 3 years may be appointed for a succeeding 3-year term.

"(b) The Board and each divisional scientific committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall devise its own rules of procedure. The Board and each such committee shall meet at the call of its own chairman or at such time as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year, including at least once each calendar quarter. Vacancies in the membership of the Board or of any divisional scientific committee shall not impair the authority of the remaining members to execute its functions, and a majority of the members of the Board or any divisional scientific committee as constituted at any given time shall constitute a quorum.

"The Board shall appoint and prescribe the duties of an executive secretary of its own selection who shall receive compensation at a rate, not exceeding $12,000 per annum, to be fixed by the Board. The Administrator shall pay the compensation of such executive secretary and may furnish the Board and the divisional scientific committees such additional personnel and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Board and the divisional scientific committees.

"(c) The Board shall continuously survey the activities and management of the Foundation and shall periodically evaluate the achievements of the Foundation in accomplishing the objectives of this act. Each divisional scientific committee shall survey continuously the scientific field which it encompasses, shall undertake to determine the specific scientific needs of such field, and shall evaluate proposed programs and projects. The Board and each divisional scientific committee shall, upon its own initiative or upon request by the Administrator, make appropriate recommendations and reports relating to its duties and findings. The Board and each such committee shall have full access to all information in the possession of the Foundation.

"(d) The Administrator shall render an annual report to the President and the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate. The Board shall annually and at such other times as it deems necessary make such recommendations to the President and the Congress as in its opinion will further the objectives of this act. The annual report shall include such independent recommendations concerning the budget, organization, and management of the Foundation, and such other recommendations as the Board and the divisional scientific committees may deem necessary to better effectuate the purposes of this act. The annual report shall include whatever dissenting opinions may be submitted for that purpose by individual members of the Board or of the divisional scientific committees. The Administrator shall, whenever requested by the Board or any divisional scientific committee, publish and disseminate widely any recommendations or reports prepared by the Board or such committee.

"(e) Members of the Board and of the divisional scientific committees shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be reimbursed for their necessary travel and other expenses incurred in the work of the Board or of any such committee. Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the Board or any divisional scientific committee, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices, nor, except for representatives of the War and Navy Departments on the scientific committee for the Division of National Defense shall they in their services as such members serve as representatives of the Government agency by which they are employed.

"(f) Members of the Board and of any divisional scientific committee established under the provisions of this act, and any other officers or employees of the Foundation shall be chosen without regard to their political affiliations and solely on the basis of their demonstrated capacity to carry out the purposes of the Foundation and their fitness to perform the duties of their office.

"(g) The Administrator may create such specialized additional advisory committees or employ the services of such advisory personnel as he may deem necessary to better effectuate the objectives of this act. Persons so employed shall be reimbursed for their necessary travel and other expenses incurred in the work of the Foundation. Such persons may be noncompensated or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $50 for each day of service. Members of the Board and of the divisional scientific committees, and any other person serving in an advisory capacity pursuant to this section, may serve as such without regard to the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C., secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, except insofar as such sections may prohibit any such person from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested."

Substitute "Administrator" for "Director" on page 15, line 13; page 16, lines 5, 11, 15, 23, 24, and 25; and on page 17, lines 2 and 3.

On page 16, lines 23 and 24, strike out "with the approval of the executive committee."

Strike out all of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 15.

Renumber appropriately sections and subsections.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, this amendment goes back to the administrative details contained in Senate bill 1850 which was passed in the Senate last year. I think the amendment is highly important. It does not represent an effort to put politics into the Foundation, but to maintain control of public funds in the proper hands. A parallel to the bill, as pending, if not amended, would be to have the American Bar Association tell the President whom to appoint to the Supreme Court of the United States, and then to name a committee to tell the Justices so appointed what they should do.

Under the bill as it now stands the Foundation, the members of which are to be selected by the President, it is true, but under the general guidance of the National Academy of Sciences and a few other organizations, would do what was done in Germany in their city administrations, which I do not think were very successful, namely, select a working group of nine, which group would tell the President whom he should appoint Director, and the Director thus appointed would be subject to the orders of the working group of nine. The worst feature of it, Mr. President, would be that the working group of nine would be nonpaid scientists, men not on the public pay roll. With all the experience we had during the last war with dollar-a-year men at a time when patriotism was paramount, it is now proposed to return to that system in the handling of public funds. It is proposed to hold the President responsible for the operation of an agency over which he has no control, and likewise, the Congress is to be held responsible. I say, Mr. President, we insult the democratic processes of government when we say to the people of the United States that the President whom they elected is not a fit man to nominate the administrator of a Government agency spending Government funds. We insult the Senate of the United States when we require it to pass on those whom these various organizations pick out to be members of the Foundation, and call that "appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." In other words it is proposed that we as Senators, shall take the responsibility for the work of individuals over whom we have no control, except to approve or eliminate appropriations after we have had time to study the annual report which is submitted to the President by the Foundation. Some people talk about socialism and communism, and yet they urge a system of this type.

Mr. President, I have found that commissions and committees in Government are excellent when it comes to reaching judicial decisions. That is why we have nine Justices on the Supreme Court. That is why we have men on public service commissions who do excellent work. We have a group of men on the Federal Communications Commission who do excellent work. But those men are appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as contemplated by the founding fathers. They are not selected by a special group for whose benefit the money is being expended.

So I feel that the method suggested in the pending bill, if unamended, goes contrary to the theory of the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States. It is class legislation of the first water. It is the very thing against which we all inveigh at times when it happens to step on our toes.

I have no personal interest in how the Foundation shall be operated, except for the fact that I do have a certain pride in democratic processes of government, processes which have been found to operate for the best interests of the greatest number at all times.

The plan suggested in the amendment I have offered is a sound governmental plan for the handling of educational and research work. It is a plan which was agreed upon by a composite group last year representing science, government, and the public. It contemplates an administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It provides, at the same time, that the President shall consider all nominations submitted by the National Academy of Sciences and kindred organizations. It contemplates an advisory board which will have much policy making to do, but the advisory board will be selected by the President.

I remember that when we were first discussing this question scientists said that it should be provided in the law that all the members of the organization should be scientists. Then a dispute arose as to what kind of scientists—whether they should all be mathematicians, physicists, pathologists, bacteriologists, or social scientists. At that time I called attention to the fact that the Constitution of the United States does not provide that a man must be a lawyer to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, but that no President had ever failed to appoint an eminent lawyer to that high post. We have never attempted to say, "You must appoint a lawyer to this job." We have trusted to the fact that even politicians are honest. They have as much pride in their work as have scientists and others.

The bill contemplates the true scientific level, the planning level, completely staffed by scientists who lay the plans, prepare the programs, and determine the details for submission to the board of nine and to the Administrator. Under the terms of the amendment, the Administrator would be truly an administrator. He would handle funds and make decisions. There is a difference between administration and judicial judgment. Judicial judgment can be arrived at by groups, thereby obtaining a cross-section of opinion; but administration by a good executive is a one-man job. I have always opposed the idea of divided responsibility in administration. If there are three men in charge of administration, it is very easy to blame everything on the other fellow. If a one-man administrator makes a mistake, the responsibility can be fixed on him. If the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States are to be held responsible, certainly they should have something to say about the organization.

The trouble with the bill as it now stands unamended is that we go back to the system which has been tried and has not worked in time of peace. This is not a wartime agency, Mr. President. This is a peacetime agency and a wartime agency. The National Academy of Sciences was founded in 1863, to do work in wartime, and it was organized somewhat along the lines of the present plan—a group of unpaid scientists giving their services in time of war. That agency was not used in any wars after the War Between the States, and it was not used in peace, except for decisions on scientific questions propounded by the President or by Congress. Gradually it has become a very fine honorary group of most eminent and distinguished scientists. Membership is much sought as a mark of distinction. But we did not rely on the National Academy of Sciences to handle the scientific program for World War II, or for World War I, or for the Spanish-American War. In World War I we established another group—still of unpaid men, still a committee form of organization—and it did very good work during World War I. Then it ceased to function, and it has not functioned since. It did not even furnish us a good nucleus for World War II. Therefore, we established the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which was more successful. Why? Because one man, and one man alone, ran the show. He was Dr. Vannevar Bush. While he had committees, he made the final decisions.

That is the point I wish to make. In the organization of this Foundation I want to follow the methods which have been tried by the Government for generations and have been found to work well. They follow the principle under

which we operate this Government. Should not the expenditure of public funds be handled by representatives of the people? If we were to let a contract to a large plant to manufacture something, we would not turn over to that plant the drawing of the specifications. We would not turn over to the same plant the handling of funds, the allocation of orders, or the scheduling of deliveries. If we are operating in the interest of government, we prepare our own plans and specifications and check the entire operation to see that the plans and specifications are followed. That is what I am trying to accomplish in this instance. The Congress of the United States contemplates appropriating funds for the betterment of the United States. The money belongs to the people of the United States, and not to a small group.

If we are to have a planning level, planning groups of scientists, to make sure that the funds are properly handled and properly expended, the control of the funds and reports to the administration should be handled by the people, or by officials elected by the people who dig down in their pockets to raise the funds—and how deeply they dig. The benefits from such funds should go to those self-same people—Mr. John Citizen and Mrs. Mary Citizen, the people of the United States. They are the people who elect the President of the United States, who send us to the United States Senate, and who choose Members of the House of Representatives. Imagine the situation we would be in if a small hand-picked group could tell the President, "You must select your Cabinet officers from among the names we submit," and could say to the Senate, "This is the group whom you must confirm." How could we say that such a procedure would be with the advice and consent of the Senate? Never were words more ineptly or misleadingly used. If we are going to do it in this way, in God's name let us not direct the Senate to have anything to do with it, and let us not put any blame on the President in going through the formality of having him submit a name selected by someone else. It is said that he must accept a list. It is not a large list. It might contain only two names; it might conceivably have but one name. He must choose from that list.

So, Mr. President, I urge the amendment of Senate bill 526 by striking out section 3, all of subsection (b) of section 4, all of section 5, and inserting the section 4 which is set forth in the amendment which I sent to the desk.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say, as one of the sponsors of this bill, that some may think that because I have urged and supported some amendments I am not in favor of the bill. I think the principal sponsors of the bill will understand that I am strongly supporting the bill and its purposes as I supported the bill of last year. I stated at the time we discussed the reintroduction of the bill this year that the question of its administration was one upon which there was a difference of opinion, and I favored the type of administration set forth in the bill last year. I think it has been stated heretofore that in the discussion of the bill last year there was some difference of opinion between the two schools of thought at that time, which schools of thought were informally identified as the Kilgore school of thought, on the one hand, and the Magnuson school of thought, on the other.

I do not think that this question is one of the greatest importance, in that, regardless of what kind of administration we want, in the final analysis it is a question of the capacity, character, and intelligence of the Administrator, whoever he may be and whether he be appointed by the President or by the Board.

I think it is important to consider the fact that we are venturing into a new field in undertaking the support of scientific research by the Government on a fairly broad scale. I think the more orthodox way, the way in which we are more accustomed to administer such programs, is that which is contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. We proceed in this kind of activity as we do in others, by a method of trial and error. I have no doubt that the bill which we shall finally pass will contain things which a year or two from this time we shall wish to amend. I think the sounder and more orthodox way to approach it is to adopt the usual method of an administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate or of an advisory board. If that shall prove to be unworkable, I would be willing that it be changed. I recall a fairly recent incident in connection with the establishment of a board of three to administer the Surplus Property Act. It was only a few months after the beginning of the operation of the act that it became quite unworkable and had to be changed to provide for a single administrator. The reasons have already been very clearly stated by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. It is a question of the responsibility, the way in which we can identify the place where the errors or maladministration arise, and then of remedying the situation in a wise way.

I have a memorandum which was sent to me by the chairman of the Washington Association of Scientists, which, in a very few words, sets out, I think, the differences in the view of the sponsors of the bill and other Members who are interested in it. I should like to read the memorandum for the information of the Senate. It is a very short statement. It reads as follows:

> Analysis of the debate on S. 526 reveals a conflict between two basic philosophies. One philosophy is that science is a national resource; that the raw material of this resource is the Nation's scientific manpower; and that, as a vital national resource, its furtherance should be entrusted to an authority directly responsible to the elected representatives of the people—the Congress and the President. The other philosophy is that science is an auxiliary to the development of industry and the national defense; that the raw materials are the existing organizations and facilities for research; and that these organizations should further the development of science with a minimum of control by the elected representatives of the people.

I think that is a fairly good statement, if our purpose is primarily to produce specific results in science, such as were efficiently produced in the war. Outstanding examples are the atomic bomb, the proximity fuse, and many mechanical devices in radar, and so forth. If that be our purpose, there is no doubt in my own mind that the administration of the bill as it is now written is probably the most efficient. But it does not seem to me that that is the sole or even the primary purpose of the research program. As the memorandum says, it looks more to the development of the Nation's scientific manpower; in other words, to cultivating the ground and preparing it for production of the desired results at a future time. We are not looking to the immediate future for specific scientific results; we are trying to promote a condition in this country favorable to the development of scientific results in the future.

I continue reading from the memorandum:

> If the objective of national science legislation is to develop science as a national resource, careful consideration indicates that its provisions would be drawn to insure the following:
>
> (a) Long-range planning for the whole field of science.
>
> (b) Encouragement and support for the most widespread scientific activity throughout the Nation.

I might say in regard to (b) that that is the thought which I had in mind and which I think all Members had in mind in voting for wide distribution of the fund under the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The memorandum continues as follows:

> (c) Close supervision and control by the elected representatives of the people.
>
> (d) Denial to special interests of disproportionate influence in formulation of policy, or of disproportionate benefits.
>
> On the other hand, if the objective of national science legislation is to support science as an auxiliary to industry and national defense—

I add that national defense is certainly one of the objectives of either school of thought—

> consideration indicates that its provisions would be drawn to insure the following:
>
> (a) Close coordination with, and control by, the recognized authorities in science, industry, and national defense.

That is in accord with the pending bill.

> (b) Relative independence of science from the people and their representatives in the interests of security, immediate efficiency, and avoidance of political regimentation of science.

Mr. President, I hope it is clear that the criticism of this bill from my point of view goes to its ultimate objective, not to the efficacy of the provisions of the bill in achieving the objective which this particular school of thought has in mind. Paragraph (b) which I have just read illustrates that very well. If what we are after is immediate efficiency and avoidance of political regimentation of science, as the immediate results from this re-

search program, then I think the pending bill is correctly drawn.

I read further:

(c) Concentration or support in existing organizations and centers where concrete results may be rapidly attained.

Both philosophies hold that there shall be a foundation for the development of science—

There is no disagreement among us as to that. There is certainly none between me and the Senator from New Jersey. I agree with him that there should be a foundation—

but conflict on the form of administration and the basis for its distribution of funds.

That is the basic difference.

I read further:

Those who regard science as a national resource desire a single administrator appointed by the President and assisted by a part-time advisory board. They favor distribution of a portion of the funds on a geographic and population basis. Those who hold to the opposing philosophy desire a large part-time administrative board steered by a small executive committee, supervising a full-time director. They see no need for a specific provision as to the distribution of funds on a geographic or population basis.

In our opinion, we cannot, as a nation, afford to regard the National Science Foundation as other than a means to the development and control of science as a national resource. We are led to this conclusion by the events of the past decade and by analysis of the debates in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses on national science legislation.

With reference to the specific points at issue, the testimony of these debates has shown:

1. The diffusion of administrative responsibility through the mechanism of a large board, with a small executive committee supervising a director, eliminates the direct line of responsibility to Congress and the President. It reduces public ability to examine the performance of the board and assess individual responsibility. On the other hand, a single administrator or very small commission will provide a direct line of responsibility to the Congress and President, and will make possible ready removal of the responsible individual in case of maladministration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield 5 minutes additional to the Senator from Arkansas, inasmuch as I believe that will constitute a fair distribution of the time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the last paragraph which I have read sums up, to my mind, the principal reason for the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. The argument is exactly the same as the one we went over last year time and again, and I thought we finally resolved the differences which existed between the two schools of thought. It seems to me that it simply insures that in the beginning of this very significant experiment in governmental support of scientific research, there shall be some control by the Congress and, I think, some guidance in setting out along the right path.

As this Foundation matures and gains experience, I have no doubt it will develop an administration which will achieve much greater independence than I would visualize it would have at the beginning. I, for one, am not afraid of any so-called pork-barreling or boondoggling in connection with the bill. I think there has arisen in this country a fallacious belief that anything which happens to have any connection with political institutions is necessarily inefficient. To the contrary, Mr. President, I think we can look through our Government and in many cases can find a great many efficient institutions—which, unfortunately, are not referred to in the press or thought of by the people; they are concerned only with those which happen to fall into bad times or bad ways.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that the way now proposed is a much more satisfactory way to begin this very important program. I think it would receive the most careful attention of the Government, including the President and the Senate, and that we would have a great interest in it, and that it would be devoted to the purposes which I have just stated, namely, the long-time development in the United States of a scientific group of persons and an interest in science and an emphasis upon the utilization of the scientific approach in the solution of many of our problems, for example, problems of government.

Before I take my seat, I may say that I have prepared and hope to offer an amendment which would include in the scope of this Foundation the social sciences. By "social sciences," I do not mean, of course, simply what we commonly call social welfare or social work in the slums. I mean the question of politics and economics, in respect to which the research which has been made in the United States is most deficient; and it is from those questions that most of our troubles arise. I look upon this bill not only as a means of promoting a better understanding of the physical world and of the laws of nature, as we think of them in connection with the physical sciences, but also as a means of leading to an understanding of the social sciences, the things which have to do with the relationships of human beings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have understood from the Senator from West Virginia that it is agreeable to him to have each side in regard to this amendment take half an hour, and then to have a vote taken on the amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Those of us on my side of the question will take half an hour on the amendment at this time, and then I understand the Senate will immediately vote on the amendment.

So now I wish to proceed to discuss the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the National Science Foundation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it the understanding that the Senator from New Jersey is about to discuss that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has just announced that it has been tentatively agreed that each side will take 30 minutes on the first amendment, offered by the Senator from West Virginia, and then the Senate will vote on the amendment, and thereafter the Senate will proceed to consider the other amendments of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me, I should like to say that earlier today he and I discussed an amendment to the bill which I think he is ready to accept. I should like to ask whether it will be agreeable to the Senator from New Jersey to have that amendment presented now, or whether he would prefer to have it presented following his speech.

Mr. SMITH. I am perfectly willing to have the amendment presented now, if the Senator from Wyoming desires to take only a few minutes in presenting it, and then we can accept the amendment, because my speech may not consume the full half hour allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From whose time is the time to be used by the Senator from Wyoming to be taken? Is it to be taken from the time of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming, to permit him to present the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey yields 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Unanimous consent is required, since another amendment is pending. Without objection, the amendment will be received and the clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of constitutional or statutory law, or any court decision, affecting the issuance or use of patents."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before discussing this amendment, I wish to say that I have previously submitted it to the Senator from New Jersey. He has just now indicated to me that he rather questions the inclusion in the amendment of the words "or any court decision." I should like to state to the Senator why I included those words.

Under the method which was followed during the war by the Army, the Navy, and the Office of Scientific Research and

Development, those Government agencies have from time to time made contracts with individuals and organizations which have been working on scientific development. Some of these contracts provide that the patents which are developed shall be the property of the United States. Some of them provide that the patents shall not be the property of the United States, but shall be the property of the contractor, with a reserved right in the United States to use the patent under certain circumstances. All kinds of variations can be made.

The language of section 11 (a) is so broad that I have been very fearful, as indicated in the debate yesterday, that unless some modification is inserted it will constitute an authority to the Commission to modify existing law and, I think, to modify court decisions.

There is no statutory law of Congress dealing with the relation of employer and employee in various research laboratories, so that unless we include the words "or court decision" the Commission would have the power, in making these contracts, to disregard the Case law which has been developed under the decisions of the courts. I will say to the Senator that that was the only reason why I included that language.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there not a general statute that provides that inventions by employees of the Government shall be the property of the Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There have been some statutes, but I doubt whether they are general. There has been an effort to develop that idea.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not looked into the matter, but I had an impression that there was a general statute, under which, for instance, if an Army or Navy officer invented something, it would belong to the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not my impression that there is a statute so broad as that.

Mr. SMITH. I remind the Senator from Wyoming that I agreed to a 5-minute interlude for his amendment, and he is taking time out of the time I allowed him to insert his amendment.

I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that as I first read the proviso, which I told him I would agree to, it merely expressed what I felt all along was the intention of section 11 (a). There was no intention whatever to have section 11 (a) interfere in any way with existing constitutional or statutory law. The words "or court decision" disturbed me a little, because there are varying court decisions, and it might be that the Foundation would want to make some sort of a contract which might conceivably agree with one court decision and disagree with another. My idea was to avoid all conflict with constitutional or statutory law. Obviously we do not in any way want to bring about such conflict. I have said right along that any changes which have to be made in our patent laws should be made through the regular patent-law channels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted the senior Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the question at the moment for me to decide is whether I want to let more time to be used in discussing this interlude, or go ahead with the discussion of the pending amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the Senator not discuss my amendment until he has finished what he wishes to say on the other.

Mr. SMITH. I think it is wiser to follow that course because of the limited time we have.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. SMITH. I see that the Senator from West Virginia wishes to make some remarks on this subject, and if he will postpone his discussion, we will recur to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming after the disposition of the pending amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to do that.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Indiana, who I understand desires to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to have unanimous consent that the members of the subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Rules and Administration Committee be excused from the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call to the attention of the Senator the unfortunate effect such request will have upon the minds of some of our good friends in the Press Gallery. Yesterday afternoon we had a discussion of this matter——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield, out of his time, for this discussion?

Mr. JENNER. I withdraw the request.

Mr. SMITH. I cannot yield further, because our time is limited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana withdraws his request. The Senator from New Jersey will proceed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the amendment which is proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and which has been supported in part by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], goes to the very heart of the controversy which we had last year, and which we are having again this year. That controversy is over the set-up, over what kind of organization we feel would be most effective to bring about an advance in scientific research in the United States.

The Senator from West Virginia proposes an ordinary governmental set-up, an Administrator, with an advisory group of scientists. He would vest in the Administrator the power of determination of policy, the working out of the program in line with any view the administration might have.

I can well realize the feeling administrative leaders have in this matter. They would like to control in the situation, and with my knowledge of scientific men, and as the result of my discussion of this matter with groups of all sorts and kinds of scientists—engineers, chemical scientists, biological scientists, physical scientists, and others—I am sure they simply will not be able to function if they feel they are to be an advisory group to some central set-up, or an administrator representing the administration. What they feel is vitally necessary is that the Foundation, composed of eminent scientists, distinguished men, men representing all the scientific groups, shall be the determining authority as to the policy while we are experimenting to find the best way of helping and developing basic science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator first to say the administrator would have control of the determination of policy, but the amendment provides for an advisory board of 9, and it seems to me that is not at all unusual. The bill as written provided for a 9-man executive committee. The main difference is in the separation of the administration from the policy determination, and that seemed to me to be good practice.

Mr. SMITH. I have to disagree with the Senator when he suggests that there be an administrator appointed with simply an advisory board made up of scientists. Unless the scientists themselves are the center of gravity of the whole movement, so to speak, we are not going to achieve any results. That is my firm conviction. In the battle last year, when there was a tie vote, even at that time, when the political complexion of the Senate was different, I offered an amendment providing the kind of a set-up proposed by the pending bill, and there was a tie vote on it, and, of course, the amendment was lost, since it did not command a majority.

There is a very strong feeling throughout the country on this question, and it has gathered strength since the debate last year. One of the reasons for the House shelving the bill of last year was that it was not thought that the set-up provided was the best way to handle the matter. Unless the scientists are given the authority to determine where projects are to be carried on, and what young scientists should be helped; in other words, unless we put confidence in them, unless we allow them to fix the policy, and unless we make the administrative and executive officials subject to them, I cannot conceive of such a scheme possibly working. I do not believe any program that creates an administrator and merely gives scientists advisory functions can succeed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator likewise advise turning over the Federal Reserve Board to a similar group, composed of bankers, and trusting them to operate it?

Mr. SMITH. My answer is that there is no comparison between the proposed Foundation and other Government boards and agencies. As I said in the

debate yesterday, we are dealing with a baby, and we do not know the color of its eyes, or whether it is going to thrive, and we must do everything in our power to have it get along. Unless the care of this baby is put into the hands of those who know what should be done, we are going to have a failure from the start.

The fundamental thing in the bill I introduced for myself and several of my colleagues—and I notice the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was one of my colleagues who joined in introducing the bill—and so we can preserve our sense of humor in this contest—is the provision for a Foundation. Let me note that every member of the Foundation is to be appointed by the President of the United States. Let me note also that the executive committee is to be set up by the Foundation from among its own members, so it is bound to be composed of persons appointed by the President of the United States. The director is to be chosen by the Executive committee. So that the power to determine policy, at least in the initial stages of the work, is to be in a board composed of persons who are supposed to know about the subject with which they are dealing. There is no analogy whatever to the Federal Reserve Board or any other board. Those are fields that have been well experimented with, that people know about. Here we are in a totally new field.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We assume that bankers know their field. The Senator is in fact drawing a distinction between scientists and all other people, it seems to me, with respect to their knowledge and experience. I think there is a strong analogy to the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. SMITH. No; the Senator is entirely wrong as to my purpose. My purpose is simply to insist that we are dealing with a totally new field which the Government has really never before entered. When the atomic-energy project was undertaken, it was necessary to trust the scientists as to what ought to be done, and as to how it had to be done. If in that instance there had been appointed as administrator someone who knew nothing about science, there would have been great difficulty in the achievement of the desired results. After gaining experience with atomic energy, a special committee was created, which the Government thought capable of taking care of the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, it has been made very clear that the administrator was General Groves, and that the people who performed scientific work were scientists; they did not conduct the administrative work at all, if I understand the reports. However, that is not what I am saying; but, even assuming the Senator's premise, there was an administrator who did exactly what this administrator would be expected to do. Scientists were doing the scientific work, and the project progressed very well.

Mr. SMITH. I am simply stating to the Senator that unless there had been a group of scientists engaged to do the work, who had been working together and exchanging views and determining the policies, the result would have been different. No one man could have done that. General Groves could not overrule the scientists, who knew more about it than he did; and it was necessary to have men having such experience. My objection is that an effort apparently is being made to provide that one man shall conduct this work, the result of which would be to make the scientists dissatisfied and unwilling to go along.

I am simply saying at the initiation of this whole project, in my judgment it will be necessary to employ scientists and other public men; because the bill provides for others than scientists in the Foundation, persons who are to be appointed by the President of the United States. He can choose them with the idea in mind of getting a group of men together to whom he will entrust the determination of policies. Those men must be given the right to determine policies and to run the show, so to speak, and they must be given virtually the right to hire and fire the man who is to be the director. He should simply be an executive officer employed to carry out the policy determined by the Foundation. The Foundation can function effectively through an executive committee. The executive committee, as I said, is to be a part of the Foundation, chosen from the Foundation and all its members are to be appointed by the President. There is plenty of Executive authority, and there is plenty of Executive responsibility, in the set-up that is called for by Senate bill 526 as it is presented to the Senate. I must take sharp exception to the idea that there should be a change in the approach to this matter, and that we should go back to a single administrator functioning with an advisory council of scientists.

I feel that this is so important that I only regret Senators are not here to listen to the debate, because this is of the very essence of the Foundation as it is seen by those of us who have been advocating this approach.

I see two of my colleagues present, who are with me on the bill. My time is running along. I should like very much to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I yield 5 minutes, or more, if the Senator wants it, on this point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while I have not heard the entire statement of the Senator from New Jersey on this point, I listened last year to several afternoons of discussion in committee on this very question as to whether the National Science Foundation should be directly under the control of one man appointed by the President, with only advice and suggestion coming from a group of affiliated scientists, or whether a designated group of scientists should have responsibility for the control of the policies of the Foundation. We must first examine to determine what are the objectives of the Foundation and, secondly, how the work is proposed to be conducted.

Very briefly, the objectives of the Foundation, as I have said during the course of the debate on this subject in the last few days, is to develop the knowledge of science through research, and to bring about, through the medium of scientific education, improvements and inventions which will promote our security, benefit the health, and add to the happiness of all our people. It is hoped that a greater number of young people may become interested in science, and it is thought that they will be encouraged to become educated along scientific lines if they know that a group of men under Government supervision are advancing the scientific effort. As I see it, that is the objective of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator will yield, I should like to have the position the Senator is discussing defined a little more clearly. That is my reason for interrupting. Is it the Senator's opinion that it is for the best interest of research to develop a continuing succession of scientifically trained men, rather than merely undertaking to foster a large number of inventions and discoveries? Men receive training through developing inventions and discoveries, but the greatest natural resource of science is that of the scientific mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from West Virginia has asked a very difficult question of a layman. I should say that the advancement of science comes from both factors. Some scientific knowledge is the result of accident—the result of accident, in the experience of minds which are scientifically trained. I have in mind penicillin, which was discovered by accident by Dr. Fleming, who was at the time engaged in other types of scientific work. That important discovery came as the result of an accident, because of a mind trained to look upon all scientific knowledge and data.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator knows that the occurrence to which he refers took place some 25 years before penicillin came into general use. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not agree with that, from my conversations with Dr. Fleming.

Mr. KILGORE. The fact is that the public was able to obtain penicillin only when men trained in research went into the question of production. We, of course, excel in the matter of applying research to production. What we must do is develop other men with minds capable of doing what Dr. Fleming did, who will in their explorations discover something of value, to be made use of, through applied research, in the production field. It was the development of the mind of Fleming that led to the discovery of penicillin, not merely the fact that an accident occurred, for Dr. Fleming would not have realized the importance of the occurrence but for his trained mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree entirely with the Senator about that. The advancement of scientific knowledge comes from minds that are attuned to the reception of scientific data from research work.

The other point in connection with the proposed Foundation is this: The Government is not going to undertake the

research work itself. It is going to parcel out the available funds, distributing the money to different agencies with which to perform the research work. That is a good deal different from the directorship of an agency or a department of Government. It is the handing out of an immense amount of Government funds to an agency, an institution, a man, or to an industry to carry on basic research. I was convinced after listening to the discussions last year that that is too great a responsibility to place solely in the charge of a director and that it should be undertaken by a group of men possessed of scientific knowledge, with the executive power in the hands of one man, to carry out the policies enunciated by the group.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator from Massachusetts missed my point. I think the bill as written is too restrictive in that the individual director is really answerable only to the Foundation, except for the writing of the report, and the only method the Government has of dealing with him is to deny him appropriations. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts think there should also be some control by the United States Government, as representing the people, over the activities of that particular individual?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; I do. I agree with the Senator on that point. But I have felt that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is approved, there will be sufficient power in the hands of the Government to have some control over the director.

Mr. KILGORE. But that amendment contains a clause providing that the director shall proceed under the direction of the Board only. It limits the direction to the Board. Let me cite a situation to the Senator. In the preliminary stages of World War II, when the President was obliged to get things done quickly, though with considerable congressional objection at times if the things the President was obliged to get done quickly were under the control of a board which was not in sympathy at all with the President's objectives, or under the control of a director who was not in sympathy with the President, the President could not have accomplished anything. On the other hand, the President did have agencies which were sympathetic with his objectives, and the President succeeded in having considerable work done without being obliged to secure appropriations for the doing of such work. That is why, while I agree with the statements made respecting the duties of the Board, and I agree in theory partially with the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Jersey, I still think that the President of the United States should have a responsibility respecting these matters, and the director should also have a responsibility to him and to the Congress as well as to the Board, and that that responsibility should not be waived so that it would place the Congress in the position that the only way it could do anything would be to say, "Very well, we will no longer continue the Foundation in existence. We will cut off its funds."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would not go so far as the Senator from West Virginia goes. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is now occupying the chair, and I have both been in executive positions. I know that I have felt, and I imagine that he has felt the same way, that so long as we have the appointive power over a man who is holding a certain position and have the opportunity to dispense with his services if we do not think he is performing his duties as we feel he should perform them, we have sufficient power to see that the Government's funds are protected and that, within reason, our policies are carried out.

We want the individual in this Scientific Foundation to be subject to the control of the scientific group, because that group has the knowledge which is necessary for successful operation of the Foundation. The Chief Executive of the country cannot have such knowledge, and does not have the time to obtain it. But if things are going haywire, if actions are taken which are contrary to his wishes, he can exercise control by simply telling this man, "If you do thus and so I am going to dispense with your services." That gives him a firing power, if you will, over the action of the committee if he cannot get his wishes carried out in any other way.

I myself cannot conceive of such a situation arising because any group of scientific leaders who get into that position with the President of the United States will have intelligence enough and patriotism enough to resign, thus permitting a new set-up. I cannot conceive of such a situation arising, but I can conceive of a situation arising where one man with one mind may lead the education of our scientific young men off on a tangent which may not be for the best interests of the security and the welfare of the country. That is why I support the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as I look about the floor of the Senate it occurs to me that a discussion of any feature of the bill at this time is utter futility. I know that the few remarks I might make will not convert my friend, the Senator from West Virginia. I am in accord with the Senator from Massachusetts, who has just spoken, as well as with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said a few moments ago that he was supporting my amendments. I am glad to hear that the Senator from Oregon is in accord with him.

Mr. CORDON. I am in accord with both, and incidentally and by the way, I am in agreement partly with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I had the privilege last year of serving on a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, which, sitting jointly with a like subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, made the initial investigation into the question of the advisability of establishng some type of science foundation. I gained the knowledge which came from listening to numerous scientists, men representing science in all its divisions, who appeared before that joint committee. I heard those who are teaching the sciences in the universities, those who are directing scientific research for sundry and divers commercial enterprises, those who are engaged in the work, or had been engaged in the work, of applying scientific knowledge to the production of articles and materials needed in the prosecution of the war.

From all the testimony adduced at those hearings I reached the conclusion, Mr. President, that what we were faced with the necessity of doing was not to furnish a great sum of money and pass it out to the educational institutions of the United States, to be used by those institutions for education in the field of science. As I saw the picture presented by those who were in a position to know, we were faced with a poverty of young people who had received the elementary training necessary to go forward into the more complex studies of the sciences themselves and the application of scientific knowledge. What we needed, according to the views of the best-informed men in the United States, was to bridge the gap resulting from taking our young people into the military service and breaking the continuity of their scientific education and training. Furthermore, it was said, and I can readily understand that it must be true, that the great holocaust of war had so disturbed the seats of scientific learning in Europe as to leave us without that reservoir upon which to draw, thus making it necessary that we not only regain what we had lost by the break resulting from the war, but increase our own reservoir, due to the fact that henceforth we must depend almost entirely upon sources within our own country for our scientific knowledge and the application thereof.

My approach to legislation to answer the problem—and legislation has no purpose at any time other than to answer a problem—was to create by law an agency which could step into the breach and evolve a program which would result in increasing the number of young people who had especial adaptability in the field of science and scientific exploration, to seek out such young people from among the myriads attending educational institutions, and then, by the aid of the Government purse, make it possible, as it were, to take those young minds into a hothouse and force the blossoming of scientific knowledge for the benefit of this country. It seemed to me that all the testimony indicated that that and that only was what was needed, and that that and that only would answer the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall be glad to grant the Senator 5 minutes more.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, already 35 minutes out of 65 have been used by the Senator from New Jersey. My understanding was that we were to vote at 1:30. It is now 1:33. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. KILGORE. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday called for a vote at 3:30 today. Because of that fact, a number of Senators are at luncheon, some of them not even in the Capitol. They are expecting to return at 3:30. I had said to the Senator from West Virginia that when we finished the discussion of any amendment I should be glad to take a vote immediately after having a quorum call. I should like to obtain a ruling from the Chair as to whether the unanimous-consent agreement means that we are to vote at 3:30, and not before 3:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair recalls, the President pro tempore announced yesterday that the unanimous-consent agreement meant that the vote would come at 3:30 or before.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Chair is entirely correct, with one exception. As I understand, the bill itself is not to be voted upon until 3:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. But amendments may be voted upon whenever they are reached for a vote.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the agreement was not to vote on the bill at 3:30, but to vote on the amendments at or before 3:30.

Mr. SMITH. That is true.

Mr. KILGORE. I am not objecting, except that the division of time is becoming somewhat confused. There are three other amendments to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read from the RECORD of yesterday:

> Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the unanimous-consent request correctly, any amendment can be voted on prior to 3 o'clock, but the bill itself will not be voted on before 3:30.
>
> Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct; together with any amendments that may be pending at that time. The vote on the amendments and the bill will start at 3:30.

The Chair interprets that to mean that any amendment ready for a vote can be disposed before 3:30, but the vote on the bill will come at 3:30.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for his explanation. I withdraw my objection to the calling of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian calls attention to the fact that the question of the time taken by the quorum call will also have to be settled. It is the ruling of the Chair that such time is equally chargeable to both sides.

Mr. SMITH. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are detained on business of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we have been debating the amendment which I have submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming is, by unanimous consent, pending. If the Senator from West Virginia wishes to have that amendment temporarily laid aside, in order to have the Senate vote on the amendment he has submitted, that may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we had agreed to vote at 1:30 on my amendment, which we have been discussing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing in the RECORD to that effect; but the Chair will say that, without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from West Virginia will now be submitted to the vote of the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair apprehends that the amendments submitted by the Senator from West Virginia can be voted upon en bloc.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; it is agreeable to have all of my amendments voted on en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be voted upon en bloc, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called.) I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and, if present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are detained on business of the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on official business at the Treasury Department.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

If present and voting the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—23

Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	McClellan	Pepper
Downey	McFarland	Russell
Fulbright	McGrath	Sparkman
George	McKellar	Stewart
Hill	McMahon	Taylor
Holland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Smith
Bushfield	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cain	Kem	Umstead
Capehart	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capper	Lodge	Watkins
Cooper	McCarthy	Wherry
Cordon	Magnuson	White
Donnell	Malone	Wiley
Dworshak	Martin	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Wilson
Ellender	Moore	Young
Ferguson	O'Daniel	
Flanders	Reed	

NOT VOTING—20

Barkley	Hawkes	O'Conor
Brewster	Hayden	Overton
Bridges	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Morse	

So Mr. KILGORE's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the period and to add the following: "*Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of constitutional or statutory law, or any court decision, affecting the issuance or use of patents."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he would be willing to omit the words "or any court decision." Those words seem to have aroused doubt in the minds of some Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand the reason for the doubt. I may say that I inserted the language at the suggestion of a distinguished Member of the majority. I am quite willing to drop the words indicated by the Senator from New Jersey, inasmuch as I believe that the remainder of the amendment is sufficiently broad to make it clear that there will be no authority to change the law, and of course the law is what the Supreme Court says it is.

Mr. SMITH. With the deletion of the words to which I have called attention, Mr. President, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I am entirely willing to accept the proviso.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I modify the amendment by eliminating the words referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming modifies his amendment as indicated.

Mr. REVERCOMB and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from New Jersey yield time?

Mr. SMITH. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as the amendment has now been changed it would read "to alter or modify any provision of constitutional or statutory law." I submit that the word "constitutional" has no place here, because there is certainly no need to express in any statute, such as the bill we are now considering, which may be enacted, that it shall not violate constitutional law. That is a prohibition which exists without expression in the statute. I call that to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey. It is purely surplusage, and unnecessary, and certainly it is unusual to say, that a statute shall not violate the Constitution. We know that it cannot. No one acting under any statute can transgress the prohibitions of the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I was endeavoring to comply with the intent of the framers of the suggestion, and the intent of the Senator from Wyoming. Of course, we do not intend to authorize the Foundation to make any contract that may modify any provision of law. If the Senator from Wyoming desires to have the expression in the amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I have no desire to be technical about the language and I quite agree that the word "constitutional" is surplusage. So, Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will consent, I shall be glad to modify the amendment so that it shall read as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to recognize any Senator except the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from West Virginia, under the unanimous-consent agreement. Time will have to be allotted by them.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, in view of the deletion of the words "or any court decision" from his amendment, which was just adopted. I should like to have it very clear that the Foundation is not given authority to make any arrangement, contractual or otherwise, which would permit the alteration of a principle of law as enunciated by the courts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As enunciated by a court of last resort. It should not be understood to apply to the decision of any court.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely wish to make it clear that authority is not given to alter deciding case law, at least decisions of the highest court.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am quite sure it does not do that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to substitute for section 6 the following:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of the Foundation, who, subject to the supervision and control of the executive committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate after receiving the recommendations of the executive committee, and he shall serve for a term of 4 years, subject to removal by the President. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. During the past 2 years, during all the hearings and conferences and discussions of the bill, there have been two schools of thought regarding the administration of the Foundation. One school of thought took the one extreme, namely, that the President should appoint a Director, and that the Foundation itself should act in an advisory capacity. That suggestion was more or less carried by the basic principles of the so-called Kilgore amendment.

There is another school of thought among those of us who have been interested in the bill, which took the other extreme as to the provision for administration which the bill should contain. In their view, the Foundation should be appointed by the President, and the members of the Foundation should in turn appoint their own director. The two views were not reconciled during the lengthy hearings. During that time, however, many of us, who felt that we did not want to jeopardize the basic purposes of the bill in the creation of a Foundation by failure of passage of the bill, felt that probably a compromise could be reached. Because of the contemplated expenditure of large sums of money by the Foundation, I personally have always felt that the Executive, whoever he might be, should have something to say about how the funds should be distributed. I personally favored the principle of the Kilgore amendment, but I realize that the bill itself might be in

jeopardy unless a compromise were reached with respect to the point now under consideration. Therefore, throughout the hearings, an effort was made to agree on a provision which would give the Executive certain control over the administration of the Foundation, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and certain control over the Director. This is the language that was more or less agreed upon by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, myself, and the Senator from Arkansas. I hope the Senate will accept it. It is a compromise, but all legislation is a matter of compromise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield in a moment. We thought the bill is so vitally important to the public welfare that we did not want to engage in a squabble over provisions relating to the question of administration, which, as I said, might jeopardize the passage of the bill. Although I am not in entire agreement, and although there are divergent views among Senators as to how the Foundation should be administered, we feel that the pending measure probably will serve the public to the best advantage, in view of the divergent opinions entertained. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, those of us who have not been on the committee try to console ourselves with the thought that we are as vitally interested in the bill as are those who are on the committee. The Senator from Washington talks about a compromise. As I understand the terms of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington, from a reading of it, it is to the effect that the President shall have the right to appoint a director, with the advice and consent of the Senate, after someone else passes on the question of whom that person shall be. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; that is not exactly correct. The amendment provides that the President shall receive recommendations from the Executive Committee, which recommendations he is free either to accept or to reject. He is not bound in any way to accept them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course; but does the Senator from Washington think that, after the committee makes a recommendation to the President, the President will do anything other than accept what has been recommended by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should imagine that normally the Foundation and the members of the Executive Committee would submit several names to the President, and that the President would select certain names, or would probably have in mind someone not recommended by the Executive Committee. The President would have full power to appoint the Administrator, but by the language of the amendment, the appointment would be made after recommendation by the Executive Committee. Possibly the President might feel morally obligated to accept the recommendation of the Executive Committee, but I do not imagine the Executive Committee would suggest one name only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe there would be any advice or consent of the Senate whatever, if the recommendation were to be made in that manner. I feel exactly as the Senator from Washington does; I believe that I can realize the importance of the proposed legislation, but I at least try to make myself believe that we are not trying to sell something to the Senate with the idea that the advice and consent of the Senate is involved. If a certain committee is to recommend and its advice is to be followed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I imagine this would be somewhat similar to the procedure in the appointment of Federal judges, whose nominations must be confirmed by the Senate; yet in many cases State bar associations make recommendations to the President, who accepts them or rejects them as he deems best. I am merely saying that the proposal is not entirely satisfactory to me, but we reached a point where, after the matter had been under debate for so long, the two positions seemed completely irreconcilible. The proposal is in the nature of a compromise, as I said. I appreciate that many Senators do not like to compromise views, but I have served for a long time in legislative bodies, and I realize that in order to accomplish the ultimate legislative goal, resort must frequently be had to compromise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Washington. I know that legislation is a matter of compromise, and I want to reach the point of compromise; but I do not want to feel that there is necessarily a compromise if we know what we are going to do. That is not a compromise, in my opinion. I want to reach approximately the same goal in this legislation as that which the Senator from Washington has in mind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I deliberately submitted this amendment after the vote was taken on the so-called Kilgore amendment, which represents one extreme. The bill itself represents the other extreme, giving the President no power at all and no say, beyond the appointment of members of the Foundation. My amendment steers a middle course. My purpose in submitting the amendment was that we might logically approach the question of administration of the Foundation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wanted to give a little more information to the Senator from New Mexico. Certain of the amendatory language now under discussion was argued last year. Under the pending proposal, the recommendations are not binding. The appointment is to be made "after receiving recommendations." I know that the Senator is, in addition, thinking of the language which says that the appointee shall serve at the pleasure of the President—or did the Senator change that to a 4-year term?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That has been limited to 4 years; which of course had in view the term of office of the President. That seemed to be only fair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wanted to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I attended the hearings last year, though not a member of the committee. This feature was discussed at great length. There was a great deal of controversy about it. The vote has already been taken on that. I hope the Senator will see the necessity of reaching some agreement such as the one proposed, because I think it is the only alternative to the complete isolation of the administration, except the drastic remedy of cutting off funds, which to me is no remedy at all. It is a matter either of killing the whole thing or of doing exactly what the group of professors dictate. I use the word "professor" with the greatest respect, having been one; but I know they are not a group apart, which I think has been the idea of certain of the sponsors of the bill, who apparently think that for some reason or other scientists have an entirely different attitude toward life, that they have a much higher degree of integrity, or selflessness, or whatever it may be called. I think professors are like other people. But, be that is it may, I believe the pending proposal is the nearest we can come to giving certain control to the Government of the United States in connection with the science program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make. I think I can go along with the general philosophy of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Arkansas. I can readily see plenty of justification for the making of recommendations, but the point I am trying to make is based on the argument by the Senator from Washington, that the proposal would give some say about the matter to the President and to the Senate of the United States. As I see it—and possibly it is correct—the recommendation should be made, possibly by those who would know more about the particular subject; but I do not want to foreclose the executive branch of the Government or the legislative branch, or the Senate, from saying, "This must be so." I have the greatest respect for scientists and for professors; and I follow their advice in many instances; but I do not think they are infallible. I hope the proposal submitted by the Senator from Washington will accomplish what I am sure we all desire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the views of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I said on Thursday last, I did not like the compromise embodied in the amendment; I do not like the amendment; but I recognize the practical difficulties which confront the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Arkansas, and I rather judge

that the amendment is the best compromise that can be worked out at this time.

I realize, furthermore, that the bill will have to go to the House, there to be considered by the House committee, acted on by the House, and the bill will most probably have to go to a conference committee.

Under the circumstances, as a practical matter, although as I said, I do not think the compromise is a good one, I much prefer the compromise to the provision now in the bill. I think the compromise is better than the provision carried in the bill, and therefore I shall support the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the views of both the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Mexico. The Kilgore proposal has been rejected by the Senate by a substantial majority. The bill provides no authority at all in the Executive. I might say that the President of the United States himself had some decided ideas on this matter. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I believe, conferred with the President about this matter some days ago. The language was not particularly agreed upon, but in general the amendment is written so as to carry out the general understanding had at the time, and I hope the amendment will be accepted by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think a word of explanation is needed in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. In order to make clear what the issue is, I shall read for the RECORD the language of section 6 as it appears in the bill proposed by the committee. It reads as follows:

SEC. 6. The Foundation shall have a chief executive officer, who shall be known as the Director of the Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"). The powers and duties of the Director shall be prescribed by the executive committee and shall be exercised and performed by him under the supervision of such committee. The Director shall be appointed by the executive committee, with the approval of a majority of the members of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

That provision is entirely in accord with the spirit of the bill, which aims to vest in the Foundation the determination of policy and the direction in which the research projects shall go. Consequently it was felt that the Director should not be independent in any way of the Board but should be subject to the direction of the Board, that his appointment should be made by the Board, and he should be subject to dismissal by the Board, acting through the Executive Committee. Frankly, it seemed to me this was the way the set-up should be made if we were to have an effectively functioning Foundation, with the center of gravity, so to speak, in the Foundation itself. That was the big issue between our group and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], which was determined by the vote just had.

But about 2 or 3 weeks ago, Mr. President—and I make this statement so that my colleagues may know what happened—Mr. Webb, Director of the Budget, came to me with Dr. Vannevar Bush, and they both said that the President felt, or that some of his advisers felt—I do not think it was so much the President himself—that as important a position as one paying $15,000 a year, should be under appointment by the President rather than by an independent agency, such as the Foundation would be. I told Mr. Webb then that I had no objection to that technical way of appointing the Director, but that inasmuch as we were insisting that the entire determination of policy should reside in the Board, which would be composed of a group of scientists and other public men, I could not yield on the principle that the Director should be subject to its direction as to policy, and that he should be simply an executive officer to carry out the policies of the Board.

We discussed the matter somewhat, and then I said, "Let us talk to President Truman about it." In line with my desire, if I could, to bring about an adjustment of these matters in entire accord with the desires of the Chief Executive, so far as we could do so, Mr. Webb and I went to see the President, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] accompanied us. The President again stated the views which I understood Mr. Webb had presented to me, that he felt that the appointment of the Director, who after all would have in charge the disbursal of considerable funds, and who after all would be an officer of the Government receiving a salary of $15,000 a year, should be by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. As I understood, the President was entirely willing that the nomination should be made by the Foundation. Having in mind that the President would appoint every member of the Foundation, and indirectly would appoint the Executive Committee—the President appoints all these officers—I said that if the President would feel happier if it were provided that he himself should appoint the Director, I should be very glad to go along with an amendment which would make it perfectly clear that the supervision and control of the whole Foundation was in the Foundation and was not in this Director. I did not want the Director to be in the position where he could say to the Foundation, "I do not approve the policies you have adopted. These are the policies someone else wants adopted." Consequently, we endeavored to put into writing the amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Arkansas in order to give to the President the power of appointing the Director and I said in my opening address on this subject last Wednesday that I was prepared to go along with the amendment.

But I must now note, Mr. President, and it is only fair that Senators should know this, that only last night Mr. Webb called me up—he does not object to me quoting him—and said that while he is prepared to recommend that this form of amendment be accepted by the President, there are others of the President's advisers who do not like this form, as has been reflected here by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. President, all I can say is that if the administration should not desire to accept this form, I would be compelled to oppose the adoption of the amendment, because I would not want to stand here and defend an amendment which I thought was within the spirit of our conversation, and then discover later that it was not, or that I was in any way misrepresenting the President's position. I would not want that to be charged to me for 1 minute. So, in order to be perfectly clear, I have to say that, so far as I know, the President and his advisers are not necessarily in accord with this provision, and I am not even sure that the President might not feel that this would be a wrong adjustment to make.

I lay that situation before the Senate before we take a vote on this amendment, as I think all the facts should be known. I tried my best, in cooperation with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, to work out a bill which would meet every wish of the President of the United States and have the Foundation set up in a way so it could function effectively, yet not give way on the main principle, which we believe is the only sound principle, that the Foundation must be the center of gravity of policy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. My question is respecting the time division. We still have another amendment to discuss.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This time is charged to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KILGORE. But there is not going to be much time left to charge to me if we keep on in this way much longer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from New Jersey has 13 minutes left and the Senator from West Virginia has 47 minutes left.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whereupon the Chair suggests that the Senator from New Jersey ought to worry about the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. What I was worried about was whether there would be any of my time left.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am very much opposed to the pending amendment. So far as I can see, it represents an attempt to compromise two fundamentally different ideas. It seems to me that the difficulty which the Senator from New Jersey has had in finding out whether the President's advisers are in favor of the amendment is a clear evidence of that fact.

The theory of the bill is that there shall be created a scientific Foundation. There are to be appointed in effect, a Board of Directors composed of 24 men. The idea is that the money appropriated shall be distributed for the purpose of

trying to find certain things that can be determined by research and for the purpose of developing scientific research. It is proposed that the Foundation shall be controlled by scientists, by individuals who are interested in the large aspects of the subject. They shall determine what projects shall be undertaken and where the money shall be distributed. The moment the balance of power is shifted to the President, and it becomes a political department, it seems to me we depart from the theory of the bill, and we immediately encounter tremendous difficulty, by reason of pressures of all kinds of a political nature coming down on the President and on the man who is responsible to the President.

I do not think we can divide this power. In the ultimate analysis the Director will determine the policies of the Foundation. They may be modified by the Board. The Senate has just rejected the theory of a Director with an advisory committee. Yet we all know that to a large extent the permanent director of a department molds the policies of the department. The Director might call in a group of 24, but they would function only occasionally. They would be present once a month. The executive committee might be there once a week, or less often. The man who determines the policy is the Director. The question is, Shall he feel in his mind that he is responsible to the Board of the National Science Foundation, or shall he feel that he is responsible to the President? If he is appointed by the President he is responsible to the President; and all the pressures which are exerted on the President or the President's advisers, or on those who are in any way connected with the President, involve demands, and to a large extent such demands must be passed on to the Director. The Director, being the appointee of the President, inevitably must listen to those demands and to a large extent yield to them.

I believe that the Director ought to be responsible to the Board of the National Science Foundation. It is said that there is no control. There is a control. The difference is this: Once a year the National Science Foundation must go to the Bureau of the Budget—the President, if you please—and say, "Here is our plan. We shall require so much money to carry it out." At that time the budget is approved and comes to Congress for its approval. From that time for at least 12 months, the Foundation will be entirely free from political pressure of all kinds. Under this plan, if the Director is appointed by the President, he will largely determine the policies of the Board; and if he is appointed by the President he will be constantly subject every day, 365 days in the year, to pressure to spend money for this or that, or to give it to some particular college which desires to build up a scientific research project. The Board will be diverted from its main purpose, which is to develop scientific research in the United States for the most necessary things, and on a scientific basis.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any compromise is possible. I feel that the control which is given to the Board over the distribution of funds, first, by the Bureau of the Budget and the President, and then by the Congress, is sufficient control to see that the Foundation does not get off the track. For the rest of the year the Foundation would have complete discretion as to how to conduct its affairs. I do not believe that that would be possible if the Director were appointed by the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], for himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Jersey have sufficient time to yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair should have asked the Senator from West Virginia whether he too agrees to a quorum call, because the time for quorum calls is chargeable to both sides. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree to the quorum call, half the time to be charged to him?

Mr. KILGORE. I agree to a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The quorum call is ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McFarland	Tydings
Donnell	McGrath	Umstead
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Wagner
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The Senator from Washington has asked for a division. [Putting the question.]

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order. The result has already been announced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained. The announcement of the result has already been made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was on my feet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The chair is sorry. There were a great many Senators on their feet. The Senator from Washington did not address the chair until after the announcement of the result had been made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from Ohio will not insist on his point of order.

I ask unanimous consent that I may ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has asked unanimous consent that he may request the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. There are other methods. The Senator can move to reconsider, if he wishes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are unavoidably detained. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] if present and voting would vote "nay." The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Texas

[Mr. O'DANIEL] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—40

Byrd	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.
Connally	McFarland	Russell
Downey	McGrath	Saltonstall
Ellender	McKellar	Sparkman
Fulbright	McMahon	Stewart
Hatch	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Murray	Tydings
Hoey	Myers	Umstead
Holland	O'Conor	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	Pepper	
Kilgore	Revercomb	

NAYS—39

Aiken	Dworshak	Martin
Ball	Ecton	Millikin
Bricker	Ferguson	Moore
Bridges	Flanders	Smith
Brooks	Gurney	Taft
Buck	Hickenlooper	Thye
Bushfield	Ives	Vandenberg
Butler	Jenner	Watkins
Cain	Kem	Wherry
Capper	Knowland	White
Cooper	Lodge	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Donnell	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Green	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Eastland	Morse	
George	O'Daniel	

So Mr. LUCAS' motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is unable to recognize any Senator except by the permission of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who has all the remaining time at his disposal.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me, to permit me to speak before this amendment is voted upon?

Mr. KILGORE. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to substitute for section 6 the following:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of the Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the executive committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate after receiving the recommendations of the executive committee, and he shall serve for a term of 4 years subject to removal by the President or the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there was so much commotion in the Chamber that I did not know that that was what the Senator from West Virginia was trying to bring up. I thought he had an entirely different matter in mind. If he wishes to take up this amendment, I yield him 3 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, first I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment that is about to be voted upon is a typed amendment, not the printed amendment which is on the desks of Senators, as proposed by the Senator from Washington in his own behalf and on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas. The pending amendment provides that the Director of the Foundation shall be nominated and appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that he shall serve for 4 years; a definite term of office is fixed. To my mind, that is one of the most important provisions with respect to a Director, however he may be selected.

It further provides that the Foundation may remove him from office at any time during his term of office. So it seems to me that the objection that has been made so strenuously upon the floor of the Senate—that the Director might be controlled through the President—is removed when the Foundation itself may remove him from office. So I call the attention of the Senate, as one of those who sponsor this bill, to the point that to my mind this is an improvement over that provision which appears in the bill, which provides no specific limit of service of a Director.

For that reason I wish to give this amendment my support.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does it not seem to the Senator from West Virginia that if the President appoints the Director, that carries out practically all of the purpose of the Kilgore amendment which was just defeated?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. That attempts to create a Director, with an advisory committee. It seems to me that ultimately the balance must rest either with the Foundation or the President—that the man who appoints the Director is the man who will have that power. But I cannot understand how we can compromise that issue by any provision such as the one now before us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot agree with the Senator. I heard his remarks on the amendment. It seems to me that if the Foundation has the right to remove the man, there is not a complete control over the Director by the President.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does not the amendment also provide that the Director may be removed by the President?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct; he may be removed either by the President, the appointing power, or by the Foundation; and it seems to me then that any Director would certainly comply with any directions of the Foundation, if the Foundation had the power to remove him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote for this amendment because I wish to see the Foundation established in law. I believe that this amendment, by the terms of which the Director will work under an executive committee, will result in having the policies of the executive committee carried out by the Director. It is true that he will be responsible to the President, as, indeed, he should be. I cannot see that he will go astray if he has to carry out the policies of the executive committee. If the executive committee do not like what the President requests the Director to do they can resign, and that will bring the issue directly to the front. If the President thinks the Director is spending money in the wrong way he can use the power an Executive should have over a Director and over an Administrator.

I do not have the fears the Senator from Ohio entertains. The executive committee, composed of intelligent scientists, are not going to lie down on the job; they are going to carry on as an executive committee, if the Director acts in a way that is absolutely wrong. I have no fear on that score.

I want to see this Scientific Foundation established. I believe the amendment is a proper one under the theory of administrative law, under the theory of good executive practice, yet affording safeguards to protect science, because the executive committee and the Foundation itself can put on the stops if the Director departs substantially from the course they think is right in the interest of science.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who if present, would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are unavoidably detained. The Senator from Kansas is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY.]

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is detained on official business. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—42

Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.
Downey	McClellan	Russell
Ellender	McFarland	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McGrath	Smith
George	McKellar	Sparkman
Hatch	McMahon	Stewart
Hayden	Magnuson	Taylor
Hill	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Murray	Tobey
Holland	Myers	Tydings
Ives	O'Conor	Umstead
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Wagner

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Dworshak	Moore
Ball	Ecton	O'Daniel
Bricker	Ferguson	Revercomb
Bridges	Flanders	Taft
Brooks	Gurney	Thye
Buck	Hickenlooper	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Jenner	Watkins
Butler	Kem	Wherry
Cain	Knowland	White
Capehart	Lodge	Wiley
Capper	McCarthy	Williams
Cooper	Malone	Wilson
Cordon	Martin	Young
Donnell	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—12

Aiken	Green	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Brewster	Langer	Reed
Eastland	McCarran	Thomas, Utah

So the amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON, on behalf of himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired. To whom does the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] control of the time I have remaining. He desires to present an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been printed and which lies on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

(4) a Division of Social Sciences, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the social sciences."

On page 7, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)."

On page 7, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of my conception of the bill as being one concerned with basic research, that is research in pure science, its purpose being to increase our knowledge, on the one hand, of the laws of nature, the character of nature, and, on the other hand, if my amendment were to be adopted, to increase our knowledge of human relationship, it seems to me it would be a great mistake at least not to mention such a division in the bill. Last year the Science Foundation bill then before the Senate carried such an amendment, but it was stricken out. I still believe that the Senate made a grave mistake in doing so.

I think we need only to look about us to see where our principal troubles lie. In the domestic field our most troublesome problems are labor relations; that is, the relations between labor and management. Our troubles are not those pertaining to the production of mechanical gadgets or any of the things of a physical nature. At present there is some shortage of certain kinds of food, but nevertheless this country is producing more food than ever in its history. We can produce more automobiles than we are producing. We can make atomic bombs. I do not believe we should continue in that field, but should lead the world into a strict control of such production if we possibly can.

Mr. President, our basic troubles arise out of our lack of knowledge and understanding of human relations. My conception of the significance of my amendment is that at some point in our history we should begin to provide for education and research in such subjects as economics, politics, psychology, philosophy, and so on, which are part and parcel of human relations. In our international affairs the reason we are obliged to vote such things as the Greek-Turkish loan, the British loan, and so on, after all, is because of the misunderstandings which arise from human relations. No one can deny that the old world, Europe, was able and would still be able to produce amply for her needs provided she did not periodically fall into wars which arise, as I said, out of a misunderstanding and misconception of the basic principles of human relations. That is the real reason why I think the Senate made a mistake last year in striking out my amendment from the bill then before it.

I think we should now give some thought to the purposes of the amendment. It is my belief that the amendment was rejected last year simply because of a misconception of what I then intended by it. I believe there is a misconception of what I intend by it now. I think some persons are inclined to confuse social sciences with the thing we usually call social welfare. My amendment is not designed to increase the relief in the slums of New York City or Chicago or any other city. I believe my amendment would enable the officers of the Foundation to initiate some studies in the subjects I have mentioned, especially in economics and politics.

I was very much impressed during the hearings on labor bills by the fact that really very few people in this country seem to have any knowledge based upon extensive study of such things as labor relations. A few have had a little practical experience in operating plants, and that is about the extent of their knowledge of labor relations. A few have had a little practical experience in some Government bureau in trying to reconcile differences. I do not know of anything in which the American people are less educated than in the matter of their own Government. I believe every Senator will agree, as he examines his letters from day to day, that many of them show a considerable lack of understanding of the difference between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, for example. I know of some suggestions which have been made, and I have made some myself, designed to improve the efficiency of our own Government. Invariably such suggestions are completely misunderstood. There is so little understanding of the principle of a democratic government that about the only way some people look at it is as a matter of personality. That is what I have in mind. For 160 years there has not been a single significant change in the system of our Government, in any of its practices. When we compare that to the changes which have come about in the physical world, in the field of industry in this country, and with the various inventions which have been made, the contrast is really amazing.

In this one field, the fundamental field of human relations, nothing has been done. The attitude is, generally speaking, as if it were a subject which is taboo by our society, something which is not discussed in polite circles. We have done practically nothing about it. The private institutions have done very little about it. It is a controversial subject. Someone during the debate last year said, "Well, it is controversial, and we cannot afford to touch it." The fact that it is controversial is one good reason why we ought to attempt to find out something about this field of knowledge which happens to be fundamental to the existence of a democratic society.

I can well imagine that it is a matter which is of no particular interest to a people of a totalitarian country, where the only thing they need know is how to obey. But I cannot believe that a democratic country can continue to progress which has little knowledge of the basic principles which are involved in the proper functioning of such a society.

I earnestly request that the Senate give favorable consideration to my amendment. All it does is to authorize a division of social sciences, which means that the board could undertake studies and research work in this field. I cannot imagine how any harm could come from its adoption, and if by chance we could discover some of the things which seem to motivate people and which lead to difficulties, both as they exist in the domestic and in the international field,

it certainly would be a great contribution in the present state of the world. So I ask, Mr. President, for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator's amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is in control of the remaining time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much remaining time is there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho the 1 minute.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is the most important amendment so far offered to the bill. Our practical sciences, so-called, have dissipated our social sciences. We can invent everything, but we know nothing about human relations, and therefore we use the products of applied science to destroy ourselves. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Are there any other amendments pending on which a vote is to be taken at 3:30 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are none of which the Chair is advised. Amendments can still be offered after 3:30 for the purpose of immediate vote. All time on the bill has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

On this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—23

Aiken	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Baldwin	Holland	Sparkman
Chavez	Kem	Taylor
Connally	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McFarland	Umstead
Hayden	McMahon	Wagner
Hill	Pepper	

NAYS—63

Ball	Hatch	O'Conor
Bricker	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Lodge	Smith
Capehart	McCarthy	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Cooper	McGrath	Thye
Cordon	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Moore	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Barkley	Green	Morse
Brewster	Langer	Overton
Eastland	McCarran	Thomas, Utah

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in voting on this bill, I think I owe it to myself to explain my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator is out of order. No debate is in order.

The question is on final passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KILGORE, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Jenner	Russell
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taylor
Chavez	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thye
Cooper	McCarthy	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Umstead
Downey	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

NAYS—8

Brooks	McKellar	Taft
Cain	O'Daniel	Williams
Dworshak	Reed	

NOT VOTING—8

Brewster	Langer	Overton
Eastland	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Green	Morse	

So the bill S. 526 was passed.

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1947."

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be men and women who are recognized leaders in the fields of the sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and without regard to political, social, or religious factors; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 8 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall

be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of 2 years, six at the end of 4 years, six at the end of 6 years, and six at the end of 8 years, after the date of enactment of this act. No person who has served as a member of the Foundation for more than 4 years shall be eligible for reappointment as a member until the expiration of 4 years after the termination of his previous term.

(c) The President shall designate one of the original members of the Foundation to act as chairman of the Foundation until such time as the executive committee referred to in section 5 (a) is elected and chooses its chairman as provided for by section 5 (b). The member so designated shall call the first meeting of the members of the Foundation and shall preside over such meeting until a chairman has been chosen.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop, and to encourage the pursuit of, a national policy for scientific research and scientific education;

(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research;

(3) to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) to grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and

(7) to establish (a) a special Commission on cancer research, (b) a special Commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and (c) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary. Each Commission shall consist of 11 members, 6 of whom shall be eminent scientists, expert in the field of medicine or the basic sciences, and 5 of whom shall represent the public, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and to serve at the pleasure of the President. It shall be the duty of each special Commission created under the authority of this subsection to make a full and adequate survey of research both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the National Science Foundation an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such programs are being carried out.

(b) The members of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less frequently than once each year. A majority of the members of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of 9 members which shall, when authorized by the Foundation, exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. The Executive Committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions, within the Foundation, any of its powers, duties, and functions.

(b) The Executive Committee shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the Foundation. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence.

(c) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(d) Five members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Executive Committee may establish such advisory committees as it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the consideration of programs administered by the Foundation.

(f) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Foundation, and to the President and Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 6. There shall be a Director of the Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the Executive Committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving the recommendations of the Executive Committee and he shall serve for a term of 4 years subject to removal by the President. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) There shall be within the Foundation a Division of National Defense and such other divisions as the Foundation may, from time to time, deem necessary. Each such division shall exercise such powers and perform such duties of the Foundation as may be prescribed by the Foundation.

(b) Until otherwise provided by the Foundation, there shall be within the Foundation—

(1) a Division of Medical Research, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the medical sciences;

(2) a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences;

(3) a Division of Biological Sciences, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research in the biological sciences;

(4) a Division of National Defense, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to research on military and naval matters; and

(5) a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall administer programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee, except the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall be appointed by the Foundation and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

(c) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of members in a number which is a multiple of 12, to be fixed by the Foundation, but which shall be not less than 12 and not more than 36. One-half of the members of such committee shall be civilians appointed by the Foundation, and the remaining half shall be representatives of the armed services, designated in equal numbers, respectively, by the Secretaries of the principal branches thereof. There shall be within the divisional committee for the Division of National Defense an executive committee of not more than 6, consisting of the chairman of the divisional committee, as chairman; 2 civilian members of such committee elected annually by the civilian members thereof; a member of such committee representing each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof. Such executive committee shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Committee for the Division of National Defense with the approval of the Foundation.

(d) The term of each member of each divisional committee shall be fixed by the appointing or designating authority. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive committee.

(e) Each divisional committee shall have the power and duty to make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the executive committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division, and shall have such additional powers and duties as the Foundation may delegate or assign to it.

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall advise the Director with respect to the establishment of regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any such information or property which may be classified by the Director in accordance with such regulations and procedures.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearing house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its possessions. No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent.

AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. The Foundation is empowered to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and, without being limited thereby, the Foundation is specifically authorized—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner

of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements for carrying on, by organizations or individuals, including other Government agencies, of such scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) to enter into such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5);

(e) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

(f) to acquire by purchase, or otherwise, hold and dispose of by sale, lease, loan, or otherwise, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, scientific research without regard to the provisions of law relating to the acquisition, holding, or disposition of property by the United States;

(g) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(h) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

(i) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) of such personnel incurred in the course of such services; and

(j) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided however*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation by any contractual or other arrangement to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however*, That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 12. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President and through the Department of State, to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes or provisions of this act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable.

(b) The Foundation may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredit international scientific congresses and meetings whenever it deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as Congress may determine necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The fund hereafter appropriated to the Foundation, as herein authorized, shall, if obligated during the fiscal year for which appropriated, remain available for expenditure for 4 years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated. After such 4-year period, the unexpended balances of appropriations shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury.

(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census. The amounts so apportioned to each State shall, except as hereinafter provided, be available for expenditure only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities (including the land-grant colleges) within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each college or university the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects. Notwithstanding the fact that funds may have been apportioned to any State under the provisions of this subsection, the Foundation shall obligate itself by contracts or other financial arrangements with the tax-supported colleges or universities within such State to expend only such part of the funds apportioned to such State as the Foundation determines may be expended, pursuant to proposals submitted by such colleges and universities, in a manner which is consistent with such general program and standards as the Foundation may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. Any funds apportioned to any State which the Foundation does not, within 9 months after the date such funds are so apportioned, obligate itself to expend pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements entered into with tax-supported colleges or universities within such State shall thereafter revert to the general funds of the Foundation and be available, either within or without such State or both, for expenditure by the Foundation for the purpose of conducting research activities in the same manner in which such activities may be conducted with unapportioned funds of the Foundation. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

SEC. 14. (a) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Committee on Science, to consist of the director of the foundation, as chairman, and the heads (or their designees) of such Government agencies engaged in or concerned with the support of scientific activity to a substantial degree as the President may from time to time determine. The interdepartmental committee shall meet whenever the chairman so determines, but not less than once a month.

(b) The Interdepartmental Committee on Science shall gather and correlate data relating to the scientific research and scientific development activities of the Federal Government; and shall make such recommenations to the President, the foundation, and other governmental agencies as in the opinion of the committee will serve to aid in effectuating the objectives of this act and of other legislation providing for Federal support of scientific research and scientific development.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that, when deemed desirable by the director, technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations, and their compensation may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The deputy director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and advisory committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the executive committee, a Deputy Director who shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of the Director during his absence or disability and shall exercise and perform such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Director.

The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed $12,000 per annum.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each individual committee and of each advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees or of any advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation or of a divisional committee or of an advisory committee shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when per-

formed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) The Office of Scientific Research and Development is abolished, and its affairs shall be liquidated by the Foundation, which shall be its successor agency. The property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds now available), and contracts (and rights and obligations thereunder) of the Office of Scientific Research and Development are transferred to the Foundation. Such abolition and transfer shall take effect as of the date upon which five members of the executive committee provided for in section 5 have qualified and taken office.

(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

(i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to engage in scientific research or scientific development.

(j) Funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research or development, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds appropriated to the Foundation for its general purposes.

(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

(l) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED CONFERENCE ON RISING FARM LAND PRICES

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, President Truman's proposal to call a conference of farm leaders for the purpose of setting a ceiling price on farm land prices is ill-conceived, and, in my opinion, can only result in damage to the farmers of America.

I believe that it was the President's intention, in seeking to curb the alleged boom in farm land prices, again to call attention to the rapidly increasing cost of living. This, however, has only a minor relation to the so-called increase in farm land prices.

In directing Secretary of Agriculture Anderson to call the conference of farm organization leaders, Government officials, and representatives of private lending agencies, President Truman made reference to the distress among farmers which resulted from land inflation in the World War I period. He stated that farm real estate values have reached a level of 92 percent above the 1935–39 average. The statistics, however, do not present a true picture of the actual circumstances. It will be well-remembered that farm land values throughout the United States plummeted to the very bottom in the thirties. They were still very near the bottom during the years 1935–39 referred to by the President. The increase since that time was not inflationary, but rather a return to normalcy.

The President went on to point out that in many States real estate values are now above the inflationary peak of 1920. A careful survey of the situation, indicates however, that farm land prices today are much lower than they were in 1920. Moreover, experts have agreed that there is little probability that they will reach the peak that occurred in 1920.

Certainly this does not justify the establishment of ceiling prices on farm real estate prices as they exist today. To do so would be to impose regulations which would strangle free enterprise.

It must be remembered that about one-fourth of the Nation's capital is invested in farm land. Even more important is the fact that 65 percent of the capital investment in productive enterprise is in the farm. Certainly the fundamental laws of economics are in operation in this major portion of our capital investment; and to attempt to manipulate supply and demand by imposing ceiling restrictions is foolhardy.

It is agreed that farmers are generally prosperous today. Many have purchased adjoining quarter-sections of land, replaced worn out equipment, and repaired homes and buildings neglected during the lean depression years. Our farmers are largely out of debt. They learned their lesson in 1920, and they will not again follow the path that prevailed at that time.

As I have pointed out, there is no skyrocketing, inflationary situation in farm land prices as the President would seem to indicate, but instead a return to normal, bringing with it a long-awaited prosperity for the farmer who suffered such severe set-backs during the depression and drought.

In view of the fact that there is no substantial inflation anywhere in the country in farm-land prices, there is no reason why the President and the Secretary of Agriculture should now seek to curb these prices.

Representing a State almost exclusively devoted to agriculture, I am keenly aware of the farm situation. The interests of the farmer are foremost in my mind, and I sincerely feel that the action of these officials in now attempting to place a ceiling legislatively upon farm-land prices can only result in damage to the farmers themselves. I hope that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture will be better advised than to attempt a continuation of the Office of Price Control upon farm lands.

IMMEDIATE DECONTROL OF SUGAR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill at this time, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]; and I should like to make a brief statement in regard to the purposes of the bill.

Mr. President, this bill is for the purpose of immediately decontrolling and doing away with all sugar rationing and all price controls of sugar. I should like to point out that at the time when the Senate voted to extend sugar controls the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] submitted an amendment under which the average housewife would receive a ration of 35 pounds of sugar a year. During the hearings we were led to believe by the Sugar Rationing Division of the OPA and by the Department of Agriculture that the housewife would receive 10 pounds of sugar on July 1 and 10 pounds of sugar on October 1. The junior Senator from New Hampshire, in order to make sure that the housewife would receive that much sugar, made his amendment mandatory. However, 3 or 4 days ago we learn that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, had issued an order to the effect that there would be no sugar ration on October 1. In other words, he reduced the sugar ration to the housewife by 50 percent.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about this matter, I wish to say that originally we were assured that the housewife would receive 10 pounds of sugar on July 1 and 10 pounds of sugar on October 1. The Secretary of Agriculture moved the date of the first ration of sugar from July 1 to June 1, and issued a statement that there will be no further ration of sugar until after sugar controls end, which will be on October 31, thereby denying the housewife her additional 10 pounds of sugar during the latter half of the canning season.

Mr. President, since the Senate took action on the question of sugar controls there have developed a number of facts which I assume that some Members of the Senate could not possibly have foreseen. However, the fact is that the predictions that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I made at that time have been proved to be not only true but conservative. We now find that according to a vast majority of the sugar brokers, there is a tremendous surplus of sugar in Cuba. For example, the United States has a contract with Cuba which provides that the United States shall take all the Cuban sugar, less certain allocations made to foreign nations by the International Emergency Food Council, less 300,000 tons listed as export-free sugar, less another 340,000 tons for Cuban home consumption.

It now develops that Cuba will not need the 340,000 tons which she had reserved for her home consumption. It further develops that she cannot sell the 300,000 tons which she had retained as export-free sugar. Originally, Mexico had planned to take approximately 100,000 tons of that sugar. Within the past week Mexico has announced that she will take no part of that export-free sugar, and that she herself has sugar for sale.

France, which had been allocated sugar by the International Emergency Food Council, does not plan to take all the sugar which has been allocated to her.

So, Mr. President, as of today there is in Cuba a tremendous surplus of sugar going begging for a buyer, and there is a tremendous surplus of sugar up and down the eastern seaboard.

I should like to discuss this matter in more detail; but I believe that the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], desires to have the Senate proceed to consider the tax bill, and would not care to have me take further time on this matter today. So I shall reserve any further comments until a later time.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, let me say that I have great respect and regard for my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]; and although sometimes we were on opposite sides in respect to the recent sugar-control legislation, nevertheless when that matter was finally disposed of, I respected him for his opinions, and I have the highest regard and feeling for him.

Let me say that the question of sugar rationing is now coming up again, in revised form, due to some changes in the existing world supply of sugar.

When I recently saw in the press articles regarding the present sugar situation and the change in the sugar ration over the period from June until October, I telephoned to Mr. James Marshall, of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture, and asked him to advise me what the sugar situation really was. He has written me a letter, which has been received today, and I ask unanimous consent to have his letter in response to my telephone request printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the statistics and supplemental data accompanying his letter.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 20, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your recent telephone request for the latest information regarding the sugar situation.

The only change of any importance in the 1947 supply situation since the recent hearings is the increased possibility that the Cuban crop will reach a very high level. At the time of the hearings we knew that the cane plantings indicated a large crop, but we also knew that any one of a number of factors could greatly limit the size of the crop and that it was not safe at that time to plan on a too optimistic estimate. It is still too early to know the final outturn of the crop, but with good weather for the remainder of the grinding season it should reach 6,000,000 tons. We shall have a more nearly final figure early in June.

You have probably noted various recent public statements regarding current large stocks of sugar. The impression which some have that these stocks are excessive is misleading. Stocks in the hands of primary distributors on April 30, of approximately 1,492,000 tons, while larger than last year, are still below the prewar (1935–39) average for the same date which totaled 1,601,000 tons. If an adjustment were made for increased population at the present time above prewar, this stock comparison would be even less favorable. Data for the above comparisons are contained in the attached table. These relatively large stocks are due in part to the necessity of moving Cuban sugar at a very high rate in order to insure adequate storage space in Cuba for the production of a large crop. The pressure to move this sugar will be over in a short time, while the heavy summer demand for sugar will soon begin. In order to alleviate the storage situation and to insure getting the sugar into the hands of the consumers before the heavy summer demand begins, we have advanced the validation date of the next household stamp and the third quarter industrial allotments to June 1. This action is explained in the attached press release.

The sugar committee of the International Emergency Food Council is constantly reviewing the over-all sugar supply situation for the purpose of bringing into the pool any additional supplies which may become available and also to reallocate any sugar which any claimant country indicates will not be taken. We have indications at present that France may not take her entire allocation; however, reallocation of any quantity so released would not be sufficient to materially change the total supply available to the United States. There is also some possibility that Cuba may make available some of the sugar which, under the terms of the Cuban contract, has been withheld for local consumption and free export. However, as yet none of this sugar has been offered, nor has Cuba indicated that this sugar will not be used for the purposes for which it was set aside.

At present we have nothing definite on the Javan sugar situation although, following the recent agreement between the Netherlands and the Indonesian Governments, a representative from the Department of Agriculture is on his way to Java to make every effort to get as much first-hand information as possible. We shall continue to follow developments in that area closely.

Since the allocations for all countries contain over 700,000 tons of "undesignated" sugar, it is not known at this time whether the United States will receive more than her 200,000 tons of undesignated sugar from the increased Cuban crop, and therefore it is too early to know whether our total supply for the year will exceed the 6,800,000 tons now allocated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MARSHALL,
Director.

Stocks of sugar in the hands of primary distributors in the United States on Apr. 30, 1947, 1946, and prewar

[1,000 short tons, raw value

	1947 [1]	1946	1935–39 average
Cane:			
Raw	284	190	332
Refined	456	245	577
Total cane	740	435	909
Beet	752	646	692
Total	1,492	1,081	1,601

[1] Preliminary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SUGAR RATIONING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 13, 1947.

NEW SUGAR RATIONING PLANS ANNOUNCED TO MINIMIZE TRANSPORTATION DIFFICULTIES

Housewives and industrial users will be permitted to buy sugar in advance of the customary rationing date to enable supplies to move while railroad transportation is available, the Sugar Rationing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture announced today. With receipts from Cuba now at their seasonal peak, and with boxcars now available which will shortly be needed to move the estimated billion-bushel winter wheat crop, the Department of Agriculture feels that speeding up sugar distribution now is imperative in order to relieve the transportation burden later in the season. This action does not increase rations, but merely advances the dates when purchases may be made.

To enable more sugar to be moved now, three changes were announced in the sugar rationing program:

1. A second 10-pound stamp for consumers (No. 12) will be validated June instead of July 1, but must still last until October 31.

2. The date of application for third quarter allotments to both percentage and provisional industrial users will be advanced from June 10 to June 1.

3. The 30-day inventory limitation will be removed for industrial users to enable them to purchase their entire allotment as soon as it is granted.

These steps will enable housewives and industrial users to obtain their requirements for canning and other needs while supplies and shipping facilities are available. The Department wishes to make certain that all users have their supply of rationed sugar on hand to can this year's fruit crops as they ripen.

This applies with equal force to home canners and industrial canners. No stamps specially designated home-canning sugar stamps will be issued this year, but the allowance of 35 pounds available for home use this year is designed to include sugar for canning.

Apparently many household and industrial users, finding supplies available at present, are postponing buying. This, together with the heavy import movement, is creating a temporary surplus in the hands of distributors. A last-minute rush to cash unused sugar-ration coupons when transportation facilities are overtaxed with the movement of other commodities could result in the development of local shortages.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire that I hope to present all the facts to him; and I feel confident that when all the facts are before both of us, we shall be on the same side.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator recalls what Agrippa said to St. Paul: "Almost thou persuadest me." [Laughter.]

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1321) to decontrol sugar, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. KEM, Mr. MALONE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ECTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from

Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], I am introducing a bill providing a national health-insurance system and a national public-health program. Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, is introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives. I send the bill to the desk, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1320) to provide a national health-insurance and public-health program, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. TAYLER, and Mr. MCGRATH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I commend this bill to the Senate for careful and sympathetic consideration. It proposes to meet one of the Nation's most important and most urgent needs, because it would lay a broad basis for the preservation and improvement of the national health.

Mr. President, the greatness of this Nation depends not so much on its natural resources, boundless as they may be. Neither does it depend on our great industrial power or geographical position. In the final analysis, it depends on a healthy, virile citizenry. Our population is indeed our greatest asset; our vigor and productiveness, which depend on health, constitute our greatest source of strength. The health of our people, from every consideration, is of paramount importance to our future national welfare.

In this troubled world, racked by great international strains, wasted by the most devastating war in history, with tens of millions of people suffering from want and from loss of their political moorings, great burdens fall upon the people of the United States. No one at this moment can foresee our future; but every thoughtful person can foresee our need to be strong and resourceful. The years that lie ahead will make unprecedented demands upon us. We must prepare now to meet those demands. We must insure that our people have that state of health, of body and of mind, which modern science makes possible; we must see to it that completely adequate health services are available, not to some people under favorable circumstances, but to all people. That, Mr. President, is today's challenge to our statesmanship, a challenge which this bill would meet.

BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT BILL

Before turning to the content of this bill, let me briefly review its background. The modern movement for constructive national health legislation began with the Social Security Act of 1935, a great legislative landmark in the history of our country, introduced in this body by Senator WAGNER. The Social Security Act made a small beginning through Federal grants-in-aid to the States for general public-health work and for maternal- and child-health services.

In 1939, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] introduced the first comprehensive national health bill. It was considered at length by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of which I had the privilege to be chairman. Though given a favorable interim report by the subcommittee, no final action was taken on the bill.

In 1940, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] introduced a hospital-construction bill which was favorably reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and passed by the Senate. It died in the House committee. A bill dealing with the same general problem was finally enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, Public Law 725, approved August 13, 1946.

In 1943, while we were still in the midst of the war, the Senator from New York and I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, Senate bill 1161, which provided for a comprehensive postwar social security program. To make this program complete in its aim to protect the people against major economic hazards, we included provisions for health insurance. The bill died in committee.

In May 1945, the Senator from New York and I introduced a similar measure, Senate bill 1050. Later in the same year, in a special health message, President Truman proposed a broad legislative program for national health and we presented Senate bill 1606, known as the National Health Act of 1945, which was specifically devoted to a health program. This bill had two major parts: Title I provided for the expansion of public health services, maternal and child health service, and the medical care of needy persons; and Title II provided for a system of personal health services to be developed on a social insurance basis. That bill was, in many respects, the forerunner of the bill we present today.

In President Truman's three major messages in the early days of the present Congress, the state-of-the-Union message, the budget message of January 3, 1947, and the economic report, he again called attention to the need for health insurance. The President submitted a broad public health program and recommended that the Congress lay the legislative groundwork for a national system of compulsory health insurance.

Yesterday, in a special message on health, he again called to the attention of the Congress the large health needs of the Nation and again recommended the enactment of a broad national health program.

These recommendations are in line with the expressed will of the people, as attested by numerous polls of public opinion which indicate that our citizens want a comprehensive health program, and particularly a system for the prepayment of medical costs. The strong expressions of public opinion should be a guide for us to proceed with legislation that meets this demand.

At last we can dispense with lengthy consideration of the need for a comprehensive health program, and the need for insurance protection against sickness costs. The record is complete and readily available. Even the leading medical organizations, which for years denied existing needs, now admit them and are themselves actively sponsoring insurance against medical costs. It is time for us to move on to constructive planning and cooperative action. The bill we present today is intended to meet the wants and needs of our citizens.

At the hearings on Senate bill 1606, held before the Committee on Education and Labor of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the provisions of that bill were subjected to close scrutiny and extended discussion. More than 100 witnesses, including representatives of physicians, dentists, nurses, labor unions, private health insurance plans, lawyers, church groups, government, and various civic and welfare groups contributed their oral and written testimony. The hearings, extending from April through June 1946, constitute a printed record of over 3,000 pages.

During the course of the hearings, many points of view were expressed, a great deal of factual information was presented, and many constructive suggestions were made. These have all had their influence on the rewriting of Senate bill 1606 and on the preparation of the bill introduced today. The testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of this kind of legislation. The need for a comprehensive health program, especially a plan for the prepayment of medical costs, was repeatedly demonstrated from many points of view. The large majority of witnesses, many from the medical and allied professions, reaffirmed the need for a national program of personal health services to be financed on an insurance basis.

The provisions for meeting this need, as contained in Senate bill 1606, were generally approved by most witnesses, excepting only those from certain professional associations. Many witnesses offered suggestions for changes. All of these proposed changes were given careful consideration. In drafting the present bill, every effort was made to improve on Senate bill 1606.

A careful reading of the provisions of this new measure will show that all reasonable criticisms of a health insurance program as set up in Senate bill 1606 have been overcome.

GENERAL OUTLINE OF THE PRESENT BILL

Our present bill has three titles, the content of each being shown in a table of contents which, for convenience, has been included with the preamble.

Title I—Declaration of Purpose.

Title II—Prepaid Personal Health Service Benefits.

Title III—Development and Expansion of Health Services.

Broadly considered, the present bill makes five provisions for the health of our population, wherever they may live—

First. A comprehensive national system of prepaid personal health services, with decentralized administration to be carried out by the States and by local agencies;

Second. Authorization to use Federal grants-in-aid to the States—public assistance—toward paying for personal

health services furnished to needy persons;

Third. Improved Federal grants-in-aid to the States for comprehensive, community-wide, public-health and maternal-and-child-health services;

Fourth. Improved Federal grants for the construction of needed hospitals and other health facilities; and

Fifth. Grants-in-aid, under the prepaid medical-care plan, to aid nonprofit institutions which engage in research or in professional education. Each of these provisions is essential to meet urgent health needs.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE SYSTEM (TITLE II)

The system of prepaid personal health services, under title II, is national in scope and would cover close to 85 percent or more of the population. This includes employees, persons in business for themselves, those receiving social-security or civil-service pensions, and their dependent children, wives—or disabled husbands—and parents.

The persons who become eligible for benefits would be entitled to medical and dental services from general practitioners and specialists, home-nursing care, hospital care, and auxiliary services—laboratory, X-ray, expensive prescribed medicines, eyeglasses, special appliances, and so forth. Other persons who are not automatically insured, including the needy who are eligible for public assistance, may be covered just like all others through premiums paid on their behalf.

Free choice of doctor, dentist, and so forth, by the patient is guaranteed, as well as the right to change one's choice.

Every qualified doctor, dentist, nurse, hospital, and so forth, is also guaranteed the right to participate or not, and to accept or reject patients. These guarantees apply to organized groups of practitioners, clinics, health-service plans, consumer cooperatives, and so forth, as well as to individuals. Every hospital that participates is guaranteed against supervision or control of its management.

The insurance fund, instead of the patient, would pay the costs for the various services. The method of payment is to be decided mainly by those practitioners who furnish the services. The bill contains guarantees that the amount of payment will be fair and adequate.

The insurance system is to be administered, at the Federal level, by a five-man board, assisted by an advisory council of lay citizens and professional people, located in the Federal Security Agency. Each State is guaranteed full responsibility for administering the system to its own population through its own State agency. The requirements which a State plan would have to meet are the minimum necessary to assure that the State carried out the intent of Congress and meets the obligations of the insurance system to the insured persons and their dependents. In each local area, administration would be carried out with the help and participation of local citizens, lay and professional. The Federal board would administer the system only where a State is unwilling or unable to do so.

The national advisory council is to consist of the chairman of the five-man board and 16 members appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The appointed members would have 4-year terms of office. At least eight of them shall be well-informed persons who would represent the people entitled to benefits; and at least six are to be outstanding professional persons who would represent those who provide the health services. The advisory council could appoint its own special committees and would have broad responsibility to advise the Board on policy and administration.

Similarly, each State would be required to have an advisory committee that includes public and professional representatives. Also each local administrative or advisory committee must be similarly constituted.

These advisory bodies would not be merely window dressing. The bill gives them broad and important functions. They would be a basic part of the whole system, assuring active and continued participation by the public and the professions.

This is not a tax bill, since all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. Therefore, it deals with only part of the financial provisions that are needed. This bill provides for annual appropriations to a Personal Health Services account of the money needed to finance the system, the total not to exceed 3½ percent of covered earnings in the first 3 years or 4 percent in the next 3 years. Thereafter, Congress would determine the limits in light of operating experience. These fiscal provisions have been written on the assumption that a separate tax bill would provide for social-insurance contributions.

The bill indicates how the insurance funds are to be allotted as between normal and emergency needs, and how they are to be allotted among the States that actually administer the system. Administrative expenses would be under direct congressional control.

In addition to the annual appropriations, the bill provides for an initial one-time appropriation to the insurance account of an amount equal to 1 percent of covered earnings, to provide an initial reserve fund. This could be an appropriation from general revenues, or a loan to be repaid to the Treasury in small installments over a period of years out of current social-insurance income, or the yield of a small social-insurance tax levy initiated in advance of the date when benefits first become available—according as may seem best when the tax bill is considered.

A special section amends the Social Security Act so that States can use public assistance grants-in-aid, along with their own money, to pay insurance premiums for needy persons who are not insured through their own earnings. Workmen's compensation cases can be served by the system and the insurance account reimbursed for the costs involved.

There are many specific provisions to deal with particular problems that are sure to arise in the operation of a health insurance system. For example, there are provisions for—

First. Making further studies and reports to Congress;

Second. Nondisclosure and confidential protection of the records about individuals;

Third. Prohibition against discrimination on account of race, creed, or color;

Fourth. Special arrangements to meet the needs of rural areas that lack practitioners or hospitals or that need ambulance services, travel to larger communities, or special health education services;

Fifth. Appeals by insured persons or by practitioners against decisions or practices that they do not like;

Sixth. Judicial review of administrative decisions; and

Seventh. Special provision to use a small fraction of the insurance funds to support research and professional education so that the system will constantly contribute to the progress of science, the training and advancement of practitioners, and the improvement of health services.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES (TITLE III)

PART A

The purpose of title III, part A, is to provide for an adequate, balanced, and flexible development of community-wide health services.

Under present laws Federal and State governments cooperate in general public-health work, maternal, and child-health services; crippled-children's services, campaigns against venereal diseases, tuberculosis, mental diseases, and so forth. These present laws, however, developed in a spotty and uneven way. They are not altogether coordinated, they have many inadequacies, and they leave large gaps. Title III repeals those existing laws and substitutes a simplified, comprehensive plan under which the Federal and State governments could go forward in a more systematic and more effective way to prevent disease and improve national health. The allotment of Federal grants among the States is placed on a uniform basis for all the health programs involved, and the Federal-State financial sharing is placed on an explicit statutory basis.

The purposes of title III include basic State and local public-health services for all communities in a State; maternal and child-health services and the location and care of crippled or otherwise physically handicapped children; programs to attack and control tuberculosis, venereal diseases, mental disorders, cancer, heart and degenerative diseases, dental disorders, nutritional deficiency diseases, other important diseases and conditions; health services for the aged, the chronically ill, workers in industry, and other groups whose health problems involved special public concern; training of personnel; and development of effective ways to carry out these various purposes. Such services may not duplicate those available under title II of this bill.

Title III, part A, authorizes the appropriation of funds to be used as grants to the States, beginning with $100,000,000 in fiscal 1948, increasing to $300,-

000,000 in the fifth year, and to sums sufficient to carry out the stated purposes of the program in succeeding years. These funds are to be allotted to the States according to the population and the financial resources of the States.

Each State may develop its own plan to carry out any or all of the various purposes for which the funds are authorized, according to its own judgment as to State needs. If the plan meets the minimum essential requirements specified by Congress to assure that the funds will be properly expended for the intended purposes, the plan must be approved by the Federal Security Administrator. The Administrator is given only limited discretion to assure that the Federal funds are not used excessively to finance some particular aspect of a plan to the neglect of other urgent needs in a State.

The minimum conditions to be met by a State plan includes provisions in its plan for:

First, a single State health agency to administer or supervise—with transitional provisions for States using multiple agencies:

Second, financial participation by the State;

Third, training of personnel;

Fourth, State-wide extension of services within 10 years;

Fifth, State standards for services;

Sixth, no discrimination on account of race, color, creed, citizenship, or economic status, and opportunity for a hearing to any individual denied service, or to those furnishing services or desiring to participate;

Seventh, efficient administration, including personnel standards on a merit basis;

Eighth, safeguards to restrict the use or disclosure of information about individuals receiving or providing services;

Ninth, cooperation with medical, health, educational, welfare, and other organizations, and with other public agencies;

Tenth, advisory councils and similar bodies, with members from public and private agencies, the professions and the public;

Eleventh, reports needed by the Federal Security Administrator; and

Twelfth, indication of the particular purposes and program to be carried out and the financial plan for the operations.

From within its allotment of total funds, each State would be entitled to Federal grants ranging from 50 to 75 percent of the cost of a program. The Federal percentage is determined by a formula which gives more to the poorer than to the wealthier States, according to their per capital income.

The States may also be assisted through Federal services, as may be provided by Congress through appropriations that are authorized in this title. These services may include demonstrations, studies, grants to public or other nonprofit institutions, training or detail of personnel, and so forth.

The Federal Security Administrator is to carry out the program of title III, part A, through the Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau and other constituent units of the Federal Security Agency.

There is special provision that Federal regulations shall be prescribed only after prior consultation with representatives of the States participating in the program and, insofar as practicable, with their agreement. Transitional provisions are included to assure that the States have sufficient time to adjust from present practices to those required of them under this bill.

PART B

The second part of title III deals with construction of hospitals and related facilities.

Last year, Congress enacted the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 13, 1946—adding a new title VI to the Public Health Service Act. Under that new act, Federal funds were provided to make State-wide surveys of hospital facilities and needs, and to aid public and other nonprofit agencies and organizations in the construction of needed hospitals, health centers, laboratories, outpatient departments, nurses' homes, clinics, and so forth. There are several major deficiencies in that act, and they should be corrected, lest they hamper the balanced development of a national health program.

Part B of title III makes the following improvements:

First. Since the funds authorized were too small to take care of all the urgently needed hospital construction, they are increased from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year—after the fiscal year 1948;

Second. Since the 5-year program is too short to meet the needs, the authorizations are extended for an additional 5 years;

Third. Since the Hospital Survey and Construction Act made no financial provision for the "maintenance and operation" of hospitals, the program had to allow special exceptions or flexibility concerning assurances that needed hospitals could be financed after they are built; but since the system of prepaid personal health services proposed in title I would guarantee payment for hospital services and thus supply money for "maintenance and operations," these provisions would no longer be needed and they are deleted;

Fourth. Since the 1946 act provides, through Federal aid, only 33⅓ percent of the construction cost, it is less helpful than it can or should be to the poorest areas, and this provision endangers the whole program by giving insufficient aid to those areas that need it most; in our bill the Federal aid is therefore made flexible, ranging from 33⅓ percent for a construction project in the wealthiest States up to 75 percent for a project in the poorest States. This provision was in the act in the form in which it originally passed in the Senate.

PRINCIPAL CHANGES IN THE HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSALS

I should like to summarize the most important changes made in title II of the present bill, by comparison with the provisions in Senate bill 1606 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Since the bill has been completely rewritten and rearranged, it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify all changes, but some major items can be indicated.

COVERAGE

In the new bill, the coverage provisions are extended to include civilian Federal employees, including retired employees receiving civil-service annuities, and their dependents. As before, there is explicit provision for coverage through voluntary agreements of groups of persons not otherwise covered; that is, State and local government employees and their dependents. Also, as before, the needy persons can be covered through action by State or local public agencies in procuring voluntary coverage for them. An amendment to the Social Security Act makes clear that Federal public-assistance grants may be used by the States for this purpose.

VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The rights of organized groups, as such, to participate in furnishing services and to be paid from the insurance fund have been clarified in the new bill to make even more explicit than before that such groups have the same kinds of guaranties as apply to individuals. Thus, groups of practitioners, hospitals and their staffs, any organized group of individuals, any partnership, association, or consumer cooperative, voluntary organizations operating health-service insurance plans or other health-service plans can participate, enter into agreements with the insurance system, serve eligible persons who choose them, and be remunerated. Also, any such organization can also act as agent for others in negotiating or carrying out agreements.

These provisions are accompanied by necessary safeguards. Under agreements with groups or organizations, services must still be provided only by persons who are themselves qualified, have authorized the agreement on their behalf, and who remain responsible to both the individuals they serve and the insurance system. Moreover, as in the case of agreements with individuals, no agreement with a group or organization may be monopolistic in scope or, for more than 1 year, preclude any person who is otherwise qualified from making another agreement or choosing another agent.

ADMINISTRATION BY THE STATES

An important change in the bill relates to State participation in the health-insurance program. In Senate bill 1606, State participation was provided, but many critics of the bill thought this was inadequately spelled out. In the new bill it is definitely stated that if States meet specified minimal conditions, their plans must be approved, and they become the administrative agents for the national system.

It always was intended that a maximum of administrative freedom be given to States and local areas, but it has now been made mandatory that a State be given the right to administer its own program when its plans conform to the basic national requirements. Although States are given explicit opportunity to be responsible for the administration of health insurance, the guaranties to the public regarding the kind, amount, and quality of service, and to the professions, hospitals, and others furnishing services, regarding their rights and prerogatives, are laid down in the bill, and these must

be observed by the States when they take over administration.

Another clarification concerns administration, which was often erroneously interpreted to be centralized under the provisions of Senate bill 1606. In the new bill, administrative responsibility is clearly decentralized, down to a system of local administration under Statewide plans.

Where States accept the responsibility for administration, they may choose the form of administration for each local health area from two broad alternatives: First, an administrative committee in charge, with an executive officer under it; or, second, an administrative officer in charge, working with an advisory committee. In either case, they shall establish local professional committees to advise and assist the administrative agency. Thus, the people living within each local health-service area are given a direct responsibility in the program's operation through membership on these local area committees or on special professional committees, all of which are entrusted with substantial and important functions.

Since the Federal Government undertakes an obligation to the persons eligible for services under the insurance system, and finances the program, it reserves the right to administer the program where benefits would not otherwise be available because a State declines or is unable to take over. If the Federal Government administers the program in a State, it also must establish local administrative agencies and local advisory and professional committees.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO STATES

Since the present bill provides for administration by the States, it also provides that the States may know how much money they will have to carry out the responsibilities they undertake. The new bill contains an allocation guide for the distribution of funds to the States and through the States to local areas. Although no specific mathematical formula is given, there is a statement of basic factors, including population, available personnel, facilities, and supplies, and the costs of fair compensation—to be considered in making the allocations. In its annual reports to Congress, the Board must make a full report upon the adequacy of financing and the methods of allocation. In time, a definite statutory formula for allocations may be evolved, but this should await the development of further data through actual experience.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION BY A BOARD

Senate bill 1606 was criticized by some people because it lodged the Federal administrative responsibility in one officer, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, operating under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator. In the new bill this responsibility is assigned to a five-man board, including three full-time members to be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, and, in addition, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Social Security, ex officio. The appointed members are to have fixed 6-year terms of office, and at least one of them must be a doctor of medicine. The President is to designate one of the appointed members to serve as Chairman of the Board. The Federal Advisory Council, retained in the new bill, would have indicated proportions of public and professional representatives.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR RURAL AREAS

It is well established and widely accepted that rural areas lag behind the rest of the country in health services, availability of doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, and other facilities. A special section, as well as numerous general provisions, regarding rural areas have therefore been added in this new bill. Coverage provisions are clarified to leave no doubt that they include farm operators, as well as farm employees. Rural representation on State advisory committees and on the National Advisory Medical Policy Council is specifically required. The special section on rural areas includes provisions designed to attract doctors to areas that lack practitioners and to make it possible for them to afford to stay there—by special methods of payment, guaranties of minimum annual income, payment of expenses for moving into such areas, loans for office equipment, and so forth. This section also contains special provisions for the training and education of practitioners needed in rural areas, for ambulance services and transportation expenses to obtain health services elsewhere, and for special rural health informational activities. Also, the Board is required, in its annual reports, to make recommendations on additional measures to assure rural people equal health opportunities under the bill.

OTHER CHANGES

Many other changes have been made, especially in light of the constructive criticism offered at the hearings on Senate bill S. 1606. For example, the guarantees of professional rights for practitioners and hospitals are more specifically stated in the new bill. The provision regarding limitations on doctor-patient ratios, which was intended in Senate bill 1606 as a protection for doctors just as much as for patients, has been clarified so that the States and the practitioners in any area have primary responsibility for establishing such standards. The 120-day-a-year limit for hospitalization, and the cash indemnity provision in lieu of hospitalization, have been dropped. The new bill clarifies the guaranty of benefits in their relation to the availability of State and local personnel and facilities, with the addition of a new provision specifically calling for improvements in the availability of benefits. If complete dental services cannot be provided to the whole eligible population because of shortage of personnel, facilities, or funds, priority shall be given to children so that they may have comprehensive services ahead of other persons.

These are some of the major changes in the health insurance part (title II) of the new bill. There are many others of a more detailed character than can be included here. The effect of these changes is, I believe, a better program. The major constructive suggestions offered by interested groups and individuals and by representatives of public organizations are reflected in the new specifications. Every effort has been made to meet squarely all legitimate criticisms of the old bill, regardless of whether they came from persons supporting or opposing the bill.

I believe that the bill we now offer is as sound and workable as it can be without the further guidance of actual experience in administering a program of prepaid health benefits.

The sponsors of the new bill are grateful to all who have contributed useful suggestions.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION NOW

Mr. President, we believe that the bill I have just introduced for myself and my colleagues, the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1947, offers a thoroughly practical plan of providing personal health services and community-wide health services for the Nation.

The bill was written with the intention that the system of medical benefits should be financed and administered on a social-insurance basis, but the details of financing have been left to the Congress to decide in connection with related financial decisions.

Insurance against medical costs is a sound, businesslike procedure. It has been widely accepted in principle by the public and the medical professions alike. It is the effective, decent, and self-respecting way to make it possible for our people to have access to modern medical care and to pay the costs without heavy sacrifices. And I wish to point out here that the contributory method of financing would be the only compulsory feature in compulsory health insurance. As one witness said at the hearings on Senate bill 1606 last year:

> The system of prepaid personal health service provided in S. 1606 is not state medicine. It is an orderly procedure for collecting the funds to pay for medical care when the emergency of sickness may arise. It is a method of payment, not a method of service. The service is to be provided exactly as at present by existing hospitals and existing physicians—the chief practical difference being that payment of bills is guaranteed (hearing, pt. 4, p. 2256).

The American people have repeatedly and in many different ways expressed their desire to have a system whereby they may pay the costs of their own medical and hospital care, on a budgeted, contributary basis, in advance of the time such care is required. Nevertheless, Senate bill 545 was presented in the Senate on February 10, 1947, again offering the outmoded stopgap of medical care for the poor. That bill is another charity program—a particularly bad kind of charity program because it offers charity not only to the destitute but even to those of our citizens who are ordinarily self-supporting.

Recognizing the fact that large numbers of people, well able to meet all the

usual expenses of living that can be budgeted, are not always able to meet the impact of an unexpected medical or hospital bill. Senate bill 545 proposes that we regard such persons as the proper objects of public charity. It would subject the man who has always earned a decent living for himself and his family and has always paid his way to the process of a "means test" or an "income test" to determine his eligibility for public help in meeting the cost of, say, an unexpected surgical operation for which he cannot pay. It is a conceivable—indeed, I think it is almost inevitable, that in time we could become a nation of public-charity patients under such a plan.

Who are the people, in terms of Senate bill 545, "having insufficient income to pay the whole cost" of hospital, surgical, medical, and dental services? They are not only those who are destitute and needy, and who need public aid for food, shelter or clothing; they are also the majority of the population. Who among us does not know that there are tens of millions of ordinarily self-supporting individuals who cannot afford expensive medical care? They are not needy for food, shelter, or clothing, but they are needy when confronted with the cost of expensive medical, dental, or hospital care. They are the "medically needy," and they are the backbone of the American population.

Senate bill 545 offers Federal grants-in-aid to the States to provide subsidy toward meeting, in whole or in part, the costs of medical care "for all those families and individuals in the State having insufficient income to pay the whole cost of" hospital, surgical, medical, and dental services. It seems clear that one of two developments must come from such a plan.

If enough money is provided by the Federal Government and by the States to pay for the services needed by all having insufficient income for health services, large amounts would have to be provided from general revenues and a large percentage of the American population would be getting their expensive medical services on a charity and subsidy basis. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in a speech which he made on January 7, 1946—Appendix of the RECORD, page A77—when discussing housing for low-income groups, repudiated a similar proposal. The inevitable end of that road is public medical care, financed out of general revenues, for most or all the population. It must be plain to anyone who will think about it that Senate bill 545 is far more likely to lead to socialized medicine than in a system of contributory social insurance such as we propose.

If, in the alternative, the amount of money proposed for Senate bill 545 is not sufficient to pay for the services needed by all having insufficient income for health services, then the declared purposes of that bill will not be met. The program would serve only a small fraction of the people who cannot meet heavy sickness costs. It would fail to solve a great national need. And it could leave tens of millions of our people with the conviction that their Federal and State governments had failed them or had played a tragic hoax on them.

In this connection, not that Senate bill 545 authorizes the appropriation of only $200,000,000 a year of Federal money for medical care and $8,000,000–$20,000,000 a year for dental care. Since the States are permitted to match this money by present expenditures for similar purposes, as well as by new appropriations, the additional money to be available for all those families and individuals in the State having insufficient income to pay the whole cost, is mainly the Federal money proposed under that bill. That amount would do little more than meet the medical and dental needs of the people who are already receiving public aid under our welfare programs. It would do little indeed for self-supporting families who have great difficulty in paying large medical, hospital or dental bills.

The insurance method of handling medical expenses is approved by both the medical profession and by the sponsors of that bill. To be sure, they favor voluntary insurance. So should we all if it were possible to do the job through voluntary insurance. Experience seems to show that there is no way of achieving the objective—the methodical financing of medical expenses—on a voluntary basis.

There are scattered groups of people, totaling to a very small percentage of our population, who have joined together to give themselves some sort of minimum protection against medical costs through their pooled contributions. In an interim report submitted in July 1946 by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor it is stated:

> In 1945 approximately 75 percent of the population had no medical care insurance whatsoever, while 2 percent had insurance against one or more items of medical care costs. Only about 2.5 percent of the population, however, are known to have had what might be called "comprehensive" coverage, i. e., at least doctor's care in hospital, home, and office, and hospital service for illnesses other than those usually excluded by insurance policies, such as mental disease and tuberculosis. (Subcommittee Rept. No. 5, p. 5.)

There is now a voluminous record of the countless inadequacies of such voluntary plans, and the futility of trying to improve them by having more such separate plans. A similar situation once existed with regard to old-age pensions and retirement funds. Private arrangements for retirement, prior to our national social insurance system of old-age benefits, had their merits, but they, too, covered only a small part of the population, and were not adequate to meet a national need. There was considerable opposition in 1935 to Government establishment of old-age benefits which in 1939 became old age and survivors insurance, but that social insurance system is now accepted almost as a matter of course.

The answer to our national need for a program of financing medical care does not lie in taking care of the needy or of those having insufficient income to pay the whole cost themselves, or in stumbling along with little voluntary plans for a small fraction of the population. As one prominent witness said last year before the Committee on Education and Labor, at the hearings on Senate bill 1606:

> Such programs may be helpful in spreading costs for families of reasonably high income; but they cannot by any possibility reach down to those families which most need assistance. Nor will it suffice to increase appropriations for the care of the indigent or to rely on the generosity of individual physicians. The great mass of our employed population will continue to refuse pauperization either by the physician or the State; and will continue to go without medical care if it cannot obtain it as a right, for which funds have been duly set aside. (Hearings, pt. 4, p. 2256.)

Mr. President, long experience shows that what this Nation needs is a comprehensive and adequate health program, resting on two broad and coordinated bases—compulsory health insurance and community-wide services. That is the program we offer for the American people in the bill introduced today.

Mr. President, my colleagues and I have prepared a detailed summary of our bill which we believe will be helpful to all who will have occasion to study it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD immediately after these remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE ACT, 1947

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

The national health insurance and public health bill (S. 1320) provides like its predecessor (S. 1606 of 1945–46), for a comprehensive national-health program through a Nation-wide system of prepaid personal-health-service benefits and through Federal grants to States for expanded health services. All the essential principles of national health insurance are maintained in the new bill.

MAIN CHANGES FROM THE 1945–46 BILL

Name of bill

The 1947 bill is entitled "The National Health Insurance and Public Health Act."

Decentralization of administration

The 1947 bill establishes a system of local administration under State-wide plans. It retains a provision for national funds (insurance and general revenue) and national standards. For details see below.

Each State, upon agreeing to observe minimum national standards, is guaranteed the right to administer the system for its own population, would be allocated a definite amount of money each year from the national-health-insurance fund. The State in turn would allocate the money to each local area. The principles for the allocations are stated in the law. Thus each State and locality would be assured a certain sum, and the general size of the amount (except for supplementary amounts needed in emergencies) would not be dependent upon the discretion of Federal officers.

Administration by a board instead of by a single Federal officer

The administration would be under a board of five persons, established as part of the Federal Security Agency. All members would be on full-time salary. Three of the Board would be appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate (at least one of these must be a physician); the other

two would be ex officio, i. e., the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Commissioner for Social Security.

Explicit recognition of voluntary plans that provide services

This principle was recognized in the 1945–46 bill. In the 1947 bill the policy is stated fully and definitely.

Persons covered

The new bill covers some groups not provided for in 1945–46, e. g., civilian Federal employees and their dependents. State and local governments may by voluntary action cover their employees and their dependents. Needy persons can be provided for, as in the 1945–46 bill, through action by State and local governments paying premiums for these persons into the health insurance fund.

Other changes

The new bill makes special provisions for rural areas; expands and makes more explicit the guarantees of professional rights to doctors, dentists, and hospitals; removes the ceilings on the per diem payments to hospitals; and makes numerous additional changes based on criticisms and suggestions expressed at the hearings on the 1945–46 bill.

HEALTH-INSURANCE PROVISIONS

What services will be available?

All needed preventive, diagnostic, and curative services by a family physician of the patient's choice; services of specialists when required; hospital care; laboratory and X-ray services; unusually expensive medicines; special appliances and eyeglasses. Dental; home nursing and auxiliary services may be limited in extent, if personnel, facilities or funds are inadequate; but if dental services have to be limited, priority must be given to services for children.

Who are eligible for services?

All employed and self-employed persons. This includes all employees in industry, commerce, agriculture, and domestic service; employees of non-profit institutions; farmers, business and professional men and women, and other persons in business for themselves. Recipients of old-age or survivors benefits, or civil-service pensions will be covered. The wives, children under 18 (or over 18 if disabled), disabled husbands, and dependent parents of all these insured persons are covered. Needy persons who are not insured through their own earnings will qualify if contributions are paid on their behalf by a public agency. The eligibility requirements are set very low, so that most people can qualify (for example, earnings of $150 in a year.)

Rights of the people and the professions

Everyone has free choice of his doctor, hospital, group clinic, dentist, or nurse from among all the practitioners and organizations in the community, that wish to participate. All physicians, dentists, nurses, and all hospitals and clinics meeting minimum standards are guaranteed the right to participate but none is required to do so.

Quality of service

Through the use of consultants, laboratory and other dagnostic services, professional advisory bodies and otherwise, provision is made for assuring high quality of services; aid would be made available for medical research and for the training of physicians, dentists and others.

How financed?

Like the 1945–46 bill, provision is made for the annual appropriation to the national health insurance fund of an amount equal to 3 percent of earnings (presumably to come from social insurance premiums to be levied one-half on employed persons, one-half on their employers). The 3 percent is calculated on earnings up to $3,600 a year. Additional sums are to be appropriated from general revenues to cover specified items of service (dental and home nursing) and any additional costs. The total may not exceed 3½ percent of earnings in the first 3 years or 4 percent in the next 3 years. Congress would then review and, if necessary, revise the program and the financial provisions in light of experience. Present law, providing Federal grants to States for public assistance cases, is amended so that the States may use some of that money—along with their own funds—to pay insurance premiums for needy persons.

How would physicians and hospitals be paid?

Physicians (general practitioners) will be paid according to methods (fee-for-service, salary, per capita basis, or combinations) chosen by a majority of the physicians in an area. Individual physicians or organized groups of physicians may be paid by methods other than that chosen by the majority of those in that area. The same applies to dentists. Specialists will be paid by the method they and the insurance officers agree upon. Hospitals would be paid full cost of service. The bill provides that all payments must be adequate in amount.

How administered?

There would be a Federal administrative board as stated above, but the administration of services and funds would fall mainly upon the States and localities. Through State surveys, local administrative areas would be defined for medical, dental, and hospital services. In each area there would be a local administrative body which might be either (a) a local administrative committee which would be appointed by the State and which would in turn appoint its own executive officer, or (b) an administrative officer appointed by the State, with a local advisory committee. The local committees of either type must include both lay and professional representatives. National and State advisory councils are provided for, with similar representation, but all strictly professional matters come under wholly professional advisory bodies. Personal medical records must be kept confidential.

AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH PURPOSES

The bill provides:

1. Federal grants-in-aid to States for expanded public health services.

2. Similar grants for expanded maternal and child health services, and services for crippled or otherwise handicapped children.

The Federal Government would pay between 50 and 75 percent of what a State spends for those two programs, with the largest percentage of Federal aid going to the poorest States.

3. For medical care of needy persons, through the insurance system, the States would be authorized to use Federal grants, as well as their own funds, to pay insurance premiums for those who are eligible for public assistance.

4. For increase in the amount of money, extension from 5 to 10 years and improvement of the grant-in-aid formula under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for the construction of needed hospitals, health centers, and other facilities.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes. I could not let this occasion pass without saying a word of congratulation to my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], on his splendid speech, and also paying a tribute to the public spirit of our colleagues who have joined with us in sponsoring a national health insurance and public-health bill which can be of inestimable importance for the future of our country.

Mr. President, as you and as all other Senators know, I have worked for many years to strengthen the health programs of this country. Much has been accomplished since 1935, when Federal grants-in-aid to the States were made available under the Social Security Act, for public health and for maternal and child-health services. The amounts of those grants have been greatly increased. More funds have been made available for medical research. Legislation for a hospital construction program was finally enacted last year.

One program is still needed to complete the arch; a national health-insurance system is the capstone which will hold together all that has been done thus far, and will actually make the benefits of our medical facilities and our medical knowledge available to the families of this country.

When I first became concerned with health problems, many years ago, I thought in terms of limited special problems or areas of special need. I am convinced now, and I believe the American people are convinced, that only a broad program through which every self-supporting family can meet the costs of medical care, will assure adequate health services to all our people.

The bill we are introducing today represents the culmination of years of study, of popular discussion, and of detailed consideration by representatives of the professions, of labor, of consumers, and of many civic and welfare groups.

I believe the program we present is sound and important. I trust that it will receive not only the consideration but also the support of all forward-looking Members of the Congress.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 1, a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

RECESS

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, who is in charge of the unfinished business, and also that it accords with the desires of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that a detailed discussion of the bill should not start this late in the afternoon, and that it is their desire that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow. I therefore move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou immortal, invisible, and eternal one, who alone is God, unto Thee be glory and honor for ever and ever. With all our manifold weaknesses and with the consciousness of our transgressions we come to Thee. We thank Thee that Thy strength is for human weakness, that Thy purity is for human sin, and Thy mercy is for human resentment. Fill us with Thy love, the love which springs from a pure heart, from a clear conscience, and from a sincere faith. Enable us not to deviate from these and lose our way in empty reasoning. We would accept and make Thee the outward and unselfish aim of our lives, knowing that the grace of our Lord is more than abundant. Clothe us with a deep sense of our responsibility that we may faithfully and wisely fulfill the mission Thou hast given us.

Hear our prayer for the sake of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3245. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. National Archives.
6. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. National Housing Agency.
9. Office of Temporary Controls.
10. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
11. Selective Service System.
12. Veterans' Administration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

THE POTATO MARKET

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I am to speak on a subject which should be approached in a very calm and collected manner, and it is my hope to be calm, but I want to tell you this whole business makes my blood boil.

I hold here in my hand a picture which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, May 18. It is an Associated Press picture. The picture shows a mountain of surplus potatoes, some 50 tons, which were dumped by the Government of the United States on Friday, May 16, because, it is alleged, of a glutted market. Here let me interpolate briefly to point out that the market which is said to be glutted is not the consumer market—for if an adequate supply was permitted to flow, prices would be reduced. The caption under the picture indicates that kerosene was poured over these potatoes to make them unfit for consumption. There is something lacking to make this picture complete. This picture would be complete if on the top of this mountain of surplus potatoes there appeared such famous advisers as Paul Porter, Chester Bowles, Leon Henderson, Robert Nathan, and Henry Wallace with the Voice of America microphone.

Keep this picture in mind as I show you a sales slip, dated May 12, 1947, indicating that 10 pounds of white potatoes sold for 97 cents right here in Washington. This means that potatoes are selling to the consumer today for nearly $6 a bushel at the retail level.

Now, gentlemen, these 50 tons of surplus potatoes—and I hesitate to think of how many more tons at other times and places—were bought and paid for by the Government with our taxpayers' money. The kerosene which was poured over them to make them unfit for consumption was poured over them by orders of our Government. Potatoes, as we all know, are one of the most important basic food items in the United States and throughout the world. With this in mind, I want to know how in good conscience and sincerity can any representative or spokesman for the present administration even so much as mention the high cost of living?

As we think of these tons of life-giving food being destroyed here in the United States, thus preventing this food from getting into the hands of people who need it, I am wondering how the administration's experts and economists justify our Government's action in view of the starvation situation throughout the world and the heavy demand on our own taxpayers to provide funds to keep body and soul together in many foreign lands?

How can the administration attempt to justify the spending of our taxpayers' money with one hand to destroy food and at the same time with the other hand ask our people to provide millions to feed a starving world?

Yes; let us keep in our mind's eye the picture of these tons of surplus potatoes being destroyed right here in our own country in order to prevent this food from reaching the consumers' market, as we think of the $31,000,000 being asked to tell a wrecked and starving world about America. Would you like the Voice of America to tell a weak, despairing, and starving people the truth about what we are doing here in the United States? I hope if we have a Voice of America, the voice will be able to tell the truth and not just propaganda. The world is fed up with propaganda. What the world wants is something to eat. Let us give the starving peoples food instead of propaganda. I think the psychological effect of food would be worth a billion dollars of propaganda. Let us convince the world that we really have a great and free system of government here in the United States by reestablishing good American common sense and humanity in the administration of our Government.

There is a lot of talk about communism in the United States. Our taxpayers are being called upon for millions of

dollars, and probably as yet undisclosed billions of dollars, for use throughout the world to prevent the spread of communism. On the other hand, the administration of our Government is spending the taxpayers' money to destroy food which hungry peoples need and which many low-income people in our own country are having great difficulty in buying. It would seem to me that such action as the administration has taken is driving prices still further up by destroying potatoes which are the very essence of life, and creates a most fertile and receptive attitude for the growth of communism.

The farmer wants and is entitled to a full and proper price for his products, and every reasonable person in the United States wants the farmer to have full and proper prices for his products. Think for a minute, however, how the farmers must feel who put their labor and sweat into raising these potatoes only to have them destroyed by their own Government with their own tax money.

This particular incident is just one example of the type of government manipulation which fosters our high cost of living and which compelled me to introduce sometime ago a resolution calling for an over-all study of the cost of living. I am fully convinced now of the urgency and necessity of studying this problem with a view to overhauling the administration of our Government in order that it might in deed as well as in word aid toward the recovery in both the domestic and foreign situations.

I ask the Members of this House if in light of the high cost of living, in light of a starving world, in view of the tremendous tax burden on our people, in view of our fight against communism, in view of the administration's verbal attacks on the high cost of living, do you know of any sound reason why potatoes should at this time be destroyed as surplus when there exists so great a need for them for consumption?

I hope in view of this situation that our Appropriations Committee and all other committees of this Congress will renew vigorous efforts to reestablish good, old American common sense and humanity in the administration of our Government.

THE CONDITION OF THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, some friends of mine came down from New York on a visit not so long ago and climbed the steps to the Capitol dome. They told me that what they saw up there is not pleasant to hear about. So a few days ago I climbed those same steps myself all the way up to the dome of the Capitol. I realize what I found up there is the accumulation of many past years but it should be corrected. There are all kinds of comments written and scribbled on the walls in red paint, lipstick, pencil marks, pens, knife markings, and other ways, indicating various things and also that other people were there besides Kilroy. At one place where a person has to go out into the open air on the trek up it is plain to see that over the last number of years the pigeons have not been very cooperative. The condition of the hand rails is a disgrace and the accumulation of filth is really terrible. You will find that the dust and grime has lain up at the dome for many years, and you can actually with your fingers make visible inscriptions in the dust and grime.

I think that situation ought to be corrected. It is a desecration of the Capitol and is something that cannot be condoned. I think once it is cleaned up we ought to put a few signs up there calling attention to the fact that it is a crime to deface public buildings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from the National Small Businessmen's Association, and in the other to include an address by Hon. Robert E. Freer, a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPEECH OF ANDREI GROMYKO

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Andrei Gromyko before the American Russian Institute in New York last night, as reported in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, is one of diplomatic double talk.

The Soviet delegate insists that Russia cannot relinquish her right of veto over decisions taken by an international control authority. At the same time, he states that the Soviet Union "has stood and does stand for strict international control of atomic energy." He also talks of outlawing of the atomic bomb and other weapons of mass destruction. Where there is a veto there is no law. Where there is a veto there can be no strict control. The American plan of abolishing the veto in atomic matters is a step toward effective world law in atomic matters. Russia desires to be beyond the law. Gromyko talks of interference with Russian sovereignty by international inspection. Of course, an international inspection would interfere with Russian sovereignty the same as it would interfere with the sovereignty of the United States or any other country. If we are to have an effective world law with regard to the atom bomb, no nation should be above that law.

The Soviet delegate speaks against investigation of so-called Russian peaceful production of atomic energy. The peaceful production of atomic power could be changed to warlike production by an act of the will. The same atomic power that could drive a locomotive across a continent could drive a missile across an ocean.

The insistence of Mr. Gromyko that before effective controls are set up a conference be first called for the prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of destruction is perhaps a rather clever attempt to force the United States first to display to Russia all of our weapons before an effective world control is established. I do not think that any American would be fooled, however, by the Russian suggestion that the United States first lay all of its modern weapons on the counter before any laws would be established to control the use of those weapons by other countries.

The United States has shown every evidence of good faith with regard to the outlawing of these weapons that would destroy a large part of civilization.

The Russians speak of scientific development. In fact, the whole Russian idea of government is one of so-called scientific materialism. Lenin and Marx disavowed spiritual values. They disavowed morals. But science has no morals.

Scientists have given us the power to split the atom. Statesmen should give us the power to unite the world under effective laws that govern all nations.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to correct what I believe is an injustice to the States of this Nation as a result of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Bethlehem Steel case, in which the State labor relations boards are completely ousted of jurisdiction in all dispute and representation cases.

In my own State, for example, the National Labor Relations Board never assumed jurisdiction of the famous Allis-Chalmers strike, which has handled completely by the State board and handled so successfully that the National Board never sought to acquire jurisdiction.

In the amendment which I am proposing, the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board is maintained, but concurrent jurisdiction is given to the States, and they will not be ousted of jurisdiction except in those cases where the National Board elects to assume full jurisdiction. In other words, a State body may in many cases assume jurisdiction and decide the issue without the necessity of intervention by the National Labor Relations Board.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the Italian Treaty, Dorothy Thompson says:

I would be against the Italian Treaty, even if there were a democratic and humane regime in Yugoslavia, because the treaty is unjust, stupid, cruel, dangerous, and in violation of our solemn promises. Why must we aid and defend Greece against the same regime to which we open Italy? Is it because the Government of Greece is more democratic than that of today's Italy? If we approve this treaty, there will not long be a government either democratic or friendly to us in Italy. The harsh terms of the Italian Treaty is no way to stop communism.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on bringing that statement to the attention of the House. I agree with every word of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions of the Mission on Christian Social Relations of the diocese of New York.

REMEMBER-DISABLED-VETERANS MONTH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part thereof a bill which I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to introduce a resolution by the Disabled American Veterans which authorizes the President of the United States to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month.

It will cost no money. I think it is a very fine measure. It will bring to people's memory the sacrifices of the men who have done so much for us. There are many things that can be done for the men today that are not being done. Many things for the benefit of the veterans could be sent to the hospitals. First-class entertainers could be sent to the hospitals. In the war great stars entertained the soldiers. They could entertain them today. Many veterans could be given employment. Many could be given housing.

This resolution will have a very salutary effect and will do a great deal for our disabled veterans, who certainly deserve it. During the war it was "the soldiers come first." In peace the disabled must come first. People so soon forget. It is remembering that counts.

A copy of the resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 204

(By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts by request)

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, a veterans' organization chartered by Congress to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, has designated the month of June as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month; and

Whereas the observance of such month of June as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month is a highly desirable objective, designed to enlist the wholehearted cooperation of American organizations and individuals in the Disabled American Veterans' program for all of America's war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas it is the patriotic duty and moral responsibility of all Americans to take an active interest in the care and rehabilitation of the Nation's war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas Americans cannot afford to permit lethargy, apathy, or indifference to dull the public's consciousness of the interests and welfare of our war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas an important factor in providing security for America is for America to provide security for its own citizens, and particularly for its disabled veterans of the past, as well as of the future; and

Whereas America can always feel assured that it will be enthusiastically protected and defended so long as America remembers to protect and defend its protectors and defenders: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested annually, to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month, with appropriate ceremonies in honor of America's war-disabled veterans and, wherever possible by:

(1) Reviewing the nature and extent of benefits provided for America's war-disabled veterans by the Federal Government and the various State, county, and municipal governments, and the adequacy of the administration and application of such beneficial laws.

(2) Increasing and facilitating the opportunities for suitable and gainful employment for all of America's employable disabled veterans.

(3) Cooperating in assistance to war-disabled veterans in readjusting themselves to civilian life.

HELPING THEM TO HELP THEMSELVES

"Organized in 1920, the Disabled American Veterans is a congressionally chartered organization of American citizens who were wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled as a result of their honorable service in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it, during time of war. The purpose of the Disabled American Veterans is to restore, as far as possible, war-disabled veterans to as good a position as they would have enjoyed had they not been disabled, and to make them better and happier citizens, through sympathetic understanding and comradely assistance in solving their problems. Toward this end the Disabled American Veterans endeavors to secure fair and just compensation, adequate and sympathetic medical care, and honest and profitable employment for those who are employable." (From the United States Government issued Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II and their Dependents.)

Purpose of the Disabled American Veterans, as set forth in its congressional charter:

"To uphold and maintain the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible for membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of wounded, injured, or disabled veterans * * *; to stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all wounded, injured, or disabled veterans; to serve our comrades, our communities, and our country; and to encourage in all people that spirit of understanding which will guard against future wars."

DAV SERVICE IS NATION-WIDE

National Headquarters, Disabled American Veterans, Cincinnati, Ohio.

National Service Headquarters, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D. C.

National campaign headquarters, National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

National service officers located in all of the Veterans' Administration Hospitals and Regional offices.

Forty-six State departments.

One thousand and five hundred local chapters.

A war is ended officially by Presidential proclamation or congressional resolution. But the rehabilitation problems of the more than 2,500,000 disabled veterans of World War II, and of the handicapped ex-service men of previous wars, will not be solved until as many of these men as possible are made self-supporting.

With the advent of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans quickly realized the tremendous added responsibility which that conflict would bring to the DAV in terms of greatly increased needs for expert, direct, personalized assistance to war-disabled veterans.

1947 OBJECTIVE: "HUMAN RECONVERSION"

World War I experience shows the way

The experience of the DAV since World War I proves that the person best qualified to assist disabled veterans in their rehabilitation problems is a fellow disabled veteran, especially if he is expertly trained. All DAV service workers are disabled veterans. All have undergone intensive academic and on-the-job training. Gen. Omar N. Bradley states that "these service workers are eminently qualified to give their fellow disabled veterans the necessary sympathetic care and understanding."

In line with the mandate in it congressional charter, and with the full cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, the DAV two years ago put into effect a comprehensive plan to expand its service program. The initial step was the training of 400 disabled veterans of World War II, to augment the national service worker set-up which the DAV had built up during the past 25 years and which was already the largest service set-up exclusively for disabled veterans.

Widespread support enlisted

This service expansion program was presented to the public and attracted widespread leadership and support. More than 16,000 individuals and corporations contributed toward the training of additional service workers, so that the needs of World War II disabled veterans could be met.

Because of this support, the DAV has been able to shoulder its large share of responsibility in connection with the initial phases of World War II rehabilitation work. The DAV has greatly facilitated the work of the Veterans' Administration and has been of inestimable help to disabled veterans as their

advocate in the preparation and presentation of their claims for benefits to which they are entitled under the law, such as medical treatment, hospitalization, disability compensation, insurance, etc.

1947 service needs must be met

The great task ahead is that of helping disabled veterans to complete their transition to useful civilian life. Every possible assistance must be given to bring about their placement in suitable, gainful employment. To accomplish this, the DAV has put into effect a national employment plan, coordinated on the national, state and local levels.

Large numbers of disabled veterans will require service and assistance of various kinds over a period of years.

The "peak service load" for disabled veterans of World War I was not reached until 1939. It is estimated that the service volume for World War II disabled veterans will reach its maximum around 1960.

The Disabled American Veterans, chartered by Congress to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration, is particularly qualified and equipped to handle the problems of these men, from the time they leave the hospital until they have been placed in suitable jobs.

An annual, united campaign

To take care of the continuing needs for specialized services to war-disabled veterans, the DAV conducts one united campaign each year to meet its budget on national, state and local levels.

1947 appeal is now under way

The money is being raised under the leadership of outstanding Americans throughout the country and the fund will be expended under their supervision.

On or before the first day of January in each year, the DAV makes and transmits to Congress a report of its activities for the preceding fiscal year, including a complete statement of receipts and disbursements, audited by an outstanding firm of certified public accountants.

From the New York Sunday Times of October 27, 1946:

"On a recent visit to the Capital, Mr. Lloyd F. Oleson, National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, caused a profound and almost startling impression among high-ranking public officials when he told them that he opposed any form of bonus to veterans, and that the objective of the DAV was to get as many disabled veterans off the pension rolls and onto pay rolls as was humanly possible.

"Furthermore, the DAV under his leadership has begun a successful effort to help private industry fit disabled veterans into jobs which the individual members can do as well as they could if they were able-bodied.

"The DAV unanimously elected Mr. Oleson as national commander in recognition of his strenuous campaign to get the disabled veteran recognized as a productive citizen rather than a ward of the Government."

Lloyd F. Oleson, national commander of the DAV, served in many battles as a captain with the First Armored Division, in Ireland, England, north Africa, and Italy. He received serious injury to his back while in combat.

He was awarded the Purple Heart with three clusters, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Service Cross. He was the first disabled veteran of World War II to receive the Distinguished Service Cross in the European Theater, and was the first veteran of mandership of a major veterans organization. that war to be elected to the national com-

A graduate of the University of Illinois, he is an attorney and former manager of the Ventura (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce

"The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work." (Robert R. Watson, past president, National Association of Manufacturers.)

"General Motors' experience has demonstrated that successfully placed handicapped workers cease to be handicapped from the standpoint of earnings and productivity." (H. W. Anderson, vice president, General Motors Corp.)

"No man at the Ford Motor Co. is disabled * * * there are 6,286 men and women who are physically limited * * * all of them have handicaps similar to those we find in many returning veterans * * * every one of these employees does a full day's work * * * receives a full day's pay * * * their absenteeism and accident rate are considerably lower than those of other employees. No jobs were created for them. Instead they were fitted to the job." (Henry Ford II.)

"Our experience indicates that industry as a whole is missing a grand opportunity to get some real good, willing, honest, and ambitious people in their organization if they fail to participate in a program for the rehabilitation of returned veterans." (C. B. Masters, horological superintendent, Gruen Watch Co.)

"The disabled have earned the right to work by the record they have made * * * we in America possess the knowledge and vast resources to create the abundant life for all men, well or ill—whole or maimed * * * it is time to put this knowledge to work to bring to our own communities the services and opportunities which will enable the handicapped to share equally in the common benefits, the common goals, and responsibilities of life in this democracy." (Howard A. Rusk, M. D., the New York Times magazine.)

COORDINATED PROGRAM OF SERVICE

The DAV service program is designed to help disabled veterans to help themselves. Coordinated on the national, state and local levels, it provides expert, personalized assistance, free of charge, to all war-disabled veterans and their dependents.

The DAV is more than an advisory and referral agency. It is a "one-stop" organization, rendering a complete service to handicapped ex-servicemen. It actually takes over the problems of disabled veterans in need of assistance and does all the work necessary for their solution.

Ninety percent of all disabled veterans are capable of working at gainful employment. And they are eager to work. The aim of the DAV is to help them to make as complete a transition as possible to productive civilian life. Experience has shown that the best way to maintain the morale and self-respect of disabled veterans is to help them to become self-supporting through gainful employment.

On the three levels, the DAV's services to disabled veterans include:

National

Advice and assistance in connection with their claims for governmental benefits, such as disability compensation, hospitalization, insurance, vocational training, and employment.

The objective is to make disabled veterans productive assets to their families, their employers, their communities, and their country.

The DAV's services on the national level are furnished through its Nation-wide set-up of expertly trained [1] National Service Workers, located in all of the Veterans' Administration regional offices throughout the country.

These service workers, all disabled veterans, are devoting their lives to the service of their fellow disabled veterans.

[1] The training course consists of 6 months of intensive study at the American University in Washington, D. C., followed by 18 months of on-the-job training.

State

State departments of the DAV cooperate with national service headquarters, principally in connection with the DAV's employment efforts to "find the man to fit the job, or the job to fit the man."

Each State department has appointed a State employment officer. He in turn has selected, and cooperates closely with, the employment officer of each chapter in his State.

On the State level, the DAV cooperates with the Veterans' Administration and State veterans' programs.

State departments also act as liaison for rural communities where no chapters have been established. In such cases, the State department either assists the rural community in starting a chapter, or arranges for a nearby chapter to handle the additional service and welfare work.

Local

On the local level, the DAV does some of its most effective work, because it is in the home community that the fight for rehabilitation is won or lost.

In local communities the DAV's services range from the paramount function of helping disabled veterans to make a successful transition to useful civilian life, to morale work such as delivering needed comforts to hospitalized veterans, and helping the families of deceased veterans.

DAV chapter employment officers confer with many small employers, who employ the majority of all workers.

The DAV service worker is experienced in selective placement of disabled veterans. He apprises handicapped ex-servicemen of existing job opportunities, and informs employers of the availability of capable disabled veterans.

"The disabled veteran must be assisted to return, not to a life of pensions and invalidism, but to an active and productive career among his working fellow Americans, as a self-reliant, self-supporting, self-respecting American.

"The Disabled American Veterans represents in its name, in its purpose, and in its accomplishments, those veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country. They, more than any others, deserve first call on all we can do.

"The DAV has been of great help to us in this important work. We welcomed its help in the past. We count confidently upon it for the future.

"I know that a free people can never forget the men whose blood was spilled to keep them free." (Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

"The disabled man is not a handicapped worker when he is properly placed. He is steadier, more careful and less inclined to absenteeism; and he generally turns out equal or superior work." (L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor.)

"If responsible citizens do not act to assist the veteran, to answer his questions, provide him with the opportunities he needs, integrate him into community life, make him feel that he is a vital part of the home-town team, then he may feel that he is an outsider. He may become disgruntled and embittered. He will face the danger of being exploited by unscrupulous men." (Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC, Administrator, Retraining and Reemployment Administration, U. S. Department of Labor.)

"Hand-outs, either by the Government or the public, do not bring about the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. The DAV has learned, through 25 years of experience since World War I, that the real answer is service—expert, direct, personalized—which will make the handicapped ex-serviceman self-supporting and self-respecting. The best way to help disabled veterans to help themselves is to contribute generously to the National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Na-

tional headquarters is located at 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y." (Lloyd F. Oleson, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans.)

"I am certain that the American public will support heartily the National Service Fund which is now being raised to expand and maintain the Disabled American Veterans' free rehabilitation services." (Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff of the Army.)

1947 NEEDS

To carry on the national service program of the Disabled American Veterans in 1947, the following budget of minimum requirements must be raised. As more fully explained in previous pages, the DAV is placing principal emphasis on helping disabled veterans to get jobs and to resume normal, productive, civilian lives.

Training course:

Training and maintaining 118 disabled veterans now studying at the American University, Washington, D. C.	$75,000
On-the-job training and maintenance of 167 disabled veterans who have been graduated from the American University and have been assigned to regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country	275,000
National service program:	
Maintenance of national service headquarters in Washington, D. C., including claims, medical, insurance, civil-service, and employment departments; coordination of field work with Veterans' Administration central office and other Government agencies; research and statistical work	250,000
Maintenance of 95 full-time national service workers throughout the country, including salaries of secretarial and clerical assistance, travel, and other incidental costs in connection with operating service offices	350,000
Employment:	
Cost of maintaining and expanding employment program on the national level, including contact officers to cooperate with Government and private agencies, employers, and veterans	125,000
Public-education program, intensive national program to educate the general public as to the needs and abilities of disabled veterans and to show disabled veterans how they can help themselves	175,000
Total cost, national service program	1,250,000

In addition to the national budget, funds must be raised in each of the States for the activities of the State departments and local chapters, in order to carry out the coordinated service program on the national, state and local levels.

The National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans is sponsored by leaders in every walk of life. It is endorsed by the President, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and officials of the armed forces.

The Governors are serving as honorary chairmen for their respective States.

The fund is administered by the board of trustees of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. On the board are men of outstanding administrative ability and wide experience in veterans' affairs. All have a keen sense of patriotism and social responsibility. Trustees are elected from various parts of the country to give the board national representation. The board includes: William E. Tate, chairman, Washington, D. C.; John D. Ames, Illinois; John J. Bradley, brigadier general, United States Army, retired, New York; Lewis L. Clarke, New York; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; Miles H. Draper, Florida; James L. Monnahan, Minnesota; Lloyd F. Oleson, California; Irving J. Phillipson, major general, United States Army, retired, New Jersey; Arthur W. Procter, New York; Millard W. Rice, Washington, D. C.; Dow V. Walker, Oregon.

"Leaders in every community in the country should participate in this campaign. Every American should do his part in this movement to help all of America's disabled veterans to help themselves." (Charles Shipman Payson, chairman.)

The following are a few of the more than 16,000 individuals and corporations whose financial support is making it possible for the DAV to meet its increased responsibilities: American Airlines, Inc.; American Car & Foundry Co.; American Locomotive Co.; American Maize-Products Co.; American Surety Corp.; American Sugar Refining Co.; American Rolling Mill Co.; American Thread Co.; American Tobacco Co.; Anaconda Copper Mining Co.; Armour & Co.; Atlas Corp.; Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Bache & Co.; Baker & Co.; Balaban & Katz Corp.; Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.; Bayer Co. Division of Sterling Drug, Inc.; Belmont Park War Relief; Blyth & Co.; Breed, Abbott & Morgan; Carson Pirie Scott & Co.; Cartier, Inc.; Celanese Corp. of America; Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.; Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.; Climax Molybdenum Co.; Commonwealth Edison Co., Chicago; Commonwealth & Southern Corp.; Conde Nast Publications, Inc.; Continental Baking Co.; Continental Bank & Trust Co. of New York; Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.; Coverdale & Colpitts; Crane Co.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Cuneo Press; Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.; Thomas A. Edison, Inc.; Eversharp, Inc.; Marshall Field & Co.; First National Bank of Chicago; General Aniline & Film Corp.; General Bronze Corp.; General Electric Co., Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; Greyhound Corp.; Gulf Oil Corp.; Harris Trust & Savings Bank; Henry Heide, Inc.; Hudnut Sales Co., Inc.; E. F. Hutton & Co.; Inland Steel Foundation, Inc.; International Business Machines Corp.; International Harvester Co.; International Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Kidder, Peabody & Co.; Lambert Pharmacal Co.; Lamborn & Co., Inc.; Lamont, Corliss & Co.; Lever Bros. Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.; London & Lancashire Insurance Co.; Lumberman's Mutual Casualty Co.; Mandel Bros., Inc.; Magnus, Mabee & Reynard, Inc.; Laurence M. Marks & Co.; Marsh & McLennan, Inc.; Metallic Lathers Union; Montgomery Ward & Co.; Northern Trust Co.; Pabst Brewing Co.; Paramount Pictures, Inc.; People's Gas Light & Coke Co.; Prentice-Hall, Inc.; Pressed Steel Car Co.; Procter & Gamble Co.; Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois; Pullman, Inc.; Quaker Oats Co.; Reader's Digest Association, Inc.; Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc.; Remington Rand, Inc.; Rustless Iron & Steel Co.; J. Henry Schroder Banking Corp.; Sears-Roebuck Foundation; Sharon Steel Corp.; L. C. Smith & Corona Typewriter, Inc.; St. Regis Paper Co.; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; Sperry Corp.; E. R. Squibb & Sons; Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Standard Railway Equipment Manufacturing Co.; J. P. Stevens & Co.; Swift & Co.; Symington-Gould Corp.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.; Tide Water Associated Oil Co.; Time, Inc.; Unexcelled Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Union Bag & Paper Co.; Union Carbide & Carbon Co.; United Air Lines; United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corp.; United States Gypsum Co.; United States Potash Co.; United States Trucking Corp.; Vanadium Corp. of America; William R Warner & Co.; Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Wilson & Co.; F. W. Woolworth Co.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp.; William Wrigley, Jr., Co.

NATIONAL SERVICE FUND OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
National Campaign Headquarters,
41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, each day the papers are filled with propaganda, in both advertising and editorial form, with reference to the labor legislation which has just passed the House and the Senate. Members of Congress are also receiving multitudinous letters in an attempt to influence them while the conference is in progress. However, all of the propaganda of those articles, editorials, and letters fail to show a real knowledge of what Congress did, what the facts of the hearings were, and what the debates disclosed.

I was therefore very much pleased to read an editorial in the Chicago Daily News, written by John S. Knight, the other day, which gives an understanding statement of the measures in question. For this reason I hope you will take time to read it, and I am therefore including the editorial as a part of my remarks.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

CONGRESS' FAIR LABOR BILL REPRESENTS NATION'S WISH

Ever since the United States Senate voted 68 to 24 to restrict labor abuses, Big Labor has let out an anguished cry that the bill is un-American, destroys our freedom, and is definitely a trend toward fascism.

What the union leaders really fear is that, if the Senate bill becomes the law of the country, an equitable and just method of dealing with labor relations will replace the autocratic powers enjoyed by the unions since the early days of the New Deal.

There is nothing in the bill that deprives any American citizen of his constitutional rights or liberties. The bill does endeavor to correct the inequities and injustices of the Wagner act. It is not a punitive measure because under its provisions, no one is to be punished.

REFLECTS VOTE OF LAST FALL

The thumping 68-to-24 majority which the bill received came as an unpleasant surprise to big labor, but it accurately represented the will of the people who voted last November to curb labor's power.

Under the protective provisions of the Wagner Act, big labor's arrogance dissipated much of the good will which could have been retained by even an occasional manifestation of statesmanship.

The people were fed up with ill-timed strikes, jurisdictional disputes, irresponsible leadership and labor's take-it-or-else attitude.

The 1946 elections gave them an opportunity to register a protest and they did it effectively.

In the past they have administered similar rebukes to big business when they thought

business and industrial leaders were outrageously defaulting their public responsibilities.

LABOR COACHES CRY "POLITICS"

Some of labor's apologists, including Edwin A. Lahey, of our Washington staff, charge that "Republican leaders in Congress are more interested in putting President Truman on a spot for 1948 than they are in prescribing for specific problems in our industrial society."

Most Americans are more likely to agree with Walter Lippmann's studied conclusion that "even with its defects, the Senate bill is a statesmanlike effort to carry out the popular will—that laws be enacted which will regulate the power of union labor."

The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The Senate and House labor bills have been passed after months of public hearings and debate.

They represent thoughtful, independent legislative action in keeping with the people's will and in sharp contrast to the spineless servitude of the American Congress under Roosevelt.

If it is Mr. Lahey's idea that Congress should pass only those laws which are acceptable to the President, he is saying, in effect, that we need no Congress at all.

If it is labor's idea that Congress is not following the wishes of the people, its leaders are suffering from a self-imposed and wishful myopia.

If it is anyone's idea that the welfare of the Nation is being jeopardized whenever Congress and the President disagree, they have too little faith in democracy.

EFFORT NOW IS FOR VETO

Big labor is now concentrating its efforts upon obtaining a Presidential veto of the final bill that will emerge from the House-Senate conference.

One of the devices being used is an attempt to persuade the President that the bill was passed with undue haste. "Actually," says the New York Times, "few bills have ever received the thorough consideration, the careful preparation, and the searching debate which this measure has received.

"Hearings on it were begun by a Senate committee on January 23, almost as soon as the new Congress convened. On February 5 the House instituted its own independent hearings. Thereafter, over a period of many weeks, both committees took testimony from witnesses representing many points of view and many interests: Government officials, university professors, businessmen, and trade-unionists themselves.

"The actual drafting of the two bills was a studiously slow and careful process, marked by frequent committee votes on contentious points. When the House bill reached the floor it received a full-dress debate. The Senate bill has been the chief business of that branch of Congress ever since debate on it was begun on April 23."

In the light of that record it should be remembered that the Wagner Act, labor's so-called Magna Carta, was introduced by Senator WAGNER on May 15, 1935, and passed after 1 day's debate.

By comparison, labor's charge that the present bills were passed in haste and without adequate consideration is not supported in fact.

PHONY EVILS AID CAMPAIGN

Big labor is also endeavoring to mislead the public by conjuring up all sorts of horrible consequences should the Taft-Hartley bill become law.

On a national ABC network show, the American Federation of Labor presented a skit in which that traditional ogre, the boss, chortles with a cat-and-canary grin:

"Soon as they pass them bills you boys're gonna be running around these machines like jack rabbits. You're gonna sweat again."

Then Superman of the AFL radio show interjects:

"If these bills are passed, wages will be slashed, purchasing power will diminish sharply, the chief market of the farmer and of industry will be destroyed, production will be cut for lack of buying, millions will lose their jobs. * * * Your voice, the voice of the American people, is the only thing that can kill these slave-labor bills."

In other words, according to these mental juveniles, everyone but labor is preparing to commit economic suicide.

REJECTED GOAL OF EMPLOYERS

To unionists who object that the Taft-Hartley bills will ruin labor, we quote Senator BALL, of Minnesota:

"A lot of employers would like to see us regulate very extensively the internal affairs of the unions. I thought that the idea behind the Republican platform was to get the Government out of interfering with the daily lives of people and organizations. It seems to me that if we take away the monopolistic special privileges of the unions * * * they can run their internal affairs any way they like, and I don't think it is any part of the Government's business."

That statement sounds like good American doctrine to us. No meddling with internal union affairs nor any mollycoddling of business.

WILL THERE BE ONE BIG VETO?

There is much speculation that the President signed the portal-to-portal bill in order to pave the way for a veto of the labor bill.

This thinking is based upon the premise that, while Big Labor expressed public disapproval of the portal-to-portal bill, union leaders will be content to settle for the one big veto they have in mind—any labor legislation that comes out of the House-Senate conference.

Since President Truman has publicly declared several times that corrective labor legislation is sorely needed, there is a distinct possibility that he may sign the bill while disapproving some of its provisions.

Should he veto the measure, the country will be put on notice that the only way to obtain remedial labor legislation is by electing a Republican President in 1948.

We are certain that thought has occurred to Mr. Truman as well.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a statement in the Communist Daily Worker this morning, signed by William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, and Eugene Dennis, the secretary of the party, who is now being prosecuted for contempt of Congress, demanding that the President veto whatever labor legislation is passed by this Congress.

Mr. OWENS. That is the criticism of most of these articles; the authors show no understanding of the facts.

THE HAZARDS OF BUSINESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, during the war thousands and thousands of contracts with the Government were on a cost-plus basis. The more the contractors spent the more they made. It reminds me of the old ditty:

Pokey, pokey, buy and take;
The more you spend the more we make.

I notice from the Wall Street Journal of April 30 that the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. reports a consolidated net loss of $19,284,680 for 1946.

This Kaiser-Frazer outfit is one that had many, many contracts under and for the New Deal, spending the people's money. Now that they are spending their money, they find it is not so easy to make a profit, that they have got to watch their pennies. They find also that it is not easy to manage a private business and make a profit. It is time more people realized the Government cannot continue under cost-plus contracts or the Government will keep losing.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

KAISER-FRAZER REPORTS CONSOLIDATED NET LOSS OF $19,284,680 IN 1946—PRODUCTION UPSWING IN APRIL, COMPANY SAYS, WILL PUT FIRM ON PROFITABLE OPERATING BASIS

WILLOW RUN, MICH.—Kaiser-Frazer Corp. reported a consolidated net loss for 1946 of $19,284,680 in its first annual report mailed to stockholders.

At the same time the company revealed a production upswing for April. This, Edgar F. Kaiser, vice president and general manager said, will put the auto firm on a profitable operating basis.

Mr. Kaiser disclosed that more than 400 cars per day were turned out during the latter part of April, and that the corporation had scheduled the production of 10,000 automobiles in May and 12,000 in June.

He said these schedules would be increased if Continental Motors Corp. meets its engine commitments.

With this greatly increased production forecast, Kaiser-Frazer should show substantial earnings in the second quarter, Mr. Kaiser added.

The statement shows that the loss for the year 1946 includes all the expenses for engineering, design, and preparation for production of automobiles, no part of which was deferred.

The report which was signed by Henry J. Kaiser, chairman, and Joseph W. Frazer, president of the company, said that despite material shortages, the company has shown steady progress in automobile production since the first seven cars rolled from the assembly lines last June. In September, 1,120 cars were built, November 4,089, January 7,141, and approximately 8,000 in April. More than 37,500 Kaiser and Frazer automobiles have been turned out at the Willow Run plant to date. Approximately 2,600 of these cars are in transit or are in the hands of dealers, 1,100 are being used by the dealers as demonstrators, while the rest of 33,800 were sold to the public.

Kaiser-Frazer Corp. and subsidiaries report for year ended December 31, 1946, net sales of $11,504,443 and miscellaneous income of $153,529, making total income of $11,657,972. Costs, expenses, and other deductions totaled $31,037,375 and minority interest was $94,722, leaving a net loss for the year of $19,284,681.

Consolidated balance sheet as of December 31, 1946, shows total assets of $46,287,879. Cash was $7,226,096; inventories $13,486,072; current assets $25,696,353, and current liabilities $13,879,007. Capital surplus was $50,466,274 and deficit from operations amounted to $20,057,402. There were 4,000,000 common shares outstanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] before a gathering at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex., on May 17, 1947, which was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain excerpts.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address he delivered over radio station WJR in Detroit on last Saturday evening.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a radio speech he made recently.

THE FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the United Press recently carried a story under a Phoenix, Ariz., dateline, quoting Robert J. Kleberg, president of the King Ranch, and brother of our former Texas colleague, as making some rather serious charges concerning the campaign to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

Believing that these charges should not go unchallenged, I asked Dr. Bennett T. Simms, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, to comment on them.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include at this point a copy of the United Press article together with a letter from Dr. Simms replying to the charges contained therein:

CATTLE DISEASE FUNDS MISUSED, KLEBERG SAYS

PHOENIX, ARIZ., May 9.—American funds intended to eradicate the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico are being used in such a way as "to permanently fasten the disease on Mexico and assure its spread to the United States," Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., president of the world's largest ranch, charged in letters received here Friday.

The head of the King Ranch made the allegation in a three-page signed "analysis" of the program financed by the United States to slaughter all cattle in the infected zone below the border.

HE MAKES CHARGES

Kleberg said the effectiveness of the program depended on disposal of slaughtered animals by burial in quicklime on the premises. He charged that the cattle were being taken to slaughterhouses and the meat distributed for human consumption, which "means a permanent source of reinfection is maintained."

The rancher added that it was difficult to believe "that it was planned that way, but an analysis * * * certainly leads to that conclusion."

"It would be normal for animals 'in herds not yet affected' to be moved to slaughterhouses provided they have not been exposed to infection," wrote Kleberg. "But it is abnormal that the United States pay for these cattle and let the Mexican Government pocket the proceeds from their sale."

The Texan pointed out that Congress appropriated $9,000,000 to pay for the program, earmarking $7,500,000 to pay for cattle slaughtered.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR DR. GILLIE: Reference is made to our telephone conversation yesterday regarding some comments made by Mr. R. J. Kleberg concerning the foot-and-mouth disease eradication campaign in Mexico.

We do not believe that Mr. Kleberg has been fully informed regarding this campaign. The basic policy agreed upon as offering the greatest promise of ultimate success in Mexico was formulated at the meeting of the Animal Industry Sub-Commission of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission. Resolution III adopted at that meeting gives the reasoning underlying this policy decision as given in the attached Supplement No. 1 to Summary of Developments in the Mexican outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. The campaign involves a combination of the drastic slaughter method in the outlying infected zones with a program of orderly marketing within the main infected zone of livestock from herds where the disease has not appeared and herds which have been infected but have since entirely recovered and are apparently healthy at the time of marketing.

Mr. Kleberg is critical of the administrative action taken under the laws authorizing the Department to participate in the Mexican campaign. We feel that the actions of the Bureau and others in the Department have been fully in accord with the program outlined to the Congress when appearances were made before the committees to explain the need for legislation and give the estimates of the initial expenditures. In addition to the printed record of the hearings before these committees we quote here for ready reference the printed statement of justification which accompanied the Department's request for funds:

"Foot-and-mouth disease has become so widespread in Mexico that the facilities of that country alone are insufficient to cope successfully with the problem. Under the cooperative campaign proposed pursuant to Public Law 8, approved February 28, 1947, an extremely rigid quarantine will be established and maintained around the area where the disease presently exists. Susceptible animals and dangerous products will be prevented from moving out of the quarantined area, and no animals will be allowed to move into the area except for immediate slaughter. All susceptible animals in newly infected and directly exposed herds or flocks will be disposed of by immediate destruction on the premises, followed by thorough disinfection."

"Contribution of the United States: It is planned that approximately 150,000 cattle will be slaughtered before June 30, 1947. These animals will be purchased by the joint board, their price being computed on a weight basis. The average cost will be about $50 per head. The purchase price for these cattle is estimated at $7,500,000, which expense will be assumed by the United States through the joint board. To facilitate the purchase of these cattle, funds will be transferred to the joint board to make these purchases. Cattle not destroyed will be turned over to the Government of Mexico for slaughter for food purposes. Any moneys received through their sale will be used by the Government of Mexico in furtherance of the campaign, in addition to other services rendered by Mexico. * * *"

It is agreed that the disposal of apparently healthy herds within the infected zone by shipment to consuming centers for slaughter is a slower process than the one always used in this country. However, the infection already exists in these consuming centers in the infected zone and it is intended that they will be left until the last of the cleanup. The products and byproducts of the slaughtering are to be consumed or destroyed within this area. In the meantime the liquidation by destruction or shipment for slaughter of all susceptible animals in the area, if accomplished, will obviate the setting up of new centers. The purpose, of course, is gradually to pinch out the infection by this means. This will allow time for education of the people, for providing replacements for work stock, consisting in many districts almost entirely of work oxen, and to take other measures to prevent complete demoralization of the economy of the region. Of course, the success or failure of these methods rests to a very considerable extent upon the effectiveness of the quarantine maintained around the main infected zone. This matter is receiving the close attention of the United States section of the Joint Commission in Mexico and there is evidence that the quarantine methods are being constantly improved.

As all products derived from animals slaughtered are to be consumed or destroyed within the area the movement of any such out of the area and the use of them in provisioning ships or planes or other carriers are precluded.

Along with the organized effort to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in central Mexico, measures have been and are being taken to guard our borders against the possibility of the appearance of the disease in the northern States of that country. It is recognized that a land boundary is not nearly as effective a barrier against introduction of the infection as are oceans or seas. Hence, if the disease penetrates into northern Mexico it must be expected that there will be occasional outbreaks in this country notwithstanding our best efforts along the border. However, as all interests concerned are aware of that danger and therefore will exercise the utmost watchfulness, any center of infection appearing here should be quickly discovered. With that advantage and with energetic action following there is every reason to believe that we shall be able to arrest and eradicate any outbreak that may occur in this country with all possible speed.

Very truly yours,

B. T. SIMMS,
Chief of Bureau.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe what we read in the papers we can come to but one conclusion, that the warehouses of this country are bulging with sugar just as the granaries of the ancient Pharaohs

were bursting with stored wheat, corn, and barley.

This food should be made available to our housewives so that the American diet may be improved. Cakes, preserved fruits, pies, bread, and all the other edibles that have been common to the American table for a century before the recent war ought to be prepared once again in home ovens. People are unable to maintain our usually high standard of living unless more sugar is distributed per capita. You will remember how Joseph in the Bible opened the granaries of ancient Egypt when the people hungered. It is time a modern Joseph came forward and opened the warehouses of sugar so that the American family may have an adequate supply for which we have all hungered for so long.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a newspaper article by Constantine Brown, an editorial from the New York Post, and a letter addressed to Members of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dean Alfange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Sunday Post.

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Dubinsky appearing in the New York Times magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Congress is about to enter the final stages of its antilabor program, which was inaugurated with the Eightieth Congress, it would be well to stop, look, and listen. I have long been a friend of labor, and while with many other of its friends, I recognize that some remedial legislation is needed, I feel certain that the bitterness engendered by the definitely hostile legislation this House has already passed and the legislation which is likely to result from the conference with the other legislative body on the hill, will only drive labor, in its efforts to retain its hard-won gains, to the left.

We know that communism has already infiltrated into many of our labor unions. We also know that the real leaders of American labor realize the dangers of this infiltration and are endeavoring to stem it. Oppressive legislation will only make the task of these true labor leaders more difficult and will give strength to the communistic effort to bend labor to the Moscow line.

The fight against communistic infiltration is well told by that distinguished labor leader, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, in an article entitled "A Warning Against Communists in Unions," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on May 11 last. I commend this article to my colleagues for their thoughtful reading.

The article, which I include herein by unanimous consent, is as follows:

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS

MR. DUBINSKY SAYS THEIR AIMS AND SPIRITS ARE HOSTILE TO THE POLICIES OF TRADE-UNIONISM

What Communists do in the trade-unions of any country vitally affects the welfare and security of its entire people, and not merely its organized labor movement.

No organization in American life has been immune from Communist penetration. Obedient to centralized direction, Communists have bored within church bodies, educational institutions, women's clubs, scientific groups, and, believe it or not, businessmen's associations.

But the labor unions have been their special target. Without control of the trade-unions the Communists would be lost. The unions form their economic base. Without direction of the key workers' groups, their other "transmission belts" would be useless. The workers' organizations are the largest and most vital nongovernmental body in the community. They are primarily dedicated to improving working conditions, to raising living standards. They are part of a delicate mechanism of modern life, the core of human engineering. The influence of organized labor reaches far beyond its 13,000,000 members or their families.

For this reason the significance of Communist operations in trade-unions can scarcely be exaggerated. Like termites, they bore into the house of labor, but are not an integral part of the structure because the spirit and aims of totalitarian communism are totally distinct from and hostile to the ideals and policies of free trade-unionism.

Free trade unionism may have its faults, but they can be remedied because essentially the processes of these unions are democratic, even though, at times, they may fall short of the ideal.

But communism, in unions and other organizations, is conspiratorial. It is based on the elimination of majority rule. It aims to establish the one-party state as the sole power over all groups. The unions, they are convinced, are the stepping stones to this goal.

The Communist technique is simple. The party agent forms the acquaintance of a member of a union which is marked for capture. They form a "cell" or "fraction" of a few like-minded members. With the help of the party agent a program is prepared. Naturally, it follows the Communist Party line.

At the outset, the party representative's choice falls on a unionist who knows something about parliamentary procedure. Then the stage is set. The innocent is introduced to an important party functionary or well-known party speaker; he is taken to cocktail parties and dances and no time is lost in introducing him to attractive partners.

The next scene is at the union meeting. Hardly is the gathering called to order before the Communist "fraction" starts to work. A member or, better still, a stooge or "innocent" makes a motion. The debate is on. It may and frequently does last long into the night. Slowly the members who want some sleep slip out of the room. As they do, the Communist tide rises. A vote may be taken at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. The party-liners win.

Sounds simple, does it not? It is simple. And yet that is the way the followers of Stalin have captured trade unions. The same procedure used at national conventions results in the Communist capture or control of the larger units

The Communists cannot act single-handed. They must have help. They must be part of a crowd, of a "united front" or a "popular front," whatever the name may be. Because they know what they want, because they are skilled in parliamentary tactics, and use any methods or weapons and because they reject no trick or device, they make headway.

But the Communist "fraction" does not always plant its own member in the union president's office. This place is often reserved for the ambitious opportunist who is ready to "play along." The "fraction" may even seek out a pliable promising non-Communist Party man to bear the title of president and thus serve as a good cover for the actual party control of the union. If he stands for the party program, that is enough. Of course the real job, such as secretary-treasurer and organizational director, must go to strict party men.

The whole Communist apparatus is highly centralized—"democratic centralism" is the phrase. But forget the "democratic." That's camouflage. The machinery is geared for quick action, for when the party line is "handed down" it must be obeyed with blind military discipline. There is no time for debate, only for "discussion and approval."

The Communists refer to themselves as the "vanguard" of labor. Nothing could be further from the truth. They have disrupted many unions with their factional quarrels and have left in their wake many saddened and disillusioned members, destroyed businesses and blasted hopes. Far from being "progressive," as they claim, they are really "dynamic reactionaries," as someone has called them.

To them ethics and morality are "bourgeois" virtues. Therefore, in the unions, as elsewhere, they will support a conservative or reactionary if he should oblige them by favoring a pro-Soviet or proparty line.

Many cases are at hand to prove this assertion. Indeed, we can show examples of union leaders who have dipped into their organizations' treasuries and grossly mismanaged union affairs without any condemnation by the Communists. In such cases the Communists have jumped hard on anyone who has tried to unseat the financially delinquent and incompetent non-Communist "friend of the Soviet Union."

As self-constituted champions of the Negro race the Communists have never faltered in praise of their alleged attitude on race discrimination. Yet they have never criticized the head of one of the Nation's important unions who is known to be largely responsible for drawing the color line in his own organization.

Why? This union official, though not a Communist, has, out of vanity, or ignorance perhaps, permitted his name to be used as a sponsor of Soviet "front" outfits.

In another important union the national president has winked at Communist domination of local activities in two important metropolitan areas. By this concession he has bought off criticism of his administration of union affairs. This officer even sits at labor conventions with men he knows are Communist leaders of his affiliates.

It is evident that vanity and lack of principle by non-Communist unionists have a bearing on the reasons why pro-Communist elements make headway in the mass work-

ers units. Opportunism is a quality that is found everywhere.

Even in our own international union any local officer, no mattter how conservative or incompetent, can avoid criticism by Communists and even obtain their support by merely endorsing some resolution favoring Russian foreign policy or the party line.

To Communists the yardstick of a union leader's "progressivism" is not the soundness of his labor policies but his readiness to approve Kremlin policy. That is why I consider them totalitarian reactionaries.

The fact is that real progressive unionists are the foremost targets of these leftists while conservative unionists are quite safe from their onslaughts. The reason is simple. The liberal unionist knows the score. He is wise to Communist machinations. He can find his way through the jungle of double talk raised by the "saviors of the working class." This will explain why the ILGWU has been the butt of bitter Communist assaults for so many years.

Although our union is free of the Communist menace today, it was not always so. In 1926 the Communist Party through its demagogic propaganda and exaggerated promises was able to attract many of our members. It thus managed to obtain control of our New York organization and succeeded in plunging the coat and suit industry into a general strike. After a futile 8-week struggle the local Communist leaders had had enough. They were ready to come to a settlement, but the Communist Party, feeling that the Moscow line was about to change, ordered their agents inside the union to continue the strike—against their better judgment and against the interests of the workers.

The strike ended disastrously after 18 more weeks of futile agony on the picket lines in order to justify the Communist class struggle dogma. This terrible fiasco, however, unseated the Communists in our union. Since then, most of the leaders of that strike have broken with Communist totalitarianism and have returned to the union. These same leaders are now the most effective fighters against Communist influence and domination.

It took 10 years for us to recover from the criminal and stupid Communist-led strike of 1926, which cost $3,500,000 and left in its wake a chaotic industry and a crippled union.

Other unions are going through the same experience we have had. Now and then the curtain is pulled aside and we see what is happening. Take the case of Joseph Curran, of the CIO's National Maritime Union. He knows the story from the inside. He says that 500 Communist Party members dominate his union of 80,000 members through tactics "no different than those practiced by the Nazis when they destroyed the trade-union movement of Germany."

By means of its cells the Communist Party, according to Mr. Curran, was able to take 107 out of 150 elective offices in this union, one of the most strategic in the Nation's life. These 107 officials, says Mr. Curran, are "more interested in assuring that the National Maritime Union becomes a stooge union of the Communist Party than they are in keeping it an instrument belonging to the rank-and-file seamen who built it."

Interference by the Communist Party in union elections, finances, and strike policies was but recently exposed by J. A. (Pat) Sullivan, president of the Canadian Seamen's Union, an affiliate of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress.

For years prior to his frank confession of Communist affiliation Mr. Sullivan repeatedly denied that tie. He did so, he says, in order to win two elective positions—secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress and head of the Canadian seamen's organization, strategic posts from which he could serve the Communist Party.

The Communists are desperately working day and night to get control of progressive unions. With these as a base they can then launch their attacks on more conservative union citadels. Once in control of a few key progressive unions they have a toehold in the inner circles and policy-making body of the whole labor movement. This is no small achievement. It means representation on committees and bodies of all sorts, visiting the President, for example, having an entree to important Government departments, and gaining access to what might otherwise be secret information, and, naturally, passing it on to the party commissars.

One Communist-dominated union suddenly conceived the idea of organizing workers in the Panama Canal Zone. Overnight the organizer flew to that strategic area. In a comparatively short time the union boasted 13,000 members there. Was this display of activity solely an interest in trade-unionism?

I will not deny that Communists, at times, fight to improve the lot of the wage earners but only when such a policy coincided with the interests of the Soviet rulers. If it is to their advantage to forego demands on their employers, to neglect grievances, to engage in the maximum of class collaboration, they will do so.

Take their attitude toward President Roosevelt. When the New Deal was sponsoring important social legislation, Earl Browder saw in it "the clearest example of the tendencies toward fascism." Roosevelt's labor policies, according to Mr. Browder, constituted "the American brother to Mussolini's corporate state with state-controlled labor unions closely tied up and under the direction of the employers."

Subsequently, when the party line changed, no praise of Roosevelt was too great for Mr. Browder. However, during the Hitler-Stalin pact this ersatz fuehrer thundered in Madison Square Garden, "The Roosevelt-ism of the New Deal has capitulated to reactionaries."

Yet the moment Russia was forced into the war by Hitler everything changed again. The Communists buried their class struggle theory temporarily and they stopped strikes abruptly because they were no longer interested in embarrassing our defense preparations or sabotaging aid to Britain. In fact, they glorified F. D. R. in terms second only to those held in reserve for Stalin. In this and in their temporarily servile submission to American employers they had but one motive: to serve Russian interests, not those of the American people.

The unions under Communist domination reflected this sudden change faithfully because they are completely wired for Communist sound. Read their organs and you will learn that as soon as Russia entered the war they abandoned their campaign against lend-lease and frowned on any interruption of production. In this period, one of the largest of these Communist-dominated unions even espoused an elaborate incentive production plan of the type denounced by labor for many years as speed-up. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the reason.

For purely Communist purposes, the needs of Russian foreign policy, the Communists have brought discredit to the time-honored weapon of trade-union picketing. They threw a picket line around a hotel to interfere with a dinner officially tendered to Winston Churchill by the city of New York. In another instance Philip Murray had to intervene to prevent the Communist-dominated New York City CIO-industrial council from proclaiming a 2-hour city-wide political strike. The strike was called ostensibly to support another CIO union—also in the Communist orbit.

Harry Bridges, who runs the west coast longshoremen's unions, is familiar with all the curves in the Communist Party line. When American cooperation with the Soviet Union was the order of the day during the war he boldly proclaimed the idea of extending the no-strike pledge beyond the war period. But he dropped this line when the war ended and the party line changed. Behind this changed expression is his belief, shared by other Communist Party line followers, that the political strike is more important than the economic strike. Keep that in mind. It is important. The reason is obvious. The political strike is a revolutionary weapon. The economic strike is not.

What would happen if the Communists should gain control of the American trade-union movement?

Let Tomsky, prominent Russian trade-union leader, a suicide in one of the party purges, give the answer:

"If for a moment we could imagine that tomorrow all the trade-unions of Germany would march hand in hand with the German Communist Party, we would have no doubt that a Soviet government would be established there within 5 minutes after that combination of forces took place. * * * If we could imagine for a moment a combination of the trade-unions with the Communist Party of England, then a Soviet government would rapidly spring up also in England."

Obviously, the extent to which Communists succeed in capturing posts and securing domination over unions vitally concerns the entire Nation and not merely the particular labor body affected.

Present-day France affords a striking and tragic confirmation of this truth. The Communists in France now dominate the General Confederation of Labor. No doubt the Communist party in France owes much of its electoral strength to the stranglehold it has over the great trade unions in the metal trades, coal fields, transportation and other key labor organizations. Through its airtight control of the trade-unions, the Communist Party has, whenever it so desired, exercised veto power over the French Government's economic policies. Because of this Communist control of the General Confederation of Labor, the numerically largest political party in France is one whose policies are controlled by a foreign power and not by its membership.

We must never forget that the Communists took to resistance in France not when their own country was attacked but only after Russia was invaded. What a menace this development is to the stability and security of France is clear to all.

In many important respects, the situation now prevailing in Italy is similar.

Were the Communists ever to exercise such domination over the American trade-union movement and thereby secure such a decisive political position, our own country would find itself just as unstable and insecure—its national independence vitally sapped—at the mercy and whim of a ruthless, foreign, totalitarian dictatorship.

Liberals render a distinct disservice to the Nation when they allow themselves to be used as fig leaves, front men or transmission belts by the Communists. Some liberals deliberately allow themselves to be thus used; others may do so unwittingly. But in both cases such liberals lend most vital prestige indispensable to Communist success.

Non-Communist trade-union leaders who join with the Communists in united front movements render an equally distinct disservice to the people as a whole and to organized labor in particular.

The present trend in the country against communism has so far resulted only in an increasing number of union members getting on to the Communist game. Some leaders of trade unions have left their posts in disgust because of their belated realization as to what the Communists have been doing right under their noses. But though more

and more rank-and-file workers in Communist-dominated unions are waking up to the fact that they have been used as dupes by the Communist Party, the Communists have not yet been dislodged from the control of any unions which they have been holding in their grip. In recent months the Communist Party has been put on the defensive and has lost some ground. But it continues to maintain its stranglehold on a number of unions.

How much strength do the Communists have in the unions? It is impossible to give an exact figure of their trade-union membership.

Today the Communist Party claims 70,000 members. Let us assume that 35,000 of these are in the unions. That would give the party a maximum numerical strength of 0.0027 percent of the 13,000,000 trade-union members. But despite their insignificant numbers, the Communists and their fellow-travelers and party-liners dominate 12 to 15 out of 40 national CIO unions. They have a strong bloc on the CIO executive board

None of the 110 national unions of the AFL is dominated by Communists, but they do control locals of an undetermined number, though not many.

It is safe to say that no important labor union in the United States has more than 2 percent Communist membership. Because of their devious methods of operation, however, the Communists and their followers wield an influence far out of proportion to their numbers. It is truly a case of the Communist tail in some cases wagging the trade-union dog.

The real danger from the Communists in trade-unions is that they control strategically placed workers in key industries such as communications, transportation, shipping and maritime and electrical manufacturing.

Here and there influential labor leaders have felt they could use the Communists to their advantage. Uniformly, this policy has been a failure, sometimes a disaster. The history of the CIO is abundant proof of my statement. Free, democratic trade-unionism and communism do not mix. One cancels out the other. To be free, the unions must keep the Communists out of leadership which they would use to advance their party interests.

How can this be done? We start from the assumption, which is a fact, that up to now the totalitarian success in trade-unions has been scored largely by default. The Communists have broken through open doors.

Today the constructive trade union leader who is fighting the infiltration of Communists into his organization is faced with other grave obstacles. Curiously enough, these hindrances come from those antiunion legislators, on the national and State levels, who presumably are opposed to communism but who at the same time are doing all they can to break down the trade unions and thereby help to strengthen the Communist position.

Every antiunion law passed by Congress becomes a trump card in the hands of the Communists. Weaken the trade-unions and you open wide the dikes for Communist propaganda to rush through. Nearsighted "regulators" of trade-unionism in our legislative halls are the best pals the Communists could wish for in this country.

It is sheer nonsense for anyone to believe the Communists have a monopoly of organizational skill. They can be beaten by the conscious combined will of the progressive and democratic forces within the unions. Over and over again our experience in the ILGWU has supported this contention.

A local of the ILGWU with a membership of 25,000 held an election recently. It has less than 500 avowed or known Communists. Yet, because of their energy, discipline, unscrupulousness in creating false issues and propagandistic activity, they polled 5,000 votes. Suppose only 9,000 members had gone to the polls. Less than 500 Communists would have taken control of a local with such a huge membership. Only because the progressive forces were alert, were well led and were able to bring 80 percent of the members out to vote did they succeed in defeating the Communist-led forces 3 to 1.

Therefore, to meet the situation, trade-union progressives must:

1. Put at least as much energy in organizing the majority as the Communists do in organizing the minority.

2. Enlightened trade-unionists do not have to ban Communist propaganda to stop party infiltration. Outlawing the Communist Party from the political arena or Communists from trade-union membership is not an effective way of combating them. We must rely on education and discussions of daily problems confronting labor, on the systematic enlightenment of our members about the grave issues facing us.

3. We must do everything we can to bring home to the rank and file the importance of attending their local meetings and sharing in the responsibilities of union membership. They must lead in handling grievances in the shops and factories. They must serve on committees that administer the policies of the union, no matter how dull this work seems to be—remembering that if progressive unionists fail in these tasks the Communists will undertake them for their party purposes.

4. Local unions should make it obligatory for members to attend meetings and participate in elections in order to insure that all decisions reflect the will of the majority. This would serve as the most effective barrier to Communist minority control of unions.

Local unions must work out practical administrative methods of stimulating all members to take part in every phase of union life, to take time and patience to interest members in such a program. Efforts must continue despite discouragement.

5. As trade union leaders we must be tireless in our efforts to solve the daily problems of the wage-earners in improving their working conditions, living standards and safeguarding their political rights and interests.

6. Constructive unionists must refrain from competing with Communists or others in making extravagant "pie-in-the-sky" promises that cannot be fulfilled.

If we follow these rules we can easily overcome the Communist nuclei in the trade unions in every test of strength. These strepto-Communist cells, like those of other diseases, thrive in darkness and ignorance. They do not multiply in unions where leaders and members are alert, honest, and competent.

What the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has been able to do since it routed the Communists 20 years ago every progressive American labor union can do today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may address themselves to the Navy appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon may have opportunity to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] who just addressed the House has inserted in the RECORD exactly what I have in my pocket. I intended to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have read that article. It is a most revealing statement by Mr. Dubinsky, a man who knows what he is talking about. Here is the leader of a great labor organization sounding a warning to the American people of the menace and threat that communism has proven itself to be among labor unions. Communism is here to destroy labor unions, because labor unions do not exist under a communistic form of government. They may compete one plant against another for the benefit of the state but beyond that they cannot organize, nor can they strike against the government.

I am delighted that the gentleman from New York has seen fit to put that article in the RECORD, because if he had not, I would have done so myself.

TERMINAL LEAVE BONDS FOR EX-SERVICEMEN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it seems that House bill 3 providing for cash payment of the GI terminal leave bonds is getting nowhere fast. There seems to be some objection to this bill because it might unbalance the budget or disturb the cash position of the Treasury. I have therefore introduced another bill, H. R. 3521, which will not do any one of these things, at the same time the GI's may get their money. This bill would make those bonds negotiable at face value plus interest to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to a purchaser.

Now, no one, department or bureau can object to this procedure. At the present time the veteran holding terminal leave pay bonds is being discriminated against as a bondholder since they cannot be exchanged for money. There is not another single Government bond issued by this Government that the holder of that bond cannot get the cash on, except the terminal leave pay bonds that have been issued to these GI Joes. He was discriminated against in that he was not given terminal leave until H. R. 4051 became law and after he got the terminal leave pay bonds, he is being discriminated against in that he cannot receive cash for these bonds, whereas all other bondholders can get the cash within 60 days to 6 months.

My bill H. R. 3521 repeals that harsh section in H. R. 4051 which provides that "such bonds shall not be negotiable and shall not be transferred by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise," thus making the

holder of the terminal leave pay bonds powerless to use these bonds for 5 years which is like giving a soldier a gun without ammunition, or an old rusty musket whose trigger will not work. My bill provides that the veteran can use these bonds. He can sell them and get the cash and in selling his bonds he will not lose anything. As a matter of fact, he probably will make a little, since the bonds are such good investments that they probably will sell at a premium. There are many banks and other investors anxious to acquire such securities at 2½ percent interest. It will not make any difference financially to the Government, since it has to pay the bonds together with accrued interest at the expiration of 5 years, anyhow. I hope that every Member of this Congress will cooperate in getting this bill passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Business Analyst.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by one of the boys from my district who was one of the six who took the oath at the Elbe 2 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered on Thursday, May 15, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and also to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennesseean concerning the Supreme Court decision in the Freight Rate case.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two clippings appearing in the Washington Post last Sunday.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters and one telegram from a veterans' organization, Cambridge, Mass., endorsing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles, one letter, and one resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered at Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Charles Luckman.

PRO-COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there was placed on the desk of each Member of this House yesterday morning a publication known as Survey Graphic, which contained 129 pages of outrageously vile and nauseating anti-Southern, anti-Christian, un-American, and pro-Communist tripe, ostensibly directed toward the elimination of the custom of racial segregation in the South.

The principal articles in this lying, preposterous, pusillanimous, dirt-flinging tirade against the white people of the South are the brain children of a couple of renegade crackpot newspapermen who list themselves as Mississippians, although I never heard of either of them. Most of the other poppycock was written by meddling un-American purveyors of hate and indecency from other parts of the country.

Now, as a southerner, a white man, and an American, I resent these continuous unwarranted and uncalled-for attacks on my people, and I am not going to stand by and see them go unanswered.

These are the same people who today are striving toward doing away with our democratic form of government by the infiltration of their communistic theology into our everyday thinking and living. They would see America destroyed through mongrelization and moral degeneration, as other great nations in history have fallen and been destroyed.

I would suggest that you consign this filthy, slimsy instrument of evil to the nearest furnace and then bury the ashes so that its foul smell will not linger in the nostrils of the American people—and heed the words of a real champion of the welfare of the Negro race—Abraham Lincoln—who said the following in a speech in Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858:

I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, not to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR FUTURE LEADERS OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and also to include an address by Charles Luckman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Luckman, the president of one of the large manufacturing concerns, made a proposal in a speech on May 15 which is worth the serious consideration of all thoughtful Americans. He proposes a broad educational program to make full use of all of our educational facilities. He says that it is about time for us to declare war on ignorance. He takes the position that if we can afford to spend $20,000,000,000 a year on recreation, alcohol, and beauty preparations, we can afford to spend an additional $3,000,000,000 for knowledge and understanding so vital to our democratic way of life. He proposes, too, that we make a fresh approach to our industrial conflict by providing an educational program for the future leaders of labor and management.

Mr. Luckman offers to provide $100,000 of the $1,000,000 needed to set up the management-labor program. It is Mr. Luckman's view that much good can be derived from living together and studying together by leaders of management and labor.

It gives me great pleasure to call your attention to this proposal of a leading industrialist who in the space of a very few years and at a very early age has risen, through his own efforts, to a position of great power and importance in American business, and who is now demonstrating a broad capacity for leadership.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP CURLEY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when death calls a leader of men, one who has been a great and good man, a deep feeling of regret results.

This is particularly so when Providence takes from our midst the spiritual leader of any faith, who by his action, his conduct, and his effort to do good, so favorably impresses others that he becomes an inspiration and an example, and thus leads the way for those who follow to become better men and better women.

The Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, was such a spiritual leader. For over 40 years as a priest, as a bishop, and an archbishop of the Catholic Church, he served his God and his country in a brilliant, courageous, and constructive manner.

He dedicated every moment of his life to the service of God and country. He can truly be called a great priest and a great American.

Archbishop Curley first began his priestly duties in Deland, Fla.; from that day forward and until the day of his death he evidenced by his efforts his love of the poor and the underprivileged.

The archbishop recognized the importance of education to the individual. He recognized its value in making better citizens and, as a result, a better country. He exemplified education productive of fine and noble character.

Despite his long illness, he unstintingly devoted himself to his duties as the spiritual leader of his archdiocese and never for a moment shirked the great responsibilities of his trust.

The people of Baltimore and Washington in particular, and the people of our country in general, will mourn deeply his death, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jew.

Archbishop Curley will be long remembered for his efforts to create better understanding among men. His lifetime work of constructive effort among men of all creeds will mark him well on the pages of history.

A great churchman and a great citizen has taken the journey into the great beyond. However, his spirit and the influence of his work for God and country will live forever.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article by Col. Harris Hull on air power, and in the other a statement by former Secretary of State Byrnes.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three short articles from a Long Beach paper.

MERCURY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that we have large stock piles of mercury in the country, and that the Stock Pile Board, therefore, is not concerned about the present condition of the mercury-producing mines of the United States. Mercury is a vital defense metal. Regardless of whether or not the stock piles of mercury are now considered adequate, our mines should be kept in a position so that they might be immediately able to turn out this needed metal for any emergency.

Unfortunately, the reluctance of the Stock Pile Board to purchase mercury from domestic sources and the fact that large quantities of cheap metal are coming in from other countries are ruining our mercury-mining industry. An inadequate tariff also contributes to this situation. Not many years ago, some 140 mercury mines were operating in this country. Now a scant half dozen are in a position to produce at all, and these may be shut down at any time. The cost of reopening these mines in time of emergency would be infinitely greater than the cost of reasonable stimulation by the Government.

If we are to have feeling of national security, we must make certain that we will not want for strategic and critical materials in time of war. Adequate stock piles are insurance and will tide us over until closed mines can be reopened, but I call attention to the fact that it is during the time of emergency that we need all of the equipment, power, and men for other purposes which would be consumed by reestablishing closed mercury mines. I believe, therefore, the Government should stimulate the production of mercury and other strategic minerals during peacetime to make certain that we have at least a nucleus of a going industry as a policy of national insurance.

Bills on this subject and to accomplish the purposes herein referred to have been introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER]. I call the attention of the House to these bills and urge that the principles embodied in them be enacted into law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report entitled "American World Intelligence."

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proposed amendment to the bill, S. 814.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House I know that you are just as sincere and honest and anxious to do the things that will further the interests of this country as I am. I know that so much of your time is employed and that you use most of your waking moments considering important matters. But I do hope and fervently pray that this particular session of the Congress will not close until we have written into law a bill that will improve our present old-age-pension program.

I think we ought to pay our old-age pensioners who are entitled to receive the money, by check, directly from Washington through the United States mail without a lot of red tape. These good old folks who are entitled to receive this money should get it without having so much of it deducted for administrative costs and I hope and fervently pray that we can do something for them along this line.

WASHINGTON POST STIRS RACE TROUBLE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse what my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said a moment ago about this inspired, concerted drive against the white people of America, and especially of the Southern States.

The one agency that has done the white people of the District of Columbia more harm and has probably done the Negroes more injury than any other is the Jewish-owned Washington Post, which is continuously trying to break down segregation in the District of Columbia and stir up race trouble by forcing Negroes into white theaters, restaurants, hotels, picture shows, and public schools.

If they keep up their drive until they stir a race riot in the District of Columbia, the Post may reap the wrath of an outraged public.

A few days ago our Committee on Un-American Activities went to Hollywood, Calif., and uncovered a conspiracy of treason, if you please, that is shocking to the American people. The Communist cartoonist for the Washington Post comes out yesterday with a cartoon making fun of that investigation, trying to destroy its influence with the Congress of the United States. This morning it carries a full-page Communist advertisement smearing and maligning the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The people of California by the thousands have appealed to us, and the people who are legitimately engaged in the moving-picture industry in Hollywood have appealed to us to clean up Hollywood and put a stop to the dissemination of Communist propaganda through the moving-picture shows.

Yet when we send our committee out there and the ablest men in California, who know more about it than anybody else, come before the committee and give the information that is a shock to the people of America, we find this Communist cartoon and this Communist advertisement in the Washington Post.

As I said, this paper is doing the Negroes more harm than good. It is doing its own people more harm than good and stirring up trouble for the white gentiles

of the District, without doing the people of the rest of the country any good.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION ACT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 2123, an act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert:

"SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the Peoria County Bar Association.

ADDRESS OF MRS. SHURA VOZILOVA LEWIS AT WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1947, a very attractive lady of Russian birth made an address at Western High School in Washington, D. C. This stirred up considerable public interest, not only here but in other sections of the country. I think the matter is of such moment that perhaps the address ought to speak for itself. So I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a verbatim copy of this address that was taken and notarized by the stenographer as a true and exact copy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am afraid he is making a mistake. If that speech is placed in the RECORD it will be frankable, and they can have millions of copies of it printed and sent out under somebody's frank, who is in sympathy with them, and distribute it all over America. I do not know whether the gentleman has thought about that or not——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The District Committee discussed this matter yesterday and proposes to have a meeting this week for the purpose of further discussion. Obviously, if we are going to arrive at an ultimate conclusion in the matter, the full text of the address should be made available to the Members.

Mr. RANKIN. I have read the speech and I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I have told the head of the school system in the District of Columbia that that principal should be removed, because he knew that woman was a Communist. He had heard her before. He took her out there and imposed her upon the boys and girls at the Western High School. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, but I doubt the advisability of making this speech frankable and embalming it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With extreme deference, I am still of the opinion that the text ought to be made available, because the language must speak for itself. I am of the opinion that this may represent some very subtle propaganda, and the best way to deal with it is to bring it out in the open.

Mr. RANKIN. Further reserving the right to object, let me say that there never has been such a drive against American institutions as the Communists are making in this country today. They insidiously pick out parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which favor them and publicize them throughout the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I rather fancy the matter will be adequately and suitably dealt with when the committee concludes its deliberations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ADDRESS OF MRS. SHURA LEWIS BEFORE WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY, MAY 6, 1947

Introduction (by Mr. Danowsky, principal): "In this world of confusion there is a country about which there is much wondering today. We are particularly fortunate in having a speaker today who was born and raised in the Ural Mountains in that great country—Russia. I have heard her speak on a number of occasions and asked her here today because I know you will enjoy hearing what she has to say."

Mrs. Lewis: "As I came here today I felt myself almost at home because it reminded me of Russia when I went to school there. The general assemblies, students, classes, and teachers brought me back. Right now I feel myself like a pupil.

"I was raised under different conditions. I was born in 1916 in a very small village below the Ural Mountains. There were 70 houses in my village. There were no schools until 1922. My father and mother were farmers and working always in the land. I have three brothers who are older than I am. I graduated from elementary school in my village and after that I was sent to secondary school to another village because in my village there was no school where I could continue my education.

"The secondary school was located about 40 miles from my native village. I studied there for 3 years. That school was called Youth. Here we studied agriculture, history, literature, art, mathematics, and also we paid very much attention how to cultivate the land and how to milk the cows. [Laughter.]

"All the subjects we were trying to learn in that way so we could use it after graduation. As soon as I graduated this school I was 16 years old. At that time the teachers were needed in Russia very badly because a greater number of schools were being opened everywhere. The schools which never exist in the in the area below the Urals each very much wanted to have their own schools for their children. The teachers were needed so badly.

"So, at the age of 15 I was as tall as I am now and they thought I am big enough to be a teacher. I thought about it was too young to teach but they say to be able to read and write, to be able to explain ABC's you better start because it was so hard for the Russian Government to provide each school with a teacher.

"It is funny but it is true that teachers needed so I thought about it and accepted this invitation to teach right away in that area. I started the first class at the age of 8 years old because the first class in Russia pupils go to school when they are eight. But before eight they have preschool—kindergarten—nurseries.

"So I started with the first grade, then the second grade was given right away and the third grade because they promised to send another teacher but she never came because they didn't find her. So I started alone by myself in a village.

"Strange, but at that time I was the best educated person in that community. So it was very hard for me to begin that profession. You have to read the theory and you have to know how to conduct the classes. So I worked 2 years in the same village then I was transferred to the same village where I was born and raised. I worked two more years there with three teachers and at the age of 19 I felt that I had not enough education to be a good teacher so I decided to go to continue my education and I chose Moscow.

"My mother, my father did not object, but my mother was exciting about that an objected. She didn't want me to go so far from home. But now I had a deep desire to study. I left my village where to the nearest railroad station it was about 200 miles and I went there partly by horses and partly by truck. So I came to the railroad station for the first time and saw the engine. I was really surprised to see everything at this time. So I took the train in (Chilahi???) and went straight to Moscow.

"I didn't take all my savings with me. They all said when I left 'Be careful with your money. Somebody will take it.'

"At Moscow I began to pass examinations. Education is free in Russia. If you want to be a teacher you go and study. Get the profession of a teacher. If you want to be an engineer, doctor, philosopher, professor, you are just able to do it because it is free. You don't need to pay money. The Government supports the students and gives the scholarships, or 'stipends' (stipenza?) as we call them, for everybody who passes examinations.

"I pass the examination and entered the workers' farm at the school in Russia for adults who were not able to get the right education when they were at my age. So that faculty gave the opportunity for aiding people to get the education they need.

"After 2 years' study in Moscow I took middle education. That would be high school here. After middle education each person can enter the institute—like college here, but a little more than college. Then I entered the Moscow Philological Institute of Foreign Languages.

"I don't know why but I chose English. The main reason was because I heard among the students such conversation. They said to study German is very easy because many sounds in German and Russian are alike, especially the sound r-r-r-olling, like that.

"So the students were discussing about what language to choose and I heard the pupils say, the students in the corridor, the most difficult language is English.

"So I wanted to know why it was difficult. [Laughter.] When we started it was very interesting, because the grammar was entirely different from Russian. English grammar is very difficult, and at the same time

easy. Each has its own disadvantages and advantages.

"So I studied in this Moscow institute for 4 years and I graduated in 1941—just 1 week after the second war started. While I was a student during this 4 years I went twice to Graymi or the rest home. Each Russian person, each citizen, is given medical care free. If you are sick you are given health aids by the hospitals and doctors and you do not need to pay for them. Our trade union of students, they were the students of the whole country, and each person had the opportunity to go once a year to rest in the Graymi—at the shore, to relax and breathe the fresh air and make gymnastics.

"Here the medical care is given by the doctors. You living for a month under the doctors who give you advice about whether you need to gain or lose or strengthen your muscles. Every morning the doctors examine you.

"As soon as I entered the school I got well acquainted with American boy who was working in the American Embassy. I arrived in Moscow in 1937—the same year when I became the student of the institute. We had a wonderful time for 2 years before we got married. [Laughter, applause.]

"Very frequently went went to the shows, to the theater and opera in Moscow. There are many theaters which are very good. They have very good ballet, drama, and all kinds of entertainment. We went there almost every week-end.

"The first year he offered me chewing gum and I didn't know what to do. I thought it was candy and I swallowed it. Later on, on my birthday, he gave me a present—a very beautiful box. When I came home—I lived in a dormitory with three girls in the same room—I went to bed, but I was so curious what was like in the box. Technique is much higher in America because Russia was always a backward country and did not produce the luxuries for better living. Just recently Russia is producing any heavy machinery at all. So we had known many things like you have in America—flashlights.

"I came home, put on my pajamas [laughter], and cleaned my teeth. Some people think Russians are ignorant and backward and don't clean their teeth and don't own tooth brushes. It was funny, but it was not funny for me. Several weeks ago I read an article somewhere telling that Russians are so wild savages they never change their underwear until it drops off. [Applause.]

"You call us dirty and of course we will start to fight. Maybe not.

"And so I opened the present, and there was lying beautiful fountain pen with a pencil What nice present. I was so happy. Then I didn't know how to operate, so there was a little thing on the top, and I push the little thing down, and so the ink go all over my pajamas, sheets, and everything. [Applause.]

"I like America very much, and I am fond of Russia, too. I think these two great countries are really great, but life in both countries is entirely different. Always if you want to study Russia you have to think about Russia of today but not Russia which was a century ago. In Russia of today there are no landlords or businessmen living on rents or profit The whole land is public property. The whole industry is publicly owned and controlled. Every family of modern Russia must live on earnings from the work. The industry and agriculture are run according to the general plan. If good or bad is full decision.

"They call it collective farm—the peasants farm and divide up products according to work put in by each individual during the year. As a result of planning, unemployment is completely wiped out and has shown no signs of returning. At the present moment in Russia more and more workers are needed, especially field workers.

"They are needed scientists, professors, teachers, doctors, and no matter how much they train them they still need them more.

"In Russia right now people absolutely do not worry about today or tomorrow. They never think 'All of a sudden I lose a job.' That fear doesn't exist among Russian people.

"Russia plans not only for production to increase but also to increase the health and culture level of the people. They work according to the plan. How many schools to open, how many hospitals and they do it according to plan. So in Russia equal right is granted to each nationality. There is no discrimination. Nobody says you are Negro, you are Jew. They don't say you are Jew or Tartar. In Russia right now live 189 different people and 111 languages are spoken.

"For many years many nationalities never had schools or had their alphabets. Now they do have. Science is taught in their native language.

"Women in Russia is given the same rights politically, economically, and culturally, the same right. Women elect and can be elected. The women in Russia is encouraged to have a career and also there is freedom for women. If she wants to be a housewife and raise a child and home she is more than welcome. She may do that.

"At the present moment pupils discuss about Russia everywhere, especially about the two policies and they all blame Russia at Moscow Conference just because Russia is so they don't want to agree. But people always forget for Russia her reparations from Germany. They always forget that during the war Germans made of great ruins for Russia about 679 mulier rubles it was destroyed 31 the factories and plants, it was ruined 65,000 kilometers of railroads, it was destroyed 1,710 towns and 70,000 villages and 6,000,000 houses destroyed so 25,000,000 of people in Russia remains without shelter

"When you read these figures you don't need to blame Russia for demanding reparations from the Germans

"The Russian people, as Americans, are fond of all kinds of sports, skiing, skating, baseball, football, tennis. But baseball isn't very popular yet. Climbing up the mountain, dancing, gymnastics. This last sport is very highly developed.

"Most people blame the Russian Government for not believing in God.

"It is not true. The Russian people are religious and really when they pray they really mean it. Very often we talk about religion and morals. Religion without morals is not religion. Millions of Russians are very good. They want to have good families. Each man or wife had a responsibility for the family. They cannot get a divorce very easily just because the wife doesn't like the husband. It is against the law to be separated. In Russia the family is like a unit. You pay fees before you get a divorce. The fees are a little high. If you get your first you pay 300 rubles, second 1,000 rubles and third 3,000 rubles. But nobody has 3,000 rubles so you won't be able to get the divorce.

"Before the revolution religion in Russia belonged to the group of people who were always trying to work the church to prevent the science from the people. I don't want to discuss much but I want to tell you one fact.

"In my village it was no school, but there was a lovely church. All people went to the church. I was 7 or 6 years old when my mother said, 'Hurry, let's go, we go now to pray. All people go to pray to God to send the rain.' All the population of the village gathered near the church. Here they took their ikons and all went singing into the fields, and they prayed and prayed for God to send the rain. There was no rain, no bread. So the Russian people prayed for rain.

"And when we come home I was so tired, and everybody was, and within 2 or 3 hours it started to pour, heavy rain. Everybody was so happy the rain is given. Especially the preacher was very proud of himself. [Laughter.] And later on a little thing was discovered in his bedroom, and that little thing was called a barometer. [Applause.]

"Right now you can go to that village and ask a child of kindergarten age what a barometer is. He will tell you. But at that time even my parents didn't know about this. Religion must be together with science. Education for all, freedom for all, without any discriminations. Then religion will go hand by hand with science and with peace.

"Three years ago I arrived in this country. As soon as I came here my husband was drafted right away into the Army immediately. I stayed here alone with two children. The first son, Eric, was born in Russia. When the time came for me to go to the hospital my husband took me, and I stayed 2 weeks. Medical care is given, food, and all expense. It did not cost me a penny. When my husband came to take me home, and the nurse was giving the little baby to my husband, because it was the Russian custom husbands must carry the baby home. [Applause.] When my husband stretched his arms he didn't know what to do. He put his arms in his pocket to make out a check. And the nurse say, 'Pardon me, this is your own baby. We don't sell babies in this hospital.' [Applause.]

"As soon as I came to America just 2 months later another baby was born in this country. I went to the hospital and was remained there 2 weeks, but I paid $120. So I want to tell you it is hard to live in any country. You have to work, especially if you have no money and your parents aren't rich—when you have to live by working.

"No matter where you live you have to work. What the Russian people have, they are more secure about this. They work They need not worry much about losing the job. They are free to travel from one place to another, and each citizen must work 25 years for after that he is able to get a pension. No matter where you work—in this plant or another, 25 years and then you get 50 percent of your salary and live the rest of your life.

"Unless you have children and all your children are educated and get professions or jobs. Then you live like a queen.

"I want just to mention that Russian educational system has its own history. At the beginning there was complete chaos. No teachers. All the old teachers were afraid after the revolution. They were afraid and didn't know what method to use. Especially after the revolution there was very great hunger, starvation, and those 2 or 3 years were just terrible. At this time Lenin told us that we have to start education for everybody and develop your own system.

"Schools were opened for everybody and everybody for schools. Russian coeducational life has its own history. They tried all methods to improve education. They tried an American system, from a lady in Dayton, Ohio, mental project and all kinds of methods for trying. Finally they decided that the lessons and the teachers is the main factor in education.

"The teachers in Russia remain at such a level which never before. During 12 years the salary of the teacher has been increased 300 percent.

"I want to mention that intellectual work—teachers, engineers, executives, especially those who work mentally, are paid much higher than the hard labor, just because to encourage the people to increase their educational level, to improve the professions and to be useful more in the society.

"You know in Russia the people don't suffer very much from toothaches. I don't know why, but very seldom you go to the dentist. I think Russian people eat so much vegetables and black bread. When I came here my

friends advised me to go to the dentist. So I went to the dentist and opened my mouth and he told me—I am 33 now and have no cavities in my mouth. He told me he would have to pull four wisdom teeth out. I said why were they dead? He said 'No, no, but they might give you trouble in the future.'

"So I gave him $10 for telling me this. I never went from that time to this. I will go when I have real trouble. I never appreciated the life in Russia until I live here. Here you have to work hard in order to live, use all your courage not to die." [Applause.]

(Mr. Danowsky announces a period of questioning will follow:)

Question (by a young red-haired girl). "How does the ruble compare with the American dollar?"

Answer. "Officially $1 costs 5 rubles. But diplomatics get 12 rubles."

Question (by a young man in khaki clothes). "If Russia really wants world peace why doesn't she allow us to see what resources she has?"

Answer. "A very interesting question. This question bothers me and the whole world. The Russian people always desire and need peace. I read both languages, Russian and English. I read all the papers here and occasionally I go to the Library of Congress and read all papers printed in Moscow. It is very interesting, and when I read these papers always you can see here evidence of press where people talk all the time about having a war, to throw the atomic bomb on Russia, to destroy because they have a system which is very prideful. At the present time Russians are busy to restore all those houses, all those cities, all those towns. Russian people make streets, plants, produce new style of shoes, new fashion of dress, new production, and never they talk about having a war. If you read the papers about 2 or 3 days ago, it was printed in the Washington Post an interview of Stalin with Stassen and Stalin said in spite of the fact that so great countries have different system they can and are able to cooperate and live peacefully because it is a desire of the people."

Question. "Does Russia's system of free hospitalization compare with our free clinics for the poor?"

Mr. Danowsky: "Assembly is ended. It is time for class periods."

(NOTE.—This transcript is an exact record of stenographic notes and no attempt has been made to correct grammar or construction.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 16, 1947.*

Elizabeth Imus Shelton personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, and made oath that the above is a stenographic transcript of the address of Mrs. Shura Lewis before the Western High School assembly on May 6, 1947.

My commission expires May 1, 1950.

Elizabeth Imus Shelton
ELIZABETH IMUS SHELTON,
Mabel Goodwin Haller
[SEAL] MABEL GOODWIN HALLER.
Notary Public.

HENRY BIG DAY—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 262)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 193, "An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "1902" insert ": *Provided*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act from lands within the naval petroleum reserves shall be deposited in the Treasury as "miscellaneous receipts", as provided by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813), as amended June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252, 34 U. S. C., sec. 524)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERECTION AND OPERATION OF MEMORIAL MUSEUM AND SHOP ON THE FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1584, "An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "supervised, managed, and controlled by" and insert "operated by the said tribes under supervision, management, and control of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, to Adolph Pfannenstiehl, the sum of , out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, loss of wages, and medical and hospital expenses as a result of being knocked through a plate-glass window at 82 Summer Street, Boston, Mass., on September 23, 1943, by an employee of the Navy Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, at the beginning of the line, insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. ORVILLE C. McKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CHARLES F. BARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2631) for the relief of Charles F. Barrett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ROGER EDGAR LAPIERRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 436) for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien, Roger Edgar Lapierre, of Lewiston, Maine, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such future warrants or orders are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws such alien shall be considered to have been, at Island Pond, Vt., on the date of his entry in 1927, lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FREDERICK FABER WESCHE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2915) for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell), the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWSON ASHBY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 408) for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and direoted to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,774.77 to Lawson Ashby, of Trinidad, Calif.; the sum of $1,000 to Mrs. Ora Ashby, of Trinidad, Calif.; the sum of $2,500 to the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; the sum of $2,500 to the legal guardian of Darrel Ashby, a minor; the sum of $2,500 to the legal guardian of Kenneth Ashby, a minor; the sum of $1,000 to the legal guardian of Vernon Ashby, a minor; such payments being in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, losses, and expenses arising out of an accident which occurred on October 3, 1942, near McKinleyville, Calif., and which involved an Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "2,500"; insert in lieu thereof "1,000." Page 2, line 1, strike out "2,500"; insert in lieu thereof "1,000." Page 2, line 2, strike out "1,000"; insert in lieu thereof "300." Amend the title so as to read "For the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBERT W. ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 651) for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Rubert W. Alexander, Des Moines, Iowa, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said estate of Rubert W. Alexander against the United States for severe personal injuries he sustained as the result of the crash on February 6, 1943, of a plane operated under the Air Transport Command of the United States Army Air Forces in which he was being returned to the United States because of ill health after being employed by the United States engineer office at Anchorage, Alaska.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the sign "$" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof—"5,647.97, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, property damages, and losses sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the late Rubert W. Alexander as a result of the crash on or about February 6, 1943, of an Army airplane, in which he was a passenger, at Watson Lake, Canada: *Provided*, That the said estate of Rubert W. Alexander, deceased, be, and it is hereby, relieved of all obligations to pay to the United States the sum of $1,439.66 heretofore paid for the benefit of Mr. Alexander by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission as a result of this accident: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUGUSTA McCALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000, to Mrs. Augusta McCall, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by her when she was struck by a Government truck in San Antonio, Tex., on July 7, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out "$3,000"; insert in lieu thereof "$500."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE LANDING TOWNSHIP, HYDE COUNTY, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of determinations reported to the Congress by the Acting Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain claimants on account of loss by fire for which the United States was adjudged liable," approved August 13, 1940, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owners of the following lands in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C., the following sums, such sums to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage or loss sustained by such persons as a result of the forest fire or fires which burned land and timber of the Pamlico Timber Corp. (in the case of which fire or fires the United States, on August 2, 1937, was held liable, in a proceeding in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, for damage suffered by certain persons specified in such act of August 13, 1940):

M. Makely and George Makely, 60 acres, $300; Mary Windley Willis, 14 acres, $70; Mrs. Thomas G. Weston, 2 acres, $35; Mrs. Rena S. Jennette, S. E. Jennette, T. A. Jennette, and Mrs. W. H. Robbins, 30 acres, $300; Lenus Benson, Marvin Benson, Arreal Benson, Sill Benson, and Viola Benson, one-half interest

in 30 acres, $75; T. J. Mann, two-thirds interest in 100 acres, $660.66; Mary E. Credle heirs, 42 acres, $420; Miss Lucy Saddler, 30 acres, $230; Etheline Ballance and Bernice Ballance, 69 acres, $345; Tom C. Spencer heirs, 5 acres, $50; Emma B. Powell, one-half interest in 30 acres, $75; J. E. Berry, Sr., Estate, 35 acres, $280; Mrs. Eitha Mason Payne, Mrs. Euginia Mason Warren, Zinkia Mason Credle, W. T. Mason, Caddie Mason Hooper, Alex W. Mason, and C. R. Mason, 40 acres, $200; Mrs. Charlie Gibbs, 7½ acres, $48.75; Edward A. Carawan, 19 3/10 acres, $143; E. W. Farrow, 10 acres, $100; J. M. Pugh, 3½ acres, $35; Ola Lucas Spencer, 8 acres, $55; J. S. Mann and E. D. Sewells, two-thirds interest in 50 acres, $694; W. H. Farrow and Charlie E. Spencer heirs (claims cover the same tract, W. H. Farrow claiming present ownership of the land) 59 acres, $317: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRON R. LEARD

The Clerk called the bill, H. R. 893, for the relief of Myron R. Leard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Myron R. Leard, of Colbert, Ga., the sum of $187.15. The payment of such sum shall be in reimbursement of the amount the said Myron R. Leard, as acting postmaster, paid the Government for loss of money and stamps resulting from robbery of the Colbert, Ga., post office on July 9, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, insert "full settlement of all claims against the United States as."

Page 2, line 1, after "1944", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Y. S. HU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Y. S. Hu.

Mr. POTTS and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A. J. CROZAT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill, H. R. 984, for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the armed forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,026.38."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY, DECEASED, AND ESTATE OF LOUISA COWLEY, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 989) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INGA PATTERSON, WIDOW OF F. X. PATTERSON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUGUST W. DIETZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of August W. Dietz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to August W. Dietz, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage suffered by him when his automobile was struck by a Government truck in San Antonio, Tex., on May 28, 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$6,000."

Page 2, line 1, after "1940", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN C. GARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of John C. Garrett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against John C. Garrett, a former employee of the Federal Public Housing Authority, in the amount of $1,520.71, and with respect to housing projects designated Florida 8101, 8104, 8105, and 8106 located at Panama City, Fla., together with the interest due on said amount from the day of the loss of public funds for which said John C. Garrett is accountable and which were stolen without his fault from his person while he was performing his duties as agent cashier for said projects. Said John C. Garrett is hereby relieved of pecuniary responsibility for the loss of said public funds.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts, not exceeding the sum stated in section 1 hereof, as may be necessary to relieve said former chief

disbursing officer of financial liability on account of the loss of said sum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MARION S. GRIGGS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Marion S. Griggs, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained in July 1934, while boarding a United States Army truck for the purpose of transportation to Fort Devens, Mass., to resume her duties as camp hostess, said injuries causing her death on January 3, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $10,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LESLIE PRICE, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1586) for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Leslie Price, the sum of $1,557.50; to Philip C. Price, the sum of $1,307.50; to Annie Curry, the sum of $1,000; to James Curry, the sum of $1,150.20; all of Donovan, Ga.; and to Mrs. Louise Keyton, of Wrightsville, Ga., the sum of $1,090, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision of a car belonging to Mrs. Leslie Price and an Army vehicle on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,557.50" and insert "$1,007.50."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,307.50" and insert "$807.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$567.19."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,150.20" and insert "$656.26."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$1,090" and insert "$590."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUBA COUNTY, CALIF., DISTRICT NO. 10

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 261) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon the claims of all persons against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which damage, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable only to the extent to which a private person would be liable under like circumstances.

SEC. 2. Suits upon which such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41 (20)).

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge to the Daughters of the American Revolution last night in Constitution Hall.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations the matter of the disposition of time, and how long he thinks we ought to occupy in general debate and when he thinks we ought to commence reading the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as requests are concerned, I think we can expedite the time. I think 2 hours of general debate, to be equally divided, will be satisfactory.

Mr. PLUMLEY. To be perfectly frank with the House, inasmuch as prolonged debate involves a greater expenditure of money, and since I have only one request for time, I am in agreement with the suggestion of the gentleman that debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California and myself.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. PLUMLEY. And as to whether or not we shall commence the reading of the bill tonight, that will be left to fate to determine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3493, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require. Mr. Chairman, I desire to acknowledge my obligation to each and every member of the subcommittee for their long-suffering close cooperation, and to Ken Sprankle for the very efficient manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office as executive secretary.

The Navy Department appropriation bill, as it is presented to you today, is the first budget for the Navy which approximates anything like a normal operating budget, free of war charges. While the conversion from a wartime to a peacetime basis is not yet completed and has not been accomplished, it has reached the point where the remaining conversion tasks are minor in character both as to the job to be done and as to the costs thereof.

The subcommittee which handled the bill commenced its hearings on the 21st day of January. Events over which it had no control necessarily interrupted and postponed the hearings from time to time until only recently was the subcommittee able to mark up the bill and make its report to the full committee.

The report is unanimous, though necessarily the result of compromise as to the figures ultimately agreed upon.

With the exception of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. D'Alesandro, who since their appointment have rendered able and outstanding service, the subcommittee is composed of

practically the same men who have comprised it during the war years, supporting the Navy unlimitedly and backing with every possible means its effort to win the war.

We feel, therefore, that we are permitted to assume and to assert that in times of peace we are competent to recommend the program to be followed presently by the Navy with respect to necessary expenditure of the taxpayers' money in order to maintain its supremacy. We are proud of what the Navy has accomplished and of our contribution to that end.

The committee recalls the necessary supplementary and deficiency bills enacted to furnish the money to win the war. It is equally sure that if and when an emergency arises the Congress will, if necessary, appropriate the needed funds by supplementary action to the bill which we now present. We, in our judgment, have appropriated all the money the Navy can presently use. Should anything happen after Congress adjourns to necessitate the calling of a special session, the President has the power and authority to act in the premise.

We have not jeopardized in the slightest degree the supremacy of the United States Navy nor the adequate maintenance of a Navy competent to do the job. The committee gave its most careful scrutiny to every item in order to insure a Navy sufficiently strong to protect the United States in the event of any emergency or catastrophe, while at the same time it endeavored to bring the necessary expenditures to as low a point as possible and thereby ease the burden of the taxpayers. That this latter task was not easy to accomplish, while at the same time undertaking to assure the provision and maintenance of that kind of a Navy which the United States must maintain for the time being at least, is obvious.

In the years to come it is to be hoped that the Navy and the Army may be reduced to a fraction of their present size without depriving the country of its position in world affairs, which it will have to continue to occupy in order to discharge the obligations of its destiny.

Until we can be certain that the safety of the United States will not be jeopardized, I can assure you the committee will always urge adequate appropriations for sufficient naval defense.

As I have said, those of us who have served on this committee throughout the war feel we do not have to justify before the House the statement that we have always furnished the necessary appropriations and that we will continue to undertake so to do as we strive to maintain our well-considered judgment that the best defense for this country is an adequate offense, which program this bill seeks to support and to accomplish.

In our best judgment, the bill does not make it necessary to take a ship off the seas nor an airplane out of the air. We have backed research and reserve programs to the limit. We have reduced unnecessary civilian personnel and top-heavy high command. We have suggested that too many people on shore duty do not necessarily contribute to the staffing of ships at sea.

I do not propose to labor my statement with details nor to be prolix. You have had an opportunity to read the report and the hearings and the bill are before you.

You should be advised that, in addition to the regular budget, the committee considered three supplemental requests which came to us during the course of the hearings, which, over all, requested a current total of $3,847,280,300. As explained on page 2 of the report, $170,000,000 of this total was requested in the form of contract authority and $164,280,000 was requested as transfers from other Navy funds. The total amount of new appropriations requested from the Treasury was $3,513,000,300.

The committee has approved in full the requests for contract authority and transfers, but has reduced the request for new cash in the amount of $377,519,200. Adding to this figure the transfer and contract authority, we find that the bill carries a total available to the Navy from all sources of $3,469,761,100, which, in our opinion, is all it needs at the present.

For your information, let me call attention to an additional feature in regard to Navy expenditures which has considerable bearing on the Navy program for the next year or two. On the 2d of last August the President issued an order, which is commonly known today as the stop-spend order, whereby he deferred for many Government departments the expenditure of a considerable amount of money during the fiscal year 1947. Insofar as the Navy is concerned, the amount so deferred was carried at $650,000,000. On page 2 of the report you will find a table indicating the planned disposition of these funds.

May I direct your attention to the fact that there is now available to the Navy in excess of $231,000,000 for expenditure during 1948 and 1949, in addition to which there are transfers provided in the bill of nearly $116,000,000. This makes a total expenditure figure in sight of about $3,700,000,000. After considering the over-all program of the Navy, your committee is of the opinion that this amount does not restrict the Navy program to any degree such as to jeopardize its supremacy and effective operation.

ELIMINATION OF SURPLUS LANGUAGE

Another feature of this year's bill is the elimination of a considerable amount of language as compared with the bills that have gone through in previous years. The elimination of this language has been made possible as a result of action instituted 2 or 3 years ago by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who was then serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. He urged the Navy strongly at that time, and has on many occasions since urged them, to go to the legislative committee and obtain substantive law to carry out their program. As a result, Congress last year passed what is now known as Public Law 604 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which cleaned up, so to speak, countless items that have been carried from year to year in the annual appropriation bill.

It is certainly a pleasure to see the bill cleaned up in this manner, and, while I do not attempt to say what other departments of the Government should do, I might toss out the suggestion that it would be well for some of them to follow the Navy's example in this respect.

FLEET

The 1948 estimates are based upon a fleet in active status which is not a great deal larger in numbers than the 1939 fleet, but for efficiency and fighting strength the two fleets would not be in the same category. The present fleet is modern and up to date, with the best equipment developed during the last war. It is supported by various types of auxiliary and amphibious craft, many of which were not in existence in 1939.

In this connection, one of the most desirable features from the standpoint of the taxpayer is that the present fleet, being new as it is, should not require nearly so great a maintenance expenditure as was required to keep the 1939 fleet serviceably afloat, because that fleet had a large number of vessels which were several years old and practically worn out, with the result that they required a much greater expenditure for maintenance.

The committee has approved a transfer of funds in the amount of $14,280,000 from the appropriation for increase and replacement of naval vessels in order to allow the Navy to get started on a program of building, small in scale, to provide certain submarines and other types of vessels which will incorporate certain requirements and ideas that have arisen as a result of the war. We do not desire to see any huge shipbuilding program underway at this time, but we do want to proceed on a small scale in order to develop the ideas now in mind and so that we may have the knowledge that can be furnished only after tests of these prototypes have been conducted.

SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

The Navy expanded its shore establishments many times during the war. We all realize the necessity for that action and the benefits derived. However, this country cannot go on in peacetime maintaining those establishments anywhere near the size and number that the Navy required during the war. That is obvious. It is absolutely necessary to reduce the number and the personnel. It is not a pleasant task to cut down on anything like this, because it means that certain districts here and there will lose activities to which they have been accustomed in the last 3 or 4 years. Nevertheless, it must be done. It is with that in mind that the committee has cut the appropriations which contribute to the support of the Shore Establishment. We wish the Navy to move promptly to reduce its Shore Establishment. In furtherance of this program steps have already been inaugurated by the Secretary of the Navy in his assignment to the

General Board of the task of reviewing the entire shore plant.

In our report we said:

The committee believes that substantial savings can be accomplished by the reduction of shore activities of the Navy. There are entirely too many of these facilities scattered over the country. Most of them were emergency wartime construction and were extremely necessary at the time, but the operation of so large a number for the smaller peacetime Navy is wholly uneconomical and presents administrative problems which can be greatly simplified by reductions in the number of stations. It is up to the Navy to close many of these shore stations at the earliest possible date. A considerable portion of the reductions in the bill can be absorbed by the Navy without reducing essential naval activities if it will take steps without delay to cut down the size of the Shore Establishment.

The committee expects the Navy to live within the amounts provided in this bill and believes it can be done without sacrificing any of the efficiency of the fleet, by taking positive steps in line with the foregoing paragraph.

It has been noted that a survey is under way for the purpose of determining which activities can best be closed. It is desired that the results of this survey be available at an early date. The determinations thereof should be made not upon the basis of political or sectional desires but rather upon the basis of efficient and economical distribution of installations which are of greatest value from a military standpoint. This applies equally to ordnance plants, aeronautical facilities, training activities, and practically all other types of shore installations.

The committee is advised that the General Board is giving its primary attention to this problem and desires to urge upon the Board that it expedite action and secure early results. The number of stations in active status on June 30, 1947, according to a table on page 1777 of the hearings is estimated to be 1,925. This number is expected to be reduced by only 71 during the fiscal year to a total of 1,854 on June 30, 1948. It is the judgment of the committee that much greater reductions can be accomplished and the committee expects to inquire into the matter during the year and to have a full report from the General Board as to its accomplishments in connection with the hearings on the 1949 budget.

To the foregoing should have been added this statement:

In future allocations or dispositions of presently used naval air training centers or airfields, the committee strongly urges that areas be considered, with their training possibilities, so that one area will not be unduly favored against another.

The above statement was omitted through inadvertence, and the attention of the Navy is specifically called to it and to the fact that the committee expects the Navy to consider the statement as part of the committee's report on the bill.

RESEARCH

The committee has approved in full the budget estimate for research of $34,400,000. The records show that this committee has for many years gone all-out on the subject or research, knowing that our successful operations in future wars depended upon obtaining successful results from research activities.

In addition to the specific appropriation which I have mentioned, the committee has set aside $75,000,000 for research in the Bureau of Aeronautics, which is the full amount of the budget request on that subject. Furthermore, the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance have between them about $90,000,000 set up for research work, and the committee feels, as stated on page 6 of the report, that the Navy should not absorb any of the reductions that we have made by cutting down on the research program.

I might call your attention to the fact that the bill provides in excess of $203,000,000 for research activity for the Navy alone. In addition to this, the Navy has available for expenditure in 1948, according to its own estimates, a little over $306,000,000 heretofore appropriated for research.

BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

As far as the Bureau of Naval Personnel is concerned, the committee reduced the request to the tune of something over $6,000,000, $3,000,000 of which measures the amount deducted from the amount for officer training. The committee approved $12,000,000 for that specific program, which amount was and is 12 times the amount obligated for the current fiscal year up to the end of March.

The program has the full endorsement of the committee, but the committee is of the opinion that $12,000,000 is all that can be reasonably spent during 1948.

With respect to the Naval Reserve, it may be said that the full amount of the budget estimate is included in the bill, since the committee realized the importance and almost necessity of maintaining a strong Reserve interested and active in naval affairs.

As far as the Naval Academy is concerned, it is the judgment of the committee that too many enlisted men are now on duty at the Academy. In 1939 there were 2,300 midshipmen and 736 enlisted men. At the present time there are 2,900 midshipmen and over 1,600 enlisted men.

BUREAU OF SHIPS

This brings us to the Bureau of Ships. Let me quote from our report:

The committee has reduced the request for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, from $374,750,000 to $300,000,000, and in addition has authorized the transfer as proposed by the Budget, of not to exceed $50,000,000 from the naval stock fund so that there will actually be new funds in the amount of $350,000,000 available for the program of this Bureau in the fiscal year 1948. In addition to this, the Bureau will have for expenditure in 1948, $14,800,000 from 1947 appropriations, which amount represents deferred expenditures pursuant to the President's stop-spend order of August 2, 1946.

This makes a total of $364,800,000 available for 1948 as compared with $394,950,000, the amount remaining for 1947 after the President's order of August 2, 1946. The fiscal year 1947 appropriation carried a considerable burden of the cost of reconversion and of laying up the reserve fleet, which program will be largely completed in the next few months and costs of which are materially reduced in 1948.

As of March 31 the Department had incurred obligations of $225,666,219 against the funds available of $394,950,000 for the year. At this rate the total obligations for the year would be about $301,000,000. As of March 31, in addition to the obligations above referred to, there were commitments outstanding of $74,206,497. These commitments added to the actual obligations projected on an annual basis attain a total of $375,000,000 for the entire year leaving a margin of approximately $20,000,000 to take care of other items. At this late date in the fiscal year 1947, it is fair to assume that additional commitments chargeable against the 1947 appropriations will leave a considerable margin. Taking this fact and the early completion of the reconversion and lay-up program into account, it is altogether logical to expect that the amount approved by the committee, plus the deferred expenditures, a total of $364,800,000, will meet all necessary requirements in 1948.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

The committee has reduced the budget estimate of $208,000,000 for ordnance and ordnance stores by $28,000,000 and is recommending in our bill $180,000,000. It so happens that this reduction is almost exactly the same amount that was deferred by the President last August, and it seems to me that there can certainly be no harm in continuing that deferment, which is practically what the bill provides.

The committee feels that the Bureau of Ordnance can and should make considerable progress in reducing its shore establishment. It is operating many plants at only a small fraction of their capacity, and anyone at all familiar with the subject realizes that operations under such conditions are of the most costly type. We feel that it would be much more economical for the Bureau to operate fewer plants at a greater percentage of their capacity than it is now doing, and place others which might be needed in a caretaker status or make other suitable disposition of them.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

The largest item in the total of $1,484,000,000 recommended for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is the item of $1,200,000,000 for pay and subsistence. Actually, there will be available for this appropriation $1,250,000,000 as a result of the committee's recommending $50,000,000 to be transferred to the subsistence subhead from the clothing and small stores fund. This represents an over-all reduction on pay of about 7 percent and would ordinarily mean a reduction in numbers of personnel of about 7 percent below the estimated average which called for 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers. However, the application of this reduction is left to the Navy Department. They can absorb some of this cut by administrative action on matters such as flight pay, promotions, and so forth.

Then, there are approximately 20,000 men assigned to activities ashore which activities will be terminated. In the opinion of the committee too large a percentage of the total enlisted personnel is on shore duty.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

So far as the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery is concerned we have allowed $2,000,000 more than was appropriated in 1947, appreciating the very fine type of work which has been done by the

Bureau and the position which it occupies in scientific and medical circles.

There can be no question but that by closer coordination with the Army and with the Veterans' Administration considerable savings could be made, for there are entirely too many vacant beds in naval hospitals while the Army and Veterans' Administration are requesting additional facilities.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

So far as the Bureau of Yards and Docks is involved, while the appropriation is $13,000,000, in round numbers, less than the estimate, it is only $4,700,000 below the current year's appropriation.

There is no construction of new public works contemplated until after legislative authorization therefor has been obtained. The committee is of the opinion that the deactivation of shore establishments will render the proposed appropriation sufficient.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

The committee has allowed $90,000,000 for new construction and the procurement of aircraft and equipment by the Bureau of Aeronautics, while also approving the recommendation of the Budget for the expenditure of $170,000,000 additional for the purchase of equipment which is covered by contract authority.

In addition to this, an appropriation of $75,000,000 is made for research, and $291,000,000 for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft, which should be sufficient.

MARINE CORPS

We have reduced the appropriation estimate of $209,000,000 for pay of the Marine Corps to $189,128,000 which reduction is approximately in line with that applied to Navy pay.

The committee was not impressed by the progress which the Marine Corps had made as of the current fiscal year with respect to its Reserve program but has approved the full amount requested, hoping that some extra effort will be made by the Marine Corps with respect to the maintenance and the operation of its Reserve program.

In the opinion of the committee, the Marine Corps, in common with the Navy, should defer the purchase of clothing, fuel, and military stores to the greatest extent possible as against the large quantities of such articles which they have carried over from the war years and as against the high prices prevalent at the present time.

SALARIES

The cut in salaries for the Navy Department is something like 25 percent below the budget estimate but is really only about 16 percent below the amount appropriated for 1947. Back in 1939, when there were 142,000 military personnel, the Navy Department employed 3,176 civilians in the Department. With 571,000 average military personnel, including the Marine Corps, as planned for 1948, the estimate calls for 15,000 civilian employees, for which increase the committee can see no justification. It does not follow that the ratio of civilian to military personnel should be parallel. It is argued with a considerable degree of merit that the larger the military personnel, the smaller should be the civilian ratio.

In conclusion may I say that your committee was confronted by situations unusual in their nature, none of which could be considered on the basis of facts established. Many of the things the committee knows in strict confidence cannot be spread upon the record.

The Russian situation; the Greek-Turkish situation; the inactivation and moth-balling of serviceable ships; the maintenance of some shore stations, the abandonment of others; these and countless other items which appear and do not appear in the printed hearings, covered discussions and hearings lasting intermittently and consecutively from January 21 until a week ago. The committee gave to all of these matters their very deepest thought and most careful consideration in open and in executive hearings.

You will, I am sure, support your committee which has given so unstintingly of its time to bring to you this bill which we feel deserves the unanimous support of this House.

Your committee has had in mind constantly the thought so well expressed in the poem of Arthur Harold:

Do not rejoice that you have found the key,
Do not cry blindly that the war is done,
That victory comes quickly, men are free,
And earth's long torment has an end! The sun
That shone on Carthage shines the same, the stars
That saw Atlantis sink beneath the sea
Observe this newest rise. This path of ours
Was used before, and used again shall be.

Do not rejoice that you have reached the gates
And in your hands the scepter of the skies—
Far greater ones before you stunned the fates
And reached out boldly for the godly prize,
To find a scarecrow on the throne sublime
And cold winds blowing down the lanes of time!

The committee has done the best it could after these months of weary worry and work in an attempt to be practical as well as to be prophets.

The bill is in your hands.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On that point of legislation on an appropriation bill, I wonder if the gentleman would care to advise us as to whether the bill now before the committee carries any legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The bill before the committee has not in it, according to my best judgment, any single item which is subject to a point of order.

Further, in response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], I would like to add that I think the example which this committee has set, with respect to encouraging legislative enactment of substantive law in order to avoid the possibility or necessity for attempting to carry in any appropriation bill language that is legislative in character, might well be followed.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, I concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman has said and in the attitude which he and his committee have taken in years past on the question of attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills. I felt reasonably certain that there would be no such riders on this bill, but to make sure of it, and for the purposes of the RECORD, I raised the question, and I am glad to have the gentleman's reply.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I take no personal credit for the situation which obtains, but shine in the reflected glory of my former chairman who was so insistent, and with whom I cooperated, to the end that this bill, so far as I know, has not in it one single item subject to a point of order on the basis of the fact that it is legislation contained in an appropriation bill.

I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it should be said also that this bill is quite a revision of the type of bill we have seen coming in here in previous years. Much of the material is a matter of permanent legislation, so the bill is simplified and much more easily understood, and is strictly an appropriation bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the gentleman discuss the item of officer candidate training under the plan known as the Halloway plan. It is my information that the Bureau of the Budget recommended a total of $15,000,000, and that the committee reduced that amount by $3,000,000 to $12,000,000, and I am told by those who have the responsibility of this training program that that reduction of $3,000,000 will result in the Navy being unable to matriculate some 3,000 students who have previously been screened and who have just recently been selected and who, if the money were available, would go to colleges this summer. I would like to have the gentleman discuss that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Without committing the members of the subcommittee in the slightest degree with respect to this matter, I understand—and I may want to strike this out of the RECORD, but this is my information in regard to it—this program has been handled by some men who are authorities in their fields so far as Reserve Officer Training Corps Navy men are concerned, but who are awfully poor mathematicians. Twice, to my knowledge, they brought statements to this committee, neither one of which checks with the other so far as the monetary end of it is concerned. However, they have recently produced facts to show that

some 50,000 young men were contacted with respect to the possibility of taking this training, out of which some 40,000 made application, out of which, after several screenings 3,000 men have been found both mentally and physically qualified to take this course. If it be true—and we will undertake to satisfy ourselves with respect to that matter between now and tomorrow when the bill comes up for amendment—that we inadvertently have knocked a leg off this baby of ours, I am sure the committee will be glad to have either an amputation or else put some kind of a leg there to make this baby walk, because we are reasonable. But, you understand, as well as I do, just the situation which confronts me and which confronted the committee. We started out on a program and we gave them twice; 12 to 1.

Mr. COLE of New York. The report so states, but the statement about the ratio of 12 to 1 is so ambiguous and vague that to my mind it is meaningless.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not think the gentleman would want to say that.

Mr. COLE of New York. At least, to my mind it is meaningless. Perhaps to some reasonable man it may have some meaning. At any rate, the gentleman can assure us that it was not the intention of the committee to curtail this program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I can assure the gentleman it is not our intent to cripple the program. It is our intent to go along with the program. When they showed us that they were unable to expand only one 1 out of 12, we appropriated 12 times 1 for the next year.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then if the gentleman and his committee can be shown that this reduction of $3,000,000 will result in the inability of the Navy to have sufficient funds with which to send these boys to school, the committee will be ready to restore the amount?

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is asking an awful lot of me as chairman to assure him of that, but if he can produce the facts and show us that there are 3,000 boys screened out of 50,000 who will be deprived, by reason of our lack of appropriation of $3,000,000, or whatever it may be, of their opportunity, the members of my committee, being reasonable human beings, I have a right to assume would consider very carefully, at least, such an amendment as the gentleman may care to offer.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman's explanation and expression of the committee's attitude is what I expected it would be, and I compliment him for it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. There can be no question as to the attitude of the committee.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. May I ask, for the purpose of the record, whether when this item was being considered the Committee on Appropriations took into account the number of vessels that might be available for the training of these new officers and the equipment that might be available for them to be trained with?

Mr. PLUMLEY. As I recall, that angle of the situation was very well covered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will yield, may I say in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that with all of the laid-up ships we have I am satisfied they would be taken care of, because there is an ample supply of ships for that purpose.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am satisfied that is the case.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I correctly understand that the regiment at Annapolis is now 2,900 men?

Mr. PLUMLEY. In round numbers.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that compare favorably with the regiment that was there during the war years, or is it reduced?

Mr. PLUMLEY. In 1939 there were 2,300 there.

Mr. DONDERO. But during the war years that increased?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Naturally so. I do not know the number. Does anybody here know the number of cadets at Annapolis during the war years? Of course, it was increased.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice a reduction of $450,000 in the training station on the Great Lakes. Does that refer to the Great Lakes Training Station at Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Outside of Chicago, yes. The gentleman will notice several other reductions if he will scrutinize the report, because of the lack of necessity for them.

Mr. DONDERO. I commend the gentleman and his committee for the carefulness with which this report has been prepared and the economies already obtained, which I am sure will be approved by the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY. There has been no attempt on the part of this committee to economize at the expense of either the Navy or the United States or the possibility of being able to do a lot of things which we may have to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has consumed 45 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss a recapitulation of H. R. 3493, the Navy Department appropriation bill, I wish to express my compliments to the chairman of the committee for the courteous manner in which he conducted the hearings. While, of course, there have been times when we have not been in mutual agreement on all the problems that were before us, yet I can assure you that the Committee has resolved those problems in a very amiable manner.

When we appeared before you with the last regular appropriation bill for the Navy we had with us as our clerk and advisor, Mr. Jack McFall, who had served the Committee long and faithfully. While he has gone to a very splendid post with the State Department and while he has been succeeded by a very splendid young gentleman, we certainly do miss Jack and his friendly attitude which we all enjoyed as we conducted the hearings. Do not, however, get the idea that I want to minimize the efforts and ability of Mr. Sprankle, who is Mr. McFall's successor. Mr. Sprankle has done a very remarkable job and has served members of both sides on the committee in a very splendid and gracious manner, and I am sure that we are going to enjoy working with him for quite some time, and the changes that have occurred in the past will not perhaps be so definitely indicated in the future.

Relative to the bill we have under consideration this afternoon there has been quite some discussion in the press relative to cuts being made by the Appropriations Committee in its various bills. I wish to call your attention, if I may, to the fact that this bill is consistent and has had a considerable cut. The cut operation, of course, had its origin in the Secretary's office, then in the Bureau of the Budget, and finally in the Congress. The original request from the Navy Department was for $8,161,232,563. After the Office of the Secretary of the Navy had scrutinized the figures very carefully, in their discretion they cut the request by $2,371,268,063, which left a balance at that time of $5,789,964,500. Then, of course, the bill went over to the Bureau of the Budget, where those mathematically astute gentlemen proceeded to amputate another $2,276,964,200. So the total cut that this bill had prior to its arrival in the Congress for its consideration is $4,648,232,263.

When Navy appeared before our committee the presentation that was made by requests at that time was an amount of $3,513,300,000 new money. The committee in its wisdom or in its conclusion made a further total cut of $376,519,200.

There is a difference between my total and that referred to by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], which I think is due to the fact that I carried a recap of special and trust funds which I do not think he had in his statement. In the final analysis the cuts that have been made and which have been referred to in detail by the chairman may have some repercussions that will not be acceptable.

I went along with the committee in the cuts that were presented to the committee as a whole and I intend to go along with them on the floor of the House, reserving, however, my right, if the Navy feels they are injured to the extent that it is going to be damaging and they can make their case before the Senate in more clarified effect than they may have had the opportunity to do it before our committee, to concur with whatever the Senate may increase the bill, if it meets with my approval.

I feel this way about appropriations for our military forces. I have been known ever since I became a member of this committee as a big Navy man and so far I am suffering no regrets for that attitude. While I was over in Europe I had an opportunity to observe the considerable operations of a foreign power

that today dominates Europe to a very large degree. Their ambition to extend their sphere of influence was very definitely indicated. How far that extension will ultimately reach nobody knows. I have watched with a great deal of interest the tactics that have been applied in conferences held by the respective committees representing the United States and other governments in international affairs, and for some reason I have not been able to diagnose at the moment, why this Nation to whom I originally referred continues to strenuously object to the expedition of a legitimate understanding of international problems. To me, if nations are seriously concerned in endeavoring to avert a repetition of World War II, there is no legitimate or logical reason why they cannot sit down around a conference table and reach a more expeditious consideration and result than appears to have taken place or have been effected as of this date. Feeling that there is an expansion ambition very definitely being exercised by Russia, in my opinion, it is within the realm of stupidity for this Nation to decrease its military strength beyond the point of requirements to meet any eventuality that may ultimately develop. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, I am reserving my right, to see what occurs when the Navy has finally analyzed the cuts that have been made in this bill and to make further justification of its position.

Of course we did not cut anything out of the transferred funds, $50,000,000 taken from the clothing and small stores fund to be applied on subsistence of the Navy, another transfer of $50,000,000 from the naval stock fund which goes to the maintenance of ships, another $50,000,000 from the Navy stock fund to go to maintenance of supplies. There was a replacement of $14,280,000 that was not disturbed at all and, as stated by the chairman of our committee, the contractual authority for purchase of aircraft, $170,000,000, was not disturbed.

So, it resolves itself to a question of whether it can be ultimately determined what the effectiveness of the cuts will be upon the Navy and its personnel. Insofar as my personal attitude is concerned, I do not intend to offer any amendment to the bill before you for consideration, but I do feel that it is only within keeping that we should keep ourselves in an open-minded attitude, so if we find that something has occurred in the decreases made in this bill that is detrimental to an adequate naval force, that we can then adjust it when it goes over to the other body.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee spent some 6 or 7 weeks hearing witnesses and generally considering this bill. No time was lost on partisanship. Your committee takes great pride in the harmony that prevails.

By and large, the objectives of the bill are all right. However, the Republican majority cut several bureaus too deeply. These items are: First, pay and subsistence of Navy personnel, which was cut approximately $94,171,000 or about 7 percent; second, pay of Marine Corps was cut $20,000,000; third, maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics was cut about $55,500,000, leaving $474,000,000; fourth, maintenance of the Bureau of Ships, about $74,750,000, leaving for expenditure in 1948, $300,000,000; and fifth, Bureau of Ordnance was cut $28,000,000 leaving for expenditure for 1948, $180,000,000. My disagreement is purely one of degree.

During these troubled times, I doubt the wisdom of these substantial cuts. Maybe 12 months hence, after world conditions are clarified, these cuts can be substantiated by even going deeper. But, at this particular time, I do not approve of the chances we are taking.

The budget estimates under "Pay and subsistence" were supposed to be based upon an enlisted strength of the Navy of 425,000 men and 40,000 officers. The Budget cut "Pay and subsistence" $32,000,000 and your committee reduced the estimate another $94,171,000, thus making a total cut in "Pay and subsistence" of $126,171,000. I am advised by the Navy Department that this sum will reduce the average enlisted strength of the Navy during fiscal 1948 from 425,000 men to 355,000; that 355,000 men is entirely insufficient to carry out the Navy operating force plan.

In my humble judgment, 425,000 enlisted men is small enough to man our fleet for the next 12 months—or at least until permanent peace is assured. A Navy of 471,000 officers and men during the fiscal 1948 is a tremendous comedown from 3,200,000 officers and men in the fiscal year 1946.

If we are to maintain an active fleet of 267 combat vessels; 31 in reduced commission status and 631 in reserve, along with our supporting shore establishments, plus Navy Aviation, then 471,000 officers and men is the bare minimum.

Yet, under this bill, we cut pay and subsistence by $126,171,000, which automatically cuts personnel by at least 70,000 men. The most effective way to reduce the size of the Navy is to reduce the funds to feed and pay the men. Without these funds, the men must be discharged.

Pay of the Marine Corps, as approved by budget, provides for 7,500 officers and 90,000 enlisted men. But the committee reduced this item $20,000,000. In doing so, we cut down the average strength of the Marine Corps to 6,500 officers and 79,000 enlisted men, which is too great a cut.

The committee has supplied the Bureau of Aeronautics funds for the purchase, during fiscal 1948, of 579 new airplanes at a total cost of $260,000,000. Thirty-six percent are new type planes; the remainder improvements on old types. That amount was the budget estimate. I am not sure that the budget was correct in its estimate. If it was, the Navy Department was wrong because it asked for funds to purchase 1,276 planes.

I must confess though that it is quite arguable whether it is wise to spend money now to buy new planes, which in all probability will be obsolete 5 years from now. Who knows, however, whether we will be called upon to fight six months from now, or 12 months, or never. If challenged, we must fight with planes we have developed and not with those that will be developed 5 years hence. That was the costly position we were in in 1941.

During fiscal year 1948, we will operate 6,130 planes for the regular Navy and Marine Corps. During the year, 2,115 of these will be junked due to crashes, old age and attrition. In other words, attrition gets 34½ percent of the number operated per year. In addition to these 6,130 planes, we have in reserve a pool of 3,800 planes. Since we are buying only 538 new planes in fiscal 1948, our reserve pool of 3,800 will be exhausted in the next 3 years.

It should be pointed out that England's air force today is stronger than ours. Also, it should be emphasized and reemphasized that the best opinion in this country is that Russia has a production capacity of planes in the neighborhood of 75,000 a year, which is several times our present capacity. That raises the all important question: What shall we do with our airplane industry? Shall we let it die or shall we support it with the purchase of new planes? If we let it die, we will be in the position that we were in 1941, namely, almost helpless. If we support it to some degree of efficiency, the taxpayers must be prepared to spend in excess of a billion dollars a year. This is for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

It should be pointed out in unmistakable terms that our first line of defense is not our battleships—with the exception of our aircraft carriers—nor is it our infantry, but our airplanes.

The cut of $55,500,000 in the Bureau of Aeronautics comes in the maintenance of our aviation stations, in the upkeep of our aircraft and fuel.

The Bureau of Aeronautics today has only 42 active fields in the United States. These ring the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific coasts. It has 21 for Reserve training and 24 outside the United States. These stations must be adequately maintained, and it costs money to do that job. The investment in these installations runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is poor business to let them go to pot.

Perhaps $20,000,000 could be saved by completely winding up the Naval Air Transport Service. By cutting out this item, no serious function of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics would be disturbed. We all know that far too much money is spent on travel in the Navy. Three to five million dollars could also be saved this Bureau by winding up blimp activities lock, stock, and barrel. They are as out of date in this world of increasing speed as the model T Ford.

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Ships was $374,750,000. This amount was reduced $74,750,000 by the committee. This cut is too deep because these funds are used, first, to maintain and operate the active fleet, with alteration to those vessels, at an estimated cost for 1948 of $154,000,000; second, to maintain 15 shipyards, where its repair work is done, and to maintain 14 manufacturing plants in stand-by condition. These are

less than 8 percent of the total construction during the war; third, to maintain the inactive fleet, which is berthed at 16 different places; fourth, scientific investigation and research. It should be borne in mind that under the heading "Maintenance of Shore Stations," these funds pay for maintenance and operation of shore radio, radar, and sonar stations, which number about 2,500.

It requires manpower to alter, repair, and maintain an operating fleet. Likewise it requires a large amount of manpower to berth our huge inactive fleet and to give it the barest minimum care and attention. It takes manpower to maintain the shipyards themselves. Most of this work necessarily is done by H–B and per diem employees. Their pay is one of the big items in the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships. If we cut their pay, we cut off the work they perform. When their work is not done, the active and inactive fleets and our shipyards deteriorate in proportion. There is no money in this bill for a new ship construction program. However, there are a few million dollars included to build several new type submarines.

What I have said about the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships can also be said with equal accuracy as to the maintenance of the Bureau of Ordnance. Today we have an investment in the Bureau of Ordnance in the form of ammunition, armament, and plant facilities approximating $5,000,200,000. The Bureau was granted $180,000,000, which was a reduction of $28,000,000 below the budget. With the funds granted, it must necessarily carry on its work of, first, research and development of improved ordnance; second, maintenance and upkeep of ordnance equipment afloat and ashore. The cost of our present supply of ammunition is three and one-half billion dollars and of guns and armaments, one and a half billion; third, maintenance and operation of the ordnance shore establishments; and fourth, production and procurement of new ordnance not required for new ships.

For new ordnance which does not come under the heading of "AAA," namely, ordnance for new ships, the Bureau requested the sum of $62,000,000; for research and development, $50,000,000; for maintenance of its shore installations and ordnance stores, $70,000,000. Thus, it is readily seen that the maintenance of our investment in ordnance stores and ordnance installations is rather small. The reduction of $28,000,000 is considerably too much.

Your committee, in two respects, did an outstanding job and used good judgment when it did not reduce the budget estimates of any of the bureaus of the Navy for scientific investigations and research. However, in my humble opinion, the budget estimates of approximately $203,000,000 should have been increased because it is these funds that will provide the new types of Navy implements should we go to war again. It might be added that it does not require a great amount of imagination to realize that one of the most destructive implements of the next war will be manless, flying missiles carrying atomic bombs, which will travel enormous distances and hit their targets. These implements are in their infancy, and they must be perfected.

Other nations are ahead of us now in the fields of scientific investigation and research, with the possible exception of the atomic bomb. It is accurate to state that in 1941 we were behind our enemies in the way of new implements of war. We had to borrow, beg, and procure by other means the ideas behind all of our modern implements. The only field of science in which we led was in the field of medicine. Even then, we had to get DDT from Germany.

Surely the Bureau of Aeronautics, which requested $150,000,000 of the budget for scientific investigation and research should have been given approximately that amount. However your committee saw fit to allow the budget estimate of only $75,000,000. In this bill we have granted the Bureau of Ordnance $50,000,000 for scientific investigation and research. That amount should be increased to at least $75,000,000. The Bureau today is carrying on some experiments that no doubt will prove to be revolutionary.

The other feather that should be placed in the cap of the committee is for its strong belief in the development of the Navy and Marine Corps Reserves. The budget estimates for these two items were not reduced. I think I speak the unanimous opinion of the committee in saying that we realize the backbone of the future wartime Navy and Marine Corps is the Reserve. If there is an answer to universal military training, it lies in a large Reserve with regular training periods, and equipped with modern implements.

Before closing, I must pay tribute to Fleet Admiral Nimitz and his staff and to the Chiefs of the bureaus and their staffs. Vice Adm. Earl Mills, Chief, Bureau of Ships; Vice Adm. E. L. Cockrane, Chief, Material Division; Rear Adm. H. B. Sallada, former Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics; Rear Adm. C. A. Swanson, Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; Rear Adm. J. J. Manning, Bureau of Yards and Docks; and Rear Adm. W. A. Buck, Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, have all done an outstanding job. It is no small matter to take the greatest navy on earth and shake it down to proportionate peacetime conditions in a period of 18 months. Each of these gentlemen is to be commended for the fine job he has done under very difficult circumstances. I should also like to mention Rear Adm. T. L. Sprague, who recently took over the Bureau of Naval Personnel from a great Chief, Louis B. Denfeld, and Rear Adm. A. M. Pride, who succeeded Admiral Sallada as Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. I know that each of them will do a grand job. Let me also pay tribute to that all-time great Chief of the Marine Corps, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift.

The charge is often leveled against bureaus of the Government that Communists are working with them. At no time, as far as I know, has any such charge been made against the Navy Department. This is another strong commendation for these fine officers.

It should be stated as an outstanding fact that more good business practices and procedures now exist in the Navy Department than any time in its history. This accomplishment is largely due to the untiring efforts of Secretary Forrestal. His budget people, led by Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood and Mr. Wilfred J. McNeil, are continually hammering away at the job. I am confident that we will see continuous and steady improvement along these lines.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Did the committee allow the amount that the Budget did for naval aviation?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No. I am sorry. We cut the Bureau of Aeronautics for maintenance $55,500,000. I intend to offer a correcting figure. However, we did allow the budget estimates on the purchase of new planes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the subcommittee and the committee have done a good job on this bill. I believe a study of the hearings will establish that the questions that have been raised with reference to the sufficiency of the provision of funds will be answered to the effect that the committee has provided what is necessary for the operation of the Navy.

Personally, I have not the intimate knowledge of the items of this appropriation bill that the members of the subcommittee have. As has been customary, the members of the subcommittee have gone ahead and held the hearings with such help as the staff of the committee has been able to provide, and it is primarily their bill. No one member of the subcommittee, of course, nor anyone else would be completely satisfied with it, but over all it is a very satisfactory job.

The thing that I have been impressed with in connection with our national defense is the utter lack of coordination between the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, and the operations of the Maritime Commission. In other words, the program of each of those agencies fails to dovetail in or be supplemental to the program of any of the others. Because of that we have an Army that could not fit into the military picture that the Navy would, a Navy that could not fit into the military picture that the Army would, an Air Corps that is built up on the same principles; and on top of that the Maritime Commission has allowed things to slide—and slide is all they have done. The conditions in that Commission are terrible, and there is no such thing as preserving or having prepared anything in the nature of goods or passenger transport which would enable the defense organization to function.

The administration, under President Truman has not brought about that coordination.

I wish to say at this time that, in my opinion, the interests of national defense

absolutely demand that this coordination take place and that if no bill is passed providing for that coordination through some officer, named by the President, who is in that measure given the authority to make the coordination and if that does not take place, if we are not assured that the administration will attempt it, I want to say to the Congress that the appropriations committee is going to assume that all other efforts having failed, it is necessary that the appropriations committee proceed with the operation of coordination.

I do not like the job. It means endless days and nights of strenuous work for the members of the appropriations committee but it is a responsibility of everyone connected with the Congress in view of the fact that the administration has not taken steps to bring this about to see that the job is done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, if I could make one contribution to this Congress and my country—yes, to the world—I think it would be toward an effort to insure peace. If victory at arms gave us a responsibility, it was that of enthusiastically pursuing the course of peace as zealously as we pursued victory at arms.

I am not a member of this distinguished subcommittee nor of the Appropriations Committee of the House. I do feel they have given careful consideration to the demands of the national defense of this country. I have great respect for the members of that committee. As a Member of this body charged with the responsibility of providing an army and navy, however, I must look first to the source that I consider most responsible for the defense of the country. That is not the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Chairman, nor the President of the United States; it is the Army and the Navy.

I am disappointed that this bill does not carry out the requests of the Navy. Admiral Nimitz has, time after time, said when asked what size of Navy we need in the interest of our responsibilities in this world that no man living could answer at this time. He did, however, give the size of a navy that would be needed to maintain peace and decency in the world.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is realized that from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day we spent, I believe, about $120,000,000,000 on the Navy? From Armistice Day in 1918 until Pearl Harbor 1941, that would have averaged more than $5,000,000,000 per year. Does anyone question the fact that if we had possessed a $5,000,000,000 Navy each year from 1918 until Pearl Harbor, 1941, there would not have been a Pearl Harbor? Very likely, and I believe it, there would not have been the terrible, bloody, dirty war in which many men of this Congress and millions outside of this Congress fought. There would not have been 300,000 white crosses. There would not have been the great concern, now felt, as to whether or not we shall live in a peaceful world.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this Congress can support an adequate navy, dedicated to peace, as enthusiastically as it supported one dedicated to war.

It is a difficult thing to spend billions of dollars of the people's money to do this, but I would rather support a $5,000,000,000 navy for the next 5 years—yes, a $6,000,000,000 navy or a $10,000,000,000 navy for the next 5 years or the next 10 years—than to lose one single American in a possible war. War is a dirty, nasty business. If there is a doubt as to the present needs of our Navy, I hope you will give the benefit of the doubt in the interest of peace in this country and of the world when we make this appropriation. I sincerely urge you to do so, for perhaps the future of mankind depends upon it. Yes; victory in arms gave us an opportunity to do a great work in the world, to insure peace and decency. I know that my people want me, and I believe that your people want you, to support the kind of navy and the kind of army that will insure the peace that was bought so dearly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this 2 minutes in order to ask the chairman and the members of the committee a couple of questions that have me a little bit puzzled. A reading of the bill and the report indicates that the over-all cut for the Navy Department is approximately 11 percent across the board. I note that on page 8, under "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," and on page 10, the amount appropriated for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, is $300,000,000, and in addition to that amount a transfer of $50,000,000 from the Navy stock fund.

Now, as I understand, that is a reduction of approximately 17 percent below what the Navy Department requested for Bureau of Ships maintenance and material. Then, if we turn to page 25, under "Salaries, Navy Department," we find an appropriation for the Bureau of Ships of $5,450,000, which is a reduction below the $7,267,500 which the Bureau of Ships requested, and which amounts to a 25-percent reduction. I cannot understand this discrepancy in figures for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, personnel; that is, salary for the Bureau of Ships, and the 11 percent over-all reduction for the entire Navy Department appropriation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. We did not try to maintain a universal percentage or a proportional cut as between the departments. I think the gentleman alluded to that.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; I alluded to that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. We did not try to do that. To be absolutely frank with the gentleman, we thought they asked too much and we cut it down.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I expected and appreciate a frank answer from the chairman, but I still cannot understand the discrepancy between an 11-percent over-all naval reduction, a 17-percent reduction in material requests, and a 25-percent reduction in personnel request for the one bureau.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The committee considered each appropriation on its own merits without any percentage for any appropriation. It is only coincidental that the reduction turned out to be the percentages you mentioned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we now get to the point of the Navy. What I shall say will be in no respect a reflection on the splendid committee who heretofore, before today, have done a pretty good job for the Navy and for the country. I believe, however, that the presentation to the Congress of this budget to operate the Navy for the next fiscal year is not well thought out, is not well prepared, and certainly is not good for the morale of the country at this time. World conditions are such that we can ill afford to immobilize our Navy or dismantle our Navy, or immobilize our Army, and send our armed forces, both the Army and the Navy, with this component part each of the air, into the limbo of forgotten men.

I wish every Member of this Congress, certainly of the Appropriations Committee, could go over the landscape of this Nation and see what facilities the Navy possesses. I wish the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York, could go from Maine to Florida and from Washington to the Gulf of Mexico and see what the Navy possesses, see the astronomical job it has of carrying on its mission now that the peace has finally arrived. I do not believe you can tell the Navy, "Here is your money. Now, cut your garment to fit it." I do not believe, in view of world conditions, that we can afford to make such a drastic reduction at this time.

We heard from the press today the results of the Security Council of the United Nations up in New York, where Gromyko told us point blank that Russia would not let us or anybody else find out what is going on behind the iron curtain. A word to the wise is sufficient. We ought to know that we can ill afford to cast to the four winds every straw in the wind which tells us we cannot now send our Navy to the bottom of the briny deep.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I will be delighted to yield to my dear friend from St. Louis, who has always been a great friend of the Navy.

Mr. PLOESER. I would hate to think that I am getting the impression from my distinguished friend, whom I admire so much and who is a practical Navy man from South Carolina, I would just hate to think that I am getting the impression or this House is getting the impression or, what is much more dangerous, the Nation is getting the impression that this bill immobilizes the United States Navy, or that we made a drastic reduction of just a lump sum. I can assure the gentleman that such is not the case.

Mr. RIVERS. I will say this to the gentleman: I would not under any condition reflect on the patriotism of my friend from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I did not mean that anything my friend said reflected on anyone's patriotism, but I want him to be factual in this thing.

Mr. RIVERS. I want this House to understand and I do not believe that the Appropriations Committee of the House or any committee of the House can tell the Nation today that the Navy can live up to a 10, 11, 15, or any arbitrary percent of reductions, in view of world conditions.

For instance, in 1938 this Congress would not permit the fortification of Guam. I did not question the patrotism of the Congress, but it turned out to be disastrous. This bill greatly curtails the Navy. I think the members of the Committee on Appropriations should go to these Navy yards and see the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of ships tied up going to wrack and ruin without any program at this time.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PLOESER. When you say that we tied up hundreds of ships without any program, you are indicting the management of the United States Navy and not the Congress.

We provided for the laying up of the ships, and we gave them everything they requested in order to do it.

Mr. RIVERS. The Congress last year set up our fleet, and when you do not provide for maintenance and do not give them the money to carry on the Reserve programs and carry on the air operation of the Navy, they cannot properly operate. We do not have sufficient money in this bill to properly operate the air arm of the Navy.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PLOESER. You have made some statements upon which I am compelled to comment.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sorry.

Mr. PLOESER. We allowed a sufficient amount of money for the reserve program. The committee last year increased the budget request for the reserve program. This committee this year gave them every nickel they asked for, the bill confirms this fact. We must not go on assumptions here, but we must go according to the facts.

Mr. RIVERS. What is going to happen to the NROTC program under this bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will answer that question by saying that we appropriated on the basis of what they were able to accomplish last year 12 times what they expended and we are ready if they show us to have been error with regard to those that I talked about this afternoon to accept a reasonable amendment to make it possible for every one of the 3,000 boys in this country who are qualified for that program to be made a part of it.

Mr. RIVERS. What is going to be a reasonable amendment, may I ask my chairman?

Mr. PLUMLEY. It would have to be a reasonable project, if you please.

Mr. RIVERS. The chairman said a while ago, and I want to say a word about it, that they thought it was too top heavy and that is why they were cut down, and if that is not arbitrary, I do not know what is.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman ought to yield to me because he has misquoted me.

Mr. RIVERS. I beg your pardon if I have.

Mr. PLUMLEY. You have.

Mr. RIVERS. Perhaps I misunderstood you.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Answering the gentleman's question a while ago as to the status of our laid-up ships and with reference to the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships, its yards, its reserve fleet, and its active fleet, and so forth, I must state that the figure we have recommended for the consideration and approval of the House is $74,500,000 less than the budget granted and some three times less than the Bureau of Ships requested of the budget. Is that clear?

Mr. RIVERS. I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not this is another one of these appropriation bills where the reduction was set before the hearings were held.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Well, the gentleman may be familiar with that modus operandi, but I never heard about it before. What are you talking about?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I was just wondering whether or not there was any instruction from the committee chairman, that is, the chairman of the full committee, to make any certain percentage of reduction before the beginning of the hearings.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The chairman of the full committee is right here. He will tell you whether he had any conference with me at any time with respect to the percentage of reduction or with reference to what action my committee might take. I will leave it to him.

I want to tell you something you should bear in mind, that this was a unanimous report of the subcommittee and a unanimous report of the Appropriations Committee. Everybody present voted for it. Now, you can kick and buck and haul as much as you want to, but you are sunk.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be nearly so sunk as is the United States Navy, if we do not carry on a more orderly program in these chaotic times and conditions.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], asked some questions that are logical and reasonable. Nobody in this House can answer those questions. The fact remains clear to all of us, I do not know what we are doing to the United States Navy at this time under this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. I have sat on the Naval Affairs Committee for 6 years while we built up this Navy. I do not think now is the time to dismantle the United States Navy. The onus will be on those who are responsible for this. Now, let us get together and reestablish some of these cuts. The gentleman has said he will entertain some reasonable amendments. I am going to try to present one or two, and I hope they will be accepted. I do not question the sincerity or patriotism of my esteemed friend from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], but I am astounded at this bill coming in here like this. I am not the only one that cannot understand it. The American people cannot understand it. We have got time before the clock strikes this afternoon to do the right thing. Let us get together and do it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I am exceedingly disappointed that the gentleman does not understand the bill, but that does not mean that the subcommittee does not understand it. We thought we did, or we would not have brought it out here. But we shall endeavor, during the course of the afternoon, to make it clear so that my distinguished friend will understand it.

Mr. RIVERS. Now, my friend does not mean to be facetious, I am sure.

Mr. PLOESER. No. I am quite serious. I have a great regard for the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Well, there is no other Member I admire more than I do the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I want to refer to the remarks made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], as to this being the unanimous action on the part of the subcommittee. I understand it was unanimous as to objectivity, but not as to the amount involved.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to know what my distinguished friend from Illinois means by "objectivity." I am a humble man from Missouri, and I do not understand all these big words.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. If the gentleman had attended school in Illinois he might have understood it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I have no alternative.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes in order that he may yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], not being a member of the Ap-

propriations Committee, he seems to know more about the workings of that committee than the members themselves. That is unusual, but then we will assume that he knows. If the gentleman will study this bill and the budget requests, he will find there has not been a percentage cut made in this bill. Naturally, all amounts, as they apply in relation to other amounts, are in a percentage, but there has been no flat percentage cut across the board. We have tried to apply these cuts as we thought they would fit. The gentleman well knows, if he is so familiar with the proceedings of the Appropriations Committee, that there was no lump sum within which we had to come, unless by a reading of the hearings we may assume that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] set a lump sum when he said we could safely cut this budget $500,000,000. We did not. We cut it $377,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. I am not going to make any statement that this bill fulfills campaign promises. I would not subscribe to that statement; but I will say that at this time I do not believe we can afford to present a bill like this to Congress and expect that it will pass in this form. I think that if reasonable amendments to serve specific bureaus in the Navy Department are not adopted providing increases—and I say this seriously to the committee—if these increases are not made and world conditions develop, as I hope they will not, the onus will be on us in this Congress, and I do not believe we can explain it to the American people—not in the light of what is transpiring today in Europe and beyond the iron curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side, either. I suggest that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay and allowances: Officers, active duty, no part of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights, by more than 85 officers above the rank of captain nor by nonflying officers or observers at rates in excess of those prescribed by law for the Army, which shall be the legal maximum rates as to such nonflying officers or observers; midshipmen; officers, retired, inactive; enlisted personnel, active, including cash prizes for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, communication, and engineering competition; enlisted men, retired, inactive; men of the Fleet Reserve, inactive; nurses, female, active; nurses, female, retired, inactive; 6 months' death gratuity, officers, nurses, and enlisted personnel; cash allowances for uniforms for officers; clothing furnished annually to enlisted personnel and issued in kind to members of the Navy Nurse Corps or cash in lieu thereof; civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $30 per person to enlisted personnel given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude; reimbursement as authorized by the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277), to persons in the naval service, for personal property lost, destroyed, or damaged; purchase of medals, crosses, bars, emblems, and other insignia; miscellaneous items, including interest on deposits by enlisted personnel; losses in the accounts of Navy and Marine Corps officers certified under the act of July 11, 1919 (31 U. S. C. 105), and the act of June 10, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 104), and payments in settlement of claims under the act of January 2, 1942 (31 U. S. C. 224d); commuted rations; money allowances for subsistence and quarters of enlisted personnel when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind, and for enlisted personnel absent from messes on temporary duty not involving travel (during which time all other subsistence shall be stopped): *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department; total, pay and allowances, $1,153,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

Page 13, line 9, strike out "$1,153,000,000" and insert "$1,279,171,000."

Page 13, line 14, strike out "$1,200,000,000", and insert "$1,326,171,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for one specific purpose, to restore to the Navy its uniformed personnel to 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers as an average throughout the fiscal year 1948. It merely adds $126,171,000. The Bureau of Personnel or the Budget apparently made some mistake. Whether it was the Bureau of Personnel or the Budget I do not know. The Bureau of Personnel says it was the Budget. The Budget attempted to allow them enough money, namely, $1,290,000,000 to support the manpower of 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers through an average of the year, but the Budget made an error by striking out $32,000,000 too much. Then our committee came along and reduced the budget figure by $94,197,000 making a total cut of $126,171,000. The Navy Department says if the figure stands as the committee has written it without this addition of $126,171,000, instead of having an average figure of 425,000 men throughout the fiscal year they will only have 355,000, a reduction of 70,000 men.

Frankly, I do not think the committee intended to cut that severely and certainly I do not think, I hope not anyway, that it is the desire and the wish of the House to reduce the strength of the Navy to that extent. If we do that we are going to change the entire operating force plan of the Navy. If my memory serves me correctly, it was only about a year or a year and a half ago when the Navy legislative committee, and this House backed it up almost unanimously, set as a peacetime figure a Navy of an average strength of 500,000. Now we are reducing it by these appropriation figures around 95,000, a reduction of 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will restore this fund because if there ever was a time not to be drastic in your cuts now is the time to act with some reason. When you go to cutting off the pay and the food, and that is what this item does, you are reducing the strength of the Navy, because if you cannot pay the men and cannot feed them the Navy will have to discharge them. I hope the committee will restore this cut and place the strength of the Navy up where it belongs. Four hundred and twenty-five thousand men, in my humble judgment, is the bare minimum that we ought to have at this time.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read to the Committee some of the testimony on this very point. I am sure the gentleman from Texas is in agreement with the committee still insofar as it was not our intention to make any drastic, radical reduction in the size of the naval force. I do not recall any of these figures being presented to the subcommittee by the gentleman, which leads me to believe that they came into his possession at a very recent hour.

Mr. Chairman, I read from page 570 of the hearings on this very point:

Mr. JOHNSON. A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay" is from $32,000,000 to $34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations to meet the pay for 425,000 men in the Navy and 46,000 officers in the Navy. Is that correct?

Captain DARDEN. That is correct.

Up to that point the gentleman's statement is accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you care to make any explanation in regard to it?

Captain DARDEN. That simply means that we will maintain the 425,000 enlisted and 46,000 officers within amounts herein asked for.

The Secretary of the Navy has very few controls over what makes up the expenditures for pay. The main one is promotions and rank and rating structure, and in the officers' savings, the administrative actions we will probably have to take to keep within this lesser amount will be rank reversions.

There is another way we can save some money to get within the total herein requested, and that is by taking on additional ensigns from the contract students that will be coming out between now and June 30.

And he goes on and made a later statement in which he says:

As a matter of fact, we are going to be at least 3,000 to 4,000 officers short of the figure which we have stated.

So, that is a frank admission that they not only could fit within the budget set forth, which the gentleman and he says was $32,000,000 short, but that they do not even anticipate meeting their officer strength as set by their own plan schedule.

When this committee considered what amounts to a 7 percent pay reduction we also had in mind the fact that there are probably too many men of high rank

in the Navy, and there might be a considerable program of reversion to prewar rank—and that does not go alone for the Navy; that statement may be said for all military forces. There is an inclination to keep high rank, using as many men as possible. So, we have not impaired the Navy.

Now, there is something else that must be taken into consideration. According to these figures, we would have had an enlisted men's strength in the original Budget Bureau of 425,000 men and 46,000 officers; 227,333 of these enlisted men are to serve the fleet and 17,846 officers are to serve the fleet. That means that under their present figures we were to have afloat, or in the immediate fleet, 245,179 men and, mind you, ashore 225,821 men. And, except for that rule, which applies to all governmental departments, that you have to justify the budget or be subject to something from above, there is not a Navy man that will tell you that you have to have a shore establishment of 225,000 men in this day to support a fleet of 245,000 men. The subcommittee reduction will not keep one ship ashore, but rather it will make more efficient the streamlining of these operations in relation to the shore establishment and the active fleet.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri will agree that it was stated in the committee that the budget estimate was $32,000,000 too low to support the estimate of 425,000 enlisted men?

Mr. PLOESER. I read that statement from the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I just wanted to clarify our thinking. All right. The gentleman agrees with me. Now, I wonder if the gentleman will read the letter that was sent from Admiral Nimitz' office this morning to the chairman of the subcommittee and, I am also advised, to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have received no letter from Admiral Nimitz; neither have I received any letter from the Secretary of the Navy, although I have seen copies of that letter addressed to other members of this subcommittee, which is confidential, and not addressed to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I knew if the gentleman had it he would read it. I am just wondering if whoever has that letter will answer this question: Does it state in there that the figures granted by the subcommittee will reduce the strength of the enlisted personnel of the Navy by 70,000, which means that we will have during 1948 an average figure not of 425,000 but of 355,000?

Mr. TABER. After a fashion it does. On the other hand, the whole picture of the hearings and the letter indicate that they are not telling the same story in the letter that they told in the hearings. That is something it is very difficult for any committee to deal with. They told us in the hearings they could carry 425,000 men with the budget estimate. On the other hand, they told us they were going to have 37,000 who would run out of work the 1st of January. You have a right to assume when these departments come before you and tell you a story that they are telling the truth.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I do not think there is a harder worker in this House than my distinguished friend from New York, for whom I have a deep love and affection, and I agree with him far more times than I disagree with him, but I wonder if, instead of giving us his conclusions about the letter, he will read the letter and tell us whether or not Operations flatly stated in that letter that this sum of money will reduce their enlisted personnel of the Navy for 1948 to 355,000 men.

Mr. TABER. The letter tells a different story than was told the committee in the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think the letter ought to speak for itself. Does not the gentleman think we ought to let Admiral Nimitz and his staff figure out the personnel needs? After all, they are going to spend the money.

Mr. TABER. This letter is not from Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No; it is from Admiral Sherman. He is deputy to Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. TABER. No; it is not.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Who is it from, then?

Mr. TABER. It is from the Secretary. Frankly, it is marked "confidential." I do not know whether or not I ought to go on the floor and read it. I do not know what is confidential about it, because very evidently the whole thing was supplied to the gentleman from Texas in an unrestrained manner so that he had the advantage over the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. It was your fault, then, if I had the advantage over the committee. You had the letter. You should have let them read it.

Mr. TABER. After I received the letter I called his attention to the testimony that was given by the representatives of the Bureau of Personnel, and he had no satisfactory explanation to offer.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Did the Secretary of the Navy ask you to be good enough to restore those cuts?

Mr. TABER. Yes. There is no question about that. But when they do not dispute the testimony they have already given and do not satisfactorily explain why they are telling a different story now than they did then, I cannot go along with them.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentleman did not hear the testimony and he knows he did not. He is giving his own conclusion. Of course they cannot explain it to his satisfaction.

Mr. TABER. I have read the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Let me read from the hearings:

Mr. JOHNSON. A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay" is from $32,000,000 to $34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations——

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe that figure? Is the gentleman questioning that figure now? Does he believe it?

Mr. TABER. When I finish reading I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe they are $34,000,000 short or does he disbelieve it?

Mr. TABER. I am going to read it, and the gentleman will see that this captain who was testifying admitted that it was not $34,000,000 short. I am wondering which side of the dilemma the gentleman is on.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Right down the middle.

Mr. TABER. Is he going to take the word of the Secretary or the admission of this man?

A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay," is from $32,000,000 to $34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations to meet the pay for 425,000 men in the Navy and 46,000 officers in the Navy. Is that correct?

Captain DARDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you care to make any explanation in regard to it?

Captain DARDEN. That simply means that we will maintain the 425,000 enlisted and 46,000 officers within amounts herein asked for.

That means it was not short a penny because they could maintain the number of men they were asking for on the money that was provided in the estimates and that it was not short thirty-two to thirty-four million dollars. So that proves absolutely the whole picture was not presented to us in the open and was not fairly presented to the committee.

When you get a story one way one time and another way another time, you almost make up your mind that you want to go along and use your own judgment.

If the gentlemen would like to have a little more about the whole situation, the gentleman from Missouri has very clearly demonstrated that there was not any shortage that would arise from this picture. They only asked for 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers. Right in the hearings they say they are not going to be able to get but 42,000 officers. That is on page 471. In addition, we know that the Committee on Armed Services is trying to get the officers of the Navy into a proper balance in rank as well as the officers of the Army. They are doing a job and trying to get the whole thing straightened out so that we may have an efficient Army and an efficient Navy without so much cost.

But why should we try to prevent that process from being worked out? Furthermore, the Navy will have 37,000 men who will be engaged in this mothball job of laying up ships, which they tell us will be finished the 1st of January, which

means that we can cut out half of them on their own say so.

Reducing the personnel of the shore stations a little bit will allow for every dollar of the less than 7 percent reduction that this committee has provided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman, because to me it is rather important so far as I am personally concerned: Was the letter the gentleman referred to in response to an interrogation he sent to the Navy or was it one that was written up generally?

Mr. TABER. It was a letter delivered to me when I came to the committee about 5:30 last evening.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was purely a letter to you as an individual?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was not intended for the subcommittee to have access to any of the letter?

Mr. TABER. It was not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accesories, including expansions of and facilities in public or private plants, $90,000,000; for replacement of navigational and radio equipment for aircraft in service, aerological, photographic, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, $18,000,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft, aircraft factory, air stations, testing laboratories, fleet and all other aviation activities, technical books and periodicals for use in the Bureau of Aeronautics and field, outfits for aviation messes, the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, and for contribution to the support of schools as authorized by section 13 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 604), $291,000,000; for continuing experiments, development, and research on all types of aircraft, $75,000,000; in all, $474,000,000, of which amount $90,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated for "Aviation, Navy," fiscal year 1945, shall continue available during the fiscal year 1948 for the liquidation of contractual obligations for aircraft and aircraft equipment procurement incurred during the fiscal year 1945: *Provided further*, That in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, contract for new construction, procurement and equipment of aircraft, including spare parts and accessories therefor, in an amount not in excess of $170,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

On page 18, line 17, strike out "$291,000,000" and insert "$345,500,000."

And on line 19, page 18, strike out "$474,000,000" and insert "$526,500,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in favor of maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The funds for Aeronautics in the Naval Department is divided into two large subheads. One is for the purchase of new airplanes, with which this amendment has nothing to do. The other is for the maintenance of the installations themselves, and the maintenance and operation of the planes and the purchase of fuel.

The Bureau of the Budget granted $345,000,000 for this purpose. Our committee cut it $55,500,000. It should be pointed out that the Bureau asked the Budget for considerably more than $345,000,000. Then, in addition to that, the committee cut that sum by $55,500,000.

Now, let us see how the Bureau will spend that money. During fiscal 1948 the Regular Navy and Marine Corps will operate about 6,000 planes. In addition to that, the Reserve of the Navy and the Marine Corps will operate an additional 2,000 planes. The committee has given the Bureau of Personnel every dime it asked for, for reserve recruiting. Thousands of aviators will train with this money in the Reserve, as well as the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. In addition to that we must maintain those 8,000 planes, keep them in running order, and buy fuel. In addition to that, we have 44 air stations in the United States, 22 beyond continental United States in our islands, and then we have 21 in more or less stand-by condition, used every now and then, under a small amount of maintenance for the Reserve. It is inconsistent to give the Reserve all the money they want with which to train, on the one hand, and then on the other hand deny them the planes and the stations and the fuel with which to operate the planes. We ought to restore this $55,000,000 cut.

I want to point out to you, when it is all said and done, the front line of the defense of our country is not the infantry or our battleships, but it is the airplanes and the aircraft carriers that carry them.

Mr. Chairman, we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish to let all these planes and these stations simply go to pot because we do not give the Bureau of Aeronautics sufficient money adequately to maintain them. Two, three, or four years from now when world conditions stabilize maybe we can reduce this amount substantially, but I for one do not want to take the chance for the next 12 months, because I do not know what is going to happen and I doubt if you do.

I ask the Members to consider this amendment. I think it has merit.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As far as the last statement made by the gentleman from Texas is concerned, I am in hearty accord with him. Nobody knows what is going to happen, but every statement that he has made in substance was made before the committee or is to be found in the justifications. After we had gone all over these hearings we determined that the amount we have brought in as a necessary appropriation was a satisfactory amount and did not do the damage or restrict the Navy to any extent such as might be imagined by what the gentleman from Texas has had to say. In all fairness to the committee, and he is a fair-minded fighter, he will say that he heard all these things. On my book he is not recorded as at the time having objected to what the committee did.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to let the membership understand what has happened in regard to some of the people who have had to do with making budgets, besides the Congress. The President in his stop order last year affected Navy aviation to this extent: He ordered them to stop spending $44,449,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1945 appropriation. He ordered them to stop spending $33,558,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1946 appropriation; and then he ordered them to stop spending $51,165,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1947 appropriation, a total of $129,172,000. The thing that rather amuses me is that the first place for the complaint of the gentleman from Texas is the White House, not the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While the gentleman's statement is correct as to the amount of money frozen, the gentleman will admit, I am sure, that the committee took care of all the unexpended balance in the frozen category.

Mr. PLOESER. Part of it was rescinded and $26,000,000, which is in the total I have talked about is left over creditable to the Navy, expendable in the fiscal year 1948. So the figures the gentleman from Texas has been talking about are $26,000,000 in error, because I failed to hear him mention that the Navy still has that $26,000,000 in their left pants' pocket.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But the gentleman will admit, of course, it is practically the amount that we did consume within our committee which was in the frozen category and left there by the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. That is substantially right.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I believe the figures the gentleman read are for the purchase of new airplanes which were under the basis of a continuing appropriation.

The amendment I offered goes to maintenance, not to the purchase of new planes.

Mr. PLOESER. But the gentleman will admit that of the $170,000,000 in contractual authorization requested for new planes this committee left every dollar.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is correct. I have no fault with that.

Mr. PLOESER. And the gentleman will further recall that these arguments that are now being presented were not presented before. At the time the bill was marked up my memorandum shows this was a unanimous agreement on this section of the bill.

I just do not understand how through a belated nightmare we can come in here this afternoon and suddenly discover a new set of figures. The gentleman from Texas is one of the keenest analysts on the Appropriations Committee. Why, he is so keen in his observations that I am one of his greatest admirers. Before we had finished marking up the bill he made this statement, on page 1193, to Captain Beardsley and Admiral Hopwood:

Well, we can reduce this budget by a half billion dollars and give you every dime you need.

Now, we have only reduced it by $377,000,000. If the gentleman is going to keep restoring these cuts, we will not have that reduction. The thing the gentleman should be talking about is where we can apply the extra $123,000,000 cut that he speaks of as reflected in the hearings instead of increasing these items.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We are talking about the maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics. Throwing up all of this other dust does not refer to the item under discussion. The figures the gentleman read is a continuing appropriation, not for maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics but for the purchase of new planes. This amendment I have offered does not touch that.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman will concede if there is anything we need in aeronautics, it is new planes. Every day the speed of these planes goes up. Present planes become obsolete with startling rapidity.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The funds are not transferable from one division to the other. Does not the gentleman think he could go along with this amendment and give them a little bit more money?

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman is asking me pointedly, the answer is "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Ordnance for new construction: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the construction and procurement of armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels provided for in the appropriation "Construction of ships," including tools and equipment in public and private plants for the production of armor, armament, and ammunition for said vessels, $4,580,000, to be transferred from the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition," to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation on the availability of the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" for construction of new vessels shall not be applicable to this appropriation nor the appropriation "Construction of ships."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to occupy the rather unique position of being a member of this Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Army Appropriations as well. It has been a great experience for me. It has been, in fact, a valuable education. It has been the greatest pleasure to work with these older members of the Navy Subcommittee on Appropriations, for they have a storehouse of knowledge of the Navy that any man in or out of the Navy would envy.

The confidence of this House in this subcommittee is well merited. Their work throughout the war and the 2 years which have followed since the shooting has ceased and the work on this particular bill warrants your continued confidence in not only their loyalty, but their judgment of things relating to the Navy. Many times I felt somewhat helpless as these millions and hundreds of millions and billions of dollars were juggled around. I can recall one occasion when one of the admirals referred to "this minor sum of $39,000,000." To me that was not a small figure, but a large one, indeed. As we have completed the hearings of both the Army and the Navy Subcommittees on Appropriations, there are a few places where it would seem that there is as yet some duplication in the work in research, particularly as it relates to aviation and to guided missiles. But, we have been assured in both committees that the Joint Research and Development Board is working now, seeking in every way possible to cut out any duplication in research by either of these Departments of our Government, and they assure us that by the end of the year many duplications will be eliminated and that they will be in a position, working back and forth, to avoid duplications in the future. Duplication in use of airfields, hospitals, and other installations can be profitably studied.

Another thing that struck me as more than passing strange was the number of times that officers of the Navy came before us and talked about this item or that item as being super secret and as hush-hush. We could not talk to anyone about it at all, only to pick up the paper a week or so later and find those things given full and complete publicity as a result of hearings, possibly before another committee of the House or, as we did upon one occasion, after we had had a lot of hush-hush, pick up one of the editions of the United States News and learn more in one page of concise print about what the postwar Navy was going to be than we had learned in weeks of hearings.

Those things I cannot quite understand. Of course, throughout all of the hearings we were concerned about what the future was to hold for us. We asked all of the men that we thought could give us a logical answer what the future held, particularly as related to the next year or the next 3 or 4 years. In no instance was there ever any indication that we faced any immediate emergency of any kind. In many of these discussions Russia or some other nation, was referred to. There is no question but what this appropriation gives the United States the greatest Navy in the world; a two-ocean Navy which many of us have wanted for so many years, a well-balanced Navy, a Navy that can carry on its functions as gloriously in the peace years as it did in the war years. They have done a splendid job. We expect them to continue to do a splendid job. They will not fail us.

The next one below us is that of England, which of course is not the navy it once was. As far as Russia is concerned, it never had a navy of any considerable size, and the larger size of the navy it now has is due, to no small degree, to the Navy ships we furnished under lend-lease, as shown by the following letter, containing a table of the Navy vessels which were delivered to Russia, some of them after VJ-day:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 30, 1947.

The Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: As requested in your letter of April 17, 1947, the following is a list, by type, of ships, boats, barges, and/or floating drydocks of the Navy transferred to the U. S. S. R. together with inclusive dates on which transfer was made:

Type	Number	Dates
AG (river tugs)	15	Aug. 21, 1944, through Apr. 11, 1945.
AM (mine sweepers)	24	June 25, 1943, through Aug. 17, 1945.
LCIL (landing craft, infantry)	20	June 10, 1945, through July 29, 1945.
PF (frigate)	28	July 13, 1945, through Sept. 4, 1945.
SC (submarine chasers, 11-foot)	78	July 13, 1943, through Sept. 2, 1945.
BPT (motor torpedo boat)	8	Feb. 8, 1944, through Feb. 16, 1945.
LCT (landing craft, tank)	17	Apr. 15, 1945, through May 26, 1945.
PT (motor torpedo boat)	194	Feb. 15, 1943, through Aug. 30, 1945.
YMA (motor mine sweepers)	43	Mar. 31, 1945, through Sept. 2, 1945.
YR (floating workshops)	4	June 19, 1945, through July 29, 1945.
PTC (submarine chasers)	26	Dec. 8, 1943, through Aug. 13, 1944.
LCM (3) (landing craft, mechanized)	84	June 7, 1943, through Dec. 30, 1944.
RPC (submarine chasers)	36	Dec. 3, 1943, through Mar. 4, 1944.
Motor launch	1	Oct. 19, 1944.
Plane personnel boat	1	Mar. 15, 1945.
LCS(S) (landing craft support)	2	Dec. 30, 1944.
LCVP (landing craft, vehicle, and personnel)	2	Do.
CR (ice breaker)	3	Feb. 25, 1944, through Mar. 24, 1945.
250-ton pontoon barges	4	Jan. 10, 1945, through Oct. 15, 1945.
CL (light cruiser)	1	Apr. 29, 1944.

With exception of the light cruiser (formerly the U. S. S. *Milwaukee*) all the above-listed craft are subject to return to the United States not later than the termination of the present wars. The light cruiser is on loan to the U. S. S. R. and is subject to return upon implementation of the terms of the Italian peace treaty.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

For the life of me I cannot understand why—and I sought to suggest this 2

weeks ago when the aid to Greece and Turkey was being proposed—we should not adopt legislation calling World War II at an end, so that we would be in a position to demand the return of not only these Navy ships but of planes, tanks, and guns, which we furnished Russia in times past, much of which built it into the powerful nation it now is—a nation whose menace causes grave concern in many quarters.

I would also call the attention of the Members who seem to think that the officers of the Navy who appeared before us are infallible. They are all fine gentlemen. I do not disparage their ability as naval officers a bit. Of course, they are advocates for the Navy and for their Bureau, and they were laboring under a handicap in that they could do nothing but support the President's budget, because they had a letter directing them to support only the President's budget, part of which reads:

> When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.
>
> HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In view of that word "only," you can well wonder, if an admiral or a captain or a commander should venture to say, "Here is where $10,000,000 can be saved," how long he would stay on that particular assignment.

Only a year ago this House had to consider the Navy appropriation for 1947. These officers had been before the committee, of which I was not then a member, just as ardently justifying the 1947 budget as they have been the 1948 budget. They told the committee then as they told us now, "This is the irreducible minimum. This is the dollar amount below which you cannot drop and still have this bureau of the Navy operate." Yet if you will refer to House Document No. 66, which has been transmitted to us by the President, you will find requests for transfers in the Navy from various funds to other funds, meaning that, in the first place, if they had had so much appropriated that they could transfer money out, they asked for more than they needed. In the second place, if they had to ask for more in one fund than they had gone to the committee for, they had misjudged their demands at that time.

In this document 66, for instance, there was a request to transfer from the Navy reserve training program $1,600,000. That is one of the reasons why the Navy reserve program got off to a slow start. It had some of its funds taken from it. That cut was not made by Congress.

There was a request to transfer from Navy Ordnance and Ordnance stores $2,500,000; from transportation and recruiting of personnel—and incidentally, recruiting is a very minor item although it has a popular appeal—a transfer of $5,000,000; and from transportation of things, a transfer of $23,000,000. If they went before the committee and justified that sum from which $23,000,000 can be deducted, then of course they missed their estimate by $23,000,000. From aviation, Navy, in 1947 they asked for another transfer of $25,000,000, and from Naval Procurement $169,160,000. In other words, when you total them all up, they asked to transfer $297,000,000, the amount by which they missed their guesses. No, they are not infallible. They make mistakes just like other people that are human do, and these men are human, surprisingly so. It has been a distinct pleasure to meet many of those officers and to listen to them and know that from the wealth of their experience and the record they piled up during the war, they have done a magnificent job with a magnificent Navy, and that they would in the future be able to maintain with these funds a two-ocean Navy of which any American could well be proud.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation for personal services at the seat of government, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to discuss briefly a subject matter that has already been determined by the House for the purpose of getting into the RECORD a very important statement which I believe ought to be fully considered when this bill goes to the Senate.

As we all know, we established the so-called Naval ROTC program about 2 years ago. The purpose of the program was to train in the universities of this country about 14,000 young men for service in the line and about 7,000 more in aviation, making a total of about 21,000 men. The intake was supposed to be about three to four thousand men a year. The program started last year. Subsequent to the Appropriation Act of 1947, there was no money available whatever to carry out the purposes of the new Naval ROTC program. They had to resort to a little over a million dollars that was carried over from the old Naval ROTC program to start it, at which time they had planned to take in about 3,100 boys. In order to finish this year they had to get funds from other sources. The only other source available was the Naval Reserve fund. They are now utilizing $17,900,000 of the Naval Reserve fund in order to carry out the program for 1947. The total cost of the Naval ROTC program this fiscal year 1947 is about $19,400,000.

The Navy Department put this request in the budget and I believe that the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations has honestly tried to arrive at a proper solution, but because of the involvement in figures and schedules and intake and output and so on, I believe the whole thing has been sort of muddled up.

My only reason for speaking today is to clarify the RECORD so that when this bill goes to the Senate the $3,000,000 that has been taken out of the so-called officer training fund for the training of these Naval ROTC boys will be put back into the appropriation. If we do not do that, there is only $12,000,000 left out of the $15,000,000 that was recommended, and that will be only sufficient to continue the boys who are now in college, and no boy, not one boy, will be taken into the Naval ROTC program next fall. Already nearly 3,000 boys have been selected and notified of their selection for this training program to start in the fall.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, my only purpose is to call this to the attention of the House and also to the attention of the members of the Committee on Appropriations so that when the bill goes to the Senate the $3,000,000 will be put back in the bill and these boys who have already been selected will be considered as part of the intake on that program for the Naval ROTC and so that it can be continued as originally intended.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I might call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that we have still to pass upon our organic national-defense legislation which has been pending before the Congress, namely, universal military training as well as other programs. Many of us hesitate to approach the point of universal military training unless it is absolutely essential and in the best interests of our country and unless it is absolutely imperative. I recognize that there are dangers to a democracy in having too large a military establishment. Many of us hesitate to go to that extent, but would unhesitatingly vote for a strong and powerful national-defense law short of that which might, however, include some features of it if necessary. An important part of the national-defense law is our Reserve activity, such as the ROTC; the same in the Army, our National Guard, our opportunities for those in civilian life going to officers' training school, both in the Army and in the Navy; our scientific schools—a strong national defense short of universal military training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. A strong national defense organic law, short of universal military training, seems to me would call for something being done as far as the Naval ROTC is concerned, along the lines to which the gentleman has referred. I join with the gentleman in the expression that the committee did the best it could under the circumstances and probably with the evidence before it. I hope that the additional evidence necessary to satisfy the Senate will be obtained between now and the time the committee holds hearings over there, and when the bill comes to conference the very able and pointed matter that the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred to will be taken care of.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wish to say I have already spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and also other members of the committee and they say very definitely that they are entirely in sympathy with the continuation of the Naval ROTC program. If they can be shown there is need for the money, they will give it their wholehearted support. My only purpose in taking the floor is so that this matter

may be called to the attention of the Senate and provision made for these 3,000 new boys who will be taken in this fall.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There have been several comments on the floor this afternoon criticizing the personnel of the Navy, some of which were rather caustic. I would like to know how any Member of this House, the Senate, or any other place in Government, can hold the Navy and the Army responsible with the kind of potential legislation that is pending around here to tear the military departments to pieces. It would seem to me they should be congratulated rather than criticized and I am getting tired of listening to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am sorry to hear in this discussion any criticism of our naval officers. I have been a member of the Naval Affairs Committee nearly 11 years, and I want to say that we are dealing with the highest type of men, who are ready and willing and on the alert at any time to give their lives, if necessary, as they have done down through the last 5 years, in order to safeguard the welfare of this country and the peace of the world. Certainly I do not countenance any criticism of our naval officers in respect to their activities and what they are doing in the interest of this country. I know them too well.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. While I am not satisfied with the selection of the men for the ROTC, it is a good proposition. There have been a number of boys selected from my district but in my own city of Lowell, Mass., which gave more men after Pearl Harbor up to August 1 than any other city of comparable size, although a very fine young man passed at Lowell, he was not selected. I think that was true also of Lawrence. I think the selection is bad, but the idea is splendid.

I want to ask the gentleman if this is not true: That today the Navy Department is more or less gagged? It does not fight for itself today as it should?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, I believe that is true. I find it on every appropriation matter coming up here, or any other matter dealing with the Navy, that their voice is stilled by higher authorities, which does not permit them to express their own convictions before committees of this House. I say we have reached a sad situation when we cannot have our representatives in the Navy and the Army come before the Congress of the United States and express themselves as they would like to be understood, only because a gag has been placed upon them. The reason we have instituted this so-called ROTC program is because we did not see fit to expand the Naval Academy to the dimensions necessary in order to train 3,000 more officers. Instead of that we have selected something like 60 different universities throughout the country for the program in order to train 14,000 officers which are so essential to the Navy as we face an uncertain future. It is only because we did not expand the Naval Academy that we have to resort to the so-called NROTC program to train the boys to meet the conditions we are bound to face in the modern world with all the scientific methods now being used in world-wide warfare.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations of the House will call to the attention of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate the fact that this deficiency denies any of these funds and practically puts a stop entirely to the induction of approximately 2,700 young men into the naval ROTC program for 1948.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I am extremely interested in the reserve components of both the Army and the Navy. I appreciate the splendid job that has been done by this committee. I know, and the committee knows, that the efficiency of an army or a navy is not necessarily in direct proportion to the amount of money you appropriate to it. In fact, if you appropriate enough to pay three men to do a job which reasonably requires only one, you break down that efficiency and the morale. But in view of the developments that have taken place since the beginning of the hearings on this bill, I would like to ask the members of the committee whether they have considered the question of the set-up of our Navy and our Army—Navy in this instance—with relation to events that have taken place beginning with and since the speech of the President on March 12, with its tremendous implications, the passage in this House and in the Senate of H. R. 2616 known as the Greek-Turkish aid bill, with its authorization of an appropriation of $400,000,000, which will be largely used for military purposes, as announced, and the undenied reports that more appropriations will be asked for other foreign governments, all alleged to be for the purpose of stopping communism, together with the future implications of the so-called Truman doctrine throughout the world, particularly since we are told in the press that Great Britain is now asking us to take over the defenses of the Suez Canal. Have the members of the committee taken those things into consideration in the laying down of our policy so far as the Navy is concerned? I am seriously concerned about it, seriously concerned. My training has taught me that a nation's military and naval policy must depend upon its foreign policy, because it is the military and naval force that is used to carry out that foreign policy.

We would better, it seems to me, first determine how far we are going in this foreign policy, if it can be called a foreign policy, and then determine what we need in the way of an army and a navy to support it. Suppose communism does not want to be stopped. Then, if it does not, and we are going to stop it, the first sensible question which arises is, What with?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in carrying out the unrestrained and limitless Truman doctrine we will not just make appropriations to involve us in difficulties from which it will require more and more appropriations for our Army and Navy to extricate ourselves.

I want to sound the warning that if we keep on as we have started we will again be caught unprepared, because we are waiting to find out where an unlimited foreign policy will take us before we figure out and supply the means to carry it out. I know of no nation in history which followed any such foreign policy with success. The sensible way is to first settle upon our reasonably attainable objectives and then prepare to supply the means to attain them before we plunge after them.

In any event I should like to see the appropriation for the naval reserve training program restored, so that the functions of the program may be carried out, inasmuch as examinations have to be held and preliminary work has to be done before these boys enter the colleges in the fall of the year. I do hope that this may be taken up in the Senate and that the conference report will contain proper provisions to carry out that program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the committee has carefully considered the various items in this appropriation bill, but I am fearful that the passage of this bill in its present form may seriously impair the effectiveness of our Navy.

It has been said on this floor today that the recommended cut in appropriations for Navy personnel will cause a reduction in strength to a total of 355,000 men. This is 70,000 below the figure which we have been considering as a reasonably safe minimum. If we do not provide the funds for the pay and subsistence of enlisted men and officers, the Navy must naturally curtail its personnel. In addition to curtailment in funds for personnel, the bill contains drastic reductions for the maintenance of our ships. I am tremendously disturbed about this.

In these turbulent times when we cannot foresee the outcome of international negotiations—when we cannot tell whether the peace will be maintained or how soon we may have another war—in times such as these we cannot afford to take risks with our national defense establishments. I am convinced that a strong Navy and a strong Army are our best insurance against war—at least until such time as an international organization capable of preserving peace is finally established.

I am thoroughly in accord with efforts to accomplish governmental economy, and frankly I believe economies can and should be made in the Navy Department. There are many evidences of steps which the Navy Department is taking to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful practices. In times like these, while we need to reduce expenditures, we can ill afford to take the chances involved by the drastic reductions proposed in this bill.

Until world conditions become more settled, we should not let our quest for

economy blind us to the utter necessity for maintaining adequate defense. It is easily possible that the spending of a few dollars now for maintaining our ships and properly manning them might discourage any would-be aggressor and save us from another war with its attendant cost in human life and suffering, as well as in money.

The fighting forces of our Nation are today the best assurance of peace. Let us not gamble with our Nation's security. There is need for greater efficiency but let us be sure that in promoting efficiency we shall not relinquish mastery of the seas or jeopardize our ability to cope with any potential enemies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Naval Records and Library, $50,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 25, line 19, after the comma, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$92,000."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase the appropriation of $50,000, approved by the committee, to the sum of $92,000, or an increase of $42,000. It concerns the Office of Naval Records and Library of the Navy Department. Those of us who had the good privilege of serving in the Navy know the value of records. Every single operation that took place in this last war can be found among the records of the Navy Department, if they are properly filed.

It is the duty of the Office of Naval Records and Library to not only file these records but keep them and make them available to those who plan the Navy of the future. The Navy Department at the moment is involved in a study of a revision of ships to meet the new age of warfare; and to make that study complete, the records of World War II will have to be made available. It is common knowledge that the Office of Naval Records and Library has a backlog that will require months and months of effort to prepare the records of World War II and properly file them. The item of $50,000 approved by the committee will provide the Office of Naval Records and Library with 20 persons, a number inadequate to do the job. My amendment, which increases the amount to $92,000, will provide 32 persons, the number necessary to do the job properly.

Mr. Chairman, we should maintain an adequate Navy to protect the interests of our Government and its people. I believe that economy is necessary at all times in maintaining that type of a navy. I further believe that we should not practice economy in a department of the Navy where the records are assembled and kept ready for the use of those who look into the future and plan the type of navy necessary to protect the security of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore ask the approval of my amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the subcommittee had no intention of injuring the work or crippling the activities of this small department of the Navy; however, it should be called to the attention of the committee in opposing this amendment that the gentleman offers to give the Navy for this small department of Records and Library $92,000, while all they asked for was $65,000. I must confess that I have never seen the Navy timid when it comes to asking for money for any of its departments. Last year they had $57,000, and the current cost of running that little department amounts to about $4,000 a month, or $48,000 a year. We have given them $2,000 more than that. Further, may I say that if they do get into any cramped period there is always additional Navy personnel that can be brought in for a short time to help them over the hump.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] made mention of gags applied to certain officers of the Navy. It is possible that the officer concerned may have been gagged; however, they do talk to their friends at times.

Mr. PLOESER. I know, and I will admit that there are probably times when they have been gagged. Certainly, in the discussion of this great question of unification of the armed forces there was an obvious gag put on the Navy, in my opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this bill has been discussed on a very fine, high plane, and I have been amazed and very sorry to see the even and smooth operation of it through the House disturbed by the injection of what might be considered to be partisan politics. I might say for the gentleman's benefit that the other day when Admiral Nimitz was before the Committee on Expenditures, which I have the honor to be a member of, under a great chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]——

Mr. PLOESER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the intimation was made. I asked Admiral Nimitz if there was anybody that censored him. And he said, "No," there has been no censuring, so let us forget the gag and go ahead on the high level we have been proceeding on.

Mr. PLOESER. I merely acknowledge from what I have observed from experience, I did not know the Navy ever entered into partisan politics, nor did I know that the administration's advocacy of unification of the services was put on a partisan basis. That was the first time I learned that. But, I must assume that the whip of the minority knows what he is talking about and if it is on a partisan basis I presume we should approach it from a different angle.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman misinterprets my statement.

Mr. PLOESER. I said nothing about partisanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. My reference to partisanship was in reference to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in picking up and quoting the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] so that the gentleman had a lapse of memory for a few minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, the gentleman recognizes the fact that neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor I mentioned partisanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman used the word "gag."

Mr. PLOESER. Does "gag" mean "partisanship?" We do not consider it in our operations on this side of the aisle.

Mr. McCORMACK. Ah, the gentleman is very naive.

Mr. PLOESER. It is a word coined by the minority party, I presume, because we do not consider the term "gag" a part of our operation.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we get into that, what about fear?

Mr. PLOESER. Fear, as the gentleman plainly see, we never have.

Mr. McGREGOR. Who?

Mr. PLOESER. The majority.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the minority.

Mr. PLOESER. No. I would say the minority frequently gives me the impression that they are operating from fear.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that a memorandum went to the heads of all departments of Government, signed by the President of the United States, directing that no one would dare take opposition or disagree with the budget proposals of the Administration. I am referring to the following memorandum:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 15, 1946.

Memorandum for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have noticed that on several occasions certain department and agency officials have shown a tendency to seek from Congress larger appropriations than were contemplated in official budget estimates.

The estimates which I transmit to Congress reflect a balanced program for the executive branch as a whole, and each individual estimate is considered in the light of this program, its relationship to other estimates, and the fiscal position of the Government. While agency witnesses before congressional committees must feel free to supply facts in answer to questions of committee members, I cannot condone the practice of seizing upon any opportunity which presents itself to indicate an opinion, either directly or indirectly, that my estimates are insufficient.

When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. PLOESER. I must honestly answer the gentleman that I have been told that on numerous occasions. Such a letter of instruction defeats honest budgeting.

Now, let me say that the subcommittee has to oppose this amendment, because we think we have made an adequate allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Maritime Commission has about 250 war-built tankers still remaining in its possession which are unsold. At the present time the Maritime Commission is seeking legislation for the chartering of tankers. Since the end of hostilities, the Navy has turned back as surplus to the Maritime Commission 46 tankers, saying the Navy does not need tankers; that they are surplus; 16 of which have been turned back since the 30th day of June, 1946. There are 250 tankers now in control of the Maritime Commission which it is unable to sell, and the American-flag operators say that they own and have purchased all they need for domestic operation.

The Navy has appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine urging that new legislation be enacted to give the Maritime Commission authority to charter these 250 unsold tankers, including the 46 the Navy turned back saying that it did not need them. The Navy says it has secured from the Appropriations Committee, the sum of $17,300,000 so that it might charter the very tankers it turned back as not needed. There is no explanation in the hearings with reference to the fact that the Navy turned back 46 tankers. The Navy did not tell the Appropriations Committee, "We want $17,300,000 to charter the very tankers we turned back."

The Navy in a statement before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on Thursday, May 15, stated that it needs 20 tankers to be chartered for the fiscal year 1948, and that it secured $17,300,000 in this appropriation bill for such chartering of tankers. I do not think that appropriation was secured fairly. There is no such explanation in the hearings. From the hearing on Thursday last before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries it first became known that the Navy is urging this legislation so that it might spend $17,300,000 to charter the very tankers the Navy turned over to the Maritime Commission as surplus. I believe this sum of $17,300,000 should be taken away from the Navy. The Navy should not be given $17,300,000 to charter the very tankers it turned back as surplus, for at the very time and even now it can secure at no cost, the 250 tankers in the possession of the Maritime Commission and unsold. All the Navy has to do is operate them. They do not have to pay $17,300,000 to secure these 250 surplus tankers. However, this was covered up in the hearings by the Navy and I believe it should be taken up in conference, and that $17,300,000 should be taken out of the appropriation of $55,000,000 set forth on page 15, line 23, of the bill and described on pages 1225, 1226, and 1227 of the hearings under H. R. 3493.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rose and asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of correcting a statement he made, that the Navy had not stated this to the subcommittee, because it did. Every member that is on this subcommittee can verify that statement.

Mr. WEICHEL. Did the Navy in asking for the $17,300,000 to charter tankers, tell the committee that the Navy had no use for 46 tankers that it turned over to the Maritime Commission as surplus within the last 15 months, and that the Navy now will need to charter 24 tankers. If the Navy told the committee all that, would you still give the Navy $17,300,000 to charter the very same tankers that it gave up to the Maritime Commission as surplus, while at the same time the Navy can secure all the tankers it needs without cost from the Maritime Commission who has 250 unsold tankers on hand.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to answer the gentleman from Ohio, to tell him that this matter of chartering tankers was discussed. My recollection is that they did not say anything about having turned back to any agency any number of tankers, but I went into it thoroughly to determine why, with the number of men they have in the Navy, the Navy could not operate these tankers. We were told that they do operate some tankers themselves but that the $17,000,000 which they sought for charter hire was a figure less than that for which they could operate tankers for themselves. I discussed that particular question and we were informed that due to the method under which the Navy operates their tankers it takes a much larger crew than it does in the civil lines, whether it be the merchant marine or private tanker, and that it is cheaper for them to charter tankers to haul oil and fuel than it is to operate them with Navy crews.

They did point out that during the war they operated tankers, fleet fuelers, and all of that, and that in view of the situation along the coast where there was no regularly maintained chartered tanker line they made short hauls themselves. We asked them whether or not there could be some training value for the personnel of the Navy in operating tankers. We were assured there could not be and that the method which they were seeking to follow resulted in the saving of dollars for the American taxpayer.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. In testimony by the Navy they admitted that in securing these tankers without cost from the Maritime Commission if they did not have to pay for the replacements it would be cheaper. We have 250 tankers that we have no purchasers for. So if the Navy has them and operates them and does not have to make replacements for them, it certainly would be cheaper. They did say that.

They also testified with reference to the crews. On a merchant tanker the crew is about 60 whereas the Navy uses 120 for the same operation. But they point out that with that 120-man crew they keep up the repairs and maintenance which they do not do on merchant tankers. They admit they are cheaper if they do not have to pay for the replacements.

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I say in view of some of the statements that have been made this morning you will find confirmation of the fact that I looked at many of these items with a very cold and fishy eye. Those who were present before the committee will tell you they had to prove what they said to me. In this one particular instance they convined me that they were right and that it was more feasible to charter these tankers, as they propose doing, than it was to operate them by Navy personnel.

If the gentleman has some information which is contrary to that, the facts should be given to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and then possibly that can be cleared up in the hearings in the Senate and if necessary worked out in conference.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I corroborate the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas who conducted the larger part of the examination of witnesses with respect to the matter under discussion. His memory corresponds to mine, and I know with that of other members of the committee who are around me.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the hour, and in view of the fact that there is only one other amendment on the Clerk's desk, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee several questions?

First, I would like to know whether or not he has given the Navy every dollar they could justify.

Mr. PLUMLEY. And a little more.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And is the chairman of the subcommittee satisfied that the amount of money allocated to the Navy will give to the American people the type of navy necessary to protect their interests?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Were it not so, your subcommittee would not have brought in the bill it did.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts in regard to the inadequacy of the Naval Academy and the shortage of commissioned personnel at the commencement of this war. As

many of you know, I graduated from the Naval Academy some 40 years ago. This spring we will have our fortieth reunion. We observe it at Annapolis next Saturday. So what I say about the Naval Academy I can say with good grace.

The Naval Academy is a fine school. It is one of the best. It does not need to take a back seat when compared to any other organization. Its graduates, I think, have been a credit to us throughout the world. However, there is nothing sacred about the Naval Academy. I have always believed there should be other ways of getting into the commissioned ranks than having to go through the Naval Academy and without having to get an appointment from a Senator or a Congressman. I believe the Navy would be better off if it took in, with reasonable safeguards, a reasonable number of graduates of colleges in the United States. I think that the proposed system, the system we are trying to build up, by which a certain number of ROTC graduates from accredited colleges are to be given commissions in the Navy, and then in a few years to go to a postgraduate school together with the regular graduates of the Naval Academy, will be for the best interests of the Nation.

We are trying to establish such a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., as you know. I have every hope that, rather than attempting to expand the facilities at the Naval Academy, at Annapolis, which I consider already very much congested, this House will support the efforts of the Navy Department to establish an adequate postgraduate school in California. We can thereby increase the number of our naval officers, have them all of the same kind, and, I hope, have them all representative Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 28, line 11, after the semicolon and following the word "employee" add the following: "No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this matter up with the committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Unless there is objection on the part of the minority, as far as our side is concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The minority accepts the ruling of the chairman of the committee most humbly and most acceptably.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That will save us a speech from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MacKINNON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in one to include an editorial.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert therein an article from the Lowell Sun bearing on the question of unification.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

LABOR-RELATIONS BILL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the labor bill recently passed by the other body, though not ideal, is a more equitable bill than the one passed by the House. Unlike the House bill, it does not authorize private employers to obtain injunctions, and it leaves the difficult and delicate problem of industry-wide bargaining for further study. Furthermore, it safeguards but does not prohibit employer contributions to union welfare funds.

It is my hope that the House conferees will see fit to accept the substance of the Senate bill. In my opinion, such a bill has a far better chance of becoming law. In the interests both of the workers and the general public it is important that some legislation on this vital problem should become law during this session.

S. 814 IMPERILS THE WHOLE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this irresponsible piece of legislation must be defeated.

Coming at a time when prices have nearly reached the breaking point, this inflationary measure may well touch off the collapse in one industry which, spreading like a contagion to others, may plunge us into a swift deflation and a ruinous depression.

Already the demand for worsted goods is beginning to ease up. The artificial jacking up of prices embodied in this bill, could not come at a worse time for the industry. The provision to increase import duties on wool up to 50 percent ad valorem without notice or hearing, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, would totally disrupt the cost estimates of manufacturers. The inevitable result would be the cutting of production to a minimum, when the cry is for more and more production. This bill would put the textile industry out on a limb. The only protection for the manufacturers would be curtailment of all activities, causing loss of income and widespread unemployment.

In the New England States, textiles provide 4 out of every 10 jobs. In my home city of Lawrence, the largest producer of worsteds in the world, the industry provides 7 out of every 10 jobs. We are in no mood to stand idly by and permit the basic element in our economy to be destroyed by the wool-raiding lobby. If the woolen and worsted industries curtail production, as they certainly will if faced with this confiscatory tariff, the wool-growers of the United States will also lose.

The extremes to which S. 814 goes, has all the earmarks of a conspiracy to profit a few, at a disastrous cost to many.

At first glance, the extra preferences granted to the wool farmers may appear attractive to them. I give them sober warning, however, that this bill will prove to be a boomerang. If you paralyze the textile industry, you will be cutting off the market for your wool. And you cannot expect the Government to go on buying your product at a highly inflated

level, when it can only dispose of it at a loss. These are totalitarian methods. They will not work and they will not be endured.

Let us face the facts honestly.

Our domestic wool crop was never able to supply more than half of the raw material needs of our manufacturers. In addition, it could not provide the long-fiber raw wool necessary for quality worsteds. Shall the manufacturers and the consumers of the Nation be penalized for this? That, precisely, will be the net result if S. 814 should be approved by this House. In essence it says: "Take my limited product at prices held high above real market value or take none at all." In effect, it is monopolistic and dangerous.

Wool needs some support. Every fair-minded person will agree with this. But when the growers seek preferences far above the bulk of all other agricultural items, their case loses ground. Ninety percent of parity is good enough insurance for any commodity. Parity is a Government index of farm-operation costs, similar to the cost-of-living index. But wool wants to be the prodigal son, getting a guaranty of 100 percent. Furthermore, they want this guaranty to hold through 1947–48, when prices in a free market are bound to come down. S. 814 would fix the price of wool for 2 years at over 100 percent of today's high parity, and could be 130 percent or more should parity drop to wartime levels, which is inevitable.

The workers in the textile industry are feeling the high cost of living because their wages have not kept pace with costs. They know that the prices of agricultural commodities, as a group, have gone higher than any others. Why wool should be seeking a support price still higher than it has enjoyed, is beyond their common-sense understanding. They are unanimously opposed to S. 814.

The Government is already stuck with a 400,000,000-pound wool surplus which it cannot get rid of. On this program, to date, it has lost over $38,000,000. It seems very strange to me that Members of the so-called economy party in Congress should be working to have the Government drop another $100,000,000 through indirect subsidies to wool farmers by outright Government purchase of the 1947 and 1948 wool production in the United States, and at the highest prices over a 27-year period. It is also a striking contradiction of their oft-expressed determination to get the Government out of business. For S. 814 means the nationalization of the raw-wool industry.

The House Agricultural Committee has inserted in the bill a provision directing the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he finds cause, to impose an import fee above the present duty, after the duty has been paid, and also allows him to impose a floor tax at the time of withdrawal of wool from bonded warehouses. The temptation to do this stems from the fact that the Government already has a huge wool surplus. The textile industry needs long-fiber imported wool. Putting on the new import fee would drive import-wool prices up and would add a dollar to the price of 75,000,000 wool garments bought annually by Americans.

The effect on manufacturers would be disastrous. In the woolen-worsted industry, prices and orders are taken twice a year—in the spring and in the fall. If, after making a sale at a stated price, the manufacturer is confronted with the fact of additional import fees and floor taxes imposed suddenly by the Secretary of Agriculture, he will be forced into bankruptcy. In this capricious set-up, free enterprise would be choked to death.

The critical need of our Nation is for more production, so that supply may catch up with demand and result in a gradual reduction in prices. The remedy for the danger which exists is not to price an industry out of business.

We, from the manufacturing areas, recognize that the domestic growers of wool are entitled to some price support. In a spirit of cooperation, we ask that they, in turn, consider our problem.

The woolen and worsted industry cannot survive the drastic penalties imposed by S. 814.

Wool growers, manufacturers, textile workers, and consumers are partners in an enterprise. They must not become antagonists because all of them will suffer.

In place of the extreme provisions of S. 814, we suggest that you join with us in supporting the moderate Herter bill, which gives due consideration to all factors in the problem. This will give Government support at 90 percent of parity to the wool growers, in line with other agricultural commodities. It will take the Government out of the wool business, where its record has been a costly failure. It will restore private incentive to the industry and protect tens of thousands of people from losing their jobs. It will bank and not fan the fires of inflation.

The wool growers already enjoy a generous tariff protection. The wool farmers are prosperous, and in this respect let it be noticed that 90 percent of the domestic wool supply is processed in the manufacturing plants in the Northeastern States and about three-quarters of the lamb crop is consumed in this area. It is hardly the best policy for the wool growers to bite the hand that feeds them.

Nor would it be wisdom on our part to fight against price support for wool.

The only reasonable course for all of us to follow is to enact legislation similar to the Herter bill, which is fair to all parties concerned.

S. 814 as amended by the Rules Committee of the House is discriminatory and inflationary. In the national interest, it must be defeated.

BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
May 16, 1947.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As representing most of the wool merchants of the country, including the National Wool Trade Association and the Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, I ask you very earnestly to give your attention to the enclosed brief which covers S. 814, the wool bill which is about to reach the floor of the House.

It happens that three-fourths of all the woolen and worsted mills are within a 300-mile radius of Boston—hence this is the center of distribution of the raw wool of the country.

For generations, our merchants have been performing their function of going West each spring and summer, buying wool from the growers competitively, bringing it East for storage, grading, and preparing according to the needs of each manufacturer, and selling it gradually as the mills may want it for their various yarns and fabrics. This bill S. 814 would have the Government take over our business.

For war reasons, in 1943 it was necessary for the Government to purchase all domestic wool, but we expected our business to be returned at the cessation of hostilities. Bill S. 814 sponsored by Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming and Representative HOPE of Kansas provides for the continuance of Government purchases for at least two more years. Normally the handling of domestic wool comprises three-fourths of our business, and we have a right to expect the Government to permit a return to free enterprise.

The wool business is intricate and a technical one, but we have tried to summarize our case very briefly as per enclosure. Should you desire more detailed facts and figures, we will be pleased to forward them at once. Having no organized lobby working in our behalf, this is the only way of bringing our case to the Members of your legislative body.

Thanking you for your consideration, and asking for your assistance in this matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

HARRY A. TILTON,
President, Boston Wool Trade Association.

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE WOOL MERCHANTS, IN OPPOSITION TO ENACTMENT OF S. 814

A. S. 814 is a denial of free enterprise to the wool distribution industry:

1. S. 814 compels Government purchase or loan on United States wool at 42.3 cents a pound (by agreed definition of 1946 support level).

2. The market price of United States wool is not over 38 cents (fact not disputed by any party).

3. By paying above the market price the Government excludes all competitive merchants from their livelihood, and nationalizes the industry.

B. S. 814 is very costly to the United States Treasury:

1. S. 814 authorizes the Government to sell the wool at market value.

2. At the present market value, which is the highest of any peacetime year since 1923, the loss under S. 814 on selling the 1947–48 wool figures to be at least $30,000,000, plus minimum costs for storage, handling, administration, etc., of $10,000,000—or $40,000,000 certain loss to the taxpayers.

3. Should market value decline 20 percent the loss under S. 814 would be sixty million additional or one hundred million total.

4. The above is in addition to losses of thirty-seven million realized loss and fifty-five million anticipated by CCC to be lost on its wool operations to date.

C. S. 814 provides an indirect subsidy to sheep farmers that is totally unnecessary:

1. Sheep farmers produce annually more than 6 pounds of meat (mostly lamb) to every single pound of wool. Wool is incidental to the sheep operation.

2. Lamb prices today are 250 percent of prewar normal (1921–40). Today 20 cents against normal 8 cents. Wool prices are 140 percent of prewar normal. Today 38 cents against normal 27 cents. (Figures from United States Department of Agriculture).

3. Thus the over-all income of the sheep farmer is by official figures shown to be over 230 percent of normal (6 times 250 percent plus 1 times 140 percent averaged equal 230 percent). This is one of the highest increases of income of any class of citizens of our country. The sheep operation certainly

does not now require subsidization from the United States Treasury.

4. If United States sheep population has declined, as it has since 1942, it is because the operators have been influenced by these high prices to sell their "seed-corn," i. e., their ewe lambs, and by intent have reduced their flocks. A similar thing happened from 1926 to 1931, when production rose 50 percent while prices declined 50 percent. It is normal in the sheep industry for production to rise when prices fall and for production to decline when prices rise.

5. Not a single individual case of farmer financial hardship was disclosed at the hearings on this bill.

Summary: S. 814 is not good legislation.

It does not get the Government out of business.

It increases taxes.

It subsidizes a segment of our economy that is in fact very prosperous.

It liquidates a class of skilled free-enterprise wool merchants and substitutes a Government bureaucracy in their place.

ADDENDA

Because S. 814 is not sound legislation it should not pass as written. This is not to say, however, that no wool legislation is in order.

Corn, wheat, tobacco, potatoes, hogs, and in fact, most agricultural products have been favored by a Government guaranty of a floor price during 1947–48 of 90 percent of parity. Wool has no such guaranty. We think that wool is equally entitled to such a guaranty and understand that Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER will submit substitute legislation to this end. Ninety percent of parity is probably the limit within which private enterprise can function without the Government having to operate the market (as has happened recently to potatoes) and suffer tremendous losses.

Also there is an enabling law needed for the disposal of the Government war surplus of wool which cannot now legally be sold under 100 percent of parity. This is also covered in the Herter legislation, to enable selling the surplus at market.

These two points are all the legislation needed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, for the purpose of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

698. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case of 191 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3308. A bill to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3516. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1260. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; with an amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1274. A bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2947. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; with an amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3151. A bill to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; with an amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3348. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella Division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3350. A bill relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 325. A bill to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1893. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3527. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3528. A bill to increase the rates of certain educational and readjustment allowances payable to veterans in order to compensate for the higher cost of living in Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3529. A bill prohibiting members of certain subversive organizations from being members of any labor organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3530. A bill to provide percentage depletion in the case of beryl, feldspar, mica, lepidolite, spodumene, bentonite, and amblygonite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3531. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit State and Territorial labor relations boards to exercise jurisdiction in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3532. A bill to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to powers of appointment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 3534. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in southwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 3535. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a housing project at Kingsville, Tex., known as Retama Park, to the housing authority of the city of Kingsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3536. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for law-enforcement officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who have rendered at least 20 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3537. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 3538. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3539. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3540. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical care and treatment of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service furnished other than by activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3541. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3542. A bill relating to eligibility for interment in Veterans' Administration cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3543. A bill to permit personnel of tugboats on the Great Lakes to work over 8 hours in 1 day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3544. A bill to provide for payment by the United States of premiums on bonds given to the United States by persons employed in the field or departmental service of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3545. A bill to amend title 11 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL (by request):

H. R. 3546. A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain ex-service organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3547. A bill to authorize funds for ceremonies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3548. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public-health program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for a continuation of the school-lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide by an amendment to any merger bill, making such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve our country; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Louise Benedict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Carl O. Young, Clifford L. Godfrey, and R. A. Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3552. A bill granting to Frank S. Howell certain pay and allowances for his travel from the Philippine Islands to the United States following his discharge from the Army in such islands in 1900; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3553. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

534. By Mr. BRADLEY of California: Petition of Rev. Rollo E. Dunham and 94 other citizens of Long Beach, Calif., and vicinity, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

535. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legislative session that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the commission of Christian relations, diocese of New York, urging adoption of the plan to admit up to 400,000 displaced persons by reopening unused immigration quotas back to 1940 and allowing quotas to be transferable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. Also, petition of the commission on Christian social relations, diocese of New York, urging Congress to enact legislation to bring within the coverage of the Federal laws providing for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, lay employees of religious organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

538. Also, petition of the commission on Christian social relations, diocese of New York, urging enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

539. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition submitted by the West Towns (Ill.) Chapter, No. 22, of the Disabled American Veterans, petitioning the Congress to revise the present statutes to provide additional pension benefits for veterans suffering from service-connected tuberculosis (resolution submitted by George Walker, commander of DAV Post No. 22); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

540. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legislative session, urging that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

541. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition by a group of residents of Brodhead, Wis., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

542. Also, resolution adopted by Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Kenosha, Wis., in support of S. 715, which provides annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

543. Also, resolution by Kenosha district, Zionist Organization of America, Kenosha, Wis., calling upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative in the General Assembly of the United Nations to champion the cause of the Jews in Palestine, and insist that the Jewish people through the Jewish agency be accorded representation in all deliberations within the United Nations regarding Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

544. Also, resolution adopted by Local No. 557, Kenosha Teachers Union, Kenosha, Wis., calling upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative in the General Assembly of the United Nations to champion the cause of the Jews in Palestine, and insist that the Jewish people through the Jewish agency be accorded representation in all deliberations within the United Nations regarding Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

545. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Ann's Holy Name Society of Indiana, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly, within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

546. Also, petition of Knebba County of Foresters, No. 1677, of St. Luke's parish, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

547. Also, petition of Augustin-Ewing Post, No. 2095, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Baton Rouge, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment into law of H. R. 501; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

548. Also, petition of Delta Council, of Stoneville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to protect the laborer, employer, and public against unwarranted encroachment upon their rights and personal liberties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.